

**Lewis Sumner**  
Vice President  
Hatch Project Support

**Southern Nuclear  
Operating Company, Inc.**  
40 Inverness Parkway  
Post Office Box 1295  
Birmingham, Alabama 35201  
  
Tel 205.992.7279  
Fax 205.992.0341



April 12, 2002

Docket Nos. 50-321  
50-366

HL-6230

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
ATTN: Document Control Desk  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant  
Response to Request for Additional Information  
Relative to  
Request to Revise Technical Specifications:  
18- to 24-Month Fuel Cycle Extension

Ladies and Gentlemen:

By letter dated September 20, 2001, Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) submitted to the NRC proposed Technical Specifications (TS) changes to support the implementation of a 24-month fuel cycle. By letter dated March 27, 2001, SNC provided responses to NRC Staff review requests related to SNC's September 20, 2001 submittal. As a result of SNC's March 27, 2002 response letter, additional questions were discussed with SNC's Staff via telephone with the NRC Staff. Enclosure 1 provides documentation of SNC's response to these questions.

Should you have any questions in this regard, please contact this office.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lewis Sumner".

H. L. Sumner, Jr.

TWL/eb

Enclosure: Response to Request for Additional Information

cc: (See next page.)

A001

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Page 2  
April 12, 2002

cc: Southern Nuclear Operating Company  
Mr. P. H. Wells, Nuclear Plant General Manager  
SNC Document Management (R-Type A02.001)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.  
Mr. L. N. Olshan, Project Manager - Hatch

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II  
Mr. L. A. Reyes, Regional Administrator  
Mr. J. T. Munday, Senior Resident Inspector - Hatch

## Enclosure

### Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Response to Request for Additional Information Technical Specifications 18- to 24-Month Fuel Cycle Extension

#### **NRC Request**

*Why are the existing Technical Specifications (TS) Surveillance Requirements (SR) 3.3.1.1.11 and 3.3.4.1.2 performed on different surveillance intervals? Unit 1 SR FREQUENCY is requested to be changed from 184 days to 24 months. Unit 2 SR FREQUENCY is requested to be changed from 18 months to 24 months. Are the component's functions different for the two units? .*

#### **SNC Response:**

In the September 20, 2001 submittal, SNC requested extending SRs 3.3.1.1.11 and 3.3.4.1.2 from their current interval to 24 month.

##### **RPS Instrumentation**

***SR 3.3.1.1.11 - "Verify Turbine Stop Valve - Closure and Turbine Control Valve Fast Closure, Trip Oil Pressure - Low Functions are not bypassed when THERMAL POWER IS  $\geq$  28% RTP."***

***Existing Unit 1 FREQUENCY - 184 days***

***Existing Unit 2 FREQUENCY - 18 months***

##### **EOC-RPT Instrumentation**

***SR 3.3.4.1.2 - "Verify TSV - Closure and TCV Fast Closure, Trip Oil Pressure - Low Functions are not bypassed when THERMAL POWER IS  $\geq$  28% RTP."***

***Existing Unit 1 FREQUENCY - 184 days***

***Existing Unit 2 FREQUENCY - 18 months***

The Turbine Stop Valve – Closure and the Turbine Control Valve Fast Closure, Trip Oil Pressure – Low Functions are the same for both units. Prior to the SNC's Standard Technical Specifications conversion, the TS were considerably different for the two units. Unit 1 TS originally contained the Trip Oil Pressure – Low Functions whereas the Unit 2 TS did not have this requirement. As part of the Standard Technical Specifications conversion, the SR was added to the Unit 2 TS as an additional requirement. For Unit 2, the SR was added and the SR FREQUENCY of 18 months was established consistent with BWR Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG 1433. Since the Unit 1 TS originally contained the SR with an SR FREQUENCY of 184 days, implementing procedures were previously established to perform the SR. Therefore, for Unit 1, SNC decided to persevere the more restrictive established SR FREQUENCY during the Standard TS conversion. Review of the instrumentation function and SR performance data indicate there are no technical reasons that would require such a difference.

As a result of the 18- to 24-Month Fuel Cycles Extension Project, efforts are made to provide more consistency between the two unit's TS.