

May 8, 2007

Mr. Dennis R. Madison  
Vice President - Hatch  
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant  
11028 Hatch Parkway North  
Baxley, GA 31513

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 (HNP) - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) REGARDING GENERIC LETTER 2006-03, "POTENTIALLY NONCONFORMING HEMYC AND MT FIRE BARRIER CONFIGURATIONS" (TAC NOS. MD1586 AND MD1587)

Dear Mr. Madison:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is reviewing your responses, dated June 9, and November 28, 2006, to Generic Letter 2006-03, "Potentially Nonconforming Hemyc and MT Fire Barrier Configurations," as they may apply to the HNP and find that additional information is needed as stated in the enclosure.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact me at 301-415-1493.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

Robert E. Martin, Sr. Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure: RAI

cc w/encl: See next page

May 8, 2007

Mr. Dennis R. Madison  
Vice President - Hatch  
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant  
11028 Hatch Parkway North  
Baxley, GA 31513

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 (HNP) - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING GENERIC LETTER 2006-03, "POTENTIALLY NONCONFORMING HEMYC AND MT FIRE BARRIER CONFIGURATIONS" (TAC NOS. MD1586, MD1587)

Dear Mr. Madison:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is reviewing your responses, dated June 9, and November 28, 2006, to Generic Letter 2006-03, "Potentially Nonconforming Hemyc and MT Fire Barrier Configurations," as they may apply to the HNP and find that additional information is needed as stated in the enclosure.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact me at 301-415-1493.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

Robert E. Martin, Sr. Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure: RAI

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Public	RidsAcrcsAcnwMailCenter
LPL2-1 R/F	RidsNrrDraAfpb (DFrumpkin)
RidsNrrDorL2-1 (EMarinos)	RidsRgn2MailCenter(SShaeffler)
RidsNrrDorIDpr	RidsNrrPMRMartin (hard copy)
RidsNrrLAMO'Brien (hard copy)	RidsOgcRp
RidsNrrAfpb (SWeerakkody)	

ADAMS No: ML071090024

OFFICE	NRR/LPL2-1/PM	NRR/LPL2-1/LA	AFPB/BC	NRR/LPL2-1/BC
NAME	RMartin:nc	MO'Brien	SWeerakkody	EMarinos
DATE	04/23/07	04/23/07	04/19/07	05/8/07

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
CONCERNING FIRE BARRIER CONFIGURATIONS  
FOR EDWIN I. HATCH PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

Please provide clarifying information regarding whether the following information, based on the letter from Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., dated November 28, 2006, for the Farley Nuclear Plant, also applies to the Edwin I. Hatch Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (HNP).

Item 1 - How was the Promat tested? Is the Promat testing, as described in the November 28, 2006, letter also applicable to HNP? That letter stated:

The Promat was tested and qualified to American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM) E119-88 by Performance Contracting Inc. under Omega Point Project No. 8806-90254 (Promat Report SR90-005). This testing included ASTM E119 time-temperature, full scale fire testing for the wall assembly and a small scale fire testing of the ceiling assembly. The test details are documented in Promat Report SR90-005.

If this information is not applicable to HNP, please provide the information in the Questions below.

Item 2 - What acceptance criteria were used? Were the same acceptance criteria as described in the November 28, 2006, letter, used? That letter stated:

The test acceptance criteria were that of ASTM E119-88 Section 16 "Conditions of Acceptance," which meets the acceptance criteria of GL 86-10, Supplement 1. The 325 degrees Fahrenheit temperature criterion was used, which assumes a maximum temperature rise of 250 degrees Fahrenheit above an ambient temperature of 75 degrees Fahrenheit.

If this information is not applicable to HNP, please provide the information in the Questions below.

Item 3 - How were installed configurations that were different from tested configurations evaluated? Were the field installations deviations evaluated similarly as described in the November 28, 2006, letter? That letter stated:

An analysis and acceptance for plant specific deviations from the tested configurations is included in Performance Contracting Inc. Fire Protection Technical Evaluation (FPTE) FPTE 2006-001, Revision 0. This evaluation received a documented review and approval by a qualified fire protection engineer within Southern Nuclear and found to be consistent with the GL 86-10, Section 3.2.2 criteria.

If this information is not applicable to HNP, please provide the information in the Questions below.

QUESTIONS, if November 28, 2006, responses do not apply to HNP

Enclosure

- 1) For HNP, the Promat H board is described as a fire barrier that separates redundant trains within the same fire area (for example, cable tray enclosures). The response states that Promat H board is tested in accordance with Underwriters Laboratory Standard 263, ASTM Standard E119, and National Fire Protection Association Standard 251. Use of these tests and standards identifies fire testing for building members and assemblies, but does not specifically address 1- and 3-hour fire barrier systems protecting electrical raceways.

If the Promat H boards were used in accordance with a listed fire rated assembly (such as a UL listed assembly), please provide that information.

The NRC staff's current guidance for raceway protection is contained in Generic Letter 86-10, Supplement 1, "Potentially Nonconforming Hemyc and MT Fire Barrier Configurations." The NRC staff is interested in whether the Promat H fire barriers (as installed in the plant) were tested and evaluated (for deviations from the testing) in accordance with the GL 86-10, Supplement 1, guidance. If not, the NRC staff is interested in the following:

- a) Is the support protection and penetrating item protection for the Promat H barriers in the plant representative of the protection provided during the testing?
- b) Does the testing encompass or bound the installed configurations?
- c) Is the plant cable loading (the thermal mass) of the installed configurations bounded by the tested configurations?

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2

cc:

Laurence Bergen  
Oglethorpe Power Corporation  
2100 E. Exchange Place  
P.O. Box 1349  
Tucker, GA 30085-1349

Mr. R. D. Baker  
Manager - Licensing  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1295  
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Resident Inspector  
Plant Hatch  
11030 Hatch Parkway N.  
Baxley, GA 31531

Harold Reheis, Director  
Department of Natural Resources  
205 Butler Street, SE., Suite 1252  
Atlanta, GA 30334

Steven M. Jackson  
Senior Engineer - Power Supply  
Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia  
1470 Riveredge Parkway, NW  
Atlanta, GA 30328-4684

Mr. Reece McAlister  
Executive Secretary  
Georgia Public Service Commission  
244 Washington St., SW  
Atlanta, GA 30334

Arthur H. Domby, Esq.  
Troutman Sanders  
Nations Bank Plaza  
600 Peachtree St, NE, Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216

Chairman  
Appling County Commissioners  
County Courthouse  
Baxley, GA 31513

Mr. Jeffrey T. Gasser  
Executive Vice President  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1295  
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

General Manager  
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
U.S. Highway 1 North  
P.O. Box 2010  
Baxley, GA 31515

Mr. K. Rosanski  
Resident Manager  
Oglethorpe Power Corporation  
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant  
P.O. Box 2010  
Baxley, GA 31515