



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 8 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-5

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
OGLETHORPE ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA
CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-366

Introduction

By letter dated May 22, 1979, Georgia Power Company (the licensee) proposed changes to the Technical Specifications appended to Operating License No. NPF-5 for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Unit No. 2. The proposed changes would revise certain action statements applicable to the Reactor Protection System (RPS) and Isolation Actuation Instrumentation; and revise Bases for Applicability to insure proper actions by the licensee in the event of operation with inoperable instrumentation channels. The application was submitted in direct response to the Commission's request.

Background

A recent review of the staff's, "Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Boiling Water Reactors" disclosed that certain action statements required revision to provide for proper action by licensees. For example, the specified action to be taken when the minimum number of operable RPS Intermediate range monitor (IRM) channels is not satisfied, provided two options: (1) place the inoperable channel in the tripped condition within one hour or (2) be in at least HOT SHUTDOWN within 12 hours. It was not the intent of the staff to permit selection of option (2) for inoperable IRM channels since selection of this option would permit continued operation for up to 12 hours with one or both channels in a non-safe (untripped) condition. A similar deficiency was identified for other RPS instrumentation and for Engineered Safety Feature (ESF) isolation actuation instrumentation. Further, the staff

464 260
7907270 328

identified the need to revise the Bases for Applicability to guide licensees in the execution of required actions. As a result of the staff's review, the Standard Technical Specifications were revised to rectify these deficiencies and the licensees of each operating reactor whose Technical Specifications contained these deficiencies were requested to propose changes. The staff's request to Georgia Power Company was transmitted by letter NRC (Ippolito) to GPC (Whitmer) dated February 1, 1979. Attached to that letter were appropriate marked-up pages of the Hatch Unit No. 2 Technical Specifications which indicated the staff's recommended changes.

Evaluation

The licensee's application is totally responsive to the staff's request. Each proposed change is more restrictive than that currently in effect. During our review of the licensee's application we identified other revisions, editorial in nature, which would provide clarity for executing required actions. These were discussed with the licensee and he agreed.

In view of the above we conclude that the application as amended by the staff is acceptable based on the finding that all substantive changes are more restrictive than currently approved.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement, negative declaration, or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: July 3, 1979