



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 187 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-57
AND AMENDMENT NO. 126 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY, ET AL.

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated September 2, 1992, Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee), proposed license amendments to change the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes would correct the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) water level corresponding to the Top of Active Fuel (TAF) for both units. The correct value is 6 inches higher than the value shown in TS Figure 2.1-1 for Unit 1 and Figure B 3/4 3-1 for Unit 2.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee stated in its September 2, 1992, submittal that

[r]ecently, an error in Unit 1 figure 2.1-1 and Unit 2 figure B 3/4 3-1 TAF notation was discovered. The same incorrect value also appeared in the Unit 1 and Unit 2 FSARS, and plant procedures. The TAF level indicated on the referenced figures (i.e., 352.56 inches) is correct for GE 7x7 fuel design which had a fuel length of 144 inches. However, Plant Hatch no longer uses 7x7 fuel. Subsequent fuel 8x8 designs purchased in the mid-to-late 1980s have maximum active fuel lengths of 150 inches. The top 6 inches of fuel in the 8x8 and newer fuels are made of nonenriched uranium. The TAF value presently referenced in the TS, as well as plant procedures, is still based on 144-inch length fuel and, therefore, should be revised to reflect the actual dimension of later fuel designs.

The licensee also stated that the correct TAF value (358.56 inches) was used in the accident analysis. In addition, the initiating RPV level setpoints for the emergency core cooling systems (ECCSs) assumed in the analysis are much lower (as measured from the bottom of the reactor vessel which is designated as zero) than the actual plant setpoints. Therefore, the use of the incorrect TAF value (i.e., 352.56 inches) did not affect the setpoints for Levels 1, 2, and 3 (corresponding to low-low-low, low-low, and low levels, respectively) or any other aspects of a loss-of-coolant accident analyses.

The licensee has concluded that raising the TAF boundary by 6 inches does not affect or require a change to the accident analysis because the analysis had used the correct fuel length and TAF boundary, and does not involve any physical changes to the plant. Thus, the proposed change will merely bring the TS in agreement with the actual plant configuration.

Based on its review of the licensee's submittal, the NRC staff finds that these changes have no adverse impact on safety and do not pose an undue risk to public health and safety. Therefore, they are acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Georgia State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change a requirement with respect to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (58 FR 19480 dated April 14, 1993). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendments.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: J. Harold
E. Wang
K. Jabbour

Date: July 1, 1993