December 14, 1990

Docket Nos: 50-321
50-366

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
Hatch Plant File
S. Varga
G. Lainas
PDII-3 R/F
R. Ingram
F. Rinaldi
F. Burrows
OGC (info only)
ACRS (10 copies)
E. Jordan
L. Reyes, RII
Hatch Plant File

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Senior Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Dear Mr. Hairston:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, EMERGENCY DIESEL GENERATOR TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE, EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TACS 75816 AND 75817)

By letter dated January 10, 1990, Georgia Power Company requested a number of changes to the Technical Specifications for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, related to the emergency diesel generators. Preliminary staff review of the requested changes has resulted in a number of questions, the answers to which are needed so that the staff may complete its review.

The additional information desired is indicated in the enclosure. It is requested that you respond to these questions within 30 days of receipt of this letter so that the review schedule may be maintained.

The reporting and/or recordkeeping requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than ten respondents; therefore, OMB clearance is not required under P.L. 96-511.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/S/

Frank Rinaldi, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
As stated

cc/w enclosure:
See next page

* See previous concurrence (attached).

OFC	LA:PDII-3	PM:PDII-3	D:PDII-3	BC:SELB/DST	PM:PDII-3
NAME	PIngram	FRinaldi	DMatthews	*FRosa	*KJabbour
DATE	12/13/90	12/13/90	12/13/90	11/29/90	12/12/90

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
Document Name: DIESEL TS CHANGE

170023

DF01

cc:
Mr. Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. J. T. Beckham
Vice President - Plant Hatch
Georgia Power Company
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. S. J. Bethay
Manager Licensing - Hatch
Georgia Power Company
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. L. Sumner
General Manager, Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
Route 1, Box 439
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 1, Box 725
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. Charles H. Badger
Office of Planning and Budget
Room 610
270 Washington Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Mr. J. Leonard Ledbetter, Director
Environmental Protection Division
Department of Natural Resources
205 Butler Street, S.E., Suite 1252
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. R. P. McDonald
Executive Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. Alan R. Herdt, Chief
Project Branch #3
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. Dan Smith
Program Director of
Power Production
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
100 Crescent Centre
Tucker, Georgia 30085

Charles A. Patrizia, Esq.
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
12th Floor
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
HATCH TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION
CHANGES FOR
EMERGENCY DIESEL GENERATORS

1. Proposed Change 2 modifies the 24-hour load test to load the emergency diesel generator (EDG) to 2950 kW for the first 2 hours. This is below the 2-hour rating of the EDG. Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.108 and Generic Letter (GL) 84-15 both recommend loading the EDG to its 2-hour rating (110%) for the first 2 hours. The current staff thinking, as reflected in the proposed Standard Technical Specifications, is to load the EDG to 105-110% of full load for the first 2 hours of this test. Explain why you expect that the Hatch EDGs would require more maintenance after a 2-hour run loaded with a load equivalent to 105-110% of full load rating when EDGs at other facilities do not require any additional maintenance after being tested in this manner.

2. Proposed Change 5 would allow a day tank to have less than 900 gallons of diesel fuel during transfer pump testing. What is the quantity of fuel remaining in the tank at the low level alarm setpoint? What is the minimum amount of fuel left in the tank during the test?

3. Proposed Change 6 modifies Unit 1 Specification 4.9.A.7.b.1 to be consistent with Unit 2 Specification 4.8.1.1.2.d.7. Please explain how the requirements for an EDG test per Unit 2 Specification 4.8.1.1.2.d.7 are incorporated into the Unit 1 Specification 4.9.A.7.b.1.

4. Unit 1 Specification 4.9.A.7.c.1 has been rewritten to place "in conjunction with an accident test signal" after "loss of offsite power" (LOSP) in lieu of after "a degraded voltage condition" with no justification. State where this proposed change is discussed or provide the necessary justification.

5. Proposed Change 6 deletes the operability and surveillance requirements for the 600-volt load shedding logic. State if the operability and surveillance of this logic is covered by another specification. If so, identify the pertinent specification. Otherwise, provide an explanation for not having a pertinent specification.

6. Proposed Change 6 adds a statement in the Bases that the EDGs can be operated in parallel under Specification 4.9.A.2.a.10. Explain why parallel operation is necessary and how it is accomplished.

7. Proposed Change 7 would allow an EDG to be inoperable for up to 1 hour without entering an LCO during the gradual startup of the EDG. Discuss why entering an LCO would present an administrative hardship for Hatch. If an LCO is not entered, state if the EDG inoperable time will be included in EDG reliability/availability data collection efforts.

8. Proposed Change 7 allows EDG 1B to be loaded to one unit's emergency bus for the first half of a test and then switched to the other unit's bus for the second half of a test. Explain how an EDG is switched from one bus to the other without paralleling the two buses. Also, address why staggering the test/loads as has been proposed for the starting circuitry used in the 6-month tests in Specification 4.9.A.2.a.2 would not be a better approach.

9. Proposed Change 4 would allow an EDG restart on an LOSP signal to be performed within 5 minutes of the completion of the 24-hour test as currently required for Unit 2 or within 5 minutes of shutting down the EDG after it has been operated for an hour or more at ≥1710 kW or it is at normal operating temperature. However, this proposed change is intended to avoid repeating the 24-hour test if the EDG fails to restart on the LOSP signal. Also, this change is in conflict with the current staff position that a restart of the EDG on an LOSP signal should be conducted within 5 minutes of completion of the 24-hour test. If the EDG fails this test, then a retest can be performed after the EDG has operated for 2 hours or more at 90-100% of its continuous rating. Address the above stated criteria.