

Georgia Power Company
333 Piedmont Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Telephone 404 526-7020

Mailing Address:
Post Office Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Vice President and General Manager
Nuclear Generation



Georgia Power
the southern electric system

November 10, 1982

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

NRC DOCKET 50-366
OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 2
REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CORRECTION

Gentlemen:


In accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.90 Georgia Power Company (GPC) hereby proposes an amendment to the Edwin I. Hatch Unit 2 Technical Specifications (Appendix A to the Operating License). This change would correct an erroneous reference contained in Section 3.5.4.b.2.

Currently the Unit 2 Technical Specifications reference Section 3.9.8 as containing limits on refueling water level; in fact, this section actually regulates crane travel over the spent fuel pool. The correct reference would be to Section 3.9.10, "Water Level-Spent Fuel Pool," which this change would accomplish.

Application of these proposed Technical Specification changes would in no way constitute an unreviewed safety question as determined by the Plant Review Board and the Safety Review Board. The probability of occurrence and the consequences of an accident or malfunction of safety-related equipment would not be increased above those analyzed in the FSAR because this change would be purely administrative and would have no effect with regards to the plant safety analysis. The possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than analyzed in the FSAR would not result from this change because no new modes of either operation or failure would be created. The margin of safety as defined in Technical Specifications would not be reduced due to this change because this correction would be administrative only in nature, and would end the possibility of confusion arising from the present incorrect reference in Section 3.5.4.b.2.

A046
w/clerk: \$1200.00

8211190263 821110
PDR ADOCK 05000366
P PDR

Georgia Power 


Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
November 10, 1982
Page Two

Instructions for incorporation of these changes along with copies of affected Technical Specification pages are enclosed.


Included with this proposal is a determination of amendment class. We have determined this to be one Class II amendment, and have enclosed the appropriate payment.

J. T. Beckham, Jr. states that he is Vice President of Georgia Power Company and is authorized to execute this oath on behalf of Georgia Power Company, and that to the best of his knowledge and belief the facts set forth in this letter are true.

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY

By: 
J. T. Beckham, Jr.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 10th day of November, 1982



Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large
My Commission Expires Sept. 20, 1983
Notary Public

CBS/mb

Enclosures

xc: H. C. Nix
J. P. O'Reilly (NRC-Region II)
Senior Resident Inspector

ATTACHMENT 1

NRC DOCKET 50-366
OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 2
REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CORRECTION

The proposed changes to Technical Specifications (Appendix A to Operating License NPF-5) would be incorporated as follows:

Remove Page

3/4 5-9

Insert Page

3/4 5-9

ATTACHMENT 2

NRC DOCKET 50-366
OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 2
REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CORRECTION

Pursuant to 10 CFR 170.22, Georgia Power Company has evaluated the attached proposed amendment to Operating License NPF-5 and has determined that:

- a. The proposed amendment does not require evaluation of a new Safety Analysis Report and rewrite of the facility license;
- b. The proposed amendment does not require evaluation of several complex issues, involve ACRS review, or require an environmental impact statement;
- c. The proposed amendment does not involve a complex issue or more than one environmental or safety issue;
- d. The proposed amendment does not involve a single environmental or safety issue;
- e. The proposed amendment is administrative in nature, in that it corrects an erroneous reference to a Technical Specification section;
- f. The proposed amendment is therefore a Class II amendment.