



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO.123 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

NO. DPR-57

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
OGLETHORPE POWER CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC AUTHORITY OF GEORGIA
CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-321

EVALUATION

By letter dated January 11, 1985, Georgia Power Company (GPC) requested that the Hatch Unit 1 Technical Specifications (TSs) be revised to delete the term "Cumulative Downtime" from the Definitions and Bases sections of the TSs. It also requested that Bases section 3.5.F.3 be renumbered as section 3.5.G.

The term "Cumulative Downtime" is not contained in the Hatch Unit 2 TSs. It is not applied in the body of the Hatch 1 TSs and only appears in the Bases to section 3.5.F.3. GPC does not apply this definition or use the concept of Cumulative Downtime as a safety criterion. The presence of this unused definition is a source of confusion to operators being trained and tested on their knowledge of the TSs. Therefore, we conclude that removal of the term Cumulative Downtime from the Definitions and Bases sections of the TSs is acceptable.

Bases section 3.5.F.3 provides the bases information related to TS section 3.5 and is therefore incorrectly numbered. Therefore we conclude that renumbering this Bases section as 3.5.G is correct and acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment involves deletion of unused terminology. We have determined that the amendment involves 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 amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendment meets

8603100663 860304
PDR ADOCK 05000321
P PDR

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 amendment.

CONCLUSION

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: March 4, 1986

Principal Contributors: G. Rivenbark, J. Moorman