

September 29, 1986

Dockets Nos. 50-321/366

Mr. J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Vice President, Nuclear Generation
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Dear Mr. Beckham:

We are reviewing your May 16, 1986 request to revise the Hatch Unit 1 and 2 Technical Specifications concerning the administration of the Safety Review Board and the Plant Review Board.

In order to complete this review, we need the additional information described in the enclosure. You are requested to provide a written response, submitting the requested information, within 60 days of receipt of this letter.

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.

Sincerely,

~~Added at request of~~

George Rivenbark, Project Manager
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File

NRC PDR
Local PDR
PD#2 Plant File
GRivenbark
UGC - Bethesda
EJordan
BGrimes
JPartlow
NThompson
SNorris
ACRS (10)

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DBL:PD#2	DBL:PD#2	DBL:PD#2
SNorris	GRivenbark:cb	DMiller
9/29/86	9/29/86	9/29/86

8610060537 860929
PDR ADOCK 05000321
P PDR

Mr. J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Georgia Power Company

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant,
Units Nos. 1 and 2

cc:

Bruce W. Chruchill, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. L. T. Gucwa
Engineering Department
Georgia Power Company
Post Office Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Mr. H. C. Nix, Jr., General Manager
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
Post Office Box 442
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. Louis B. Long
Southern Company Services, Inc.
Post Office Box 2625
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 1, Post Office Box 279
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
101 Marietta Street, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

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

Mr. J. Leonard Ledbetter, Commissioner
Department of Natural Resources
270 Washington Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
RELATING TO A PROPOSED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE
GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

By letter dated May 16, 1986, Georgia Power Company requested a revision to the Technical Specifications (TS) for Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 concerning the administration of the Safety Review Board (SRB) and the Plant Review Board (PRB). In order that the staff can complete the evaluation of this proposed change additional information is necessary. The information should be provided as a revision or supplement to the proposed TS change.

The exact intent of Section 6.5.1.2 of the TS, as proposed, is unclear to the staff. We have evaluated and agree with the need to improve the flexibility of the membership for the PRB; however, the wording of Section 6.5.1.2 should be clearly understandable and interpretable. In particular, we request that the following areas be clarified:

1. The staff agrees with the deletion of the requirement for the Plant Hatch General Manager and the Deputy General Manager to serve on the PRB. However, the Chairman and alternate Chairman of the PRB should be filled by individuals at the Superintendent or Manager level and the functional titles of the positions should be designated in the TS. The Chairman of the PRB should be at a sufficiently high level of management to deal effectively with PRB members who could be managers or supervisors.
2. We don't understand why it is necessary to add the words "or equally qualified individual" in Section 6.5.1.2 of the TS. As indicated in Enclosure 1 of the submittal, "Basis for Change Request," the intent is that only supervisory level personnel would serve as permanent PRB members.
3. We believe it was the intent of Section 6.5.1.2 that there should be a representative on the PRB from each of the departments listed in the TS. The revision should be clarified to denote this.