

From: [Martin, Robert](#)
To: crpierce@southernco.com; [McElroy, G. Ken \(GKMCELRO@southernco.com\)](mailto:McElroy, G. Ken (GKMCELRO@southernco.com))
Cc: [Joyce, Ryan M. \(RMJOYCE@southernco.com\)](mailto:Joyce, Ryan M. (RMJOYCE@southernco.com))
Subject: Acceptance Review - Hatch Alternative HNP-ISI-ALT-5-01
Date: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 6:22:00 PM

By letter dated July 16, 2015 (Agency-wide Documents and Access Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. [ML15197A174](#)), Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC) proposed an alternative (HNP-ISI-ALT-5-01) to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2), 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4) and 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) for the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (HNP). Specifically, SNC proposes to update the HNP Inservice Inspection (ISI) and Containment Inservice Inspection (CII) programs to the 2007 Edition with the 2008 Addenda while maintaining and performing ISI/CII related activities such as Repair/Replacements, Pressure Testing, and Nondestructive Examination to the current ASME Section XI 2001 Edition through the 2003 Addenda requirements.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this proposed alternative. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to continue its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(z)(1) and 50.55a(z)(2) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternative would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of Section 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your proposed alternative and concludes that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to continue its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed alternative in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff's ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. You will be advised of any further information needed to support the NRC staff's detailed technical review by separate correspondence.

Bob Martin, Senior Project Manager
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321, 50-366

cc: Distribution via Listserv