



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

REVISION TO QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

1.0 BACKGROUND

By letter dated June 12, 1996, Georgia Power Company (GPC) proposed to revise the Quality Assurance Program (QAP) for the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, to permit the use of a Qualified Reviewer (QR) to perform the screening evaluation of potential 10 CFR 50.59 matters. All such matters are currently reviewed by the Plant Review Board (PRB). For each matter to be screened under the proposed plan, the QR would determine the applicability of 50.59 based on the response to the following four questions:

1. Is there a change to the plant as described in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR)?
2. Is there a change to procedures as described in the FSAR?
3. Is a test or experiment proposed that is not described in the FSAR?
4. Is there a change to the Technical Specifications as incorporated in the operating license?

If the QR determines that none of the above situations exist, the matter is determined to be a non-50.59 issue that can be implemented without further consideration by the PRB. The QR only determines the answers to the screening questions and their bases. If the answer to at least one of the situations is positive, the matter is referred to the PRB for completion of the 50.59 unreviewed safety question (USQ) evaluation and further consideration of acceptability.

2.0 EVALUATION

The staff reviewed the licensee's proposed use of a QR to screen potential 50.59 matters and requested additional information by letters dated August 5 and November 14, 1996. The licensee responded by letters dated September 4 and December 11, 1996. In the information provided, the licensee proposed to use the following criteria for a QR to screen potential 50.59 matters:

- The QR's conclusions on the 50.59 evaluation form, for instances in which all the screening questions are answered NO, is that the determination of the existence of a USQ need not be performed. Should the QR be unable to arrive at a clear determination regarding the applicability of 50.59, then the matter will be returned to the originator for additional work or forwarded to the PRB for its review.
- Administrative controls associated with the QR process will address the requirement for cross-disciplinary reviews of screening determinations as necessary. This requirement will be included in Section 13 of the FSAR, applicable plant procedures governing the preparation and review of 50.59 screening reviews and evaluations, and the revised QA Program.
- QR screening evaluations will be limited to program and procedure changes only. Proposed plant modifications will continue to be evaluated for 50.59 applicability by the PRB.
- While the QR evaluation process will replace the PRB review for applicable plant program and procedure revisions, the involvement of other affected organizational elements in this process for both new and revised procedures will continue as before, and the screening determinations will be peer reviewed by another qualified individual and then reviewed/approved by the responsible department manager prior to the QR evaluation.
- Currently, PRB members must be supervisory or higher level representatives from the plant functional areas. Alternate PRB members must be qualified to serve in a supervisory capacity. To assure consistency in the quality of reviews, each QR will be required to satisfy the same qualification requirements as a PRB alternate.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

Based on its review of the licensee's submittals, the staff finds that the use of the above described criteria will result in an acceptable process for the screening evaluation of potential 50.59 matters by a QR. Therefore, the QA program, as revised, is acceptable.

Principal Contributor: W. Haass

Date: January 28, 1997