

January 30, 1997

Mr. Jack D. Woodard
Senior Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE
RESOLUTION OF UNRESOLVED SAFETY ISSUE A-46 - EDWIN I. HATCH
NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M69451 AND M69452)

Dear Mr. Woodard:

By letter dated August 23, 1996, you provided a response to the staff's request for additional information (RAI) on the plant-specific summary report addressing the resolution of unresolved safety issue (USI) A-46 program at the Hatch Nuclear Plant. The staff has reviewed your response and determined that supplemental additional information, as outlined in the enclosure, is needed before we can complete our review.

A significant item in the enclosure relates to your statement in the July 31, 1996, letter that you have changed the plant licensing bases to incorporate the Generic Implementation Procedure methodology in the Final Safety Analysis Report prior to receiving the plant-specific safety evaluation on the USI A-46 resolution. In this regard, we request that you submit for staff review the complete documentation of your evaluation associated with 10 CFR 50.59.

We request that you provide the additional information within 60 days from the date of this letter. Please contact me at (301) 415-1496 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate II-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution:

Docket File
PUBLIC
PD II-2 Rdg.

SVarga
JZwolinski
HBerkow

LBerry
KJabbour
OGC

ACRS
EMerschhoff, RII
PSkinner, RII

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

DFC 1/1

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\HATCH\A46.RAI *See previous concurrence

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box C=Copy w/o attachment/enclosure E=Copy with attachment/enclosure N = No copy

OFFICE	PM:PDII-2	E	LA:PDII-2*		D:PDII-2				
NAME	KJabbour	KNS	LBerry		HBerkow				
DATE	01/29/97		1/22/97		1/29/97				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9701310342 970130
PDR ADOCK 05000321
P PDR



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 30, 1997

Mr. Jack D. Woodard
Senior Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE
RESOLUTION OF UNRESOLVED SAFETY ISSUE A-46 - EDWIN I. HATCH
NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M69451 AND M69452)

Dear Mr. Woodard:

By letter dated August 23, 1996, you provided a response to the staff's request for additional information (RAI) on the plant-specific summary report addressing the resolution of unresolved safety issue (USI) A-46 program at the Hatch Nuclear Plant. The staff has reviewed your response and determined that supplemental additional information, as outlined in the enclosure, is needed before we can complete our review.

A significant item in the enclosure relates to your statement in the July 31, 1996, letter that you have changed the plant licensing bases to incorporate the Generic Implementation Procedure methodology in the Final Safety Analysis Report prior to receiving the plant-specific safety evaluation on the USI A-46 resolution. In this regard, we request that you submit for staff review the complete documentation of your evaluation associated with 10 CFR 50.59.

We request that you provide the additional information within 60 days from the date of this letter. Please contact me at (301) 415-1496 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kahtan N. Jabbour".

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate II-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

Georgia Power Company

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant

cc:

Mr. Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. D. M. Crowe
Manager Licensing - Hatch
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. L. Sumner
General Manager, Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 439
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11030 Hatch Parkway North
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

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

Harold Reheis, Director
Department of Natural Resources
205 Butler Street, SE., Suite 1252
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Mr. Thomas P. Mozingo
Program Manager
Nuclear Operations
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
2100 East Exchange Place
P. O. Box 1349
Tucker, Georgia 30085-1349

Charles A. Patrizia, Esquire
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
10th Floor
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20004-9500

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Steven M. Jackson
Senior Engineer - Power Supply
Municipal Electric Authority
of Georgia
1470 Riveredge Parkway, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30328-4684

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

USI A-46

1. With regard to the concern involving the use of proper seismic demand for equipment within 40 feet above the effective grade level, the staff's assessment is that your response of August 23, 1996, did not address the requested information. In the SQUG/NRC meeting held on August 28, 1996, the staff elaborated its concern and the primary focus of the request for additional information (RAI) question. As a result of considerable discussion on the subject, the staff agreed to clarify the question. The following represents the revised question, which is being forwarded to the affected USI A-46 licensees for their response:

Referring to the in-structure response spectra provided in your 120 day response to the NRC's request in Supplement No. 1 to Generic Letter (GL) 87-02, dated May 22, 1992, the following information is requested:

- a. Identify structure(s) that have in-structure response spectra (5% critical damping) for elevations within 40 feet above the effective grade, which are higher in amplitude than 1.5 times the SQUG Bounding Spectrum.
- b. With respect to the comparison of equipment seismic capacity and seismic demand, indicate which method in Table 4-1 of the Generic Implementation Procedure (GIP) GIP-2 was used to evaluate the seismic adequacy for equipment installed on the corresponding floors in the structure(s) identified in Item (a) above. If you have elected to use method A in Table 4-1 of the GIP-2, provide a technical justification for not using the in-structure response spectra provided in your 120-day response. It appears that some A-46 licensees are making an incorrect comparison between their plant's safe shutdown earthquake (SSE) ground motion response spectrum and the SQUG Bounding Spectrum. The SSE ground motion response spectrum for most nuclear power plants is defined at the plant foundation level. The SQUG Bounding Spectrum is defined at the free field ground surface. For plants founded on deep soil or rock, there may not be a significant difference between the ground motion amplitudes at the foundation level and those at the ground surface. However, for sites where a structure is founded on shallow soil, the amplification of the ground motion from the foundation level to the ground surface may be significant.
- c. For the structure(s) identified in Item (a) above, provide the in-structure response spectra designated according to the height above the effective grade. If the in-structure response spectra identified in the 120-day response to Supplement No. 1 to Generic Letter 87-02 was not used, provide the response spectra that were actually used to verify the seismic adequacy of equipment within the structures identified in Item (a) above. Also, provide a comparison of these spectra to 1.5 times the Bounding Spectrum.

ENCLOSURE

2. In reference to your letter dated July 31, 1996, regarding the completion of actions in accordance with Supplement 1 to GL 87-02, you stated that you have changed the plant licensing bases prior to receipt of the plant-specific safety evaluation. The changes performed were related to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), for Units 1 and 2, that incorporate the USI A-46 GIP methodology for verifying the seismic adequacy of new, replacement, and existing electrical and mechanical equipment. We request that you submit, for the staff's review, the complete documentation associated with your evaluation of the unreviewed safety question associated with 10 CFR 50.59 for carrying out the FSAR changes for equipment qualification.
3. Your response to NRC staff's question No. 9, transmitted by our letter dated June 27, 1996, stated in part that: "For Plant Hatch, the only issue identified is the possible loss of the normal lighting system, in which case the operators rely upon emergency lighting or hand-held lights to perform their duties."

Describe what, if any, other barriers to successful operator performance to reset the DG relays were considered and resolved as part of the seismic and relay evaluation. In addition to lighting, discuss what, if any, other hazards or environmental factors such as temperature, humidity, debris, or damaged structures, which could inhibit an operator from accomplishing the task of resetting the DG relays in the time-frame allotted, were considered.