

CONTRIBUTION

Docket 50-268

November 13, 1978

NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
ORB Reading  
V. Stello  
D. Eisenhut  
Kitty Parrish  
Ed Reeves  
OELD  
OI&E (5)  
B. Jones (4)  
B. Scharf(10)  
J. McGough  
XXXXXXXXXXXXBallard  
W. Pasciak

B. Harless  
B. Grimes  
ACRS(16)  
OPA (Clare Miles)  
R. Diggs  
J. Carter  
TERA  
J. R. Buchanan, NSIC  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Docket No. 50-348

Alabama Power Company  
ATTN: Mr. Alan R. Barton  
Senior Vice President  
Post Office Box 2641  
Birmingham, Alabama 35291

Gentlemen:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 7 to Facility Operating License No. NPI-2 for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated April 26, 1978.

This amendment clarifies the action requirements associated with reactor coolant leak detection systems, allows the reactor coolant pumps and residual heat removal pumps to be secured for up to one hour during decay heat removal operation, provides for an additional senior member on the Nuclear Operations Review Board, and includes minor editorial changes. As discussed with and agreed to by your staff, in issuing this amendment, we have made certain revisions to your proposed amendment. Your proposed option for a qualified advisor instead of the qualified Supervisor for Chemistry and Health Physics would not meet the intent of Regulatory Guide 1.8 (September 1975). We discussed this with your staff and it was agreed not to pursue this option.

Copies of the Safety Evaluation and the Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures and cc:  
See next page

7811270059

Const. 1  
D.D. - subject to change  
as noted on attached copy  
GD

OFFICE >	DOR:ORB #1	DOR:ORB #1/C	DOR:ORB #1/LA	OELD
SURNAME >	E Reeves: pab	ASchwencer	CParrish	D SWANSON
DATE >	9/13/78	11/13/78	9/2/78	9/15/78



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555  
November 13, 1978

Docket No. 50-<sup>348</sup>268

Alabama Power Company  
ATTN: Mr. Alan R. Barton  
Senior Vice President  
Post Office Box 2641  
Birmingham, Alabama 35291

Gentlemen:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 7 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated April 26, 1978.

This amendment clarifies the action requirements associated with reactor coolant leak detection systems, allows the reactor coolant pumps and residual heat removal pumps to be secured for up to one hour during decay heat removal operation, provides for an additional senior member on the Nuclear Operations Review Board, and includes minor editorial changes. As discussed with and agreed to by your staff, in issuing this amendment, we have made certain revisions to your proposed amendment. Your proposed option for a qualified advisor instead of the qualified Supervisor for Chemistry and Health Physics would not meet the intent of Regulatory Guide 1.8 (September 1975). We discussed this with your staff and it was agreed not to pursue this option.

Copies of the Safety Evaluation and the Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. Schwencer".

A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures and cc:  
See next page

November 13, 1978

cc: Ruble A. Thomas, Vice President  
Southern Services, Inc.  
Post Office Box 2625  
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region IV Office  
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR  
345 Courtland Street, NE  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

George F. Trowbridge, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. - 20036

George S. Houston Memorial Library  
212 W. Vurdeshaw Street  
Dothan, Alabama 36301

Chairman  
Houston Co. Commission  
Dothan, Alabama 36301

John Bingham, Esquire  
Balch, Bingham, Baker, Hawthorne,  
Williams & Ward  
600 North 18th Street  
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Edward H. Keiler, Esquire  
Keiler & Buckley  
9047 Jefferson Highway  
River Ridge, Louisiana 70123

State Department of Public Health  
ATTN: State Health Officer  
State Office Building  
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Chief, Energy Systems  
Analyses Branch (AW-459)  
Office of Radiation Programs  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Room 645, East Tower  
401 M Street, SW.  
Washington, D.C. 20460



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

ALABAMA POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-348

JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 7  
License No. NPF-2

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by Alabama Power Company (the licensee) dated April 26, 1978, complies with the standards and the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
  - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
  - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
  - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
  - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 is hereby amended to read as follows:


7811270061

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 7, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors, Branch #1  
Division of Operating Reactors

Attachment:  
Changes to the Technical  
Specifications

Date of Issuance: November 13, 1978

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 7

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2

DOCKET NO. 50-348

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change. The corresponding overleaf pages are also provided to maintain document completeness.

Remove

3/4 4-2  
3/4 4-14  
3/4 7-23  
6-8  
6-9

Replace

3/4 4-2  
3/4 4-14  
3/4 7-23  
6-8  
6-9

### 3/4.4 REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM

#### REACTOR COOLANT LOOPS

#### LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

---

3.4.1. All reactor coolant loops shall be in operation.

APPLICABILITY: As noted below, but excluding MODE 6.\*

ACTION:

Above P-7, comply with either of the following ACTIONS:

- a. With one reactor coolant loop and associated pump not in operation, STARTUP and/or continued POWER OPERATION may proceed provided THERMAL POWER is restricted to less than 36% of RATED THERMAL POWER and the following ESF instrumentation channels associated with the loop not in operation, are placed in their tripped condition within 1 hour:
  1. T<sub>AVG</sub> -- Low-Low channel used in the coincidence circuit with Steam Flow - High for Steam Line Isolation.
  2. Steam Line Pressure - Low for Safety Injection.
  3. Steam Flow-High Channel used for MSIV Isolation.
  4. Differential Pressure Between Steam Lines - High channel used for Safety Injection (trip all bistables which indicate low active loop steam pressure with respect to the idle loop steam pressure).
  
- b. With one reactor coolant loop and associated pump not in operation, subsequent STARTUP and POWER OPERATION above 36% of RATED THERMAL POWER may proceed provided:
  1. The following actions have been completed with the reactor in at least HOT STANDBY.
    - a) Reduce the overtemperature  $\Delta T$  trip setpoint to the value specified in Specification 2.2.1 for 2 loop operation.

\*See Special Test Exception 3.10.4.

## REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM

### ACTION (Continued)

- b) Place the following reactor trip system and ESF instrumentation channels, associated with the loop not in operation, in their tripped conditions:
- 1) Overpower  $\Delta T$  channel.
  - 2) Overtemperature  $\Delta T$  channel.
  - 3)  $T_{avg}$  -- Low-Low channel used in the coincidence circuit with Steam Flow - High for Steam Line Isolation.
  - 4) Steam Line Pressure - Low channel used for Safety Injection.
  - 5) Steam Flow-High channel used for MSIV Isolation.
  - 6) Differential Pressure Between Steam Lines - High channel used for Safety Injection (trip all bistables which indicate low active loop steam pressure with respect to the idle loop steam pressure).
- c) Change the P-8 interlock setpoint from the value specified in Table 3.3-1 to  $\leq 66\%$  of RATED THERMAL POWER.

2. THERMAL POWER is restricted to  $\leq 61\%$  of RATED THERMAL POWER.

Below P-7:

- a. With  $K_{eff} \geq 1.0$ , operation may proceed provided at least two reactor coolant loops and associated pumps are in operation.
- b. With  $K_{eff} < 1.0$ , operation may proceed provided at least one reactor coolant loop is in operation with an associated reactor coolant or residual heat removal pump.\*
- c. The provisions of Specifications 3.0.3 and 3.0.4 are not applicable.

\*All reactor coolant pumps and residual heat removal pumps may be deenergized for up to one (1) hour provided no operations are permitted which could cause dilution or reactor coolant system boron concentration.



TABLE 4.4-2

STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INSPECTION

1ST SAMPLE INSPECTION			2ND SAMPLE INSPECTION		3RD SAMPLE INSPECTION	
Sample Size	Result	Action Required	Result	Action Required	Result	Action Required
A minimum of S Tubes per S. G.	C-1	None	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	C-2	Plug defective tubes and inspect additional 2S tubes in this S. G.	C-1	None	N/A	N/A
			C-2	Plug defective tubes and inspect additional 4S tubes in this S. G.	C-1	None
					C-2	Plug defective tubes
			C-3	Perform action for C-3 result of first sample	N/A	N/A
	C-3	Perform action for C-3 result of first sample	N/A	N/A		
	C-3	Inspect all tubes in this S. G., plug defective tubes and inspect 2S tubes in each other S. G.  Prompt notification to NRC pursuant to specification 6.9.1	All other S. G.s are C-1	None	N/A	N/A
			Some S. G.s C-2 but no additional S. G. are C-3	Perform action for C-2 result of second sample	N/A	N/A
			Additional S. G. is C-3	Inspect all tubes in each S. G. and plug defective tubes. Prompt notification to NRC pursuant to specification 6.9.1	N/A	N/A

$S = 3 \frac{N}{n} \%$  Where N is the number of steam generators in the unit, and n is the number of steam generators inspected during an inspection

REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM

3/4.4.6 REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM LEAKAGE

LEAKAGE DETECTION SYSTEMS

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

---

3.4.6.1 The following Reactor Coolant System leakage detection systems shall be OPERABLE:

- a. The containment atmosphere particulate radioactivity monitoring system (R-11), and
- b. A containment air cooler condensate level monitoring system or, the containment atmosphere gaseous radioactivity monitoring system (R-12).

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4.

ACTION:

- a. With one of the above required leakage detection systems inoperable, operation may continue for up to 7 days provided:
  1. One of the two above required leakage detection systems are OPERABLE, and
  2. Appropriate grab samples are obtained and analyzed at least once per 24 hours:

Otherwise, be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours.

PLANT SYSTEMS

3/4.7.8 ECCS PUMP ROOM EXHAUST AIR FILTRATION  
(PENETRATION ROOM FILTRATION SYSTEM)

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

---

3.7.8.1 Two independent penetration room filtration systems shall be OPERABLE.

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4.

ACTION:

With one penetration room filtration system inoperable, restore the inoperable system to OPERABLE status within 7 days or be in at least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

---

4.7.8.1 Each penetration room filtration system shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 31 days on a STAGGERED TEST BASIS by:
  1. Initiating, from the control room, flow through the HEPA filter and charcoal adsorber train and verifying that the train operates for at least 15 minutes.
- b. At least once per 18 months or (1) after any structural maintenance on the HEPA filter or charcoal adsorber housings, or (2) following painting, fire or chemical release in any ventilation zone communication with the system by:
  1. Verifying that with the system operating at a flow rate of 5000 cfm + 10% and exhausting through the HEPA filters and charcoal adsorbers, the total bypass flow of the system to the facility vent, including leakage through the system diverting valves, is  $\leq 1\%$  when the system is tested by admitting cold DOP at the system intake.

PLANT SYSTEMS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

---

2. Verifying that the cleanup system satisfies the in-place testing acceptance criteria and uses the test procedures of Regulatory Position C.5.c and C.5.d of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 1, July 1976, and the system flow rate is 5000 cfm  $\pm$  10%.
  3. Verifying within 31 days after removal that a laboratory analysis of a representative carbon sample obtained in accordance with Regulatory Position C.6.b of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 1, July 1976, meets the laboratory testing criteria of Regulatory Position C.6.a of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 1, July 1976.
  4. Verifying a system flow rate of 5000 cfm  $\pm$  10% during system operation when tested in accordance with ANSI N510-1975.
- c. After every 720 hours of charcoal adsorber operation by verifying within 31 days after removal that a laboratory analysis of representative carbon sample obtained in accordance with Regulatory Position C.6.b of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 1, July 1976, meets the laboratory testing criteria of Regulatory Position C.6.a of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 1, July 1976.
- d. At least once per 18 months by:
1. Verifying that the pressure drop across the combined HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber banks is < 6 inches Water Gauge while operating the filter train at a flow rate of 5000 cfm  $\pm$  10%.
  2. Verifying that the filter train starts on a Phase B Actuation Test Signal.
  3. Verifying that the heaters dissipate 25  $\pm$  2.5 kw when tested in accordance with ANSI N510-1975.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

- j. The plant Security Plan.
- k. The Emergency Plan.
- l. Facility operations to detect potential nuclear safety hazards.
- m. Performance of special reviews, investigations or analyses and reports thereon as requested by the Chairman of the Nuclear Operations Review Board.

### AUTHORITY

6.5.1.7 The PORC shall:

- a. Recommend to the Plant Manager written approval or disapproval of items considered under 6.5.1.6(a) through (e) and (j) and (k) above.
- b. Render determinations in writing with regard to whether or not each item considered under 6.5.1.6(a), (c) and (d) above constitutes an unreviewed safety question.
- c. Make recommendations to the Plant Manager in writing that actions reviewed under 6.5.1.6(b) above did not constitute an unreviewed safety question.

### RECORDS

6.5.1.8 The PORC shall maintain written minutes of each meeting and copies shall be provided to the Vice President-Power Supply and Chairman of the Nuclear Operations Review Board.

## 6.5.2 NUCLEAR OPERATIONS REVIEW BOARD NORB

### FUNCTION

6.5.2.1 The NORB shall function to provide independent review and audit of designated activities in the areas of:

- a. Nuclear power plant operations
- b. Nuclear engineering
- c. Chemistry and radiochemistry

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

- d. Metallurgy
- e. Instrumentation and control
- f. Radiological safety
- g. Mechanical and electrical engineering
- h. Quality assurance practices

### COMPOSITION

6.5.2.2 The NORB shall be composed of at least five persons including;

Chairman:	Senior Vice President
Vice Chairman:	Vice President-Production
Alternate Vice Chairman:	Vice President-Power Supply Services
Secretary:	Manager-Operations Quality Assurance
Member:	Manager-Nuclear Generation

and other appointed personnel having an academic degree in an engineering or physical science field and a minimum of five years technical experience, of which a minimum of three years shall be in one or more of the areas given in 6.5.2.1.

### ALTERNATES

6.5.2.3 All alternate members shall be appointed in writing by the NORB Chairman to serve on a temporary basis; however, no more than two alternates shall participate as voting members in NORB activities at any one time.

### CONSULTANTS

6.5.2.4 Consultants shall be utilized as determined by the NORB Chairman to provide expert advice to the NORB.

### MEETING FREQUENCY

6.5.2.5 The NORB shall meet at least once per calendar quarter during the initial year of facility operation following fuel loading and at least once per six months thereafter.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

---

### QUORUM

6.5.2.6 A quorum shall consist of the Chairman or Vice Chairman or Alternate Vice Chairman plus enough voting members to constitute a majority of the NORB. No more than a minority of the quorum shall have line responsibility for operation of the facility. For the purpose of a quorum those considered to have line responsibility will include the Manager - Nuclear Generation, Plant Manager and personnel reporting to the Plant Manager.

### REVIEW

6.5.2.7 The NORB shall review:

- a. Proposed changes to procedures, equipment or systems which involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in Section 50.59, 10 CFR.
- b. Proposed tests or experiments which involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in Section 50.59, 10 CFR.
- c. Violations of codes, regulations, orders, Technical Specifications, license requirements, or of internal procedures or instructions having nuclear safety significance or abnormal degradation of systems designed to contain radioactive material.
- d. Significant operating abnormalities or deviations from normal and expected performance of plant equipment that affect nuclear safety.
- e. All written reports concerning events requiring 24 hour notification to the Commission.
- f. All recognized indications of an unanticipated deficiency in some aspect of design or operation of safety related structures, systems, or components.
- g. Reports and meetings minutes of the PORC.
- h. Proposed changes to Technical Specifications or this Operating License.
- i. The safety evaluations for proposed 1) procedures 2) changes to procedures, equipment or systems and 3) test or experiments completed under the provision of Section 50.59 10 CFR, to verify that such actions did not constitute an unreviewed safety question.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

### AUDITS

6.5.2.8 The following audits shall be conducted under the direction of APCO's Manager - Operations Quality Assurance:

- a. The conformance of facility operation to provisions contained within the Technical Specifications and applicable license conditions at least once per 12 months.
- b. The performance, training and qualifications of the entire facility staff at least once per 12 months.
- c. The results of actions taken to correct deficiencies occurring in facility equipment, structures, systems or method of operation that affect nuclear safety at least once per 6 months.
- d. The performance of activities required by the operational Quality Assurance Program to meet the criteria of Appendix "B", 10 CFR 50, at least once per 24 months.
- e. The Facility Emergency Plan at least once per 24 months.
- f. The Facility Security Plan at least once per 24 months.
- g. Any other area of facility operation considered appropriate by the NORB or the Senior Vice President.
- h. The Facility Fire Protection Program and implementing procedures at least once per 24 months.
- i. An independent fire protection and loss prevention program inspection and audit shall be performed at least once per 12 months utilizing either qualified offsite licensee personnel or an outside fire protection firm.
- j. An inspection and audit of the fire protection and loss prevention program shall be performed by a qualified outside fire consultant at least once per 36 months.
- k. At each scheduled NORB meeting the Manager - Operations Quality Assurance shall make a summary report of these activities.

### AUTHORITY

6.5.2.9 The NORB shall report to and advise the Senior Vice President on those areas of responsibility specified in Sections 6.5.2.7 and 6.5.2.8.

### RECORDS

6.5.2.10 Records of NORB activities shall be prepared, approved and distributed as indicated below:





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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

FOR FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2

ALABAMA POWER COMPANY

JOSEPH M. FARLEY

NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-348

Introduction

By letter dated April 26, 1978, Alabama Power Company (APC) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1. The proposal would: (1) clarify the action requirements to the limiting conditions for the operation of the reactor coolant system leakage detection systems, (2) allow the reactor coolant pumps and the residual heat removal pumps to be secured for one hour during decay heat removal operation, (3) provide for another senior member on the Nuclear Operations Review Board, and (4) make minor editorial changes. Certain revisions were made to the proposed amendment and were discussed with and accepted by APC. The proposed option for a qualified advisor instead of the qualified Supervisor for Chemistry and Health Physics would conflict with the intent of Regulatory Guide 1.8 (September 1975). APC agreed not to pursue this option during discussions with us.

Discussion and Evaluation

1. Reactor Coolant System Leakage Detection System

APC proposed a change to clarify the ACTION statement in Technical Specification 3.4.6.1. There are three leakage detection systems R-11, R-12 and the containment air cooler condensate level monitoring system. For operating MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4, R-11 and one of the other two systems must be in operation. If this limiting condition for operation is not met the ACTION statement permits continued operation up to MODE 1 for a limited time if certain conditions are met then requires the plant to be down to MODES 4 and 5 within specified times. The intent is that if either the R-11 system or both of the other systems become inoperable, operation could continue for a limited time if compensatory action is taken. As presently worded, the ACTION

7811270063

statement refers to two systems, rather than two conditions (3.4.6.1a and b) which involve three systems. We have reworded the ACTION statement consistent with our original intent to clarify this editorial problem called to our attention by APC.

Another change to this specification which we consider prudent is to reduce the time allowed for operation above MODE 4 under conditions specified in the ACTION statement, from 30 days to seven days. This reduction in time takes into account that a single additional failure could cause loss of all leak detection capability. Our change reduces the probability of being without continuous coolant leak detection in the event of an accident. The licensee has agreed to this change. Therefore, the ACTION statement for Technical Specification 3.4.6.1, modified as discussed above, is appropriate and acceptable.

2. Securing Reactor Coolant Pumps and Residual Heat Removal (RHR) Pumps During Decay Heat Removal

With the Reactor shut down, Technical Specification 3.4.1 requires that either one reactor coolant pump or one RHR pump be in operation. This is overly restrictive since it does not allow even a momentary loss of forced flow through the core. There are two reasons for such forced flow: decay heat removal and prevention of an undetected boron dilution event. Neither of these reasons would require that forced flow be continuous. When the reactor is shut down, the only source of heat is the decay of fission products. The natural convection flow of reactor coolant is more than sufficient to provide adequate decay heat removal during the one hour limit proposed by the licensee. Reactor coolant boron dilution would be prevented by prohibiting all operations which could cause such dilution while no forced flow exists.

Being able to temporarily interrupt forced flow would provide for a more orderly transition from one cooling mode to another, e.g., shifting from decay heat removal via the steam generators to decay heat removal via the RHR system, without undue emphasis on starting one pump before stopping another.

This change is consistent with the most recent edition of the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse plants. The change will also allow APC to stop all Reactor Coolant Pumps and RHR pumps for up to one hour while in MODES 3, 4, or 5 to investigate and correct a problem.

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the licensee's proposal to allow all of the above-mentioned pumps to be stopped during reactor shut down (MODES 3, 4, or 5 operation) for up to one hour is acceptable.

3. Additional Member for Nuclear Operations Review Board (NORB)

Specification 6.5.2.6 requires that a senior member of management be chairman of each NORB meeting. The present specification requires only two members of the NORB to be senior managers. These are the Senior Vice President and the Vice President-Production, who serve as the NORB's Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively. The duties of the NORB are such that it is sometimes necessary to call an emergency meeting of the NORB when neither the Chairman nor the Vice Chairman is available to convene the NORB. This has happened in the past.

To alleviate this situation, APC has proposed to create an Alternate Vice Chairman position on the NORB. This position would be filled by the Vice President-Power Supply Services, who, as a senior manager, would be qualified to convene the NORB. We conclude, therefore, that this change is acceptable.

4. Other Changes

The two penetration room filtration systems (PRFS) serve both the ECCS Pump Room and the spent fuel pool room. These systems are independent of one another, and can be aligned to either the ECCS Pump Room or to the spent fuel pool room. Present Technical Specification 3.7.8.1 requires that both PRFS's be aligned to the spent fuel room during operation in MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4. We consider it to be more desirable to have one PRFS aligned to the ECCS Pump Room during MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4. This is already provided for in Specifications 3.9.12 and 3.9.13 governing the alignment of the PRFS. We find that the phrase "and aligned to the spent fuel pool room" in Specification 3.7.8.1 is inconsistent with our intent, as expressed in Specifications 3.9.12 and 3.9.13, and therefore conclude that it should be deleted as proposed by APC.

The other change involves correction of a typographical error in Specification 6.5.2.7.i. The section of 10 CFR that should be referenced is Section 50.59 which deals with the topics covered by that Specification.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: November 13, 1978

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONDOCKET NO. 50-348ALABAMA POWER COMPANYNOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITYOPERATING LICENSE

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 7 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 issued to the Alabama Power Company (the licensee), which revised Technical Specifications for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1, located in Houston County, Alabama. The amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

This amendment clarifies the action requirements associated with reactor coolant leak detection systems, allows the reactor coolant pumps and residual heat removal pumps to be secured for up to one hour during decay heat removal operation, provides for an additional senior number on the Nuclear Operations Review Board, and includes minor editorial changes.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pur-

7811270066

suant to 10 CFRs 51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement, negative declaration or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated April 26, 1978, (2) Amendment No. 7 to License No. NPF-2, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. and at the G. S. Houston Memorial Library, 212 W. Verdeshaw Street, Dothan, Alabama. A copy of items (2) & (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Operating Reactors.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 13th day of November 1978.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Operating Reactors