

August 31, 1988

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File C. Cheng (9H15)
NRC PDR L. Marsh (9H3)
Local PDR
PD21 r/f
T. Murley/J. Sniezek (12G18)
F. Miraglia (12G18)
C. Rossi (11E4)
S. Varga (14E4)
G. Lainas
E. Adensam
P. Anderson
E. Reeves (2)
OGC
E. Jordan (MNBB 3302)
B. Grimes (9A2)
T. Barnhart (4) (P1-137)
ACRS (10)
GPA/PA
ARM/LFMB

Docket No. 50-364

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Senior Vice President
Alabama Power Company
Post Office Box 2641
Birmingham, Alabama 35291-0400

Dear Mr. Hairston:

SUBJECT: EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) -
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2 (TAC NO. 66678)

By letter dated June 22, 1988, you requested an Exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a. This request involves the requirement for updating the Inservice Inspection (ISI) program and the Inservice Testing (IST) program for Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 2 (Farley 2). The current schedule for updating these programs would require a new submittal to the NRC staff for review prior to July 31, 1991.

However, you propose to make the Unit 2 ISI and IST programs identical to the existing Unit 1 programs now under review by the NRC staff. To accomplish this combination of separate programs into one program, an exemption to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) is necessary. Your proposal would update the Farley 2 ASME Code of record three years in advance of the July 31, 1991, Code requirements. The new combined programs would continue through the first and second 40-month period of the second ten-year interval until December 1, 1997. At that time, the programs would be updated to the applicable ASME Code Edition and Addenda in accordance with the regulations.

We have reviewed your proposal and agree that the action taken would eliminate administrative problems caused by the separate programs for the nearly identical units at the Farley site. The action would provide an equivalent degree of inservice testing and examination, would apply the 1983 Code to be used on Unit 2 for the additional three year period until July 31, 1991, would result in uniform tests and procedures for both units, and would result in less NRC staff resources required to review two separate ISI and IST programs. We would expect a minimal increase or no increase in the risk of failure of safety related pumps, valves or other components resulting from this action.

8809060278 880831
PDR ADOCK 05000364
P PNU

DF01
11

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III

- 2 -

Therefore, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has granted your Exemption request pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12. The bases for the Exemption are discussed in the enclosed Exemption.

The Exemption is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication. This completes our action on your submittal.

Sincerely,



Edward A. Reeves, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects I/II

Enclosure:
Exemption

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

OFC	: LA :	PD21 :	DRPR :	PM :	PD21 :	DRPR :	D :	PD21 :	DRPR :	:	:	:	:
NAME	: PA	derson :	E	Reeves :	ch :	F	densam :	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 8/13/88	:	8/13/88	:	8/22/88	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Alabama Power Company

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

cc:

Mr. R. P. McDonald
Executive Vice President
Alabama Power Company
Post Office Box 2641
Birmingham, Alabama 35291-0400

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 24 - Route 2
Columbia, Alabama 36319

Mr. Bill M. Guthrie
Executive Vice President
Alabama Power Company
Post Office Box 2641
Birmingham, Alabama 35291-0400

D. Biard MacGuineas, Esquire
Volpe, Boskey and Lyons
918 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

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

Charles R. Lowman
Alabama Electric Corporation
Post Office Box 550
Andalusia, Alabama 35420

Chairman
Houston County Commission
Dothan, Alabama 36301

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

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

Claude Earl Fox, M.D.
State Health Officer
State Department of Public Health
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Robert A. Buettner, Esquire
Balch, Bingham, Baker, Hawthorne,
Williams and Ward
Post Office Box 306
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. D. N. Morey
General Manager - Farley Nuclear Plant
Post Office Box 470
Ashford, Alabama 36312

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
ALABAMA POWER COMPANY) Docket No. 50-364
Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant,)
Unit 2)

EXEMPTION

I.

Alabama Power Company (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF-8, which authorizes operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 2 (Farley 2 or Unit 2), a pressurized water reactor located in Houston County near Dothan, Alabama. The license provides, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations and Orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

II.

Section 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) to 10 CFR Part 50 requires that inservice examinations of components, inservice tests to verify operational readiness of pumps and valves whose function is required for safety, and system pressure tests, shall comply with requirements of the latest Edition and Addenda of the ASME Code for each successive 120-month inspection interval. These intervals start from the date of commercial operation of the facility. Thus, the second ten-year interval for Farley 2 would begin on July 31, 1991.

By letter dated June 22, 1988, the licensee requested an exemption from 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) from the next schedule for updating (July 31, 1991) the Inservice Inspection (ISI) Program and Inservice Testing (IST) Program for Farley 2.

8809060290 880831
PDR ADDCK 05000364
P PNU

The licensee proposes to make the Unit 2 ISI and IST programs essentially identical to the existing Unit 1 program. The licensee proposes to implement the ASME Code 1983 Edition and Summer 1983 Addenda during the Farley 2 sixth refueling outage (March 1989) for the remainder of the Farley 2 first ten-year interval. The 1983 Edition and Summer 1983 Addenda would remain effective for the Farley 2 second ten-year interval which commences on July 31, 1991. In support of its request, the licensee provided supporting reasons for issuance of an exemption from the program update requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12 for Farley 2.

III.

The Commission staff has reviewed the request and has determined that this action would provide a common ASME Code of record start date for Farley 1 and Farley 2. Inherent administrative, technical, and cost-saving advantages for the licensee and for the Commission staff are apparent. Without granting of the exemption, the licensee would prepare and implement ISI and IST programs for Unit 2, which are different from those being reviewed for Unit 1, using ASME Code Editions and Addenda existing one year prior to the July 31, 1991 start date of the next 120-month interval. The Commission staff would then be required to review the separate programs and associated relief requests for Farley 2.

The Farley 1 ISI and IST updated programs implemented on December 1, 1987, remain under review by the staff. The Farley 2 programs would be made similar to these Farley 1 programs. The staff has determined that:

1. The Farley units are nearly identical designs and only one ISI and IST program will be adequate to meet the basic intent of 10 CFR 50.55a(g). Application of a strict reading of the rule is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule and, therefore, the special circumstances required by 10 CFR 50.12(2)(ii) are met.

2. There should be minimal or no increase in risk of failure of safety related pumps, valves or other components resulting from the use of common ISI and IST programs for the remainder of the operating life of the two units.

3. The use of only one program instead of two separate programs by operators and maintenance personnel will increase plant safety through the simplification and standardization of plant testing procedures and testing requirements. The use of uniform procedures for both units may reduce the chance of personnel errors during tests and surveillances.

4. The change will result in a savings of manpower requirements for the licensee, as well as for the Commission staff.

The purpose of the rule, as it currently exists, is to assure periodic updating of ISI and IST practices to conform to industry changes on a 120-month schedule in order that any improvements in code provisions may be periodically incorporated in plant inspection and testing programs. Section XI Code changes generally deal with practical considerations of implementation or the application of new developments. The safety aspects of the code remain relatively unchanged from edition to edition. The Unit 2 programs will be updated three years ahead of the next required update. The Unit 1 programs now under staff review were updated in 1987 to the 1983 Edition through the Summer 1983 Addenda of the ASME Code. Thus, the Unit 1 and Unit 2 programs would both

utilize the 1983 Edition through the Summer 1983 Addenda until December 1, 1997. Updating the Farley 2 program three years in advance of the required update is consistent with the purpose of the regulation and will provide a level of safety comparable to the later code and will incorporate code improvements earlier than required.

The licensee states that an attempt has been made to complete the maximum number of ISI inspections permitted by the Code for Farley 2 during the first two inspection periods. Since the third forty-month ISI period for Farley 2 began on March 30, 1988, the only remaining refueling outages (March 1989 and September 1990) do not allow sufficient time to complete all remaining inspections to the 1974 Edition. Therefore, the licensee proposes to use the 1983 Edition through the Summer 1983 Addenda of the ASME Code for the third forty-month period of the first ten-year interval on Farley 2. Because the later Code Edition and Addenda will provide adequate assurance of the integrity of safety related pumps, valves or other components, the Commission staff finds this acceptable.

In order to provide the licensee with administrative flexibility and yet meet the intent of the regulation to update ISI and IST programs at 120-month intervals, the staff has determined that an exemption to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii), as requested by the licensee pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, should be granted.

IV.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), the exemption requested by the licensee's letter of June 22, 1988 is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense

and security, and is otherwise in the public interest and that special circumstances are present as set forth in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii). The Commission hereby grants the licensee an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii), as it relates to the 120-month inspection interval for inservice examination of components, inservice tests to verify operational readiness of pumps and valves, and system pressure tests for Farley 2.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that granting this exemption will have no significant impact on the environment (53 FR 32950).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 31st day of August, 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga, Director
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

*Added EA FR**
8/3/88

OFC	:LA:PD21:DRPR:PM:PD21:DRPR	EMTB:DEST	: EMEB:DEST	: OGC	:D:PD21:DRPR	: ADRII:DRPR
NAME	: PAnderson*	: EReeves.ch*	: CYCheng*	: LMarsh*	: MYoung*	: EAdensam* : GLainas*
DATE	: 8/03/88	: 8/03/88	: 8/10/88	: 8/05/88	: 8/15/88	: 8/22/88 : 8/26/88

D:DRPR
SVarga
8/1/88

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY