

July 11, 1990

Docket No. 50-364

DISTRIBUTION
See attached page

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Senior Vice President
Alabama Power Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Dear Mr. Hairston:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 75 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NO. NPF-8 - JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2, REGARDING
SNUBBER SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (TAC NO. 76064)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 75 to Facility Operating License NPF-8 for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 2. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your submittal dated February 8, 1990.

The amendment modifies the Technical Specification 4.7.9 relating to the visual inspection requirements for snubbers. The new requirements will be applicable on a one-time basis until startup from the seventh refueling outage on Unit 2. This one-time action will preclude an additional inspection prior to the next Unit 2 refueling outage.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's bi-weekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Stephen T. Hoffman, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 75 to NPF-8
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

STH 7/19/90

OFC	:LA:PD21:DRPR:PM:PD21:DRPR:D:PD21:DRPR	:	:	:	:
NAME	: PAnderson : SHoffman:sw: EAdensam	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 7/2/90 : 7/3/90 : 7/11/90	:	:	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9007170200 900711
PDR ADDCK 05000364
P PIC

C/Per

DF01
11

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

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

cc:

Mr. R. P. McDonald
Executive Vice President
Nuclear Operations
Alabama Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

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

Mr. B. L. Moore
Manager, Licensing
Alabama Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

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

Mr. Louis B. Long, General Manager
Southern Company Services, Inc.
Houston County Commission
P. O. Box 2625
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Chairman
Houston County Commission
Dothan, Alabama 36301

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

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

Mr. J. D. Woodward
Vice-President - Nuclear
Farley Project
Alabama Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201



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

ALABAMA POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-364

JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 75
License No. NPF-8

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Alabama Power Company (the licensee), dated February 8, 1990, complies with the standards and 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 license 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-8 is hereby amended to read as follows:

9007170206 900711
PDR ADOCK 05000364
P FDC

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 75, 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 its date of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Original Signed By:

Elinor G. Adensam, Director
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: July 11, 1990

RD

OFC	:LA:PD21:DRPR:PM:PD21:DRPR:	OGC	:D:PD21:DRPR:	:	:
NAME	: <i>PA</i> Anderson	: SHoffman:sw	: <i>L. Dewey</i>	: EAdensam	:
DATE	: 7/2/90	: 7/9/90	: 7/13/90	: 7/11/90	:

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 75

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8

DOCKET NO. 50-364

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised areas are indicated by marginal lines.

Remove Pages

3/4 7-20

Insert Pages

3/4 7-20

PLANT SYSTEMS

3/4.7.9 SNUBBERS

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.7.9 All snubbers shall be OPERABLE. The only snubbers excluded from this requirement are those installed on nonsafety-related systems and then only if their failure or the failure of the system on which they are installed would have no adverse effect on any safety-related system.

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, 3 and 4. (MODES 5 and 6 for snubbers located on systems required OPERABLE in those MODES).

ACTION:

With one or more snubbers inoperable, within 72 hours replace or restore the inoperable snubber(s) to OPERABLE status and perform an engineering evaluation per Specification 4.7.9.c on the supported component or declare the supported system inoperable and follow the appropriate ACTION statement for that system.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.7.9 Each snubber shall be demonstrated OPERABLE by performance of the following augmented inservice inspection program and the requirements of Specification 4.0.5.

a. Visual Inspections

The first inservice visual inspection of snubbers shall be performed after four months but within 10 months of POWER OPERATION and shall include all snubbers within the scope of Specification 3.7.9. If less than two (2) snubbers are found inoperable during the first inservice visual inspection, the second inservice visual inspection shall be performed 12 months + 25% from the date of the first inspection. Otherwise, subsequent visual inspections shall be performed in accordance with the following schedule: **

<u>No. of Inoperable Snubbers per Inspection Period</u>	<u>Subsequent Visual Inspection Period**</u>
0	18 months + 25%
1	12 months + 25%
2	6 months + 25%
3, 4	124 days + 25%
5, 6, 7	62 days + 25%
8 or more	31 days + 25%

The snubbers may be categorized into two groups: Those accessible and those inaccessible during reactor operation. Each group may be inspected independently in accordance with the above schedule.

* The inspection interval shall not be lengthened more than one step at a time.

The provisions of Specification 4.0.2 are not applicable.

** This is a one-time Technical Specification change until startup from the seventh refueling outage. Table 4.7-3 should be utilized during this interval to determine the subsequent visual inspection period.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 75 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8
ALABAMA POWER COMPANY
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2
DOCKET NO. 50-364

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 8, 1990, Alabama Power Company (the licensee) requested changes in the Technical Specification (TS) 4.7.9 relating to snubber visual inspection frequency requirements for Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (Farley), Unit 2. This amendment modifies the existing snubber visual inspection frequency schedule from one that is independent of the snubber population size to one that is dependent on a snubber population of 200. The proposal is similar to a TS change submitted by the licensee in Amendment No. 69 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 and Amendment No. 61 to NPF-8, for Farley, Units 1 and 2, and approved by the NRC staff in a letter dated March 30, 1987. Approval of these amendments was granted by the NRC on a one-time only basis due to ongoing generic NRC efforts in this area. These generic efforts which are now approaching completion are anticipated to result in relief from the current requirements for visual inspection; however, it is not certain that this generic relief will be provided in sufficient time to preclude an additional inspection by Alabama Power Company just prior to its next (seventh) Unit 2 refueling outage. A one-time only TS change is, therefore, proposed.

The next refueling outage for Farley, Unit 2, is currently scheduled for October 1990. If the proposed amendment is not approved, the licensee would be required to shut down the plant in early August 1990 to satisfy the TS requirements.

2.0 EVALUATION

Snubber Visual Inspection Schedule

The basis for the proposed snubber visual inspection schedule was originally submitted by the licensee on September 2, 1986. A statistical methodology was used in deriving the proposed snubber visual inspection schedule. Based on the assumed statistical model, the proposed visual inspection schedule will provide a 95% confidence level that at least 90%

9007170210 900711
PDR ADOCK 05000364
P FDC

of the snubbers in the plant are operable as determined by visual examinations. It is noted that the existing Technical Specifications require both visual and functional tests of snubbers. The licensee proposed changes in the snubber visual inspection schedule only.

The existing snubber visual inspection schedule is independent of the snubber population size. However, the methodology used for the proposed snubber visual inspection schedule depends on the snubber population size. The licensee used a snubber population size of 200 in deriving the snubber visual inspection schedule in their 1987 submittals. The current change request would, effectively, be applicable only to the Unit 2 inaccessible snubber population which exceeds 400 snubbers. Thus, actual snubber reliability would exceed that utilized by the NRC in their March 30, 1987 approval. A comparison of the results of the proposed visual inspection schedule with the inspection schedule in the generic letter under preparation by the staff, indicates that the licensee's approach yields more conservative results. Thus, fewer inoperable snubbers would be permitted by the licensee's proposed methodology in comparison with the number anticipated to be allowed by the staff's approach in the generic letter under preparation, assuming other parameters such as snubber population and inspection interval are the same. The licensee indicated in a telephone conversation on June 15, 1990, that the actual results of the statistical analysis were less restrictive, but that the proposed numbers for inoperable snubbers were conservatively reduced to the extent necessary to satisfy the relief request requirements of the 1987 submittal and, also, to provide an additional margin of safety. On this basis, the staff finds the licensee's proposed inspection schedule acceptable.

Inoperable Snubber In Visual Examination of Unit 2

An inaccessible hydraulic snubber, 2MS-R88 in the main steam piping system was found unsatisfactory during the last visual inspection because the pivot pin was not engaged in the top ear of the clevis at the pipe side of the snubber. The snubber was functionally tested with both ends pinned, and found to be acceptable. It was not tested in the as-found condition because of safety considerations. An evaluation of the as-found condition indicated that in the case of a dynamic event the snubber would have remained marginally functional but would not have been capable of carrying its designed load. The evaluation for short-term operability was based on an assumption that the snubber was unpinned because of the uncertainty of whether the vertically oriented pin with the top retaining ring missing would have remained partially engaged had a seismic event occurred. The evaluation concluded that the snubber failure did not adversely affect the short-term operability of the related portions of piping and pipe supports.

Based on a review of the circumstances and the nature of the snubber failure, the staff finds that inoperable snubber 2MS-R88, was an isolated case. Therefore, the statistical analysis on which the staff's acceptance of the proposed methodology for snubber visual inspection was based remain valid.

3.0 SUMMARY

The staff has reviewed and evaluated the licensee's requests. We have concluded that the proposed snubber visual inspection schedule submitted in the letter dated February 8, 1990, provides a level of snubber reliability similar to that of the existing inspection schedule when compared on a consistent statistical basis using the proposed statistical model and snubber population size. Thus, the proposed one-time TS change that will be in effect until the startup from the seventh refueling outage at Farley, Unit 2, is acceptable. Furthermore, we have concluded that the inoperable snubber (i.e., 2MS-R88) found during the last visual inspection at Farley, Unit 2 was an isolated case and the statistical analysis on which the proposed methodology for visual inspection was based is still valid.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes the surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released off site, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (55 FR 12588) on April 4, 1990, and consulted with the State of Alabama. No public comments or requests for hearing were received, and the State of Alabama did not have any comments.

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: July 11, 1990

Principal Contributor: J. Rajan

AMENDMENT NO. 75 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8 - FARLEY, UNIT 2

~~Docket File~~

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PDII-1 Reading

S. Varga (14E4)

G. Lainas

E. Adensam

P. Anderson

S. Hoffman

OGC

D. Hagan (MNBB 3302)

E. Jordan (MNBB 3302)

G. Hill (4) (P1-137)

Wanda Jones (P-130A)

J. Calvo (11D3)

J. Rajan

L. Marsh

ACRS (10)

GPA/PA

OC/LFMB

cc: Farley Service List