

October 13, 2006

Mr. H. L. Sumner, Jr.  
Vice President - Farley Project  
Southern Nuclear Operating  
Company, Inc.  
Post Office Box 1295  
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

SUBJECT: JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 REQUEST  
FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR GENERIC LETTER 2006-03,  
"POTENTIALLY NONCONFORMING HEMYC AND MT FIRE BARRIER  
CONFIGURATIONS" (TAC NOS. MD1578 AND MD1579)

Dear Mr. Sumner:

By letter dated June 9, 2006, Southern Nuclear Company (SNC) provided a response to Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Generic Letter 2006-03, "Potentially Nonconforming Hemyc and MT Fire Barrier Configurations," for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (FNP). The NRC staff has reviewed that response and has identified a need for additional information as stated in the enclosure. This issue was discussed with the SNC staff for the FNP on July 27, 2006. We request that a response to these issues be provided within 45 days of the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

Robert E. Martin, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

October 13, 2006

Mr. H. L. Sumner, Jr.  
Vice President - Farley Project  
Southern Nuclear Operating  
Company, Inc.  
Post Office Box 1295  
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

SUBJECT: JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 REQUEST  
FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR GENERIC LETTER 2006-03,  
"POTENTIALLY NONCONFORMING HEMYC AND MT FIRE BARRIER  
CONFIGURATIONS" (TAC NOS. MD1578 AND MD1579)

Dear Mr. Sumner:

By letter dated June 9, 2006, Southern Nuclear Company (SNC) provided a response to Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Generic Letter 2006-03, "Potentially Nonconforming Hemyc and MT Fire Barrier Configurations," for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (FNP). The NRC staff has reviewed that response and has identified a need for additional information as stated in the enclosure. This issue was discussed with the SNC staff for the FNP on July 27, 2006. We request that a response to these issues be provided within 45 days of the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

Robert E. Martin, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

**DISTRIBUTION:**

Public	RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsNrrPMRJervy
LPL2-1 R/F	RidsNrrDorLpl2-1(EMarinos)	RidsNrrPMRMartin(hard copy)
RidsOgcRp	RidsRgn2MailCenter(SShaeffe)	
RidsNrrLARSola(hard copy)	RidsNrrDraAfpb	

Accession No.: ML062780449

OFFICE	NRR/LPL2-1/PM	NRR/LPL2-1/LA	NRR/AFP/BC	NRR/LPL2-1/BC
NAME	RMartin	RSola	SWeerakkody	EMarinos
DATE	10/11/06	10/6/06	09/07/06	10/13/06

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

GENERIC LETTER 2006-03

POTENTIALLY NONCONFORMING HEYMC AND MT FIRE BARRIER CONFIGURATIONS

JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

FOR RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2, DOCKET NO. 50-348

AND RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8 DOCKET NO. 50-364

For the Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP), the Promat H board is described as a fire barrier that separates redundant trains within the same fire area (for example, cable tray enclosures). The response states that Promat H board is tested in accordance with Underwriter Laboratories document UL 263, American Society for Testing and Materials document ASTM E119, and the National Fire Protection Association document NFPA 251. Use of these tests and standards identifies fire testing for building members and assemblies, but does not specifically address 1 and 3-hour fire barrier systems protecting electrical raceways.

This issue was discussed during a phone call with the FNP staff on July 27, 2006. The following are follow-up questions from that phone call to confirm the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff's understanding of the FNP Promat configuration.

1. How was the Promat tested? Confirm that, per the phone call, the ASTM E119 time temperature, full scale fire testing was used.
2. What acceptance criteria were used? Confirm that, per the phone call, the 325 degrees Fahrenheit temperature criterion was used.
3. How were installed configurations that were different from tested configurations evaluated? Confirm that, per the phone call, the field installation deviations from the tested configurations were evaluated in accordance with the Generic Letter 86-10, Section 3.2.2 criteria.

Enclosure

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2

cc:

Mr. J. R. Johnson  
General Manager  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
P.O. Box 470  
Ashford, AL 36312

Mr. B. D. McKinney, Licensing Manager  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1295  
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Mr. M. Stanford Blanton  
Balch and Bingham Law Firm  
P.O. Box 306  
1710 Sixth Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35201

Mr. J. Gasser  
Executive Vice President  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1295  
Birmingham, AL 35201

State Health Officer  
Alabama Department of Public Health  
434 Monroe St.  
Montgomery, AL 36130-1701

Chairman  
Houston County Commission  
P.O. Box 6406  
Dothan, AL 36302

Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
7388 N. State Highway 95  
Columbia, AL 36319