



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos. 50-348/81-01 and 50-364/81-01

Licensee: Alabama Power Company
600 North 18th Street
Birmingham, AL 35202

Facility Name: Farley 1 and 2

Docket Nos. 50-348, 50-364

License Nos. NPF-2, CPPR-86

Inspection at Farley site near Dothan, Alabama

Inspector: P. H. Skinner
P. H. Skinner

Feb. 6, 1981
Date Signed

Approved by: C. M. Upright
C. M. Upright, Acting Section Chief, RONS Branch

2/6/81
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on January 12-16, 1981

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 38 inspector-hours on site. The area examined was Plant Procedures.

Results

Of the area inspected, one apparent violation was found (failure to update an operating procedure).

8104060 134-

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *W. Carr, Safety, Audit and Engineering Review
- *G. Hairston, III, Plant Manager
- J. Hudspeth, Document Control Supervisor
- *J. Kale, Jr., Safety Audit and Engineering Review
- *H. McClellan, General Plant Engineering, Supervisor, Acting
- D. Morey, Operations Superintendent
- R. Rodgers, Technical Supervisor

Other licensee employees contacted included technicians, operators, and office personnel.

NRC Resident Inspectors

- *W. Bradford
- *J. Mulkey

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on January 16, 1981 with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee was informed of the violation as discussed in paragraph 5.b. The licensee acknowledged the inspection findings.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Procedures (42700)

- References:
- (a) ANSI 18.7, 1972, Administrative Controls for Nuclear Power Plants
 - (b) Technical Specifications
 - (c) 10 CFR 50.59 Changes, tests and experiments
 - (d) Regulatory Guide 1.33, dated November 1972, Quality Assurance Program Requirements (Operation)

(e) Final Safety Analysis Report

The inspector reviewed plant procedures in accordance with the guidance and requirements provided by references (a) through (e) above to ascertain whether overall procedures are in accordance with Regulatory requirements. Procedures in the following categories were reviewed: Unit Operating Procedures (UOP), System Operating Procedures (SOP), and Administrative Procedures (AP). In conjunction with the SOP review, various Annunciator Response Procedures (ARP), Abnormal Operating Procedures (AOP), Maintenance Procedures (MP), and Instrument Maintenance Procedures (IMP) associated with the SOP's were also examined.

The following criteria were used during this review:

- Required review and approval of procedure changes and temporary changes had been performed, including conformance to reference (c) requirements.
- Overall procedure content is consistent with references (b) and (e).
- Operating procedures located in the Control Room area were current with respect to revisions and temporary changes.
- Records of changes in procedures made pursuant to reference (c) are being maintained.

As a result of this review, one apparent violation (paragraph 5.b.) and one inspector followup item (paragraph 5.c.) were identified.

a. Unit Operating Procedures

FNP-1-UOP-2.1 Shutdown of Unit From Minimum Load to Hot Standby, Revision 8, dated 11/79.

FNP-1-UOP-1.2 Startup of Unit From Hot Standby to Minimum Load, Revision 13, dated 10/79.

No violations or deviations were identified.

b. System Operating Procedures

FNP-1-SOP-9.0 Containment Spray System, Revision 4 dated 12/79

FNP-1-SOP-1.1 Reactor Coolant System, Revision 7 dated 11/79

FNP-1-SOP-2.1 CVCS Plant Startup and Operation, Revision 7 dated 11/79

FNP-1-SOP-17 Main and Reheat Steam, Revision 6 dated 3/80

FNP-1-SOP-23 Component Cooling Water System, Revision 2 dated 11/79.

FNP-1-SOP-39.0 Nuclear Instrumentation System, Revision 0 dated 10/75.

Based on this review, one apparent violation was identified. The System Checklist of SOP-23 required the position of Valve Q1P17V189 RHR pump 1A seal HxCCW inlet line drain to be open. Normal system operation requires this valve to be closed. No revision or temporary change had been written to correct this deficiency. A review of the most recently completed valve lineup performed in March, 1980 identified that the valve had been closed by the operator performing the valve lineup. This was identified by a single line through the required position and writing in the new position. No documentation was initiated by personnel performing the lineup or persons checking the lineup as required by FNP-0-AP-6 Procedure Adherence, Revision 1 dated 4/77.

This failure to maintain adequate written procedures is a violation (348/81-01-01).

c. Administrative Procedures

FNP-0-AP-1 Development, Review, and Approval of Plant Procedures, Revision 7 dated 10/77

FNP-0-AP-4 Control of Plant Documents and Records, Revision 5 dated 10/80

FNP-0-AP-6 Procedure Adherence Revision 1 dated 4/77

FNP-0-AP-11 Control and Calibration of Test Equipment and test Instrumentation, Revision 3 dated 11/80.

FNP-0-AP-16 Conduct of Operations - Operations Group

Based on this review, one inspector followup item was identified. FNP-0-AP-4, Control of Plant Documents and Records, requires that verification be performed by all personnel holding controlled copies of procedures. This verification is to be performed at intervals not to exceed twelve months. In reviewing the verification documentation of this audit, the inspector could not substantiate with the available documentation that this requirement was performed.

The AP-4 procedure is not specific in that it does not delineate requirements to assure the audit is performed in a timely manner. The review of this documentation identified the following; of 36 controlled copies of Administrative Procedures, only 26 verifications had been received by

document control; of 20 controlled copies of Unit Operating Procedures, only 14 verifications had been received; of 12 controlled copies of System Operating Procedures, only 11 verifications had been received (the one that had not been received was the Control Room copy). The procedure did not require nor is the verification sheet dated as to issue, due and accomplishment date. The inspector audited the control room copy of System Operating Procedures to assure that only the latest approved procedures were being used and found no discrepancies. The Document Control Supervisor stated he would revise the audit form to incorporate dates that will specify when this audit will be accomplished.

This is identified as an inspector followup item (348/81-01-02).