



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 105 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2
AND AMENDMENT NO. 98 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8
SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, INC.
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-348 AND 50-364

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated November 24, 1993, as supplemented February 15, 1994, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (the licensee), submitted a request for changes to the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS). The February 15, 1994, submittal provided clarifying information that did not change the initial determination of no significant hazards consideration as published in the Federal Register.

The requested amendment would change the TS to modify the requirements of TS 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 and relocate Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-5, which provide the response time limits for the reactor trip system (RTS) and the engineered safety features actuation system (ESFAS) instruments, from the TS to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The licensee has stated that the next update of the UFSAR will include these tables. The NRC provided guidance to all holders of operating licenses or construction permits for nuclear power reactors on the proposed TS changes in Generic Letter 93-08, "Relocation of Technical Specification Tables of Instrument Response Time Limits," dated December 23, 1993.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee has proposed changes to TS 3.3.1 and TS 3.3.2 that remove the references to Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-5 and deletes these tables from the TS. In a letter dated February 15, 1994, the licensee committed to relocate the tables on response time limits to the UFSAR in the next periodic update.

Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-5 contain the values of the response time limits for the RTS and ESFAS instruments. The limiting conditions for operation for the RTS and ESFAS instrumentation specify these systems shall be operable with the response times as specified in these tables. These limits are the acceptance criteria for the response time tests performed to satisfy the surveillance requirements of TS 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.2.3 for each applicable RTS and ESFAS trip function. These surveillances ensure that the response times of the RTS and ESFAS instruments are consistent with the assumptions of the safety analyses performed for design basis accidents and transients. Because it does not alter the TS requirements to perform response time tests or to ensure that the

response times of the RTS and ESFAS instruments are within their limits, the staff has concluded that relocation of these response time limit tables from the TS to UFSAR is a change only in the administrative requirements. In addition the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 provide an acceptable means to control changes in response time limits. The staff also has concluded that 10 CFR 50.36 does not require inclusion of specific response time limits for the RTS and ESFAS systems in the TS because, within the operability determination for these systems, the surveillance requirements have to be satisfied.

In addition, the licensee is modifying the TS Bases Sections 3/4.3.1 and 3/4.3.2 to reflect these changes and has stated that the plant procedures for response time testing include acceptance criteria that reflect the RTS and ESFAS response time limits in the tables being relocated to the UFSAR.

These TS changes are consistent with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 93-08 and the TS requirement of 10 CFR 50.36. The staff has determined that the proposed changes to the TS for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 are acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the State of Alabama official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The 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. The NRC 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 offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (59 FR 629). Accordingly, the 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 the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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 the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: Thomas G. Dunning
Byron L. Siegel

Date: March 21, 1994