



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 34 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8  
ALABAMA POWER COMPANY  
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 2  
DOCKET NO. 50-364

INTRODUCTION

Alabama Power Company (APCo) letter dated November 24, 1982, supplemented March 23, 1984, submitted proposed changes to the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 2 Technical Specifications. Specifically, the proposed changes are:

- 1) Addition of a list of containment penetration overcurrent protection devices as Table 3.8-1 in accordance with license condition 2.C.(19)(b).
- 2) Changing the description of the replaced 18" mini-purge valves to 8" containment vent valves, in accordance with license condition 2.C.(17).
- 3) Addition of a list of safety-related mechanical snubbers into Table 3.7-4b in accordance with the note requiring the addition following the first refueling outage.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

We have reviewed the APCo submittals, noted above, as follows:

1. Overcurrent Protection Devices

The proposed amendment lists in Table 3.8-1 of the Technical Specifications the modification of circuit protection devices in the containment penetration circuits. The modifications were approved in the NRC Safety Evaluation Report, Supplement No. 5, dated March 1981. The proposed change updates Table 3.8-1, Containment Penetration Conductor Overcurrent Protective Devices, to include all installed protection devices.

Some changes to the approved containment penetration circuits were made and are shown in the proposed Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes involve the addition or changes to backup protection to the primary protection for various circuits, and changes to the primary protection trip setpoints and response times.

The changes are considered administrative in nature, not affecting the licensing requirements or the previously approved NRC Safety Evaluation

B406080085 B40517  
PDR ADOCK 05000364  
P PDR

Report. Based on our review, the intent of license condition 2.C.(19)(b) has been met by the licensee, and the Technical Specification changes are acceptable.

## 2. Containment Ventilation System 8" Valve

License condition 2.C.(17) required installation of a modified containment vent and purge system prior to startup following the first refueling. The licensee has modified the system by replacing the 18" mini-purge valves with 8" valves as described in letters dated September 30 and October 30, 1981. The NRC staff review of the design resulted in several discussions with the licensee's staff and supplemental letters from APCo dated December 20, 1983 and March 23, 1984.

The licensee continues to state that the system, as designed, requires continuous venting of the containment to the outside atmosphere through the 8" lines to limit containment pressure. Based on this continuous vent mode of operation, Technical Specifications for periodic leakage rate testing of the valves has not been proposed by APCo. The licensee's basis for the continuous operation of the vent system is to purge the containment of contaminants to ensure ready entry to the containment building. Also, the licensee contends that the modified design complies with the requirements of NRC's Branch Technical Position CSB 6-4 Containment Purging During Normal Plant Operations. However, the intent of CSB 6-4 is that plant designs should not rely on the use of containment purge and vent systems on a routine, continuous basis. The position also states that provisions should be made for testing the leakage rate of the isolation valves during reactor operations. We are continuing our review of the design and operation of the system. The need for continuous purging and venting is still considered an open issue for the Farley Plant pending agreement on a "goal" for purging as identified to APCo in our letter dated August 5, 1981, Enclosure 2, and on Technical Specifications for leakage tests of valves with resident seals and actions when the 8" valves are inoperable.

The proposed Technical Specifications provided by the licensee's letter dated November 24, 1982, supplemented March 23, 1984, are acceptable as needed administrative changes. The changes correct the vent valve size to agree with the existing valve size. Other minor changes meet NRC guidance to clarify that the inoperable 48" valve is sealed closed (NUREG-0737 Item II.E.4.2.6) and that the 8" vent is used only for safety related reasons. The intent of license condition 2.C.(17) has been met by the licensee since the 18" system has been replaced by the 8" system whose design we are reviewing under separate action.

## 3. Listing of Safety-Related Mechanical Snubbers

The note shown on Table 3.7-4b of the Technical Specifications contains a requirement that a list of safety-related mechanical snubbers be provided prior to startup following the first refueling outage. The proposed change

simply adds the list of mechanical snubbers to Table 3.7-4b. We have reviewed the Table 3.7-4b listing of snubbers and find the tabulated data to be acceptable.

#### SUMMARY

Our review, based on the discussion and evaluation noted above, concludes that the licensee's proposed Technical Specification changes meet the intent of license conditions 2.C.(17) and 2.C.(19)(b), and the notation of specification Table 3.7-4b, and are acceptable as administrative changes made to comply with Commission guidance.

#### Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### Conclusion

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and 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: May 17, 1984

#### Principal Contributors:

E. H. Brooks  
E.A. Reeves