



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 54 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2  
AND AMENDMENT NO. 45 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8

ALABAMA POWER COMPANY

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

DOCKET NOS. 50-348 AND 50-364

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 25, 1984, supplemented September 24, 1984, Alabama Power Company (APCo), the licensee of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2, proposed changes to the Technical Specifications, Section 6, Administrative Controls. The changes relate to the licensee's proposed facility organizational changes to reflect two Assistant Plant Managers. Our discussion and evaluation follows.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

The proposed change would establish two Assistant Plant Managers: an Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Operations (SRO licensed) responsible for Operations, Maintenance, and Technical Support; and a new Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Support who will have responsibility for Administration Training, and Performance and Planning. The justification provided by the licensee for the change is to allow the Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Operations "greater freedom from administrative and non-operations related responsibilities. This greater freedom will allow more management attention to be focused on the safe operation of the two Farley nuclear units and therefore enhance safety."

Following discussions between the Commission staff and the APCo staff the licensee proposed a clarification by letter dated September 24, 1984 to the staffing table in Figure 6.2-2 of the Technical Specifications to add a footnote #1 referencing the Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Support. Footnote #1 states that "The person filling this position may act as the Plant Manager, provided this person meets the requirements of ANSI N18.1-1971 Section 4.2.1, FSAR Section 13.1.3.1.1, and has completed Emergency Director Training." In addition, the licensee has agreed to amend the Farley FSAR and plant procedure references to the Assistant Plant Manager assuming responsibility for normal or emergency plant operations, or replacing the Plant Manager, to normally specify Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Operations, an SRO licensed position.

As specified in the September 24, 1984, clarification letter, the Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Support may also occasionally fulfill these responsibilities provided he meets all of the requirements specified in Footnote #1 of Technical Specification 6.2.2. The FSAR amendments have already been initiated by the licensee per 10 CFR 50.59, and the procedure modifications should be completed within 30 days after approval of these licensing amendments.

The licensee states that their September 24, 1984, letter clarifies the original intent of the earlier proposed change relating to the Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Support. The licensee also states that the clarification is a non-substantive change to the June 25, 1984 proposal. We agree. However, we consider the change as a necessary clarification to assure a fully qualified Plant Manager when the Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Support would replace or substitute for the actual Plant Manager.

#### SAFETY SUMMARY

It is our opinion that the June 25 submittal with the clarification of September 24, 1984, adequately ensures that the person responsible for operation of the plant will at all times meet the training and experience requirements necessary to ensure the health and safety of the public. The establishment of two Assistant Plant Manager positions should allow increased management attention on plant operations. Therefore, the requested Technical Specification changes to Section 6, Administrative Controls, are acceptable.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve only changes in administrative procedure and requirements. Accordingly, these amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Section 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

#### 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: November 27, 1984

#### Principal Contributors:

D. Statler, Region II

E. A. Reeves