



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2
AND AMENDMENT NO. 70 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-8
ALABAMA POWER COMPANY
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-348 AND 50-364

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 10, 1988, as superceded by letter dated May 26, 1988, Alabama Power Company (APCo) submitted a request for changes to the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications.

The Amendments revise management titles shown in Technical Specifications, Section 6, Administrative Controls. The title of Senior Vice President is replaced with Vice President-Nuclear.

2.0 EVALUATION AND SAFETY SUMMARY

The following is a brief description and evaluation of the changes proposed by the licensee in a letter dated May 26, 1988, after discussions with the NRC staff:

Technical Specification Sections 6.1.2, 6.2.1.c, 6.2.3.4, 6.5.2.2, 6.5.2.8, 6.5.2.9, 6.5.2.10, 6.6.1, and 6.7.1 would change the reference of Senior Vice President to the new title of Vice President-Nuclear. The requested changes are acceptable since the position of Vice President-Nuclear is a sufficiently high corporate level position to implement the responsibilities designated within each of these sections.

Technical Specification Sections 6.5.1.8 and 6.5.3.1.d would be changed to delete the requirement that certain items be forwarded to the Senior Vice President (now Vice President-Nuclear) in addition to the Chairman of the Nuclear Operations Review Board. These changes are acceptable since the Vice President-Nuclear is now the Chairman of the Nuclear Operations Review Board and has assumed the duties previously designated to the Senior Vice President. Also, we consider the Vice President-Nuclear to be a sufficiently high corporate level position, as discussed above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments change recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, these amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 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.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (53 FR 22398) on June 15, 1988, and consulted with the State of Alabama. No public comments or requests for hearing were received, and the State of Alabama did not have any comments.

The Staff 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, 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.

Principal Contributors: F. Allenspach
E. Reeves

Dated: July 18, 1988