



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 60 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-2  
AND AMENDMENT NO. 51 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 September 19, 1985, Alabama Power Company (APCo) proposed Technical Specification (TS) changes to revise the Administrative Controls section. The changes would reflect retitles of on-site and off-site licensee management. Other reorganizational changes would be made for certain plant maintenance activities, and for computer services and operations functions. The licensee states the proposed changes will restructure the off-site and on-site organizations and enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the support services and operations functions for the Farley Nuclear Plant. Our evaluation of these changes follows.

Discussion and Evaluation

For the on-site organization, the following title changes have been proposed; Plant Manager to General Manager-Nuclear Plant; Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Operations to Assistant General Manager-Plant Operations; Assistant Plant Manager-Plant Support to Assistant General Manager-Plant Support; and Plant Superintendents to Managers of their respective organizations. These changes in titles result in administrative changes being needed to the existing TS. Such changes would have no direct effect on safe operation of the facility. Possibly there would be some enhancement in stature of the on-site management. In any case, these changes are acceptable to the staff.

For the off-site organization, APCo proposed to combine and retitle the positions Manager - Nuclear Operations and Administration, and Manager - Nuclear Engineering and Technical Support (NETS) as General Manager-Nuclear Support. The functional responsibilities of the Manager-Nuclear Operations and Administration and the Manager-NETS have been delegated to the General Manager-Nuclear Support. The management change to a single General Manager-Nuclear Support also necessitates a change in the members of the Nuclear Operations Review Board (NORB). In order to preserve the current membership of four persons in the NORB, it is proposed that the General Manager-Nuclear Plant become a permanent member of the NORB.

8602120549 860127  
PDR ADDCK 05000348  
P PDR

There is some concern in having the General Manager-Nuclear Plant function as a permanent member of both the on-site Plant Operations Review Committee and the independent, off-site NORB. The licensee is aware of ANSI Standard N18.7-1976/ANS-3.2, Section 4.3.2.1, which states:

Committee Composition: When a standing committee is responsible for the independent review program, it shall be composed of no less than five persons, of whom no more than a minority are members of the onsite operating organization. Competent alternates are permitted if designated in advance. The use of alternates shall be restricted to legitimate absences of principals.

The current TS 6.5.2.2 requires that the NORB be composed of at least four persons. The licensee may want to consider changing this TS at a future date to more accurately reflect the ANSI standard. The NRC staff will evaluate the independent functioning of the NORB during future site inspections. However, at this time we consider the proposed changes to be acceptable.

The other organizational changes as proposed are also acceptable based on the following:

- (1) Changing of the maintenance and electrical groups functions from a single maintenance supervisor to separate supervisions, in one case a supervisor responsible for mechanical maintenance and in the other case a supervisor responsible for the electrical area would appear to be an improvement which could affect efficiency in a positive way.
- (2) The Plant Modifications Supervisor is retitled Plant Modifications Manager and reports directly to the Assistant General Manager - Plant Support. Previously the position reported to the Systems and Performance Planning Superintendent. The change appears to enhance the position. The management of the plant modifications has become a very important post-licensing area of responsibility. Thus, the change could be a safety enhancement.
- (3) The change of the Computer Services Supervisor from reporting to the Technical Superintendent (Operations) to reporting to the Performance and Planning Manager (Plant Support) is more in line with actual computer usage at the facility. It also removes some administrative duties from the operations side of the organization.
- (4) The change to replace the Operations Supervisor function with an Operations Staff eliminates one level of management between the Operations Manager and the Shift Supervisor who are both directly responsible for day-to-day plant operations. Thus, the change places the Operations Manager in more direct control of plant operations and plant safety.
- (5) The changes to add a Daily Planning Supervisor and Building and Grounds Supervisor reporting directly to the Operations Manager raised some staff concerns. However, during a discussion between our staff and the APCo staff, APCo noted that the changes simply corrected an omission in

the earlier figure. These two groups have existed and reported in the same manner for years. Since the changes are considered as administrative corrections to Figure 6.2-2, we conclude that the changes are acceptable. However, we consider that the Buildings and Grounds Supervisor (who now reports to the Operations Manager) should more appropriately report in the plant support chain. This would reduce the administrative burden as we noted in (4) above. APCo should consider such a change to remove this maintenance function from the plant operations line of command in a future review of the organization.

#### Safety Summary

Based on our review of the licensee's submittal and the evaluation as noted above, we find the proposed changes to the Farley Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications to be acceptable. We have determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved since the changes are administrative in nature.

#### 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: January 27, 1986

#### Principal Contributors:

P. B. Moore  
E. A. Reeves