

Alabama Power Company
600 North 18th Street
Post Office Box 2641
Birmingham, Alabama 35291-0400
Telephone 205 250-1835

R. P. McDonald
Senior Vice President

Docket Nos. 50-348
50-364



Alabama Power
the southern electric system

10CFR50.54

May 23, 1988

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

Gentlemen:

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant - Units 1 & 2
Bolt Samples Obtained During
Procurement Inspection Conducted May 11-22, 1987

In response to NRC letter dated April 21, 1988 concerning the chemical and mechanical test results for the samples of fasteners obtained during the procurement inspection conducted May 11-22, 1987 at Farley Nuclear Plant, the following information is provided for the actions requested:

1. NRC Item

The results of your review of the test data with respect to the use of the fasteners in your plant and any corrective actions deemed necessary:

APCo Response

According to the NRC letter, bolt Nos. SO-18 through SO-21 were not within the chemical specification requirements and bolt No. SO-23 exceeded the maximum hardness limit. A review of the Brookhaven reports and the procurement records resulted in the following summary of the individual bolt samples:

SO-18

This bolt was purchased as non-safety related, QA review Code A from the Johnston Pump Company. It was purchased as a part for the River Water Pumps which are non-safety related. According to the Brookhaven report, the chromium value of 1.55% exceeded the specification requirement of 1.20% and the carbon content of 0.34% was 0.01% below the minimum. However, the "Certificate of Compliance" furnished by the supplier documents that the bolt meets the required chemical specifications.

A001
110
Add: NRR/DLPG/QAB Ltr
NRR/DRIS/VIB 1

SO-19

This bolt was purchased as safety-related, QA review Code A from the Westinghouse Electric Corporation. It was purchased as a part for the inspection handhole covers for the steam generators. According to the Brookhaven report, the chromium value of 1.80% exceeds the specification requirement of 1.20%. However, according to the mill analysis and a certified test report furnished by Westinghouse, the bolt meets the required chemistry specifications.

SO-20

This bolt was purchased as non-safety related, QA review Code D from Energy Steel and Supply. According to the Brookhaven report, the chromium value of 1.51% exceeds the specification requirement of 1.20%. However, the "Certificate of Compliance" furnished by the supplier documents that the bolt meets the required chemical specifications.

SO-21

This bolt was purchased as non-safety related QA review Code D from Energy Steel and Supply. According to the Brookhaven report the chromium value of 1.46% exceeds the specification requirement of 1.20%. However, the "Certificate of Compliance" furnished by the supplier documents that the bolt meets the required chemical specifications.

SO-23

This bolt was purchased as safety-related, QA review Code A from Power and Engineered Products. According to the Brookhaven report the hardness was out of specification; however, on retest as prescribed by ASTM it was concluded that the bolt met specification requirements.

Prior to determining corrective actions, the chemistry of these bolts will be confirmed. Duplicate bolts of these particular identification numbers have been obtained for analysis by an independent laboratory. Identification numbers and the elements to be checked include:

SO-18	R/N	30603	chromium, carbon
SO-19	R/N	36255	chromium
SO-20	R/N	35108	chromium
SO-21	R/N	35106	chromium

Since it was concluded by the Brookhaven lab that sample SO-23 met the specifications, another analysis of this bolt will not be made.

According to the Brookhaven National Laboratory's "Metallurgical Evaluation" included in the NRC letter of April 21, 1988, the discrepancies in the chemistry of these bolts may be beneficial and/or would not have a significant effect on mechanical properties. It was also concluded in this evaluation that bolts SO-18 through SO-21 are considered "suitable for service." In addition, Alabama Power Company requested a design engineering review of the deviations described in this report. This review resulted in a conclusion that these fasteners are acceptable for service.

2. NRC Item

A description of the steps that have been or will be taken to prevent a reoccurrence, i.e. assure that fasteners purchased meet specifications.

APCo Response

Once it has been confirmed that a fastener does not meet specifications, a plan of action will be developed and appropriate actions taken.

3. NRC Item

The dates your corrective action and preventive measures were or will be completed.

APCo Response

A report including review and evaluation of additional test results, corrective actions, and preventive measures, if any, will be submitted to the NRC by July 22, 1988.

If there are any questions, please advise.

Respectfully submitted,

ALABAMA POWER COMPANY

W.S. Haint
R. P. McDonald

cc: Mr. L. B. Long
Dr. J. N. Grace
Mr. E. A. Reeves
Mr. W. H. Bradford

bc: Mr. Bill M. Guthrie
Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Mr. J. D. Woodard
Mr. J. W. McGowan
Mr. C. D. Nesbitt
Mr. R. G. Berryhill
Mr. D. E. Mansfield
Mr. J. E. Garlington
Mr. K. W. McCracken
Mr. J. A. Ripple
Mr. Scott Fulmer
Mr. J. T. Brantley
Mr. D. B. Hartline
Mr. D. E. Dutton
Mr. J. R. Crane
Mr. T. N. Epps
Mr. K. C. Gandhi
Commitment Tracking System (2)
FNP Document Control
File: K-30.6.2