

Official

SEP 26 1988

Alabama Power Company
ATTN: Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Senior Vice President-Nuclear
Operations
P. O. Box 2641
Birmingham, AL 35291-0400

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: DOCKET NOS. 50-348 AND 50-364, CONFIRMATORY MEASUREMENT RESULTS,
SUPPLEMENT TO INSPECTION REPORT NOS. 50-348/88-10 AND 50-364/88-10

As part of the NRC Confirmatory Measurements Program, spiked liquid samples were sent on June 2, 1988, to your Farley facility for selected radiochemical analyses. We are in receipt of your analytical results transmitted to us by your letter dated August 4, 1988, and the following comparison of your results to the known values are presented in Enclosure 1 for your information. The acceptance criteria for the comparisons are listed in Enclosure 2.

In our review of the data, comparative results were in agreement for H-3, Sr-89, and Sr-90 analyses and disagreement for the Fe55 analysis. This disagreement may be indicative of a programmatic weakness and therefore your attention is directed to determining the underlying cause for this disagreement. Furthermore, all data should be reviewed in greater detail by cognizant staff members for significant trends in the data among successive years in which samples have been analyzed by your facility.

Mr. D. Grissette of your Farley facility staff, was informally notified of these results on September 19, 1988.

These results and any results from previous years pertaining to these analyses will be discussed at future NRC inspections.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By
D. M. Collins

Douglas M. Collins, Chief
Emergency Preparedness and
Radiological Protection Branch
Division of Radiation Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosures:

1. Confirmatory Measurement Comparisons
2. Criteria for Comparing Analytical Measurements

cc w/encl: (See page 2)

8810100004 880926
PDR ADOCK 05000348
G PNU

11
IC06

cc w/encls:

- ✓ B. M. Guthrie, Executive Vice President
- ✓ D. N. Morey, General Manager - Nuclear Plant
- ✓ D. D. Woodard, Vice President - Nuclear Generation
- ✓ J. W. McGowan, Manager-Safety Audit and Engineering Review
- ✓ S. Fulmer, Supervisor-Safety Audit and Engineering Review State of Alabama

bcc w/encls:

- ✓ NRC Resident Inspector
- DRS Technical Assistant
- ✓ E. [unclear], Project Manager, NRR
- ✓ [unclear] Control Desk

RII
PLS
PStoddart
9/21/88

RII
JMH
JMahle
9/23/88

RII
HD
HDance
9/22/88

ENCLOSURE 1

CONFIRMATORY MEASUREMENT COMPARISONS OF H-3, Fe-55, Sr-89, AND Sr-90 ANALYSES
FOR FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT ON AUGUST 4, 1988

<u>Isotope</u>	<u>Licensee</u> [uCi/ml]	<u>NRC</u> [uCi/ml]	<u>Resolution</u>	<u>Ratio</u> [Licensee/NRC]	<u>Comparison</u>
H-3	2.22 E-05	2.02 ± 0.04 E-05	51	1.10	Agreement
Fe-55	1.46 E-05	1.99 ± 0.04 E-05	50	0.73	Disagreement
Sr-89	1.22 E-04	1.53 ± 0.05 E-04	31	0.80	Agreement
Sr-90	7.36 E-06	9.20 ± 0.37 E-06	25	0.80	Agreement

ENCLOSURE 2

CRITERIA FOR COMPARING ANALYTICAL MEASUREMENTS

This enclosure provides criteria for comparing results of capability tests and verification measurements. The criteria are based on an empirical relationship which combines prior experience and the accuracy needs of this program.

In these criteria, the judgment limits denoting agreements of disagreement between licensee and NRC results are variable. This variability is a function of the NRC's value relative to its associated uncertainty, referred to in this program as "Resolution"¹ increases, the range of acceptable differences between the NRC and licensee values should be more restrictive. Conversely, poorer agreement between NRC and licensee values must be considered acceptable as the resolution decreases.

For comparison purposes, a ratio² of the licensee value to the NRC value for each individual nuclide is computed. This ratio is then evaluated for agreement based on the calculated resolution. The corresponding resolution and calculated ratios which denote agreement are listed in Table 1 below. Values outside of the agreement ratios for a selected nuclide are considered in disagreement.

$$^1 \text{ Resolution} = \frac{\text{NRC Reference Value for a Particular Nuclide}}{\text{Associated Uncertainty for the Value}}$$

$$^2 \text{ Comparison Ratio} = \frac{\text{Licensee Value}}{\text{NRC Reference Value}}$$

TABLE 1

Confirmatory Measurements Acceptance Criteria
Resolutions vs. Comparison Ratio

<u>Resolution</u>	<u>Comparison Ratio for Agreement</u>
<4	0.4 - 2.5
4 - 7	0.5 - 2.0
8 - 15	0.6 - 1.66
16 - 50	0.75 - 1.33
51 - 200	0.80 - 1.25
>200	0.85 - 1.18