

ENCLOSURE

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

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

DOCKET NOS. 50-348 AND 364

CONFORMANCE TO REGULATORY GUIDE 1.97

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Alabama Power Company (APCo), the licensee for Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, was requested by Generic Letter 82-33 to provide a report to the NRC describing how the post-accident monitoring instrumentation meets the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.97 as applied to emergency response facilities. APCo's response to Regulatory Guide 1.97 was provided by letters dated March 30, 1984 for Unit No. 1 and June 29, 1984 for Unit No. 2. Additional information was provided by APCo in letters dated April 10, 1985 and August 8, 1986.

A detailed review and technical evaluation of the licensee's submittals was performed by EG&G Idaho, Inc., under contract to the NRC, with general supervision by the NRC staff. This work was reported by EG&G in their Technical Evaluation Report (TER), "Conformance to Regulatory Guide 1.97, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 & 2," dated November 1986 (attached). We have reviewed this report and concur with the conclusion that the licensee either conforms to, or is justified in deviating from the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97 for each post-accident monitoring variable.

8702240016 870212
PDR ADOCK 05000348
P PDR

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Subsequent to the issuance of Generic Letter 82-33, the NRC held regional meetings in February and March 1983 to answer licensee and applicant questions and concerns regarding the NRC policy on Regulatory Guide 1.97. At these meetings, it was noted that the NRC review would only address exceptions taken to the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97. Further, where licensees or applicants explicitly state that instrument systems conform to the provisions of the regulatory guide, it was noted that no further staff review would be necessary. Therefore, the review performed and reported by EG&G only addresses exceptions to the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97. This safety evaluation addresses the licensee's submittals based on the review policy described in the NRC regional meetings and the conclusions of the review as reported by EG&G.

EVALUATION

We have reviewed the evaluation performed by our consultant contained in the enclosed TER and concur with its bases and findings. The licensee either conforms to, or has provided an acceptable justification for deviating from, the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97 for each post-accident monitoring variable.

CONCLUSION

Based on the staff's review of the enclosed Technical Evaluation Report, and the licensee's submittals, we find that the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 design is acceptable with respect to conformance to Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2.

Date:

Principal Contributor: J. Lazevnick