

June 15, 2000

LICENSEE: Tennessee Valley Authority

FACILITIES: Browns Ferry Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3  
Sequoyah Plant, Units 1 and 2  
Watts Bar Plant, Unit 1

SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY OF NRC/TVA LICENSING WORKSHOP  
TAC NO. MA7873

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) jointly sponsored a licensing workshop on April 11 and 12, 2000, at TVA's corporate offices in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The goals of the workshop included improving the quality of licensing submittals, raising the level of knowledge of regulatory processes, and enhancing the licensing interface between the licensee and the NRC staff.

The major topics of discussion included an overview of various regulatory processes such as license amendment and relief request reviews, updates on the status of significant regulatory activities such as ADAMS, Risk Informed Applications, the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation project manager responsibilities, information on electronic information exchange, licensee submittal breakout discussions, and related regulatory topics. A copy of the workshop agenda and presentation materials are available under ADAMS Accession Number ML003720462. Enclosure 1 is a list of attendees at the workshop. Enclosure 2 is an analysis of the feedback forms received after the workshop. Enclosure 3 is a list developed during the workshop of the attributes of a quality license amendment application. Enclosure 4 is a list of questions raised during the workshop.

Please direct any inquiries concerning this workshop to Bob Martin, Project Manager, who can be reached at 301 415-1493.

***/RA/***

Robert E. Martin, Project Manager, Section 2  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-390, 50-327, 50-328, 50-259, 50-260 and 50-296

Enclosures: 1. List of Attendees  
2. Feedback Form Analysis  
3. Attributes of a Quality Submittal  
4. List of Questions and Answers

cc w/encls: See next page

LICENSEE: Tennessee Valley Authority

FACILITIES: Browns Ferry Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3  
Sequoyah Plant, Units 1 and 2  
Watts Bar Plant, Unit 1

SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY OF NRC/TVA LICENSING WORKSHOP  
TAC NO. MA7873

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) jointly sponsored a licensing workshop on April 11 and 12, 2000, at TVA's corporate offices in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The goals of the workshop included improving the quality of licensing submittals, raising the level of knowledge of regulatory processes, and enhancing the licensing interface between the licensee and the NRC staff.

The major topics of discussion included an overview of various regulatory processes such as license amendment and relief request reviews, updates on the status of significant regulatory activities such as ADAMS, Risk Informed Applications, the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation project manager responsibilities, information on electronic information exchange, licensee submittal breakout discussions, and related regulatory topics. A copy of the workshop agenda and presentation materials are available under ADAMS Accession Number ML003720462. Enclosure 1 is a list of attendees at the workshop. Enclosure 2 is an analysis of the feedback forms received after the workshop. Enclosure 3 is a list developed during the workshop of the attributes of a quality license amendment application. Enclosure 4 is a list of questions raised during the workshop.

Please direct any inquiries concerning this workshop to Bob Martin, Project Manager, who can be reached at 301 415-1493.

***/RA/***

Robert E. Martin, Project Manager, Section 2  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-390, 50-327, 50-328, 50-259, 50-260 and 50-296

Enclosures: 1. List of Attendees  
2. Feedback Form Analysis  
3. Attributes of a Quality Submittal  
4. List of Questions and Answers

cc w/encls: See next page

***DISTRIBUTION: see next page***

**Accession Number ML003723991**

OFFICE	PDII-2/PM		PDII-2/LA		PDII-2/SC				
NAME	RMartin		BClayton		RCorreia				
DATE	06/14/00		06/6/00		06/15/00				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

## ATTENDEES

### LICENSING WORKSHOP MEETING OF APRIL 11-12, 2000 WITH TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Jim Smith	SQN Licensing
Zachary Kitts	SQN Licensing
Richard M. Emrath	TVAN Engineering
Linda Moore	Corporate Licensing
Jeffery Goulart	SQN Engineering
Kevin Casey	WBN Engineering
Rebecca N. Mays	WBN Licensing
Frank Koontz	WBN Engineering
Duncan Massey	BFN Licensing
Terry Knuettel	Corporate Licensing
Don J. Green	Corporate Engineering
Bob Martin	NRR/DLPM/PDII
Tim Abney	BFN Licensing
Bill Long	NRR/DLPM/PDII
Richard Correia	NRR/DLPM/PDII
Gerald Moody	BFN Licensing
Paul Heck	BFN Licensing
Steve Austin	BFN Licensing
Charlie Touchstone	WBN Licensing
Don Goodin	SQN Licensing
Keith Weller	SQN Licensing
Lillian Martin	Corporate Licensing
Paul Pace	WBN Licensing
Herb Berkow	NRR/DLPM/PDII
Chuck Wilson	Corporate Licensing
Jerry Bushnell	WBN Licensing
Rickey Stockton	WBN Licensing
Larry Alexander	SQN Engineering
John Kammeyer	WBN Engineering
Bert Morris	BFN Licensing
Robert C. Williams	Corporate Engineering
Ron Hernan	NRR/DLPM/PDII
Jim Shaw	BFN Engineering
Allen Hansen	NRR/DLPM/PDII
James W. Davenport	BFN Licensing
Tony Rogers	BFN Licensing
Mike Morrison	BFN Licensing

## TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY WRITTEN FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

Feedback forms were issued as part of the workshop and all attendees were requested to complete the forms so that improvements could be made for future workshops. Twelve forms were returned. The following are general trends or highlights:

1. The average overall rating for the workshop was approximately 8, which fell into the "Very Good" category.
2. The responses were positive concerning the overall format and context of the workshop. A number of responses were made concerning specific aspects of the workshop. These comments have been included with feedback concerning strengths, weaknesses, or recommended changes to the workshop.
3. Typical responses to the question, "What were the workshop's strengths?" included:
  - a. The opportunity to enhance the communication relationship with NRC licensing staff (multiple comments).
  - b. The open discussion forum.
  - c. Improved licensee perspective on NRC's information needs in licensing processes.
  - d. The involvement of licensee engineering representatives.
  - e. The use of examples in illustrating strengths and weaknesses in licensing submittals.
4. Typical responses to the question, "What were the workshop's weaknesses?" included:
  - a. Some of the details of NRC's administrative procedures seemed unnecessary for the workshop.
  - b. More attention to breakout sessions discussing examples of strong licensing submittals (license amendments, relief requests and generic issues) would be beneficial (multiple comments).
5. A representative licensee response to the question "How will you use what you've learned at the workshop?" was "The guidelines provided will help improve the quality of the submittals that I develop." (Similar comment from licensing and engineering staff.)
6. The general consensus for the most desirable frequency for these workshops was once every 2 years, with the suggestion that the agenda be adjusted to reflect current regulatory and industry issues with less emphasis on covering baseline processes in each workshop.

QUALITIES OF A "GOOD" LICENSE SUBMITTAL  
FROM TVA/NRC LICENSING WORKSHOP  
April 11 - 12, 2000

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) jointly sponsored a licensing workshop at the Chattanooga Office Complex on April 11 and 12, 2000. A result of the workshop was an outline of the qualities of a "good" submittal as provided below.

The COVER LETTER should include the following attributes and features:

- Docket number(s)
- Specify what action is needed (e.g., technical specification change, relief request, or exemption)
- Cite applicable Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section (10 CFR 50.12, 10 CFR 50.90, or 10 CFR 50.55a)
- Describe contents of letter (e.g., number of enclosures)
- TAC number (get from Project Manager) for all followup correspondence
- Include subject statement (with appropriate key words: technical specification (TS) change, relief request, exemption for Agency Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS))
- Provide background information
- Reference telecons if responding to request from call (include dates and individuals involved)
- References to other relevant item (i.e., Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOEDs), previous letter, etc.)
- Specify if it is a risk-informed request
- Describe regulatory guidance used and any exceptions taken
- Cite precedents for same or similar NRC actions
- Note any commitments made to support request
- Specify approval need date, including basis for exigent and emergency requests
- Identification of other pending changes that may be impacted
- Indicate that Plant Operations Review Committee and Nuclear Safety Review Board approvals have been obtained when required
- Describe contacts with other agencies (Federal or State) and industry groups
- Note whether or not request contains proprietary information
- List TVA contact information
- Signature with oath or affirmation statement, if required
- CC list and addressees required by 10 CFR 50.4
- Why 10 CFR Part 51 review was necessary with summary of how it was reviewed

The ENCLOSURES format should generally follow this outline:

- Statement of content
- Developed to be a stand-alone document
  - ◊ Include question and answer for Requests for Additional Information
  - ◊ Provide Code Case or Code quotes for relief requests
  - ◊ Provide references if not already available to staff

- Describe inputs assumptions, conclusions, and method previously approved for calculations. Do not provide calculations to staff unless requested.
- For No Significant Hazard Evaluations:
  - ◊ Use no numbers (e.g., state whether an increase or decrease without stating value)
  - ◊ Include basis for conclusions
  - ◊ Use no undefined acronyms or jargon
  - ◊ Make it a stand-alone document
  - ◊ Do not list references
  - ◊ Do not cite specific TS sections
- Provide clear TS Markups (include other pending changes)
- Provide clean Technical Specification pages
- Provide clear Drawings
- Avoid oversize paper (use 8 ½ x 11)
- Provide affidavits for withholding proprietary information
- Provide list of commitments written with sufficient detail to describe committed action and schedule
- Provide NDE Level III Sketches for inservice inspection and inservice testing relief requests

The LEVEL OF DETAIL should generally provide the following:

- Provide values if they change (don't just say slightly changed)
- Write for technically competent reviewer who knows nothing about the plant
- Use plain English language (i.e., no jargon)
- Describe what is being changed and reason for the change
- Description of any physical plant modification
- Background information
  - ◊ System description and safety function
  - ◊ Relevant prior activities or problems
- Final Safety Analysis Report references and any associated changes
- Describe precedents and how they are applicable
- Describe any deviations from precedents and reasons for deviations
- Describe regulatory guidance used and any exceptions taken
- Identify applicable TSTF
- Describe consistency with ITS or reason for deviation
- Cite relevant regulations and how they are met
- Provide basis for change and technical justification for proposed action
- Associated Bases changes

## List of Questions and Responses

### REVISED 50.59 PROCESS

Question: Confirm that the new 50.59 Rule scope includes the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), the Technical Requirements Manual (TRM), the Fire Protection Rule and leaves out the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's safety evaluations (SEs).

Answer: The scope of Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.59 includes the FSAR and inasmuch as the TRM is incorporated as part of the FSAR, it includes the TRM. The fire protection plan is also incorporated as part of the FSAR. The relationship between the license condition concerning the Fire Protection program and 50.59, is addressed in the draft guidance on 50.59, which is now out for public comment. The issue as it relates to staff SEs is addressed in the publication of the new rule on October 4, 1999 (64 Federal Register 53582). Specifically, the "FSAR (as updated)" is defined in the rule (and this does not include the NRC SEs) - see also response to public comments. Other discussion in the rule about the evaluation criteria also notes that it is the FSAR (as updated) that is the baseline for assessing changes. (See also Office Letter 807, "Control of Licensing Bases for Operating Reactors," ADAMS ML003693397.)

Question: (Tennessee Valley Authority) observed that the level of effort required to prepare periodic lists of all 50.59 evaluations is a burden. Has there been any change in this requirement?

Answer: This reporting requirement remains in the 50.59 Rule.

### RELIEF REQUESTS per 50.55a

Question: Why can't a relief be granted on a generic basis?

Answer: It depends on what the term "generic" refers to. If "generic" means, for example, a pump or valve relief request for all pumps in a particular plant, then such a relief has been approved in the past by the staff. With regard to generic approvals of relief requests, the language of 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3), (f) and (g) indicates that individual applicants or licensees must submit information to the NRC in order to have alternatives authorized or relief granted.

Question: What would be required for a plant to go completely from an earlier Edition of American Society of Mechanical Engineers Code to a later Edition? That is, going from the 1989 Edition to the recently approved 1995 Edition.

Answer: If a licensee, whose Code of record for inservice inspection (ISI) or inservice testing (IST) is the 1989 or earlier Edition/Addenda, wishes to adopt the 1995 Edition/1996 Addenda for ISI or IST, then the licensee needs to submit its request to the NRC for approval pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(f)(4)(iv) or (g)(4)(iv). Basically, sections (f)(4) and (g)(4) allow the adoption, with Commission approval, of later code editions and addenda (in whole or in part) that are incorporated by referenced in 50.55a. If a licensee only wants

to use a portion, the licensee must show that related requirements are met. Approval of later code editions not incorporated in 10 CFR 50.55a must be approved pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3). Adoption of such later editions involve considerable resources and has not been done often. More limited requests have been granted when the requisite showing has been made by the licensee.

Question: Is there an efficient way for licensees to access all issued Relief Requests, such as a central location that can be conveniently accessed?

Answer: Although the NRC staff is aware of some prior industry indications of interest in a data base for relief requests, the NRC staff has not, to date, published such a data base.

However, it should also be noted that with the advent of Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS), licensees can search NRC's records for relief requests and develop a list of approved or denied reliefs, although such a search would only contain relief requests granted since ADAMS became effective, January 2000.

Question: TVA indicated that it did not fully understand the basis for a relief request being granted for one power plant but denied for another plant. Subsequent to the Workshop TVA clarified that its concern related to Code Case N-597, "Requirements for Analytical Evaluation of Pipe Wall Thinning"

Answer: The NRC staff issued a letter dated April 19, 2000, to the Virginia Electric and Power Company for the North Anna and Surry Power Stations denying the request for approval to use Code Case N-597 (ADAMS # ML003704851). The staff concluded in its letter that the request for non-situation-specific application of Code Case N-597 was not acceptable. However, the staff indicated that the licensee may request approval for application of the Code Case on a case-by-case basis, subject to staff review and approval, until it is endorsed by the NRC in Regulatory Guide 1.147, with appropriate limitations and conditions for application.

## ADAMS

Question: Is the distribution list mandated by 10 CFR Section 50.4 going to be changed?

Answer: When a licensee implements Electronic Information Exchange (EIE), it will send one electronic copy to the NRC's EIE server. The 10 CFR 50.4 distribution of hard copies will not be required.

Question: On EIE, is there a limit on the version of WORD specified? TVA uses WORD-95 now. Are there any limits that would impact TVA's movement to later versions of WORD?

Answer: There is no limit on the WORD version, NRC will use the latest version with backward compatibility.

Question: How will proprietary information be handled as it is received in the Document Control Center and interfaced with ADAMS and the NRC's external public server?

Answer: Each document is profiled in its Availability field as either (1) Publically-Available or (2) Non-Publically Available. In addition, there is a Sensitivity field which is used to flag a document as either (1) Non-sensitive, (2) Non-sensitive - Copyright, (3) Sensitive, or (4) Sensitive - Copyright. Proprietary documents will be coded Sensitive and will not be Publically-Available.

Question: Are NUREGs put into ADAMS or otherwise on the NRC website, ie, in the reference Library?

Answer: Future NUREGS will be put into ADAMS.

Question: How significant is the manner and the sequence of construction of the subject line for incoming documents with respect to what will be picked up by Document control to develop the keywords that will be used for subsequent searches for that document?

Answer: Each ADAMS document or package has a "profile" consisting of 31 "property" fields, one of which is "Title." A limit of 254 alphanumeric characters can be entered in this field. The ADAMS document processing personnel will typically enter a document's subject line into the Title field. There is a "Keywords" field, for which words throughout the document are chosen, but due to budget constraints, it is currently used only for internally-generated documents.

The ADAMS search display presented on a computer screen has a limited view area. Only the first few words are displayed unless the mouse is used to rearrange the display. Thus, a well-written subject line will facilitate future retrievals.

## OTHER

Question: How will licensees capture the approximately 250 Technical Specification Task Force travelers (TSTFs) in the most recently approved revision of the Standard Technical Specifications (STS)? That is, how will licensees with STS be able to utilize the many individual TSTFs included in the recent update?

Answer: At present, there are several approaches for licensees to utilize the TSTFs that have been approved in the most recent version of the STS. One approach is to engage in an integrated conversion of a licensee's complete TS to be consistent with the currently approved version of the STS. Another approach is for licensees to submit plant-specific TS change applications addressing one or more of the TSTFs. The NRC staff notes that this latter process may be facilitated by appropriate reference to precedents where certain TSTFs have already been the subject of licensee applications.

Question: Who does the fee review process in the Region (comparable to what the Project Manager does for docket-related TACs in NRR [Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation])

Answer: It is the customary duty of the Projects Branch Chief to determine that the hours charged to Inspection Reports by Resident Inspectors are appropriate.

Question: TVA requested updated guidance on the appropriate level of reporting of operator medical conditions. How much and what type of information needs to be reported to NRC? TVA felt that available guidance is somewhat dated: Information Notice 94-14, Rev 1 and NUREG-1262.

Answer: The medical requirements for operators are contained in Subpart C of 10 CFR 55. The regulation is summarized below and is accompanied by explanatory notes in brackets.

10 CFR Section 55.21: Applicants must have a physical exam to apply and licensed operators must have an exam every two years.

[The applicable medical standards are contained in ANSI/ANS-3.4-1996, "Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," which was endorsed (with minor exceptions and clarifications) by the NRC with Revision 3 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.134, "Medical Evaluation of Licensed Personnel at Nuclear Power Plants," in March 1998 (after the public comment process).]

10 CFR Section 55.23: New and renewal applicants (every 6 years) must submit NRC Form 396 to certify that a physician has performed an examination (within the previous two years) and determined that the applicant's health will not adversely affect the performance of the operators' duties.

[Licensees do not need to submit the results of the mid-term physical examinations to the NRC unless there is a change in the operator's medical status that might disqualify the operator or require a conditional license.]

10 CFR Section 55.25: If, at any time during the term of the license, there is a permanent change in an operator's medical status that causes the operator to fail to meet the medical standards in the version of ANSI/ANS-3.4 to which the facility has committed, the facility licensee is required to notify the NRC within 30 days of learning of the diagnosis.

[Licensees are not expected to report temporary medical conditions; they can administratively control those operators' activities until the condition is resolved or they determine that it is permanently disqualifying or requires a conditional license in accordance with ANSI/ANS-3.4. This is explained in NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors."]

These requirements have not changed since the Part 55 rulemaking in 1987. The staff issued NUREG-1262, "Answers to Questions at Public Meetings Regarding Implementation of Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 55 on Operators' Licenses," to clarify the requirements. Information Notice (IN) 94-14, which was

issued in February 1994, and Supplement 1 to IN 94-14, issued in April 1997, provided further guidance.

The staff has reviewed the answers to the medical questions in NUREG-1262, and believes that the information therein is generally still current. The answer to Question 78, regarding the timing of the medical examination for a new license applicant has been clarified in Revision 8 of NUREG-1021, which was issued in April 1999.

In addition to the opportunities that facility licensees have had to comment on the industry consensus standards and Revision 3 of RG 1.134, in June 1999, the NRC published a notice in the *Federal Register* soliciting public comments on the OMB clearance associated with NRC Form 396, which facility licensees have to use to certify their operators' medical status.

In summary, the NRC staff feels that the available guidance is current and up to date and that the current reporting requirements are appropriate and reasonable. It is also noted that questions may be submitted to the NRC's Operator Licensing program office through the NRC external Web site via the path Nuclear Reactors/Operator Licensing/General Information/Questions & Answers.

Question: TVA would like more explicit guidance on what would constitute a "reduction of effectiveness" for potential changes to the Emergency Plan.

Answer: The NRC staff has prepared and placed in the NRC Public Document Room two documents providing guidance for the review of emergency plans. These are a memorandum, C. Miller, NRC, to M. Modes and others, NRC, November 19, 1998, "Emergency Preparedness Position (EPPOS) on Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedure Changes," and memorandum, T. Essig, NRC, to R. Conte, and others, NRC, February 3, 1999, "Clarification of EPPOS No. 4 On Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedure Changes."

### NOTICE OF ENFORCEMENT DISCRETION (NOED)

Question: Is a Licensee Event Report (LER) required for a NOED condition if the condition existed long enough to exceed the TS for which the NOED provided relief - even with NOED approval.

Answer: The reporting requirements for an LER are separate and independent from NOED processes. If the conditions of plant operations warrant reporting pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50.73, then such reports must continue to be made independent of any NOED processes.

Question: Does TVA qualify as a Regional Power Authority for purposes of being an independent authority to verify the need for a weather related NOED?

Answer: The Division of Licensing Project Management staff believes that TVA meets the requirements for such purposes, subject to participation in the NOED process by appropriate levels of TVA management. Such TVA management should be independent from the load dispatching organization.

## RISK INFORMED ISSUES - An Observation

TVA made an observation that presenting an issue as a Risk Informed application involves a burden in responding to the many Requests for Additional Information (RAIs).

### RAIs

Question: Do RAIs require an additional Oath and Affirmation (O&A) in addition to that provided with the initial license amendment application?

Answer: Office Letter 803, Revision 3, Section 3.1, addresses this issue. However, in response to guidance provided by the NRC's Office of General Counsel, the staff is considering the need for further revision to Office Letter 803 in this regard.

**DISTRIBUTION:**

**HARD COPY**

File Center  
PUBLIC  
PDII-2 Reading

**E-MAIL**

PUBLIC (RidsPublic)  
JZwolinski/SBlack (RidsNrrDlpm)  
HBerkow (RidsNrrDlpmLpdii)  
RCorreia (RidsNrrDlpmLpdii2)  
BClayton (Hardcopy)  
WLong (RidsNrrPmWLong)  
RHernan (RidsNrrPmRHernan)  
AHansen (RidsNrrPmAHansen)  
KCotton (RidsNrrPmKCotton)  
RMartin (RidsNrrPmRMartin)  
PFredrickson, RII (RidsRgn2MailCenter)  
DLange (RidsEdoMailCenter)  
OGC (RidsOgcRp)  
ACRS (RidsAcrcsAcwnMailCenter)

Tennessee Valley Authority

cc:

Mr. J. A. Scalice  
Chief Nuclear Officer and  
Executive Vice President  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
6A Lookout Place  
1101 Market Street  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Mr. Karl W. Singer, Senior Vice President  
Nuclear Operations  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
6A Lookout Place  
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801

Mr. Jack A. Bailey, Vice President  
Engineering & Technical Services  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
6A Lookout Place  
1101 Market Street  
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801

Mr. Pedro Salas, Manager  
Licensing and Industry Affairs  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Soddy Daisy, TN 37379

Mr. Lawrence E. Nanney, Director  
Division of Radiological Health  
Dept. of Environment & Conservation  
Third Floor, L and C Annex  
401 Church Street  
Nashville, TN 37243-1532

Mr. Russell A. Gibbs  
Senior Resident Inspector  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
2600 Igou Ferry Road  
Soddy Daisy, TN 37379

Mr. N. C. Kazanas, General Manager  
Nuclear Assurance  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
5M Lookout Place  
1101 Market Street  
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801

**BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT  
SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT  
WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT**

Mr. Mark J. Burzynski, Manager  
Nuclear Licensing  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
4X Blue Ridge  
1101 Market Street  
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801

General Counsel  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
ET 10H  
400 West Summit Hill Drive  
Knoxville, TN 37902

Chairman  
Limestone County Commission  
310 West Washington Street  
Athens, AL 35611

State Health Officer  
Alabama Dept. of Public Health  
RSA Tower - Administration  
Suite 1552  
P.O. Box 303017  
Montgomery, AL 36130-3017

Mr. Robert G. Jones, Plant Manager  
Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Decatur, AL 35609

Mr. Timothy E. Abney, Manager  
Licensing and Industry Affairs  
Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Decatur, AL 35609

Senior Resident Inspector  
Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
10833 Shaw Road  
Athens, AL 35611

Tennessee Valley Authority

cc:

Mr. John T. Herron, Site Vice President  
Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Decatur, AL 35609

Mr. D. L. Koehl, Plant Manager  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Soddy Daisy, TN 37379

County Executive  
Hamilton County Courthouse  
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801

Mr. Masoud Bajestani  
Site Vice President  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Soddy Daisy, TN 37379

Mr. Richard T. Purcell  
Site Vice President  
Watts Bar Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Spring City, TN 37381

Mr. Paul L. Pace, Manager  
Licensing and Industry Affairs  
Watts Bar Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Spring City, TN 37381

Mr. William R. Lagergren, Plant Manager  
Watts Bar Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Spring City, TN 37381

Senior Resident Inspector  
Watts Bar Nuclear Plant  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1260 Nuclear Plant Road  
Spring City, TN 37381

**BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT  
SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT  
WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT**

Rhea County Executive  
375 Church Street  
Suite 215  
Dayton, TN 37321

County Executive  
Meigs County Courthouse  
Decatur, TN 37322

Ms. Ann Harris  
305 Pickel Road  
Ten Mile, TN 37880

