

Docket Nos. 50-327  
and 50-328

April 15, 1992

Tennessee Valley Authority  
ATTN: Dr. Mark O. Medford, Vice President  
Nuclear Assurance, Licensing & Fuels  
3B Lookout Place  
1101 Market Street  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Dear Dr. Medford:

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT CORRECTION, SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 1 AND 2  
(TAC NOS. 80498 AND 80499)

By letter dated October 23, 1991, the Commission issued Amendment No. 155 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-77 for the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 1. Also, by letter dated March 30, 1992, the Commission issued Amendment No. 146 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-79 for the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 2. The Technical Specification changes were made in response to the amendment applications dated May 24, 1991 and August 23, 1991. It has subsequently been determined that one of the proposed changes was not completely incorporated onto the amendment pages due to a reproduction error. The error affected Technical Specification page 3/4 2-7 for Unit 1 and 3/4 2-6 for Unit 2. The corrected pages are attached. We regret any inconvenience this may have caused.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

David E. LaBarge, Senior Project Manager  
Project Directorate II-4  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Unit 1 page 3/4 2-7
2. Unit 2 page 3/4 2-6

cc w/enclosures:  
See attached

OFC	PDII4/LA	PDII-4/PM <i>DL</i>	PDII-4/D	
NAME	MSanders <i>MS</i>	DLaBarge:dw	FHebdon	
DATE	4/9/92 <i>4/15/92</i>	4/15/92	4/15/92	

*DFD*

9204200087 920415  
PDR ADOCK 05000327  
P PDR

REPRODUCTION COPY

CP-1  
*db*

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

SQN Rdg. File

S. Varga

14-E-4

F. Hebdon

B. Wilson

RII

D. LaBarge

M. Sanders

OGC

15-B-18

D. Hagan

MNBB-3206

E. Jordan

MNBB-3701

G. Hill (4 copies)

P1-37

W. Little

RII

J. Brady

RII

W. Holland

RII

W. Jones

MNBB-7103

J. Calvo

14-E-4

T. Huang

8-E-23

ACRS (10)

GPA/PA

2-G-5

OC/LEMB

MNBB-9112

Tennessee Valley Authority  
ATTN: Dr. Mark O. Medford

cc:

Mr. John B. Waters Director  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
ET 12A  
400 West Summit Hill Drive  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Mr. J. R. Bynum, Vice President  
Nuclear Operations  
3B Lookout Place  
1101 Market Street  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Mr. M. J. Burzynski, Manager  
Nuclear Licensing and Regulatory Affairs  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
5B Lookout Place  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Mr. Jack Wilson, Vice President  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Soddy Daisy, Tennessee 37379

TVA Representative  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
11921 Rockville Pike  
Suite 402  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Ms. Marci Cooper, Site Licensing Manager  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 2000  
Soddy Daisy, Tennessee 37379

Mr. Michael H. Mobley, Director  
Division of Radiological Health  
T.E.R.R.A. Building 6th Floor  
150 9th Avenue North  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219-5404

General Counsel  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
ET 11H  
400 West Summit Hill Drive  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Sequoyah Nuclear Plant

County Judge  
Hamilton County Courthouse  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

Regional Administrator  
U.S.N.R.C. Region II  
101 Marietta Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. William E. Holland  
Senior Resident Inspector  
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant  
U.S.N.R.C.  
2600 Igou Ferry Road  
Soddy Daisy, Tennessee 37379

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

e. With measurements indicating

maximum  
over z

$$\left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)} \right]$$

has increased since the previous determination of  $F_Q^M(z)$  either of the following actions shall be taken:

1.  $F_Q^M(z)$  shall be increased by 2 percent over that specified in 4.2.2.2.c, or
2.  $F_Q^M(z)$  shall be measured at least once per 7 effective full power days until 2 successive maps indicate that

maximum  
over z

$$\left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)} \right]$$

is not increasing.

f. With the relationships specified in 4.2.2.2.c above not being satisfied:

1. Calculate the percent  $F_Q(z)$  exceeds its limit by the following expression:

$$\left\{ \left( \text{maximum over z} \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z) \times W(z)}{F_Q^{RTP} \times K(z)} \right] - 1 \right) \times 100 \right\} \text{ for } P \geq 0.5$$

$$\left\{ \left( \text{maximum over z} \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z) \times W(z)}{F_Q^{RTP} \times K(z)} \right] - 1 \right) \times 100 \right\} \text{ for } P < 0.5$$

2. Either of the following actions shall be taken:

- a. Place the core in an equilibrium condition where the limit in 4.2.2.2.c is satisfied. Power level may then be increased provided the AFD limits of Specification 3.2.1 are reduced 1% AFD for each percent  $F_Q(z)$  exceeded its limit, or
- b. Comply with the requirements of Specification 3.2.2 for  $F_Q(z)$  exceeding its limit by the percent calculated above.

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

e. With measurements indicating

$$\text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)} \right]$$

has increased since the previous determination of  $F_Q^M(z)$  either of the following actions shall be taken:

1.  $F_Q^M(z)$  shall be increased by 2 percent over that specified in 4.2.2.2.c, or
2.  $F_Q^M(z)$  shall be measured at least once per 7 effective full power days until 2 successive maps indicate that

$$\text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)} \right] \text{ is not increasing.}$$

f. With the relationships specified in 4.2.2.2.c above not being satisfied:

1. Calculate the percent  $F_Q(z)$  exceeds its limit by the following expression:

$$\left\{ \left( \text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z) \times W(z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{P} \times K(z)} \right] - 1 \right) \times 100 \quad \text{for } P \geq 0.5 \right.$$

$$\left. \left\{ \left( \text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z) \times W(z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{0.5} \times K(z)} \right] - 1 \right) \times 100 \quad \text{for } P < 0.5 \right. \right.$$

2. Either of the following actions shall be taken:

- a. Place the core in an equilibrium condition where the limit in 4.2.2.2.c is satisfied. Power level may then be increased provided the AFD limits of Specification 3.2.1 are reduced 1% AFD for each percent  $F_Q(z)$  exceeded its limit, or
- b. Comply with the requirements of Specification 3.2.2 for  $F_Q(z)$  exceeding its limit by the percent calculated above.

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

e. With measurements indicating

$$\text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)} \right]$$

has increased since the previous determination of  $F_Q^M(z)$  either of the following actions shall be taken:

1.  $F_Q^M(z)$  shall be increased by 2 percent over that specified in 4.2.2.2.c, or
2.  $F_Q^M(z)$  shall be measured at least once per 7 effective full power days until 2 successive maps indicate that

$$\text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)} \right] \text{ is not increasing.}$$

f. With the relationships specified in 4.2.2.2.c above not being satisfied:

1. Calculate the percent  $F_Q(z)$  exceeds its limit by the following expression:

$$\left\{ \left( \text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z) \times W(z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{P} \times K(z)} \right] - 1 \right) \times 100 \right. \quad \text{for } P \geq 0.5$$

$$\left\{ \left( \text{maximum over } z \left[ \frac{F_Q^M(z) \times W(z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{0.5} \times K(z)} \right] - 1 \right) \times 100 \right. \quad \text{for } P < 0.5$$

2. Either of the following actions shall be taken:

- a. Place the core in an equilibrium condition where the limit in 4.2.2.2.c is satisfied. Power level may then be increased provided the AFD limits of Specification 3.2.1 are reduced 1% AFD for each percent  $F_Q(z)$  exceeded its limit, or
- b. Comply with the requirements of Specification 3.2.2 for  $F_Q(z)$  exceeding its limit by the percent calculated above.