SEP 1 1 1980

Distribution:
Docket
NRC PDR
Local PDR
ORB Reading
NRR Reading
DEisenhut
RPurple
TNovak
RTedesco
GLainas
JOlshinski
SNorris
RJClark
OELD
OI&E (5)
BJones (4)
BScharf (10)
JWetmore
ACRS (16)
OPA (Clare Miles)
RDiggs
HDenton
JHeltemes, AEOD
NSIC
TERA
Chairman, ASLAB

Docket No. 50-296

Mr. Hugh G. Parris
Manager of Power
Tennessee Valley Authority
500A Chestnut Street, Tower II
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Dear Mr. Parris:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 34 to Facility License No. DPR-68 for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 3. This amendment changes the Technical Specifications in response to your request of August 26, 1980 (Tennessee Valley Authority Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Technical Specifications 147) as supplemented by your letter of August 28, 1980.

The changes to the Technical Specifications permit isolation of the residual heat removal service water (RHRSW) to the Browns Ferry Unit No. 2 2B residual heat removal heat exchanger for a period up to 10 days which also isolates the backup source of RHRSW to Browns Ferry Unit No. 3 through the cross connection between Units No. 2 and 3.

Copies of the Safety Evaluation and Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
T. A. Ippolito

Thomas A. Ippolito, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 34 to DPR-68
2. Safety Evaluation
3. Notice

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

No legal objections to form of notice as amended

8009260324

OFFICE	ORB #2	ORB #2	A:D/DL	OELD	ORB #2	
SURNAME	SNorris	RJClark:kf	TMNovak	CUTCHIN	TAIppolito	
DATE	9/5/80	9/5/80	9/9/80	9/9/80	9/5/80	

NRC FORM 318 (9-76) NRCM 0240 ☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979-289-369

cc:

H. S. Sanger, Jr., Esquire
General Counsel
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 Commerce Avenue
E 11B 33C
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Mr. Ron Rogers
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 Chestnut Street, Tower II
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Mr. Charles R. Christopher
Chairman, Limestone County Commission
P. O. Box 188
Athens, Alabama 35611

Ira L. Myers, M.D.
State Health Officer
State Department of Public Health
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Mr. H. N. Culver
249A HBD
400 Commerce Avenue
Tennessee Valley Authority
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Athens Public Library
South and Forrest
Athens, Alabama 35611

Director, Office of Urban & Federal Affairs
108 Parkway Towers
404 James Robertson Way
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Director, Technical Assessment Division
Office of Radiation Programs (AW-459)
US EPA
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IV Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
345 Courtland Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Mr. Robert F. Sullivan
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 1863
Decatur, Alabama 35602

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

DOCKET NO. 50-296

BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 3

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 34
License No. DPR-68

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee) dated August 26, 1980, as supplemented by letter dated August 28, 1980, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment and paragraph 2.C(2) of Facility License No. DPR-68 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   (2) Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No.34, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Thomas A. Ippolito, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: September 9, 1980

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 34

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-68

DOCKET NO. 50-296

Revise Appendix A as follows:

1. Remove the following pages and replace with the identically numbered pages:

156
157
171

2. Marginal lines on each page indicate the revised area.

LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

3.5 CORE AND CONTAINMENT COOLING SYSTEMS

2. During reactor power operation, RHRSW pumps must be operable and assigned to service as indicated below for the specified time limits.

TIME LIMIT (DAYS)	MINIMUM SERVICE ASSIGNMENT RHRSW	EECW**
Indefinite	7*	3*
30	7* or 6***	2* or 3***
7	6*	2*

*At least one operable pump must be assigned to each header.

**Only automatically starting pumps may be assigned to EECW header service.

***Nine pumps must be operable. Either configuration is acceptable: 7 and 2 or 6 and 3.

3. During power operation, both RHRSW pumps B1 and B2 normally or alternately assigned to the RHR heat exchanger header supplying the standby coolant supply connection must be operable; except as specified in 3.5.C.4 and 3.5.C.5 below.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.5 CORE AND CONTAINMENT COOLING SYSTEMS

2. a. If no more than two RHRSW pumps are inoperable, increased surveillance is not required.

b. When three RHRSW pumps are inoperable, the remaining pumps, associated essential control valves, and associated diesel generators shall be operated weekly.

c. When four RHRSW pumps are inoperable, the remaining pumps, associated essential control valves, and associated diesel generators shall be operated daily.

3. Routine surveillance for these pumps is specified in 4.5.C.1.

LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION	SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS
3.5 CORE AND CONTAINMENT COOLING SYSTEMS	4.5 CORE AND CONTAINMENT COOLING SYSTEMS
4. One of the B1 or B2 RHRSW pumps assigned to the RHR heat exchanger supplying the standby coolant supply connection may be inoperable for a period not to exceed 30 days provided the operable pump is aligned to supply the RHR heat exchanger header and the associated diesel generator and essential control valves are operable.	4. When it is determined that the B1 or B2 RHRSW pump is inoperable at a time when operability is required, the operable RHRSW pump on the same header and its associated diesel generator and the RHR heat exchanger header and associated essential control valves shall be demonstrated to be operable immediately and every 15 days thereafter.
5. The standby coolant supply capability may be inoperable for a period not to exceed ten days.	
6. If specifications 3.5.C.2 through 3.5.C.5 are not met, an orderly shutdown shall be initiated and the unit placed in the cold shutdown condition within 24 hours.	
7. There shall be at least 2 RHRSW pumps, associated with the selected RHR pumps, aligned for RHR heat exchanger service for each reactor vessel containing irradiated fuel.	

REFERENCES

1. Residual Heat Removal System (BFNP FSAR subsection 4.8)
2. Core Standby Cooling Systems (BFNP FSAR Section 6)

C. RHR Service Water System and Emergency Equipment Cooling Water System (EECWS)

There are two EECW headers (north and south) with four automatic starting RHRSW pumps on each header. All components requiring emergency cooling water are fed from both headers thus assuring continuity of operation if either header is operable. Each header alone can handle the flows to all components. Two RHRSW pumps can supply the full flow requirements of all essential EECW loads for any abnormal or postaccident situation.

There are four RHR heat exchanger headers (A, B, C, D) with one RHR heat exchanger from each unit on each header. There are two RHRSW pumps on each header; one normally assigned to each header (A2, B2, C2, or D2) and one on alternate assignment (A1, B1, C1, or D1). One RHR heat exchanger header can adequately deliver the flow supplied by both RHRSW pumps to any two of the three RHR heat exchangers on the header. One RHRSW pump can supply the full flow requirement of one RHR heat exchanger. Two RHR heat exchangers can more than adequately handle the cooling requirements of one unit in any abnormal or postaccident situation.

The RHR Service Water System was designed as a shared system for three units. The specification, as written, is conservative when consideration is given to particular pumps being out of service and to possible valving arrangements. If unusual operating conditions arise such that more pumps are out of service than allowed by this specification, a special case request may be made to the NRC to allow continued operation if the actual system cooling requirements can be assured.

Should one of the two RHRSW pumps normally or alternately assigned to the RHR heat exchanger header supplying the standby coolant supply connection become inoperable, an equal capability for long-term fluid makeup to the unit reactor and for cooling of the unit containment remains operable. Because of the availability of an equal makeup and cooling capability which is demonstrated to be operable immediately and with specified subsequent surveillance, a 30-day repair period is justified. Should the capability to provide standby coolant supply be lost, a 10-day repair time is justified based on the low probability for ever needing the standby coolant supply.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 34 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-68

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 3

DOCKET NO. 50-296

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated August 26, 1980, (Tennessee Valley Authority Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Technical Specifications 147), and supplemented by letter dated August 28, 1980, the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee or TVA) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-68 for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 3. The proposed amendment and revised Technical Specifications would permit isolation of the residual heat removal service water (RHRSW) to the Unit No. 2 2B RHR heat exchanger for a period up to 10 days, which also isolates the standby coolant supply (RHRSW supply) from Unit No. 2 to Unit No. 3.

2.0 Discussion

Each of the three Browns Ferry units has four residual heat removal (RHR) heat exchangers and four associated main system pumps. One of the RHR loops, consisting of two heat exchangers, two main system pumps in parallel, and associated piping, is located in one area of the reactor building. The other heat exchangers, pumps, and piping, forming a second loop, are located in another area of the reactor building to minimize the possibility of a single physical event causing the loss of the entire system. In addition, the pump suction and heat exchanger discharge lines of one loop in Unit 1 are cross-connected to the pump suction and heat exchanger discharge lines of one loop in Unit 2. Unit 2 and Unit 3 systems are cross-connected in a similar manner. Two normally closed isolation valves are provided in each heat exchanger discharge cross-connection and four normally closed isolation valves are provided in each suction cross-connection (one at each pump suction). This arrangement between Units 2 and 3 is shown in the attached figure; the cross-connection valves are those in the cross-hatched circles.

The RHR system is designed for three modes of operation: (1) shutdown cooling and reactor vessel head spray, (2) containment cooling, and (3) low pressure coolant injection. Except for the initial period of decay heat removal during a normal shutdown and for reflooding the core following a postulated maximum line break, one of the four RHR heat

exchangers in each unit is adequate for all required functions. The cross-connections between the units in the RHR systems thus provide a third, redundant backup cooling system in case the pumps and heat exchangers in an RHR loop of an adjoining unit are both inoperable. As can be noted in the attached figure, the RHR heat exchangers and their associated pumps are in parallel with each other, so that a heat exchanger can be used even if the other heat exchanger in the loop is out of operation.

The four RHR heat exchangers in each unit are cooled by service water taken directly from Wheeler Reservoir. There are 12 service water pumps for the plant. Four pairs of pumps are for the RHR systems in each unit, with each pair connected to one of four RHR service water (RHRSW) system headers. The other four RHRSW pumps are connected to the two Emergency Equipment Cooling Water (EECW) system headers (two pumps per header). Under this arrangement, a pair of service water pumps (for example, the B1 and B2 service water pumps) supply cooling water to just one RHR heat exchanger in each unit. (In the above example, the B pumps service the 1B RHR heat exchanger in Unit 1, the 2B heat exchanger in Unit 2 and the 3B heat exchanger in Unit 3). The maximum requirements on the RHRSW system (one hour following a postulated design basis accident) would require six (out of nine) pumps to supply cooling water to the RHR heat exchangers and three (out of four) to supply EECW requirements.

Because of the redundancy in the RHR systems, the present Technical Specifications permit the units to continue to operate for up to 30 days if one RHR heat exchanger or pump is out of service and for up to seven days if both heat exchangers or pumps in a loop are inoperable, provided certain other conditions are met. Likewise, normal operation only requires nine of the twelve service water pumps to be operable.

There is one other backup crosstie connection pertinent to this evaluation. On the service water outlet from the 1D RHR heat exchanger in Unit 1 and on the service water outlet from the 2B RHR heat exchanger in Unit 2, there is a connection to the primary system crosstie between the units. The connection from the 2B heat exchanger is shown in the attached figure. If all primary coolant and suppression pool water and condensate were lost, this cross-connection would permit the pair of B service water pumps to supply raw river water to the reactor core of Unit 2 or 3 (after the pressure approaches 50 psig) or to supply river water to the respective suppression chambers. Thus, the RHR service water in the B loop in Unit 2 is an emergency back-up supply of cooling water to Unit 3. Because of this function, the present Technical Specifications for Unit No. 3 only permit the unit to be operated for 30 days if one of the B1 or B2 RHRSW pumps is inoperable and require shutdown of the unit if the service water to the Unit No. 2 2B RHR heat exchanger is lost. TVA has requested that the present Technical Specifications for Unit No. 3 be amended to permit Unit No. 3 to be

operated for a period up to 10 days without the RHR and RHRSW back-up coolant supply from Unit No. 2. The Unit No. 2 2B has developed a leak. The proposed Technical Specification change would allow maintenance of the Unit No. 2 2B heat exchangers without necessitating the shutdown of Unit No. 3.

To perform the required heat exchanger maintenance, both the RHR and RHRSW lines must be isolated. Isolation of the RHRSW line to the 2B heat exchanger isolates the standby coolant supply (RHRSW supply) from Unit 2 to Unit 3. Technical Specification 3.5.C.3 (Unit 3) presently states that "During power operation, both RHRSW pumps B1 and B2 normally or alternately assigned to the RHR heat exchanger header supplying the standby coolant supply connection must be operable." Although the proposed maintenance activity will not affect the operability of the 1B and 2B RHRSW pumps, it will isolate the RHR heat exchanger header supplying the standby coolant supply connection.

3.0 Evaluation

The present Technical Specifications (Section 3.5.B.13) permit operation of Unit No. 3 without the RHR (primary coolant) cross flow connection for up to ten days. Specifically, 3.5.B.13 reads: "If RHR cross-connection flow or heat removal capability is lost, the unit may remain in operation for a period not to exceed ten days unless such capability is restored." This was judged to be acceptable because the cross connection would not be required unless both redundant RHR loops in Unit No. 3 were lost, no credit for this cross-connected RHR flow was taken in the ECCS Appendix K analysis in the FSAR and the very low probability of ever needing the cross flow standby cooling capability.

Although the present Technical Specifications as noted above permit operation for up to 10 days without the RHR primary coolant cross-flow capability, as described in the above "Discussion", Section 3.5.C.3 does not permit operation without the RHR service water cross-flow capability. The probability of needing-or using-the raw river water for backup cooling capability is far less than the possibility of using the RHR cross flow capability. If the raw service water were needed for backup coolant supply in Unit No. 3, the normal source would be the service water headers in Unit No. 3, rather than the cross-connection from Unit No. 2. If the RHR cross-flow connection can be out of service for 10 days - and our reevaluation concludes that this is reasonable and acceptable - it is logical and acceptable that the service water cross-connection can be out of service for 10 days also in view of the very low probability of ever needing this redundant backup source of raw river cooling water. We conclude that the proposed Technical Specification change to allow a 10 day outage time for the RHRSW cross-flow connection between units is acceptable and that the overall reduction in plant safety margin is insignificant.

4.0 Environmental Considerations

We have determined that this amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that this amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4) that an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

5.0 Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission"s regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: September 9, 1980



BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT

Residual Heat Removal System, Unit
Cross Connections and Standby Coolant Supply

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 50-296

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 34 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-68 issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee), which revised Technical Specifications for operation of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 3, located in Limestone County, Alabama. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

This amendment changes the Technical Specifications to permit continued operation following isolation of the residual heat removal service water (RHRSW) to the Browns Ferry Unit No. 2 28 residual heat removal heat exchanger for a period of up to 10 days which also isolates this backup source of RHRSW to Browns Ferry Unit No. 3 through the cross connection between Unit Nos. 2 and 3.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR Section 51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated August 26, 1980, as supplemented by letter dated August 28, 1980, (2) Amendment No. 34 to License No. DPR-68, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. and at the Athens Public Library, South and Forrest, Athens, Alabama 35611. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 9th day of September, 1980.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Thomas A. Ippolito, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing