



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

ENCLOSURE

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 202 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-33
AMENDMENT NO. 221 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-52,
AMENDMENT NO. 175 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-68

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3

DOCKET NOS. 50-259, 50-260, AND 50-296

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated September 30, 1993, the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee) requested amendments to the operating licenses for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) Units 1, 2, and 3 to delete license conditions invoking requirements to comply with 10 CFR 73.55(d)(8). This regulation, in part, provides requirements that positive containment access controls be maintained during periods of frequent access. The license conditions were added to the BFN licenses on October 29, 1984 following denial of a portion of the BFN Physical Security Plan. The licensee also requests deletion of a redundant license condition for BFN Unit 3.

On September 2, 1993, the licensee requested an exemption from the frequent access control requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(8) for BFN Units 1 and 3. These units are in an extended shutdown for modifications required to bring them in compliance with applicable regulations. In addition to an exemption, the license conditions invoking 10 CFR 73.55(d)(8) must also be deleted.

2.0 EVALUATION

The license conditions invoking the positive containment access control requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(8) read as follows:

Notwithstanding the statement in Section 9.1 of the physical security plan, the licensee shall maintain positive access control over containment in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(8).

This statement is found as the current BFN Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(8), BFN Unit 2 license condition 2.C.(8), and BFN Unit 3 license condition 2.C.(4). This condition was added to the respective licenses because Section 9.1 of the then-current revision of the licensee's Physical Security Plan would have permitted designating containment as a non-vital area.

9402100204 940201
PDR ADOCK 05000259
P PDR





2 1 1

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

The licensee's submittal of September 30, 1993 states that the security plan has since been revised to delete the portions permitting this designation, so the need for the license condition has disappeared. Removal of this condition in no way relieves the licensee's responsibility to comply with the applicable security requirements. Therefore, the proposed deletion of the license condition is acceptable.

The licensee also proposes that BFN Unit 3 license condition 2.C.(8) be deleted. This license condition is redundant to license condition 2.C.(4), so its deletion does not affect the license requirements. Therefore, this proposed deletion is acceptable.

In summary, the staff finds that the license changes proposed by the licensee in its letter of September 30, 1993 are acceptable. The changes do not affect the licensee's responsibility to comply with applicable security requirements.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Alabama State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change requirements relating solely to safeguards matters, and are confined to procedural matters. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (58 FR 64616). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(12). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendments.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Joseph F. Williams

Date: February 1, 1994

