



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 58 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-33

AMENDMENT NO. 53 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-52

AMENDMENT NO. 31 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-68

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

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

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

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated November 29, 1979 (TVA BFNP TS 132), the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee or TVA) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A) appended to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52, and DPR-68 for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1, 2 and 3. The proposed amendments and revised Technical Specifications would change subsection 6.2 of the Administrative Controls Section of the Technical Specifications to increase the duties and functions of TVA's Browns Ferry Nuclear Safety Review Board (BFNSRB) and to increase the designated membership on the Plant Operations Review Committee from seven to nine functional representatives. By letter dated January 4, 1980, TVA advised us that there was a typographical error in their submittal of August 6, 1979, and a typographical error in their submittal of August 27, 1979 - in sections of the Technical Specifications for which they had not requested any revisions. These two typographical errors were incorporated in Amendment Nos. 26 and 28 to Operating License DPR-68 which we issued on November 9, 1979 and November 30, 1979, respectively.

2.0 Discussion

TVA's Browns Ferry Nuclear Safety Review Board, (BFNSRB) reports directly to the Manager of Power. The function of the NSRB is to provide independent review and audit of (1) operations, (2) proposed changes to procedures, Technical Specifications, equipment, systems, tests, experiments, (3) violations of codes, regulations, orders, Technical Specifications, license requirements or of internal procedures or instructions, (4) deviations from normal and expected performance of equipment, (5) quality assurance and (6) training.

800529068

The proposed Technical Specifications for the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant are based on the "Standard" Technical Specifications for Light Water Reactors. During the staff's review of the Sequoyah Technical Specifications, the staff proposed - and TVA accepted - the principal that TVA's NSRBs should have responsibility for all reviews and audits, including review and audit of the quality assurance program, fire protection, security, emergency planning, etc. (In the present Browns Ferry Technical Specifications, the latter are listed as being performed by separate groups). Section 6.5.2 of the Sequoyah Technical Specifications, which describes the duties and functions of the Sequoyah NSRB, has been accepted by the staff. The inconsistency between the duties and functions of the Sequoyah NSRB in the Sequoyah Technical Specifications vs those for the BFNSRB in the Browns Ferry Technical Specifications indicated a need to review and probably revise the latter. As a result of such review, TVA has proposed the changes which are the subject of this Safety Evaluation.

3.0 Evaluation

Section 6.2 of the Browns Ferry Technical Specifications describes the duties and functions of the three groups within TVA responsible for reviews and audits of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant. These three groups presently are the BFNSRB and the Quality Assurance and Audit Staff, which report to the Manager of Power, and the Plant Operations Review Committee, which reports to the plant superintendent. The changes to Section 6.2 proposed by TVA would make the duties and functions of the BFNSRB in the Browns Ferry Technical Specifications the same as the duties and functions of the Sequoyah NSRB in the draft Sequoyah Technical Specifications. We have compared the proposed duties and functions of the BFNSRB with those presently listed in the Technical Specifications. The proposed duties and functions encompass all that are presently listed with one minor exception. The present Technical Specifications require the BFNSRB to review proposed changes to equipment, systems or procedures which are described in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). The proposed duties would only require NSRB review for those changes which involve an unreviewed safety question or review to the extent necessary to verify that such actions do not constitute an unreviewed safety question. We find this distinction in duties to be acceptable. The proposed duties and functions of the BFNSRB would encompass the duties and functions now shown for the Quality Assurance and Audit Staff (Section 6.2.C). The change would not require the NSRB to actually perform the audits; the audits "shall be performed under the cognizance of the NSRB" and the results will be reviewed by the NSRB. The proposed changes would also assign responsibility to the NSRB for review and audit of several programs which at present are only reviewed at the plant level, including the "Facility Fire Protection Program", the "Plant Physical Security Plan" and the "Site Radiological Emergency Plan". We conclude that the addition of these duties to the BFNSRB is both desirable and acceptable.

We have reviewed the changes to the duties and functions of the BFNSRB proposed by TVA. We find that they encompass all of the duties and functions now specified in the Technical Specifications plus additional desirable duties and functions. On the above basis, we conclude that the proposed changes are acceptable.

TVA has also proposed a change in the functional offices designated for membership on the Plant Operations Review Committee. Specifically, the change would substitute for the overall maintenance supervisor the mechanical maintenance supervisor, the electrical maintenance supervisor and the instrument maintenance supervisor. This would increase the membership from seven to nine functional representatives. There would be no change in the other functions required to be represented (e.g., health physics supervisor, QA staff supervisor, et al). Because of the increase in the size of the PORC, the number of members constituting a quorum has been increased from five to six, one of whom must be the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent. We conclude that the increased technical coverage on the PORC should result in more in-depth review of maintenance activities. We conclude that the proposed change is acceptable.

The other changes being effected by these amendments are correction of two typographical errors as described in the Introduction on pages 13 and 57 of the Technical Specifications for Unit No. 3. The low pressure setpoint for the closure of the main steam isolation valves was erroneously listed as 350 psig whereas the correct value, as reflected in the Unit 1 and 2 Technical Specifications, is 825 psig.

4.0 Environmental Considerations

We have determined that these amendments do 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 these amendments involve 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 these amendments.

5.0 Conclusion

We have concluded based on the considerations discussed above that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: February 13, 1980