

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 15 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-7
AND AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-79
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

INTRODUCTION

On July 30, 1982, TVA informed the NRC that the pressurizer relief tank water level indication in the auxiliary control room for Unit 2 was inoperative. The technical specifications require that an inoperable instrument must be restored within seven days or be in a hot shutdown within the next twelve hours. It was determined that the level transmitter failed and to make repairs or replace the instrument requires entrance into the lower part of the containment which cannot be made with the reactor at power.

EVALUATION

The auxiliary control room is designed for emergency shutdown of the plant from outside the main control room in the unlikely event the main control room requires evacuation. Tables 3.3-6 and 4.3-6 of the technical specifications identify the instrumentation in the auxiliary control room and their surveillance requirements. The staff agrees that item 12, Pressurizer Relief Tank Level, need not be in these tables of instrumentation for shutdown and surveillance requirements. The basis for this conclusion is that in the emergency operating instructions for shutdown outside the control room no operator reliance, action, or decision is based on the pressurizer relief tank level. Also, there are no technical specification requirements for tank level requirements in the main control room. Also Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications do not identify this instrument as necessary.

Discussions with the applicant indicate that this item was included in the technical specification tables simply because it was one of the instruments in the auxiliary control room. Pressurizer relief tank water level is regarded as a useful piece of information, but not essential to the safe shutdown of the plant. This instrument will be put back in operation at the next extended forced outage of Unit 2. The instrument in Unit 1 is still operational.

B209020050 B20817
PDR ADOCK 05000327
P PDR

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the 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 the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 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.

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the consideration discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, 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.

Date: August 17, 1982

Principal Contributors: Frank Orr, Reactor Systems Branch, DSI
Martin Virgilio, Instrumentation and Control
Systems Branch, DSI
Carl Stahle, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶