SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 22 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-77

AND AMENDMENT NO. 12 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-79

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

INTRODUCTION

In an August 16, 1982, transmittal TVA requested Sequoyah Unit 1 and 2 Technical Specification changes concerning flood protection. The three Technical Specification changes involved were discussed in a September 14, 1982, telecon between NRC and TVA staffs. One change was accepted as TVA proposed, a second was denied and the final was amended to the agreement of both parties.

EVALUATION

The staff agrees with TVA's proposed change to Technical Specification 3.7.6. The change corrects an error in the winter critical flood level and provides uniformity of 703 ft mean sea level (MSL) for both winter and summer critical flood levels. The summer elevation of 703 ft MSL had previously been approved for Technical Specifications.

The proposed change in Technical Specification 4.7.6.2 would decrease the communication frequency between Sequoyah Nuclear Plant and TVA Division of Water Resources to every 4 hours rather than every 3 hours. The proposal was denied because TVA has not incorporated changes which would warrant the longer communications interval of 4 hours, and the staff feels the 3 hour period is necessary.

Additionally, Technical Specification 4.7.6.1 dealing with Surveillance Requirements has been amended. The 703 ft MSL has been lowered to 693 ft MSL to allow additional time for the TVA Division of Water Resources to predict the actual arrival time of flood peak. The frequency of water level determination when above this level has been changed from 2 hours to 15 minutes to aid in achieving an accurate flood peak arrival time. The arrival time may then be coordinated with the initiation of Stage II plant modifications to ensure their completion before flooding of the site.

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 §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.

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

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, 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: December 27, 1982

Principal Contributors: Melanie Miller, Licensing Branch No. 4,DL
Carl Stahle, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL
Gary Staley, Hydrologic and Geotechnical Engineering Branch, DE

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							