



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL PROJECTS

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 134 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-33

AMENDMENT NO. 130 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-52

AMENDMENT NO. 105 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-68

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3

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

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 9, 1987, (TS-226) the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA or the licensee) requested amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52, and DPR-68 for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, 2, and 3 (BFN). The amendments would change the Technical Specifications (TS) to delete one of the alternative actions specified in Table 3.1.A when the Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) High Flux or Inoperative trip channels are inoperable. It also makes minor clarifications and improvements.

2.0 EVALUATION

2.1 Deletion of Alternative Action

The amendments would revise Table 3.1.A, page 3.1/4.1-3 (Units 1 and 2) and page 3.1/4.1-2 (Unit 3) to delete alternative action "or 1.B" from the action column for the APRM, High Flux and APRM, Inoperative trip function.

The APRM, High Flux and Inoperative trip functions are required to be operable by the TS in the Run and Startup/Hot Standby modes of reactor operation. If the APRM, High Flux or Inoperative trip functions are inoperable in the RUN mode of reactor operation, TS allow action 1.B to be taken which results in the plant being placed in the Startup/Hot Standby Mode of operation. Taking this action, however, as the TS are currently written, would require the APRM, High Flux and the Inoperative trip functions to be operable. This ambiguity could lead to confusion by the operators. The deletion of option 1.B is appropriate in order to remove the ambiguity and would result in additional restriction, not allowing action 1.B to be taken, thereby improving the margin of nuclear safety. Therefore, the staff finds the change to the TS acceptable.

2.2 Clarifications and Improvements

The amendments would revise Table 3.1.A, page 3.1/4.1-4 (Units 1 and 2) and page 3.1/4.1-3 (Unit 3) to make two administrative changes.

The first change adds "1.A or 1.D" to the Action column for the Turbine First Stage Pressure Permissive trip function. The action column currently references note 19 which specifies when actions 1.A or 1.D are required. This addition in the Action column is consistent with the content of and clarifies the intent of note 19 and enhances consistency throughout the table.

For the second change note 2 is added in the Shutdown column for the High Water Level in West and East Scram Discharge Tanks trip functions. Since the note itself currently specifies its applicability during shutdown, the intent of the requirement is not changed and the addition of the note enhances table consistency with and clarifies the intent of note 2. Therefore, the staff finds the above changes acceptable.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The amendments involve a change to a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement nor environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

### 4.0 CONCLUSION

The staff 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: John Stang

Dated: July 17, 1987