

May 8, 1984

Docket Nos. 50-324

Mr. E. E. Utley  
Executive Vice President  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Post Office Box 1551  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Dear Mr. Utley:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 96 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-62 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2. The amendment consists of changes to the technical specifications in response to your application of January 10, 1984.

This amendment changes the technical specifications to permit postponement of a flow test of the core spray system until within 48 hours after restoration of the suppression chamber to operable status but, in any case, no later than November 15, 1984.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by /  
Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 96 to DPR-62
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File  
NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
ORB#2 Reading  
DEisenhut  
SNorris  
SMacKay  
OELD

SECY  
LJHarmon  
ELJordan  
JMTaylor *Grive*  
TBarnhart (4)  
WJones  
DBrinkman  
ACRS (10)

OPA, CMiles  
RDiggs  
NSIC  
Gray File  
Extra - 5  
HDenton  
MGrotenhuis

DVassallo  
GLainas  
*DL:ORB#2*  
*MGrotenhuis*  
*04/27/84*

*DL:ORB#2*  
*SNorris:jk*  
*04/26/84*

*DL:ORB#1*  
*SMacKay*  
*04/26/84*

*DL:ORB#2*  
*DVassallo*  
*04/27/84*

*DL:ORB-OR*  
*GLainas*  
*04/27/84*

*OELD*  
*04/27/84*

Mr. E. E. Utley  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2

cc:

Richard E. Jones, Esquire  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
336 Fayetteville Street  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

George F. Trowbridge, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Charles R. Dietz  
Plant Manager  
Post Office Box 458  
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. Franky Thomas, Chairman  
Board of Commissioners  
Post Office Box 249  
Bolivia, North Carolina 28422

Mrs. Chrys Baggett  
State Clearinghouse  
Budget and Management  
116 West Jones Street  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

U. S. Environmental Protection  
Agency  
Region IV Office  
Regional Radiation Representative  
345 Courtland Street, N. W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Star Route 1  
Post Office Box 208  
Southport, North Carolina 28461

James P. O'Reilly  
Regional Administrator  
Region II Office  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dayne H. Brown, Chief  
Radiation Protection Branch  
Division of Facility Services  
Department of Human Resources  
Post Office Box 12200  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605



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

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-324

BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 96  
License No. DPR-62

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) dated January 10, 1984, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
  - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
  - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
  - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
  - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-62 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8406010410 840508  
PDR ADDCK 05000324  
P PDR

2. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 96, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*[Signature]*  
Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Licensing

Attachment:  
Changes to the  
Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 8, 1984

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 96

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-62

DOCKET NO. 50-324

Revise the Appendix A Technical Specifications by removing page 3/4 5-6 and inserting revised page 3/4 5-6. The changed area is indicated by vertical line.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

2. Verifying that each valve (manual, power-operated, or automatic) in the flow path that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position.
- c. At least once per 92 days\* by:
1. Verifying that each CSS pump can be started from the control room and develops a flow of at least 4625 gpm on recirculation flow against a system head corresponding to a reactor vessel pressure of  $\geq$  113 psig.
  2. Performing a CHANNEL CALIBRATION of the core spray header  $\Delta P$  instrumentation (E21-dPIS-N004A,B) and verifying the setpoint to be 5, +1.5, psid greater than the normal indicated  $\Delta P$ .
- d. At least once per 18 months by performing a system functional test which includes simulated automatic actuation of the system throughout its emergency operating sequence and verifying that each automatic valve in the flow path actuates to its correct position. Actual injection of coolant into the reactor vessel is excluded from this test.

\* The surveillance test required by this license in Appendix A, paragraph 4.5.3.1.C.1, regarding the flow test of the core spray system may be postponed during the current refueling outage (Reload 5) until within 48 hours after restoration of the suppression chamber to operable status but in any case no later than November 15, 1984.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 96 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-62

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-324

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated January 10, 1984, the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-62 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP) Unit No. 2. The amendment would permit postponement of one full-flow test of the core spray pumps until the primary containment suppression chamber is restored to its operational condition.

2.0 Background

Brunswick Unit 2 was shut down on March 11, 1984 for refueling, maintenance work and modification of the Mark I torus suppression pool. In conjunction with the latter, the suppression pool has been drained and therefore it is now not possible to perform the usual full-flow surveillance test of the Core Spray System (CSS) wherein water is pumped from the suppression pool and back into it.

Technical Specification 4.5.3.1.c.1 states:

"4.5.3.1 Each CSS subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE: ...

c. At least once per 92 days by:

1. Verifying that each CSS pump can be started from the control room and develops a flow of at least 4625 gpm on recirculation flow against a system head corresponding to a reactor vessel pressure of  $\geq$  113 psig."

In regard to this requirement, the maximum permissible interval between full flow tests is presently 92 days, plus a 25 percent extension of surveillance intervals generally permitted by Technical Specification 4.0.2.a. Thus, the maximum permissible interval is presently 115 days.

This full flow test was last performed on March 9 and March 11, 1984 for loops B and A, respectively. Due to the modifications being made to the suppression pool the maximum permissible interval between full flow tests

will be exceeded. Carolina Power & Light is, therefore, requesting a one time extension of the maximum surveillance interval during the upcoming refueling outage (Reload 5) until within 48 hours after restoration of the suppression chamber to operable status, but in any case no later than November 15, 1984. Based on the present outage schedule, CP&L plans to restore the suppression chamber to operable status and perform Surveillance Requirement 4.5.3.1.c.1 by approximately August 15, 1984. This will extend the surveillance interval from the present maximum of 115 days to approximately 159 days. The November 15, 1984 date allows for contingencies in the completion of modification to the suppression pool making the total allowable surveillance interval 251 days.

### 3.0 Evaluation

We have considered the safety significance of extending the present surveillance interval for performing a full flow test of the Core Spray System. The interval would be extended from a nominal 92-day interval to a maximum of 251 days. We have considered the potential need for a CSS during this shutdown period, the availability of the CSS, the verification of operability of the CSS by other surveillance tests, the availability of other means of cooling the reactor core and the past performance of the CSS.

The licensee has provided the following information in response to these considerations.

1. For the majority of the outage (approximately 20 weeks), the fuel will not be in the vessel therefore, removing the need for CSS at that time.
2. Normally, in the refueling condition (OPERATIONAL CONDITION 5), the CSS is not required to be operable if the suppression pool is not operable and the following conditions are met: (1) the reactor vessel head is removed, (2) the refueling cavity is flooded, (3) the spent fuel pool gates are removed and (4) the water level is maintained within specified limits.

The CSS will be available for operation, if needed, during the relatively short interval when operability is required due to plant conditions.

3. The CSS consists of two independent subsystems, each with 100% capacity. Redundant systems that will be available to supply core reflood capability include the condensate and the service water injection system, with a small volume from the control rod drive system.
4. Surveillance will be performed every 12 hours to verify that the CSS has an operable water source (TS 4.5.3.1.a). Surveillance will be

performed every 31 days to verify that the CSS is filled with water (TS 4.5.3.1.b.1).

Surveillance will be performed every 31 days to verify that all valves in the CSS flow path are properly aligned (TS 4.5.3.1.b.2).

Surveillance will be performed every 92 days to verify the operability of the core spray header differential pressure instrumentation (TS 4.5.3.1.c.2).

5. A review of previous CSS operability testing shows that the system is reliable, as no failures have been identified since 1978.

Based on this information and the considerations above, we have concluded that extending the surveillance interval for a full flow test of the CSS from 92 days to 251 days does not constitute a significant reduction in the verification of operability or the availability of this system. Furthermore, if the CSS were not available, other systems would be available to provide adequate cooling of the reactor core. Therefore, we find the proposed amendment to be acceptable.

#### 4.0 Environmental Considerations

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.

#### 5.0 Conclusions

We have 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 amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: E. Marinos

Dated: May 8, 1984