

June 21, 1985

Docket No. 50-325

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. 84 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-71 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application of February 13, 1985, as supplemented April 4, 1985.

The 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 October 30, 1985.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original signed by/

Marshall Grotenhuis, Project Manager
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 84 to License No. DPR-71
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

8507030294 850621
PDR ADDCK 05000325
P PDR

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
ORB#2 Reading
HThompson

KDesai
SNorris
MGrotenhuis
OELD
LJHarmon
ELJordan
BGrimes
TBarnhart (8)
WJones
MVirgilio
ACRS (10)

OPA, CMiles
RDiggs
Gray File
Extra - 5
JPartlow

DL:ORB#2
SNorris:ajs
06/12/85

DL:ORB#2 *rb*
MGrotenhuis
06/12/85 *uh*

DL:ORB#2
DVassallo
06/17/85

OELD
cbant
06/19/85

DL:OP-OR
GLainas
06/20/85

MW

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
Rohivia, North Carolina 28422

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

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

J. Nelson Grace
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. 50-325

BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 84
License No. DPR-71

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) dated February 13, 1985, as supplemented April 4, 1985 complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and 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-71 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8507030303 850621
PDR ADOCK 05000325
P PDR

2. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 84, 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



Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: June 21, 1985

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 84

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-71

DOCKET NO. 50-325

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 a vertical line.

EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEMSSURVEILLANCE 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 ΔP instrumentation (E21-dPIS-N004A,B) and verifying the set point to be 5, +1.5, psid greater than the normal indicated ΔP .
- 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 4) until within 48 hours after restoration of the suppression chamber to operable status but in any case no later than October 30, 1985.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 84 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-71

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-325

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 13, 1985, as supplemented April 4, 1985, the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L, the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-71 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP), Unit 1. 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 1 was shut down about March 31, 1985 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 (TS) 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 greater than or equal to 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 or about April 1, 1985. Due to the modifications being made to the suppression pool, the maximum permissible interval between full-flow tests will be exceeded. CP&L is, therefore, requesting a one-time extension of the maximum surveillance

interval during the upcoming refueling outage (Reload 4) until within 48 hours after restoration of the suppression chamber to operable status, but, in any case, no later than October 30, 1985. 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 29, 1985. This will extend the surveillance interval from the present maximum of 115 days to approximately 150 days. The October 30, 1985 date allows for contingencies in the completion of modification to the suppression pool making the total allowable surveillance interval 212 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 212 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 a large portion of the outage (approximately 10 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.
3. The CSS consists of two independent subsystems, each with 100% capacity.
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).

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 212 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

The amendment involves a change in a surveillance requirement. The staff has determined that the amendment involves 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendment meets 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 or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

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 Contributor: K. Desai and M. Grotenhuis

Dated: June 21, 1985