

July 13, 1984

Docket No. 50-325

Mr. E. E. Utley  
Executive Vice President  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Post Office Box 1551  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27062

Dear Mr. Utley:

Re: Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1

The Commission has filed the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing" with the Office of the Federal Register for publication. The notice relates to your request dated May 10, 1984, as supplemented June 20, 1984, regarding revisions to the Technical Specifications which would permit a one-time extension of the surveillance interval on the excess flow check valves for two and one half months.

Sincerely,

Original signed by DBVassallo for/

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

Enclosure:  
Notice of Consideration

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

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

MGrotenhuis  
ELJordan  
JNGrace  
ACRS (10)  
Gray File  
ORB#2 NSCHD File

*DB Vassallo*  
*for Marshall Grotenhuis*  
*7/12/84*

DL:ORB#2  
SNorris:ajs  
06/29/84

*[Signature]*  
DL:ORB#2  
MGrotenhuis  
07/2/84

*[Signature]*  
DL:ORB#2  
DVassallo  
07/2/84

OELD  
07/ /84

*[Signature]*  
DL:ADLOR  
GLainas  
07/13/84

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 COMMISSIONCAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANYDOCKET NO. 50-325NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS  
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-71, issued to Carolina Power & Light Company, for operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1 located in Brunswick County, North Carolina.

The amendment proposed by the licensee would permit a one-time only deferment of Technical Specification (TS) required surveillance involving full-stroke cycling of four reactor instrumentation system isolation valves in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 10, 1984 as supplemented June 20, 1984. The deferment would be from August 19, 1984 until the end of the current outage scheduled to be no later than November 2, 1984. The valves involved in this request are excess flow check valves (EFCV) located in the instrument sensing lines on drywell (DW) penetrations E-53A, X-53B, X-69F and E-83A. These instrument lines provide input to reactor instrumentation transmitters. The purpose of the EFCVs is to provide a means of isolating an instrument line in the event of a line failure downstream of the EFCV; therefore, the EFCVs involved are only required to function in the unlikely event of such an instrument line failure.

Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP) Technical Specification Section 4.6.3.4 requires that each reactor instrumentation system isolation valve be demonstrated operable at least every 18 months by cycling each valve through at least one full cycle of travel. The four EFCVs involved in this request were last tested on October 2, 1982. Utilizing the maximum surveillance period of 125 percent, the latest required performance date is August 19, 1984. This proposed revision will permit a one-time only extension of the surveillance interval until the outage scheduled to begin no later than November 2, 1984. Instead of the permitted interval of 22.5 months (687 days), which is 18 months plus 4.5 months (25%) flexibility, the interval would be 25 months (762 days). This represents an extension of the surveillance interval of 2.5 months (75 days) or 10.9%.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has reviewed its request, and has concluded that the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration. The staff agrees with this conclusion. The proposed change represents a relaxation in the surveillance requirements; however, the length of the requested extension is small with respect to the maximum allowable frequency and that the need for the EFCVs to function during the proposed extension is very small.

The only safety question associated with this change is whether a one time increase in surveillance interval for these valves would significantly increase the risk of malfunction of these valves in the event of instrument line failure. Extending the surveillance interval for the valve cycling of the EFCVs involved, from a maximum surveillance interval of 22.5 months to 25 months, does not constitute a significant reduction in the verification of operability of the involved EFCVs less than 10%. For a one time extension it would be even less. This small change in reliability would have no significant effect on the probability of instrument line failure followed by EFCV failure. This is based on the following information:

1. There is a high level of confidence in the instrument lines involved based on seismic qualification and hydrostatic testing. The high level of confidence in the integrity of the lines is based on the fact that the instrument lines involved are seismically qualified and that the lines were tested during a reactor pressure vessel hydrostatic test on June 1, 1983.

2. The likelihood of the simultaneous failure of an instrument line and the associated EFCV is small.
3. The excess flow check valves involved will continue to be available, if called upon, to perform their reactor coolant system isolation function if an accident involving the failure of a reactor instrumentation line were to occur during the interim period. Thus the margin of safety provided is not significantly reduced.
4. The increase in likelihood of a malfunction of the EFCVs resulting from the 10.9 percent increase in the maximum surveillance frequency permitted by the TS is small. Extending the surveillance interval from 687 days to 762 days represents only a 10.9 percent increase in the maximum surveillance frequency permitted and thus does not significantly affect the level of assurance that the valves are capable of performing their intended function.

Based on the above evaluations the proposed amendment request would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or
2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or
3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Comments should be addressed to the Secretary of the Commission, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attn: Docketing and Service Branch.

By August 20, 1984, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Request for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR §2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the

proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish a notice of issuance and

provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attn: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to Domenic B. Vassallo: petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, and to George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petition and/or request should be granted based

upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., and at the Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 13th day of July, 1984.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "D. Vassallo", written in black ink.

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