

May 25, 1990

Docket No. 50-400

DISTRIBUTION
See attached list

Mr. Lynn W. Eury
Executive Vice President
Power Supply
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Dear Mr. Eury:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 18 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NO. NPF-63 - SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1,
REGARDING DELETION OF SPECIFIED SURVEILLANCE INTERVAL
RESTRICTION (TAC NO. 76138)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. to Facility Operating License No. NPF-63 for the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. This amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your request dated February 26, 1990, as supplemented April 24, 1990.

The change removes the provision of Specification 4.0.2 that limits the combined time interval for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. Guidance on this proposed change to the TS was provided to all power reactor licensees and applicants by Generic Letter 89-14, dated August 21, 1989.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's regular Bi-weekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Richard A. Becker, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

9005310098 900525
FDR ADOCK 05000400
P FDC

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 18 to NPF-63
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

OFC	:LA:PD21:DRPR:PM:PD21:DRPR:D:PD21:DRPR	:	:	:	:
NAME	:PAAnderson: RBBecker:sw EAdensam	:	:	:	:
DATE	:5/4/90 : 5/4/90 : 5/7/90	:	:	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Mr. L. W. Eury
Carolina Power & Light Company

Shearon Harris

cc:

Mr. R. E. Jones, General Counsel
Carolina Power & Light Company
P. O. Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street
Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Resident Inspector/Harris NPS
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 1, Box 315B
New Hill, North Carolina 27562

Mr. C. S. Hinnant
Plant General Manager
Harris Nuclear Plant
P. O. Box 165
New Hill, North Carolina 27562

Mr. R. B. Richey, Manager
Harris Nuclear Project
Harris Nuclear Plant
P. O. Box 165
New Hill, North Carolina 27562

Mr. Dayne H. Brown, Director
Division of Radiation Protection
N. C. Department of Environmental,
Commerce & Natural Resources
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687

Mr. H. A. Cole
Special Deputy Attorney General
State of North Carolina
P. O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

AMENDMENT NO. 18 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-63 - HARRIS, UNIT 1

Docket File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PDII-1 Reading

S. Varga (14E4)

G. Lainas

E. Adensam

P. Anderson

R. Becker

T. Dunning

OGC

D. Hagan (MNBB 3302)

E. Jordan (MNBB 3302)

G. Hill (4) (P1-137)

W. Jones (P-130A)

J. Calvo (11D3)

ACRS (10)

GPA/PA

OC/LFMB

cc: Licensee/Applicant Service List



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

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, et al.

DOCKET NO. 50-400

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 18
License No. NPF-63

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Carolina Power & Light Company, (the licensee), dated February 26, 1990, as supplemented April 24, 1990, 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. NPF-63 is hereby amended to read as follows:

9005310103 900525
PDR ADOCK 05000400
P PDC

(2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, both of which are attached hereto, as revised through Amendment No. 18, are hereby incorporated into this license. Carolina Power & Light Company shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

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

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Original signed by:
Elinor G. Adensam, Director
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 25, 1990

OFC	: LA: 6527	: DRPR: PM: PD21: DRPR:	OGC	: D: PD21: DRPR :	:	:
NAME	: PAnderson:	: RBecker-sw :	GMB	: EAdensam :	:	:
DATE	: 5/4/90 :	: 5/4/90 :	5-10-90	: 5/15/90 :	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Conditioned use
PACKAGE NOT GOING
OUT UNTIL EXPIRATION
OF 30 DAY FA NOTICE PERIOD

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 18

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-63

DOCKET NO. 50-400

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised areas are indicated by marginal lines.

Remove Pages

3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-2a

Insert Pages

3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-2a

APPLICABILITY

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be met during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25% of the specified surveillance interval.

4.0.3 Failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the specified time interval shall constitute a failure to meet the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. Exceptions to these requirements are stated in the individual specifications. Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified condition shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation has been performed within the stated surveillance interval or as otherwise specified.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. Inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i);

APPLICABILITY

BASES

3.0.4 (Continued)

The intent of this provision is to ensure that facility operation is not initiated with either required equipment or systems inoperable or other specified limits being exceeded.

Exceptions to this provision have been provided for a limited number of specifications when startup with inoperable equipment would not affect plant safety. These exceptions are stated in the ACTION statements of the appropriate specifications.

4.0.1 This specification provides that surveillance activities necessary to ensure the Limiting Conditions for Operation are met and will be performed during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions for which the Limiting Conditions for Operation are applicable. Provisions for additional surveillance activities to be performed without regard to the applicable OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions are provided in the individual Surveillance Requirements. Surveillance Requirements for Special Test Exceptions need only be performed when the Special Test Exception is being utilized as an exception to an individual specification.

4.0.2 The provisions of this specification establish the limit for which the specified time interval for Surveillance Requirements may be extended. It permits an allowable extension of the normal surveillance interval to facilitate surveillance scheduling and consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting the surveillance; e.g., transient conditions or other ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. It also provides flexibility to accommodate the length of a fuel cycle for surveillances that are performed at each refueling outage and are specified with an 18 month surveillance interval. It is not intended that this provision be used repeatedly as a convenience to extend surveillance intervals beyond that specified for surveillances that are not performed during refueling outages. The limitation of Specification 4.0.2 is based on engineering judgement and the recognition that the most probable result of any particular surveillance being performed is the verification of conformance with the Surveillance Requirements. This provision is sufficient to ensure that the reliability ensured through surveillance activities is not significantly degraded beyond that obtained from the specified surveillance interval.

4.0.3 The provisions of this specification set forth the criteria for determination of compliance with the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Conditions for Operation. Under these criteria, equipment, systems or components are assumed to be OPERABLE if the associated surveillance activities have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval. Nothing in this provision is to be construed as defining equipment, systems or components OPERABLE when such items are found or known to be inoperable although still meeting the Surveillance Requirements. Items may be

determined inoperable during use, during surveillance tests, or in accordance with this specification. Therefore, ACTION statements are entered when the Surveillance Requirements should have been performed rather than at the time it is discovered that the tests were not performed.

4.0.4 This specification ensures that the surveillance activities associated with a Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the specified time interval prior to entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other applicable condition. The intent of this provision is to ensure that surveillance activities have been satisfactorily demonstrated on a current basis as required to meet the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 18 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-63

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, et al.

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-400

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 26, 1990, as supplemented April 24, 1990, Carolina Power & Light Company submitted a request for a change to the Technical Specifications (TS) for Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Harris). The proposed change removes the provision of Specification 4.0.2 that limits the combined time interval for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. Guidance on this proposed change to the TS was provided to all power reactor licensees and applicants by Generic Letter 89-14, dated August 21, 1989.

The April 24, 1990, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial determination of no significant hazards consideration as published in the Federal Register (55 FR 14504) on April 18, 1990.

2.0 EVALUATION

Specification 4.0.2 includes the provision that allows a surveillance interval to be extended by 25 percent of the specified time interval. This extension provides flexibility for scheduling the performance of surveillances and to permit consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting a surveillance at the specified time interval. Such operating conditions may include transient plant operation, or ongoing surveillance, or maintenance activities. Specification 4.0.2 further limits the allowance for extending surveillance intervals by requiring that the combined time interval for any three consecutive surveillances not exceed 3.25 times the specified time interval. The purpose of this provision is to assure that surveillances are not extended repeatedly as an operational convenience to provide an overall increase in the surveillance interval.

Experience has shown that the 18-month surveillance interval, with the provision to extend it by 25 percent, is usually sufficient to accommodate normal variations in the length of a fuel cycle. However, the NRC staff has routinely granted requests for one-time exceptions to the 3.25 limit on extending refueling surveillances because the risk to safety is low in contrast to the alternative of a forced shutdown to perform these surveillances. Therefore, the 3.25 limitation on extending surveillances has not been a practical limit on the use of the 25 percent allowance for extending surveillances that are performed on a refueling outage basis.

Extending surveillance intervals during plant operation can also result in a benefit to safety when a scheduled surveillance is due at a time that is not suitable for conducting the surveillance. This may occur when transient plant operating conditions exist, when safety systems are out of service for maintenance or other surveillance activities. In such cases, the benefit to safety of extending a surveillance interval would exceed any safety benefit derived by limiting the use of the 25 percent allowance to extend a surveillance. Furthermore, there is the administrative burden associated with tracking the use of the 25 percent allowance to ensure compliance with the 3.25 limit.

In view of these findings, the staff concluded that Specification 4.0.2 should be changed to remove the 3.25 limit for all surveillances because its removal will have an overall positive effect on safety. The guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14 included the following change to this specification and removes the 3.25 limit on three consecutive surveillances with the following statement:

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25 percent of the specified surveillance interval.

In addition, the Bases of this specification were updated to reflect this change and noted that it is not the intent of the allowance for extending surveillance intervals that it be used repeatedly merely as an operational convenience to extend surveillance intervals beyond that which is specified.

The licensee has proposed changes to Specification 4.0.2 that are consistent with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14, as noted above. On the basis of its review of this matter, the staff finds that the above change to the TS for Harris is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in surveillance requirements of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts and no significant changes in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational exposure. The staff has determined 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 this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (55 FR 14504) on April 18, 1990. The Commission consulted with the State of North Carolina. No public comments were received, and the State of North Carolina did not have any comments.

On the basis of the considerations discussed above, the staff concludes that (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: T. Dunning
R. Becker

Dated: May 25, 1990