

March 17, 1997

Mr. W. R. Robinson, Vice President  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Post Office Box 165, Mail Code: Zone 1  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE  
NO. NPF-63 REGARDING - SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1  
(TAC NO. M97818)

Dear Mr. Robinson:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued Amendment No. 69 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-63 for the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. This amendment changes the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your request dated January 29, 1997, as supplemented February 6, and February 21, 1997.

The amendment adds a new TS 3.0.5 and its associated Bases. This new specification will provide specific guidance for returning equipment to service under administrative control for the sole purpose of performing testing to demonstrate its OPERABILITY or the OPERABILITY of other equipment.

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

Sincerely,  
Original signed by:  
Ngoc B. Le, Project Manager  
Project Directorate II-1  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-400

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 69 to NPF-63
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:

See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\HARRIS\HAR97818.AMD (\*see previous concurrences)

OFFICE	PM:PDII-1	LA:PDII-1	SCSB*	BC:OTSB	BC:HICB*
NAME	NLe <i>to</i>	Domington	CBerlinger	CGrimes <i>JBL</i>	JWermiel
DATE	02/24/97	02/27/97	02/13/97	02/24/97	02/13/97
COPY	(Yes/No)	(Yes/No)	(Yes/No)	(Yes/No)	(Yes/No)
OFFICE	OGC	D:PDII-1			
NAME	<i>St Luke</i> <i>W. Charles</i>	MReinhardt			
DATE	3/4/97	3/17/97			
COPY	Yes/No	(Yes/No)	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9703200191 970317  
PDR ADOCK 05000400  
P PDR

**NRC FILE CENTER COPY**

CPI

Mr. W. R. Robinson  
Carolina Power & Light Company

Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Unit 1

cc:

Mr. William D. Johnson  
Vice President and Senior Counsel  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Post Office Box 1551  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. J. W. Donahue  
Director of Site Operations  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Post Office Box 165, MC: Zone 1  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

Resident Inspector/Harris NPS  
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
5421 Shearon Harris Road  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-9998

Mr. Robert P. Gruber  
Executive Director  
Public Staff NCUC  
Post Office Box 29520  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626

Ms. Karen E. Long  
Assistant Attorney General  
State of North Carolina  
Post Office Box 629  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Chairman of the North Carolina  
Utilities Commission  
Post Office Box 29510  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626-0510

Public Service Commission  
State of South Carolina  
Post Office Drawer 11649  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Ms. D. B. Alexander, Supervisor  
Licensing/Regulatory Programs  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
P. O. Box 165, Mail Zone 1  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

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

Mr. Stewart Adcock, Chairman  
Board of County Commissioners  
of Wake County  
P. O. Box 550  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Mel Fry, Acting Director  
Division of Radiation Protection  
N.C. Department of Environment,  
Health and Natural Resources  
3825 Barrett Dr.  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Margaret Bryant Pollard, Chairman  
Board of County Commissioners  
of Chatham County  
P. O. Box 87  
Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312

Mr. T. D. Walt  
Director  
Operations & Environmental  
Support Department  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
412 S. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

Mr. Milton Shymlock  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.  
101 Marietta Street, N.W.  
Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323-0199

Mr. Bo Clark  
Plant General Manager - Harris Plant  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
P.O. Box 165  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-63 - HARRIS, UNIT 1

Docket File  
PUBLIC  
PDII-1 Reading  
S. Varga  
J. Zwolinski  
OGC  
G. Hill (2)  
C. Grimes (11E22)  
ACRS  
OPA  
OC/LFMB  
J. Johnson, RII

cc: Harris Service List



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, et al.

DOCKET NO. 50-400

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 69  
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 January 29, 1997, as supplemented February 6, and February 21, 1997, 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:

9703200193 970317  
PDR ADOCK 05000400  
P PDR

(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. 69, 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 and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Mark Reinhart, Acting 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: March 17, 1997

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 69

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 0-1  
B 3/4 0-2  
B 3/4 0-2a  
---

Insert Pages

3/4 0-1  
B 3/4 0-2  
B 3/4 0-2a  
B 3/4 0-2b

### 3/4.0 APPLICABILITY

#### LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

---

3.0.1 Compliance with the Limiting Conditions for Operation contained in the succeeding specifications is required during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions specified therein; except that upon failure to meet the Limiting Conditions for Operation, the associated ACTION requirements shall be met.

3.0.2 Noncompliance with a specification shall exist when the requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation and associated ACTION requirements are not met within the specified time intervals. If the Limiting Condition for Operation is restored prior to expiration of the specified time intervals, completion of the ACTION requirements is not required unless otherwise noted in the ACTION statement.

3.0.3 When a Limiting Condition for Operation is not met, except as provided in the associated ACTION requirements, within 1 hour action shall be initiated to place the unit in a MODE in which the specification does not apply by placing it, as applicable, in:

- a. At least HOT STANDBY within the next 6 hours.
- b. At least HOT SHUTDOWN within the following 6 hours, and
- c. At least COLD SHUTDOWN within the subsequent 24 hours.

Where corrective measures are completed that permit operation under the ACTION requirements, the action may be taken in accordance with the specified time limits as measured from the time of failure to meet the Limiting Condition for Operation. Exceptions to these requirements are stated in the individual specifications.

This specification is not applicable in MODE 5 or 6.

3.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified condition shall not be made unless the conditions for the Limiting Condition for Operation are met without reliance on provisions contained in the ACTION requirements. This provision shall not prevent passage through or to OPERATIONAL MODES as required to comply with ACTION requirements. Exceptions to these requirements are stated in the individual specifications.

3.0.5 Equipment removed from service or declared inoperable to comply with ACTIONS may be returned to service under administrative control solely to perform testing required to demonstrate its OPERABILITY or the OPERABILITY of other equipment. This is an exception to 3.0.1 above for the system returned to service under administrative control to perform the testing required to demonstrate OPERABILITY.

## 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.

3.0.5 This specification establishes the allowance for restoring equipment to service under administrative controls when it has been removed from service or declared inoperable to comply with ACTIONS. The sole purpose of this Specification is to provide an exception to 3.0.1 (e.g., to not comply with the applicable Required Action(s)) to allow the performance of surveillance testing to demonstrate:

- a. The OPERABILITY of the equipment being returned to service; or
- b. The OPERABILITY of other equipment

The administrative controls ensure the time the equipment is returned to service in conflict with the requirements of the ACTIONS is limited to the time absolutely necessary to perform the allowed surveillance tests. This Specification does not provide time to perform any other preventive or corrective maintenance.

An example of demonstrating the OPERABILITY of the equipment being returned to service is reopening a containment isolation valve that has been closed to comply with Required Actions and must be reopened to perform the surveillance tests.

An example of demonstrating the OPERABILITY of other equipment is taking an inoperable channel or trip system out of the tripped condition to prevent the trip function from occurring during the performance of a surveillance test on another channel in the other trip system. A similar example of demonstrating the OPERABILITY of other equipment is taking an inoperable channel or trip system out of the tripped condition to permit the logic to function and indicate the appropriate response during the performance of a surveillance test on another channel in the same trip system.

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.

## APPLICABILITY

### BASES

---

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 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 Specification 4.0.3 establishes the flexibility to defer declaring affected equipment inoperable or an affected variable outside the specified limits when a surveillance has not been completed within the specified surveillance interval. A delay period of up to 24 hours or up to the limit of the specified surveillance interval, whichever is less, applies from the point in time that it is discovered that the surveillance has not been performed in accordance with Specification 4.0.2, and not at the time that the specified surveillance interval was not met.

This delay period provides adequate time to complete surveillances that have been missed. This delay period permits the completion of a surveillance before complying with ACTION requirements or other remedial measures that might preclude completion of the surveillance.

The basis for this delay period includes consideration of unit conditions, adequate planning, availability of personnel, the time required to perform the surveillance, the safety significance of the delay in completing the required surveillance, and the recognition that the most probable result of any particular surveillance being performed is the verification of conformance with the requirements. When a surveillance with a surveillance interval based not on time intervals, but upon specified unit conditions or operational situations, is discovered not to have been performed when specified, Specification 4.0.3 allows the full delay period of 24 hours to perform the surveillance.

Specification 4.0.3 also provides a time limit for completion of surveillances that become applicable as a consequence of MODE changes imposed by ACTION requirements.

Failure to comply with specified surveillance intervals for surveillance requirements is expected to be an infrequent occurrence. Use of the delay period established by Specification 4.0.3 is a flexibility which is not intended to be used as an operational convenience to extend surveillance intervals.

## APPLICABILITY

### BASES

---

#### 4.0.3 (Continued)

If a surveillance is not completed within the allowed delay period, then the equipment is considered inoperable or the variable is considered outside the specified limits and the time limits of the ACTION requirements for the applicable LCO begin immediately upon expiration of the delay period. If a surveillance is failed within the delay period, then the equipment is inoperable or the variable is outside the specified limits, and the time limits of the ACTION requirements for the applicable LCO begin immediately upon the failure of the surveillance.

Completion of the surveillance within the delay period allowed by this Specification, or within the completion time of the ACTIONS, restores compliance with Specification 4.0.1.

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. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-63  
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-400

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 29, 1997, as supplemented February 6, and February 21, 1997, the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L or the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (SHNPP), Technical Specifications (TSs). The February 6, and 21, 1997, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The requested changes would add TS 3.0.5 and its associated Bases. This new specification will revise the plant TS to provide specific guidance allowing equipment removed from service or declared inoperable to comply with ACTIONS to be returned to service under plant administrative control in order to perform the required testing to demonstrate its OPERABILITY or the OPERABILITY of other equipment. This proposed change is functionally identical to the guidance provided in the current Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Plants, NUREG-1431, Rev. 1.

2.0 EVALUATION

The present TSs for SHNPP neither specifically allow nor prohibit re-entry into ACTION statements. In the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Plants, NUREG-1431, Vol. 1, Rev. 1, the NRC staff approved a provision, via TS 3.0.5 section, that establishes the allowance for restoring equipment to service under plant administrative control when it has been removed from service or declared inoperable to comply with ACTIONS statement. The sole purpose of this specification is to provide an exception to the limiting conditions for operation (LCO) 3.0.1 (e.g., to not comply with the applicable Required Action(s) to allow the performance of surveillance requirements (SRs) to demonstrate:

- a. The OPERABILITY of the equipment being returned to service; or
- b. The OPERABILITY of other equipment.

Currently, the SHNPP TSs require that when equipment has been out of service it is necessary to demonstrate that it can perform its required function, before it can be returned to service in an OPERABLE condition. In its submittal, the licensee stated that most testing can be done prior to returning equipment to service, but in some cases it is necessary to return to a functional status in order to demonstrate an activity required for OPERABILITY. A particular example for SHNPP is Specification 3.3.3.1, RADIATION MONITORING FOR PLANT OPERATIONS, items 1.b and 1.c of TS Table 3.3-6 that deal with containment airborne radioactivity monitors during normal and pre-entry purge operation. Each of these items has an ACTION statement which requires the associated purge valves to be maintained closed in the event the radiation monitor is inoperable, and in order to demonstrate the OPERABILITY of the radiation monitor prior to its return to service, it is necessary to demonstrate that the associated purge valves will be automatically closed if a trip set point is reached on the monitor. However, the only way this test can be performed is by opening the associated valves to observe their closing as a result of the radiation monitor signal; and on the other hand, the valve cannot be opened because of the ACTION statement in force due to the INOPERABLE radiation monitor. This creates a situation in which it can become logically impossible to demonstrate the operability of the radiation monitor; and thus, the requested change would resolve this situation by adding new TS 3.0.5 to provide an exception for the required compliance with ACTION statements of existing TS 3.0.1. For the above example, the new TS clarifies that it is permissible to open a purge valve in order to observe its closure by the functional radiation monitor signal.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's proposed change and concludes that the addition of TS 3.0.5 and its associated Bases is functionally consistent with NUREG-1431, provides clarification of the existing SHNPP's LCOs 3.0.1 and 3.0.2, and maintains compliance with the intent of both LCO 3.0.1 and 3.0.2. The staff notes that in NUREG-1431, LCO 3.0.1 simply references LCO 3.0.2 for instances of noncompliance and does not mention ACTION statements. The staff reviews the current SHNPP TS 3.0.1 and finds it contains the phrase "...upon failure to meet the Limiting Condition for Operation, the associated ACTION requirements shall be met." Furthermore, the current SHNPP TS 3.0.2 states: "Noncompliance with a specification shall exist when the requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation and the associated ACTION requirements are not met within the specified time intervals." The staff finds the licensee's proposed new TS 3.0.5 is functionally similar to that of TS 3.0.5 in the staff-approved NUREG-1431, Rev.1, "Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Plants," and concurs with the need for the licensee to have an exception to their current SHNPP TS 3.0.1. As stated in TS 3.0.5, this exception is solely intended to allow the performance of surveillance testing to demonstrate the operability of the equipment being returned to service; or the operability of other equipment.

Based on the above review, the staff finds that the licensee's proposed change to add TS 3.0.5 and its associated Bases (1) to be functionally consistent with the TS 3.0.5 statement incorporated in the current staff-approved

Standard Specifications for Westinghouse Plants, NUREG-1431, (2) has no impact on plant equipment or its operation; and (3) clarifies that the testing necessary to declare equipment OPERABLE may be completed under administrative controls. Therefore, the proposed change is acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the State of North Carolina official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes the Surveillance Requirements. The NRC 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 (62 FR 6569). 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

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) 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: N. B. Le

Date: March 17, 1997