

May 3, 2004

Mr. James Scarola, 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: SAFETY EVALUATION FOR SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT,  
UNIT 1, RELIEF REQUEST - ASME CODE, SECTION XI, APPENDIX VIII,  
SUPPLEMENT 10 (TAC NO. MC1638)

Dear Mr. Scarola:

By letter dated December 5, 2003, as supplemented by letter dated March 2, 2004, Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L, the licensee) submitted a request for relief for Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP). CP&L proposed an alternative to certain American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) requirements. Specifically, CP&L requested relief from selected provisions of ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 10, "Qualification Requirements for Inspection of Dissimilar Metal Piping Welds," for the second 10-year inservice inspection (ISI) interval for HNP.

The NRC staff concludes that the request, which proposed an alternative to Supplement 10 as administered by the Electric Power Research Institute - Performance Demonstration Initiative program, provides an acceptable level of quality and safety. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), the NRC staff authorizes the proposed alternative described in CP&L's December 5, 2003, letter for the second 10-year ISI interval for HNP.

The NRC staff's evaluation and conclusions are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

William F. Burton, Acting Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-400

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

May 3, 2004

Mr. James Scarola, 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: SAFETY EVALUATION FOR SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT,  
UNIT 1, RELIEF REQUEST - ASME CODE, SECTION XI, APPENDIX VIII,  
SUPPLEMENT 10 (TAC NO. MC1638)

Dear Mr. Scarola:

By letter dated December 5, 2003, as supplemented by letter dated March 2, 2004, Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L, the licensee) submitted a request for relief for Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP). CP&L proposed an alternative to certain American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) requirements. Specifically, CP&L requested relief from selected provisions of ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 10, "Qualification Requirements for Inspection of Dissimilar Metal Piping Welds," for the second 10-year inservice inspection (ISI) interval for HNP.

The NRC staff concludes that the request, which proposed an alternative to Supplement 10 as administered by the Electric Power Research Institute - Performance Demonstration Initiative program, provides an acceptable level of quality and safety. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), the NRC staff authorizes the proposed alternative described in CP&L's December 5, 2003, letter for the second 10-year ISI interval for HNP.

The NRC staff's evaluation and conclusions are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

William F. Burton, Acting Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-400

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC	CPatel	ACRS	GHill (2)
PDII-2 Reading	EDunnington	PFredrickson, RII	TJKim
WBurton	OGC	DVotolato	

**ADAMS Accession No. ML041290002**

OFFICE	PM:PDII/S2	LA:PDII/S2	SC:PDII/S2	SC:EMCB/SB	OGC
NAME	CPatel	EDunnington	WBurton	TChan	GMLargo for JGoldberg
DATE	4/13/04	4/13/04	4/30/04	4/15/04	4/22/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELIEF REQUEST FROM ASME CODE, SECTION XI, APPENDIX VIII, SUPPLEMENT 10  
SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1  
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
DOCKET NUMBER 50-400

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The inservice inspection of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 components is to be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Code and applicable edition and addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i). 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3) states in part that alternatives to the requirements of paragraph (g) may be used, when authorized by the NRC, if the licensee demonstrates that: (i) the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or (ii) compliance with the specified requirements would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4), ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components (including supports) shall meet the requirements, except the design and access provisions and the pre-service examination requirements, set forth in the ASME Code, Section XI, "Rules for Inservice Inspection (ISI) of Nuclear Power Plant Components," to the extent practical within the limitations of design, geometry, and materials of construction of the components. The regulations require that inservice examination of components and system pressure tests conducted during the first 10-year interval and subsequent intervals comply with the requirements in the latest edition and addenda of Section XI of the ASME Code incorporated by reference in 10 CFR 50.55a(b) 12 months prior to the start of the 120-month interval, subject to the limitations and modifications listed therein. Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP), is in the second ISI interval, which started on February 2, 1998, and will end on May 1, 2007. The current ISI Code of record for HNP is the 1989 Edition of the ASME Code. The components (including supports) may meet the requirements set forth in subsequent editions and addenda of the ASME Code incorporated by reference in 10 CFR 50.55a(b) subject to the limitations and modifications listed therein and subject to Commission approval.

By letter dated December 5, 2003, as supplemented by letter dated March 2, 2004, Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) requested relief from certain ASME Code requirements for HNP. Specifically, the licensee proposed using the Dissimilar Metal Weld (DMW)

Enclosure

criteria of the Electric Power Research Institute - Performance Demonstration Initiative Program (EPRI-PDI) in lieu of select provisions of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 10.

## 2.0 DISCUSSION

### 2.1 Components for Which Relief Is Requested

Dissimilar metal piping welds that are subject to examination using procedures, personnel, and equipment qualified to the 1989 Edition of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 10, "Qualification Requirements for Dissimilar Metal Piping Welds."

### 2.2 Code Requirements

The licensee proposed alternatives to the following Supplement 10 requirements.

Item 1 - Paragraph 1.1(b) states in part - Pipe diameters within a range of 0.9 to 1.5 times a nominal diameter shall be considered equivalent.

Item 2 - Paragraph 1.1(d) states - All flaws in the specimen set shall be cracks.

Item 3 - Paragraph 1.1(d)(1) states - At least 50% of the cracks shall be in austenitic material. At least 50% of the cracks in austenitic material shall be contained wholly in weld or buttering material. At least 10% of the cracks shall be in ferritic material. The remainder of the cracks may be in either austenitic or ferritic material.

Item 4 - Paragraph 1.2(b) states in part - The number of unflawed grading units shall be at least twice the number of flawed grading units.

Item 5 - Paragraphs 1.2(c)(1) and 1.3(c) state in part - At least 1/3 of the flaws, rounded to the next higher whole number, shall have depths between 10% and 30% of the nominal pipe wall thickness. Paragraph 1.4(b) distribution table requires 20% of the flaws to have depths between 10% and 30%.

Item 6 - Paragraph 2.0 first sentence states - The specimen inside surface and identification shall be concealed from the candidate.

Item 7 - Paragraph 2.2(b) states in part - The regions containing a flaw to be sized shall be identified to the candidate.

Item 8 - Paragraph 2.2(c) states in part - For a separate length sizing test, the regions of each specimen containing a flaw to be sized shall be identified to the candidate.

Item 9 - Paragraph 2.3(a) states - For the depth sizing test, 80% of the flaws shall be sized at a specific location on the surface of the specimen identified to the candidate.

Item 10 - Paragraph 2.3(b) states - For the remaining flaws, the regions of each specimen containing a flaw to be sized shall be identified to the candidate. The candidate shall determine the maximum depth of the flaw in each region.

Item 11 - Paragraph 3.1, Table VIII-S2-1 provides the false call criteria when the number of unflawed grading units is at least twice the number of flawed grading units.

### 2.3 Proposed Alternative and Licensee Basis for Use

The licensee proposed the following alternative requirements to selected provisions of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 10 requirements for HNP. The proposed alternative as implemented through the PDI Program is attached to the licensee's submittal. The proposed alternative was incorporated in ASME Code Case N-695, which was approved by ASME on May 21, 2003.

Item 1 - Paragraph 1.1(b) alternative:

"The specimen set shall include the minimum and maximum pipe diameters and thicknesses for which the examination procedure is applicable. Pipe diameters within a range of ½ in. (13 mm) of the nominal diameter shall be considered equivalent. Pipe diameters larger than 24 in. (610 mm) shall be considered to be flat. When a range of thicknesses is to be examined, a thickness tolerance of ±25% is acceptable."

Technical Basis - The change in the minimum pipe diameter tolerance from 0.9 times the diameter to the nominal diameter minus 0.5 inch provides tolerances more in line with industry practice. Though the alternative is less stringent for small pipe diameters they typically have a thinner wall thickness than larger diameter piping. A thinner wall thickness results in shorter sound path distances that reduce the detrimental effects of the curvature. This change maintains consistency between Supplement 10 and the recent revision to Supplement 2.

Item 2 - Paragraph 1.1(d) alternative:

"At least 60% of the flaws shall be cracks, the remainder shall be alternative flaws. Specimens with Intergranular Stress Corrosion Cracking (IGSCC) shall be used when available. Alternative flaws, if used, shall provide crack-like reflective characteristics and shall be limited to the case where implantation of cracks produces spurious reflectors that are uncharacteristic of service induced flaws. Alternative flaw mechanisms shall have a tip width of less than or equal to 0.002 in. (.05 mm)."

Technical Basis - ... [I]mplanting a crack requires excavation of the base material on at least one side of the flaw. While this may be satisfactory for ferritic materials, it does not produce a useable axial flaw in austenitic materials because the sound beam, which normally passes only through base material, must now travel through weld material on at least one side, producing an unrealistic flaw response. In addition, it is important to preserve the dendritic structure present in field welds that would otherwise be destroyed by the implantation process. To resolve these issues, the proposed alternative allows the use of up to 40% fabricated flaws as an alternative flaw mechanism under controlled conditions. The fabricated flaws are isostatically compressed which produces ultrasonic reflective characteristics similar to tight cracks. To avoid confusion, the proposed alternative modifies instances of the term[s] "cracks" or "cracking" to the term "flaws" because of the use of "alternative flaw mechanisms."

Item 3 - Paragraph 1.1(d)(1) alternative:

"At least 80% of the flaws shall be contained wholly in weld or buttering material. At least one and a maximum of 10% of the flaws shall be in ferritic base material. At least one and a maximum of 10% of the flaws shall be in austenitic base material."

Technical Basis - Under the current Code, as few as 25% of the flaws are contained in austenitic weld or buttering material. The metallurgical structure of austenitic weld material is ultrasonically more challenging than either ferritic or austenitic base material. The proposed alternative is therefore more challenging than the current Code.

Item 4 - Paragraph 1.2(b) alternative:

"Detection sets shall be selected from Table VIII-S10-1. The number of unflawed grading units shall be at least one and a half times the number of flawed grading units."

Technical Basis - New Table VIII-S10-1 provides a statistically based ratio between the number of unflawed grading units and the number of flawed grading units. Based on information provided by the PDI, the proposed alternative reduces the ratio to 1.5 times to reduce the number of test samples to a more reasonable number. However, the statistical basis used for screening personnel and procedures is still maintained at the same level with competent personnel being successful and less skilled personnel being unsuccessful. The acceptance criteria for the statistical basis are in Table VIII-S10-1.

Item 5 - Paragraphs 1.2(c)(1) and 1.3(c) alternative:

The proposed alternative to the flaw distribution requirements of Paragraphs 1.2(c)(1) (detection) and 1.3(c) (length) is to use the Paragraph 1.4(b) (depth) distribution table (see below) for all qualifications.

Flaw Depth (% Wall Thickness)	Minimum Number of Flaws
10-30%	20%
31-60%	20%
61-100%	20%

Technical Basis - The proposed alternative uses the depth sizing distribution for both detection and depth sizing because it provides for a better distribution of flaw sizes within the test set. This distribution allows candidates to perform detection, length, and depth sizing demonstrations simultaneously utilizing the same test set. The requirement that at least 75% of the flaws shall be in the range of 10 to 60% of wall thickness provides an overall distribution tolerance, yet the distribution uncertainty decreases the possibilities for testmanship that would be inherent to a uniform distribution. It must be noted that it is possible to achieve the same distribution utilizing the present requirements, but it is preferable to make the criteria consistent.

Item 6 - Paragraph 2.0 alternative to the first sentence:

"For qualifications from the outside surface, the specimen inside surface and identification shall be concealed from the candidate. When qualifications are performed from the inside surface, the flaw location and specimen identification shall be obscured to maintain a 'blind test'."

Technical Basis - The current Code requires that the inside surface be concealed from the candidate. This makes qualifications conducted from the inside of the pipe (e.g., Pressurized Water Reactor nozzle to safe end welds) impractical. The proposed alternative differentiates between Inside Diameter (ID) and Outside Diameter (OD) scanning surfaces, requires that they be conducted separately, and requires that flaws be concealed from the candidate. This is consistent with the recent revision to Supplement 2 of ASME Code Section XI, Division 1, Appendix XIII, "Qualification Requirements for Wrought Austenitic Piping Welds."

Items 7 and 8 - Paragraphs 2.2(b) and 2.2(c) alternative:

"... containing a flaw to be sized may be identified to the candidate."

Technical Basis - The current Code requires that the regions of each specimen containing a flaw to be length sized shall be identified to the candidate. The candidate shall determine the length of the flaw in each region (note that length and depth sizing use the term "regions" while detection uses the term "grading units"). To ensure security of the samples, the proposed alternative modifies the first "shall" to a "may" to allow the test administrator the option of not identifying specifically where a flaw is located. This is consistent with the recent revision to Supplement 2 of ASME Code Section XI, Division 1, Appendix XIII, "Qualification Requirements for Wrought Austenitic Piping Welds."

Items 9 and 10 - Paragraphs 2.3(a) and 2.3(b) alternative:

"... regions of each specimen containing a flaw to be sized may be identified to the candidate."

Technical Basis - The current Code requires that a large number of flaws be sized at a specific location. The proposed alternative changes the "shall" to a "may" which modifies this from a specific area to a more generalized region to ensure security of samples. This is consistent with the recent revision to Supplement 2 of ASME Code Section XI, Division 1, Appendix XIII, "Qualification Requirements for Wrought Austenitic Piping Welds. It also incorporates terminology from length sizing for additional clarity.

Item 11 - Paragraph 3.1 alternative:

Use the acceptance Table VIII-S10-1 (shown in the licensee's submittal), which is a modification of Table VIII-S2-1.

Technical Basis - The proposed alternative adds new Table VIII-S10-1. It is a modified version of Table VIII-S2-1 to reflect the reduced number of unflawed grading units and allowable false calls. As provided by the PDI, as part of ongoing ASME Code activities,

Pacific Northwest National [Laboratory] has reviewed the statistical significance of these revisions and offered the new Table VIII-S10-1.

## 2.4 Evaluation

Since 2001, PDI has been developing a program to implement Supplement 10 to Appendix VIII of Section XI of the ASME Code. During the development process, certain aspects of Supplement 10 were identified as difficult or impossible to implement. To overcome the implementation difficulties, PDI researched, tested, and demonstrated the effectiveness of an alternative to selected paragraphs of the Code. PDI representatives presented the alternative before the appropriate ASME committees that formalized the alternative in Code Case N-695, which was approved on May 21, 2003. The NRC staff representatives on these committees participated in the consensus process and joined with the industry in approving Code Case N-695. The differences between the Code and the PDI program are discussed below.

### Paragraph 1.1(b)

The Code requirement of “0.9 to 1.5 times the nominal diameter are equivalent” was established for a single nominal diameter. When applying the Code-required tolerance to a range of diameters, the tolerance rapidly expands on the high side. Under the current Code requirements, a 5-inch OD pipe would be equivalent to a range of 4.5-inch to 7.5-inch diameter pipe. Under the proposed PDI guidelines, the equivalent range would be reduced to 4.5-inch to 5.5-inch diameter pipe. With current Code requirements, a 16-inch nominal diameter pipe would be equivalent to a range of 14.4-inch to 24-inch diameter pipe. The proposed alternative would significantly reduce the equivalent range to between 15.5-inch and 16.5-inch diameter pipe. The difference between the Code and the proposed PDI program for diameters less than 5 inches is not significant because of shorter metal path and beam spread associated with smaller diameter piping. The NRC staff considers the proposed alternative to be more conservative overall than current Code requirements. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

### Paragraph 1.1(d)

The Code requires all flaws to be cracks. Manufacturing test specimens containing cracks free of spurious reflections and telltale indicators is extremely difficult in austenitic material. To overcome these difficulties, PDI developed a process for fabricating flaws that produce ultrasonic testing (UT) acoustic responses similar to the responses associated with real cracks. PDI presented its process for discussion at public meetings held June 12 through 14, 2001, and January 31 through February 2, 2002, at the EPRI NDE Center, Charlotte, NC. The NRC staff attended these meetings and determined that the process parameters used for manufacturing fabricated flaws resulted in acceptable acoustic responses. PDI is selectively installing these fabricated flaws in specimen locations that are unsuitable for real cracks. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

Paragraph 1.1(d)(1)

The Code requires that at least 50 percent of the flaws be contained in austenitic material and 50 percent of the flaws in the austenitic material shall be contained fully in weld or buttering material. This means that at least 25 percent of the total flaws must be located in the weld or buttering material. Field experience shows that flaws identified during ISI of dissimilar metal welds are more likely to be located in the weld or buttering material. The grain structure of austenitic weld and buttering material represents a much more stringent ultrasonic scenario than that of a ferritic or austenitic base material. Flaws made in austenitic base material are difficult to create free of spurious reflectors and telltale indicators. The proposed alternative of 80 percent of the flaws in the weld metal or buttering material provides a challenging testing scenario reflective of field experience and minimizes testmanship associated with telltale reflectors common to placing flaws in austenitic base material. The NRC staff considers the proposed alternative to be more conservative overall than current Code requirements. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

Paragraph 1.2(b), Paragraph 3.1

The Code requires that detection sets meet the requirements of Table VIII-S2-1, which specifies the minimum number of flaws in a test set to be 5 with 100-percent detection. The current Code also requires the number of unflawed grading units to be two times the number of flawed grading units. The proposed alternative, shown in the licensee's submittal as Table VIII-S10-1, would follow the detection criteria of the table beginning with a minimum number of flaws in a test set being 10, and reducing the number of unflawed grading units to one and a half times the number of flawed grading units. The allowable number of false calls is also reduced in order to maintain the statistical basis for the pass/fail criteria. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

Paragraph 1.2(c)(1), Paragraph 1.3(c)

For detection and length sizing, the Code requires at least one third of the flaws be located between 10 and 30 percent through the wall thickness and one third located greater than 30 percent through the wall thickness. The remaining flaws would be located randomly throughout the wall thickness. The proposed alternative sets the distribution criteria for detection and length sizing to be the same as the depth sizing distribution, which stipulates that at least 20 percent of the flaws be located in each of the increments of 10-30 percent, 31-60 percent, and 61-100 percent. At least 75 percent of the flaws shall be in the range of 10 to 60 percent of the wall thickness with the remaining flaws located randomly throughout the pipe thickness. With the exception of the 10-30 percent increment, the proposed alternative is a subset of the current Code requirements. The 10-30 percent increment would be in the subset if it contained at least 30 percent of the flaws. The change simplifies assembling test sets for detection and sizing qualifications and is more indicative of conditions in the field. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

## Paragraph 2.0

The Code requires the specimen inside surface be concealed from the candidate. This requirement is applicable for test specimens used for qualification performed from the outside surface. With the expansion of Supplement 10 to include qualifications performed from the inside surface, the inside surface must be accessible while maintaining the specimen integrity. The proposed alternative requires that flaws and specimen identifications be obscured from candidates, thus maintaining blind test conditions. The NRC staff considers this to be consistent with the intent of ASME Code requirements. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

## Paragraphs 2.2(b) and 2.2(c)

The Code requires that the location of flaws added to the test set for length sizing shall be identified to the candidate. The proposed alternative is to make identifying the location of additional flaws an option. This option provides an additional element of difficulty to the testing process because the candidate would be expected to demonstrate the skill of detecting and sizing flaws over an area larger than a specific location. The NRC staff considers the proposed alternative to be more conservative than current Code requirements. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

## Paragraphs 2.3(a) and 2.3(b)

In paragraph 2.3(a), the Code requires that 80 percent of the flaws be sized in a specific location that is identified to the candidate. The proposed alternative allows identification of the specific location to be an option. This permits detection and depth sizing to be conducted separately or concurrently. In order to maintain a blind test, the location of flaws cannot be shared with the candidate. For depth sizing that is conducted separately, allowing the test administrator the option of not identifying flaw locations makes the testing process more challenging. The NRC staff considers the proposed alternative to be more conservative than current Code requirements. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

In paragraph 2.3(b), the Code also requires that the location of flaws added to the test set for depth sizing shall be identified to the candidate. The proposed alternative is to make identifying the location of additional flaws an option. This option provides an additional element of difficulty to the testing process because the candidate would be expected to demonstrate the skill of finding and sizing flaws in an area larger than a specific location. The NRC staff considers the proposed alternative to be more conservative than current Code requirements. The NRC staff finds that the proposed alternative will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

## 3.0 CONCLUSION

The NRC staff concludes that the licensee's request that proposed an alternative to Supplement 10 as administered by the EPRI-PDI program provides an acceptable level of quality and safety. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), the NRC staff authorizes the proposed alternative described in the licensee's December 5, 2003, letter for the second 10-year ISI interval for HNP. All other ASME Code, Section XI requirements for which relief

was not specifically requested and approved in this relief request remain applicable, including third party review by the Authorized Nuclear Inservice Inspector.

Principal Contributor: D. Votolato

Date: May 3, 2004

Mr. James Scarola  
Carolina Power & Light Company

Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Unit 1

cc:

Steven R. Carr  
Associate General Counsel - Legal  
Department  
Progress Energy Service Company, LLC  
Post Office Box 1551  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. Robert J. Duncan II  
Director of Site Operations  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
Post Office Box 165, Mail 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  
4326 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4326

Ms. Margaret A. Force  
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

Mr. Herb Council, Chair  
Board of County Commissioners  
of Wake County  
P. O. Box 550  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Ms. Beverly Hall, Section Chief  
Division of Radiation Protection  
N.C. Department of Environment  
and Natural Resources  
3825 Barrett Drive  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Mr. Tommy Emerson, Chair  
Board of County Commissioners  
of Chatham County  
P. O. Box 87  
Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312

Mr. James W. Holt  
Manager  
Performance Evaluation and  
Regulatory Affairs PEB 7  
Progress Energy  
Post Office Box 1551  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. Terry C. Morton, Manager  
Support Services  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
P. O. Box 165, Mail Zone 1  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

Mr. Benjamin C. Waldrep  
Plant General Manager  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
P. O. Box 165, Mail Zone 3  
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

Mr. John R. Caves, Supervisor  
Licensing/Regulatory Programs  
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant  
Carolina Power & Light Company  
P. O. Box 165, Mail Zone 1  
New Hill, NC 27562-0165

Mr. John H. O'Neill, Jr.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20037-1128