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

July 9, 2010

Christopher Burton, Vice President
Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 165, Mail Zone 1
New Hill, North Carolina 27562-0165

SUBJECT: SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1 – ACCEPTANCE REVIEW REGARDING A RELIEF REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE INSERVICE INSPECTION METHOD FOR SIX PRESSURE RETAINING DISSIMILAR METAL WELDS IN THE REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL NOZZLES (TAC NO. ME3894)

Dear Mr. Burton:

By letter dated May 27, 2010, Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee), now doing business as Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc., submitted a relief request for the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP). The proposed relief request seeks approval to allow an alternative to the inservice inspection requirements of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, "Rules for Inservice Inspection of Nuclear Power Plant Components," for six pressure retaining dissimilar metal welds in the reactor pressure vessel nozzles. The proposed alternative pertains to the third 10-year inspection interval at HNP.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) and 50.55a(a)(3)(ii) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the final results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this request. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed change. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's relief request and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed request in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment.

If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence. Should you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-3178.

Sincerely,

Marlayna Vaaler, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch II-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-400

cc: Distribution via ListServ

If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence. Should you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-3178.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Marlayna Vaaler, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch II-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-400

cc: Distribution via ListServ

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	LPL2-2 r/f	RidsNrrDorlLpl2-2
RidsNrrLACSola	RidsNrrPMHarris	RidsNrrDorlDpr

ADAMS Accession No.: ML10101870720 NRR-106

OFFICE	LPL2-2/PM	LPL2-2/LA	LPL2-2/BC
NAME	MVaaler	BClayton for CSola	DBroaddus
DATE	07/07/10	07/07/10	07/09/10

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY