



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 56 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-23

CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

H. B. ROBINSON STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-261

Introduction

By letter dated May 5, 1981, Carolina Power and Light Company (the licensee) requested an amendment to License No. DPR-23 for the H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2. This amendment would clarify the requirements for testing primary coolant system check valves.

Discussion and Evaluation

Requirements for testing primary coolant system check valves were imposed by Order dated April 20, 1981 with the addition of Technical Specifications to the license. These Technical Specifications require the periodic testing of each check valve at a leakage rate not to exceed 5.0 gpm.

The purpose of this change is to clarify what is meant by "each" valve. "Each" in this instance means that one of two check valves in series may be tested either individually or in parallel with redundant valves, but in no case shall it be tested in series with the valve in the same line. The 5.0 gpm leakage tested rate applies to each valve tested individually or as a combined leakage of each valve tested in parallel.

Other minor changes have also been made.

We have reviewed this change and conclude that this clarification meets the requirements intended in the Order.

8105260265 P

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: May 14, 1981