



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 72 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

By letter dated June 28, 1982 we issued Amendment No. 70 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-23 for the H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2. The effective date of Amendment No. 70 was 45 days from the date of issuance, i.e., August 12, 1982.

In a letter dated August 6, 1982, Carolina Power and Light Company (the licensee) requested an extension of the implementation date of Amendment No. 70 from August 12, 1982 to September 13, 1982. The licensee's justification for this request was that the plant staff would be unable to effectively complete and review all of the administrative changes and training necessary to implement Amendment No. 70 within the allotted 45 days. This problem was due, in part, to the fact that the current refueling outage has extended approximately one month longer than scheduled and plant staff have been occupied with the completion of actions required for start up.

We have reviewed the licensee's request and find that it is administrative in nature and justified. Therefore we approve an extension of the implementation date of the Technical Specifications required by Amendment No. 70 until September 13, 1982.

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 an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, 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: August 24, 1982

Principal Contributor:  
W. Ross