



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 129 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-23
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
H. B. ROBINSON STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT NO. 2
DOCKET NO. 50-261

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 26, 1990, the Carolina Power & Light Company submitted a request for changes to the Technical Specifications of the H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2. The proposed amendment would allow steam generator tube inspection to be performed from either the hot-leg or cold-leg side of the channel head.

2.0 EVALUATION

Section 4.2.1.1.1 of the Technical Specifications defines a tube inspection as "entry from the hot-leg side with examination from the point of entry completely around the U-bend to the top support on the cold-leg side." The licensee is proposing that this definition be changed so that a tube inspection could involve entry from either the hot- or cold-leg side. Specifically, a tube inspection would be defined to consist of "entry from either the hot-leg or cold-leg side with examination encompassing the area from the hot-leg tube end completely around the U-bend to the top support on the cold-leg."

The licensee is proposing this change because of damage to the tubesheet and tube ends of steam generator C from a loose part (split pin nut) incident on April 2, 1987. This damage obliterated some of the tubesheet face markings used to identify specific tubes on the hot-leg. Similar markings on the cold-leg remain intact. Damage to the hot-leg tube ends resulted in limitations on the ability to insert the eddy current test probe through these tube ends. These limitations do not exist for the cold-leg tube ends.

The licensee states that entry from the cold-leg side will increase inspection times slightly but will provide more flexibility in how the inspection data are obtained and would preclude potential damage to the eddy current test probe resulting from tube end damage.

The proposed revision to the definition of tube inspection will not change the portion of the tube length which is presently required to be inspected. Because this portion can be accessed from either the hot-or cold leg tube end, the staff concludes that the proposed change is acceptable.

Concerning radiation exposure to personnel during the inspection, the licensee indicates that there should be no difference for entry either from the hot-leg or the cold-leg side. In fact, the flexibility should reduce the time required from performing the inspection and result in a reduction of radiation exposure. The staff concludes that the amendment is consistent with keeping the radiation dose to plant personnel as low as reasonable achievable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment changes the surveillance requirements of facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The 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 off site; and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this 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 this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, which was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (55 FR 30292) on July 25, 1990, and consulted with the State of South Carolina. No public comments or requests for hearing were received, and the State of South Carolina did not have any comments.

The Staff 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: September 6, 1990

Principal Contributor: Emmett Murphy