



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

December 11, 1991

Docket No. 50-400

Mr. Lynn W. Eury
Executive Vice President
Power Supply
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Dear Mr. Eury:

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION - SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1
STATION BLACKOUT ANALYSIS (TAC NO. M68552)

The Station Blackout (SBO) Rule requires licensees to submit information as defined in 10 CFR 50.63 and to provide a plan and schedule for conformance to the SBO Rule. The Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) provided responses to the SBO Rule regarding the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (Harris) by letters from M. A. McDuffie on March 3, 1989, and A. B. Cutter on March 30, 1990, to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Document Control Desk. Also, a teleconference between representatives of the licensee and the NRC staff was held on March 8, 1991.

The licensee's responses were reviewed by the NRC Staff and by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) under contract to the NRC. The results of the review are documented in the enclosed Safety Evaluation (SE) and the SAIC Technical Evaluation Report (TER) SAIC-91/6655, "SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NUMBER 1, STATION BLACKOUT EVALUATION," dated August 22, 1991, (Attachment 1 of the Enclosure).

The licensee calculated a minimum acceptable SBO duration of 4 hours for Harris. The licensee indicated that there will be some modifications necessary to attain this coping duration.

The licensee submitted its initial response in the SBO generic response format. Based on our review of that response and subsequent submittals, we find, subject to satisfactory resolution of the recommendations presented in this SE, that Harris conforms with the SBO Rule, the guidance of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.155, Nuclear Management and Resources Council (NUMARC) 87-00, and NUMARC 87-00 Supplemental Question/Answers and Major Assumptions, dated December 27, 1989, (issued to the industry by NUMARC January 4, 1990). The licensee should submit confirmation of the resolution of the recommendations of this SE within 30 days of receipt of this SE and present a schedule for implementation in accordance with 10 CFR 50.63(c)(4).

In addition, the following areas may require a followup inspection by the NRC to verify that the implementation of any modifications and the supporting

NRG FILE CENTER COPY

9112130229 911211
PDR ADOCK 05000400
P PDR

7.11.1954

Mr. Lynn W. Eury

- 2 -

documentation that the licensee may propose as a result of this evaluation are adequate to meet the SBO Rule. The staff is developing guidance for this followup inspection to verify the following:

- a. Hardware and procedural modifications;
- b. SBO procedures in accordance with RG 1.155, Position 3.4, and NUMARC 87-00, Section 4;
- c. Operator staffing and training to follow the identified actions in the procedures;
- d. EDG reliability program meets, as a minimum, the guidelines of RG 1.155;
- e. Equipment and components required to cope with an SBO are incorporated in a QA program that meets the guidance of RG 1.155, Appendix A; and
- f. Actions taken pertaining to the specific recommendations noted in the SE.

The guidance provided on Technical Specifications (TS) for an SBO states that the TS should be consistent with the "Interim Commission Policy Statement on Technical Specifications." The staff has taken the position that TS are required for SBO response equipment. However, the question of how TS for the SBO equipment will be applied is currently being considered generically by the NRC in the context of the Technical Specification Improvement Program and remains an open item at this time. In the interim, the staff expects plant procedures to reflect the appropriate testing and surveillance requirements to ensure the operability of the necessary SBO equipment. If the staff later determines that TS regarding the SBO equipment are warranted, the licensee will be notified of the implementation requirements.

The reporting and/or recordkeeping requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than ten respondents; therefore, OMB clearance is not required under P.L. 96-511.

Sincerely,

Brenda L. Mozafari, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
Safety Evaluation Report

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

OFC	:LA: [Signature]	:PM: [Signature]	:D: [Signature]	:	:
NAME	:PAnderson	:Bmozafari	:sl:dbGAdensam	:	:
DATE	:12/5/91	:12/5/91	:12/6/91	:	:

Mr. L. W. Eury
Carolina Power & Light Company

Shearon Harris

cc:

Mr. H. Ray Starling
Manager - Legal Department
Carolina Power & Light Company
P. O. Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street
Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Resident Inspector/Harris NPS
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 1, Box 315B
New Hill, North Carolina 27562

Mr. C. S. Hinnant
Plant General Manager
Harris Nuclear Plant
P. O. Box 165
New Hill, North Carolina 27562

Mr. R. B. Richey, Vice President
Harris Nuclear Project
Harris Nuclear Plant
P. O. Box 165
New Hill, North Carolina 27562

Mr. Dayne H. Brown, Director
Division of Radiation Protection
N. C. Department of Environmental,
Commerce & Natural Resources
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687

Mr. H. A. Cole
Special Deputy Attorney General
State of North Carolina
P. O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File
NRC & Local PDRs
PDII-1 Reading
Harris File
S. Varga
G. Lainas
A. Thadani
E. Adensam
B. Mozafari
P. Anderson
P. Tam
D. Shum
OGC
ACRS (10)
E. Mershoff, RII

130015

DF01
11

