



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 110 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-9
AND AMENDMENT NO. 92 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-17
DUKE POWER COMPANY
DOCKET NOS. 50-369 AND 50-370
MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated November 28, 1988, as revised February 15, 1990, Duke Power Company (the licensee) proposed amendments to change the name of the "Station Safety Review Group (SSRG)" in Technical Specification (TS) 6.2.3 to the "McGuire Safety Review Group (MSRG)." The change to TS 6.2.3 would also clarify and supplement the specified function, composition, responsibilities, reporting, and records requirements for the MSRG consistent with Item 1.B.1.2 of NUREG-0737. Specifically:

- The function of the MSRG in TS 6.2.3.1 would be revised to specifically define the function of the group.
- The composition of the MSRG in TS 6.2.3.2 would be revised to add the qualification requirements for members of the group.
- The responsibilities requirement of TS 6.2.3.3 would be revised to replace a general statement with an itemized list of specific responsibilities.
- The reporting of the MSRG, specified by TS 6.2.3.4, would be revised to reflect that they report to the Manager of Nuclear Safety Assurance, rather than to the Director, Nuclear Safety Review Board.
- The recordkeeping and distribution requirements of TS 6.2.3.5 would be revised to require that records of MSRG activities be maintained for the life of the station, and that reports of MSRG activities be forwarded to the Manager of Nuclear Safety Assurance.

2.0 EVALUATION

TS 6.2.3 provides requirements regarding administrative controls for the SSRG. The SSRG represents the "Independent Safety Engineering Group" that is discussed by Item 1.B.1.2 of NUREG-0737. At McGuire this group is known as the MSRG in order to distinguish it from similar groups at the licensee's other stations. The proposed change to TS 6.2.3 to replace SSRG by MSRG is a change in nomenclature to be consistent with licensee's terminology.

In late 1988, Duke Power Company made several changes in the organization of its Nuclear Production Department. Under this reorganization, the MSRG reports to the Manager of Nuclear Safety Assurance instead of the Director of the Nuclear Safety Review Board. The proposed change to the TSs would reflect this organizational change. This change in reporting requirements for the MSRG is purely an administrative change in that the Manager of Nuclear Safety Assurance also serves as the Director of the Nuclear Safety Review Board.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes. We find the proposed TSs to be consistent with the licensee's most recent organizational changes. We also find that the revised TSs will provide the necessary level of specificity to ensure effective control regarding the function, composition, responsibilities, reporting and records requirements for the MSRG. The proposed changes continue to provide assurance of compliance with NUREG-0737, Item I.B.1.2, and are, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments relate to changes in recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (54 FR 6193) on February 8, 1989. The licensee's subsequent Letter of February 15, 1990, revised the initial application regarding composition to provide increased specificity with respect to the qualifications of the MSRG. It did not alter the Commission's initial determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission consulted with the State of North Carolina. No public comments were received, and the State of North Carolina did not have any comments.

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: D. Hood, PDII-3/DRP-I/II
F. Allenspach, LPEB

Dated: June 6, 1990