



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 73 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-62
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNIT 2
DOCKET NO. 50-324

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated June 16, 1982, the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) submitted proposed changes to the Technical Specifications appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-62 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP), Unit 2. The proposed changes revise the Technical Specifications to reflect (1) the addition of diverse instrumentation to the scram discharge instrument volumes (SDIVs), and (2) the deletion of certain snubbers resulting from removal of the control rod drive (CRD) return line.

2.0 Discussion and Evaluation

2.1 Scram Discharge Instrument Volume (SDIV) Diverse Instrumentation

During the 1982 BSEP Unit 2 refueling outage, the licensee installed additional, diverse instrumentation on the SDIVs. Installation of such instrumentation has been previously evaluated and approved as documented by the safety evaluation appended to an NRC generic letter dated December 9, 1980.

The licensee proposes to incorporate this additional instrumentation into the technical specifications. We have reviewed the proposed technical specification change and determined that the scram discharge volume (SDV) water level high operability, applicability, action and surveillance requirements remain unchanged, and that the proposed change only adds additional instrumentation. Therefore since the installation of SDIV diverse instrumentation has been previously approved and since the proposed change only adds additional SDV water level high instruments to the technical specifications, we find the proposed technical specification change to be acceptable.

2.2 Control Rod Drive (CRD) Return Line Snubbers

During the 1982 BSEP Unit 2 refueling outage, the licensee, in accordance with NUREG-0619 as forwarded by NRC generic letter dated November 13, 1980, cut and capped the CRD return line.

The licensee proposes to delete from the technical specifications those snubbers that supported the CRD return line prior to its removal. Since we are only concerned with snubbers that are required to insure the integrity of the reactor coolant system and safety related systems and since the snubbers in question no longer support a safety related system, we find the proposed technical specification change to be acceptable.

3.0 Environmental Considerations

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 the amendment.

4.0 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.

Dated: August 17, 1982
Author: J. A. Van Vliet