



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 53 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-71 AND  
AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-62  
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-325 AND 50-324

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated November 12, 1982, the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) submitted proposed changes to the Technical Specifications appended to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP), Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes revise the Technical Specifications to reflect certain digital to analog instrument replacements, revise instrumentation formats, and correct miscellaneous typographical errors.

2.0 Evaluation

On November 19, 1979 the licensee submitted a request for Technical Specification changes to replace certain digital instrumentation with analog equipment. In response, the staff issued License Amendment Nos. 26 and 50 on March 14, 1980. The Safety Evaluation (SE) attached to those amendments found the proposed modifications to be technically acceptable and established a procedure whereby the licensee would periodically submit administrative Technical Specification changes to revise instrument designations for those systems that had been modified. The licensee now proposes certain instrument designation Technical Specification changes in accordance with the procedures of the previously issued SE. Therefore, since the technical acceptability of the modifications has been previously reviewed and approved and since the licensee is following previously established instrument designation Technical Specification change procedure, we find the proposed designation changes to be acceptable.

With respect to the proposed instrumentation table format changes, we have reviewed the proposed changes and found them to be consistent with the BWR Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG-0123, Revision 3, which we recognize as an acceptable format. We, therefore, consider the proposed format to be acceptable.

3.0 Environmental Considerations

We have determined that the amendments do 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 amendments involve 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 these amendments.

#### 4.0 Conclusions

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendments do 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 the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: December 20, 1982

Principal Contributor: James A. Van Vliet