



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 174 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-71
AND AMENDMENT NO. 205 TO FACILITY OPERATING 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 March 25, 1994, as supplemented July 29, 1994, and August 24, 1994, the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS). The amendments would change the TS to correct several of the licensee's typographical errors, to add material implicitly contained in a footnote to an applicability statement, to provide detailed labels for items listed in a table, to correct the citation of references, and to remove references to the rod sequence control system that should have been included in a previous submittal. The July 29, 1994, and August 24, 1994, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee proposed the changes to the TS to correct various administrative errors. In this regard, the licensee requested the following changes to the TS, referenced tables, and the supporting Bases sections.

Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1

a. Bases Section 2.2.1, Item 2, Average Power Range Monitor

In Amendment No. 144 to the TS issued on September 11, 1990, the staff approved the licensee's request to remove the rod sequence control system (RSCS) and to reduce the rod worth minimizer cutoff setpoint to 10 percent of rated thermal power. However, the licensee's submittal of March 14, 1990, did not propose the removal of the reference to the RSCS in the Bases. Therefore, the proposed change will correct this oversight. Since the RSCS removal was previously approved by the NRC staff, this change only corrects a previous administrative error and is acceptable.

h. Section 3.4.2, Safety/Relief Valves Limiting Condition for Operation

The proposed change removes the footnote identifier "#" that indicates a second footnote that does not exist. The second footnote was removed in Amendment No. 66, dated March 6, 1984, but the footnote indicator was not corrected. Since this change corrects an administrative error, the staff finds it acceptable.

Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2

a. Table 2.2.1-1, Reactor Protection System Instrumentation Setpoints

The proposed change would correct an error introduced in Amendment No. 171 on February 6, 1990, for the maximum allowable value of rated thermal power in the flow biased simulated thermal power - high trip. In Amendment No. 168, dated October 12, 1989, the NRC approved a change to the allowable value that was dependent on core flow but with a maximum value of 115.5 percent. However, when Amendment No. 171 was issued, approving a TS change related to the main steam line radiation monitors, Table 2.2.1-1 was revised and it did not include the change based on Amendment No. 168. Therefore, the allowable value stated in the table was incorrectly returned to 115 percent. The proposed change corrects an administratively introduced error. Since this error is now being corrected to the value given in Amendment No. 168, the staff finds this change acceptable.

b. Bases Section 2.2.1, Item 2, Average Power Range Monitor

The proposed change removes the references to the rod sequence control system and reduces the rod worth minimizer cutoff setpoint from 20 percent to 10 percent of rated thermal power. The NRC staff finds this change acceptable for the same reasons given for BSEP Unit 1.

c. Bases Section 2.2.1, Item 10, Turbine Control Valve Fast Closure, Control Oil Pressure - Low

As with the proposed change to Bases Section 2.2.1, Item 2, the TS change removes the reference to the rod sequence control system and reduces the rod worth minimizer cutoff setpoint from 20 percent to 10 percent of rated thermal power. The proposed change would also revise the Bases description for the select rod insertion that was not revised when the removal of the rod sequence control system was approved. The NRC has reviewed the Bases changes and finds them to be acceptable.

d. Section 3.1.4.1, Rod Worth Minimizer Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO)

In Action Statement d.1 of this LCO, the abbreviation for the blanked position withdrawal sequence would be changed from "BWS" to "BPWS." This change corrects a typographical error and is satisfactory.

- e. Table 4.3.1-1, Reactor Protection System Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements

The proposed change to this table would add the word "is" after the words "THERMAL POWER" in Note (e). This change corrects a grammatical error in the sentence and makes it consistent with the wording used in the same table note for Unit 1. Since the change is grammatical in nature and does not alter the meaning of the note, the NRC staff finds the change acceptable.

- f. Table 4.3.4-1, Control Rod Withdrawl Block Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements

The proposed change to Note (g) in this TS Table will remove the reference to the RSCS for the reasons stated above. Since the RSCS removal was previously approved by the NRC staff, this change only corrects a previous administrative error and is, therefore, acceptable.

- g. Table 3.3.5.5-1, Control Room Emergency Ventillation System Instrumentation

The proposed change modifies the numbering scheme (labeling) of the functions as listed in the table to be consistent other TS and the surveillance test scheduling system. This change is the same as proposed for Unit 1. For the same reasons as Unit 1, the NRC staff finds the changes to be acceptable.

- h. Table 4.3.5.5-1, Control Room Emergency Ventillation System Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements

The proposed changes to the numbering of the functions in this table are consistent with the changes to Table 3.3.5.5-1. The staff finds these changes to be editorial and acceptable.

- i. Section 3.3.6.2, End-of-Cycle Recirculation Pump Trip System Instrumentation Limiting Condition for Operation

The proposed change (a) eliminates the portion of the footnote regarding the inoperability and manual bypass of the end-of-cycle recirculation pump trip (EOC-RPT) instrumentation, (b) revises the applicability statement to require the EOC-RPT if the minimum critical power ratio (MCPR) limits from the core operating limits report (COLR) require its use, and (c) revises action statements d. and e. to reference the correct TS section.

The footnote to Specification 3.3.6.2 indicates a non-cycle specific statement concerning the inoperability of the EOC-RPT, and thus the non-applicability of this specification. The incorporation of the requirement for the EOC-RPT to be operable if required to satisfy the MCPR limits more correctly describes when the EOC-RPT should be operable and eliminates the need for the footnote. Since the changes to

applicability statement and the footnote better clarify the applicability of the EOC-RPT, the staff finds this change to be acceptable.

In Amendment No. 71, dated July 12, 1982, TS action statements 3.2.3.1 and 3.2.3.2 were created and contained the requirements previously in Specification 3.2.3. However, the references in Specification 3.3.6.2 were not revised at that time. Since the proposed change corrects the previous omission error, the staff finds it acceptable.

j. Bases Section 3/4.1.4, Control Rod Program Controls

The proposed change corrects a typographical error in the Reference number listed for a General Electric report that provided the details for statements in this section. Since this change corrects a typographical error, the staff finds it to be acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the State of North Carolina official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 [and changes the Surveillance Requirements]. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (59 FR 27052). Accordingly, the amendments meet 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 the amendments.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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 the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: P. Milano

Date: February 1, 1995