



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-71 AND  
AMENDMENT NO. 105 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 June 6, 1984, the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L/the licensee) submitted proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62 for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP), Units 1 and 2. The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 to allow alternate actions to be taken rather than placing an inoperative channel of the Reactor Protection System (RPS) or Isolation System in the tripped condition when this would cause the Trip Function to occur.

2.0 Evaluation of Proposed Revisions

The licensee has submitted to NRC revisions to Brunswick Technical Specifications 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 4.3.2.3. The proposed specific Technical Specifications are delineated below:

Technical Specification 3.3.1 - The requested TS change adds footnotes to TS 3.3.1 (Actions a and b). These footnotes defer placement of an inoperative channel in the tripped condition when this would cause the trip function to occur. Instead, the appropriate action required by Table 3.3.1-1 is initiated. TS 3.3.1 is also revised to make it more closely conform to the Standard Technical Specifications (STS).

Technical Specification 3.3.2 - The requested TS change adds footnotes to TS 3.3.2 (Actions b and c). These footnotes defer placement of an inoperative channel in the tripped condition when this would cause the trip function to occur. Instead, the appropriate action required by Table 3.3.2-1 is initiated. TS 3.3.2 is also revised to make it more closely conform to the Standard Technical Specifications.

Technical Specification 4.3.2.3 (Unit 1 only) - A footnote providing for a one-time extension to Surveillance Requirement 4.3.2.3 is deleted.

Technical Specifications 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 presently contain footnotes that defer placing an inoperable channel in the tripped condition when the requirements for the minimum number of operable channels is not satisfied

for both trip systems and placement of the inoperable channel in the tripped condition would cause the Trip Function to occur. The proposed changes clarify the action required when the minimum number of operable channels is not satisfied for only one trip system and placement of the inoperable channel in the tripped condition would cause the Trip Function to occur.

This revision is consistent with the guidelines provided in the Standard Technical Specifications and allows the safety of the plant to be maintained without subjecting it to an abnormal operating condition. Administrative changes in this revision make the Brunswick Technical Specifications more closely conform to the Standard Technical Specifications.

Based on our review of the licensee's June 6, 1984 submittal, consisting of the proposed Technical Specification changes and the associated discussions for their change, we have determined that this revision causes no significant increase in the probability or consequence of a previously-analyzed accident nor a significant reduction in safety margin. The revision is consistent with the guidance provided in the Standard Technical Specifications and is acceptable.

### 3.0 Environmental Considerations

The amendments involve a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The 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. 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.

### 4.0 Conclusions

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

Principal Contributor: K. Porter, Region II

Dated: December 4, 1984