



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

March 13, 1986

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 95 TO FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-71 AND
AMENDMENT NO. 120 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 August 20, 1985, the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L, the licensee) requested a change to the limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) for Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 as set forth in the Technical Specifications (TS) of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62.

The amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Table 3.3.3-1, Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) Actuation Instrumentation, by adding a footnote to allow required surveillance without placing the trip system in the tripped condition.

2.0 EVALUATION

Currently, when performing required surveillance on the ECCS Actuation Instrumentation, the TS require that the inoperable channel be placed in the tripped condition and/or that the associated ECCS be declared inoperable. This requirement places an unnecessary restriction on plant operation during instrument testing. The proposed TS adds a footnote to Table 3.3.3-1, ECCS actuation instrumentation, to allow placing a channel in an inoperable status for up to two hours for required surveillance without placing the trip system in the tripped condition provided at least one operable channel in the same trip system is monitoring the affected parameter. This change reflects the guidance provided in NUREG-0123, the Standard Technical Specifications (STS). In addition, this capability is already allowed by the current TS for instrumentation of the Reactor Protection System (TS 3/4.4.1), Isolation Actuation (TS 3/4.3.2), Control Rod Withdrawal Block (TS 3/4.3.4), and Reactor Core Isolation Cooling System (TS 3/4.3.7). The proposed TS also reformat the table notations in Table 3.3.3-1; does not effect the operation of the plant and is acceptable.

8603210257 860313
PDR ADOCK 05000324
P PDR

We have reviewed the proposed amendments and find the changes are acceptable. Based on our review we find that allowing for testing of a channel as specified by the proposed TS does not prevent the instrumentation from performing its design function. The proposed TS provide the limiting conditions for operation necessary to preserve the ability of the system to perform its intended function even during periods when instrument channels may be out of service because of maintenance. Therefore, when necessary, one channel may be made inoperable for brief intervals to conduct surveillance. In addition, we find that the proposed change will not significantly affect the ability of the system to meet its design functions of initiating actions to mitigate the consequences of accidents. This changed requirement for the ECCS actuation instrumentation is consistent with the requirements in the current Technical Specification that involve the Reactor Protection System, Isolation Actuation, Control Rod Withdrawal Block and Reactor Core Isolation Cooling System.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The amendments change requirements with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes in surveillance requirements. 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 CONCLUSION

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: C. Graves, M. Grotenhuis

Dated: March 13, 1986