

From: [Hood, Tanya](#)
To: Steve.Snider@duke-energy.com
Cc: [Zaremba, Arthur H.](#)
Subject: Acceptance Review - Duke Fleet – RA-20-0207 – Request to revise the Technical Specification for Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation” (EPID L-2020-LLA-0262)
Date: Wednesday, January 06, 2021 11:01:00 AM

SUBJECT: CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; AND SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1 – ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION RE: “APPLICATION TO REVISE THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION FOR ENGINEERED SAFETY FEATURE ACTUATION SYSTEM (ESFAS) INSTRUMENTATION” (EPID L-2020-LLA-0262)

Dear Mr. Snider:

By letter dated December 3, 2020 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML20338A264), Duke Energy Progress, LLC (the licensee) submitted a license amendment request (LAR) for Catawba Nuclear Station (Catawba), Units 1 and 2; McGuire Nuclear Station (McGuire), Units 1 and 2; and Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (Harris), Unit 1. The licensee is proposing changes to the Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation Technical Specifications (TSs) for Catawba, McGuire, and Harris to prevent unnecessary trips of the main turbine during turbine warm up that adversely impacts startup and shutdown evolutions. The proposed amendment would modify TSs requirements to Table 3.3.2-1, Function 8.a. of TS 3.3.2, “Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation for Catawba and Harris. For Harris, the proposed change would revise Table 3.3-3, Functional Unit 10.c. of TS 3/4.3.2, “Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation.” For Catawba only, the licensee is proposing the removal of the steam dump function of the P-4 interlock in MODES 1, 2, and 3. The licensee is also proposing to add a footnote to the applicable modes portion of the P-4 interlock Function to identify the enabled functions and the applicable MODES for each enabled function. In doing so, the licensee is proposing the removal of the turbine trip function of the P-4 interlock in MODE 3 from the existing specifications.

The purpose of this e-mail is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff’s acceptance review of this amendment request. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed amendment in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff’s ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. If additional information is needed, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

Based on the information provided in your submittal, the NRC staff has estimated that this licensing request will take approximately 605 hours to complete. The NRC staff expects to complete this review in approximately 12 months, which is January 2022. If there are emergent complexities or challenges in our review that would cause changes to the initial forecasted completion date or significant changes in the forecasted hours, the reasons for the changes, along with the new estimates, will be communicated during the routine

interactions with the assigned project manager.

These estimates are based on the NRC staff's initial review of the application and they could change, due to several factors including requests for additional information, unanticipated addition of scope to the review, and review by NRC advisory committees or hearing-related activities.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Tanya E. Hood
Project Manager
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852-2738
301-415-1387
Tanya.Hood@nrc.gov