and reviews of the RCS pressure peaking events determined that the UFSAR design pressure limit is still bounding with this change. Therefore, the proposed Technical Specification amendment maintains the margin of safety to the design pressure limit.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensees' analysis and, based on that review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Phoenix Public Library, 12 East McDowell Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorney for licensees: Nancy C. Loftin, Esq., Corporate Secretary and Counsel, Arizona Public Service Company, P.O. Box 53999, Mail Station 9068, Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

NRC Project Director: Theodore R. Quay

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County,North Carolina

Date of amendments request: November 16, 1994Description of amendments request: The proposed revision to the Technical Specifications (TS) would change the Technical Specification 3/4.6.2 to remove the specific instrumentation requirements for monitoring of the suppression chamber average water temperature. Also, the proposed revision would change the TS Bases 3/4.6.2 to indicate the methods that are acceptable for determining suppression chamber average water temperature.Proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change maintains the same number of monitored locations from which an average suppression chamber water temperature can be derived, while making available additional valid RTD [resistance temperature detector] inputs from what was the redundant channel. No safety-related equipment, safety function or plant operation will be altered as a result of the proposed change. The SPTMS [suppression chamber temperature monitoring system] is neither an accident initiator nor does it provide any automatic accident mitigation function. The change does not affect the design, materials, or construction standards applicable to the suppression chamber average water temperature monitoring instrumentation.

2. The proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The fundamental function and objective of the system is not affected by the proposed change. As stated above, no safety-related equipment, safety function or plant operations will be altered as a result of the proposed change. The change does not affect the design, materials, or construction standards applicable to the suppression chamber average water temperature instrumentation.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change allows the substitution of a qualified RTD already installed at a monitored location to insure the suppression chamber average water temperature remains valid. It does not involve any changes to the plant design or operation, therefore, no margins of safety, as defined by the plant's accident analyses, are impacted. Deletion of the defined instrument channels will not affect the ability to verify the suppression chamber "average" water temperature is being maintained below the maximum average temperatures required by the specification. This will insure the suppression chamber is Operable and able to perform its intended safety function.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2, Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: December 12, 1994

Description of amendment request: The requested change would revise the containment spray (CS) nozzle surveillance interval from 5 to 10 years.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below: 1. The requested change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The requested change extends the surveillance interval for performance of qualitative flow testing of the CS nozzles. A revision to this surveillance interval can in no way increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

Containment spray nozzle testing is not intended to track degradation of equipment by monitoring or trending performance. Rather, this surveillance constitutes a test of the passive design of the spray nozzles, i.e., it merely demonstrates whether the nozzles are or are not blocked or clogged. Based upon industry and plant-specific operating experience, a single failure rendering a significant number of nozzles inoperable as a result of blockage is considered highly unlikely. Since the reliability or functioning of the spray nozzles will not be affected by the revised surveillance interval, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated will not be increased. The requested change does not affect the physical design or operation of the plant, does not alter assumptions contained within the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, and will not affect other Technical Specifications that preserve safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the requested change will not involve a significant increase in the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. The requested change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The requested change extends the surveillance interval for performance of qualitative flow testing of the CS nozzles. This change in the spray nozzle surveillance interval will not change or affect the physical plant or the modes of plant operation defined within the facility Operating License. This change does not involve the addition or modification of plant equipment, nor does it alter the design or operation of plant systems. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the requested change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The requested change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The requested change extends the surveillance for performance of qualitative flow testing of the CS nozzles. This revised surveillance interval will not change or otherwise influence the degree of operability assumed for the CS system within the plant safety analyses. As demonstrated by plantspecific and industry experience, an operational failure of the containment spray nozzles is considered highly unlikely. Since prior testing has demonstrated proper functioning of the CS spray nozzles, and operational single-failures are considered highly unlikely, a reduction in testing frequency should not affect the ability of the CS system to mitigate the affects of a large loss-of-coolant or steam release accident.