

September 6, 2007

Mr. Dale E. Young, Vice President  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (NA1B)  
ATTN: Supervisor, Licensing & Regulatory Programs  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

SUBJECT: CRYSTAL RIVER, UNIT NO. 3 - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE  
OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO  
SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND  
OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING (TAC NO. MD5241)

Dear Mr. Young:

Enclosed is a copy of a "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity For a Hearing" related to the application for an amendment dated April 13, 2007, for the Crystal River Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 3. The application proposes to change the Technical Specifications related to low pressure injection, reactor building spray, decay heat closed cycle cooling water, and decay heat seawater systems.

The notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

***/RA Marlayna Vaaler for Stewart Bailey/***

Stewart N. Bailey, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-302

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

September 6, 2007

Mr. Dale E. Young, Vice President  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (NA1B)  
ATTN: Supervisor, Licensing & Regulatory Programs  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

SUBJECT: CRYSTAL RIVER, UNIT NO. 3 - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE  
OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO  
SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND  
OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING (TAC NO. MD5241)

Dear Mr. Young:

Enclosed is a copy of a "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity For a Hearing" related to the application for an amendment dated April 13, 2007, for the Crystal River Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 3. The application proposes to change the Technical Specifications related to low pressure injection, reactor building spray, decay heat closed cycle cooling water, and decay heat seawater systems.

The notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

***/RA Marlayna Vaaler for Stewart Bailey/***

Stewart N. Bailey, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-302

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC	RidsOgcRp	LPL2-2 R/F
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsNrrDorlLpl2-2	RidsRgn2MailCenter
RidsNrrPMSBailey	RidsNrrDorlDpr	RidsNrrLABClayton
MVaaler		

ADAMS ACCESSION NO: ML072470496

NRR-041

OFFICE	LPL2-2/PM	LPL2-2/PM	LPL2-2/LA	LPL2-2/BC
NAME	MVaaler	MVaaler for SBailey *	BClayton	BMozafari for TBoyce
DATE	09/05/07	09/06/07	09/05/07	09/06/07

\*By E-Mail

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

Mr. Dale E. Young  
Florida Power Corporation

Crystal River Nuclear Plant, Unit 3

cc:

Mr. R. Alexander Glenn  
Associate General Counsel (MAC-BT15A)  
Florida Power Corporation  
P.O. Box 14042  
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733-4042

Mr. Jon A. Franke  
Director Site Operations  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (NA2C)  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

Mr. Michael J. Annacone  
Plant General Manager  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (NA2C)  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

Senior Resident Inspector  
Crystal River Unit 3  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
6745 N. Tallahassee Road  
Crystal River, Florida 34428

Mr. Jim Mallay  
Framatome ANP  
1911 North Ft. Myer Drive, Suite 705  
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

Ms. Phyllis Dixon  
Manager, Nuclear Assessment  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (NA2C)  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

Mr. William A. Passetti, Chief  
Department of Health  
Bureau of Radiation Control  
2020 Capital Circle, SE, Bin #C21  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1741

David T. Conley  
Associate General Counsel II - Legal Dept.  
Progress Energy Service Company, LLC  
Post Office Box 1551  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Attorney General  
Department of Legal Affairs  
The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. Daniel L. Roderick  
Vice President, Nuclear Projects &  
Construction  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (SA2C)  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

Mr. Craig Fugate, Director  
Division of Emergency Preparedness  
Department of Community Affairs  
2740 Centerview Drive  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

Mr. David Varner  
Manager, Support Services - Nuclear  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (SA2C)  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

Chairman  
Board of County Commissioners  
Citrus County  
110 North Apopka Avenue  
Inverness, Florida 34450-4245

Mr. Stephen J. Cahill (Acting)  
Engineering Manager  
Crystal River Nuclear Plant (NA2C)  
15760 W. Power Line Street  
Crystal River, Florida 34428-6708

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-302

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS  
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-72 issued to the Carolina Power & Light Company (FPC, the licensee) for operation of the Crystal River Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 3 (CR- 3), located in Citrus County, Florida.

The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TSs) related to low pressure injection, reactor building spray, decay heat closed cycle cooling water, and decay heat seawater systems to extend the allowable completion time associated with one inoperable train of these systems.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS (10 CFR), Section 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or

(3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. 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. Does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Part of the proposed changes introduces a Condition for an inoperable LPI [low pressure injection] with an AOT [allowed outage time] of seven days, introduces another Condition for an inoperable BS train coincident with an inoperable Containment Cooling train with an AOT of 72 hours, and extends the AOT for one inoperable BS train, DC train, and/or RW train to seven days. These systems are not initiators for any accident previously evaluated. The consequences of an event during the extended Completion Time are no more severe than the consequences of the same event during the current Completion Time. Therefore, the consequences of an event previously analyzed are not increased, so the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Another part of the proposed changes eliminates second Completion Times from the CR-3 ITS [Improved TSs]. Second Completion Times are not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not affected. The consequences of an accident during the revised Completion Time are no different from the consequences of the same accident during the existing Completion Times. As a result, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not affected by this change. The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of SSCs [structures, systems, or components] from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed changes do not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed changes do not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences.

The proposed editorial/administrative changes remove obsolete information and provide clarification. These changes do not affect any system that is an initiator for any accidents previously evaluated. The consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not affected. The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of SSCs from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event. The proposed editorial/administrative changes do not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed editorial/administrative changes do not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be

released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. These changes do not alter any assumptions made in the safety analysis.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

One part of the proposed changes introduces a Condition for an inoperable LPI with an AOT of seven days, introduces another Condition for an inoperable BS train coincident with an inoperable Containment Cooling train with an AOT of 72 hours, and extends the AOT for one inoperable BS train, DC train, and/or RW train to seven days. An evaluation presented in Reference 8.3, and accepted by the NRC, concluded that the extended Completion Time did not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety. An analysis performed by FPC also drew the same conclusion. Therefore, extending the AOT to seven days for these components does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change to delete the second Completion Time from the CR-3 ITS does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or LCOs [limiting conditions for operation] are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis.

Similarly, the proposed editorial/administrative changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or LCOs are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. As such, the proposed editorial/administrative changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this *Federal Register* notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding;



and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestors/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the petitioner/requestor seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner/requestor must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner/requestor who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a

significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Nontimely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission or the presiding officer of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition, request and/or the contentions should be granted based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii).

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed by: 1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; 2) courier, express mail, and expedited delivery services: Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; 3) E-mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, [HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV](mailto:HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV); or 4) facsimile transmission addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff at (301) 415-1101, verification number is (301) 415-1966. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and it is requested that copies be transmitted either by means of facsimile transmission to 301-415-3725 or by email to [OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov](mailto:OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov). A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to David T. Conley, Associate General Counsel II - Legal Department, Progress Energy Service Company, LLC, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, attorney for the licensee.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 22, 2007, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, File Public Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville,

Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdrc@nrc.gov](mailto:pdrc@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September 2007.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**/RA/**

Brenda L. Mozafari, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation