August 2, 2001

Mr. Stephen A. Byrne
Senior Vice President, Nuclear Operations
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station
Post Office Box 88
Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

SUBJECT: VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1 -- REQUESTED CORRECTIONS/CLARIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 148 AND NRC SAFETY EVALUATION (TAC NO. MA1378)

Dear Mr. Byrne:

By letter dated September 28, 2000, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G) informed us of inconsistencies in the information included in the Safety Evaluation (SE) for Amendment No. 148, dated September 6, 2000, for Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. We have reviewed the SCE&G comments, and the resolutions are noted below.

An editorial correction was requested regarding the indenture of the third paragraph of TS 6.8.4.h, page 6-12c, i.e., the paragraph should not be indented to be consistent with the two previous paragraphs. The paragraph has been changed as requested for consistency.

An editorial correction was requested regarding TS pages 3/4 6-8 and 3/4 6-9, i.e., either the note, "(Next Page is 3/4 6-11)" needs to be removed from the bottom of TS page 3/4 6-8 or TS page 3/4 6-9 needs to be removed from the Amendment. TS page 3/4 6-9 should be removed from the Amendment.

Rewording of the last sentence of the second paragraph of the conclusion statement, Section 6.0, page 4 of the Safety Evaluation (SE) was requested, i.e., this sentence should to be reworded to state:

> These conditions include serious degradation of the containment concrete structure, such as de-lamination of the dome concrete, widespread corrosion and pitting of prestressing elements or anchorage components, tendon force trend not meeting the requirement of 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(viii)(B), and widespread corrosion of the steel liner plate.

The staff agreed to reword the sentence as stated above. The rewording only provides clarity and corrects a typographical error. The rewording does not affect the staff conclusion.

The thoroughness of your staff in identifying these inconsistencies is appreciated and is an important contribution in ensuring the accuracy of the SEs that form the basis for approval of licensing amendments. In this case, none of the inconsistencies identified by your staff affected our conclusion in the subject SE. If you or your staff have any questions concerning the resolution of your comments, please call me at (301) 415-1438.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Karen R. Cotton, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-395

Enclosures:
1. Corrected TS page 6-12c
2. Corrected SE page 4

cc w/encls: See next page

our conclusion in the subject SE. If you or your staff have any questions concerning the resolution of your comments, please call me at (301) 415-1438.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Karen R. Cotton, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-395

Enclosures:
1. Corrected TS page 6-12c
2. Corrected SE page 4

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	KCotton
PDII-1 Reading	EDunnington
HBerkow	OGC
REmch	ACRS
GHill (2)	Region II
WBeckner	TCheng

Accession Number:
Document Name: C:\Program Files\Adobe\Acrobat 4.0\PDF Output\ma1378correction.wpd

OFFICE	PM:PDII-1	LA:PDII-2	SC:PDII-1
NAME	KCotton	EDunnington	REmch
DATE	08/02/01	08/02/01	08/02/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

Revised by NRC Letter dated August 2, 2001

g. Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program (Continued)

2) Air lock testing acceptance criteria are:

a. Overall air lock leakage rate is $\leq 0.10\ L_a$ when tested at $\geq P_a$.

b. For each door, leakage rate is $\leq 0.01\ L_a$ when pressurized to $\geq$ 8.0 psig for at least 3 minutes.

The provisions of Specification 4.0.2 do not apply to the test frequencies specified in the Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program.

The provisions of Specification 4.0.3 are applicable to the Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program.

h. Containment Inservice Inspection Program

This program provides controls for monitoring containment vessel structural integrity including routine inspections and tests to identify degradation and corrective actions if degradation is found. The Containment Inservice Inspection Program, inspection frequencies and acceptance criteria shall be in accordance with 10CFR50.55a as modified by approved exemptions. Predicted lift-off forces shall be determined consistent with the recommendations of Regulatory Guide 1.35.1, Revision 3 dated July 1990.

Any degradation exceeding the acceptance criteria of the containment structure detected during the tests required by the Containment Inservice Inspection Program shall undergo an engineering evaluation within 60 days of the completion of the inspection surveillance. The results of the engineering evaluation shall be reported to the NRC within an additional 30 days of the time the evaluation is completed. The report shall include the cause of the condition that does not meet the acceptance criteria, the acceptability of the concrete containment without repair of the item, whether or not repair or replacement is required and, if required, the extent, method, and completion of necessary repairs, and the extent, nature, and frequency of additional examinations.

In addition, any significant degradation which seriously challenges containment operability found during the inspection shall be reported to the NRC in accordance with Technical Specification 6.9.2 within 30 days. The report shall include the description of degradation, operability determination, root cause determination, and corrective actions taken.

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 amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (65 FR 9010). Accordingly, the amendment meets 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 amendment.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Approval of the proposed TS changes does not relieve the licensee of its responsibility to report, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.73(a)(2)(ii), any event or condition that results in the condition of the nuclear power plant being seriously degraded. These conditions include serious degradation of the containment concrete structure, such as de-lamination of the dome concrete, widespread corrosion and pitting of prestressing elements or anchorage components, tendon force trend not meeting the requirement of 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(viii)(B), and widespread corrosion of the steel liner plate.

Principal Contributor: T. Chang

Date: September 6, 2000

Mr. Stephen A. Byrne
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

cc:

Mr. R. J. White
Nuclear Coordinator
S.C. Public Service Authority
c/o Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station
Post Office Box 88, Mail Code 802
Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

Resident Inspector/Summer NPS
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
576 Stairway Road
Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

Chairman, Fairfield County Council
Drawer 60
Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180

Mr. Henry Porter, Assistant Director
Division of Waste Management
Bureau of Land & Waste Management
Department of Health & Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. Gregory H. Halnon, General Manager
Nuclear Plant Operations
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Mail Code 303
Post Office Box 88
Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

Mr. Melvin N. Browne, Manager
Nuclear Licensing & Operating Experience
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Mail Code 830
Post Office Box 88
Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

Ms. Kathryn M. Sutton, Esquire
Winston & Strawn Law Firm
1400 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-3502