

October 9, 1987

Docket Nos. 50-280
and 50-281

Mr. W. L. Stewart
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Virginia Electric and Power Company
Post Office Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Dear Mr. Stewart:

The Commission has forwarded the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination" to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

This notice relates to your application dated September 25, 1987, as superseded October 7, 1987, to revise Section 4.7, "Main Steam Line Trip Valves" of the Surry Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications by removing the partial-closure test specified in Sections 4.7A and 4.7B and replacing it by a more rigorous full-closure test to be performed at each startup. The proposed amendment would also revise the acceptance criteria for the Main Steam Trip Valve (MSTV) closure time testing. Table 4.1-2A would also be revised to be consistent with TS 4.7.

Sincerely,

/s/

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-2
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	OGC-Bethesda
NRC PDR	EJordan
Local PDR	JPartlow
PD22 Rdg	ACRS (10)
SVarga	Gray File
GLainas	
DMiller	
CPatel	

LA: PD22
DMiller
10/9/87

CPP
PM: PD22
CPatel:bd
10/9/87

D: PD22
HBenkow
10/9/87

8710150080 871009
PDR ADDCK 05000280
P PDR

October 9, 1987

Docket Nos. 50-280
and 50-281

Mr. W. L. Stewart
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Virginia Electric and Power Company
Post Office Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Dear Mr. Stewart:

The Commission has forwarded the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination" to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

This notice relates to your application dated September 25, 1987, as superseded October 7, 1987, to revise Section 4.7, "Main Steam Line Trip Valves" of the Surry Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications by removing the partial-closure test specified in Sections 4.7A and 4.7B and replacing it by a more rigorous full-closure test to be performed at each startup. The proposed amendment would also revise the acceptance criteria for the Main Steam Trip Valve (MSTV) closure time testing. Table 4.1-2A would also be revised to be consistent with TS 4.7.

Sincerely,

/s/

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-2
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	OGC-Bethesda
NRC PDR	EJordan
Local PDR	JPartlow
PD22 Rdg	ACRS (10)
SVarga	Gray File
GLainas	
DMiller	
CPatel	

LA:PD22
DMiller
10/9/87

CPP
PM:PD22
CPatel:bd
10/9/87

D:PD22
HPerrow
10/9/87

Mr. W. L. Stewart
Virginia Electric and Power Company

Surry Power Station

cc:

Mr. Michael W. Maupin
Hunton and Williams
Post Office Box 1535
Richmond, Virginia 23213

Attorney General
Supreme Court Building
101 North 8th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. Robert F. Saunders, Manager
Surry Power Station
Post Office Box 315
Surry, Virginia 23883

Resident Inspector
Surry Power Station
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 166, Route 1
Surry, Virginia 23883

Mr. Sherlock Holmes, Chairman
Board of Supervisors of Surry County
Surry County Courthouse
Surry, Virginia 23683

W. T. Lough
Virginia Corporation Commission
Division of Energy Regulation
Post Office Box 1197
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street N.W., Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

James B. Kenley, M.D., Commissioner
Department of Health
109 Governor Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONVIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANYDOCKET NOS. 50-280 AND 50-281NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Surry Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Surry County, Virginia.

The proposed amendments would revise Section 4.7, "Main Steam Line Trip Valves" of the Surry Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications by removing the partial-closure test specified in Sections 4.7A and 4.7B and replacing it by a more rigorous full-closure test to be performed at each startup. Also, the proposed amendments would remove the discussion of the partial closure test from the Bases section of the Technical Specifications. The proposed amendments would also revise the full-closure test frequency and test conditions, and revise the acceptance criteria for consistency with the accident analysis assumptions. A parallel specification appears in Table 4.1-2A and would be revised to be consistent with the proposed revision to TS 4.7. The Bases section would be expanded to include a discussion of the accident analysis assumptions and derivation of the acceptance criteria for the valve closure time.

8710150089 871009
PDR ADOCK 05000280
P PDR

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, 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 requested amendments involve no significant hazards considerations. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments 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.

The licensee has proposed a modification to Section 4.7, "Main Steam Line Trip Valves," of the Surry Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications. The proposed modification would result in two changes. The first change is the elimination of the partial-closure test specified in Section 4.7A, which would be replaced with a more rigorous full-closure test to be performed at each startup instead of at each cold shutdown. The second change involves a revision to the acceptance criterion for Main Steam Trip Valve (MSTV) closure time testing from the present five seconds to a criterion which would result in a more accurate reflection of the assumptions of the existing safety analyses.

The current safety analysis assumes a 5-second time delay from the time the measured process variables (e.g., steam line flow, steam line pressure) reach the main steam line isolation setpoints to the initiation of MSTV motion, followed by an additional 5-second ramp closure of the valves. The proposed surveillance criteria would confirm that each of these components of the MSTV response time are bounded by the analysis assumptions.

The licensee has reviewed the proposed changes against the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92 and has concluded that the changes do not pose a significant hazards consideration as defined therein. Specifically, operation of Surry Power Station with the proposed amendments would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes impact only the Main Steam Trip Valve response time acceptance criteria and associated surveillance frequencies and therefore have no effect on initiating event frequencies. Since the proposed response time criteria remain bounded by the response characteristics assumed in the safety analysis (main steam line break analysis discussed in Section 14.3.2 of the Surry Updated Final Safety Analysis Report), the current analysis results and conclusions are unchanged. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve any increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.
2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The response time characteristics of the engineered safety features have no impact on the range of initiating events previously assessed. Likewise, the revised surveillance frequencies will have no impact. Therefore, new or different kinds of accidents are not created.
3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Since the proposed response time criteria for the MSTV's are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions, the existing accident analysis results remain bounding. Therefore, the safety margins are not impacted.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the requested amendments involve no significant hazards considerations.

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. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules and Procedures Branch, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of the FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 4000, Maryland National Bank Building, 7735 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, Maryland from 8:15 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene are discussed below.

By November 16, 1987, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating licenses 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 petition for leave to intervene. Request for a hearing and petitions 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. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission

or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR §2.714, 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 factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set

forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendments under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies 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, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards considerations. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the request for amendments involve no significant hazards considerations, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the amendments involve a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of the amendments.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments

involve no significant hazards considerations. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to Herbert N. Berkow: (petitioner's name and telephone number), (date petition was mailed), (plant name), and (publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice). A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel-Bethesda, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to Mr. Michael W. Maupin, Hunton and Williams, P. O. Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23213.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request,

that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated September 25, 1987, as superseded October 7, 1987, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 9th day of October, 1987.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Chandu P. Patel
Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-2
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II