Docket file

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

May 19, 1981

Docket Nos. 50-280
and 50-281

RECEIVED
JUN 03 1981
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. J. H. Ferguson
Executive Vice President - Power
Virginia Electric and Power Company
Post Office Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Dear Mr. Ferguson:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 68 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-32 and Amendment No. 68 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-37 for the Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application transmitted by letter dated September 22, 1978, as supplemented January 9 and September 24, 1979.

These amendments revise the Technical Specifications to delete reference to the proposed Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 and clarify the requirement for testing the personnel air lock.

An exemption was also requested to the Appendix J provision which required testing the personnel air lock after each entry. Since Appendix J was revised on October 22, 1980, we conclude that an exemption is no longer required as discussed in our Safety Evaluation.

Copies of the Safety Evaluation and the Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Varga

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 68 to DPR-32
2. Amendment No. 68 to DPR-37
3. Safety Evaluation
4. Notice of Issuance

cc: w/enclosures
See next page

8106080 488
P

Mr. J. H. Ferguson
Virginia Electric and Power Company

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

Mr. J. L. Wilson, Manager
P. O. Box 315
Surry, Virginia 23883

Swem Library
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Donald J. Burke, 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, Virginia 23683

Commonwealth of Virginia
Council on the Environment
903 Ninth Street Office Building
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Attorney General
1101 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. James R. Wittine
Commonwealth of Virginia
State Corporation Commission
Post Office Box 1197
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Director, Criteria and Standards Division
Office of Radiation Programs (ANR-460)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D. C. 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
Curtis Building - 6th Floor
6th and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-280

SURRY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 68
License No. DPR-32

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) dated September 22, 1978, as supplemented January 9 and September 24, 1979, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 3.B of Facility Operating License No. DPR-32 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   B. Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 68 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 19, 1981

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-281

SURRY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 68
License No. DPR-37

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) dated September 22, 1978, as supplemented January 9 and September 24, 1979, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 3.B of Facility Operating License No. DPR-37 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   B. Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 68 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 19, 1981

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 68 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-32

AMENDMENT NO. 68 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-37

DOCKET NOS. 50-280 AND 50-281

Revise Appendix A as follows:

Remove Pages	Insert Pages
4.4-1	4.4-1
4.4-2	4.4-2
4.4-3	4.4-3

4.4 CONTAINMENT TESTS

Applicability

Applies to containment leakage testing.

Objective

To assure that leakage of the primary reactor containment and associated systems is held within allowable leakage rate limits; and to assure that periodic surveillance is performed to assure proper maintenance and leak repair during the service life of the containment.

Specification

A. Periodic and post-operational integrated leakage rate tests of the containment shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, "Reactor Containment Leakage Testing For Water Cooled Power Reactors."

B. Testing Requirements

1. Type A tests will be performed in accordance with the peak pressure test program as defined in paragraph III, of Appendix J.

   a. The absolute method of leakage rate testing will be used as the method for performing the test. The make-up air method for verification of leakage test accuracy will be used. Testing to be done in accordance with the guidelines in ANSI N45.4-1972.

b. The leakage rate test will be performed at a pressure of at least 39.2 psig (P_a).

c. The measured leakage rate L_{am} shall not exceed 75% of the design basis accident leakage rate (L_a) of 0.1 weight percent per 24 hours at pressure P_a.

2. Type B and C tests will be performed at a pressure of at least 39.2 psig (P_a) in accordance with the provisions of Appendix J, Section III. B. and C. Also, within 72 hours after use of the personnel airlock, the seals will be tested at least at the peak calculated accident pressure to verify that they are properly sealed.

C. Acceptance Criteria

Type A, B and C tests will be considered to be satisfactory if the acceptance criteria delineated in Appendix J, Sections III.A.5(b) III.B.3., and III.C.3 are met.

D. Retest Schedule

The retest schedules for Type A, B, and C tests will be in accordance with Section III.D of Appendix J.

E. Inspection and Reporting of Tests

Inspection and reporting of tests will be in accordance with Section V of Appendix J.

Basis

The leaktightness testing of all liner welds was performed during construction by welding a structural steel test channel over each weld seam and performing soap bubble and halogen leak tests.

The containment is designed for a maximum pressure of 45 psig. The containment is maintained at a subatmospheric air partial pressure which varies between 9 psia and 11 psia depending upon the cooldown capability of the Engineered Safeguards and is not expected to rise above 39.2 psig for any postulated loss-of-coolant accident.

All loss-of-coolant accident evaluations have been based on an integrated containment leakage rate not to exceed 0.1 percent of containment volume per 24 hr.

The above specification satisfies the conditions of 10 CFR 50.54(O) which states that primary reactor containments shall meet the containment leakage test requirements set forth in Appendix J.

References

FSAR Section 5.4 Design Evaluation of Containment Tests and Inspections of Containment

FSAR Sections 7.5.1 Design Bases of Engineered Safeguards Instrumentation

FSAR Section 14.5 Loss-of-Coolant Accident

10 CFR 50 Appendix J "Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water Cooled Power Reactors,"

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 68 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-32

AND AMENDMENT NO. 68 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-37

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

SURRY POWER STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-280 AND 50-281

Introduction

By letter dated September 22, 1978, as supplemented January 9 and September 24, 1979, Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) requested amendmentsto License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37 for the Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. These proposed amendments relate to Containment Leakage Testing, Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50. This request also asked for an exemption to certain provisions of Appendix J related to personnel air lock testing.

Discussion

On August 4, 1975[1], the NRC requested the licensee to review its containment leakage testing program for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, and the associated technical specifications, for compliance with the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50.

Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 was published on February 14, 1973. Since by this date there were already many operating nuclear plants and a number more in advanced stages of design or construction, the NRC decided to have these plants re-evaluated against the requirements of this new regulation. Therefore, beginning in August 1975, requests for review of the extent of compliance with the requirements of Appendix J were made of each licensee. Following the initial responses to these requests, NRC staff positions were developed which would assure that the objectives of the testing requirements of the above cited regulation were satisfied. These staff positions have since been applied in our review of the submittals filed by the licensee for the Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The results of our evaluation are provided below.

Evaluation

Our consultant, the Franklin Research Center (FRC), has reviewed the licensee's submittals [2, 3, 4, 5] and prepared the attached evaluation of containment tests for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. We have reviewed this evaluation and concur in its bases and findings.

Based on our review of the attached technical evaluation report as prepared by the FRC, the following conclusions are made regarding the Appendix J review for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2:

1. The licensee's request for exemption from the requirement of Appendix J regarding the containment air lock testing is found to be no longer necessary because of the revision to Section III.D.2 of Appendix J (effective October 22, 1980). However, the licensee's proposed approach as stated in Reference 4 should be revised to include the following requirements:

   Within 72 hours after use of the airlock, the seals will be tested at the peak calculated accident pressure to verify that they are properly seated.

   We have discussed this change with the licensee and the licensee agrees and these words have been added to the Technical Specifications (T.S.)

2. The licensee's proposed changes to T.S. 4.4.A through 4.4.D (Reference 3) are found to be acceptable. However, due to the Appendix J revision, the exception made for the personnel hatch is no longer necessary, and the proposed T.S. 4.4.A and T.S. 4.4.D should be worded as follows.

   Proposed T.S. 4.4.A

   "Periodic and post-operational integrated leakage rate tests of the containment shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, 'Reactor Containment Leakage Testing For Water Cooled Power Reactors.'"

   Proposed T.S. 4.4.D

   "The reset schedules for Type A, B and C tests will be in accordance with Section III.D of Appendix J."

In addition, specific references to the Federal Register Notices have been deleted.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendments do not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendments involve an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: May 19, 1981

REFERENCES

[1] NRC Generic Letter from Mr. Karl Goller, Acting Director for Operating Reactors, to Virginia Electric and Power Company, dated August 4, 1975.

[2] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to R. W. Reid, Chief, ORB-4, dated October 20, 1975.

[3] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, dated September 22, 1978, forwarding Proposed Technical Specification Change No. 69.

[4] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, dated January 9, 1979.

[5] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, dated September 24, 1979.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT

CONTAINMENT LEAKAGE RATE TESTING

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
SURRY UNITS 1 AND 2

NRC DOCKET NO. 50-280, 50-281

NRC TAC NO. 08638, 08639

NRC CONTRACT NO. NRC-03-79-118

FRC PROJECT C5257

FRC TASK 50, 51

Prepared by

Franklin Research Center
The Parkway at Twentieth Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Author: J. E. Kaucher

FRC Group Leader: T. J. Delgaizo

Prepared for

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Lead NRC Engineer: Y. S. Huang

April, 1981

Franklin Research Center
A Division of The Franklin Institute
The Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Phila., Pa. 19103 (215) 448-1000

8104140416

CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND

In a letter date October 20, 1975 [1], Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCO) requested an exemption from the requirements of 10CFR50, Appendix J, Containment Leakage Testing, regarding the testing of containment airlocks. On September 22, 1978 [2], VEPCO submitted Proposed Technical Specification Change No. 69 for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 to revise the technical specifications to conform to Appendix J with the exception of airlock testing requirements. Subsequent VEPCO letters of January 9, 1979 [3], and September 24, 1979 [4], provided additional information concerning the proposed exemption and technical specification changes.

The purpose of this report is to provide technical evaluations of all outstanding issues pertaining to the implementation of 10CFR50, Appendix J, at Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. Consequently, the request for exemption for the personnel airlock of Reference 1 and the proposed technical specification changes of Reference 2 are evaluated.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria for the evaluations were 10CFR50, Appendix J, Containment Leakage Testing, and ANSI N45.4-1972, Leakage Rate Testing of Containment Structures for Nuclear Reactors. Where applied to the evaluations, the criteria are either referenced or briefly stated, where necessary, to support the results. Furthermore, in recognition of the plant-specific conditions that could lead to requests for exemption not explicitly covered by the regulations, the NRC directed that the technical review constantly emphasize the basic intent of Appendix J that potential containment atmospheric leakage paths be identified, monitored, and maintained below established limits.

3. TECHNIAL EVALUATION

3.1 Exemption from Airlock Testing Requirements

In Reference 1, VEPCO requested authority to continue testing the personnel airlock every 4 months, based upon the reliability of the airlock during past testing and the need for frequent containment entries. Following additional correspondence from the NRC however, VEPCO revised its request in Reference 3 stating:

> Within 72 hours after use of the airlock the seals will be tested to verify that they are properly seated. At intervals no more than six months the entire airlock will be tested at the peak calculated accident pressure.

EVALUATION

Airlock testing experience has shown that for some operating reactors, it is impractical to leak test an airlock at peak calculated accident pressure (Pa), especially when frequent airlock usage is necessary. Testing is a time consuming process. Frequent testing may result in unnecssary exposure to operating personnel. Since the inner door is exposed to pressure in the direction opposite that of the pressure which would exist under accident conditions, strong-backs or other mechanical adjustments are often necessary to prevent the inner door from unseating during the test. The employment of strong-backs or other mechanical adjustments may cause a degradation of the airlock operating mechanisms, which could eventually lead to reduced airlock reliability.

Since 1969, there have been approximately 70 reported instances in which airlock leak tests have resulted in greater than allowable leak rates. Of these, 75 percent were caused by the failure of door seals. Testing to verify the integrity of the seals within 72 hours of airlock use or the first of a series of openings, achieves the objective of ensuring that the seals were not damaged during the containment entry and also that the doors have been properly secured after use; at the same time it minimizes the possible degradation of airlock reliability caused by excessive testing and the use of stong-backs or other mechanical adjustments.

Consequently, FRC finds that VEPCO's proposal to test the entire airlock at peak calculated accident pressure at 6-month intervals and to verify the integrity of the door seals within 72 hours after use is acceptable, since the intent of Appendix J is achieved while the possibility of degradation of airlock reliability is minimized. FRC further finds that an exemption from the requirements of Appendix J is no longer required because VEPCO's request is within the requirements of Section III.D.1, as revised effective October 22, 1980. The Licensee should ensure that the requirements of the revised rule are fully implemented.

3.2 Proposed Technical Specification Changes

In Reference 2, VEPCO proposed changes to technical specification 4.4, Containment Tests. The following paragraphs provide technical evaluations of each of the major subsections of technical specification (TS) 4.4 as proposed by VEPCO.

3.2.1 Periodic Integrated Leakage Rate Tests (TS 4.4.A)

As submitted in Reference 2, proposed TS 4.4.A states:

> Periodic and post-operational integrated leakage rate tests of the containment shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of 10CFR50, Appendix J, "Reactor Containment Leakage Testing For Water Cooled Power Reactors," as published in the Federal Register, 38 FR 4385, corrected, 38 FR 5997 and amended 41 FR 16445. An exception is made for the personnel hatch which need not be tested after every entry but must be tested at least quarterly.

As subsequently modified by VEPCO's commitment in Reference 3 and in view of the revision to Section III.D.2, effective October 22, 1980, the last sentence of Proposed TS 4.4.A should be deleted.

EVALUATION

FRC finds Proposed TS 4.4.A as modified above (lasted sentence deleted), to be acceptable because it is in compliance with Appendix J. VEPCO has indicated that the airlock door seals will be tested at Pa; therefore, no additional information is needed in the technical specification.

3.2.2 Testing Requirements (TS 4.4.B)

As submitted in Reference 2 and subsequently modified by Reference 4, Proposed TS 4.4.B states:

1. Type-A tests will be performed in accordance with the peak pressure test program, as defined in paragraph III, of Appendix J.

   a. The absolute method of leakage rate testing will be used as the method for performing the test. The make-up air method for verification of leakage test accuracy will be used. Testing to be done in accordance with the guidelines in ANSI N45.4-1972.

   b. The leakage rate test will be performed at a pressure of 39.2 psig (Pa).

   c. The measured leakage rate (Lam) shall not exceed 75 percent of the design basis accident leakage rate (La) of 0.1 weight-percent per 24 hours at pressure Pa.

2. Type B and C tests will be performed at a pressure of 39.2 psig (Pa) in accordance with the provisions of Appendix J, section III.B and C.

EVALUATION

Section III.A.3 of Appendix J requires Type-A testing in accordance with ANSI N45.4-1972. Section III.A.4 permits periodic Type-A tests to be performed at a pressure of Pa or at a reduced pressure of not less than 1/2 Pa. Section III.A.5 specifies a Type-A testing acceptance criteria and specifies that Lam be less than 0.75 La. Additionally, 0.1 weight-percent of containment atmosphere in 24 hours is the value of La for the containment structures at Surry. Finally, Sections III.B and C require Type-B and -C tests to be performed at a pressure of Pa.

Consequently, FRC finds proposed TS 4.4.B, as modified by Reference 4, to be acceptable because it is in compliance with Appendix J.

3.2.3 Acceptance Criteria (TS 4.4.C)

As submitted in Reference 2, Proposed TS 4.4.C states:

> Type A, B, and C tests will be considered to be satisfactory if the acceptance criteria delineated in Appendix J, Sections III.A.5 (b), III.B.3 and III.C.3 are met.

EVALUATION

FRC finds Proposed TS 4.4.C to be acceptable because it is in compliance with Appendix J.

3.2.4 Retest Schedule (TS 4.4.D)

As submitted in Reference 2, Proposed TS 4.4.D states:

> The retest schedules for Type A, B and C tests will be in accordance with Section III.D of Appendix J. An exception is made for the personnel hatch which need not be tested after each entry but must be tested at least quarterly.

As subsequently modified by VEPCO's commitment in Reference 3 and in view of the revision to Section III.D.2, effective October 22, 1980, the last sentence of Proposed TS 4.4.D should be deleted.

EVALUATION

FRC finds Proposed TS 4.4.D, as modified above (last sentence deleted), to be acceptable because it is in compliance with Appendix J.

3.2.5 Inspection and Reporting of Tests (TS 4.4.E)

As submitted in Reference 2, Proposed TS 4.4.E states:

> Inspection and reporting of tests will be in accordance with Section V of Appendix J.

EVALUATION

FRC finds Proposed TS 4.4.E to be acceptable because it is in compliance with Appendix J.

4. CONCLUSIONS

A request for exemption from the requirements of 10CFR50, Appendix J, regarding airlock testing and proposed changes to the techincal specifications for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 were evaluated. The request for exemption from the airlock testing requirements was found to be no longer necessary because of VEPCO's commitment in Reference 3 and because of the revison to Section III.D.2 of Appendix J (effective October 22, 1980). The following proposed changes to the technical specifications were found to be technically acceptable in accordance with the established criteria:

- Periodic integrated leakage testing in accordance with Appendix J.
- Type-A, -B, and -C testing in accordance with Appendix J and the absolute method of ANSI N45.4-1972.
- Acceptance criteria in accordance with Appendix J.
- Retest schedules in accordance with Apendix J.
- Inspection and reporting in accordance with Appendix J.

5. REFERENCES

[1] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to R. W. Reid, Chief ORB-4, dated October 20, 1975.

[2] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, dated September 22, 1978, forwarding Proposed Technical Specification Change No. 69.

[3] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, dated January 9, 1979.

[4] VEPCO letter from C. M. Stallings to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, dated September 24, 1979.

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NOS. 50-280 AND 50-281

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 68 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-32 and Amendment No. 68 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-37 issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee), which revised Technical Specifications for operation of the Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively, (the facilities), located in Surry County, Virginia. The amendments are effective as of the date of issuance.

These amendments revise the Technical Specifications to delete reference to the proposed Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 and clarify the requirement for testing the personnel air lock.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendments. Prior public notice of these amendments was not required since these amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of these amendments will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of these amendments.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendments dated September 22, 1978, as supplemented January 9 and September 24, 1979, (2) Amendment Nos. 68 and 68 to License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items 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. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 19th day of May, 1981.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing