

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 50-338

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 7 to the Facility Operating License No. NPF-4, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company, which rewords condition 2.D.(3)j contained in Facility Operating License NPF-4 Amendment No. 3. Amendment No. 7 is effective as of its date of issuance.

The amendment redesignates testing transmitters Barton 386/752 and Barton 393 to Barton 764 and Barton 763, respectively and deletes the use of the Foxboro EllGM (MCA/RRW) transmitter. The amendment also extends the date from (July 1, 1978 to October 1, 1978) which the results of the testing shall be provided to the Commission.

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 amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the amendment does 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, it has further been concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 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 this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) Virginia Electric and Power Company letters, dated May 5, 1978, and June 7, 1978, (2) Amendment No. 7 to License No. NPF-4, 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. 20555 and at the Board of Supervisor's Office, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Virginia 23093 and at the Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901. 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 Project Management.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 3rd day of July 1978.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


Olan D. Parr, Chief

Light Water Reactors Branch No. 3
Division of Project Management

JUL 3 1978

SAFETY EVALUATION
BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 7
(VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY)

A. Evaluation of Licensee's Request concerning Environmental Testing of Barton Transmitters

In Supplement 9 to the North Anna Safety Evaluation Report, we concluded that certain instruments were not properly qualified. We informed the licensee that as a condition of the license, they were required to complete a properly conducted test which demonstrates that these instruments are acceptably qualified. This verification testing was to be done within 90 days from the receipt of the license. The instruments involved were:

1. Barton 386/752 (now designated Barton 764) pressurizer level transmitter,
2. Barton 393 (now designated Barton 763) reactor coolant pressure (wide range) transmitter, and
3. Foxboro E11GM (MCA/RRW) pressurizer pressure transmitter.

We believed that the testing could be completed during this three-month period at the time Supplement No. 9 to the Safety Evaluation Report was completed; however, since that time, the licensee has informed the staff by letter, dated May 5, 1978, that he has entered into an arrangement with the Westinghouse Electric Company to provide the necessary verification testing for the Barton transmitters. In addition, the licensee has stated in a letter dated June 7, 1978 that the Foxboro pressurizer pressure transmitters have been replaced with the Barton 393(763) transmitters. The Westinghouse verification testing of the Barton transmitters is now anticipated to provide the required test data by the end of July 1978. We understand that at that time sufficient information will be available to determine whether the required tests have been successfully completed and that a final report can be provided by October 1, 1978.

JUL 3 1978

Since these verification tests will not be completed in the originally allowed time frame (i.e. 90 days from April 1, 1978), we have reevaluated the information provided by the licensee to determine whether the additional time required to perform the tests would be acceptable. The purpose of the required verification test is to confirm by sequential testing that the Barton transmitters presently installed in the North Anna Station can conservatively perform their design requirements with ample margin. The staff has reevaluated the information presented in the Westinghouse letter to NRC, NS-CE-1384, dated March 23, 1977. The Barton transmitters previously tested, which were identical to those installed in the plant, demonstrated acceptable results when exposed to pressure, temperature and chemical spray environments more severe than those that would result from any design basis event. The radiation testing of the electronics performed for these Barton transmitters was completed in other separate tests on different instruments of the same type which demonstrated acceptable results at integrated radiation exposures higher than those that would result from forty-year integrated dose levels plus the radiation from any design basis event. Our basis in Supplement No. 9 to the Safety Evaluation Report for initially permitting plant operation for 90 days, within which we anticipated completion of the sequential verification test, was that separate radiation and environment tests had been performed successfully, and that the normal in-plant radiation levels are insignificantly low during that period of time, in fact almost negligible compared to those in the test. An additional 90 days of exposure to normal in-plant radiation levels is still insignificant compared to the test levels. We conclude that the additional time to complete the sequential verification test does not result in a significant risk to the health and safety of the public.

Therefore, we conclude that the operation of the North Anna Unit 1 up to the receipt of the preliminary verification test data (now anticipated at the end of July '78) is acceptable. We shall require that the licensee provide the preliminary results of these tests as soon as the tests are completed and a final report by October 1, 1978. The final acceptance of these transmitters will be addressed by the staff after completion of the qualification testing and the review of the final test program report which is to be supplied by October 1978.

JUL 3 1978

B. Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does 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 amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 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 this amendment.

C. Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the consideration discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered or a significant decrease in any safety margin, it does 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. Also, we reaffirm our conclusions as otherwise stated in our Safety Evaluation Report and its Supplements.