

## UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

# SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 127 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-12

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1

**DOCKET NO. 50-395** 

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 19, 1995, as supplemented on August 21, 1995, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (the licensee), submitted a request for a change to the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, (VCSNS) Technical-Specifications (TS). The proposed amendment would implement a TS improvement recommended by Generic Letter (GL) 93-05, "Line-Item Technical Specification Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operation," September 27, 1993. The August 21, 1995 letter provided supplemental information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the scope of the original Federal Register notice.

#### 2.0 BACKGROUND

NUREG-1366, "Improvements to Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements," December 1992, reported the TS line-item improvements that were identified by the NRC staff. The TS improvements were based on an NRC study of surveillance requirements (SRs) and included information provided by licensee personnel that plan, manage, and perform surveillances. The study included insights from a qualitative risk assessment of SRs bases on the standard TS for Westinghouse plants and the TS for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2. The staff examined operational data from licensee event reports, the nuclear plant reliability data system, and other sources to assess the effect of TS SRs on plant operation. The staff evaluated the effect of longer surveillance intervals to reduce the possibility for plant transients, wear on equipment, personnel radiation exposure, and burden on personnel resources. Finally, the staff considered surveillance activities for which the safety benefits are small and not justified when compared to the effects of these activities on the safety of personnel and the plant. The NRC staff issued guidance on the proposed TS changes in GL 93-05.

\* P • • • v

#### 3.0 EVALUATION

The licensee proposed to revise TS SR 4.6.2.1.d to change the testing frequency of the reactor building spray system nozzle from once every 5 years to once every 10 years. This TS modification implements GL 93-05, Item 8.1, "Containment Spray System (PWR)."

The proposed TS modification is consistent with the guidance provided in GL 93-05. In addition, in its August 21, 1995 supplemental submittal, the licensee stated that the proposed TS changes are compatible with plant operating experience. The GL 93-05 guidance is based on the NRC staff findings and recommendations stated in NUREG-1366. NUREG-1366 recognized that testing is important to periodically verify that systems, structures, and components are available to perform their safety functions. The study did find that, while most testing is important, safety can be improved, equipment degradation decreased, and an unnecessary burden on personnel resources eliminated by reducing the amount of testing that TS required. The staff concludes that the proposed TS change does not adversely affect plant safety and, therefore, is acceptable.

#### 4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the State of South Carolina official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

#### 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a surveillance requirement. The NRC staff has determined that the amendment involves no 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 (60 FR 37100). 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.

Principal Contributor: S. Dembek

Date: September 18, 1995

• •

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

J. B. Knotts, Jr., Esquire Winston & Strawn Law Firm 1400 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3502

Resident Inspector/Summer NPS c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Route 1, Box 64 Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

Regional Administrator, Region II U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 101 Marietta St., NW., Ste. 2900 Atlanta, Georgia 30323

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

Mr. Virgil R. Autry
Director of Radioactive Waste Management
Bureau of Solid & Hazardous Waste Management
Department of Health & Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. R. M. Fowlkes, Manager Nuclear Licensing & Operating Experience South Carolina Electric & Gas Company Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Post Office Box 88 Jenkinsville, South Carolina 29065

