Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281

May 17, 1984

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
NRC PDR

EJordan BDLiaw

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

Gray File CParrish JDNeighbors DEisenhut OELD ACRS 10 JNGrace

LPDR ORB#1 Rda

Dear Mr. Stewart:

We have reviewed your letters dated March 26 and April 12, 1984, for Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. You requested relief, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a paragraph g(5), from certain requirements of the ASME Code, Section XI, which is granted by this letter.

Your letters requested relief from hydrostatic testing of a 3-inch manual isolation valve (1-MS-86) for Unit 1, a $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch manual isolation valve (2-MS-74) for Unit 2, and three 3-inch check valves (2-FW-27, 58 and 89) for Unit 2. Testing of the manual isolation valves after replacement on Units 1 and 2 would have required testing the "A" steam generator and much of the main steam piping in each unit. Testing the check valves on Unit 2 would have included all three steam generators and a significant portion of the attached feedwater and main steam piping. You considered these tests extremely difficult and impractical, and, you proposed alternative inspections.

In the case of the manual isolation valves, you performed liquid penetrant testing and a system pressure test in conjunction with a visual examination. We have reviewed this request and conclude your proposed alternative is adequate. We provide similar relief previously as discussed in our October 1, 1982, letter.

For the 3-inch check valves, you performed a liquid penetrant (surface) examination and a radiographic (volumetric) examination in lieu of a pressure test. We have reviewed your proposed alternative inspection and conclude that it is adequate to insure the integrity of the welds.

We have determined that this relief 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 relief involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to $10 \ \text{CFR} \ \S 51.5(d)(4)$, that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this relief.

Mr. W. L. Stewart - 2 - May 17, 1984

The staff has determined that where stated the Code requirements

The staff has determined that where stated the Code requirements are impractical, the granting of this relief is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest considering the burden that could result if they were imposed on your facilities.

Sincerely,



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

cc:
See next page

ORB#1:DL ORB#1:DL CParrish JDNeffenbors;ps 5//6/84 5/16/884

5/17/84

5/10/984

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

> Mr. J. L. Wilson, Manager Post Office Box 315 Surry, Virginia 23883

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 Surry, Virginia 23683

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

Regional Radiation Representative EPA Region III Curtis Building - 6th Floor 6th and Walnut Streets Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

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

James P. O'Reilly Regional Administrator - Region II U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100 Atlanta, Georgia 30303