VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

April 20, 1995

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

Serial No. 94-746A
NL&P/CGL R0
Docket Nos. 50-280
50-281
License Nos. DPR-32
DPR-37

Gentlemen:

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
SURRY POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2
CORE UPRATE - MECHANICAL ENGINEERING BRANCH
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Surry Core Uprate Technical Specification change request was submitted for NRC review by an August 30, 1994 letter (Serial No. 94-509). By a December 16, 1994 letter, the NRC (NRR Mechanical Engineering Branch (EMEB)) requested additional information to support their review of our core uprate submittal. Our responses to those questions were provided by a February 13, 1995 letter (Serial No. 94-746). As a follow-up to that letter, we received an additional question on March 27, 1995. The response to that question is provided by this letter.

If you have further questions or require additional information, please contact us.

Very truly yours,

James P. O'Hanlon

James P. O'Hanlon
Senior Vice President - Nuclear

Attachment 1- Response to Request for Additional Information - Proposed Amendment for Power Uprate - Surry Power Station Units 1 and 2 - Mechanical Engineering Branch

A001
1/1

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

Mr. M. W. Branch
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
Surry Power Station

Commissioner
Department of Radiological Health
Room 104A
1500 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

ATTACHMENT 1

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR POWER UPRATE - SURRY POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

Mechanical Engineering Branch

QUESTION:

In Appendix G of the May 2, 1968 Safety Evaluation, on page six, a statement is made that the criteria presented for the design of the reactor internals is satisfactory. It is assumed that the statement refers to the discussion presented in Section 10 of Supplement - Volume 2. Is this criteria still valid?

RESPONSE:

The information referenced in Section 10 of Supplement - Volume 2 was the response to NRC Question 10.1 on the Surry PSAR. The response to that question identified design criteria, including stress limits, for the original reactor internals design.

The NSSS vendor, Westinghouse, has verified that the information provided in the response to PSAR Question 10.1 with respect to the design criteria, including stress limits, continues to be applicable to the Surry reactor internals. Neither the Surry Improved Fuel design changes nor the Surry Core Uprate Project have a significant impact on the reactor internals. Therefore, the design criteria, including stress limits, applicable to the original design of the internals remain valid at uprated conditions.