



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 87 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-32
VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
SURRY POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-280

Introduction

By letter dated April 14, 1983, Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) requested an amendment to Surry Power Station, Unit No. 1. This amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to change the control rod insertion limits.

Discussion and Evaluation

As a result of inspections performed of the fuel assemblies in Unit 1 during the current refueling outages, the licensee has had to develop a different loading pattern than was anticipated for the upcoming Cycle 7. The results of these inspections are discussed in the licensee's letter dated March 23, 1983.

The revised core loading configuration required another reload Safety Evaluation. The reload Safety Evaluation provided is based on analysis performed by Westinghouse in accordance with the methodology documented in Westinghouse Topical Report WCAP-9272. The results indicated that no key analysis parameters would become more limiting during Cycle 7 operation than the values assumed in the currently applicable safety analysis. The basis of this evaluation include the assumption of a revision to the presently approved control rod insertion limits. The revised insertion limits are required to meet the current radial power peaking factor design limits for Cycle 7 operation.

We have reviewed the proposed Technical Specification on control rod insertion limits and conclude that they are acceptable since the insertion limits have been obtained using methods previously approved by NRC.

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 §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.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendment 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.

Date: April 26, 1993

Principal Contributor:
Margaret Chatterton