



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 192 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-32
AND AMENDMENT NO. 192 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-37
VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
SURRY POWER STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-280 AND 50-281

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 19, 1994 Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Surry Power Station Units 1 and 2. These changes will modify the surveillance frequency of the control rod motion testing from monthly to quarterly in accordance with Generic Letter 93-05, "Line-Item Technical Specifications Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operation," dated September 27, 1993.

TS require periodic testing of each control and shutdown control rod assembly bank in the core during power operation to ensure that the control rod assemblies are trippable. This testing requires partial movement of each control rod assembly not fully inserted into the core. This is typically done at or near full power, one bank at a time.

2.0 EVALUATION

Control rod motion testing was reviewed as part of the evaluation of power testing requirements. NUREG-1366 determined that electrical problems with the control rod drive system were the major contributor to rod motion failure. Mechanical problems were found to be less common than electrical problems. Most stuck rods were discovered during rod drop testing or during plant startup after refueling. Based on the generic evaluation it was concluded in GL 93-05 that the surveillance interval for control rod motion testing could be increased to once every 92 days without any decrease in plant safety.

Neither Surry unit has identified any stuck rods during routine surveillance testing. However, both Surry units have experienced Rod Control Drive System failures during surveillance testing. In these cases the control rods could not be moved by the control rod system but they remained trippable and continued to be capable of performing their intended safety function.

Thus, from review of this operating experience, the proposed control rod surveillance test improvements specified in the NUREG are appropriate and applicable to both Surry units.

3.0 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES

Table 4.1-2A Change the frequency of the Control Rod Assemblies testing from monthly to quarterly.

4.0 SUMMARY

Based on the staff evaluation in Section 2.0 above, the staff concludes that the proposed TS changes are acceptable. These changes are all consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications.

5.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Virginia State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comment.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and change surveillance requirements. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve 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 these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (59 FR 27070). Accordingly, these amendments meet 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 these amendments.

7.0 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: M. Chatterton

Date: August 2, 1994

DATED: August 2, 1994

AMENDMENT NO. 192 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-32 - SURRY UNIT 1
AMENDMENT NO. 192 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-37 - SURRY UNIT 2

Distribution

Docket File

NRC & Local PDRs

PDII-2 Reading

S. Varga, 14/E/4

V. McCree

E. Tana

B. Buckley

OGC

D. Hagan, T-4 A43

G. Hill (4), T-5 C3

C. Grimes, 11/F/23

M. Chatterton, O-8 E23

ACRS (10)

OPA

OC/LFDCB

D. Verelli, R-II