



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 163 AND 143 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-4 AND NPF-7

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

OLD DOMINION ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

NORTH ANNA POWER STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-338 AND 50-339

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 1, 1992, the Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) proposed a change to the North Anna Power Station, Units Nos. 1&2 (NA-1&2) Technical Specifications (TS). The proposed change would revise NA-1&2 TS 3.7.4.1.a, "Service Water System - Operating," to permit progression through modes upon meeting the design basis for the service water system (SWS).

2.0 DISCUSSION

The current NA-1&2 TS 3.7.4.1.a action statement permits operation with one service water (SW) pump inoperable provided flows to the component cooling water (CCW) heat exchangers are throttled to ensure the remaining SW pumps deliver design basis flows to the recirculation spray heat exchangers. Since design basis flows are met upon completion of throttling the CCW heat exchanger flows, progression through modes would not be outside the design basis. However, the current NA-1&2 TS 3.0.4 does not permit mode changes once an action statement is entered. Therefore, the proposed change would allow progression through modes once throttling of the CCW heat exchanger flows had been completed by specifying that the NA-1&2 TS 3.0.4 is not applicable.

NRC Generic Letter (GL) 89-07, "Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements," was issued to address TS improvements. One issue addressed in the GL involved the unnecessary restrictions on mode changes by TS 3.0.4. In GL 89-07, the NRC states that TS 3.0.4 unduly restricts operation when conformance to the action statement provides an acceptable level of safety for continued operation. Therefore, making the NA-1&2 TS 3.0.4 not applicable in the NA-1&2 action statement 3.7.4.1.a would be consistent with the NRC position stated in GL 89-07. The proposed change would permit mode changes while in action statement 3.7.4.1.a by stating that TS 3.0.4 is not applicable once SW flows to the CCW heat exchangers are throttled.

3.0 EVALUATION

Action statement 3.7.4.1.a requires component cooling heat exchanger SW flows to be throttled, within 72 hours, if one of the four required normal SW pumps becomes inoperable. This action ensures that the normal SW pumps remain capable of providing design basis flows to the recirculation spray heat exchangers and allows design basis flows to be delivered by two normal SW pumps with the failure of the third operable normal SW pump. In addition, the proposed change is consistent with a stated position in NRC GL 89-07. Based on all of the above, the staff finds the proposed change to be acceptable.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

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

5.0 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. 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 the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (57 FR 28207). Accordingly, the 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 the amendments.

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

Principal Contributor: Leon B. Engle

Date: August 4, 1992