



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20566-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 213 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-32
AND AMENDMENT NO. 213 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 December 18, 1997, the Virginia Electric and Power Company proposed Technical Specifications (TS) changes to Surry Power Station Units 1 and 2 to clarify the intent of the terminology used for describing equipment surveillances conducted on refueling interval frequencies. The intent of the proposed clarification to the refueling interval surveillances was to be consistent with the specified frequency provided in Revision 1 of NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants," dated April 1995.

The TS establish surveillance requirements for systems and components directly related to safety limits and limiting conditions for operation. These requirements ensure that the systems/components will perform their intended plant function consistent with safe plant operation and as assumed by the safety analyses. Section 4 of the Surry TS, and the associated Bases, specify the type of surveillance to be performed for systems/components and the minimum performance frequency. The surveillance intervals range from hours, days, months, and quarters to refueling frequencies.

The Surry Units 1 and 2 TS were issued in 1972 and 1973, respectively, and are customized specifications since they pre-date the Standard Technical Specifications format. The original issue of the Surry TS used various terms to refer to refueling interval surveillances; i.e., "each refueling," "each refueling shutdown," "once per refueling cycle," "refueling interval" and similar variations in reference to refueling interval surveillance frequencies. Use of these various terms has caused confusion because it was not clear if the surveillances were intended to be performed when a unit was shut down for refueling, during the REFUELING SHUTDOWN Mode, or at a refueling interval frequency.

2.0 EVALUATION

The staff reviewed the proposed amendment to licenses DPR-32 and DPR-37, clarifying the terminology used for describing equipment surveillances conducted in refueling interval frequencies. The proposed changes to Section 4 of the Surry TS, and the associated Bases, were revised to clarify the intent of the refueling interval surveillances and to use consistent

wording, i.e. "once per 18 months." In addition, minor typographical errors were also corrected, and an obsolete reference was deleted.

The staff finds that with two exceptions, the proposed clarification to the Surry TS refueling interval surveillances is acceptable and the terminology for describing equipment surveillances on refueling interval frequencies provides adequate clarification. The proposed changes to the Surry TS are consistent with the specified frequencies provided in NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants," Revision 1 dated April 1995. The two exceptions, TS 4.6.A.1.b and 4.6.C.1.e, do not include Standard Technical Specification (STS) Mode restrictions. During the development of Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1431), NRC staff held discussions with the industry regarding the imposition of operating mode restrictions on emergency power surveillance testing. The result of these discussions, is that specific mode restrictions were imposed for certain emergency power surveillance tests as provided in TS 3.8 of the STS. The existing Surry TS currently impose refueling shutdown requirements for the performance of TS 4.6.A.1.b and 4.6.C.1.e. Since the existing Surry TS requirements for these two specifications are more consistent with the STS shutdown mode restrictions (as opposed to a higher power operating mode), the proposed changes for these two TS (to eliminate restrictions for performing these surveillances) are denied at this time. The licensee has indicated that they will revise their request for these two changes and resubmit them at a later time.

Based on the above evaluation, the staff concludes that the proposed changes to the Surry TS, Section 4.0, clarify the terminology used to describe refueling interval frequencies and provide consistent wording of the TS for these equipment surveillances. These TS changes will not increase the surveillance intervals, and the surveillance intervals will continue to validate system/component availability and performance. Relative to the TS changes, there was no change in the technical basis for the TS; there is only a clarification of intent of the TS. Therefore, with the exception of TS 4.6.A.1.b and 4.6.C.1.e, these proposed changes to the TS are acceptable.

3.0 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.

4.0 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 (63 FR 25118). 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.

5.0 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. Reardon

Date: June 11, 1998