

USNRC REGION II  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA  
**VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY**  
**RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261**

0 AUG 26 A 9: 57

August 21, 1980

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director  
Office of Inspection and Enforcement  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region II  
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303


Serial No. 680  
NO/RMT:ms  
Docket No. 50-281  
License No. DPR-37

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

We have reviewed your letter of July 25, 1980 in reference to the inspection conducted at Surry Power Station on June 23-27, 1980 and reported in IE Inspection Report No. 50-281/80-24. Our response to the specific infraction is attached.

We have determined that no proprietary information is contained in the report. Accordingly, the Virginia Electric and Power Company has no objection to this inspection report being made a matter of public disclosure.

Very truly yours,

  
B. R. Sylvia  
Manager - Nuclear  
Operations and Maintenance

Attachment

cc: Mr. Steven A. Varga, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch No. 1

8009240 661

OFFICIAL COPY

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF VIOLATION REPORTED IN  
INSPECTION REPORT NO. 50-281/80-24

A. NRC CONCERNS:

As required by 10 CFR 50 Appendix B, Criteria V activities affecting quality must be accomplished in accordance with approved procedures.

Section 5.1.5 of the VEPCO Nuclear Power Station Quality Assurance Manual requires the Supervisor of Engineering Services, or his designee to review test results for completeness, to determine if the established acceptance criteria has been met and to recommend final approval by the Station Nuclear Safety and Operating Committee.

Contrary to the above, the two auxiliary steam generator feed pumps, 2-FW-P-3A and 2-FW-P-3B, failed to meet the start time acceptance criteria as stated in Steps 6.2.2.3 and 6.4.3 of ST-78. The discrepancy was not noted in the procedure nor was any change of acceptance criteria written. The outside recirculation spray pump, 2-RS-P-2B, failed to start due to an improperly racked-in circuit breaker. Problem resolution or required retesting was not identified.

This is an infraction.

VEPCO RESPONSE:

The infraction is correct as stated; however, even though the requirement for retesting was not written on the Special Test, corrective steps were being pursued. Safety Committee review on June 11, 1980 was followed by retesting on June 13, and June 25.

1) Corrective steps which have been taken and results achieved:

On June 13, 1980, Periodic Test 18.2, "Safety Injection Sytem Test" was conducted. One purpose of this test is to verify that all appropriate components have received a safety injection signal in proper sequence. The Auxiliary Steam Generator Feed Pumps 2-FW-P-3A and 2-FW-P-3B had respective start times of 54 and 57 seconds. These start times are within the acceptance criteria as stated in the procedure.

On June 25, 1980, Periodic Test 8.5A, "Consequence Limiting Safeguards Functional Test HI-HI System" was conducted. One purpose of this test is to verify that the outputs of the Consequence Limiting Safeguards HI-HI System are operable as defined in the Technical Specification. The outside Recirculation Spray Pump, 2-RS-P-2B started after a five minute time delay as designed. Reference Step 5.26.1.3.

2) Corrective steps to avoid further deficiencies:

Test Engineers reviewing test results have been instructed to record all discrepancies noted in the procedure as well as the recommended resolution in the reviewers' section.

3) Date when full compliance will be achieved:

Periodic Test 18.2 "Safety Injection System Test" was conducted on June 13, 1980 with full compliance achieved. Periodic Test 8.5A, "Consequence Limiting Safeguards Functional Test HI-HI System" was conducted on June 25, 1980 with full compliance achieved.