

REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

November 4, 1977



Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II - Suite 818
230 Peachtree Street, Northwest
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Serial No. 481/102077
PO&M/TAP:dgt
Docket Nos. 50-280
50-281
License Nos. DPR-32
DPR-37

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

This is in response to your letter of October 20, 1977, in reference to the inspection conducted at Surry Power Station on September 14-16, 1977, and reported in inspection reports IE-50-280/77-26 and 50-281/77-26.

We have reviewed your letter and the enclosed inspection reports and have determined that no proprietary information is contained in the reports. Accordingly, the Virginia Electric and Power Company interposes no objection to these inspections reports being made a matter of public disclosure.

Very truly yours,

C. M. Stallings

C. M. Stallings
Vice President-Power Supply
and Production Operations

cc: Mr. Robert W. Reid ✓

773120111

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

November 4, 1977

Central File

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II - Suite 818
230 Peachtree Street, Northwest
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Serial No. 481/102077
PO&M/TAP:dgt
Docket Nos. 50-280
50-281
License Nos. DPR-32
DPR-37

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

This is in response to your letter of October 20, 1977, in reference to the inspection conducted at Surry Power Station on September 14-16, 1977, and reported in inspection reports IE-50-280/77-26 and 50-281/77-26.

We have reviewed your letter and the enclosed inspection reports and have determined that no proprietary information is contained in the reports. Accordingly, the Virginia Electric and Power Company interposes no objection to these inspections reports being made a matter of public disclosure.

Very truly yours,

C. M. Stallings

C. M. Stallings
Vice President-Power Supply
and Production Operations

cc: Mr. Robert W. Reid

9



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
230 PEACHTREE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1217
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

OCT 20 1977

In Reply Refer To:

RII:FJ

50-280/77-26

50-281/77-26

Virginia Electric and Power Company
Attn: Mr. W. L. Proffitt
Senior Vice President,
Power
P. O. Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261


Gentlemen:

This refers to the inspection conducted by Mr. Frank Jape of this office on September 14-16, 1977, of activities authorized by NRC Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37 for the Surry Unit 1 and 2 facilities, and to the discussion of our findings held with Mr. W. L. Stewart at the conclusion of the inspection.

Areas examined during the inspection and our findings are discussed in the enclosed inspection report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector.

Within the scope of this inspection, no items of noncompliance were disclosed.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice", Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosed inspection report will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room. If this report contains any information that you (or your contractor) believe to be proprietary, it is necessary that you make a written application within 20 days to this office to withhold such information from public disclosure. Any such application must include a full statement of the reasons on the basis of which it is claimed that the information is proprietary, and should be prepared so that proprietary information identified in the application is contained in a separate part of the document. If we do not hear from you in this regard within the specified period, the report will be placed in the Public Document Room.

A large, handwritten, stylized signature or mark is located in the bottom right corner of the page.

Virginia Electric and Power
Company

-2-

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, we will be glad to discuss them with you.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. J. Long', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

F. J. Long, Chief
Reactor Operations and Nuclear
Support Branch

Enclosure:

RII Inspection Report Nos.

50-280/77-26

50-281/77-26

cc: Mr. T. L. Baucom, Manager
Surry Power Station
P. O. Box 315
Surry, Virginia 23883



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
230 PEACHTREE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1217
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos.: 50-280/77-26 and 50-281/77-26

Docket Nos.: 50-280 and 50-281

Licensee No.: DPR-32 and DPR-37

Licensee: Virginia Electric and Power Company
P. O. Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Facility Name: Surry Units 1 and 2

Inspection at: Surry Power Station, Surry Virginia

Inspection conducted: September 14-16, 1977
Routine, Announced

Inspector: F. Jape

Reviewed by: AK Harden for
R. C. Lewis, Chief
Reactor Projects Section No. 2
Reactor Operations and Nuclear Support Branch

10/19/77
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on September 14-16, 1977 (Report Nos. 50-280/77-26 and 50-281/77-26)

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection to witness a flow control test of the low pressure safety injection system, observe maintenance activities and review of plant operations. The inspection involved 26 inspector-hours on site by one NRC inspector.

Results: Of the three areas inspected no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS I

Prepared by:

AK Harden for
F. Jape, Reactor Inspector
Reactor Projects Section No. 2
Reactor Operations and Nuclear
Support Branch

10/19/77
Date

Dates of Inspection: September 14-16, 1977

Reviewed by:

AK Harden for
R. C. Lewis, Chief
Reactor Projects Section No. 2
Reactor Operations and Nuclear
Support Branch

10/19/77
Date

1. Persons Contacted

Virginia Electric and Power Company

W. L. Stewart, Superintendent, Station Operations
T. L. Baucom, Station Manager
D. S. Taylor, Supervisor Mechanical Maintenance
T. A. Swanson, Shift Supervisor
D. L. Johnson, Shift Supervisor
L. A. Wagner, Shift Supervisor
L. Speckline, Maintenance Foreman
P. Grigonis, Maintenance Foreman
B. F. Bell, Journeyman
L. W. Earley, Journeyman
E. W. Shorter, Journeyman
H. Eubanks, Maintenance Foreman
G. E. Kane, Assistant Operating Supervisor
J. L. Wilson, Operating Supervisor

2. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not applicable.

3. Unresolved Items

No new unresolved items were identified.

4. Exit Interview

An exit management interview was held with Mr. W. L. Stewart and other staff management on September 16, 1977. The scope and findings of the inspection were summarized. The licensee representatives acknowledged the inspectors findings without significant comment.

5. Low Head Safety Injection Test

The inspector witnessed performance of a flow control test using the Unit 2 LHSI pumps. The test successfully demonstrated flow control capability such that NPSH limits were not exceeded with one or two pumps operating. The test was conducted with both pumps operating and flow throttled with MOV-2890 A and B to obtain 2100 ± 50 gpm. The A pump was then tripped off and flow increased to 2250 ± 150 gpm. This test was repeated by tripping the B pump and flow was observed to increase to 2250 ± 150 gpm.

With one pump operating, flow control at 3200 ± 150 gpm was demonstrated by throttling MOV-2890 to about 34% open. The throttle position of MOV 2890 A&B was about 25% open to obtain a flow of 2100 ± 50 gpm.

The entire test was conducted twice, once by throttling the valves manually and a second time by remote operation of the valves from the control room.

6. Plant Operations

The inspector reviewed plant operations to ascertain conformance with regulatory requirement technical specifications and administrative procedures. The Shift Supervisors Log, Control Room Operators Log and the Minimum Equipment Log were reviewed using administrative Procedure 29, "Conduct of Operations," Section 29.1.2 and Technical Specification 6.5 as guidance. Supervisor and Operator actions were observed during the shift and at shift change. Shift turnovers were conducted as prescribed in Section 29.3.1 of ADM 29, and activities during the shift were observed to comply with Section 29.3.2 of ADM 29.

During the inspection period, Unit 1 was operating at essentially full power and Unit 2 was at cold shutdown preparing for refueling. Compliance with technical specifications for these two different plant operational modes was verified by spot checking equipment status while touring the plant and reviewing past records for the past two weeks. During the periods of observation, personnel requirements specified by Technical Specification 6.1 B.3 on both units were met. Within the areas reviewed, no items of noncompliance were identified.

7. Maintenance

During the Unit 2 outage ethylene propylene seals were being installed in the hydraulic snubbers. The inspector observed this

activity during the regular work hours and on back-shifts. The activity was conducted using an approved procedure as delineated in Section 16 of the NPSQA manual.

Discussions were held with workmen who were removing and installing the repaired snubbers, those who were disassembling, repairing, inspecting and reassembling the snubbers and those who were performing the functional tests and setting the tension and compression bleed rates. All workmen were complying with the maintenance procedure for their part of the job. The men appeared to be knowledgeable with the procedure and were aware of the importance of adhering to the details specified for the job.

A log was being maintained to keep track of repair status. A separate procedure was also filled out for each snubber as work progressed. The work areas for disassembly and reassembly with the new seals was maintained clean and orderly. The snubbers were reassembled using new GE SF-1154 hydraulic fluid. Throughout the procedure, QA hold points were specified requiring QA personnel to verify or witness a measurement. Conformance with these hold points was observed by the inspector.

The overall activity appeared to be progressing within established requirements in a satisfactory manner. The snubbers observed by the inspector being tested met the stated acceptance criteria. Within the areas inspected, there were no items of noncompliance or deviation identified.

8. IE Circulars

The inspector verified by discussions with licensee management that circulars are reviewed for applicability even though no response is requested by the NRC. Each circular is reviewed by management and distributed to department heads for their use.