

Response: No.

This is a revision to the Technical Specifications for the control room emergency/filtration system which is a mitigation system designed to minimize in leakage and to filter the control room atmosphere to protect the operator following accidents previously analyzed. An important part of the system is the control room boundary. The control room boundary integrity is not an initiator or precursor to any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not increased. The analysis of the consequences of analyzed accident scenarios under the control room breach conditions along with the compensatory actions for restoration of control room integrity demonstrate that the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not increased. Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not significantly increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes will not impact the accident analysis. The changes will not alter the requirements of the control room emergency/filtration system or its function during accident conditions. The administrative controls and compensatory actions will ensure the control room emergency/filtration system will perform its safety function. [Sentence deleted] The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by these changes. The proposed changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for an unacceptable period of time without compensatory actions and administrative controls. The proposed changes do not affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Section Chief: Robert A. Gramm.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia.

Date of amendment request: September 5, 2002, as supplemented April 16, June 9, and July 7, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The proposed technical specification (TS) amendment will add provisions to permit inspection and related repair of a buried fuel oil storage tank during plant operation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

This proposed TS change does not alter the assumptions of the accident analyses or the TS Basis. The inclusion of provisions to permit inspection and related repair of a buried fuel oil storage tank during plant operation does not impact the availability of the EDGs [emergency diesel generators] to perform their required function, which is to provide an emergency source of power to vital equipment when a normal power source is not available. Furthermore, while a buried tank is out of service, the proposed change includes requirements to verify the availability of onsite and offsite fuel oil sources to ensure that an adequate supply of fuel oil remains available. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant increase in either the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed license amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

This proposed TS change does not involve a physical change to the plant, nor does it alter the assumptions of the accident analyses. Inclusion of provisions to permit inspection and related repair of a buried fuel oil storage tank does not introduce any new failure modes. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

This proposed TS change alters the method of operation of the Fuel Oil System. However, the availability of the EDGs to perform their required function is not impacted, and the assumptions of the accident analyses are not altered. Furthermore, a plant specific risk evaluation of the acceptability of the provisions was

performed. The risk evaluation concluded that the risk impact is acceptable (*i.e.*, is characterized as "very small" by Regulatory Guide 1.174 criteria and is within the acceptance criteria of Regulatory Guide 1.177). Therefore, the proposed change does not significantly reduce the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Ms. Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., Millstone Power Station, Building 475, 5th Floor, Rope Ferry Road, Rt. 156, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

NRC Section Chief: John A. Nakoski.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection