

January 18, 2000

Mr. Harold B. Ray
Executive Vice President
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

SUBJECT: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING (TAC NOS. MA0597 AND MA0598)

Dear Mr. Ray:

The Commission has forwarded subject notice to the Office of the Federal Register for publication. A copy is enclosed for your information.

The notice relates to your application dated January 2, 1998, as supplemented December 13, 1999 (PCN-482), to revise the Technical Specification (TS) related to the Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) System. Specifically, you requested a revision to TS 3.7.5 to add a note that states: "The steam driven AFW pump is OPERABLE when running and controlled manually to support plant start-ups, plant shut-downs, and AFW pump and valve testing."

Sincerely,

/RA/

L. Raghavan, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

January 18, 2000

Mr. Harold B. Ray
Executive Vice President
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

SUBJECT: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING (TAC NOS. MA0597 AND MA0598)

Dear Mr. Ray:

The Commission has forwarded subject notice to the Office of the Federal Register for publication. A copy is enclosed for your information.

The notice relates to your application dated January 2, 1998, as supplemented December 13, 1999 (PCN-482), to revise the Technical Specification (TS) related to the Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) System. Specifically, you requested a revision to TS 3.7.5 to add a note that states: "The steam driven AFW pump is OPERABLE when running and controlled manually to support plant start-ups, plant shut-downs, and AFW pump and valve testing."

Sincerely,

/RA/

L. Raghavan, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

File Center
PUBLIC
PDIV-2 Reading
LSmith, RIV
OGC
ACRS

To receive a copy of this document, indicate "C" in the box					
OFFICE	PDIV-2/PM	C	PDIV-D/LA	C	PDIV-2/SC
NAME	LRaghavan:am		RBouling for CJamerson		SDembek
DATE	01/ 12 /00		01/ 11 /00		01/12/00

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ind0597.wpd

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3

cc:

Mr. R. W. Krieger, Vice President
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P. O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

Chairman, Board of Supervisors
County of San Diego
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335
San Diego, CA 92101

Alan R. Watts, Esq.
Woodruff, Spradlin & Smart
701 S. Parker St. No. 7000
Orange, CA 92668-4720

Mr. Sherwin Harris
Resource Project Manager
Public Utilities Department
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Harris Tower & Pavilion
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Arlington, TX 76011-8064

Mr. Michael Olson
San Onofre Liaison
San Diego Gas & Electric Company
P.O. Box 1831
San Diego, CA 92112-4150

Mr. Steve Hsu
Radiological Health Branch
State Department of Health Services
Post Office Box 942732
Sacramento, CA 94327-7320

Resident Inspector/San Onofre NPS
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 4329
San Clemente, CA 92674

Mayor
City of San Clemente
100 Avenida Presidio
San Clemente, CA 92672

Mr. Dwight E. Nunn, Vice President
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

Mr. Robert A. Laurie, Commissioner
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street (MS 31)
Sacramento, CA 95814

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3

DOCKET NOS. 50-361 AND 50-362

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15 issued to Southern California Edison Company (SCE, the licensee) for operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 2 and 3, located in San Diego County, California.

The proposed amendments would revise the SONGS, Units 2 and 3, Technical Specification (TS) relating to the Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) System. Specifically, the licensee proposed to revise TS 3.7.5 to add a note that states: "The steam driven AFW pump is OPERABLE when running and controlled manually to support plant start-ups, plant shut-downs, and AFW pump and valve testing."

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident

previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. 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. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

Probabilistic analyses have been performed in support of declaring P140 operable when the pump is manually actuated and operating.

The results show that, considering P-140 to be in test for an entire year, the core damage risk of a Main Steam Line Break/Feedwater Line Break (MSLB/FWLB) slightly increases ($4.3E-8/\text{yr}$) while the risk due to other initiating events decreases ($3E-7/\text{yr}$). The net core damage impact of P-140 in test for an entire year is a Core Damage Frequency (CDF) decrease of $2E-7/\text{yr}$. Having P140 operating instead of being in standby increases its reliability. This increased reliability reduces the risk due to other initiating events, such as loss of main feedwater, medium and small Loss of Coolant Accidents (LOCAs), Steam Generator Tube Rupture (SGTR), and Loss of Offsite Power (LOP), which require Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) and which occur with much greater frequency than MSLB/FWLB. With the overall CDF reduction a result of considering P140 being in a test configuration for an entire year, the actual cumulative risk incurred is the weighted fraction that P140 is in the test configuration over a year period. Based on past experience, the pump is running in manual approximately 500 minutes/year, which results in an annual net cumulative CDF reduction on the order of $2E-10/\text{yr}$ due to running P140 in the manual mode.

Therefore, the operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

This change does not involve a plant hardware modification or allow the operation of any plant equipment in any way other than originally designed. This change only affects the administrative tracking of the turbine-driven AFW pump when the steam driven AFW pump is operating in the manual mode.

Therefore, the operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No

Pump history shows the pump is run approximately 500 minutes per year. In all cases except for the one postulated scenario of the Main Steam Isolation Signal followed by an Emergency Feedwater Actuation Signal the turbine-driven AFW pump is not susceptible to being tripped. Also, this postulated scenario does not affect the capability of the motor-driven AFW pumps.

Even though there is a small increase in the CDF from the AFW steam driven pump operating in manual mode based on the possibility of a MSLB/FWLB, also considering other initiating events results in an annual net cumulative CDF reduction on the order of $2E-10$ /yr due to P140 running in the manual mode.

Therefore, the operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in 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.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments

received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By February 18, 2000, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which

satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead, California 91770, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the

Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated January 2, 1998, as supplemented December 13, 1999, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12TH day of January 2000.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

L. Raghavan, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation