

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON)	
COMPANY, <u>ET AL.</u> for a Class 103 license to)	DOCKET NO. 50-361
Acquire, Possess, and Use a Utilization)	
Facility as Part of Unit No. 2 of the San)	Amendment Application
Onofre Nuclear Generating Station)	No. 10

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, ET AL. pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, hereby submit Amendment Application No. 10.

This amendment application consists of Proposed Changes NPF-10-28 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-10, Technical Specifications incorporated as Appendix A. Proposed Change NPF-10-28 is a request to revise Technical Specification 3.3.3.9, Table 3.3-13, RADIOACTIVE GASEOUS EFFLUENT MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 170.22 proposed changes contained in Amendment Application No. 10 are considered to constitute a Class II Amendment. The basis for the determination is that the changes have no safety or environmental significance.

Accordingly, the fee of \$1,200.00 corresponding to this determination is remitted herewith as required by 10 CFR 170.22.

Subscribed on this 31st day of August, 1982

Respectfully submitted,


SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

By Robert Dietch
Robert Dietch

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
31st day of August, 1982.

Agnes Crabtree
Notary Public in and for the County of
Los Angeles, State of California

My Commission Expires: Aug 27, 1986



Charles R. Kocher
James A. Beoletto
Attorneys for Southern
California Edison Company

By James A. Beoletto

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

By

G.D. Cotton
G.D. Cotton

David R. Pigott
Samuel B. Casey
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe
Attorneys for San Diego
Gas & Electric Company


By

Samuel B. Casey

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

23 day of August 1982

Anne R. Schmidt
Notary Public in and for the County of
San Diego, State of California



THE CITY OF ANAHEIM


By Gordon W. Hoyt
Gordon W. Hoyt

Alan R. Watts
Rourke & Woodruff
Attorney for the City of Anaheim

By Alan R. Watts


Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 17th day of AUG, 1982.

Roland B. Sharpless
Notary Public in and for the County
of ORANGE, State of California




200 S. Anaheim Blvd., Anaheim, CA 92805

THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE


By 


Everett C. Ross

Alan R. Watts
Rourke & Woodruff
Attorney for the City of Riverside

By 

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 18th day of August, 1982.




Notary Public in and for the County
of Los Angeles, State of California

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CHANGE NPF-10-28 AND SAFETY ANALYSIS
AMENDMENT APPLICATION NO. 10 OPERATING LICENSE NPF-10

This is a request to revise Technical Specification 3.3.3.9, Table 3.3-13, RADIOACTIVE GASEOUS EFFLUENT MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION.

Existing Specification

See Attachment "A"

Proposed Specification

See Attachment "B"

Reason for Proposed Change

Failure of the containment purge system noble gas activity monitor 2RT-7804-1 prevents containment purging to reduce containment pressure buildup. Containment pressure buildup in excess of the limits of Technical Specification 3.6.1.4 will force shutdown. This proposed change will permit limited containment purging with 2RT-7804-1 inoperable.

Safety Analysis of the Proposed Change

Noble gas activity monitor 2RT-7804-1 is provided to monitor and control the release of activity during containment purging operations. When 2RT-7804-1 is inoperable, the proposed change would fulfill the requirement to monitor and control the release of activity when purging is required by: (1) using wide range monitor 2RT-7865-1 to monitor purge effluent; and (2) using an operator to manually suspend containment purging should 2RT-7865-1 indicate high activity in the containment purge effluent and realign 2RT-7865-1 to its normal vent stack post-accident monitoring position. Containment purging would be limited to a maximum of two hours per day using this method.

Accordingly, it is concluded that: (1) Proposed Change NPF-10-28 does not present significant hazard considerations not described or implicit in the Final Safety Analysis; (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the proposed change; and (3) this action will not result in a condition which significantly alters the impact of the station on the environment as described in the NRC Final Environmental Statement.

NPF-10-28

ATTACHMENT A