



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 153 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-13
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-206

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated November 18, 1992, Southern California Edison Company submitted a request to change the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1, Technical Specifications (TS). The request would change TS 6.9.1.8, "Semiannual Radioactive Effluent Release Report," and TS 6.14, "Offsite Dose Calculation Manual," to extend the Radioactive Effluent Release Report submittal frequency from semiannual to annual. This requested change is in accord with the change in Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 50.36a, "Technical specifications on effluents from nuclear power reactors," effective October 1, 1992.

2.0 EVALUATION

As indicated above, 10 CFR 50.36a was changed to require that a report to the Commission specifying the quantity of each of the principal radionuclides released to unrestricted areas during the previous twelve months should be prepared and submitted. The new regulation also requires that the time interval between submissions of the reports must be no longer than twelve months. Previously, 10 CFR 50.36a required these reports to be submitted semiannually and within sixty days after January 1 and July 1 of each year.

It was the intent of the regulation that the period between submittals should be no greater than twelve months. Since the most recent report was due and submitted on or about August 29, 1992, under the old TS, and the next one will be required by May 1, 1993, under the new TS, the period between the most recent submittal and the next one will be eight months - well within the required twelve months. Since the requested technical specification changes are consistent with the new regulation and since the submittals of the required reports will be within the time periods specified by the regulations, the staff finds that the licensee's proposed changes to Technical Specifications 6.9.18 and 6.14 meet both the letter and the intent of the regulations and are, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the California State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 but changes no surveillance requirements. The NRC staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (57 FR 61121). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: John O. Bradfute

Date: February 17, 1993