

November 3, 1998

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

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. MA2186 AND MA2187)

Dear Mr. Ray:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice for your information. The notice relates to your application for amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15 dated June 12, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated October 29, 1998. The proposed amendments would revise the turbine missile protection calculation methodology in the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3 licensing basis.

The notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,
Original Signed By
James W. Clifford, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-361
and 50-362

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket
PUBLIC
PDIV-2 Reading
EAdensam (EGA1)
WBateman
EPeyton
JClifford
MGray
ACRS
OGC
PGwynn, Region IV
GPick, Region IV

1/1
DF01

Document Name: SO.LTR

OFC	PDIV-2	PDIV-2	PDIV-2/
NAME	MGray	EPeyton	JClifford
DATE	11/2/98	11/2/98	11/2/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9811100120 981103
PDR ADOCK 05000361
P PDR

REPRODUCTION CENTER COPY

Mr. Harold B. Ray

- 2 -

November 3, 1998

cc w/encl:

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

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

Alan R. Watts, Esq.
Woodruff, Spradlin & Smart
701 S. Parker St. No. 7000
Orange, California 92668-4702

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

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

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

Mr. Steve Hsu
Radiologic Health Branch
State Department of Health Services
Post Office Box 942732
Sacramento, California 94234

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

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

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

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONSOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANYDOCKET NOS. 50-361 AND 50-362NOTICE 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 License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15 issued to Southern California Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3 located in San Diego County, California.

The proposed amendments would revise the turbine missile protection calculation methodology in the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3 (SONGS) licensing basis.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, 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 amendment 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. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

This change is in support of a planned replacement of the existing shrunk-on disc turbines with welded-rotor turbines for Units 2 and 3. The new design is believed to be superior to the existing design in terms of the probability of generation of missiles. However, because a new missile strike-and-damage analysis has not been performed, and due to differences in the method of calculation of missile generation probability--for instance, inclusion of stress corrosion cracking as a potential failure mechanism--it is difficult to quantify the change in probability of damage to safety-related equipment due to turbine missile strikes.

However, in order to characterize the effect of the proposed change, a comparison can be made using the current turbine missile methodology for the current design and the proposed methodology for the proposed design. Using the methodology currently approved for San Onofre Units 2 and 3 for the current shrunk-on disc rotor design, the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components is 0.9×10^{-7} .

Using the methodology proposed by this change for the new welded rotor design, the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components is calculated to be 1.7×10^{-8} per year.

Ultimately, the proposed change is acceptable because the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components will be less than or equal to the acceptance criteria of 1×10^{-7} per year stated in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.115. The difference between the calculated value of 1.7×10^{-8} and the acceptance criteria of 1×10^{-7} is considered margin that is available to account for any future changes to the turbine missile generation analysis.

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

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components from turbine missiles is currently evaluated in Section 3.5.1.3 of the Updated Final Safety

Analysis Report (UFSAR). This proposed change merely provides an alternative method to demonstrate that the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components from turbine missiles will remain less than or equal to the acceptance criterion of 1×10^{-7} per year, which is the current acceptance criterion.

Therefore, this proposed change will not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident that has been previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

There is no change to the method of operation of the turbine for Units 2 and 3 as a result of this change. Turbine overspeed protection is unaffected, and provides assurance that the turbine will operate within design limits.

Therefore, there will be no significant reduction in a margin of safety as a result of this change.

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 December 9, 1998, 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 at the local public document room located at the Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California 92713. 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, P.O. Box 800, 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 amendment dated June 12, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated October 29, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California 92713.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of November 1998.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



James W. Clifford, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation