

April 26, 1991

Docket No. 50-361  
and 50-362

Mr. Harold B. Ray  
Senior Vice President  
Southern California Edison Company  
Irvine Operations Center  
23 Parker Street  
Irvine, California 92718

Mr. Gary D. Cotton  
Senior Vice President  
Engineering and Operations  
San Diego Gas & Electric Co.  
101 Ash Street  
San Diego, California 92112

Dear Mr. Ray:

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR EXEMPTION TO 10 CFR 50, APPENDIX J, SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. 80099 AND 80100)

Enclosed for your information is a copy of an "Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact." The Environmental Assessment relates to your request dated April 8, 1991 for an exemption to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.1(a), "Periodic Retest Schedule."

The Environmental Assessment has been sent to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Lawrence E. Kokajko, Project Manager  
Project Directorate V  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV/V  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	NRC & LPDRs	PDV Reading	BBoger	MVirgilio
LKokajko	DFoster	OGC	EJordan	ACRS (10)
GPA/PA	PD Plant File		RZimmerman	

*subject removed with retention  
DONE 4/25/91*

OFC	:LA/PD5/DRP345	:PM/PD5/DRP345	:OGC	:D/PD5/DRP345	:	:
NAME	:DFoster <i>Foster</i>	:LKokajko:sg <i>Kokajko</i>	:Bmrb <i>Bmrb</i>	:EByer <i>EByer</i>	:	:
DATE	:4/15/90	:4/15/90	:4/22/90	:4/25/90	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY  
Document Name: SO ENVIROMENT

**NRC FILE CENTER COPY**

Messrs. Ray and Cotton  
Southern California Edison Company

San Onofre Nuclear Generating  
Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3

cc:

James A. Beoletto, Esq.  
Southern California Edison Company  
Irvine Operations Center  
23 Parker Street  
Irvine, California 92718

Mr. Richard J. Kosiba, Project Manager  
Bechtel Power Corporation  
12440 E. Imperial Highway  
Norwalk, California 90650

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

Mr. Robert G. Lacy  
Manager, Nuclear Department  
San Diego Gas & Electric Company  
P. O. Box 1831  
San Diego, California 92112

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

Mr. John Hickman  
Senior Health Physicist  
Environmental Radioactive Mgmt. Unit  
Environmental Management Branch  
State Department of Health Services  
714 P Street, Room 616  
Sacramento, California 95814

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

Resident Inspector, San Onofre NPS  
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Post Office Box 4329  
San Clemente, California 92672

Mr. Charles B. Brinkman  
Combustion Engineering, Inc.  
12300 Twinbrook Parkway, Suite 330  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

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

Mr. Phil Johnson  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region V  
1450 Maria Lane, Suite 210  
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Regional Administrator, Region V  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1450 Maria Lane, Suite 210  
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Mr. Don J. Womeldorf  
Chief, Environmental Management Branch  
California Department of Health Services  
714 P Street, Room 616  
Sacramento, California 95814

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKET NO. 50-361 AND 50-362

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption to Facility Operating License No. 10 and No. 15 issued to Southern California Edison Company, et al., for operation of San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, located in San Diego County, California.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would allow the licensee relief from the provision of Section III.D.1(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 that requires that the third test of each set of three Type A (Containment integrated leak rate) tests for a 10-year service period shall be conducted when the unit is shutdown for the 10-year unit inservice inspection (ISI). In a letter dated April 8, 1991, the licensee requested to be allowed to conduct the third Type A test of each 10-year inservice interval during a separate plant outage from the 10-year plant ISI.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption is required in order to permit the licensee to uncouple the third Type A test for a 10-year service period from the 10-year ISI for San Onofre Units 2 and 3.

### Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed exemption and concludes that the exemption would only permit the licensee to conduct the third Type A test in a 10-year service period and the 10-year ISI in different outages. The 10-year ISI would be conducted at an outage later than the Type A test. The exemption does not change the licensed power level, or reduce the containment integrity requirements or 10-year ISI requirements. Therefore, the proposed exemption does not increase the probability or consequences of accidents; no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that granting the proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption involves systems located within the restricted areas as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with a grant of the proposed exemption.

### Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from a grant of the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. This would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3 dated April 1981 and its Errata dated June 1981.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's request and did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's application for exemption dated April 8, 1991, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20555 and at the local public document room at the Main Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92173.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April, 1991.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Charles M. Trammell*

Charles M. Trammell, Acting Director  
Project Directorate V  
Division of Reactor Project III/IV/V  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation