

August 25, 1983

Docket No.: 50-275

Distribution:
 *W/initial NSHD
 NRC PDR Document Control*
 L PDR
 NSIC
 PRC System
 LB#3 Reading
 GWKnighton
 BBuckley*
 JLee*(5)
 LChandler*
 ELJordan, IE
 JTaylor, IE
 HDenton
 DEisenhut
 TMNovak
 RAClark
 PKrueztzer*

Mr. James O. Schuyler
 Vice President - Nuclear Generation
 Department
 Pacific Gas & Electric Company
 77 Beale, Room 1451
 San Francisco, California 94106

Dear Mr. Schuyler:

Subject: Issuance of Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing" related to your application of May 23, 1983, regarding proposed Technical Specification changes to reflect installation of an additional 2500 gpm firewater pump to provide an increased capacity and modify the surveillance requirements for explosive initiators in the Halon fire suppression system. This Notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 B. C. Buckley

Bart Buckley, Project Manager
 Licensing Branch No. 3
 Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
Federal Register Notice

cc w/encl.: See next page

8309130148 830825
 PDR ADOCK 05000275
 PDR

OFFICE	DL: LB#3	DL: LB#3	DL: LB#3				
SURNAME	JLee:ph	BBuckley	GWKnighton				
DATE	8/12/83	8/12/83	8/12/83				

Mr. J. O. Schuyler, Vice President
Nuclear Power Generation
c/o Nuclear Power Generation, Licensing
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, Room 1435
San Francisco, California 94106

Philip A. Crane, Jr., Esq.
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Post Office Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120

Mr. Malcolm H. Furbush
Vice President - General Counsel
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Post Office Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120

Janice E. Kerr, Esq.
California Public Utilities Commission
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Mr. Frederick Eissler, President
Scenic Shoreline Preservation
Conference, Inc.
4623 More Mesa Drive
Santa Barbara, California 93105

Ms. Elizabeth Apfelberg
1415 Cozadero
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Mr. Gordon A. Silver
Ms. Sandra A. Silver
1760 Alisal Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Harry M. Willis, Esq.
Seymour & Willis
601 California Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94108

Mr. Richard Hubbard
MHB Technical Associates
Suite K
1725 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, CA 96125

Mr. John Marrs, Managing Editor
San Luis Obispo County Telegram Tribune
1321 Johnson Avenue
P. O. Box 112
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Resident Inspector/Diablo Canyon NPS
c/o US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 369
Avila Beach, California 93424

Ms. Raye Fleming
1920 Mattie Road
Shell Beach, California 93440

Joel Reynolds, Esq.
John R. Phillips, Esq.
Center for Law in the Public Interest
10951 West Pico Boulevard
Third Floor
Los Angeles, California 90064

Paul C. Valentine, Esq.
321 Lytton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94302

Dr. William E. Cooper
Project Manager - 5511
Teledyne Engineering Services
130 Second Avenue
Waltham, Massachusetts 02254

Mr. Dick Blankenburg
Editor & Co-Publisher
South County Publishing Company
P. O. Box 460
Arroyo Grande, California 93420

Norton, Burke, Berry & French, P.C.
2002 E. Osborn Road
P. O. Box 10569
Phoenix, Arizona 85064

Mr. W. C. Gangloff
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
P. O. Box 355
Pittsburg, Pennsylvania 15230

David F. Fleischaker, Esq.
P. O. Box 1178
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101

Arthur C. Gehr, Esq.
Snell & Wilmer
3100 Valley Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85073

Mr. Lee M. Gustafson, Director
Federal Agency Relations
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
1050 17th Street, N. W.
Suite 1180
Washington, D. C. 20036

Regional Administrator - Region V
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1450 Maria Lane
Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Dr. Jose Roesset
3506 Duval Road
Austin, Texas 78759

Michael J. Strumwasser, Esq.
Special Council to the Attorney General
State of California
3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800
Los Angeles 90010

Mr. Thomas H. Harris
San Jose Mercury News
750 Ridder Park Drive
San Jose, California 95190

Mr. Mark Gottlieb
California Energy Commission
1111 Howe Avenue, MS 27
Sacramento, California 95825

Maurice Axelrad, Esq.
Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

Chairman
San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors
Room 220
County Courthouse Annex
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

California Department of Health
ATTN: Chief, Environmental Radiation
Control Unit
Radiologic Health Section
741 P Street - Room 498
Sacramento, California 95814

Director
Energy Facilities Siting Division
Energy Resources Conservation and
Development Commission
1111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, California 95825

President
California Public Utilities Commission
California State Building
350 McAllester Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Mr. Joseph O. Ward, Chief
Radiological Health Branch
State Department of Health Services
714 P Street, Office Building #8
Sacramento, California 95814

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-275

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-76, issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Diablo Canyon, Unit 1 nuclear power plant located in San Luis Obispo County, California.

The proposed amendment would update the facility Technical Specifications to reflect the installation of an additional 2500 gpm firewater pump to provide an increased capacity, based on a reanalysis of the largest fire system demand, and modify the surveillance requirements for explosive initiators in the Halon fire suppression system in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 23, 1983.

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 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

OFFICE	previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of			
SURNAME	safety.	83090	10325	XA
DATE				XA Copy Has Been Sent to PDR

- 2 -

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of these criteria by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One such example is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The proposed amendment which increases the required capacity of the firewater system by installing a new fire pump constitutes an additional limitation than is currently required by the Technical Specifications. Therefore, based on this consideration and the three criteria given above we have made a proposed determination that this amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Section 4.7.9.4c of the Technical Specifications currently requires that the explosive initiators in the Halon fire suppression system be replaced at least once every five years with initiators that have a remaining service life of at least 5 years. The licensee states that the greatest service life available for the type of explosive initiators used in the Halon system is 5 years from the time that they are made based on information obtained from the vendor. Consequently, to meet the letter of the Technical Specifications replacement explosive initiators, which must have a remaining service life of at least 5 years, is feasible only if zero time has elapsed from the time of manufacture. The proposed amendment request would require replacement of the explosive initiator prior to the expiration of its service life and at least once every 5 years.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the above mentioned criteria by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One such example is a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specification, a correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

The proposed amendment is to correct an error in the current Technical Specification which requires replacement explosive initiators having a remaining service life of at least 5 years which is not currently technically feasible, since some period of time must elapse from the moment of fabrication to installation at the facility. Therefore, based on this consideration and the three criteria mentioned above, we have made a proposed determination 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. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Comments should be addressed to the Secretary of the Commission, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attn: Docketing and Service Branch.

By September 30, 1983, 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

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Request for a hearing and petitions 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. 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 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 a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; (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 fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene in the proceeding which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements which 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 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 involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30 day notice period. However, should circumstances change

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

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 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.

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, D. C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to George W. Knighton: petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, and to Philip A. Crane, Jr., Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California 94106 and Norton,

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Burke, Berry and French, P.C., Attn: Bruce Norton, Esq., 2002 East Osborn Road, Phonex, Arizona 85106, attorneys 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 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be 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 May 23, 1983, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public document Room 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., and the California Polytechnic State University Library, Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 25th day of August 1983.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

151

George W. Knighton, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

*See previous page for concurrence/initials

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3	OELD	DL:LB#3			
SURNAME	*JLee:yt	BBuckley	*BHVogler	G. Knighton			
DATE	8/12/83	8/12/83	8/17/83	8/12/83			

granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be 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 May 23, 1983, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., and the California Polytechnic State University Library, Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 1983.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

George W. Knighton, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

OFFICE ▶	DLB#3	DLB#3	DLB#3	DLB#3			
SURNAME ▶	J. E. Yt	Buckley	L. Chandler	G. Knighton			
DATE ▶	8/12/83	8/12/83	8/11/83	8/12/83			

INITIAL
NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION
AND NOTICING ACTION

Docket No. 50-275 Facility: Diablo Canyon, Unit 1
Licensee: Pacific Gas & Electric Company Date of application: May 23, 1983

Request for: Proposal change to amend Sections 3.7.9.1 and 4.7.9.4 of the Technical Specifications to install an additional fire water pump and modify the interval for replacement of explosive initiators in the Halon fire suppression system.

(See attached notice or press release for more details.)

Initial Determination:

- () Proposed determination - amendment request involves no significant hazards considerations (NSHC).
- () Final determination - amendment request involves significant hazards considerations (SHC).

Basis for Determination

- () Licensee's NSHC discussion has been reviewed and is accepted. See attached amendment request.
- () Basis for this determination is presented in the attached notice.
- (X) Other (state): NRC See attachments 1 and 2

836223

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

Initial Noticing Action: (Attach appropriate notice or input for monthly FRN)

1. () Monthly FRN. Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination - monthly FRN input is attached (Attachment 8).
2. (X) Individual FRN (30 days). Same notice matter as above. Time does not allow waiting for next monthly FRN (Attachments 9a and 9b).

(THIS FORM SHOULD BE TYPED EXCEPT FOR UNUSUAL, URGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.)

8309130217 830825
PDR ADOCK 05000275
P CF

- 3. () No initial FRN. Valid exigent circumstances exist (evaluated below). Local media notice requesting public comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachment 10);
- 4. () No initial FRN or local media notice. A valid emergency situation exists (evaluated below) and there is no time for public notice on proposed NSHC determination. (No attachment)
- 5. () Individual FRN. Licensee's claim of exigent or emergency circumstances is invalid (evaluated below). Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachments 9a and 9b). Letter of explanation to licensee is also attached.
- 6. () Individual FRN. Conclusion cannot be made that the amendment request involves NSHC. Notice of opportunity for prior hearing is attached (Attachment 5). Letter to licensee also attached.

Evaluation of exigent or emergency circumstances (if applicable): _____

Approvals:

Date

- 1. B. C. Buckley (Project Manager) _____ 08/09/83
- 2. SM Knighton (Branch Chief) _____ 08/12/83
- 3. See concurrence on Federal Register Notice (OELD) _____ BCB 08/23/83

Additional approvals

- 4. BJ Youngblood (Assistant Director) _____
- 5. _____ (Director, Division of Licensing) _____

ATTACHMENT 1

The proposed change to Section 3.7.9.1 of the Technical Specifications is to install an additional 2500 gpm firewater pump to provide an increased capacity based on a reanalysis of the largest fire system demand. The installation of the second pump, required as a result of a reanalysis by the licensee, will also improve system availability during a single failure event.

The Commission has made a determination that the proposed 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.

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of these criteria by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One such example is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The proposed amendment to add a second fire water pump constitutes an additional limitation than is currently required by the Technical Specifications. Therefore, based on this consideration and the three criteria mentioned above, we have made a proposed determination that this amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

ATTACHMENT 2

Section 4.7.9.4c of the Technical Specifications currently requires that the explosive initiators in the Halon fire suppression system be replaced at least once every five years with initiators that have a remaining service life of at least 5 years. The licensee states that the greatest service life available for the type of explosive initiators used in the Halon system is 5 years from the time that they are made based on information obtained from the vendor. Consequently, to meet the letter of the Technical Specifications replacement explosive initiators which must have a remaining service life of at least 5 years is feasible only if zero time has elapsed from the time of manufacture. The proposed amendment request would require replacement of the explosive initiator prior to the expiration of its service life and at least once every 5 years.

The Commission has made a determination that the proposed 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.

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of these criteria by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One such example is a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, a correction of an error, or a change in nonenclature.

The proposed amendment is to correct an error in the current Technical Specification which requires replacement explosive initiators having a remaining service life of at least 5 years which is not currently technically feasible since some period of time must elapse from the moment of fabrication to installation at the facility. Therefore, based on this consideration and the three criteria mentioned above, we have made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.