

JUN 18 1979

Docket No. 50-206

Mr. James H. Drake Vice President Southern California Edison Company 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue Post Office Box 800 Rosemead, California \91770

Dear Mr. Drake:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 41 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13 for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1 (SONGS, Unit 1). The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your request dated May 4, 1979.

The amendment increases the annual discharge limits of sulfate for calendar years 1979 and 1980, as specified in Subsection 2.2.2, "Added Process Chemicals" in the Appendix B Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS).

This ETS change will allow temporary discharge of waste water containing sulfates from the startup flushing of SONGS, Units 2 and 3, via the SONGS, Unit 1 service water system. This method of disposal of the startup water from SONGS, Units 2 and 3, would be utilized through 1980 when the circulating water system of these units is expected to be placed in service. The effluent containing sulfuric acid from Units 2 and 3 would be neutralized with sodium hydroxide to a pH of 6.0 to 9.0. This procedure would increase the sulfate concentration presently allowed in the Unit 1 ETS.

The current ETS limits the maximum sulfate concentration in the discharge into the Pacific Ocean to 1.89 ppm. The natural occurring sulfate concentration of the Pacific Ocean near San Onofre is 2,650 ppm. Thus, the present ETS allows only a 0.07% increase over ambient sulfate concentration. The proposed temporary increase of the discharge of sulfate from Units 2 and 3 via the Unit 1 discharge structure would allow a maximum sulfate concentration of 17.9 ppm into the Pacific Ocean or a 0.07% increase over ambient sulfate concentration through 1980. On January 1, 1981, the sulfate limits would revert back to the current ETS limits.

OFFICE>

BURNAME>

DATE>

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit for San Onofre, Unit 1 issued by the California Regional Water Quality Board (the Board) does not include a sulfate concentration limit. Nevertheless, we have discussed the licensee's proposal with the Board in San Diego. They indicated that the proposed 18-month higher sulfate concentration is environmentally insignificant and would not cause a noticeable impact to the Pacific Ocean. This is consistent with our previous findings discussed in the San Onofre, Unit 1 Final Environmental Statement (FES), that these proposed sulfate concentrations do not cause an environmental impact to the Pacific Ocean. Since the proposed 18-month increase of sulfate is temporary and still insignificant compared with the ambient concentrations, the assessment of sulfate discharge being environmentally insignificant in the FES for Unit 1 is still valid and acceptable.

Based on the above, we conclude that a temporary increase in sulfate concentration to permit the Units 2 and 3 startup flushing is acceptable as proposed.

We have evaluated the potential for environmental impact of plant operation in accordance with the enclosed amendment. The amendment applies only to temporarily increasing discharge of sulfate at environmentally insignificant concentrations. We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or an increase in power level, and will not result in any environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to $10~\mathrm{CFR}~\S51.5(d)(4)$ that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Since the amendment only permits a temporary increase in the concentration of sulfate in the effluent and is environmentally insignificant, it does not involve significant new safety information of a type not considered by a previous Commission safety review of the facility. It does not involve a significant increase in the probability

or consequences of an accident, does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, and therefore does not involve a significant hazards consideration. We have also concluded that there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by this action and that the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

A copy of the related Notice of Issuance is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by: Dennis L. Ziemann

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief Operating Reactors Branch #2 Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:

- Amendment No. 41 to DPR-13
- Notice of Issuance

cc w/enclosures: See next page

Dócket 50-206

Local PDR

ORB#2 RDG

NRR RDG

DEisenhut

BGrimes

HSmith -

ABurger

Attorney, OELD

BScharf(10)

DISTRIBUTION

DBrinkman

BHarless

ACRS(16)

RDiggs

GLear

TERA

DDavis

JRBuchanan

HDenton

OPA(CMiles)

NRC PDR

RVollmer

TCarter

WRussell

OI&E(5)

BJones (4)

OFFICE≯	DOR ORB#2	DOR:ORB#2	OELD N	DOR:ORB#2	DOR ADAS &P	T
SURNAME >	HSm/tth:sah	ABurger 🚜	WICHARDER	DLZiemann	RHOOMmer	
DATE→	6/ (779	6/ 15 /79 (V	6/13/79	6/ 1/79	6/8/ 79	
	1 1	•	<u> </u>	· l	<u>i</u>	

A spend to and ca Muston	icals and
Nazel HAMBO Cherce In Affect of	1 1 - 170
William O. Miller, Chief License Fee Management Branch, ADM "Suffete Discharge" Date: Amended Form Date:	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
FACILITY AMENDMENT CLASSIFICATION - DOCKET NO(S). 50-206	
Licensee: Southern Caly, Ed.	
Diant Name and Unit(s): Sam Orthopel	
license No(s): DPR -13 Mail Control No:	- 3/7
Request Dated: 5/4/79 Fee Remitted: Yes	No_\
_Assigned TAC No:	V VI
Licensee's Fee Classification: Class I, II, III, IV,	, vi,
None Date of Issuance 6/18	19
Allertamente no.	Section
1. This request has been reviewed by DOR/DPM in accordance with 9 170.22 of Part 170 and is properly categorized.	\\.
2. This request is incorrectly classified and should be properly as Class Justification for classification or reclassif	categorized \ ication:
	request:
3. Additional information is required to properly categorize the	er mination
a la la la constante de la con	7 DRY
4. This request is a Class type of action and is exempted from the company of the company o	m fees because
7 T *	6-18-79
(a) was filed by a nonprofit educational institution,(b) was filed by a Government agency and is not for a	DATE
power reactor,	
(c) is for a Class (can only be a I, II, or III) and the first commission request dated	mendment
which results from a written Commission request dated for the application and the amendment is to simplify controls.	or clarify
license or technical specifications, has only minor sa significance, and is being issued for the convenience	ilety
Commission, or	
(d)other (state reason therefor):	
146/4/79	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
HS 6/4/19 Dennis L Zumani	·
VI Burnis A Jumani	
Division of Operating Reactors/Project Management	agement
The above request has been reviewed and is exempt from fees.	
Affiched: William O. Miller, Chief License Fee Management Branch	Date
LFMB 6/78 License Fee Management Branch	•

CC Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel Southern California Edison Company Post Office Box 800 Rosemead, California 91770

David R. Pigott
Samuel B. Casey
Chickering & Gregory
Three Embarcadero Center
Twenty-Third Floor
San Francisco, California 94111

Jack E. Thomas Harry B. Stoehr San Diego Gas & Electric Company P. O. Box 1831 San Diego, California 92112

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Robert J. Pate P. O. Box 4167 San Clemente, California 92672

Mission Viejo Branch Library 24851 Chrisanta Drive Mission Viejo, California 92676

Mayor City of San Clemente San Clemente, California 92672

Chairman Board of Supervisors County of San Diego San Diego, California 92101

** California Department of Health ATTN: Chief, Environmental Radiation Control Unit Radiological Health Section 714 P Street, Room 498 Sacramento, California 95814

** (w/copy of incoming dtd 5/4/79)

Director, Technical Assessment
Division
Office of Radiation Programs
(AW-459)
U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Region IX Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
215 Freemont Street
San Francisco, California 94111