

Docket No. 50-206

## REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY

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

AUG 16 1979

Dear Mr. Drake:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 45 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13 for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1 (San Onofre, Unit 1). The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your request dated July 31, 1979.

The amendment allows simultaneous chlorination of both condenser halves and an increase of the chlorination time during special fish impingement studies required under Section 316(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The current Appendix B Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS) in Subsection 2.2.1 "Biocides" limit the maximum chlorination time per condenser half to 30 minutes per 24 hours for no more than 4 months and a maximum of 15 minutes per hour for the remainder of the year. The two condenser halves are not to be chlorinated simultaneously. The Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) at the outlet of the condenser half being chlorinated is not to exceed 1.0 ppm.

This ETS change would allow an increased chlorination time of 10 minutes per 24 hours and simultaneous chlorination of both condenser halves. The time of each chlorine injection would not exceed 5 minutes with up to 8 times per 24 hours (40 minutes total, maximum). The TRC at the condenser outlet would not exceed 0.5 ppm. This portion of the 316(b) demonstration study should take no more than three days each year.

7909180 565

The use of chlorine (sodium hypochlorite) in the 316(b) demonstration study will result in a TRC concentration in the immediate vicinity of the discharge of less than 0.1 ppm for no more than 40 minutes per 24 hours for 3 days for the entire station. Only those organisms already entrained in the circulating water system will be exposed to chlorine levels high enough to induce their impingement on the traveling screens. Chlorine (TRC) will be discharged from Unit 1 between 0.1 and 0.5 ppm which is below the currently allowable limit of 1.0 ppm (as measured at the condenser outlet). The 40 minutes per 24 hours simultaneous condenser chlorination time proposed by the licensee is only 30 minutes more of chlorination for the entire study than the current ETS allows. Based on the low chlorine levels and the short chlorination periods, no adverse environmental effects are expected.

KB  
CP  
Z

OFFICE:   
BURNHAM:   
DATE:   
The 40 minutes per 24 hours simultaneous condenser chlorination time proposed by the licensee is only 30 minutes more of chlorination for the entire study than the current ETS allows. Based on the low chlorine levels and the short chlorination periods, no adverse environmental effects are expected.

AUG 16 1979

from the use of sodium hypochlorite in the 3-day 316(b) demonstration study. The use of sodium hypochlorite solution for inducing fish impingement will not result in any modifications to, or change typical operation of the circulating water system. Further, monitoring will be conducted to assure that all ETS parameters affected by the 316(b) study will be maintained within required limits. The use of sodium hypochlorite solution in the manner proposed by the licensee will not result in a condition which significantly alters the impact of San Onofre Unit 1 on the environment.

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit for San Onofre, Unit 1 issued by the California Regional Water Quality Board (The Board) sets a discharge limit for TRC at 1.0 ppm. We discussed the licensee's proposal with the Board in San Diego. They indicated that the 3-day 316(b) demonstration study is environmentally insignificant and would not cause a noticeable impact. In our Final Environmental Statement (FES) for San Onofre, Unit 1, chlorination was discussed and was found to be environmentally acceptable. The proposed chlorination scheme for the 316(b) study is temporary (3 days) and still insignificant. Therefore, the assessment in the FES for Unit 1, that the chlorine discharge is insignificant, is still valid and acceptable.

Based on the above, we conclude that the chlorination scheme to accommodate the 316(b) fish impingement study 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 changing the condenser chlorination scheme 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 CFR 51.5(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 change in the condenser chlorination scheme which 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

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

Mr. James H. Drake

- 3 -

AUG 16 1979

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:

1. Amendment No. 45 to License No. DPR-13
2. Notice of Issuance

cc w/enclosures:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket  
NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
ORB #2 Reading  
NRR Reading  
Deisenhut  
RHVollmer  
HSmith  
ABurger  
EOLD  
IE (5)  
BJones (4)  
BScharf (10)  
DBrinkman  
BHarless  
GLear  
ACRS (16)  
OPA (CMiles)  
RMDiggs  
HRDenton  
JRBuchanan  
TERA  
DCrutchfield  
RRomano

OFFICE ➤	DOR:ORB #2	DOR:ORB #2	CELD	DOR:ORB #2	DOR:AD/SEP
SURNAME ➤	ABurger:ah	HSmith	W. C. ...	DLZiemann	RHVollmer
DATE ➤	8/15/79	8/15/79	8/16/79	8/16/79	8/16/79

Mr. James H. Drake

- 4 -

AUG 16 1979

cc w/enclosures:

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/cy of incoming dtd 7/31/79)

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