



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 30 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-41,
AMENDMENT NO. 17 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-51
AND AMENDMENT NO. 5 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-74
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, ET AL.
PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1, 2 AND 3
DOCKET NOS. STN 50-528, STN 50-529 AND STN 50-530

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 22, 1987, the Arizona Public Service Company (APS) on behalf of itself, the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, Southern California Edison Company, El Paso Electric Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and Southern California Public Power Authority (licensees), requested a change to the Technical Specifications for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3 (Appendix A to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-41, NPF-51 and NPF-74, respectively). The application requests a change to Section 6, "Administrative Controls," of the Technical Specifications to reflect a proposed change to the due date requirement for the annual radiological reports required by T.S. 6.9.1.4.

2.0 DISCUSSION

The current Technical Specifications require that the annual radiological reports described in T.S. 6.9.1.5 be submitted prior to March 1 of each year. The proposed change would modify this to require submission of the reports within the first calendar quarter of each year.

The licensees state that the current Technical Specification requirement is not consistent with the requirements of 10 CFR 20.407, which requires annual radiological reports to be submitted "within the first quarter of each calendar year...". The licensees further state that the potential for reports to be sent in late exists due to the inconsistency in the reporting requirements.

3.0 EVALUATION

The proposed change is administrative in nature, making the reporting requirements in Technical Specification 6.9.1.4 consistent with the reporting requirements in 10 CFR 20.407. The change does not affect any equipment important to safety or any accident analyses; therefore the

THE
OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF TEXAS
AUGUST 19, 1900

TO THE HONORABLE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE
LAND OFFICE
AT DALLAS, TEXAS

YOUR LETTER OF THE 14TH INSTANT IS RECEIVED AND THE MATTER IS UNDER CONSIDERATION.

THE LAND OFFICE HAS BEEN ADVISED BY THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE THAT THE
LANDS IN QUESTION ARE NOT SUBJECT TO
THE OPERATION OF THE ACT OF MARCH 19, 1891,
AS AMENDED BY THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879,
AND THAT THE SAME ARE SUBJECT TO THE
OPERATION OF THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879,
AS AMENDED BY THE ACT OF MARCH 19, 1891.

VERY RESPECTFULLY,
YOUR Obedient Servant,
ATTORNEY GENERAL

probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not be increased, and the possibility of a new or different kind of accident will not be created. The change in no way affects any LCOs or surveillance requirements in the Technical Specifications, thereby maintaining the margin of safety they provide.

Based on the above, the staff concludes that the proposed change to Specification 6.9.1.4 is acceptable.

4.0 CONTACT WITH STATE OFFICIAL

The Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency has been advised of the proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration with regard to this change. No comments were received.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The amendments involve an administrative change. Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need to be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. We, therefore, conclude that the proposed change is acceptable.

Principal Contributor: M. Davis

Dated: March 7, 1988

