



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO.41 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-41

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, ET AL.

PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. STN 50-528

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 25, 1988 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 changes to the Technical Specifications for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (Appendix A to Facility Operating License No. NPF-41. The proposed changes would revise Technical Specification (TS) Table 3.3-5, "Engineered Safety Features Response Times" by adding a footnote to the Control Room Essential Filtration (CREF) Actuation function which would exempt the radiation detectors from response time testing. In addition, editorial corrections would also be implemented.

2.0 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

Arizona Nuclear Power Project (ANPP) has proposed the exemption of response time testing of the radiation detectors associated with the 18 month surveillance requirement of the CREF Actuation function on the basis that the simulation of a radiation signal is not required, per IEEE Standard 338-1977. This Standard states in part that "In general, incident environmental conditions such as seismic events, radiation fields, extreme pressures, temperatures, and moisture conditions are covered by design qualification and need not be simulated."

Notwithstanding the fact that the above statement is not applicable to this proposed change in that "incident environmental conditions" do not include the process variable itself, the proposed exemption of the radiation detectors was previously reviewed and accepted by the staff during the licensing review of Palo Verde Units 2 and 3. The Technical Specifications for Palo Verde Units 2 and 3 already include the above stated exemption. Since all three Palo Verde Units are of the same standardized design, the proposed exemption is equally applicable to Unit 1. Furthermore, surveillance testing for the functionality of the radiation detectors are verified on a monthly basis, per Administrative Procedure 36ST-9SQ01, "Radiation Monitoring Monthly Functional Test Procedure." As such, we conclude that the proposed change is acceptable. We also find the editorial corrections to be appropriate and acceptable.

8901190143 881228
PDR ADOCK 05000528
P PNU



3.0 CONTACT WITH STATE OFFICIAL

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

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment involves changes to the surveillance requirements of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amount, and no significant change in the type, of any effluent that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued proposed findings that the amendment involves no significant hazard consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need to be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 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 the amendment 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 changes are acceptable.

Principal Contributor:

T. Chan

Dated: December 28, 1988

