



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 51 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-41,
AMENDMENT NO. 37 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-51
AND AMENDMENT NO. 23 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-74
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, ET AL.
PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3
DOCKET NOS. STN 50-528, STN 50-529, AND STN 50-530

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 26, 1989 as superseded March 16, 1990, the Arizona Public Service Company (APS) on behalf of itself, the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, Southern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, Units 1, 2, and 3 (Appendix A to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-41, NPF-51, and NPF-74, respectively). The proposed changes would revise Technical Specification Section 6.5.1 Plant Review Board (PRB) and Section 6.5.2 Technical Review and Control Activities. The proposed amendments reflect an organizational change and change the composition of the PRB in that specific titles of the members are being deleted and replaced with a generic phrase. The proposed changes also delete the review of administrative control procedures and changes that do not affect nuclear safety from the PRB responsibilities.

2.0 DISCUSSION

The licensee has proposed to change TS 6.5.1.2, Plant Review Board (PRB) composition, by replacing the titles of PRB members with the requirement that the PRB will be composed of nine members from the Palo Verde management staff as designated by the Plant Director in Administrative Procedures. The areas of responsibility of the PRB members will also be located in Administrative Procedures. Changes to these procedures are made in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59. In addition, as part of the composition change, the makeup of the PRB will be from management personnel which would allow decisions to be made and approved at an appropriate level. The staff concludes that the proposed TS 6.5.1.2 is acceptable because it defines the number and qualifications of the PRB members.

9007170355 900702
PDR ADOCK 05000528
P PDC



Handwritten marks or scribbles in the top right corner.

The licensee has proposed to change TS 6.5.1.6, Plant Review Board Responsibilities, by deleting the review of administrative control procedures and changes that do not affect nuclear safety. The purpose of the PRB is that it shall function to advise the Plant Director on all matters relating to nuclear safety. The proposed amendments will allow the PRB to review in greater detail safety significant items. However, the PRB will continue reviewing administrative control procedures as they relate to nuclear safety as well as procedures which may have an impact on operation of the units. In addition, TS Section 6.5.2.1 states that the Director, Standards and Technical Support shall assure that each procedure and program required by Specification 6.8 and other procedures which affect nuclear safety is prepared by a qualified individual or organization. Each such procedure shall be reviewed by an individual or group other than the one which prepared the procedure, however, they may be from the same organization as the individual which prepared the procedure. For these reasons, the staff concludes that the proposed TS 6.5.1.6 is acceptable.

The proposed change also revises TS 6.5.1.7a to correctly reference 6.5.1.6b in lieu of 6.5.1.6c, based on the deletion of the above requirement to review administrative control procedures and changes. Finally, the proposed amendment corrects individuals' titles based on organizational changes and would also delete the term station nuclear production in TS 6.5.2.4. These are editorial and administrative changes, and therefore, are acceptable.

On the basis of its review, the staff concludes that the licensee has provided an acceptable evaluation of these items. Accordingly, the staff finds the proposed changes to be acceptable.

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 amendments change recordkeeping, reporting or administrative procedures or requirements. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these 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 be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

