

Public Service
Electric and Gas
Company

Steven E. Miltenberger

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 609-339-4199

Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer

DEC 27 1988
NLR-E88537

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-70 AND DPR-75
SALEM GENERATING STATION
UNITS NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the regulations thereunder, Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G) hereby transmits a request for amendment of Facility Operating License DPR-70 and DPR-75 for Salem Generating Station (SGS), Unit Nos. 1 and 2. In accordance with the requirements of 10CFR170.21, a check in the amount of \$150.00 is enclosed. Pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.90(b)(1), a copy of the request has been sent to the State of New Jersey as indicated below.

The attached proposed change deletes the existing Unit Nos. 1 and 2 Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS) and replaces them with the enclosed Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological).

A report entitled , "An Environmental Monitoring Program (1974-1984) on Diamondback Terrapin Nesting and Osprey Nesting/Bald Eagle Occurrence in the Vicinity of Artificial Island," dated March 28, 1985 is also enclosed in support of this request. The monitoring program has continued to be conducted to the present time. The data collected in the years subsequent to this report, support the conclusions of this report. Section 3.1.2.1 of the Unit 1 ETS requires that this monitoring continue for 5 years after Unit 2 becomes operational. Unit 2 became operational in 1981.

This submittal includes one (1) signed original, including affidavit, and thirty-seven (37) copies pursuant to 10CFR50.4(b)(2)(ii).

8901050131 881227
PDR ADOCK 05000272
PNU

A001
w/check \$150
#2564

DEC 27 1988

Should you have any questions on the subject transmittal, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "S. Mittenberger".

Attachment

C Mr. J. C. Stone
Licensing Project Manager

Ms. K. Halvey Gibson
Senior Resident Inspector - Salem

Mr. W. T. Russell, Administrator
Region I

Ms. J. Moon, Interim Chief
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Environmental Quality
Bureau of Nuclear Engineering
CN 415
Trenton, NJ 08625

PROPOSED CHANGE TO
ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS
SALEM GENERATING STATION
UNITS NOS. 1 AND 2

REF:LCR 88-17

Description of Change

Delete the existing Environmental Technical Specifications from Appendix B for both Salem Units 1 and 2 and replace them with the attached Environmental Protection Plan. Adopt the attached Environmental Protection Plan as an administrative replacement for the Environmental Technical Specifications.

Reason for Change

Adoption of the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) in lieu of the Non-radiological Environmental Technical Specifications will provide an up-to-date definition of the Station's environmental review and protection responsibilities to the NRC and standardize environmental requirements for the two units.

Justification for Change

The EPP reflects delegation of responsibility for aquatic environmental monitoring to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Implementation of the EPP also terminates terrestrial monitoring requirements. A summary assessment report entitled, "An Environmental Monitoring Program 1974-1984 on Diamondback Terrapin Nesting and Osprey Nesting/Bald Eagle Occurrence in the Vicinity of Artificial Island," is attached as supporting documentation.

This report concludes that Salem has had no adverse environmental impact on either the diamond terrapin or the osprey/bald eagles. The monitoring program has continued to be conducted to the present time. The data collected in the years subsequent to this report, support the reported conclusions. Section 3.1.2.1 of the Unit 1 Environmental Technical Specifications requires that this monitoring continue for 5 years after Unit 2 becomes operational. Unit 2 became operational in 1981.

Adoption of an EPP for Salem has been strongly encouraged by the NRC and will be administratively controlled by the licensee in the same manner as other non-technical specification plans and programs.

Significant Hazards Consideration

PSE&G has evaluated the hazards consideration involved with the proposed amendment, focusing on the three standards set forth in 10CFR50.92(c) as quoted below:

"The Commission may make a final determination, pursuant to the procedures in paragraph 50.91, that a proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility licensed under paragraph 50.21(b) or paragraph 50.22 or for a testing facility involves no significant hazards consideration, if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not:

- (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or
- (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or
- (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety."

The following evaluation is provided for the significant hazards consideration standards.

1. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. This change merely replaces the present Environmental Technical Specifications with the Environmental Protection Plan and is administrative in nature.

2. Does the change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes do not make any physical changes to the plant or changes in parameters governing normal plant operation. Therefore, the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

As discussed above, the proposed changes are administrative and do not degrade the existing margin of safety. Therefore, changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Conclusion

Based on the above safety evaluation, PSE&G concludes that the activities associated with this license amendment request satisfy the significant hazards consideration standards of 10CFR50.92(c). Accordingly, a no significant hazard consideration finding is justified.