



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 18 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-7
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
HUMBOLDT BAY POWER PLANT UNIT NO. 3
DOCKET NO. 50-135

Introduction

By letter dated October 20, 1978, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications for Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit No. 3 (the facility), and by letter dated January 24, 1979 the licensee supplemented that request.

Because reactor system containment is not required until power operation resumes, the requested changes provide a one time waiver of the reactor system containment integrated leak rate test until that time. The requested changes also include the following administrative changes to the Technical Specifications:

1. An allowable tolerance for performing surveillance intervals,
2. An additional member for the Plant Staff Review Committee,
3. Correction of a typographical error, and
4. Clarification of General Office Nuclear Power Plant Review and Audit Committee responsibilities.

This Safety Evaluation deals with those proposed changes.

Evaluation

1. It is proposed that the requirement for a containment integrated leakage rate test be waived on a one time basis until immediately prior to returning the facility to power operation. The facility has been shutdown since July 31, 1976. The purpose of an

7908170 532 p

698 261

integrated leakage rate test is to provide confidence in the integrity of the reactor system containment. Technical Specifications do not require reactor system containment until power operation resumes. Therefore the proposed change does not reduce safety and is acceptable.

2. It was proposed that the operational testing of nuclear safeguards systems be performed within the specified time interval with:
 - a. A maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25% of the test interval.
 - b. A total interval time for any 3 consecutive test intervals not to exceed 3.25 times the specified time interval.

The new requirement provides allowable tolerances for performing surveillance activities beyond those specified in the nominal surveillance interval. These tolerances are necessary to provide operational flexibility because of scheduling and performance considerations.

The tolerance values, taken either individually or consecutively over 3 test intervals, are sufficiently restrictive to ensure that the reliability associated with the surveillance activity is not significantly degraded beyond that obtained from the nominal specified interval.

The change is acceptable. The same requirement is used in the Standard Technical Specifications.

3. An additional member (QA Supervisor) is added to the Plant Staff Review Committee. The addition of an additional member will not detract from safety, and so the change is acceptable.
4. The requirement for Plant Staff Review Committee review of the Plant Security Plan and site emergency plan is changed from "biannual" (2/year) to "biennial" (1/2 years) which corrects a typographical error. The proposed change is consistent with current staff requirements and is acceptable.

5. The General Office Nuclear Power Plant Review and Audit Committee responsibilities are clarified so that performance of direct audits (as contrasted to having cognizance over audits) is not required. The staff does not require that offsite safety committees perform audits directly themselves. Sufficient audit assurance is provided by their oversight responsibility. This change is acceptable.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant 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 Section 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.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: July 13, 1979