



SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT □ 6201 S Street, Box 15830, Sacramento, California 95813; (916) 452-3211

July 9, 1980

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. Robert W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors, Branch No. 4
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Docket No. 50-312
Proposed Amendment No. 67
Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating
Station, Unit No. 1

Dear Mr. Reid:

Two license items have recently been brought to the District's attention by our NRC Resident Inspector. The Technical Specifications are being clarified and only have minor safety significance.

The two items are:

- 1) The original Technical Specifications for Rancho Seco Unit 1 approved August 16, 1974 contained Figure 6.2-1 "Plant Organization Chart." The chart specifically designated the position of Senior Control Room Operator to have an AEC license. When Amendment No. 24 was forwarded to your office on February 21, 1978, describing the Rancho Seco staff reorganization, it contained a typo which designated the position of Senior Control Room Operator to have a Senior Operators License. Proposed Amendment No. 67 corrects this error.
- 2) The original Technical Specifications for Rancho Seco Unit 1 approved August 16, 1974 contained Paragraph 4.1.1 which requires Surveillance Testing when the reactor is critical. An interpretation could be that no testing is required when the unit is subcritical. The District has agreed that during plant shutdowns specific equipment required for nuclear safety will continue to be tested as required in Technical Specifications Table 4.1-1. Proposed Amendment No. 67 clarifies this commitment.

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District proposes to amend its operating license DPR-54 for Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station No. 1, by submitting Proposed Amendment No. 67 on July 9, 1980. Today, we are submitting forty (40) copies of Proposed Amendment No. 67

which incorporates the pertinent and applicable changes suggested and required by your staff. This submittal is exempt from the requested Class III fee under the provision of Footnote 2 to 10 CFR 170.22. Footnote 2 does permit the exemption of certain types of license amendments from fees. These are:

- 1) Those in fee Classes I, II and III which result from written Commission request provided that they have only minor safety significance are to simplify or clarify the license or Technical Specifications and are being issued for the convenience of the Commission, and
- 2) Orders issued by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 2.204.

The Proposed Amendment No. 67 is a clarification and only has minor safety significance and therefore exempt from Class III fees.

Sincerely,

J. J. Mattimoe

J. J. Mattimoe
Assistant General Manager
and Chief Engineer

JJM:RWC:jr

Sworn to and subscribed before me
this 9th day of July, 1980.

Patricia K. Geisler
Notary Public

