



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

SAFETY EVALUATION  
AMENDMENT 5 to NPF-10  
SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT 2  
DOCKET NO. 50-361

Introduction

By letter dated July 9, 1982, the licensee requested that the date for completion of control room ventilation system modifications required by condition 2.C(8) of the San Onofre Unit 2 Operating License, NPF-10, be changed from August 1, 1982 to November 1, 1982. The licensee also requested that the associated Technical Specification, 4.7.5, be changed, effective as of the date that the modification to the control room ventilation system is complete. Our evaluation of the proposed change and the associated Technical Specification modification is given below.

Evaluation

In Supplement Number 2 to the San Onofre Unit 2 and 3 Safety Evaluation Report (NUREG-0712), the staff completed its review of control room habitability. The review was conducted in accordance with Section 6.4 of the SRP (NUREG-0800) and Item III.D.3.4 of NUREG-0737 and there were no open items.

Subsequently, the licensee conducted air tests to demonstrate the effectiveness of the control room ventilation system when operated in the pressurization mode. The tests were to show that the control room could be pressurized to 1/8" water gauge as the licensee had committed. The licensee concluded that the system as originally installed could not achieve 1/8" water gauge pressure and that it was necessary to make modifications to the ventilation system design. The air tests did, however, demonstrate the original system could pressurize the control room to 0.04" water gauge.

The staff and the licensee met on January 21, 1982 in Bethesda to discuss the licensee's proposed changes and the schedule for those modifications. The licensee provided justification for operation prior to making the modifications and formally submitted documentation on these changes in its submittal dated January 27, 1982. In that submittal, the licensee indicated that the control room modifications would be in place by August 1, 1982, and that the modifications would permit the control room to be pressurized to 1/8" water gauge. The licensee indicated that the modifications could not be accomplished prior to fuel loading (February 1982) and operation above 5% power (scheduled for August 1982).

On the basis of the licensee's presentation in the January 21, 1982 meeting and on the staff's review of the formal submittal dated January 27, 1982, the staff found the analysis to be conservative. Calculated radiation doses were less than the GDC-19 guideline values and the chlorine analysis indicated acceptable concentration limits without taking credit for cleanup by the control room recirculation charcoal filters.

The staff concluded that operation until the modifications were completed (August 1, 1982) was acceptable because the licensee has demonstrated that the original system can provide 0.04" water gauge pressurization, which will provide substantial protection against both toxic gases and airborne radiation, and the licensee has committed to bringing this pressure up to 1/8" water gauge by the installation of:

1. seismically qualified low leakage dampers on the normal ventilation system ducts; and
2. a larger seismically qualified-safety grade ventilation system fan motor.

The San Onofre Unit 2 Operating License was conditioned to require that the modifications specified above be in place by August 1, 1982 and to require that with these modifications in place the licensee demonstrate that the control room can be pressurized to 1/8" water gauge. Finally, we required that the control room be periodically tested in accordance with the provisions of the Standard Technical Specifications.

Subsequently, in a meeting in Bethesda on June 24, 1982, and in a letter dated July 9, 1982, the licensee requested an extension of the schedule because of delays associated with the delivery of the larger, seismically qualified-safety grade fan motor identified above. The licensee proposed to complete the work by November 1, 1982 rather than August 1, 1982. In considering the request, the staff notes that the licensee has stated that the low leakage dampers are installed and will be operational by August 1, 1982. Even without the new fan motor, the new low leakage dampers will provide significant additional protection for the control room operators prior to replacement of the original fan motor.

As a result, the staff concludes that the completion of the control room habitability system modification, as previously described by the licensee and as identified above, by November 1, 1982 versus August 1, 1982, is acceptable.

The ventilation system change required a change in Technical Specification 4.7.5, Control Room Emergency Air Cleanup System, to reflect the new system air flow rate and heater capacity. We have reviewed the proposed revision to Technical Specification 4.7.5 and find it acceptable because it properly reflects the proposed system changes.

#### Environmental Consideration

We have determined that this amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amount nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that this amendment involves 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 statement.

#### Conclusion

Based upon our evaluation of the proposed changes to the San Onofre, Unit 2 Technical Specifications, we have concluded that: (1) because this amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, this amendment does not involve a significant safety 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. We, therefore, conclude that the proposed changes are acceptable.

Dated: JUL 30 1982