

SAFETY EVALUATION

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT 2

DOCKET NO. 50-361

Introduction

By letter dated March 12, 1982 the Southern California Edison Company, the licensee, requested a change to the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2 Technical Specifications, Section 3.4.8.3.1.a (Overpressure Protection Systems), to clarify the ASME Section III Code setpoint requirements for the Shutdown Cooling System (SDCS) relief valve (PSV 9349). The Technical Specifications currently require that the SDCS relief valve left setpoint be equal to or less than 402 psig. The licensee's proposal is to change the relief valve setpoint to 406 + 10 psig at ambient temperature.

Evaluation

By letter dated March 12, 1982 the licensee requested that the SDCS relief valve lift setpoint be changed from 402 psig to 406 + 10 psig. The ASME Section III Code left setpoint of the SDCS relief valve, as installed, is 402 psig at a design temperature of 400 F and 406 psig at ambient temperature. The proposed setpoint of 406 + 10 psig envelopes the required relief valve lift setpoints to provide the required reactor coolant system overpressure protection for the 0-5 year reactor coolant system pressure-temperature curves and is consistent with the ASME Code tolerances for these valves in this pressure range.

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.

8205030007

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Conclusion

Based upon our evaluation of the proposed change to the San Onofre, Unit 2 Technical Specifications, we have concluded, 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. We, therefore, conclude that the proposed changes are acceptable.

Dated: March 30, 1982

OFFICE ▶	DL: [Signature]	DL: [Signature]					
SURNAME ▶	HRoad:ph	F. [Signature]					
DATE ▶	3/30/82	3/30/82					