PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PGWE

77 BEALE STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 P O. BOX 7442, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94120

TELEPHONE (415) 781-4211 TELECOPIER (415) 543-7813

ROBERT OHLBACH VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL ATTORNEY

CHARLES T. VAN DEUSEN PHILIPA, CRANE, JR. HENRY J. LAPLANTE JOHN B. GIBSON ARTHUR L. HILLMAN, JR. CHARLES W. THISSELL DANIEL E. GIBSON JACK F. FALLIN, JR. JOSEPH I. KELLY HOWARD V. GCLUB GLENN WEST, JR. ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

SENIOR COUNSEL

DOCKETED USNEC

October 28, 1982

*82 NOV -1 A11:27

GFFICE OF SEURETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Attention: Docketing and Service Branch

Re:

Deviation from License Conditions and Technical Specifications in an Emergency

PROPOSED RULE PR-

Dear Sir:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company is pleased to comment on the proposed rule for "Applicability of License Conditions and Technical Specifications in an Emergency" in the Federal Register of August 18, 1982 (47 FR 35996).

Very truly yours,

Enclosure

Sadd. Charles Phill

8211060377 821028 50 47FR35996 PDR

ENCLOSURE

PGandE Comments on Proposed Rule, "Applicability of License Conditions and Technical Specifications in an Emergency"

PGandE supports the proposed rule change which recognizes the potential need for the licensee to deviate from the license or technical specifications in emergency situations in order to better protect public health and safety. The rule is written in general terms to cover unanticipated situations which may arise. Any attempt to define and limit the situations during which departure from license requirements would be permitted may limit operator action and restrain the operator's ability to protect the public. Therefore we do agree that in emergency situations it is wise to permit the flexibility provided in the proposed rule.

The rule appropriately does not provide the NRC Staff with guidance for determining if enforcement action against the licensee is warranted after the licensee has invoked the rule. We believe the lack of such guidance is certainly justified considering the general nature of the rule. Just as the licensee will determine the need to evoke this rule on a case by case basis, the NRC will similarly need to evaluate if enforcement action is appropriate. The licensee report, as may be required by the NRC following use of the rule, will provide the NRC Staff with the basis for their determination.

Regarding the "Additional Comments of Commissioner Gilinsky," we agree with the proposed rule which provides that the licensed operator shall, as a minimum, obtain concurrence of a licensed Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) prior to taking action contrary to the license. We interpret this provision to mean that concurrence may be obtained from any SRO on shift.