

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 9 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-12

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY  
SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

INTRODUCTION

By letter, dated November 17, 1982, the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G) requested a change to the Technical Specifications to provide for an independent review of the security plan and its implementing procedures at least once per 12 months.

EVALUATION

A letter dated October 30, 1982, was sent from D. G. Eisenhut of the NRC staff, to all licensees and applicants for operating power reactors and holders of construction permits for power reactors. This letter stated that Section 73.40(d) of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires that each nuclear power reactor licensee provide for an independent review of its safeguards contingency program at least every 12 months. The letter requested a review of the Technical Specifications to assure that they were consistent with the requirements of Section 73.40(d).

On November 17, 1982, the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company responded in a letter from O. W. Dixon, Jr., to H. R. Denton. This letter proposed a modification to the current Technical Specifications to comply with the provisions of Section 73.40(d).

We have reviewed the requested change and concluded that it is acceptable since it complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.40(d).

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent type 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 §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.

OFFICE							
SURNAM	8302170401	830203					
DATL	PDR ADCK	05000395					
	P	PDR					

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, 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, 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.

Date: February 3, 1983

Principal Contributor: Jon Hopkins, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL

OFFICE ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SURNAME ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DATE ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....