

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 26 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-80

AND AMENDMENT NO. 25 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-82

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-275 AND 50-323

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 10, 1986, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the licensee) requested amendments to the Technical Specifications appended to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82 for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The proposed amendments would clarify the types of radioactivity analyses and lower limits of detection for gaseous effluents from the waste gas decay tanks, the plant vent, containment purge, and the steam generator blowdown tank vent.

2.0 EVALUATION

The amendments are proposed by PG&E in response to an NRC inspection report IR 50-275/85-41 dated January 24, 1986. This report observed that the surveillance requirement for sampling radioactive gases for the containment purge pathway before release did not include sampling for I-131, I-133, and radionuclides in particulate form with half-lives greater than 8 days. This was not consistent with the limiting condition for operation which contains dose rate limits based on these radionuclides.

In response, PG&E revised its procedures to include sampling for iodine and particulates and committed to propose a change to the technical specification to correct the deficiency.

The proposed change adds specific requirements for sampling for I-131, I-133 and particulates, together with appropriate lower limits of detection, and closes out the actions committed to in the PG&E letter of February 24, 1986. The proposed change is fully consistent with the commitments and is acceptable.

In addition, the licensee proposes to clarify the type of activity analysis required for the waste gas decay tank, the plant vent, and the steam generator blowdown tank by the adding term "noble gases" to the sample for principal gamma emitters to avoid the type of confusion that arose with respect to the sample for principal gamma emitters for the containment purge. This clarification is acceptable.

PDR ADOCK 05000275

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve changes in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. We have determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and (3) the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Charles M. Trammell

Dated: December 28, 1987