UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 50-133

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Notice is hereby given that the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 3 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-7 issued to the Pacific Gas and Electric Company which revised Technical Specifications for operation of the Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit No. 3, located near Eureka, California. The amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

This amendment incorporates changes in Section V of the Technical Specifications necessary to permit operation of the Humboldt Bay reactor with the reload core (Cycle 11) by revising the calculated thermal, hydraulic and nuclear characteristics listed in Tables V-2 and V-3.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment is not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated May 1, 1975, (2) Amendment No. 8 to

			1
OFFICE			
BURNAME 🎔		8502110419 851212 PDR FOIA	and a set of the set o
DATE >		FIRESTO85-665 PDR	
Parm AEC.319 (Per 1	2.51) AFCM 0240	A	and the second

License No. DPR-7 with Change No. 50, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 3rd day of June 1975.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Original signed by Dennis L. Ziemann

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief Operating Reactors Branch #2 Division of Reactor Licensing

OPPICE	
SURNAME >	
DATE	
Form AEC-318 (Rev.	53) AECM 0240 Du. s. government printing officei 1874-828-188

- 2 -

to the Technical Specifications for Humboldt Bay Unit 3 dated August 31, 1973. At that time we concluded that operation of the Humboldt Bay reactor with Type IV fuel assemblies would not present a significant hazards consideration and that there was reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public would not be endangered.

The Type IV - Batch 3 fuel assemblies introduced into the reactor during this refueling are identical to the Type IV - Batch 1 fuel assemblies evaluated and approved for Cycle 9 operation and their use does not involve an unreviewed safety question. However, the Humboldt Bay Technical Specifications include a detailed listing of principal thermal, hydraulic and nuclear characteristics which must be changed for each operating cycle.

- Table V-2 compares all of the calculated thermal and hydraulic characteristics for the Cycle 11 core with the same characteristics for the previously approved and operated Cycle 10 core. Only the gross and consequently the total peaking factors are changed from the Cycle 10 core. Because of a different core configuration, these peaking factors will be increased for Cycle 11, However, the the increase is less than 3 percent and is not significant, Because of the larger size core for Cycle 11, the heat flux, fuel center temperatures and average power density are lower and the burnout ratio is larger for Cycle 11 than for Cycle 10. The safety margins of these core characteristics therefore are increased for Cycle 11. All other characteristics remain the same for Cycle 11 as for Cycle 10.
 - 2. Table V-3 provides a comparison of all the calculated nuclear characteristics for Cycle 11 core with the same characteristics for the previously approved and operated Cycle 10 core. Since it is planned to operate the Cycle 11 core for a normal operating period, the core effective multiplication factors are higher than they were for the Cycle 10 core which was to be operated for only half of a period of the core loading pattern and do not represent a significant operation change in the neutronic characteristics of the Cycle 11 core from that present in the approved Cycle 10 core. These changes reflect the core design characteristics and are acceptable.

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does

SURNAME		and the same of a subscription of the same section of the section	
DATE			