January 6, 1992

Docket No. 50-289

DISTRIBUTION

Docket file	OGC
NRC & L PDRs	RHernan
PDI-4 PLANT	EJordan
SVarga	ACRS (10)
JCalvo	GPA/PA
SNorris	CHehl, RI
GWunder	

Mr. T. Gary Broughton, Vice President
and Director - TMI-1
GPU Nuclear Corporation
Post Office Box 480
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Dear Mr. Broughton:

SUBJECT: THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1 - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT - SPENT FUEL POOL EXPANSION (TAC NO 79289)

By letter dated November 14, 1990, as supplemented June 6, June 14, and September 18, 1991, you requested a license amendment to change the Technical Specifications to accomodate a proposed spent fuel pool expansion at Three Mile Island, Unit 1. Enclosed is our Environmental Assessment related to this proposed action. Based on our assessment, we have concluded that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed spent fuel pool expansion and it will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

We have also enclosed a Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. This notice is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ronald W. Hernan, Sr. Project Manager
Project Directorate I-4
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
1. Environmental Assessment
2. Notice

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

Please make minor corrections on the EA as indicated. RWH

OFC	PDI-4:LA	PDI-4:PM	PDI-4:D	OGC	
NAME	SNorris	RHernan/BaRWH	JStolz		
DATE	12/26/91	12/26/91	12/27/91	12/30/91	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
Document Name: EA 79289 TMI/1

DF01
1/1

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

9201090264 920106
PDR ADOCK 05000289
P PDR

Mr. T. Gary Broughton
GPU Nuclear Corporation

Three Mile Island Nuclear Station,
Unit No. 1

cc:

Michael Ross
O&M Director, TMI-1
GPU Nuclear Corporation
Post Office Box 480
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Michael Laggart
Manager, Licensing
GPU Nuclear Corporation
100 Interpace Parkway
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Robert Knight (Acting)
TMI-1 Licensing Manager
GPU Nuclear Corporation
Post Office Box 480
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20037

Sally S. Klein, Chairperson
Dauphin County Commissioner
Dauphin County Courthouse
Front and Market Streets
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Kenneth E. Witmer, Chairman
Board of Supervisors
of Londonderry Township
25 Roslyn Road
Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania 17022

Francis I. Young
Senior Resident Inspector (TMI-1)
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 311
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Robert B. Borsum
B&W Nuclear Technologies
Suite 525
1700 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Governor's Office of State Planning
and Development
ATTN: Coordinator, Pennsylvania
State Clearinghouse
Post Office Box 1323
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Thomas M. Gerusky, Director
Bureau of Radiation Protection
Pennsylvania Department of
Environmental Resources
Post Office Box 2063
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-289

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Description of Proposed Amendment

By letter dated November 14, 1990, as supplemented June 6, June 14, and September 18, 1991, GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN or the licensee) requested an amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-50 for the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1). The amendment would increase the combined number of spent fuel storage locations in spent fuel pool A from 749 to 1494. The increase in spent fuel pool capacity would be accomplished by removing the existing storage racks and replacing them with free-standing, high-density fuel racks. The new racks are not double-tiered, and will rest on either the fuel pool floor or pool floor plates.

1.2 Need for Increased Storage Capacity

TMI-1 has two spent fuel pools (SFPs) which, at the present time, contain interconnected spent fuel storage racks with a total capacity of 749 storage cells. Because all spent fuel generated so far from operation of the facility has been stored on-site in these pools, the SFPs are approaching their maximum storage capacity. After the completion of the present fuel cycle (Cycle 9), the SFPs will no longer have full-core offload storage capability. This will occur in late 1993. Therefore, to preclude this situation, the licensee will install high density spent fuel storage racks in SFP "A."

The proposed reracking would meet the objective of keeping radiation exposure as low as is reasonably achievable (ALARA). Shielding from the spent fuel assemblies will be assured by maintaining the water level in the pool at or above a minimum level. Protective clothing and respirators will be worn as required by the Radiation Work Permit. The station radiation protection staff will closely monitor and control all aspects of the work.

9201090268 920106
PDR ADOCK 05000289
P PDR

1.3 Alternatives

Commercial reprocessing of spent fuel has not developed as originally anticipated. In 1975, the Commission directred the staff to perform a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) on spent fuel storage. The Commission directed the staff to evaluate alternatives for the handling and storage of spent light water power reactor fuel with particular emphasis on developing long-range policy. The GEIS was to consider alternative methods of spent fuel storage as well as the possible restrictions on termination of the generation of spent fuel through reactor shutdown.

A "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel" (NUREG-0575, Volumes 1-3) was issued by the Commission in August 1979. The finding of the FGEIS is that the environmental costs of interim storage are essentially negligible, regardless of where such spent fuel is stored. A comparison of the impact costs of various alternatives reflects the advantage of continued generation of nuclear power versus its replacement by coal-fired power generation. Continued generation of nuclear power versus its replacement by oil-fired generation provides an even greater economic advantage. In the bounding case considered in the FGEIS, that of shutting down the reactor when the existing spent fuel storage capacity is filled, the cost of replacing nuclear stations before the end of their normal lifetime makes this alternative uneconomical. The storage of spent fuel as evaluated in NUREG-0575 is considered to be an interim action, not a final solution to permanent disposal.

One spent fuel storage alternative considered in detail in the FGEIS is the expansion of the onsite fuel storage capacity by modification of the existing spent fuel pools. Over 100 applications for spent fuel pool expansion have either been approved or are under consideration by the Commission. The finding in each case has been that the environmental impact of such increased storage capacity is negligible. Since there are variations in storage design and limitations caused by spent fuel already in storage, however, the FGEIS recommends that licensing reviews be done on a case-by-case basis, so as to resolve plant-specific concerns.

The continuing validity and site-specific applicability of the conclusions in NUREG-0575 have been confirmed in the Environmental Assessments for the Surry and H.B. Robinson plants' independent spent fuel storage installations.

The licensee has considered several alternatives to the proposed action of the spent fuel pool expansion, including fuel consolidation and dry cask storage. The staff has evaluated these and certain other alternatives with respect to the need for proposed action as discussed in Section 1.2 of this assessment. The following alternatives were considered by the staff:

(1) Shipment of fuel to a permanent Federal fuel storage/disposal facility.

(2) Shipment of fuel to a reprocessing facility.

(3) Shipment of fuel to another utility or site for storage.

(4) Reduction of spent fuel generation.

(5) Construction of a new independent spent fuel storage installation.

(6) No action taken.

Each of these alternatives is discussed below.

(1) Shipment of Fuel to a Permanent Federal Fuel Storage/Disposal Facility

Shipment of fuel to a permanent Federal fuel storage disposal facility is an alternative to increasing the onsite spent fuel storage capacity. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is developing a repository under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (NWPA). The facility, however, is not likely to be able to receive spent fuel until approximately 2010, at the earliest. The existing TMI-1 spent fuel storage pool will lose full core offload capability in 1993. Therefore, spent fuel acceptance and disposal by DOE is not an alternative to increased onsite pool storage capacity.

As an interim measure, shipment to a Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) facility is another alternative to increasing the onsite spent fuel storage capacity. DOE, under the NWPA, has recently submitted its MRS proposal to Congress. Because Congress has not athorizied an MRS, and because one is not projected to be available before 1998, this alternative does not meet the near-term storage needs of TMI-1.

Under the NWPA, the Federal Government has the responsibility to provide not more than 1900 metric tons capacity for the interim storage of spent fuel. The impacts of storing spent fuel at a Federal Interim Storage (FIS) facility fall within those already assessed by the Commission in NUREG-0575. In enacting NWPA, Congress found that the owners and operators of nuclear power stations have the primary responsibility for providing interim storage for spent nuclear fuel. In accordance with the NWPA and 10 CFR Part 53, shipping of spent fuel to an FIS facility is considered a last resort alternative. At this time the licensee cannot take advantage of FIS because existing storage capacity is not maximized.

(2) Shipment of Fuel to a Reprocessing Facility.

Reprocessing of spent fuel from TMI-1 is not viable because there is no operating commercial reprocessing facility in the United States, nor is there the prospect of one in the foreseeable future.

(3) Shipment of Fuel to Another Utility or Site for Storage

The shipment of fuel from TMI-1 to the storage facility of another utility would provide short-term relief from the storage problem. The NWPA and 10 CFR Part 53, however, clearly place the responsibility for the interim storage of spent nuclear fuel with each owner or operator of a nuclear power plant. The shipment of the fuel to another site is not an acceptable alternative since the only other nuclear power plant operated by the licensee is Oyster Creek, which also has a spent fuel storage problem of its own.

(4) Reduction of Spent Fuel Generation

Improved usage of fuel in the reactor and/or operation at a reduced power level would extend the life of the fuel in the reactor. In the case of extended burnup of fuel assemblies, the fuel cycle would be extended, and fewer offloads would take place. Through increasing the enrichment of the fuel, the licensee is already working toward extended fuel cycles. As discussed in item 1, however, full offload capability will be lost in the near future. Operations at reduced power would not make effective use of available resources, and would cause unnecessary economic hardship on the licensee and its customers. Therefore, reduction of the amount of spent nuclear fuel generated is not a practical alternative for TMI-1.

(5) Construction of a New Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI)

Additional storage capacity could be developed by building a new ISFSI. This facility could be either a pool, similar to the existing facility, or a dry storage area. The staff has generically assessed the impacts of the pool alternative and found, as reported in NUREG-0575, that the storage of spent light water reactor fuel in water pools has an insignificant impact on the environment. The staff has not made a generic assessment of the dry storage area; however, assessments for the dry cask ISFSI at the Surry Power Station and the dry modular concrete ISFSI at the H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant and the Oconee Nuclear Station resulted in findings of no significant impact.

While these alternatives are environmentally acceptable, such a new storage facility, either at TMI-1 or offsite, would require new site-specific engineering and design, including equipment for the transfer of spent fuel. Commission review, evaluation, and licensing of such a facility would also be required. It is not likely that this entire effort would be completed in time to meet the need for additional capacity as discussed in item (1). Furthermore, such construction would not use the existing expansion capacity of the existing pool, and thus would waste resources.

(6) No Action Taken

If no action were taken, the storage capacity would become exhausted in the near future and TMI-1 would have to shut down. This alternative is considered a waste of an available resource, TMI-1 itself, and is not considered viable.

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

The only viable long-term alternative solution to the licensee's spent fuel storage problem is the construction of an ISFSI; however, it is not likely that the construction of such a facility could be completed in a timely manner. Furthermore, construction of such a facility would be a waste of available resources, costing the licensee 4-6 times the cost (dollars/KgU) of the proposed reracking.

1.4 Fuel Reprocessing History

Currently, commercial fuel is not being reprocessed in the United States. The Nuclear Fuel Services (NFS) plant at West Valley, New York, was shut down in 1972 for alterations and expansion. In September 1976, NFS informed the Commission that it was withdrawing from the nuclear fuel reprocessing business.

The proposed Allied General Nuclear Services (AGNS) plant in Barnwell, South Carolina, is not yet licensed to operate. The General Electric Company (GE) Morris operation in Morris, Illinois, has been decommissioned.

In 1977, President Carter issued a policy statement on commercial reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel that effectively eliminated reprocessing as part of the near-term nuclear fuel cycle.

Although no plants are licensed for reprocessing fuel, the storage pools at Morris and West Valley are licensed to store spent fuel. The storage pool at West Valley is not full, but the licensee is not presently accepting any additional spent fuel for storage. On May 4, 1982, the license held by GE for spent fuel storage activities at its Morris operation was renewed for another 20 years; however, GE is committed to accept only limited quantities of additional spent fuel for storage at this facility from Cooper and San Onofre Unit 1.

2.0 RADIOACTIVE WASTES

The TMI-1 design contains waste treatment systems designed to collect and process the gaseous, liquid, and solid waste that might contain radioactive material. The radioactive waste treatment systems are evaluated in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) dated December 1972. The proposed rerack will not involve any change in the waste treatment systems described in the FES.

2.1 Radioactive Material Released to the Atmosphere

With respect to releases of gaseous materials to the atmosphere, the only radioactive gas of significance that could be attributable to storing additional spent fuel assemblies for a longer time is the radionuclide Krypton-85 (Kr-85). Experience has demonstrated that after spent fuel has decayed 4 to 6 months, there is no longer a significant release of fission products, including Kr-85, from stored spent fuel containing cladding defects. To determine the average annual release of Kr-85, it was assumed that all of the Kr-85 released from any defective fuel discharged to the spent fuel pool would be released before the next refueling. Enlarging the storage capacity of the spent fuel pool has no effect on the calculated average annual quantities of Kr-85 released to the atmosphere. There may be some small change in the calculated quantities due to a change in fuel burnup; however, this is expected to be a small fraction of the calculated annual quantities. To account for this potential increase, the staff conservatively assumed an additional release of 125 curies/year of Kr-85. Historically, actual Kr-85 releases have been a small fraction of that assumed in the TMI-1 FES. For example, the FES estimates release of 705 curies/year; actual release during 1990 was less than 1.0 curies.

Iodine-131 releases from spent fuel assemblies to the spent fuel pool water will not increase significantly since Iodine-131 will decay to negligible levels between refuelings.

Most of the tritium in the spent fuel pool water results from activation of boron and lithium in the primary coolant and this will not be affected by the proposed changes. A relatively small amount of tritium is contributed during reactor operation by fissioning of reactor fuel and subsequent diffusion of the tritium through the fuel and cladding. Tritium releases from the fuel assemblies occur mainly during reactor operations and, to a limited extent, shortly after shutdown. Thus, expanding the spent fuel pool capacity will not increase the tritium activity in the pool.

Storing additional spent fuel assemblies is not expected to increase the bulk water temperature during normal refueling above the value used in the design analysis. Therefore, it is not expected that there will be any significant change in the annual release of tritium or iodine as a result of the proposed modifications from that previously evaluated in the FES. Most airborne releases of tritium and iodine result from evaporation of reactor coolant, which contains tritium and iodine in higher concentrations than the spent fuel pool. Therefore, even if there were a higher evaporation rate from the spent fuel pool, the resulting tritium and iodine releases would be small in comparison to the amount already evaluated in the FES. The spent fuel pool exhaust system must be operating and discharging through both high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) and charcoal filters whenever spent fuel is stored in the pool, whenever fuel is being moved, and whenever loads are being carried over the pool.

2.2 Solid Radioactive Wastes

Currently, less than 10 cubic feet of solid radioactive waste per year is generated by the spent fuel pool cleanup system. No significant increase in volume of solid radioactive wastes is expected as a result of the expansion of the capacity of the spent fuel pool.

There are eight spent fuel racks (weighing approximately 32,000 pounds) that will be removed from the spent fuel pool and be disposed of. The licensee intends to decontaminate the old racks to the extent possible to minimize the amount of solid radioactive waste generated by the rerack project. That portion of the racks that is not able to be decontaminated will be packaged, shipped to a processing facility for volume reduction (to about 10% of their original volume), and sent to a licensed radioactive waste burial site. The racks will be decontaminated at the Alaron facility near Mars, Pennsylvania and will be disposed of at the Barnwell, South Carolina waste disposal facility.

It is not expected that either the rerack or the disposal of the existing spent fuel storage racks will have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

2.3 Radioactive Material Released to Receiving Waters

There should not be a significant increase in the liquid release of radionuclides from the plant as a result of the modifications. The spent fuel pool cooling and cleanup systems operate as a closed system. The spent fuel pool demineralizer resin removes soluble radioactive materials from the spent fuel pool water. These resins are periodically replaced (i.e., annually) and disposed of as solid radioactive waste. The amount of activity in the resin may increase slightly due to the increased amount of spent fuel in the pool; however, the amount of radioactivity released to the environment as a result of the proposed change would be negligible.

3.0 RADIOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Operating experience shows dose rates of less than 1 mrem/hour at the edge of and above the center of the pools, regardless of the quantity of fuel stored. These dose rates may temporarily increase to about 3 mrem/hr during refueling operations. This is not expected to change with the proposed reracking because radiation levels above the pool are due primarily to activity in the water, which experience shows will return to an equilibrium value. Stored spent fuel is so well shielded by the water in the pool that dose rates at the top of the pool from this source are negligible. Additionally, there has been no crud built up along the sides of the pool. Should crud buildup ever be detected, it could easily be washed down. Furthermore, the water level in the spent fuel pool will be kept as high as possible in order to maintain exposure levels as low as is reasonably achievable. Therefore increased exposure due to this source is considered negligible. There is no noticeable concentration of airborne activity in the area of the spent fuel pool. The spent fuel pool ventilation system maintains a continuous sweep of air across the top of the spent fuel pools and cask loading pit. Additionally, a continuous exhaust flow is maintained from the enclosed top portion of the pools when the top enclosing shields are in place. The exhaust flow is directed to the main auxiliary building filter system where it is passed through roughing, HEPA and charcoal filters before being discharged to the plant vent. The proposed reracking is not expected to increase this activity. Therefore, the staff concludes that the proposed spent fuel pool expansion will not result in any significant long-term increases in doses received by workers.

The total occupational exposure to plant workers as a result of the reracking operation is estimated to be 5-10 person-rem, assuming dose rates between 2.5 mrem/hr to 5 mrem/hr for most of the operation. The effort is estimated to involve above 2000 person hours of work and it is not anticipated that divers will be needed to complete the operation. The reracking operation will utilize detailed procedures prepared with full consideration of ALARA principles. Similar operations have been performed at a number of other facilities in the past and there is every reason to believe that reracking can be safely and efficiently accomplished at TMI-1, with minimum radiation exposure to personnel.

4.0 NONRADIOLOGICAL IMPACT

The only nonradiological effluent affected by the spent fuel pool expansion is the additional spent fuel waste heat rejected from the plant. The total increase in heat load rejected to the environment will be small in comparison to the amount of total heat currently being released. No impact on aquatic life is expected. Thus, the increase in rejected heat will have a negligible effect on the environment.

The licensee has not proposed any change in the use or discharge of chemicals in conjunction with the expansion of the spent fuel pool. The proposed expansion will not require any change to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit. Therefore, the staff concludes that the nonradiological environmental impacts of expanding the spent fuel pool will be insignificant.

5.0 SEVERE ACCIDENT CONSIDERATIONS

The staff, in its related Safety Evaluation to be issued at a later date, has addressed both the safety and environmental aspects of a fuel handling accident. A fuel handling accident bounds the potential consequences of an accident attributable to operation of a spent fuel pool with high density racks. A fuel handling accident may be viewed as a "reasonably foreseeable" design basis event which the pool and its associated structures systems and components (including the racks) are designed and constructed to prevent. The environmental impacts of the accident were found not to be significant.

The staff has considered accidents whose consequences might exceed a fuel handling accident, that is, beyond design basis events. An accident evaluated by the staff involves a structural failure of the spent fuel pool resulting in loss of all contained cooling water followed by fuel heatup and a Zircaloy cladding fire. The details of this severe accident are discussed in NUREG/CR-4982, entitled "Severe Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools in Support of Generic Issue 82." Subsequently, the staff issued NUREG/CR-5176, entitled "Seismic Failure and Cask Drop Analysis of the Spent Fuel Pools at Two Representative Nuclear Power Plants." This report considers the structural integrity of the spent fuel pool and the pool response to the circumstances considered. More recently, the staff issued NUREG/CR-5281, "Value/Impact Analysis of Accident Preventive and Mitigative Options for Spent Fuel Pools" and NUREG-1353 "Regulatory Analysis for the Resolution of Generic Issue 82: Beyond Design Basis Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools." In NUREG-1353, the staff concluded that Generic Issue 82 concerning the possibility of Zircaloy,cladding fires in spent fuel pools was resolved and required no further study.

The staff believes that the probability of severe structual damage occurring at TMI-1 is extremely low. This belief is based upon the Commission's requirements for the design and construction of spent fuel pools and their contents, and on the licensee's adherence to approved industry codes and standards. For example, in the TMI-1 case the pool is an integral part of the auxiliary building which is designed to Seismic Category I standards. The spent fuel storage racks are Seismic Catagory 1 and, thus, are required to remain functional

during and after a safe shutdown earthquake. The cooling water system is extremely reliable. In the unlikely event of a total loss of the cooling system, makeup water sources are available.

The staff acknowledges that if the severe accidents occurred as above the environmental impacts could be significant; however, these events are unlikely and are not reasonably foreseeable in light of the design of the spent fuel pool and racks. Therefore, further discussion of severe accidents is not warranted, and the staff concludes that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

6.0 SUMMARY

The FGEIS on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Reactor Fuel concluded that the cost of the various alternatives reflects the advantage of continued generation of nuclear power with the accompanying spent fuel storage. Because of the differences in spent fuel pool designs, the FGEIS recommended environmental evaluation of spent fuel pool expansions on a case-by-case basis.

The occupational radiation dose for the proposed operation of the expanded spent fuel pool is extremely small compared to the annual occupational exposure for a facility of this type. The small increase in radiation dose should not affect the licensee's ability to maintain individual occupational doses at TMI-1 within the limits of 10 CFR Part 20, and as is low as reasonably achievable. Furthermore, the nonradiological impacts of expanding the spent fuel pool will be insignificant, and none of the alternatives are practical or reasonable.

6.1 Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Commission's Final Environmental Statement, dated December 1972 in connection with TMI-1.

6.2 Agencies and Persons Consulted

The staff reviewed the licensee's request. No other agencies or persons were consulted.

7.0 BASIS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR NOT PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The staff has reviewed the proposed spent fuel pool modification to TMI-1 relative to the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based upon the environmental assessment, the staff has concluded that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed action and that the proposed license amendment will not have a significant effect on the

quality of the human environment. Therefore, the Commission has determined, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31, not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed amendment.

Principal Contributors: G. Wunder
R. Hernan

Date: January 6, 1992

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-289

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-50, issued to the GPU Nuclear Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1) located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

Identification of Proposed Action:

The amendment would consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) and would authorize an increase of the storage capacity of the spent fuel pool from 749 fuel assemblies to 1494 fuel assemblies.

The amendment to the TS is responsive to the licensee's application dated November 14, 1990, as supplemented June 6, June 14 and September 18, 1991. The NRC staff has prepared an Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Action.

Summary of Environmental Assessment:

The "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel" (NUREG-0575), Volumes 1-3, concluded that the environmental impact of interim storage of spent fuel was negligible and the cost of the various alternatives reflects the advantage of continued generation of nuclear power with the accompanying spent fuel storage. Because of the differences in design, the FGEIS recommended evaluating spent fuel pool expansions on a case-by-case basis.

9201090279 920106
PDR ADOCK 05000289
P PDR

For TMI-1, the expansion of the storage capacity of the spent fuel pool will not create any significant additional radiological effects or nonradiological environmental impacts.

The additional whole body dose that might be received by an individual at the site boundary and the estimated dose to the population within an 80 kilometer radius is believed to be too small to have any significance when compared to the fluctuations in the annual dose this population receives from exposure to background radiation. The occupational radiation dose for the proposed operation of the expanded spent fuel pool is estimated to be less than one percent of the total annual occupational radiation exposure for this facility.

The only nonradiological impact affected by the spent fuel pool expansion is the waste heat rejected. The total increase in heat load rejected to the environment will be small in comparison to the amount of total heat currently being released. There is no significant environmental impact attributed to the waste heat from the plant due to this very small increase.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The staff has reviewed the proposed spent fuel pool expansion to the facility relative to the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based on this assessment, the staff concludes that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed action and that the issuance of the proposed amendment to the license will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31, no environmental impact statement needs to be prepared for this action.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment to the Technical Specifications dated November 14, 1990, as supplemented June 6, June 14, and September 18, 1991, (2) the FGEIS on Handling

and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel (NUREG-0575), (3) the Final Environmental Statement for the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 dated December 1972, and (4) the Environmental Assessment dated January 6, 1992.

These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. 20555 and at the local public document room located at the Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of January 1992.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

David H. Jaffe, Acting Director
Project Directorate I-4
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of the Nuclear Reactor Regulation