January 9, 1989

Docket No. 50-412

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
NRC & Local PDRs
Gray File
SVarga
BBoger
SNorris
PTam
OGC
EJordan
BGrimes
ACRS(10)
GPA/PA

Mr. J. D. Sieber, Vice President
Nuclear Group
Duquesne Light Company
Post Office Box 4
Shippingport, PA 15077

Dear Mr. Sieber:

SUBJECT: BEAVER VALLEY UNIT 2 - TRANSMITTAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (TAC 69300)

Enclosed is a copy of an "Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact" for your information. This assessment relates to your application dated August 30, 1988, to revise the Technical Specifications to permit use of high enrichment fuel (up to 4.85 weight-percent U-235) at the Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2.

The assessment has been sent to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Signed by

Peter S. Tam, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate I-4
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

[DOCKET NO. 50-412]

LA:PDI-4	PM:PDI-4	D:PDI-4	OGC
SNorris	PTam:cb	JStolz	Barth
12/13/88	12/14/88	1/9/~~88~~89	1/5/~~88~~89

8901190290 890109
PDR ADOCK 05000412
P PNU

DF01
1/1

Mr. J. Sieber
Duquesne Light Company

cc:

Jay E. Silberg, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Kenny Grada, Manager
Nuclear Safety
Duquesne Light Company
P. O. Box 4
Shippingport, Pennsylvania 15077

William Lacey, Manager
Nuclear Operations Department
Post Office Box 4
Duquesne Light Company
Shippingport, Pennsylvania 15077

John A. Lee, Esquire
Duquesne Light Company
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15279

W.F. Carmichael, Commissioner
Department of Labor
1800 Washington Street East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

John D. Borrows
Director, Utilities Department
Public Utilities Commission
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0573

Beaver Valley Power Station
Units 1 & 2

Bureau of Radiation Protection
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental
Resources
ATTN: R. Janati
Post Office Box 2063
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Mayor of the Borrough of
Shippingport
Post Office Box 3
Shippingport, Pennsylvania 15077

Ashley C. Schannauer
Assistant City Solicitor
City of Pittsburgh
313 City-County Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

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

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 181
Shippingport, Pennsylvania 15077

Director, Pennsylvania Emergency
Management Agency
Post Office Box 3321
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3321

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY

OHIO EDISON COMPANY

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-412

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-73 to Duquesne Light Company (DLC or the licensee), for the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2 located in Shippingport, Pennsylvania.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of Proposed Action:

The proposed amendment would revise the provisions in the Technical Specifications (TS) relating to fuel enrichment.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated August 30, 1988.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed changes are needed so that the licensee can use higher enrichment fuel, and provide the flexibility of extending the fuel irradiation and permitting operation of longer fuel cycles.

8901190291 890109
PDR ADOCK 05000412
P PNU

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The staff has completed its evaluation of the proposed revisions to the Technical Specifications. The proposed revision would permit use of fuel enriched with Uranium 235 up to 4.85 weight percent. The safety considerations associated with reactor operation with higher enrichment and extended irradiation have been evaluated by the NRC staff. The staff has concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes have no adverse effect on the probability of any accident. The increased burnup may slightly change the mix of fission products that might be released in the event of a serious accident but such small changes would not significantly affect the consequences of serious accidents. No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite during normal operation. There is also no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts of reactor operation with higher enrichment and extended irradiation, the proposed changes to the TS involve systems located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. They do not affect nonradiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment fuel and extended irradiation have been discussed in the staff assessment entitled, "NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation," dated July 7, 1988 (53 FR 30355). As indicated therein, the environmental cost

contribution of the proposed increase in the fuel enrichment and irradiation limits are either unchanged or may in fact be reduced from those summarized in Table S-4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c).

Therefore, the staff concludes that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Alternative to the Proposed Action:

Since the staff concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendment. This would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources:

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the "Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2," dated September 1985.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's request and did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The staff has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed license amendment.

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the staff concluded

that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 30, 1988, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. and at the B.F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of January, 1989.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Peter S. Tam

Peter S. Tam, Acting Director
Project Directorate I-4
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation