

November 22, 1994

Mr. John J. Barton
Vice President and Director
GPU Nuclear Corporation
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Post Office Box 388
Forked River, NJ 08731

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION - (TAC NO. M89782)

Dear Mr. Barton:

Enclosed is a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact related to your application for amendment dated June 24, 1994, as supplemented September 30, 1994. The proposed amendment would delete Technical Specification Section 2.3.0 and its associated bases. The amendment would remove the limiting safety system setting for a high recirculation flow reactor scram based on a maximum attainable recirculation flow analysis.

The assessment is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

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

Docket No. 50-219

Enclosure: Environmental Assessment

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File
PUBLIC
PDI-4 File
SVarga
JZwolinski
PMcKee
ADromerick
SNorris
OGC
EJordan, D/AEOD
ACRS (4)
OPA
JRogge, RGI

9411280076 941122
PDR ADDCK 05000219
P PDR

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DROMERICK\M89782.ENV

OFFICE	LA:PDI-4	PM:PDI-4	D:PDI-4	OGC	
NAME	SNorris	ADromerick	PMcKee	WSD	
DATE	10/ /94 10/31	10/ /94	10/ /94	10/ /94	10/ /94



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 22, 1994

Mr. John J. Barton
Vice President and Director
GPU Nuclear Corporation
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Post Office Box 388
Forked River, NJ 08731

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION - (TAC NO. M89782)

Dear Mr. Barton:

Enclosed is a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact related to your application for amendment dated June 24, 1994, as supplemented September 30, 1994. The proposed amendment would delete Technical Specification Section 2.3.0 and its associated bases. The amendment would remove the limiting safety system setting for a high recirculation flow reactor scram based on a maximum attainable recirculation flow analysis.

The assessment is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alexander W. Dromerick, Sr." with a stylized flourish at the end.

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

Docket No. 50-219

Enclosure: Environmental Assessment

cc w/encl: See next page

Mr. John J. Barton
Vice President and Director

Oyster Creek Nuclear
Generating Station

cc:

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

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

BWR Licensing Manager
GPU Nuclear Corporation
1 Upper Pond Road
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Mayor
Lacey Township
818 West Lacey Road
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Licensing Manager
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Mail Stop: Site Emergency Bldg.
Post Office Box 388
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Resident Inspector
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 445
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Kent Tosch, Chief
New Jersey Department of
Environmental Protection
Bureau of Nuclear Engineering
CN 415
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Robert Hargrove (5)
Environmental Review Coordinator
26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10278

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONGPU NUCLEAR CORPORATIONDOCKET NO. 50-219OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATIONENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OFNO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-16, issued to GPU Nuclear Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, located in Ocean County, New Jersey.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTIdentification of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would delete Technical Specification Section 2.3.0 and its associated bases. The amendment would remove the limiting safety system setting for a high recirculation flow reactor scram based on a maximum attainable recirculation flow analysis.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated June 24, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated September 30, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would delete the high recirculation flow scram setpoint of $\geq 117\%$ of rated flow since the licensee has analytically demonstrated that the flow scram setpoint is not necessary.

9411280074

XA

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that deletion of the high recirculation flow reactor scram based on a maximum attainable flow analysis performed by the licensee with respect to safety system settings and thermal safety limit analyses is acceptable.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action:

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request. Such action would not enhance the protection of the environment.

Alternative Use of Resources:

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

The NRC staff consulted with the New Jersey State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated June 24, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated September 30, 1994, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of November 1994.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Phillip F. McKee, Director
Project Directorate I-4
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation