Docket No.: 50-272/311

Mr. Corbin A. McNeill, Jr. Senior Vice President - Nuclear Public Service Electric and Gas Company Post Office Box 236 Hancocks Bridge. New Jersev 08038

Dear Mr. McNeill:

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT-APPENDIX J EXEMPTION, SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1

AND 2 (TAC NOS. 59527 AND 59528)

By letters dated April 11 and August 29, 1986, and March 13, 1987, you requested a partial exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, III.D.2(b)(ii) for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2. Based on our assessment, we have concluded that there are no significant radiological or non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption and no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

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

Sincerely,

/s/ Walter R. Butler, Director Project Directorate PDI-2 Division of Reactor Projects I/II

Enclosure:

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

cc w/enclosure: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File

EJordan JPartlow

NRC PDR Local PDR

DFischer/MThadani

PDI-2 Reading

MO'Brien w/incoming(2)

SVarga

ACRS (10)

BBoger

GPA/PA

OGC-Bethesda

BClayton

RGa 110

8708030357 870728

ADOCK 05000272 PDR

DFischer:ca

05/20/87



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

July 28, 1987

Docket No.: 50-272/311

Mr. Corbin A. McNeill, Jr.
Senior Vice President - Nuclear
Public Service Electric and Gas
Company
Post Office Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

Dear Mr. McNeill:

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT-

APPENDIX J EXEMPTION, SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1

AND 2 (TAC NOS. 59527 AND 59528)

By letters dated April 11 and August 29, 1986, and March 13, 1987, you requested a partial exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, III.D.2(b)(ii) for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2. Based on our assessment, we have concluded that there are no significant radiological or non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption and no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

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

Sincerely,

Walter R. Butler, Director Project Directorate PDI-2

Division of Reactor Projects I/II

Enclosure:

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

Mr. C. A. McNeill
Public Service Electric & Gas Company

Salem Nuclear Generating Station

cc:

S. E. Miltenberger Vice President - Nuclear Operations Nuclear Department P. O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire Conner and Wetterhahn Suite 1050 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20006

Richard Fryling, Jr., Esquire Law Department - Tower 5E 80 Park Place Newark, NJ 07101

Gene Fisher, Bureau Chief Bureau of Radiation Protection 380 Scotch Road Trenton, NJ 08628

Mr. John M. Zupko, Jr. General Manager - Salem Operations Salem Generating Station Post Office Box E Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Robert Traae, Mayor Lower Alloways Creek Township Municipal Hall Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Thomas Kenny, Resident Inspector Salem Nuclear Generating Station U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Drawer I Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Richard F. Engel
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Law and Public Safety
CN-112
State House Annex
Trenton, NJ 08625

Frank Casolito, Action Chief Bureau of Radiation Protection Department of Environmental Protection 380 Scotch Road Trenton, NJ 08628

Richard B. McGlynn, Commission Department of Public Utilities State of New Jersey 101 Commerce Street Newark, NJ 07102

Regional Administrator, Region I U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 631 Park Avenue King of Prussia, PA 19406

Lower Alloways Creek Township c/o Mary O. Henderson, Clerk Municipal Building, P.O. Box 157 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Bruce A. Preston, Manager Licensing and Regulation Nuclear Department P. O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NY 08038

Mr. David Wersan Assistant Consumer Advocate Office of Consumer Advocate 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY, ET. AL. SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of a partial exemption from the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et. al. (the licensee) for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, located at the licensee's site in Salem County, New Jersey.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of Proposed Actions: Licensee's request for exemption and the bases therefore are contained in a letter dated April 11, 1986. By letters dated August 29, 1986 and March 13, 1987, the licensee requested a slightly revised exemption that would additionally allow the door seal leakage rate test of III.D.2(b)(iii) to be used when the maintenance affecting the airlocks sealing capability was performed only on the door gaskets. The proposed exemption would partially relieve the licensee from the requirement of conducting a full pressure airlock leakage test, pursuant to Paragraph III.D.2(b)(ii) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, whenever airlocks are opened during periods when containment integrity is not required. Licensee would rely, instead, on the door seal leakage test described in Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) when the airlocks are opened when the reactor is in cold shutdown (Mode 5) or refueling (Mode 6) and

when no maintenance has been performed on the airlock that could affect its sealing ability, unless the maintenance is performed only on the door seals (gaskets) themselves. If maintenance that could affect sealing ability has been performed on an airlock, other than the door gaskets, a full pressure airlock test must still be performed. Door seal testing will be done after each opening, after maintenance which could affect the airlock door gaskets, and prior to establishing containment integrity.

The Need for the Proposed Actions: The proposed exemption is from performance of the leakage rate test required by Paragraph III.D.2(b)(ii) of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, which takes at least 8 hours per airlock. Exemption from full pressure leakage tests on airlocks opened during a period when containment integrity is not required, would provide the licensee with greater plant availability over the lifetime of the plant.

Environmental Impact of Proposed Actions: The proposed exemption would permit the substitution of an airlock seal leakage test (Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) of Appendix J, 10 CFR Part 50) for the full pressure airlock test otherwise required by Paragraph III.D.2.(b)(ii) when the airlock is opened while the reactor is in a cold shutdown or refueling mode. If the tests required by III.D.2(b)(i) and (iii) are current, if no maintenance (other than on door gaskets) has been performed on the airlock, and if the airlock has been properly sealed, this exemption will not affect containment integrity and does not affect the risk of facility accidents. Thus, post-accident radiological releases will not be greater than previously determined nor does the proposed exemption otherwise affect radiological plant effluents, nor result in any

significant occupational exposure. Likewise, the exemption does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact.

Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological or non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Actions: Because we have concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, any alternatives to the exemption will have either no environmental impact or greater environmental impact.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. Such action would not reduce environmental impacts of Salem Units 1 and 2 operations and would result in reduced operational flexibility or unwarranted delays in power ascension.

Alternative Use of Resources: These actions do not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the "Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2," dated April 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: The NRC reviewed the licensee's request that supports the proposed exemption. The NRC staff did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed exemption 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to the proposed actions, see the licensee's requests for the exemption dated April 11, 1986, August 29, 1986, and March 13, 1987, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Salem Free County Public Library, 112 W. Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 28th day of July 1987.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Walter R. Butler, Director Project Directorate I-2

Division of Reactor Projects I/II

TSTRIBUTION w/enclosure ocket File PDI-2 Reading DFischer/MThadani MO'Brien FIngram, GPA/PA

July 28, 1987

DOCKET NO. 50-272/311

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Rules and Procedures Branch Division of Rules and Records

Office of Administration

FROM:

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT:

SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 162 PUBLIC SERVICE KLECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY

One signed original of the Federal Register Notice identified below is enclosed for your transmittal to the Office of the Federal 5 Register for publication. Additional conformed copies () of the Notice are enclosed for your use. Notice of Receipt of Application for Construction Permit(s) and Operating License(s). Notice of Receipt of Partial Application for Construction Permit(s) and Facility License(s): Time for Submission of Views on Antitrust Matters. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License. Notice of Receipt of Application for Facility License(s); Notice of Availability of Applicant's Environmental Report; and Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility License(s) and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. Notice of Availability of NRC Draft/Final Environmental Statement. Notice of Limited Work Authorization. Notice of Availability of Safety Evaluation Report. Notice of Issuance of Construction Permit(s). Notice of Issuance of Facility Operating License(s) or Amendment(s). Order. Exemption. Notice of Granting Exemption. Environmental Assessment. Notice of Preparation of Environmental Assessment. Other:

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: As stated

Contact: M. O'Brien

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NRC FORM 318 (10/80) NRCM 0240

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY, ET. AL. SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of a partial exemption from the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et. al. (the licensee) for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, located at the licensee's site in Salem County, New Jersey.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of Proposed Actions: Licensee's request for exemption and the bases therefore are contained in a letter dated April 11, 1986. By letters dated August 29, 1986 and March 13, 1987, the licensee requested a slightly revised exemption that would additionally allow the door seal leakage rate test of III.D.2(b)(iii) to be used when the maintenance affecting the airlocks sealing capability was performed only on the door gaskets. The proposed exemption would partially relieve the licensee from the requirement of conducting a full pressure airlock leakage test, pursuant to Paragraph III.D.2(b)(ii) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, whenever airlocks are opened during periods when containment integrity is not required. Licensee would rely, instead, on the door seal leakage test described in Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) when the airlocks are opened when the reactor is in cold shutdown (Mode 5) or refueling (Mode 6) and

when no maintenance has been performed on the airlock that could affect its sealing ability, unless the maintenance is performed only on the door seals (gaskets) themselves. If maintenance that could affect sealing ability has been performed on an airlock, other than the door gaskets, a full pressure airlock test must still be performed. Door seal testing will be done after each opening, after maintenance which could affect the airlock door gaskets, and prior to establishing containment integrity.

The Need for the Proposed Actions: The proposed exemption is from performance of the leakage rate test required by Paragraph III.D.2(b)(ii) of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, which takes at least 8 hours per airlock. Exemption from full pressure leakage tests on airlocks opened during a period when containment integrity is not required, would provide the licensee with greater plant availability over the lifetime of the plant.

Environmental Impact of Proposed Actions: The proposed exemption would permit the substitution of an airlock seal leakage test (Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) of Appendix J, 10 CFR Part 50) for the full pressure airlock test otherwise required by Paragraph III.D.2.(b)(ii) when the airlock is opened while the reactor is in a cold shutdown or refueling mode. If the tests required by III.D.2(b)(i) and (iii) are current, if no maintenance (other than on door gaskets) has been performed on the airlock, and if the airlock has been properly sealed, this exemption will not affect containment integrity and does not affect the risk of facility accidents. Thus, post-accident radiological releases will not be greater than previously determined nor does the proposed exemption otherwise affect radiological plant effluents, nor result in any

significant occupational exposure. Likewise, the exemption does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact.

Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological or non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Actions: Because we have concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, any alternatives to the exemption will have either no environmental impact or greater environmental impact.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. Such action would not reduce environmental impacts of Salem Units 1 and 2 operations and would result in reduced operational flexibility or unwarranted delays in power ascension.

Alternative Use of Resources: These actions do not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the "Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2," dated April 1973.

<u>Agencies and Persons Consulted</u>: The NRC reviewed the licensee's request that supports the proposed exemption. The NRC staff did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed exemption 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to the proposed actions, see the licensee's requests for the exemption dated April 11, 1986, August 29, 1986, and March 13, 1987, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Salem Free County Public Library, 112 W. Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 28th day of July 1987.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Walter R. Butler, Director Project Directorate I-2

Division of Reactor Projects I/II