



JUN 4 1981

Docket Nos: 50-413 and 50-414

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket Nos. 50-413/414

LB #4 r/f

DEisenhut

EAdensam

KJabbour

JLee

SHanauer

RTedesco

RVollmer

TMurley

RMattson

RHartfield, MPA

OELD

OIE (3)

SLewis

JRutberg

WMiller

ASchwencer

RDiggs

GDeegan

BSharf (10)

bcc: TERA

IE (3)

NRC/PDR

ACRS (16)

L/PDR

ASLAB

OPA

ASLPB

NSIC

Mr. William O. Parker
Vice resident - Steam Production
Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dear Mr. Parker:

SUBJECT: ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATES - CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

In response to your request of April 30, 1981, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued an Order extending the construction completion dates for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The referenced Order extends the construction completion dates specified in CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 to March 1, 1984 and September 1, 1985, respectively.

A copy of the Order, the staff safety evaluation, negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal are enclosed for your information. The Order and the negative declaration have been transmitted to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Darrell G. Eisenhut

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: See next page

8106100158

*KWJ no legal objections
make corrections*

OFFICE	LA/LB #4	LB #4/DL	OELD <i>ML</i>	LB #4/DL	AD/DL	DIR/DL
4E	JLee/hmc	KJabbour	JLavery	EAdensam	RTedesco	DEisenhut
	5/22/81	5/26/81	5/26/81	5/1/81	5/1/81	5/4/81

JUN 4 1981

-2-

Mr. William O. Parker
Vice President - Steam Production
Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

cc: William L. Porter, Esq.
Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.
Debevoise & Liberman
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

North Carolina MPA-1
P.O. Box 95162
Raleigh, North Carolina 27625

Mr. R. S. Howard
Power Systems Division
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Mr. J. C. Plunkett, Jr.
NUS Corporation
2536 Countryside Boulevard
Clearwater, Florida 33515

Mr. Jesse L. Riley, President
Carolina Environmental Study Group
854 Henley Place
Charlotte, North Carolina 28208

Richard P. Wilson, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
S. C. Attorney General's Office
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Walton J. McLeod, Jr., Esq.
General Counsel
South Carolina State Board of Health
J. Marion Sims Building
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

North Carolina Electric Membership Corp.
333 North Boulevard
P.O. Box 27306
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Saluda River Electric Cooperative, Inc.
207 Sherwood Drive
Laurens, South Carolina 29360

James W. Burch, Director
Nuclear Advisory Counsel
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. Peter K. VanDoorn, Resident Inspector
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 11695
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
825 North Capital Street, NE
Washington, D. C. 20426

Chairman
South Carolina Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

JUN 4 1981

cc: County Manager of York County
York County Courthouse
York, South Carolina 29745

State Clearinghouse
Office of the Governor
Division of Administration
1205 Pendleton Street
4th Floor
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dr. Lamar Priester, Jr.
Deputy Commissioner for Environmental
Health and Safety
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Attorney General
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Office of Intergovernmental Relations
116 West Jones Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

Chairman
South Carolina Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 02903

Chairman
North Carolina Utilities Commission
430 North Salisbury Street
Dobbs Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
ATTN: EIS Coordinator
Region IV Office
345 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Director
Criteria and Standards Division
Office of Radiation Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Washington, D. C. 20460

DUKE POWER COMPANY
NORTH CAROLINA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY NUMBER 1
NORTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION
SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414
ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATES

Duke Power Company, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency Number 1, North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation, and Saluda River Electric Cooperative, Inc. are the current holders of Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on August 7, 1975 for the Catawba Nuclear Station. These facilities are presently under construction at the applicants' site on the shore of Lake Wylie in York County, South Carolina. By letter dated April 30, 1981, Duke Power Company filed a request for an extension of the latest construction completion dates for the facilities to March 1, 1984 for Unit 1 and to September 1, 1985 for Unit 2. This extension was requested due to (1) a delay in completion of support systems for the auxiliary boiler, (2) problems with vendor deliveries which in turn delayed installation of equipment, (3) impact on manpower due to projects resulting from the accident at Three Mile Island, (4) a revised preoperational test plan, and (5) a delay in erection of piping support restraints caused by late design information, a shortage of key support restraint material and an increase in the total number of support restraints required.

8106100163

This action involves no significant hazards consideration, good cause has been shown for the delay, and the requested extension is for a reasonable period, the bases for which are set forth in the staff evaluation. The preparation of an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because there will be no significant environmental impact attributable to the Order other than that which has already been predicted and described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement-Construction Permit Stage for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, published in December 1973. A Negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Appraisal have been prepared and are available, as are the above stated documents, for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20555 and at the local public document room established for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 at the York County Library, 325 South Oakland Avenue, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730.

It is HEREBY ORDERED THAT the latest completion date for CPPR-116 be extended from June 1, 1981 to March 1, 1984 and the latest date for CPPR-117 be extended from June 1, 1982 to September 1, 1985.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Date of Issuance: June 4, 1981

SAFETY EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NOS. CPPR-116 AND CPPR-117
FOR THE CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

INTRODUCTION

Construction Permits CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 were issued on August 7, 1975 to Duke Power Company authorizing construction of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The latest dates for completion of the construction of these facilities, as stated in the permits, were June 1, 1981 and June 1, 1982, respectively. On April 30, 1981, Duke Power Company filed a request for extension of the construction completion dates to March 1, 1984 for Unit 1, and to September 1, 1985 for Unit 2.

EVALUATION

In its application for extension of construction completion dates, Duke Power Company indicated that five factors were responsible for the delay in completion of construction activities. The following is a discussion of the causes for delay.

1. Due to design changes, a three month delay was estimated in the completion of support systems for the auxiliary boiler.
2. Problems had been encountered with vendor deliveries causing a delay in the actual erection of piping supports and piping restraints, delay in the installation of the Unit 1 reactor building equipment hatch, and delay in the erection of the steam generator upper lateral restraints.
3. Impact due to Three Mile Island accident, Duke's response to NRC IE Bulletins and Notices, and the dedication of manpower to projects such as a total hanger reinspection program at Duke's McGuire Nuclear Station.
4. A revised preoperational test plan was developed which identified all required activities, their sequence and interdependencies, and the manpower resources needed to support the plant. This revised plan in preoperational and hot functional test duration schedules was approximately 11 months longer than the previously planned schedule and the sequence of system turnovers required was significantly altered.
5. Piping support restraints had been scheduled to be erected closely following and essentially within the duration of the erection of the corresponding piping. This support restraint erection began to lag due initially to late

8106100 170
4

design information and then later due to a shortage of key support restraint material. Later, revised seismic and thermal analysis of piping systems increased the total number of support restraints required.

Although Duke has sizable Design Engineering, Construction, and Steam Production departments, the number of qualified personnel currently available, supplemented by a substantial number of consultant and contract personnel, have not been able to offset the above delays. Duke's manpower resources have been heavily taxed since 1979 in conducting special studies and investigations as a result of NRC regulations applicable to all Duke nuclear projects, including Duke's operating nuclear station at Oconee.

Duke stated in its April 30, 1981 letter that the new completion dates will provide for a further delay in the licensing of the units due to the uncertainty of the status of current and future rules which will directly affect the Catawba Nuclear Station. In addition, the new dates are consistent with currently scheduled fuel load dates of August 1983 and February 1985 for Units 1 and 2, respectively.

CONCLUSION

We have reviewed the information provided in Duke Power Company's submittal and we conclude that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay. Further, the staff has evaluated each factor contributing to the construction delay and concurs with the permittees as to the reasonableness of time of each delay. Thus, the requested extension of Construction Permits CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 to March 1, 1984 and September 1, 1985, respectively is justified. As a result of our review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date, and considering the nature of the delays, we have identified no areas of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction completion dates for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2.

The staff finds that because the request is solely for more time to complete work already reviewed and approved, no significant hazards consideration is involved in granting the request and thus prior public notice of this action is not required. We also find that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the construction completion dates. Accordingly, issuance of an Order extending the latest construction completion dates for the Catawba Nuclear Station as set forth in CPPR-116 to March 1, 1984 for Unit 1 and to September 1, 1985 for Unit 2 is reasonable and should be authorized.

Dated: June 4, 1981

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

SUPPORTING: EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION

PERMIT NOS. CPPR-116 AND CPPR-117 EXPIRATION DATES FOR

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DUKE POWER COMPANY

NORTH CAROLINA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY NUMBER 1

NORTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION

SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has reviewed the letter from Duke Power Company requesting an extension of the expiration dates of the construction permits for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (CPPR-116 and CPPR-117) which are located in York County in the State of South Carolina. The request is for an extension of the permits through March 1, 1984 for CPPR-116 and through September 1, 1985 for CPPR-117, to allow for completion of construction of the facilities.

The Commission's Division of Licensing has prepared an environmental impact appraisal relative to these changes to CPPR-116 and CPPR-117. Based on this appraisal, the Commission has concluded that an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because there will be no significant environmental impact attributable to the proposed action other than that which has already been described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement-Construction Permit Stage or evaluated in the environmental impact appraisal.

8106100 178

The environmental impact appraisal is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. and at the York County Library, 325 South Oakland Avenue, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 4th day of June, 1981.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Elinor Adensam, Acting Chief
Licensing Branch No. 4
Division of Licensing

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL BY THE DIVISION OF LICENSING
SUPPORTING EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
NOS. CPPR-116 AND CPPR-117
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION,
UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

Description of Proposed Action

By letter of April 30, 1981, Duke Power Company (Duke) filed a request with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to extend the completion dates specified in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (Catawba 1 & 2). The action proposed is the issuance of an order providing for an extension of the latest completion dates of the construction permits from June 1, 1981 to and including March 1, 1984 for Unit 1, and from June 1, 1982 to and including September 1, 1985 for Unit 2. The NRC staff has reviewed the application and found that good cause has been shown for the requested extension of the completion dates specified in Construction Permits CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 for Catawba 1 & 2 (see attached Safety Evaluation by the NRC staff).

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

A. Need for the Facility

Catawba 1 & 2 are now scheduled to begin commercial operation in March 1, 1984 for Unit 1 and September 1, 1985 for Unit 2. Examination of the most recent information regarding loads and resources indicates that the conclusion reached in the Final Environmental Statement, Construction Permit Stage (FES-CP), published in December 1973 regarding need for this plant is still valid.

The staff's overall conclusion that the plant should be constructed is unaffected by the extension of the construction permit.

- B. The FES-CP for Catawba 1 & 2 includes an assessment of potential environmental, economic, and community impacts due to site preparation and plant construction. In addition, the staff's review of the inspection reports prepared by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement as a result of periodic inspection visits to the Catawba 1 & 2 site did not identify any adverse impacts on the environment or the surrounding community which were not anticipated and adequately discussed in the FES-CP or which were significantly greater than those discussed in the FES-CP.

C. Assessment of Impacts

The only effects possibly resulting from the requested extension would be those due to transposing the impacts in time or extending the total time the local community is subjected to temporary construction impacts. This in the staff's view will not result in any significant additional impact. The staff concludes that the environmental impact associated with construction of the plant described in the FES-CP are not affected by the proposed extension. Thus, no significant change in impact is expected to result from the extension.

Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that the impact attributable to the proposed action will be confined to those already predicted and described in the Commission's FES-CP issued in 1973. Having made this conclusion, the Commission has further concluded that no environmental impact statement for the proposed action need be prepared, and that a negative declaration to this effect is appropriate.

Dated: June 4, 1981