

September 6, 1988

Docket Nos.: 50-413
50-414

Mr. H. B. Tucker, Vice President
Nuclear Production Department
Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dear Mr. Tucker:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Enclosed for your information is a copy of an "Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact" related to your October 16, 1987, request for amendments to the operating licenses for Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The amendments would modify the Technical Specifications related to the nuclear service water system. The assessment has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II

8809130133 880906
PDR ADOCK 05000413
P PNU

Enclosure:
F. R. Notice

cc w/encl:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PDII-3 Reading

S. Varga	14-E-4
G. Lainas	14-H-3
D. Matthews	14-H-25
M. Rood	14-H-25
K. Jabbour	14-H-25
OGC	15-B-18
E. Jordan	MNBB-3302
B. Grimes	9-A-2
ACRS (10)	H-1016

CATAWBA PLANT FILE

9/10/11

PDII-3
MRood
8/18/88

PDII-3 *KNT*
KJabbour:sw
8/18/88

DS/11m
PDII-3
DMatthews
9/6/88

Mr. H. B. Tucker
Duke Power Company

Catawba Nuclear Station

cc:

A.V. Carr, Esq.
Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

North Carolina Electric Membership
Corp.
3400 Summer Boulevard
P.O. Box 27306
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.
Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell
and Reynolds
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Saluda River Electric Cooperative,
Inc.
P.O. Box 929
Laurens, South Carolina 29360

North Carolina MPA-1
Suite 600
3100 Smoketree Ct.
P.O. Box 29513
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626-0513

Senior Resident Inspector
Route 2, Box 179N
York, South Carolina 29745

S. S. Kilborn
Area Manager, Mid-South Area
ESSD Projects
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
MNC West Tower - Bay 239
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Regional Administrator, Region II:
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

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

Mr. Heyward G. Shealy, Chief
Bureau of Radiological Health
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

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

Karen E. Long
Assistant Attorney General
N.C. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Piedmont Municipal Power Agency
100 Memorial Drive
Greer, South Carolina 29651

Spence Perry, Esquire
General Counsel
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Room 840
500 C Street
Washington, D. C. 20472

Mr. Michael Hirsch
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Office of the General Counsel
Room 840
500 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20472

Brian P. Cassidy, Regional Counsel
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Region I
J. W. McCormach POCH
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONDUKE POWER COMPANY, ET AL.DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OFNO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Duke Power Company, et al., (the licensee) for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of Proposed Action: The proposed action would more clearly specify in the Technical Specifications (TS) the Limiting Conditions for Operation, Applicability, required Actions and additional Surveillance Requirements for the Nuclear Service Water (RN) System at Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2.

The current TS requirements will be expanded and clarified to more accurately reflect the design and operation of the system and to more specifically state remedial actions which are to be implemented in the event of system degradation or inoperability.

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application for amendments dated October 16, 1987. Additional information was provided by letter dated February 18, 1988, in response to NRC staff's letter dated January 22, 1988. Further clarifications were also provided by letters dated May 12 and July 12, 1988.

8809130135 880906
PDR ADOCK 05000413
P PNU

The Need for the Proposed Action: The current RN System TS requirements are based on the Standard Technical Specifications which were set up for single unit plants (i.e., non-shared systems). The Catawba RN System is partially shared between the two units. The proposed amendments will more accurately reflect the design and operation of the RN System by more clearly specifying the requirements based on recognition of the shared portions of this system.

Better TS requirements will alleviate ambiguity concerning their applicability and will result in more clearly defined and easily understood actions concerning the operation of the RN System.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action: The proposed TS changes will not reduce the restrictions on the operation of the RN System. The changes will not allow the RN System to be operated in any conditions other than those previously allowed. Therefore, the proposed changes will not have any effect or impact on the environment that has not been already reviewed and approved.

Because no previous accident analyses are affected by these amendments, the probability of an accident has not been increased and the post-accident radiological releases will not be greater than those previously determined. Therefore, plant radiological and non-radiological releases during normal operation or after an accident will not be increased by the proposed action. Accordingly, we conclude that this proposed action would result in no significant environmental impact.

Alternative to the Proposed Action: Since we have concluded that the environmental effects of the proposed action are negligible, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendments. That alternative, in effect, is the same as the "no action" alternative. Neither alternative would reduce environmental impacts of plant operation but would result in increased personnel radiation exposure during plant life.

Alternative Use of Resources: This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Final Environmental Statement dated January 1983 (NUREG-0921) related to the facility.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's request of October 16, 1987, as supplemented February 18, May 12, and July 12, 1988. The NRC staff did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed license amendments.

Based upon this environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for the amendments dated October 16, 1987, and its supplements dated February 18, May 12, and July 12, 1988; and the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 (NUREG-0921) dated January 1983, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and the York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina. 29730.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 6th day of September 1988 .

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Darl S. Hood, Acting Director
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
CONCURRENCES

*LA:PDII-3
MRood
/ /88

*PM:PDII-3
/ /88

*SEE PREVIOUS
/ /88

*OGC/WF
D:PDII-3
DBMatthews
/ /88

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendments. That alternative, in effect, is the same as the "no action" alternative. Neither alternative would reduce environmental impacts of plant operation but would result in increased personnel radiation exposure during plant life.

Alternative Use of Resources: This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Final Environmental Statement dated January 1983 (NUREG-0921) related to the facility.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's request of October 16, 1987, as supplemented February 18, May 12, and July 12, 1988. The NRC staff did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed license amendments.

Based upon this environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for the amendments dated October 16, 1987, and its supplements dated February 18, May 12, and July 12, 1988; and the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 (NUREG-0921) dated January 1983, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and the York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina. 29730.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 6th day of September .

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

David B. Matthews, Director
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
D:PDII-3
DBMatthews
1 / 88

K. JARBOUR
PM:PDII-3
OGC/WF
8/18/88
8/24/88

LA:PDII-3
MROOD
8/18/88