

Mr. W. S. Wilgus
Florida Power Corporation

Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear
Generating Plant

cc:

Mr. R. W. Neiser
Senior Vice President
and General Counsel
Florida Power Corporation
P. O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

State Planning and Development
Clearinghouse
Office of Planning and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
The Capitol Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Mr. P. McKee
Nuclear Plant Manager
Florida Power Corporation
P. O. Box 219
Crystal River, Florida 32629

Mr. F. Alex Griffin, Chairman
Board of County Commissioners
Citrus County
110 North Apopka Avenue
Inverness, Florida 36250

Mr. Robert B. Borsum
Babcock & Wilcox
Nuclear Power Generation Division
Suite 220, 7910 Woodmont Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
15760 West Powerline Street
Crystal River, Florida 32629

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Allan Schubert, Manager
Public Health Physicist
Department of Health and
Rehabilitative Services
1323 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Administrator
Department of Environmental Regulation
Power Plant Siting Section
State of Florida
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Attorney General
Department of Legal Affairs
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONFLORIDA POWER CORPORATION, ET AL.CRYSTAL RIVER UNIT 3 NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANTDOCKET NO. 50-302ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of a partial exemption from the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to Florida Power Corporation, et al., (the licensee) for Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, located in Citrus County, Florida.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of the Proposed Action: The proposed exemption would 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 and no maintenance has been performed on the airlock that affect its sealing capabilities. The licensee would rely, instead, on the seal leakage test described in Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) when the reactor is in cold shutdown (Mode 5) or refueling (Mode 6) and when no maintenance has been performed on the airlock.

The licensee's request for exemption and the bases therefor are contained in a letter dated December 1, 1986.

The Need for the Proposed Action: 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 requires at least 28 man-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 Action: The proposed exemption would permit the substitution of an airlock seal leakage test (Paragraph III.D.2(b)(iii) of Appendix J of 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 cold shutdown or refueling mode. If the tests required by Paragraph III.D.2(b)(i) and (iii) are current, no maintenance having been performed on the airlock, then there will be adequate assurance of continued leak tight integrity of the airlock, and 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 Action: Because it has been concluded that there is no measurable 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 Crystal River Unit 3 operations and would result in reduced operational flexibility or unwarranted delays in power ascension.

Alternative Use of Resources: This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the "Final Environmental Statement Related to the Proposed Crystal River Unit 3" dated May 1973.

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

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon the foregoing 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's request for exemption dated December 1, 1986, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 4th day of December, 1986

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

A E Edison for
John F. Stolz, Director
PWR Project Directorate #6
Division of PWR Licensing-B