

DIST:  
 Document Control (STN 50-54/455)  
 NRC PDR  
 L PDR  
 TERA  
 NSIC

CP  
 31

OCT 12 1982

Docket Nos.: STN 50-454  
 and STN 50-455

Mr. Louis O. DeGeorge  
 Director of Nuclear Licensing  
 Commonwealth Edison Company  
 Post Office Box 767  
 Chicago, Illinois 60690

LB#1 Rdg.  
 KKiper/LO1shan  
 MRushbrook  
 JYoungblood  
 SGoldberg, OELD  
 JRutberg, OELD  
 DEisenhut/RPurple  
 TNovak  
 AToalston, AIG  
 JSouder  
 EJordan, DEQA:IE  
 JTaylor, DRP:IE

MPA  
 TBarnhart (8)  
 WMiller  
 IDinitz  
 WJones, OA (10)  
 ACRS (16)  
 BPCotter, ASLBP  
 ARosenthal, ASLAP  
 FPagano, OIE

Dear Mr. DeGeorge:

Subject: Order Extending Construction Completion Dates for the Byron  
 Station, Units 1 and 2

In response to your letter, dated April 19, 1982, the Nuclear Regulatory  
 Commission has issued an Order extending the latest construction completion  
 dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The referenced Order extends  
 Construction Permit CPPR-130 for Unit 1 from June 1, 1982 to October 1, 1984  
 and Construction Permit CPPR-131 for Unit 2 from November 1, 1983 to April 1,  
 1986.

A copy of the Order granting the extension and staff's evaluation of your  
 request are enclosed for your information and use. The Order has been for-  
 forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

*15/*

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
 Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Order
2. Staff Evaluation

cc: See next page

8211040037 821012  
 PDR ADOCK 05000454  
 A PDR

\*SEE PREVIOUS ORC FOR CONCURRENCES.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1*	OELD*	DL:LB#1*	DL:AD/L*	DL:DIR	
SURNAME	MRushbrook/1	VSchesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoungblood	TNovak	DEisenhut	
DATE	10/8/82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/12/82	

DIST:  
 Document Control (STN 50-454/455)  
 NRC PDR  
 L PDR  
 TERA  
 NSIC

Docket Nos.: STN 50-454  
 and STN 50-455

LB#1 Rdg. MPA  
 KKiper/L01shan TBarnhart (8)  
 MRushbrook WMiller  
 JYoungblood IDinitz  
 SGoldberg, OELD WJones, OA (10)  
 JRutberg, OELD ACRS (16)  
 DEisenhut/RPurple BPCotter, ASLBP  
 TNovak AROsenthal, ASLAP  
 AToalston, AIG FPagano, OIE  
 JSouder  
 EJordan, DEQA:IE  
 JTaylor, DRP:IE

Mr. Louis O. DelGeorge  
 Director of Nuclear Licensing  
 Commonwealth Edison Company  
 Post Office Box 767  
 Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. DelGeorge:

Subject: Order Extending Construction Completion Dates for the Byron  
 Station, Units 1 and 2

In response to your letter, dated April 19, 1982, the Nuclear Regulatory  
 Commission has issued an Order extending the latest construction completion  
 dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The referenced Order extends  
 Construction Permit CPPR-130 for Unit 1 from June 1, 1982 to October 1, 1984  
 and Construction Permit CPPR-131 for Unit 2 from November 1, 1983 to April 1,  
 1986.

A copy of the Order granting the extension and staff's evaluation of your  
 request are enclosed for your information and use. The Order has been forwarded  
 to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
 Division of Licensing

- Enclosures:  
 1. Order  
 2. Staff Evaluation

cc: See next page

6-22-82 102

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	OELD	DL:LB#1	DL:AD/L	DL:DIR	
SURNAME	Rushbrook/yt	SGoldberg	SGoldberg	JYoungblood	TNovak	DEisenhut	
DATE	6/21/82	6/21/82	9/22/82	10/17/82	10/17/82	6/ /82	
			1/16/9-22-82				

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

BYRON STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-454 AND 50-455

ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATES

Commonwealth Edison Company is the holder of Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 issued on December 31, 1975 by the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for construction of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 to be located in Ogle County, Illinois, approximately 17 miles southwest of Rockford, Illinois.

By letter, dated April 19, 1982, Commonwealth Edison Company filed a request for extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 Construction Permits. It was requested that Construction Permit No. CPPR-130 for Unit 1 be extended from June 1, 1982 to October 1, 1984 and Construction Permit No. CPPR-131 for Unit 2 be extended from November 1, 1983 to April 1, 1986. The reasons given for the requested extension in time were: (1) extended construction period caused by the need to install larger quantities of material and equipment than originally contemplated as well as changes in NRC regulatory requirements some of which resulted from the Three Mile Island incident, (2) improvements in the manner of implementing NRC requirements including increased amounts of design work and installation labor required to complete installation of various components, pipes, cables, and structural members, and (3) implementation of work requirements at a pace consistent with the need to spread financial requirements evenly throughout the construction period in order to maintain annual financial requirements within the capabilities of Commonwealth Edison Company.

8211040041 821012  
PDR ADDCK 05000454  
A PDR

OFFICE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SURNAME	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DATE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

This action involves no significant hazards consideration, good cause has been shown for the delays, and the requested extension is for a reasonable period, the bases for which are set forth in the staff's safety evaluation for this extension.

The Commission has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal, need not be prepared in connection with this action.

The applicant's letter, dated April 19, 1982, and the NRC staff's safety evaluation supporting the Order are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20555 and at the Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61103.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the latest construction completion date for CPPR-130, Unit 1, be extended from June 1, 1982 to October 1, 1984 and for CPPR-131, Unit 2, be extended from November 1, 1983 to April 1, 1986.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*for* *Gus C. Larnai*  
Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
Division of Licensing

Date of Issuance: OCT 12 1982

SEE PREVIOUS ORC FOR CONCURRENCES.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1*	OELD*	DL:LB#1*	DL:AD#1	DL:DIR	
SURNAME	MRushbrook/1	gSchesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoungblood	TNovak	DGEisenhut	
DATE	10/8/82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/12/82	

This action involves no significant hazards consideration. good cause has been shown for the delays. and the requested extension is for a reasonable period. the bases for which are set forth in the staff's safety evaluation for this extension.

The Commission has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal. need not be prepared in connection with this action.

The applicant's letter, dated April 19, 1982, and the NRC staff's safety evaluation supporting the Order are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room. 1717 H Street. N. W.. Washington. D. C. 20555 and at the Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61103.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the latest construction completion date for CPPR-130, Unit 1, be extended from June 1, 1982 to October 1, 1984 and for CPPR-131, Unit 2, be extended from November 1, 1983 to April 1, 1986.

Darrell G. Eisenhut. Director  
Division of Licensing

Date of Issuance:

\*See previous yellow.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1	OELD, <i>J</i>	DL:LB#1 <i>AK</i>	DL:AD/L	DL:DIR	
SURNAME	Rushbrook, yt	SChesnut	SGoldberg	BYoungblood	TMNovak	DEisenhut	
DATE	7/2/82	9/20/82	9/22/82	10/7/82	7/ /82	7/ /82	

This action involves no significant hazards consideration, good cause has been shown for the delays, and the requested extension is for a reasonable period, the bases for which are set forth in the staff's safety evaluation for this extension.

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 evaluated in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 (NUREG-0848) which was issued in April 1982.

The Commission has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal, need not be prepared in connection with this action.

The applicant's letter, dated April 19, 1982, and the NRC staff's safety evaluation supporting the Order are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20555 and at the Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61103.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the latest construction completion date for CPPR-130, Unit 1, be extended from June 1, 1982 to October 1, 1984 and for CPPR-131, Unit 2, be extended from November 1, 1983 to April 1, 1986.

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
Division of Licensing

Date of Issuance:

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	OELD	DL:LB#1	DL:AD/L		
SURNAME	Rushbrook/yt	Schesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoungblood	RLTedesco		
DATE	6/21/82	6/21/80					

STAFF SAFETY EVALUATION FOR EXTENSION OF THE  
LATEST CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATES FOR THE BYRON  
STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

INTRODUCTION

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorized the construction of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 by issuing Construction Permit No. CPPR-130 and Construction Permit No. CPPR-131 to the Commonwealth Edison Company on December 31, 1975. The latest date for completion of Unit 1 was June 1, 1982 and for Unit 2 was November 1, 1983.

By letter, dated April 19, 1982, Commonwealth Edison Company submitted an application for amendment of the construction permits to reflect new "latest completion dates" for each of the two units. The application requested an additional time of twenty-eight months for each unit, i.e., CPPR-130 for Unit 1 would be extended to October 1, 1984 and CPPR-131 for Unit 2 would be extended to April 1, 1986.

In accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.55(b), the NRC staff, having found good cause shown, recommends that the latest completion dates of October 1, 1984 for Unit 1 and April 1, 1986 for Unit 2 be granted for the reasons stated below.

ANALYSIS

Commonwealth Edison Company stated in the April 19, 1982 letter that the following factors led to the overall delay in the completion of construction of the facility:

1. The need for an extension of time beyond the present construction permit completion dates is a result of an extended construction period, despite the fact that construction has continued without interruption since its inception. The longer period has resulted principally from the need to install larger quantities of material and equipment than originally contemplated, as well as changes in NRC regulatory requirements, some of which resulted from the NRC's response to the Three Mile Island incident.
2. The need for extension is also based upon improvements in the manner in which Commonwealth Edison Company is implementing NRC requirements. These changes have increased the amount of design work and installation labor required to complete the installation of each component, pipe, cable, and structural member.
3. The above additional measures have been and are being implemented at a pace consistent with Commonwealth Edison's need to spread financing requirements more evenly throughout the construction period in order to keep annual financing requirements within their capabilities.

Commonwealth Edison Company also stated that the requested 28 months extension included a conservative estimate of the actual completion of the units to allow a margin for unforeseen contingencies.

8211040042 821012  
PDR ADOCK 05000454  
A PDR

OFFICE ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SURNAME ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DATE ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the possible need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permits is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This extension will not allow any work to be performed involving new safety information of a type not considered by previous Commission safety reviews of the facility and that is not already allowed by the existing construction permits. Therefore, the staff finds that (1) this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) prior public notice of this action is not required, (3) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the requested extension of the construction completion dates, and (4) good cause exists for issuance of an Order extending the construction completion date.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is reasonable and justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

The NRC staff has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal, need not be prepared in connection with this action.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

B. J. Youngblood, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated: OCT 12 1982 \*SEE PREVIOUS ORC FOR CONCURRENCES.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1*	OELD*	DL:LB#1*			
SURNAME	MWashbrook/1	SChesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoungblood			
DATE	10/8/82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ /82			

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the possible need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permits is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This extension will not allow any work to be performed involving new safety information of a type not considered by previous Commission safety reviews of the facility and that is not already allowed by the existing construction permits. Therefore, the staff finds that (1) this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) prior public notice of this action is not required, (3) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the requested extension of the construction completion dates, and (4) good cause exists for issuance of an Order extending the construction completion date.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is reasonable and justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

The NRC staff has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal, need not be prepared in connection with this action.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

\*SEE PREVIOUS ORC FOR CONCURRENCE

Dated:						
OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1*	OELD*	DL:LB#		
SURNAME	MRushbrook/1	SChesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoung/1		
DATE	10/6/82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/7/82		

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permits is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This extension will not allow any work to be performed involving new safety information of a type not considered by previous Commission safety reviews of the facility and that is not already allowed by the existing construction permits. Therefore, the staff finds that (1) this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) prior public notice of this action is not required, (3) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the requested extension of the construction completion dates, and (4) good cause exists for issuance of an order extending the construction completion date.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

The NRC staff has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5 (d) (4), an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal, need not be prepared in connection with this action.

reasonable and

Add conclusion paragraph on no environmental impacts from extension

possible

X

X

X

X



The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permit is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This extension will not allow any work to be performed involving new safety information of a type not considered by previous Commission safety reviews of the facility and that is not already allowed by the existing construction permits. Therefore, the staff finds that (1) this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) prior public notice of this action is not required, (3) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the requested extension of the construction completion dates, and (4) good cause exists for issuance of an Order extending the construction completion date.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

\*See previous yellow.

*Attachments P. 2*

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	5.6-339C		
SURNAME	MRusbrook/yt	SChesnut	JYoungblood	<i>[Signature]</i>		
DATE	9/14/82	9/16/82	9/18/82	1-22-82		

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits for Units 1 and 2 be extended an additional 28 months to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date, and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permit is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This extension will not allow any work to be performed involving new safety information of a type not considered by previous Commission safety reviews of the facility and that is not already allowed by the existing construction permits. Therefore, the staff finds that (1) this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) prior public notice of this action is not required, (3) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the requested extension of the construction completion dates, and (4) good cause exists for issuance of an Order extending the construction completion date.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

\*See previous yellow.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1				
SURNAME	MRushbrook/yt	SChesnut	JYoungblood				
DATE	7/ /82	7/ /82	7/ /82				

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits for Units 1 and 2 be extended an additional 28 months to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of this review of the Final Safety Analysis Report, and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The staff finds that this proposed action does not:

- (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated;
- (2) Create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously; or
- (3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff finds that because the request is merely for more time to complete work already reviewed and approved for Construction Permits CPPR-130 and CPPR-131, no significant hazards consideration is involved in granting the request and thus prior notice of this action is not required.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

\*See previous yellow.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1 * Rushbrook/yt	DL:LB#1 S Chesnut	DL:LB#1 J Youngblood				
SURNAME							
DATE	6/1/82	6/1/82	6/1/82				

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes that the applicant has shown good cause for the delay in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.55(b). The NRC staff further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits for Units 1 and 2 be extended an additional 28 months to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of this review of the Final Safety Analysis Report, and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2.

The NRC staff finds that because the request is merely for more time to complete work already reviewed and approved for Construction Permits CPPR-130 and CPPR-131, no significant hazards consideration is involved in granting the request and thus prior notice of this action is not required.

CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is justifiable.

The NRC staff finds that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the latest completion dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1				
SURNAME	Rushbrook/yt	SChesnut	JYoungblood				
DATE	6/2/82	6/2/82	6/ /82				