

MAY 31 1978

Distribution w/enclosures:

Docket Files JJackson  
 NRC PDR PKreutzer  
 Local PDR MRushbrook  
 LWR #3 File FWilliams  
 OELD HSmith  
 RDeYoung BScott, PM  
 RBoyd IE (3)  
 DVassallo NDube, MIPC  
 OParr MJinks, (8)  
 ABournia WMiller, ADM  
 GKnighton HDenton, DSE  
 VMoore, DSE

BScharf, OA (15 copies)  
 DSkovholt  
 LCobb, IE  
 WHaass

BCC: ACRS (16)  
 TIC  
 NSIC  
 JYore, ASLBP

Docket Nos. 50-373  
 and 50-374

Commonwealth Edison Company  
 Attn: Mr. Byron Lee, Jr.  
 Vice President  
 P. O. Box 767  
 Chicago, Illinois 60690

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE FOR LA SALLE  
 COUNTY STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

In response to your request, dated September 22, 1977, and supplemented by your letter, dated February 2, 1978, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued an Order extending the construction completion dates for the La Salle County Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2. The latest construction completion dates have been extended for Unit No. 1 from June 1, 1978 to March 31, 1980 and for Unit No. 2 from June 1, 1979 to December 31, 1980.

A copy of the Order, Staff Evaluation, Negative Declaration and Environmental Impact Appraisal, are enclosed for your information. The Order and Negative Declarations have been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by R. C. DeYoung

Roger S. Boyd, Director  
 Division of Project Management  
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Order
2. Staff Evaluation
3. Negative Declaration
4. Environmental Impact Appraisal

cc w/enclosures:

See next page See previous yellow for concurrences

Subj to  
 late

LWR:AD  
 DVassallo  
 5/30/78

DD/DPM  
 RCDeYoung  
 5/31/78

Const. 3  
 GO

OFFICE	LWR #3:LA	LWR #3:LPM	DSE/EP-1	OELD	LWR #3:BC	D:DPM
SURNAME	MRushbrook/LM	ABournia	GKnighton	JDenton	ODParr	RSBoyd
DATE	5/25/78	5/25/78	5/25/78	5/26/78	5/30/78	5/31/78

MAY 31 1978

cc: Richard E. Powell, Esq.  
Isham, Lincoln & Beale  
One First National Plaza  
Suite 2400  
Chicago, Illinois 60670

Illinois Department of Public Health  
ATTN: Chief, Division of Nuclear Safety  
535 West Jefferson  
Springfield, Illinois 62761

Edward R. Lambert, Chairman  
Board of Supervisors of La Salle County  
La Salle County Courthouse  
Ottawa, Illinois 61350

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ATTN: EIS Coordinator  
Federal Activities Branch  
Region V Office  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Chief, Energy Systems  
Analyses Branch (AW-459)  
Office of Radiation Programs  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Room 645, East Tower  
401 M Street, S. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20460

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

Distribution w/enclosures:

Docket Files JJackson  
 NRC PDR PKreutzer  
 Local PDR MRushbrook  
 LWR #3 File FWilliams  
 OELD HSmith  
 RDeYoung BScott, PM  
 RBoyd IE (3)  
 DVassallo NDube, MIPC  
 OParr MJinks, (8)  
 ABournia WMiller, ADM  
 GKnighton HDenton, DSE  
 VMoore, DSE

BScharf, OA (15 copies)  
 DSkovholt  
 LCobb, IE  
 WHaass

BCC: ACRS (16)  
 TIC  
 NSIC  
 JYore, ASLBP

Docket Nos. 50-373  
 and 50-374

Commonwealth Edison Company  
 ATTN: Mr. Byron Lee, Jr.  
 Vice President  
 P. O. Box 767  
 Chicago, Illinois 60690

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE FOR LA SALLE  
 COUNTY STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

In response to your request, dated September 22, 1977, and supplemented  
 by your letter, dated February 2, 1978, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 has issued an Order extending the construction completion dates for the  
 La Salle County Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2. The latest construction  
 completion dates have been extended for Unit No. 1 from June 1, 1978 to  
 March 31, 1980 and for Unit No. 2 from June 1, 1979 to December 31, 1980.

A copy of the Order, Staff Evaluation, Negative Declaration and  
 Environmental Impact Appraisal, are enclosed for your information.  
 The Order and Negative Declarations have been forwarded to the  
 Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Roger S. Boyd, Director  
 Division of Project Management  
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Order
2. Staff Evaluation
3. Negative Declaration
4. Environmental Impact Appraisal

cc w/enclosures:  
 See next page

*Subj to May 78  
 note*

OFFICE➤	LWR #3:LA	LWR #3:LPM	DSE/EP-1	OELD	LWR #3:BC	
SURNAME➤	MRushbrook/LN	ABournia	GKnighton	SBrenn	ODParr	
DATE➤	4/ /78	4/ /78	4/ /78	5/24/78	4/ /78	

cc: Richard E. Powell, Esq.  
Isham, Lincoln & Beale  
One First National Plaza  
Suite 2400  
Chicago, Illinois 60670

Illinois Department of Public Health  
ATTN: Chief, Division of Nuclear Safety  
535 West Jefferson  
Springfield, Illinois 62761

Edward R. Lambert, Chairman  
Board of Supervisors of La Salle County  
La Salle County Courthouse  
Ottawa, Illinois 61350

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ATTN: EIS Coordinator  
Federal Activities Branch  
Region V Office  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Chief, Energy Systems  
Analyses Branch (AW-459)  
Office of Radiation Programs  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Room 645, East Tower  
401 M Street, S. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20460

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

Docket Nos. 50-373  
and 50-374

Commonwealth Edison Company  
ATTN: Mr. Byron Lee, Jr.  
Vice President  
P. O. Box 767  
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE FOR LA SALLE  
COUNTY STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

In response to your request, dated September 22, 1977, the Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission has issued an Order extending the construction  
completion dates for the La Salle County Station, Units No. 1 and  
No. 2. The latest construction completion dates have been extended  
for Unit No. 1 from June 1, 1978 to March 31, 1980 and for Unit No. 2  
from June 1, 1979 to December 31, 1980.

A copy of the Order, Staff Evaluation, Negative Declaration and  
Environmental Impact Appraisal, are enclosed for your information.  
The Order and Negative Declaration have been forwarded to the  
Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Roger S. Boyd, Director  
Division of Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Order
2. Staff Evaluation
3. Negative Declaration
4. Environmental Impact Appraisal

cc w/enclosures:  
See next page

A/D LWR                      DD/DPM  
D. Vassallo                  RDeYoung  
4/                      4/                      /78                      /78

OFFICE>	LWR #3:LA	LWR #3:LPM	DSE/DP-1	OELD	LWR #3:BC	D:DPM
SURNAME>	MRushbrook/LM	ABournia	GKnighton		ODParr	RSBoyd
DATE>	3/30/78	3/30/78	3/30/78	3/     /78	3/     /78	4/     /78

Distribution w/enclosures:  
Docket Files              BScott, PM  
NRC PDR                    I&E (3)  
Local PDR                  NDube, MIPC  
LWR #3 File                MJinks (8)  
OELD                        WMiller, ADM  
RDeYoung                  HDenton, DSE  
RBoyd                       VMoore, DSE  
DVassallo                  BScharf, OA (15 copies)  
OParr                       DSkovholt  
ABournia                   LCobb, IE  
GKnighton                  WHaass  
JJackson  
PKreutzer                  BCC: ACRS (16)  
MRushbrook                TIC  
FWilliams                  NSIC  
HSmith                      JYore, ASLBP

ENCLOSURE 1

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

LA SALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-373 AND 50-374

ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATES

Commonwealth Edison Company is the holder of Construction Permits Nos. CPPR-99 and CPPR-100 issued by the Atomic Energy Commission\* on September 10, 1973, for the construction of the La Salle County Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, presently under construction at the applicant's site in Brookfield Township, La Salle County, Illinois. On September 22, 1977, the applicant filed a request for an extension of the completion dates. By letter, dated October 13, 1977, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requested additional information in order to justify extending the construction completion dates. Supplemental information was received from Commonwealth Edison Company, dated February 2, 1978 stating that construction had been delayed due to:

- (1) Optimistic construction schedule,
- (2) Delays due to unusually wet winter,
- (3) Numerous strikes and work stoppages,
- (4) Lack of manpower, i.e., in crafts,
- (5) Design revisions and structural changes due to additional analysis of multiple or prolonged discharge of the safety relief valves,
- (6) Additional requirements by the staff.

\*Effective January 20, 1975, the Atomic Energy Commission became the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and permits in effect on that day continued under the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

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 dated May 31, 1978. The preparation of an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because there will be no environmental impact attributable to the Order other than that which has already been predicted and described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement for the La Salle County Nuclear Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, published in February 1973, and the Draft Environmental Statement published in March 1978. 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 La Salle County Station facility in the Illinois Valley Community College Library, Rural Route No. 1 Oglesby, Illinois 16348.

It is HEREBY ORDERED THAT THE latest completion date for CPPR-99 be extended from June 1, 1978 to March 31, 1980 and for CPPR-100 be extended from June 1, 1979 to December 31, 1980.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Original signed by R. C. DeYoung

Roger S. Boyd, Director  
Division of Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DATE OF ISSUANCE: MAY 31 1978

LWR:AD  
DVassallo  
5/30/78  
DD:RPM  
RDeYoung  
5/31/78

OFFICE	LWR #3:LA	LWR #3:LPM	DSE/ER-1	OELD J.B.	LWR #3:BC	RPM
SURNAME	MRushbrook/LM	ABournia	GKnighton	L. BRENNER	ODParr	RSBoyd
DATE	5/30/78	5/30/78	5/30/78	5/30/78	5/30/78	5/31/78

ENCLOSURE 2

EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF

CONSTRUCTION PERMITS NO. CPPR-99 AND NO. CPPR-100

FOR THE LA SALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-373 AND 50-374

Introduction

On September 22, 1977, the Commonwealth Edison Company (CEC or applicant) filed a request for an extension of the construction completion dates for Construction Permits CPPR-99 and CPPR-100 issued for the La Salle County Station, Units Nos. 1 and 2 on September 10, 1973. At the staff's request, CEC submitted additional information by letter, dated February 2, 1978, to support its request for an extension of the latest completion dates.

Discussions

In the applicant's application for extension of the construction completion dates for Unit 1 from June 1, 1978 to March 31, 1980 and for Unit 2 from June 1, 1979 to December 31, 1980, CEC cited approximately five (5) reasons for the approximate twenty two (22) months delay in the construction schedule. According to the applicant:

- (1) The excavation period was extended by approximately two (2) months due to water retention from an unusually wet winter;
- (2) The construction schedule has been adversely affected approximately five (5) months by a number of strikes and work stoppages. Moreover, significant losses in productivity were experienced following a strike while efforts were made to return manpower to their pre-strike levels;
- (3) Design changes were made to the containment system as a result of combined seismic, conventional (thermal, weight, pressure) and accident losses (SRV discharge, LOCA, large steam break). The following changes resulted in increased safety margins:
  - (a) Added structural steel at the intersecting planes where the base mat and containment walls meet. Added structural steel to the reactor pedestal and redesigned pedestal openings;

OFFICE➤						
SURNAME➤						
DATE➤						



- (b) Added structural stiffness on inside of suppression pool floor to increase the load carrying capacity from minus two (2) psi to minus eight (8) psi;
- (c) Added lateral reinforcing braces between downcomers in the suppression pool volume;
- (d) Redesigned existing drywell embedments and added new imbedments to drywell for more anchor/attachment points as a result of load combinations referenced above; and
- (e) Dynamic reactor pressure vessel and piping analyses with load combinations referenced above required additional snubbers, hangers and restraints.

The project was delayed by a minimum of four (4) months to complete this redesign effort.

- (4) The manpower levels to support the schedule were not attained. The original project schedule was predicted on a full multiple shift basis. Limited manpower availability restricted the second shift to approximately fifty percent of manpower goals and eliminated all but a skeleton force on the third shift. The project has and will be delayed by approximately seven (7) months due to this manpower shortage.
- (5) Increased staff's requirements have directly and indirectly extended the construction schedule. Comprehensive preoperational testing and flushing required by Regulatory Guide 1.68 and ANSI N45.2.8 have directly extended the schedule. The application of seismic criteria to additional components, moderate energy line break analysis, fire hazard analysis, industrial security, and containment leak rate criteria have indirectly extended the schedule by delaying engineering activities which later impacted upon construction. The project was delayed by eight (8) months as a result of these requirements.

It is noted that the above delays are not totally additive because in a number of instances, the period of delay overlap.

#### Conclusion

We have reviewed the information provided by the applicant and conclude that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of construction for the La Salle County Station for 22 months is justified.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

As a result of our review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date, we further conclude that this action does not involve significant hazards considerations and that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the completion dates.

Accordingly, issuance of an Order extending the latest construction completion dates for the La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2 as set forth in CPPR-99 and CPPR-100, to March 31, 1980 and December 31, 1980, respectively is reasonable and should be authorized.

Original signed by:  
Anthony Bournia

Anthony Bournia, Project Manager  
Light Water Reactors Branch No. 3  
Division of Project Management

Original Signed by  
O. D. Parr

Olan D. Parr, Chief  
Light Water Reactors Branch No. 3  
Division of Project Management

MAY 31 1978

OFFICE ➤	LWR #3:LA	LWR #3:LPM		OELD L.B.	LWR #3:BC	
SURNAME ➤	MRushbrook/LM	ABournia		L.B. Parr	ODParr	
DATE ➤	5/ /78	5/ 30 /78		5/ 30 /78	5/ 30 /78	

NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
SUPPORTING ORDER RELATING TO THE EXTENSION OF  
DATES FOR COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION  
LASALLE COUNTY STATION  
UNITS NO. 1 AND 2 (CPPR-99 AND CPPR-100)  
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY  
DOCKET NOS. 50-373 AND 50-374

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has reviewed the Order relating to the construction permits for the LaSalle County Station, Units No. 1 and 2 (CPPR-99 and CPPR-100), located in LaSalle County, Illinois, issued to Commonwealth Edison Company. The Order would authorize the extension for twenty-two months of the date for completion of construction of Unit No. 1, and for nineteen months of the date for completion of construction of Unit No. 2.

The Commission's Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis has prepared an environmental impact appraisal for the Order, and has concluded that an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because there will be no environmental impact attributable to the Order other than that which has already been predicted and described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement for the LaSalle County Nuclear Station, Units No. 1 and 2, published in February 1973, the Draft Environmental Statement published in March 1978, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board decisions of September 1973 and March 1974, and the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board decisions of October 1973 and April 1974.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

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 Illinois Valley Community College Library, Rural Route #1, Oglesby, Illinois 16348. A copy may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 31<sup>st</sup> day of May 1978.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

151

George W. Knighton, Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch No. 1  
Division of Site Safety  
and Environmental Analysis

Subject to  
May, 19, 1978

~~No, it was subject to the Public Release Section note~~

\*For concurrence see previous yellow

OFFICE >	DSE:EP-1	OELD:8-	DSE:EP-1			
SURNAME >	JJackson:mh	LBrenner *	GWKnighton			
DATE >	3/29/78	5/26/78	3/29/78			

Rural Route #1, Oglesby, Illinois 16348. A copy may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 31<sup>st</sup> day of May 1978.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/s/

George W. Knighton, Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

*AW Concurrence*  
*SB.*

OFFICE ➤	DSE:EP-1	OELD <i>for</i>	DSE:EP-1			
SURNAME ➤	JJackson/1k	LBrenner	GWKnighton			
DATE ➤	12/5/77	12/12/77	12/29/77			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL  
BY THE DIVISION OF SITE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS  
SUPPORTING AN ORDER RELATING TO THE EXTENSION OF  
DATES FOR COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION  
LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS NO. 1 AND 2 (CPPR-99 AND CPPR-100)  
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY  
DOCKET NOS. 50-373 AND 50-374

1. Description of Proposed Action

The action proposed is the issuance of an ORDER pertaining to the LaSalle County Station (LSCS), Units No. 1 and 2. The ORDER extends for 22 and 19 months the latest dates for completion of Units No. 1 and 2, respectively.

The permittee, Commonwealth Edison Company, requested the extensions by letter dated September 22, 1977. The construction permit for Unit 1 (CPPR-99) will be extended from a latest completion date of June 1, 1978 to March 31 1980; the construction permit for Unit 2 (CPPR-100) will be extended from a latest completion date of June 1, 1979 to December 31, 1980. The NRC staff has reviewed the request and found that good cause has been shown for extension of the construction completion dates (see attached Safety Evaluation by the NRC staff).

2. Summary Description of the Probable Impacts of the Proposed Action

The environmental impacts associated with construction of LSCS have been previously addressed in the NRC staff's final environmental statement, construction permit stage (FES-CP) issued February 1973, addressed in the NRC staff's draft environmental statement, operating license stage (DES-OL) issued March 1978, and determined by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in their Initial Decisions dated September 5, 1973 (6 AEC 645) and March 18, 1974 (7 AEC 289), and the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board in their decisions of October 19, 1973 (ALAB 153, 6 AEC 821, affirmed 6 AEC 1072), and April 15, 1974 (ALAB 193, 7 AEC 423).

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board identified in the Initial Decision five major effects due to construction. These were:

1. Dredging and construction of facilities on the Illinois River will have an impact on the river bottom and channel.
2. The construction of the cooling lake and the station itself will involve major earthmoving and will generate some noise and dust.
3. Short term traffic problems may occur.
4. Ancillary activities such as transmission line and rail spur construction, and the increased use of local roads may create minor impacts.
5. Station-related construction will temporarily remove ninety acres of land from agricultural production.

The first three construction-related effects noted above have already occurred. The dredging and construction of river facilities were completed in 1975. The major earthmoving activities were completed in 1976. The construction work force has already peaked during the fourth quarter of 1976; remaining work forces will be at most 72 percent and at least 1 percent of the peak. Thus, local community-related impacts (such as traffic congestion) have already reached a maximum and are now declining. Therefore, because these three major construction effects have already occurred, the construction permit extensions will not add to impacts in these areas.

The latter two effects will generally be postponed as a result of the construction permit extensions. Although the rail spur has been completed, and station-related heavy components have already been transported to the site, the transmission lines have not yet been completed. Thus, those impacts resulting from transmission line construction (see Chapter V of the FES-CP) may be continued or postponed over the construction permit extension period. The permittee will minimize these impacts, however, and therefore they are expected to be minor (see Chapter IV of the FES-CP).

Finally, the return to agricultural production of 90 acres of land will be postponed until construction is complete. This, too, is a minor and temporary impact; its magnitude was evaluated by the Board in its Initial Decision.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

In summary, the environmental impact resulting from extending the construction permits will be either a postponement or continuation of previously identified and evaluated impacts.

The Appeals Board highlighted another impact due to construction: the creation of the cooling lake would result in the removal of approximately 2058 acres of arable farmland from agricultural use. This impact has occurred, however, and the extension of the construction permits therefore will result in no further adverse effect relative to changes in land use.

Additionally, another significant impact due to construction was evaluated in the DES-OL. It was found that subsequent to construction of the cooling lake, significant erosion occurred downstream from the station site along the banks of a drainage creek. The applicant, however, has committed to a mitigation program (see letter dated May 25, 1978 from Cordell Reed of Commonwealth Edison Company to V. A. Moore of the NRC) which should reduce the impacts to preconstruction levels. Thus, once the mitigation plan is in effect, the construction permit extensions should not result in any additional erosion impacts.

### 3. Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that there will be no environmental impacts attributable to the proposed action other than those already predicted and described in the FES-CP issued in February 1973, the DES-OL issued in March 1978, the Board's Initial Decisions issued in September 1973 and March 1974, and subsequent Appeal Board Decisions. 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: MAY 3 1 1978

See previous concurrences. Date changed per OELD.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						



In summary, the environmental impact resulting from extending the construction permits will be either a postponement or continuation of previously identified and evaluated impacts.

The Appeals Board highlighted another impact due to construction: the creation of the cooling lake would result in the removal of approximately 2058 acres of arable farmland from agricultural use. This impact has occurred, however, and the extension of the construction permits therefore will result in no further adverse effect relative to changes in land use.

Additionally, another significant impact due to construction was evaluated in the DES-OL. It was found that subsequent to construction of the cooling lake, significant erosion occurred downstream from the station site along the banks of a drainage creek. The applicant, however, has committed to a mitigation program (see letter dated March 16, 1978 from M. S. Turbak of Commonwealth Edison Company to V. A. Moore of the NRC) which should reduce the impacts to preconstruction levels. Thus, once the mitigation plan is in effect, the construction permit extensions should not result in any additional erosion impacts.

### 3. Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that there will be no environmental impacts attributable to the proposed action other than those already predicted and described in the FES-CP issued in February 1973, the DES-OL issued in March 1978, the Board's Initial Decisions issued in September 1973 and March 1974, and subsequent Appeal Board Decisions. 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:

Jeremiah D. Jackson, Project Manager  
Environmental Projects Branch No. 1  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

*Handwritten notes:*  
- ~~some other subject to data~~  
- ~~See full data~~  
- ~~Public statement~~  
- ~~Sh; t-May 78~~  
- ~~note~~

\*For concurrence see previous

George W. Knighton, Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch No. 1  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

OFFICE	DES-CP-1	OELD	yellow	DES-CP-1		
SURNAME	Jackson: mh	LBrenner*	GWKnighton			
DATE	3/28/78	5/2/78	3/28/78			

In summary, the environmental impact resulting from extending the construction permits will be either a postponement or continuation of previously identified and evaluated impacts.

3. Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that there will be no environmental impacts attributable to the proposed action other than those already predicted and described in the FES issued in February 1973, and the Board's Initial Decision issued in September 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: 12/5/77  
MAY 31 1978

151

Jeremiah D. Jackson, Project Manager  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

*George W. Knighton*  
George W. Knighton, Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

NO CONCURRENCE  
S.B.

OFFICE	DSE:EP-1	OEAD	DSE:EP-1			
SURNAME	J Jackson/1k	L. Brenner	G W Knighton			
DATE	12/5/77	12/12/77	12/ 77			