

October 16, 1989

Docket No. 50-483

Joseph J. Dolgin
Dolgin, Beilenson, Klein, Denlow & Nodiff
7777 Bonhomme, Suite 190
St. Louis (Clayton), Missouri 63105

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
PDIII-3
JZwolinski
TAlexion
EJordan
IBailey
ACRS(10)
SECY Files

NRC & Local PDR's
JHannon
PKreutzer
OGC
BGrimes
JHoyle
PDIII- gray

Dear Mr. Dolgin:

SUBJECT: CERTIFIED COPY OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERMIT ON THE UNION ELECTRIC
COMPANY'S CALLAWAY PLANT (TAC 74897)

In response to your request, enclosed is a certified copy of the
constructions permits for Callaway Units 1 and 2, dated April 16, 1976. In
addition, I've enclosed orders dated December 21, 1981 and December 21, 1983
which extended the construction completion date of Callaway Unit 1 (Unit 2 was
cancelled).

If I can be of further assistance, I can be reached at (301) 492- 1387.

Sincerely,

/s/

Thomas W. Alexion, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects - III,
IV, V and Special Projects
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures as stated
cc: See attached list

DOCUMENT NAME: 74897-dolgin

Office: LA/PDIII-3
Surname: PKreutzer
Date: 10 / 10 / 89

~~PM/PDIII-3~~
TAlexion/mw
10 / 11 / 89
10 / 16

~~PD/PDIII-3~~
JHannon
10 / 12 / 89

DF01
/11

CR4



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I am employed by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), that I am the official custodian of NRC records that include the documents listed below, that the attached are true and correct copies of those documents, and that they are copies of official records that are kept by the NRC in the regular course of its business.

1. Construction permits for Callaway Plant, Units 1 and 2, dated April 16, 1976.
2. Order extending construction completion date for Callaway Plant, Unit 1, dated December 21, 1981.
3. Order extending construction completion date for Callaway Plant, Unit 1, dated December 12, 1983.

Inez K. Bailey
(Inez K. Bailey)

10/13/89
(Date)

I hereby certify that the person whose signature appears above is the official custodian of this information on file in the Division of Information Support Services to which certification is made and was official custodian at the time of executing the above certificate.

John Hoyle
John Hoyle, Assistant Secretary
Office of the Secretary of the
Commission

October 13, 1989
(Date)

Attachments: As stated



NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. STN 50-483

CALLAWAY PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

Construction Permit No. CPPR-139

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) having found that:
 - A. The application for construction permit complies with the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the rules and regulations of the Commission, there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the permit will be conducted in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Commission, and all required notifications to other agencies or bodies have been duly made;
 - B. The Union Electric Company (the Applicant) has described the proposed design of the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1 (the facility), including, but not limited to, the principal architectural and engineering criteria for the design and has identified the major features or components incorporated therein for the protection of the health and safety of the public;
 - C. Such further technical or design information as may be required to complete the safety analysis, and which can reasonably be left for later consideration, will be supplied in the final safety analysis report.
 - D. Safety features or components, if any, which require research and development have been described by the Applicant and the Applicant has identified, and there will be conducted, a research and development program reasonably designed to resolve any safety questions associated with such features or components;
 - E. On the basis of the foregoing, there is reasonable assurance that (i) such safety questions will be satisfactorily resolved at or before the latest date stated in the application for completion of construction of the proposed facility and (ii) taking into consideration the site criteria contained in 10 CFR Part 100, the proposed facility can be constructed and operated at the proposed location without undue risk to the health and safety of the public;

- F. The Applicant is technically qualified to design and construct the proposed facility;
 - G. The Applicant is financially qualified to design and construct the proposed facility;
 - H. The issuance of a permit for the construction of the facility will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - I. After weighing the environmental, economic, technical and other benefits of the facility against environmental and other costs and considering available alternatives, the issuance of a construction permit subject to the conditions for protection of the environment set forth herein is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Pursuant to Section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and Title 10, Chapter I, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50, "Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," and pursuant to the Partial Initial Decision and the Initial Decision of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, dated August 8, 1975 and April 8, 1976, respectively, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hereby issues a construction permit to the Applicant for a utilization facility designed to operate at 3411 megawatts thermal as described in the application and amendments thereto (the application) filed in this matter by the Applicant and as more fully described in the evidence received at the public hearing upon that application. The facility, known as the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1 will be located on the Applicant's site in Callaway County, Missouri.
3. This permit shall be deemed to contain and be subject to the conditions specified in Sections 50.54 and 50.55 of said regulations; is subject to all applicable provisions of the Act, and rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect; and is subject to the conditions specified or incorporated below:
- A. The earliest date for the completion of the facility is June 30, 1981, and the latest date for completion is February 28, 1982.
 - B. The facility shall be constructed and located at the site as described in the application, in Callaway County, Missouri, approximately 5 miles north of the Missouri River.

- C. This construction permit authorizes the Applicant to construct the facility described in the application and the hearing record, in accordance with the principal architectural and engineering criteria and environmental protection commitments set forth therein.
- D. In view of the fact that the Attorney General has not recommended an antitrust hearing in this matter, that no antitrust issues have been raised by another in a manner according with the Commission's Rules of Practice, and that no finding has been made that an antitrust hearing is otherwise required (10 CFR, Part 2 Section 2.104(d)), antitrust review of the application for this construction permit under Section 105c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, has been completed and a hearing thereon determined to be unnecessary.
- E. This facility is subject to the following conditions for the protection of the environment:
- (1) The disposal of the sludge from the water treatment plant providing make up water in the cooling system as well as sludges from the potable water supply at the facility shall be in accordance with effluent guidance limitation documents being developed by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and in the same manner as approved for all other public and private water treatment plants using the Missouri River as a raw water source. Detailed plans for the potable water supply system shall be submitted to the Missouri Division of Environmental Quality, Public Water Supply Section, for review.
 - (2) Monitoring of the facility discharge shall be conducted in whatever manner is necessary to assure safety of downstream water users, including the development of procedures for monitoring of copper concentrations in the effluents from the Callaway Plant.
 - (3) The Applicant shall take the necessary mitigating actions, including those summarized in Section 4.6 of the Final Environmental Statement during construction of the facility and associated transmission lines to avoid unnecessary adverse environmental impacts from construction activities.
 - (4) The Applicant shall establish a control program which shall include written procedures and instructions to control all construction activities as prescribed herein and shall provide for periodic management audits to determine the adequacy of implementation of environmental conditions. The Applicant shall maintain sufficient records to furnish evidence of compliance with all the environmental conditions herein.

- (5) Before engaging in a construction activity not evaluated by the Commission, the Applicant will prepare and record an environmental evaluation of such activity. When the evaluation indicates that such activity may result in a significant adverse environmental impact that was not evaluated, or that is significantly greater than that evaluated in the Final Environmental Statement, the Applicant shall provide a written evaluation of such activities and obtain approval of the Director of the Division of Project Management prior to conducting such activities.
- (6) If unexpected harmful effects or evidence of serious damage are detected during facility construction, the Applicant shall provide to the staff an acceptable analysis of the problem and a plan of action to eliminate or significantly reduce the harmful effects or damage.
- (7) The Applicant shall conduct his proposed monitoring programs, as summarized in Section 6 of the Final Environmental Statement, including the modifications defined by the staff in Subsections 6.1.1, 6.1.2 and 6.1.4.1 of the Final Environmental Statement regarding the duration of the water wells monitoring program, the extent of the radiological monitoring program and the sampling frequency of the aquatic ecology monitoring program.
- (8) The Applicant shall geologically map in detail all major excavations. The staff must be notified when the mapping is being done so that the staff can make arrangements to examine the excavations to determine if the subsurface structure correlates with the interpretations made from the nearby water well data and the onsite core borings. The Applicant shall include the resulting maps and evaluation in the Final Safety Analysis Report.
- (9) The Applicant shall conduct a program to assess the significance of Logan Creek as a fish spawning and nursery area, the extent of damage to the creek and its biota which may ensue from the construction of crossings for pipelines, and the need for protective measures to ameliorate adverse impacts. Prior to starting pipeline construction, the Applicant shall submit the impact assessment and plan for construction of the crossings to the staff for review and approval as provided in Subsections 4.3.2.1, 4.4.1 and 6.1.4 of the Final Environmental Statement.
- (10) The Applicant will use a mine for obtaining rock for concrete aggregate and backfill. If the Applicant chooses to develop a quarry instead of a mine, a revised description and impact assessment must be submitted to the staff for review and approval prior to commencement of work at the quarry.

4. This permit is subject to the limitation that a license authorizing operation of the facility will not be issued by the Commission unless (a) the Applicant submits to the Commission the complete Final Safety Analysis Report, portions of which may be submitted and evaluated from time to time; (b) the Commission finds that the final design provides reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the operation of the facility in accordance with procedures approved by it in connection with the issuance of said license; (c) the Commission finds that operation of the facility will be in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements were satisfied; and (d) the Applicant submits proof of financial protection and executes an indemnity agreement as required by Section 170 of the Act.

5. This permit is effective as of its date of issuance and shall expire on the latest completion date indicated in paragraph 3.A above.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



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

Date of Issuance: April 16, 1976



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. STN 50-486

CALLAWAY PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

Construction Permit No. CPPR-140

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) having found that:
 - A. The application for construction permit complies with the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the rules and regulations of the Commission; there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the permit will be conducted in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Commission, and all required notifications to other agencies or bodies have been duly made;
 - B. The Union Electric Company (the Applicant) has described the proposed design of the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 2 (the facility), including, but not limited to, the principal architectural and engineering criteria for the design and has identified the major features or components incorporated therein for the protection of the health and safety of the public;
 - C. Such further technical or design information as may be required to complete the safety analysis, and which can reasonably be left for later consideration, will be supplied in the final safety analysis report.
 - D. Safety features or components, if any, which require research and development have been described by the Applicant and the Applicant has identified, and there will be conducted, a research and development program reasonably designed to resolve any safety questions associated with such features or components;
 - E. On the basis of the foregoing, there is reasonable assurance that (i) such safety questions will be satisfactorily resolved at or before the latest date stated in the application for completion of construction of the proposed facility and (ii) taking into consideration the site criteria contained in 10 CFR Part 100, the proposed facility can be constructed and operated at the proposed location without undue risk to the health and safety of the public;

- F. The Applicant is technically qualified to design and construct the proposed facility;
 - G. The Applicant is financially qualified to design and construct the proposed facility;
 - H. The issuance of a permit for the construction of the facility will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - I. After weighing the environmental, economic, technical and other benefits of the facility against environmental and other costs and considering available alternatives, the issuance of a construction permit subject to the conditions for protection of the environment set forth herein is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Pursuant to Section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and Title 10, Chapter I, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50, "Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," and pursuant to the Partial Initial Decision and the Initial Decision of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, dated August 8, 1975 and April 8, 1976, respectively, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hereby issues a construction permit to the Applicant for a utilization facility designed to operate at 3411 megawatts thermal as described in the application and amendments thereto (the application) filed in this matter by the Applicant and as more fully described in the evidence received at the public hearing upon that application. The facility, known as the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 2 will be located on the Applicant's site in Callaway County, Missouri.
3. This permit shall be deemed to contain and be subject to the conditions specified in Sections 50.54 and 50.55 of said regulations; is subject to all applicable provisions of the Act, and rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect; and is subject to the conditions specified or incorporated below:
- A. The earliest date for the completion of the facility is December 31, 1982, and the latest date for completion is February 28, 1984.
 - B. The facility shall be constructed and located at the site as described in the application, in Callaway County, Missouri, approximately 5 miles north of the Missouri River.


- C. This construction permit authorizes the Applicant to construct the facility described in the application and the hearing record, in accordance with the principal architectural and engineering criteria and environmental protection commitments set forth therein.
- D. In view of the fact that the Attorney General has not recommended an antitrust hearing in this matter, that no antitrust issues have been raised by another in a manner according with the Commission's Rules of Practice, and that no finding has been made that an antitrust hearing is otherwise required (10 CFR, Part 2 Section 2.104(d)), antitrust review of the application for this construction permit under Section 105c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, has been completed and a hearing thereon determined to be unnecessary.
- E. This facility is subject to the following conditions for the protection of the environment:
- (1) The disposal of the sludge from the water treatment plant providing make up water in the cooling system as well as sludges from the potable water supply at the facility shall be in accordance with effluent guidance limitation documents being developed by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and in the same manner as approved for all other public and private water treatment plants using the Missouri River as a raw water source. Detailed plans for the potable water supply system shall be submitted to the Missouri Division of Environmental Quality, Public Water Supply Section, for review.
 - (2) Monitoring of the facility discharge shall be conducted in whatever manner is necessary to assure safety of downstream water users, including the development of procedures for monitoring of copper concentrations in the effluents from the Callaway Plant.
 - (3) The Applicant shall take the necessary mitigating actions, including those summarized in Section 4.6 of the Final Environmental Statement during construction of the facility and associated transmission lines to avoid unnecessary adverse environmental impacts from construction activities.
 - (4) The Applicant shall establish a control program which shall include written procedures and instructions to control all construction activities as prescribed herein and shall provide for periodic management audits to determine the adequacy of implementation of environmental conditions. The Applicant shall maintain sufficient records to furnish evidence of compliance with all the environmental conditions herein.

- (5) Before engaging in a construction activity not evaluated by the Commission, the Applicant will prepare and record an environmental evaluation of such activity. When the evaluation indicates that such activity may result in a significant adverse environmental impact that was not evaluated, or that is significantly greater than that evaluated in the Final Environmental Statement, the Applicant shall provide a written evaluation of such activities and obtain approval of the Director of the Division of Project Management prior to conducting such activities.
- (6) If unexpected harmful effects or evidence of serious damage are detected during facility construction, the Applicant shall provide to the staff an acceptable analysis of the problem and a plan of action to eliminate or significantly reduce the harmful effects or damage.
- (7) The Applicant shall conduct his proposed monitoring programs, as summarized in Section 6 of the Final Environmental Statement, including the modifications defined by the staff in Subsections 6.1.1, 6.1.2 and 6.1.4.1 of the Final Environmental Statement regarding the duration of the water wells monitoring program, the extent of the radiological monitoring program and the sampling frequency of the aquatic ecology monitoring program.
- (8) The Applicant shall geologically map in detail all major excavation. The staff must be notified when the mapping is being done so that the staff can make arrangements to examine the excavations to determine if the subsurface structure correlates with the interpretations made from the nearby water well data and the onsite core borings. The Applicant shall include the resulting maps and evaluation in the Final Safety Analysis Report.
- (9) The Applicant shall conduct a program to assess the significance of Logan Creek as a fish spawning and nursery area, the extent of damage to the creek and its biota which may ensue from the construction of crossings for pipelines, and the need for protective measures to ameliorate adverse impacts. Prior to starting pipeline construction, the Applicant shall submit the impact assessment and plan for construction of the crossings to the staff for review and approval as provided in Subsections 4.3.2.1, 4.4.1 and 6.1.4 of the Final Environmental Statement.
- (10) The Applicant will use a mine for obtaining rock for concrete aggregate and backfill. If the Applicant chooses to develop a quarry instead of a mine, a revised description and impact assessment must be submitted to the staff for review and approval prior to commencement of work at the quarry.

4. This permit is subject to the limitation that a license authorizing operation of the facility will not be issued by the Commission unless (a) the Applicant submits to the Commission the complete Final Safety Analysis Report, portions of which may be submitted and evaluated from time to time; (b) the Commission finds that the final design provides reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the operation of the facility in accordance with procedures approved by it in connection with the issuance of said license; (c) the Commission finds that operation of the facility will be in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements were satisfied; and (d) the Applicant submits proof of financial protection and executes an indemnity agreement as required by Section 170 of the Act.

5. This permit is effective as of its date of issuance and shall expire on the latest completion date indicated in paragraph 3.A above.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



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

Date of Issuance: April 16, 1976

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY
CALLAWAY PLANT, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. STN 50-483

ORDER EXTENDING THE CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE

Union Electric Company is the holder of Construction Permit No. CPPR-139 issued on April 16, 1976 for construction of the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1 on a site in Callaway County, Missouri.

By letter, dated July 22, 1981, Union Electric Company filed a request for the extension of the latest construction completion date for the Callaway Plant from February 28, 1982 to December 31, 1983. The requested extension is required because of changes to Union Electric's construction program delaying scheduled completion for twelve months resulting from, according to Union Electric: (1) a change in the Missouri public utility law which prohibits the inclusion of construction work in progress in the rate base; and (2) projected load growth being less than originally anticipated. The aforementioned state law change, according to Union Electric, affected the amount of funds available for construction of the Callaway Plant. Additional reasons for the extension include successive strikes by the laborers' and the operating engineers' unions which together lasted nine weeks, and design changes to the plant initiated to satisfy NRC requirements resulting from the accident at Three Mile Island. Included in the new requirements are two new buildings, a Technical Support Center and an Emergency Operations Facility, and associated data systems which are to be

~~8201250468~~ 5 pp.

operational prior to fuel loading. The time required for design and construction of these two facilities will extend beyond the earlier fuel load date of April 1981. In addition, the productivity of construction labor has been lower than anticipated and is requiring more manhours than estimated at the initial planning stage due, in part, to increased quality control requirements.

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

The Commission has determined that this action will not result in any significant environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 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 NRC staff evaluation and the order and the request for extension of the construction permit are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20555 and at the Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri and at the Olin Library of Washington University, Skinker and Lindell Boulevards, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the latest construction completion date for CPPR-139 be extended from February 28, 1982 to December 31, 1983.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Approved by
Darrell G. Eisenhut

Date of Issuance: DEC 21 1981

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NO. CPPR-139
FOR THE CALLAWAY PLANT, UNIT 1
DOCKET NO. STN 50-483

A. INTRODUCTION

Union Electric Company is the holder of Construction Permit No. CPPR-139 issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on April 16, 1976 for construction of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1. The plant is presently under construction at a site located in Callaway County, Missouri approximately 30 miles south of Columbia, Missouri. In accordance with Section 185 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U. S. C. Section 2235, and in accordance with the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR Section 50.55, the Construction Permit states the earliest and latest dates for the completion of construction. By letter dated July 22, 1981, the permittee advised the NRC staff that construction could not be completed by the latest date presently specified, namely February 28, 1982.

The permittee has therefore requested in the July 22, 1981 letter that the Construction Permit be extended to December 31, 1983. In accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.55 (b), the staff, having found good cause shown, and for the reasons stated below, is extending the latest completion date to December 31, 1983.

This evaluation contains the following Sections: Section B, the specification of "good cause" shown by the permittee for an extension, i.e., the specific delays which the permittee has cited in support of its request for an extension; Section C, the staff's independent judgment as to the "reasonable time" necessary from the present forward to compensate for each factor of delay; Section D, a finding as to significant hazards and environmental impact consideration, and Section E, a conclusion and recommendation for an Order.

B. Specified Delays

The permittee stated in the July 21, 1981 letter that the following factors led to the overall delay in the completion of construction of the facility.

1. A change in Missouri public utility law prohibited the inclusion of construction work in the rate base, which affected the amount of funds available for construction.
2. Between 1973 and 1977 the projected load growth for the company decreased from 5.6% to 4.4% per year.

3. A number of additions and modifications to design have been made late in the construction schedule to meet recent and changing NRC requirements in the aftermath of TMI. The construction schedule has been adversely affected by the additional work to implement plant modifications required as a result of reassessment made following the TMI accident. This includes the construction of two new buildings, the Technical Support Center and the Emergency Operations Facility.
4. A significant drop in labor productivity has occurred due to increased regulatory requirements in the area of quality control.
5. Successive strikes by two labor unions lasted a total of nine weeks during the spring of 1980.

C. REASONABLE COMPENSATION TIME

We concur with the applicant that the construction permit should be extended an additional 22 months to account for schedule delays and contingencies. We find that the justification for this extension is primarily a combination of less funds available for construction, lower demand growth rate for electric power, and increased regulatory requirements which require changes in construction as well as lowering labor productivity.

We have also examined the construction times for other commercial pressurized water reactors constructed during the same period. We find that the construction time for this facility is comparable to other plants and reasonable. Because of this and the above reasons, we find December 31, 1983 acceptable as the latest date for completion of construction for this facility.

D. SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONSIDERATION

We find that because the request is merely for an extension of time to complete work already reviewed and approved, no significant hazard consideration is involved in granting the request; thus, prior notice of this action is not required. It is also concluded that there will be no environmental impact attributable to the proposed action other than that already predicted and described in the Commission's Draft Environmental Statement issued in September 1981. 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.

E. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the reasons stated herein, the staff concludes that issuance of an Order extending the latest construction completion date for construction of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Construction Permit No. CPPR-139, to December 31, 1983 is reasonable and so ordered.

15/

G. E. Edison, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

15/

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

Dated: DEC 21 1981

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONUNION ELECTRIC COMPANYCALLAWAY PLANT, UNIT NO. 1DOCKET NO. STN 50-483ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE

Union Electric Company is the holder of Construction Permit No. CPPR-139 issued on April 16, 1976 by the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for construction of the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1 located in Callaway County, Missouri.

By letter, dated October 28, 1983, Union Electric Company filed an application for extension of the latest construction completion date for the Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1 Construction Permit. It was requested that Construction Permit CPPR-139 be extended from December 31, 1983 to June 30, 1985. The reasons given for the requested extension in time were: (1) the exacting nature of the work during latter stages of construction; (2) the slow progress of construction due in part to increasingly stringent quality requirements; and (3) numerous changes and additional requirements for plant design, including those required as a result of the Commission's regulatory review of the Three Mile Island accident.

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.

~~8312210324~~ 2pp .


-2-

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 October 28, 1983, 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 Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the latest construction completion date for CPPR-139 be extended from December 31, 1983 to June 30, 1985.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


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

Date of Issuance: DEC 12 1983



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

STAFF SAFETY EVALUATION FOR EXTENSION OF THE
LATEST CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE FOR THE
CALLAWAY PLANT, UNIT 1

Introduction

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) authorized the construction of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1 by issuing Construction Permit No. CPPR-139 to Union Electric Company. The latest date for completion of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1 is December 31, 1983.

By letter dated October 28, 1983, Union Electric Company submitted an application for amendment of the construction permit to reflect the new "latest completion date" for Callaway Plant, Unit 1. The applicant requested an additional time of 18 months for completion of construction. This would extend the completion date to June 30, 1985.

In accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.55(b), the NRC staff, having found good cause shown, recommends that the latest completion date of June 30, 1985 be granted for reasons stated below.

Analysis

Union Electric Company stated in the October 28, 1983 letter that the extension of time for completion of construction was needed because of the following:

1. The exacting nature of the work during the latter stages of construction.
2. Construction has not progressed as rapidly as projected, due in part to increasingly stringent quality requirements.
3. Numerous changes and additional requirements for plant design and analysis have been incorporated, including those required by the Commission as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and during the course of the NRC's regulatory review.

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for delay stated in the October 28, 1983 letter and has concluded 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 recommends that the construction permit be extended an additional 18 months to provide for schedule delays as requested by the applicant.

~~96312210325~~ 2 pp.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion date. This is the only change proposed by the applicant and the 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 permit. 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 latest construction completion date.

Conclusion

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and has concluded that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay. Therefore, the NRC staff has concluded that the latest construction completion date for the Callaway Plant 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 date for Construction Permit No. CPPR-139 from December 31, 1983 to June 30, 1985.

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.

Joseph J. Holonich

Joseph J. Holonich, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

B. J. Youngblood

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

Date of Issuance: DEC 12 1983