

MS 016

AUG 27 1984

Docket No. 50-266

DISTRIBUTION:

Mr. C. W. Fay, Vice President
Nuclear Power Department
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street Room 308
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
ORB#3 Rdg
DEisenhut
TColburn
PMKreutzer
EJordan

JNGrace
ACRS (10)
OPA, CMiles
Gray File #4

Dear Mr. Fay:

Enclosed is a copy of a "Notice of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact" for your information. This notice relates to your application dated January 13, 1983 for relief from certain of the requirements of Section XI of the ASME Code as modified by 10 CFR 50.55a. Specifically, you requested, in part, relief from the requirement to perform surface examinations of the safety injection reducer-to safe-end welds RC-4-SI-1001-32 and RC-4-SI-1002-18 (Item No. B9.11, Category BJ) for Point Beach Unit 1. Other reliefs for Point Beach Units 1 and 2 requested by your January 13, 1983 application have been addressed by the staff's March 29, 1984 Safety Evaluation.

The enclosed Notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

James R. Miller, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
Notice

ORB#3:DL
PKreutzer
8/10/84

ORB#3:DL
TColburn:dd
8/10/84

ORB#3:DL
JRMiller
8/16/84

OELD
M. R. R. MAX
8/20/84
AD:OR:DL
GCLainas
8/27/84

CP

8409110268 840827
PDR ADOCK 05000266
P PDR

UK

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONWISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANYDOCKET NO. 50-266NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OFNO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of relief from the requirements of Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code as specified by the provisions of 10 CFR 50.55a(b) to Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee), for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1, located in the Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of Proposed Action: The action would provide relief from the requirement to perform surface examinations of the safety injection reducer-to-safe end welds as required by Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code which has been incorporated by reference in the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a relating to Inservice Inspection of Safety Related Components. Volumetric examinations of these welds would be performed every 10 years as required.

The Need for the Proposed Action: The proposed relief is required because surface examinations of these welds are not possible due to the inaccessibility of the weld surfaces. The welds are located between the reactor vessel and the biological shield wall.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action: The proposed relief is allowed by the provisions of 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i) where the tests or examinations required by the code are determined impractical to perform. As the surfaces of the welds in question are inaccessible, a surface examination has been determined by the licensee and evaluated by the Commission as impractical to perform. The

has determined that the required volumetric inspection of the welds once every 10 years will provide adequate assurance of the structural integrity of the welds. Identical relief to that requested for Unit 1 was provided for Point Beach Unit 2 by the Commission's Safety Evaluation and letter of March 29, 1984.

Consequently, as the Commission has determined that the welds will retain adequate structural integrity utilizing the licensee's proposed alternate examination (volumetric examination once every 10 years), the probability of weld failure has not been increased significantly and the consequences of post-weld failure radiological releases will not be greater than previously determined nor does the requested relief otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. Therefore, the Commission has determined that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the requested relief.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the requested relief involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other non-radiological environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission has determined that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the requested relief.

Alternative Use of Resources: This action involves no use of resources not considered in the Final Environmental Statement (construction permit and operating license) for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1.

staff has determined that the required volumetric inspection of the welds once every 10 years will provide adequate assurance of the structural integrity of the welds. Identical relief to that requested for Unit 1 was provided for Point Beach Unit 2 by the Commission's Safety Evaluation and letter of March 29, 1984.

Consequently, as the Commission has determined that the welds will retain adequate structural integrity utilizing the licensee's proposed alternate examination (volumetric examination once every 10 years) the probability of weld failure has not been increased significantly and the consequences of post-weld failure radiological releases will not be greater than previously determined nor does the requested relief otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. Therefore, the Commission has determined that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the requested relief.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the requested relief involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other non-radiological environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission has determined that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the requested relief.

Alternative Use of Resources: This action involves no use of resources not considered in the Final Environmental Statement (construction permit and operating license) for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's request and did consult other agencies or persons.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the requested relief.

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

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for relief dated January 13, 1983, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Joseph P. Mann Public Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 27th day of August, 1984

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Gus C. Lainas, Acting Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

ORB#3:DL
PKreutzer
8/10/84

TC
ORB#3:DL
TColburn:dd
8/10/84

cm
ORB#3:DL
JRMiller
8/16/84

GB
OELB
Bachmann
8/20/84

G
AD:OR:DL
GCLainas
8/27/84

DL
D:DL
DGEisenhut
8/27/84

W