Central File

JUN 30 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: R. Reid, Chief, Operating Reactors Branch #4, DOR

FROM: G. Knighton, Chief, Environmental Evaluation Branch, DOR

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF NON-RADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION AMENDMENT FOR OCONEE 1, 2, 3

PLANT NAME: Oconee, Units 1, 2, 3
DOCKET NUMBERS: 50-269, -270, -287
RESPONSIBLE BRANCH: ORB #4
PROJECT MANAGER: M. Fairtile
TAC NUMBER: 7210
REVIEW STATUS: EEB Review continuing

By letter dated December 2, 1977 to NRC, Duke Power Company requested an amendment to their operating license for Oconee Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2 and 3. They requested termination of their non-radiological special study requirements on the basis that their review of the results of these special study programs indicated that no major adverse environmental impact has occurred or is likely to result from operation of the station. In addition to this, they requested that the environmental surveillance programs be terminated, in effect, eliminating the entire non-radiological ETS.

On May 31, 1978, W. Pasciak and M. Fairtile met with members of the Duke Power Company staff to discuss their proposal. We informed them that it will be necessary that some environmental surveillance programs be designed for the entire operational life of the plant. As such, their request to terminate them on the basis that "technical specifications are not considered necessary nor desirable," without an adequate evaluation of program results justifying the action, could not be accepted. We informed them that the "special studies" could also be terminated if sufficient analysis of the results were presented to justify termination. This analysis should include certain specific information supplementing their summary reports. In response to their request that we transmit a list describing this specific information to them, we include the enclosure containing the list. It should be pointed out that their analysis should not be restricted to the list presented, but include all the assessments to support their request.

S/GEORGE W. KNIGHTON

781030252

G. W. Knighton, Chief
Environmental Evaluation Branch
Division of Operating Reactors

Drep 2

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc: See page 2

Contact: W. Pasciak, EEB/DOR
28066

OFFICE ➔						
SURNAME ➔						
DATE ➔						

NRC FORM 318 (9-76) NRCM 0240 ☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976 — 626-624

8001020 846 P

JUN 30 1978

R. Reid - 2 -

cc: V. Stello
B. Grimes
D. Eisenhut
M. Fairtile
E. Adensam

DISTRIBUTION:

Central Files
EEB/Reading
G. Knighton
W. Pasciak

OFFICE ➤	EEB/DOR	EEB/DOR	EEB/DOR			
SURNAME ➤	WPasciak/vg	EAdensam	GKnighton			
DATE ➤	6/30/78	6/30/78	6/30/78			

NRC FORM 318 (9-76) NRCM 0240 ☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976 — 626-624

Enclosure

SPECIFIC INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN THE LICENSEE'S ASSESSMENTS SUPPORTING THE TERMINATION OF NON-RADIOLOGICAL SPECIAL STUDIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS

1. On an annual basis, compare the fish impingement and entrainment rate to the studies of fishing catch rates for all age classes and important species defined by the FES to determine whether the plant is killing an amount of fish comparable to that killed by fishing. (E.g., see Reference 1.)

2. Regarding fisheries studies, on page 117 of the FES, it is stated that: "It is clear that to determine ecological significance of condenser effluents, the observed effects must be related to the population density, dynamics, and regeneration times of the aquatic organisms present in the affected areas. Additional information is needed before expanded, detailed assessments of impacts on terrestrial and aquatic biota in and around Keowee Lake and Hartwell Reservoir can be made." The effects of both condenser effluents and intake effects should be compared to the population density determined in these studies.

3. In the paper (p. 492) discussion population dynamics of young-of-the-year fish in a reservoir receiving heated effluent, you conclude that, "Because changes from the fish populations resulting from heated effluents from the Oconee Nuclear Station are still occurring in the Keowee

Reservoir, the total impact of the plant's operation on young fish stocks cannot yet be assessed . . . . The decline appears to be due to heated water." Elaborate on this conclusion and describe whether or not it is premature to draw conclusions as to the impact of operation of the plant.

Reference:

1. Mathur, D., P. G. Heisey, N. C. Magnusson. Impingement of Fishes at Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Pennsylvania. Trans. Amer. Fisheries Soc. Vol. 106, No. 3, May 1977.