

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

Region I

Report No. 50-363/80-02

Docket No. 50-363

License No. CPPR-96

Priority -

Category A-2

Licensee: Jersey Central Power and Light Company

Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road

Morristown, New Jersey 07960

Facility Name: Forked River Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1

Inspection at: Forked River Nuclear Generating Station, Forked River, New Jersey

Inspection conducted: December 18, 1980

Inspectors:

C. A. Sakenas  
C. A. Sakenas, Radiation Specialist

1-28-81  
date signed

T. J. Jackson  
T. J. Jackson, Radiation Specialist

1/29/81  
date signed

Approved by:

Robert J. Bores  
R. J. Bores, Chief, Environmental and  
Special Projects Section, FF&MS Branch

1/29/81  
date signed

Inspection Summary

Inspection on December 18, 1980 (Report No. 50-363/80-02)

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection of environmental protection programs (construction phase), including observations made by the inspector of the existing environmental conditions at the construction site and the surrounding environment, and management controls and procedures for implementing the environmental protection program during site preparation and construction. The inspection involved 12 inspector hours onsite by two regionally-based NRC inspectors.

Results: Of the two areas inspected, no items of noncompliance were found in one area; one item of noncompliance was found in one area (Failure to control erosion at the site - Detail 2.b).

8104290029

## DETAILS

### 1. Individuals Contacted

\*J. Greist, Project Construction Manager, General Public Utilities Service Company (GPU)

\*D. Callahan, Corporate Environmental Controls Manager, GPU

\*denotes those present at exit interview.

### 2. Verification of Construction Permit Requirements

#### a. Site Tour

Upon arrival at the Forked River site, the inspector toured the perimeter and examined the prevailing conditions at the Oyster Creek and Forked River streams, soil condition and vegetation at the site, backfill storage and equipment laydown areas, sedimentation basins, and the main site excavation.

One item of noncompliance, discussed in Detail 2.b, was identified.

#### b. Land Clearing and Dredging Operations

Several areas were identified by the inspector on December 18, 1980 where environmental impacts from construction were evident.

- (1) An area north of the fire pond and south of sedimentation basin #3 containing some dredging spoils was not stabilized and material was observed entering Oyster Creek. The licensee stated that the remainder of this area had been stabilized by the addition of soil and had been seeded, and that additional work in this area had not been planned.
- (2) The barge unloading area east of Rt. 9 had areas at the northern and eastern boundaries which have eroded into the discharge canal.
- (3) A portion of Oyster Creek between the discharge canal and the South Access Rd. to the Oyster Creek Training Center (north of the temporary bridge) contained dredging spoils which had not been stabilized. Erosion of this material into Oyster Creek was observed.

The observed erosion in these areas was discussed with the licensee, including the establishment of vegetative cover and implementation of other measures to prevent silting problems and protect aquatic ecosystems in the area. The inspector stated that failure to take measures to minimize environmental impact from site operations was an item of noncompliance with the requirements of Section 3.E.1 of the Construction Permit, CPPR-96 (80-02-01).

Another area, along the Forked River Access Road, west of the Energy Spectrum and north of sedimentation basin #2, had eroded and material had been deposited into the South Branch of Forked River.

This area was identified by the licensee in a recent Environmental Problem Report. The licensee stated that the area will be stabilized by seeding in the spring of 1981. The inspector stated that this area will remain unresolved pending implementation of corrective actions (80-02-02).

Two other areas were identified by the inspector as having a potential environmental impact from soil erosion.

- (a) The area designated for the location of the natural draft cooling tower had no vegetative covering and would be subject to loss of material from wind.
- (b) The backfill from the reactor building excavation (about 40 ft. high) also had no vegetative cover and would be subject to material loss during high winds.

The licensee stated that disposition of these areas was pending on formalization of site plans. The inspector stated that these areas will be re-evaluated following formulation of a plan for the Forked River site (80-02-03).

### 3. Management Controls

The inspector reviewed the licensee's procedure for management of the construction phase of the environmental programs (Forked River Site Field Shutdown Procedure - Rev. 2). The inspector reviewed the monthly Progress Reports from 1979 and 1980 and determined that site inspections were performed as scheduled.

The inspector had no further questions in this area.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, items of noncompliance, or deviations. One unresolved item disclosed during this inspection was discussed in detail 2.b.

5. Exit Interview

The inspector met with the licensee representatives (denoted in detail 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on December 18, 1980, at the Forked River Site, Forked River, New Jersey. The inspector summarized the purpose and scope of the inspection and findings. The licensee representatives acknowledged the statement by the inspector with respect to the item of noncompliance (detail 2.b).