SAFETY EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NOS. CPPR-116 AND CPPR-117

FOR THE CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

INTRODUCTION

Construction Permits CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 were issued on August 7, 1975 to Duke Power Company authorizing construction of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The latest dates for completion of the construction of these facilities, as stated in the permits, were June 1, 1981 and June 1, 1982, respectively. On April 30, 1981, Duke Power Company filed a request for extension of the construction completion dates to March 1, 1984 for Unit 1, and to September 1, 1985 for Unit 2.

EVALUATION

In its application for extension of construction completion dates, Duke Power Company indicated that five factors were responsible for the delay in completion of construction activities. The following is a discussion of the causes for delay.

1. Due to design changes, a three month delay was estimated in the completion of support systems for the auxiliary boiler.

2. Problems had been encountered with vendor deliveries causing a delay in the actual erection of piping supports and piping restraints, delay in the installation of the Unit 1 reactor building equipment hatch, and delay in the erection of the steam generator upper lateral restraints.

3. Impact due to Three Mile Island accident, Duke's response to NRC IE Bulletins and Notices, and the dedication of manpower to projects such as a total hanger reinspection program at Duke's McGuire Nuclear Station.

4. A revised preoperational test plan was developed which identified all required activities, their sequence and interdependencies, and the manpower resources needed to support the plant. This revised plan in preoperational and hot functional test duration schedules was approximately 11 months longer than the previously planned schedule and the sequence of system turnovers required was significantly altered.

5. Piping support restraints had been scheduled to be erected closely following and essentially within the duration of the erection of the corresponding piping. This support restraint erection began to lag due initially to late

design information and then later due to a shortage of key support restraint material. Later, revised seismic and thermal analysis of piping systems increased the total number of support restraints required.

Although Duke has sizable Design Engineering, Construction, and Steam Production departments, the number of qualified personnel currently available, supplemented by a substantial number of consultant and contract personnel, have not been able to offset the above delays. Duke's manpower resources have been heavily taxed since 1979 in conducting special studies and investigations as a result of NRC regulations applicable to all Duke nuclear projects, including Duke's operating nuclear station at Oconee.

Duke stated in its April 30, 1981 letter that the new completion dates will provide for a further delay in the licensing of the units due to the uncertainty of the status of current and future rules which will directly affect the Catawba Nuclear Station. In addition, the new dates are consistent with currently scheduled fuel load dates of August 1983 and February 1985 for Units 1 and 2, respectively.

CONCLUSION

We have reviewed the information provided in Duke Power Company's submittal and we conclude that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay. Further, the staff has evaluated each factor contributing to the construction delay and concurs with the permittees as to the reasonableness of time of each delay. Thus, the requested extension of Construction Permits CPPR-116 and CPPR-117 to March 1, 1984 and September 1, 1985, respectively is justified. As a result of our review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date, and considering the nature of the delays, we have identified no areas of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction completion dates for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2.

The staff finds that because the request is solely for more time to complete work already reviewed and approved, no significant hazards consideration is involved in granting the request and thus prior public notice of this action is not required. We also find that good cause exists for the issuance of an Order extending the construction completion dates. Accordingly, issuance of an Order extending the latest construction completion dates for the Catawba Nuclear Station as set forth in CPPR-116 to March 1, 1984 for Unit 1 and to September 1, 1985 for Unit 2 is reasonable and should be authorized.

Dated: June 4, 1981