

STAFF SAFETY EVALUATION FOR EXTENSION OF THE  
LATEST CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATES FOR THE BYRON  
STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

INTRODUCTION

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorized the construction of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 by issuing Construction Permit No. CPPR-130 and Construction Permit No. CPPR-131 to the Commonwealth Edison Company on December 31, 1975. The latest date for completion of Unit 1 was June 1, 1982 and for Unit 2 was November 1, 1983.

By letter, dated April 19, 1982, Commonwealth Edison Company submitted an application for amendment of the construction permits to reflect new "latest completion dates" for each of the two units. The application requested an additional time of twenty-eight months for each unit, i.e., CPPR-130 for Unit 1 would be extended to October 1, 1984 and CPPR-131 for Unit 2 would be extended to April 1, 1986.

In accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.55(b), the NRC staff, having found good cause shown, recommends that the latest completion dates of October 1, 1984 for Unit 1 and April 1, 1986 for Unit 2 be granted for the reasons stated below.

ANALYSIS

Commonwealth Edison Company stated in the April 19, 1982 letter that the following factors led to the overall delay in the completion of construction of the facility:

1. The need for an extension of time beyond the present construction permit completion dates is a result of an extended construction period, despite the fact that construction has continued without interruption since its inception. The longer period has resulted principally from the need to install larger quantities of material and equipment than originally contemplated, as well as changes in NRC regulatory requirements, some of which resulted from the NRC's response to the Three Mile Island incident.
2. The need for extension is also based upon improvements in the manner in which Commonwealth Edison Company is implementing NRC requirements. These changes have increased the amount of design work and installation labor required to complete the installation of each component, pipe, cable, and structural member.
3. The above additional measures have been and are being implemented at a pace consistent with Commonwealth Edison's need to spread financing requirements more evenly throughout the construction period in order to keep annual financing requirements within their capabilities.

Commonwealth Edison Company also stated that the requested 28 months extension included a conservative estimate of the actual completion of the units to allow a margin for unforeseen contingencies.

8211040042 821012  
PDR ADOCK 05000454  
A PDR

OFFICE						
SURNAME						
DATE						

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the possible need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permits is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This 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 permits. 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 construction completion date.

#### CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

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.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

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

Dated: OCT 12 1982 \*SEE PREVIOUS ORC FOR CONCURRENCES.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1*	OELD*	DL:LB#1*			
SURNAME	MRushbrook/1	gSChesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoungblood			
DATE	10/8/82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ /82			

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the possible need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permits is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This 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 permits. 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 construction completion date.

# CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

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.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

\*SEE PREVIOUS ORC FOR CONCURRENCE

Dated:		DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1*	OELD*	DL:LB#1*		
OFFICE		MRushbrook/lg	SChesnut	SGoldberg	BJYoungblood		
SURNAME		10/6/82	10/ /82	10/ /82	10/ 7/82		
DATE							

*possible*

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant. X

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permits is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This 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 permits. 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 construction completion date. X

#### CONCLUSION

*reasonable and*

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is justifiable. X

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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

*Add conclusion paragraph on no environmental impacts from extension*

*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 narrative declaration and environmental impact appraisal, need not be prepared in connection with this action.*



The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 28 months for Unit 1 and 29 months for Unit 2 to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permit is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This 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 permits. Therefore, the staff finds that (1) this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) prior 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 construction completion date.

# CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is 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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

\*See previous yellow.

*PERMITMENTS P. 2*

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	5.6-93RC			
SURNAME	MRushbrook/y	SChesnut	JYoungblood	1			
DATE	9/1/82	9/1/82	9/1/82	1-22-82			

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits for Units 1 and 2 be extended an additional 28 months to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of the review of the Final Safety Analysis Report to date, and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The only change proposed by the Permittee to the existing construction permit is an extension of the latest construction completion dates. This 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 permits. 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 construction completion date.

#### CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is 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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

\*See previous yellow.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1				
SURNAME	MRushbrook/yt	SChesnut	JYoungblood				
DATE	7/ /82	7/ /82	7/ /82				

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits for Units 1 and 2 be extended an additional 28 months to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of this review of the Final Safety Analysis Report, and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2. The staff finds that this proposed action does not:

- (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated;
- (2) Create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously; or
- (3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff finds that because the request is merely for more time to complete work already reviewed and approved for Construction Permits CPPR-130 and CPPR-131, no significant hazards consideration is involved in granting the request and thus prior notice of this action is not required.

#### CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is 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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

\*See previous yellow.

OFFICE	DL:LB#1 *	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1				
SURNAME	Rushbrook/yt	SChesnut	JYoungblood				
DATE	6/1/82	6/1/82	6/1/82				

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of April 19, 1982 and concludes 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 further concludes that the provisions of a substantial margin for unforeseen contingencies is appropriate in view of the status of construction and the need for design changes. The NRC staff recommends that the construction permits for Units 1 and 2 be extended an additional 28 months to provide for schedule delays and contingencies as requested by the applicant.

As a result of this review of the Final Safety Analysis Report, and considering the nature of the delays, the NRC staff has identified no area of significant safety consideration in connection with the extension of the construction permit completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2.

The NRC staff finds that because the request is merely for more time to complete work already reviewed and approved for Construction Permits CPPR-130 and CPPR-131, no significant hazards consideration is involved in granting the request and thus prior notice of this action is not required.

#### CONCLUSION

The Commission's staff has reviewed the information provided in the applicant's submittal and concludes that the factors discussed above are reasonable and constitute good cause for delay; and that extension of the latest construction completion dates for the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 is 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 dates in Construction Permit Nos. CPPR-130 and CPPR-131 to October 1, 1984 and April 1, 1986, respectively.

Stephen Chesnut, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Dated:

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1				
SURNAME	Rushbrook/yt	SChesnut	JYoungblood				
DATE	6/1/82	6/1/82	6/1/82				