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

## INTRODUCTION

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorized the construction of the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2 by issuing Construction Permit No. CPPR-132 and Construction Permit CPPR-133 to the Commonwealth Edison Company on December 31, 1975. The latest date for completion of Unit 1 was November 1, 1982 and for Unit 2 was November 1, 1983.

By letter, dated 5 tember 30, 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 fifty-four months for each unit, i.e., CPPR-132 for Unit 1 would be extended to April 30, 1987 and CPPR-133 for Unit 2 would be extended to April 30, 1988.

In accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.55(b), the NRC staff, having found good cause shown, recommends that the latest completion dates of April 30, 1987 for Unit 1 and April 30, 1988 for Unit 2 be granted for the reasons stated below.

## ANALYSIS

Commonwealth Edison Company stated in the September 30, 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 a work stoppage which occurred at Braidwood from September 1979 to March 1980. In September 1979 Commonwealth Edison Company halted work at Braidwood following the Illinois Commerce Commission's denial of a substantial portion of Commonwealth Edison's request for an interim increase in rates. Following the Illinois Commerce Commission's final decision on February 7, 1980 authorizing increased rates, construction was resumed. Due to effort involved in restoring buildings, equipment and services, and requalifying and retraining contractor personnel following the work stoppage, the period of delay attributable to the work stoppage was substantially in excess of the seven month period during which construction was halted. As of August 1982, the rate of construction, in terms of manpower, was back to the level which existed prior to the stoppage.
- 2. The need for extension is also based upon improvements in the manner in which Commonwealth Edison Company is implementing NRC requirements, some of which resulted from the NRC's response to the Three Mile Island incident. 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.

OFFICE	***************************************	*******	*****				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
SUI 821	2010020 821 ADOCK 0500	115					***************************************
A		PDR		******************		***************************************	*******************
NRC FORM 318	(10-90) NRCM 0240		OFFICIAL	RECORD C	OPY		USGPO: 1981-335-960

3. The above additional measures have been and are being implemented at a pace consistent with the Company's need to spread financing requirements more evenly throughout the construction period in order to keep annual financing requirements within Commonwealth Edison's capabilities.

Commonwealth Edison Company stated that the 54 months' extension for each Braidwood unit has been requested to avoid another construction completion date extension at some future time should any unanticipated delays in construction actually occur. However, the present fuel load dates for Braidwood 1 and 2 of April 30, 1985 and April 30, 1986, respectively, are still considered attainable.

The NRC staff has reviewed the cause for the delay stated in the letter of September 30, 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 recommends that the construction permits be extended an additional 54 months' each for Braidwood Units 1 and 2 to provide for schedule delays 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 Braidwood 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 latest construction completion dates.

## 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 Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2 are 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-132 and CPPR-133 to April 30, 1987 and April 30, 1988, respectively.

OFFICE	******************	****************		3,41,71,81,81,81,81,81,81,81,81		*****************	
SURNAME >	***************************************	*******************			********		
DATE	*****************		***************************************		***********		*******

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.

15

Leonard Olshan, Project Manager Licensing Branch No. 1 Division of Licensing

Dated: NOV 8 1982

15/

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

			allt		Line Charles		
OFFICE	DL:LB#1 MRushbrook:c	DL:LB#1	DL:AD				
SHONANE	MRushbrook:c	v/LO1shan	BJYoungbloo	d	***************************************	******************	
DATE	11/4/82	11/8/82	11/4/82				

Document Control STN 50-456 and STN 50-457 NRC PDR

L PDR PRC System NSIC

LB#1 Rdg L01shan MRushbrook BJYoungblood Attorney, OELD DEisenhut/RPurple ELJordan, DEQA: IE JMTaylor, DRP: IE LJHarmon, IE File (2) JSauder WMiller IDinitz WJones, OA TBarnhart BPCotter, ASLBP ARosenthal, ASLAP ACRS (16) FPagano, IE

cc: Licensee Service List