

SEP 10 1977

Docket No. 50-263

Northern States Power Company
ATTN: Mr. L. O. Mayer, Manager
Nuclear Support Services
414 Nicollet Mall - 8th Floor
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Gentlemen:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 29 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-22 for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant in response to your request dated August 9, 1977.

This amendment revises the provisions in the Technical Specifications relating to the radiation environmental monitoring program.

We have evaluated the potential for environmental impact of plant operation in accordance with the enclosed amendment. The amendment applies to the clam sampling program. The clam sampling program is being deleted because in eight years of sampling, extensive searching for clams has met with little success. Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant's radiation monitoring program will be adequate to protect the health and safety of the general public even though the clam sampling program is deleted. We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level, and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4) that an environmental statement, negative declaration or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Since the amendment applies only to administrative details and to the sampling program, it does not involve significant new safety information of a type not considered by a previous Commission safety review of the facility. It does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident, does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, and therefore does not involve a significant hazards consideration. We have also concluded that there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by this action.

OFFICE →						
SURNAME →						
DATE →						

SEP 16 1977

A copy of the related Federal Register Notice is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Wm. H. Regan, Jr.

Wm. F. Regan, Jr., Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis

Enclosure:

1. Amendment No. 29
to DPR-22
2. F.R. Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

bcc: J. R. Buchanan, ORNL
T. B. Abernathy, DTIE
A. Rosenthal, ASLAB
J. Yore, ASLBP

DISTRIBUTION:

✓ DOCKET FILE (ENVIRON)
NRC PDR
LOCAL PDR
OR TIC
IE(5)
B. Jones (4)
W. Regan/S. Bajwa
M. Duncan
D. Davis/R. Snaider
R. Diggs
N. Dube (w/o encl)
C. Heltemes, QA
B. Scott (w/o encl)
S. Varga
A. Steen
B. Scharf (15 cys)
Attorney, OELD
DSE Reading
EP-2 Reading
I. Nelson, ANL
ORB-2 Gray File

ORB-2 LA

9/6/77

ORB-2 BC

9/7/77

subject to
additional
sentence

OFFICE →	DSE:EP-2	DSE:EP-2	ORB-2	OELD	DSE:EP-2
SURNAME →	MDuncan:s1	SBajwa	RSnaider	S.H. Lewis	WRegan
DATE →	9/2/77	9/6/77	9/6/77	9/9/77	9/13/77

SEP 16 1977

cc w/enclosure:

Gerald Charnoff, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Arthur Renquist, Esquire
Vice President - Law
Northern States Power Company
414 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Howard J. Vogel, Esquire
Legal Counsel
2750 Dean Parkway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

Steve Gadler
2120 Carter Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Mr. Kenneth Dzigan
Environmental Planning Consultant
St. Paul City Planning
421 Wabasha Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Sandra S. Gardebring
Executive Director
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
1935 W. County Road, B2
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esquire
Sheldon, Harmon and Roisman
1025 11th Street, N. W., Fifth Floor
Washington, D. C. 20005

The Environmental Conservation
Library
Minneapolis Public Library
300 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Mr. D. S. Douglas, Auditor
Wright County Board of
Commissioners
Buffalo, Minnesota 55313

Warren R. Lawson, M. D.
Secretary and Executive Officer
State Department of Health
University Campus
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440

Environmental Impact Coordinator
Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Chief, Energy Systems Analysis
Branch
Office of Radiation Programs
Environmental Protection Agency
Rm. 645, East
401 M Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20460

Docket No. 50-263

★ Add in a sentence explaining that the amendment is being granted because the Licensee hasn't found any clams out there.

Northern States Power Company
ATTN: Mr. L. O. Mayer, Manager
Nuclear Support Services
414 Nicollet Mall - 8th Floor
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Gentlemen:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-22 for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant in response to your request dated August 9, 1977.

This amendment revises the provisions in the Technical Specifications relating to the radiation environmental monitoring program.

We have evaluated the potential for environmental impact of plant operation in accordance with the enclosed amendment. The amendment applies to the clam sampling program. We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level, and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4) that an environmental statement, negative declaration or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Since the amendment applies only to administrative details and to the sampling program, it does not involve significant new safety information of a type not considered by a previous Commission safety review of the facility. It does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident, does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, and therefore does not involve a significant hazards consideration. We have also concluded that there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by this action.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						