

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONDETROIT EDISON COMPANYFERMI, UNIT 2DOCKET NO. 50-341ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OFNO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of a schedular exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, to the Detroit Edison Company (the licensee) for the Fermi, Unit 2, facility located in Monroe County, Michigan.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTIdentification of Proposed Action:

The proposed action would grant a one-time schedular exemption from the requirements of Sections III.D.2(a) and III.D.3 (Type B and Type C tests, respectively) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 relating to the primary reactor containment leakage testing for water-cooled reactors. Type B and C tests are associated with leakage testing of bellows, manway gasket seals, flanges, and containment isolation valves. Sections III.D.2(a) and III.D.3 require, in part, that Type B and C tests be performed at intervals no greater than 2 years. The purpose of the tests is to assure that leakage through primary reactor containment shall not exceed allowable leakage rate values as specified in the Technical Specifications and that periodic surveillance is performed. The licensee has proposed a one-time exemption to allow a 25-percent extension to the 2-year testing interval.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated September 1, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would provide a one-time schedular exemption for Fermi, Unit 2, from the local leak rate test intervals for Type B and C leak rate tests required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections III.D.2(a) and III.D.3. The exemption is requested to support a revised outage schedule and to avoid the potential for a forced reactor shutdown. If a forced outage is imposed to perform testing, it would present undue hardship and cost in the form of increased radiological exposure. Furthermore, if a forced outage is imposed to perform the required testing, an additional plant shutdown and startup will be required.

Due to a lengthy turbine outage and power ascension program, the licensee proposed deferring the spring 1996 refueling outage until September 27, 1996. This would permit targeted fuel burnup to be met so that Cycle 6 operation can be conducted as planned. However, the 2-year interval for performing Type B and C tests expires in April 1996. Since these tests cannot be performed when the plant is at power, performance of these tests to meet the 2-year interval would necessitate a plant shutdown. Therefore, Detroit Edison has proposed a one-time exemption to allow a 25-percent extension to the testing interval. This would allow for a maximum Type B and C test interval of 30 months and would permit continued plant operation until the September 27, 1996, outage date.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The proposed exemptions will add a one-time only 6-month extension to the Appendix J test intervals for Type B and C testing. As stated in 10 CFR

Part 50, Appendix J, the purpose of the primary containment leak rate testing requirements is to ensure that leakage rates are maintained within the Technical Specification requirements and to assure that proper maintenance and repair is performed throughout the service life of the containment boundary components. The requested exemption is consistent with the intent of 10 CFR 50.12(a), in that it represents a one-time only schedular extension of short duration. The required leak tests will still be performed to assess compliance with Technical Specification requirements, albeit later, and to assure that any required maintenance or repair is performed. As noted in Sections III.D.2(a) and III.D.3 of Appendix J, it was intended that the testing be performed during refueling outages or other convenient intervals. Extending the Appendix J intervals by a small amount to reach the next refueling outage will not significantly impact the integrity of the containment boundary, and therefore, will not significantly impact the consequences of an accident or transient in the unlikely event of such an occurrence during the 6-month extended period.

Past Unit 2 local leak rate test data have, in general, demonstrated good leak rate test results. A combined Type B and C leakage rate was established by the licensee at the conclusion of the last refueling outage and a running total leakage is maintained during each operating cycle. This running total leakage rate is 73.81 standard cubic feet per hour, which is 41.5 percent of the limit of $0.6 L_a$. Based on this margin, it is clear that extending the test interval a maximum of 6 months will not affect the overall integrity of the containment.

The above data provides a basis for showing that the probability of exceeding the offsite dose rates established in 10 CFR Part 100 will not be

increased by extending the current Type B and C testing intervals for a maximum of 6 months. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action:

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the exemption would be to require rigid compliance with the requirements of Sections III.D.2(a) and III.D.3 of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50. Such action would not enhance the protection of the environment and would result in increased radiation exposure for the licensee.

Alternate Use of Resources:

This action does not involve the use of any resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for Fermi, Unit 2, dated August 1981.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 9, 1995, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Mr. Dennis Hahn of the Michigan Department of Public Health, Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's request for exemption dated September 1, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of November 1995.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Tae Kim, Acting Director
Project Directorate III-1
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation