



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 130 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-49

IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY
CENTRAL IOWA POWER COOPERATIVE
CORN BELT POWER COOPERATIVE

DUANE ARNOLD ENERGY CENTER

DOCKET NO. 50-331

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 26, 1984, Iowa Electric Light and Power Company (the licensee) requested to amend its operating license by deleting Section 4.1.2 of the Environmental Technical Specification (TS) (Appendix B). By letters dated May 14, and October 4, 1984, the licensee provided the environmental studies referenced in its January 26, 1984 request.

2.0 EVALUATION

Specification 4.1.2 required that the terrestrial monitoring program as reported in the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Terrestrial Flora Study (August 1972) will be repeated 2 years after commercial operation of the plant commences. The licensee's Technical Specification 4.1.2 in Appendix B requires that the licensee perform a terrestrial environmental surveillance after 2 years of commercial operation to document any adverse effects of salt drift from the DAEC cooling towers. The licensee has conducted such studies over a period of 9 years. The results of the licensee's study and evaluations by the NRC staff, including review of the licensee's reports and a visit to the site indicate that there has been no increase in plant disease or insect damage to the vegetation in the area impacted by the cooling tower drift. Our site inspection indicates that there has been a beneficial effect on the impacted area as a result of enhanced green vegetation color due to the impact of cooling tower water drift. The environmental surveillance required in Technical Specifications Section 4.1.2 of Appendix B has, therefore, been satisfactorily completed and may be deleted. The proposed Technical Specification change deleting Section 4.1.2 of Appendix B is, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

This amendment involves changes in the environmental surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there

B603030488 B60218
PDR ADOCK 05000331
P PDR

has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We have concluded that, since the amendment involves only non-radiological environmental matters, (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: G. LaRoche

Dated: February 18, 1986