

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-440

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF

NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58, issued to the FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee), for operation of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, located in Lake County, Ohio.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

Identification of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would eliminate the requirement in the Environmental Protection Plan to perform semi-annual (late spring and early fall) sampling of Lake Erie sediment in the Perry and Eastlake Plant area for *Corbicula* (i.e., Asiatic clams).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated September 9, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The Perry Environmental Protection Plan was modified in 1988 to require semi-annual (late spring and early fall) sampling of areas at Perry and the licensee's Eastlake Plant to detect the presence of *Corbicula*. The purpose of the monitoring program is to provide for sufficient time to prepare for prevention and control programs, should *Corbicula* be detected at the Perry

PDR ADOCK

DF01

site. *Corbicula*, which have been detected in Lake Erie at the Eastlake Plant since June 1987, have not been detected at the Perry site. Zebra Mussels have been detected at the Perry site since 1987 and an effective control program has been implemented to suppress their growth and minimize the potential for system biofouling. The licensee has concluded that the control program used for Zebra Mussels at the Perry site would be equally effective against *Corbicula*. Therefore, since adequate control programs have already been implemented at the Perry site, there would be no apparent benefit in requiring the licensee to perform semi-annual sampling for their detection. The proposed action is needed to eliminate the sampling program in the Environmental Protection Plan. The elimination of the sampling program will result in savings of about \$22,000 per year.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it is acceptable because the control program currently implemented to monitor and mitigate potential biofouling by Zebra Mussels would be equally effective for *Corbicula*.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action:

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources:

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 27, 1999, the staff consulted with the Ohio State official, Carol O'Claire, of the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC 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 letter dated September 9, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. Publicly

available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of December 1999.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Douglas V Pickett

**Douglas V. Pickett, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation**