The projected doses for GGNS Unit 1 at EPU power level remained within regulatory limits. The NRC staff expects continued compliance with NRC’s and EPA’s public dose limits during operation at the proposed EPU power level and at the proposed new reactor, if it is constructed and operated. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that operation of GGNS Unit 1 at the proposed EPU power level and the proposed new reactor would not result in a significant impact to the worker’s cumulative radiological dose.

Radiological Impacts Summary

As discussed above, the proposed EPU would not result in any significant radiological impacts. Table 3 summarizes the radiological environmental impacts of the proposed EPU at GGNS Unit 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3—SUMMARY OF RADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radioactive Gaseous Effluents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radioactive Liquid Effluents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Radiation Doses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offsite Radiation Doses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radioactive Solid Waste</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spent Nuclear Fuel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postulated Design-Basis Accident Doses.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Radiological</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed EPU (i.e., the “no-action” alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in the current environmental impacts. However, if the EPU were not approved for GGNS Unit 1, other agencies and electric power organizations may be required to pursue other means, such as fossil fuel or alternative fuel power generation, to provide electric generation capacity to offset future demand. Construction and operation of such a fossil-fueled or alternative-fueled plant could result in impacts in air quality, land use, and waste management greater than those identified for the proposed EPU for GGNS Unit 1.

Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the GGNS FES.

IV. Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the details provided in the EA, the NRC concludes that granting the proposed EPU license amendment is not expected to cause impacts significantly greater than current operations. Therefore, the proposed action of implementing the EPU for GGNS Unit 1 will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment because no significant permanent changes are involved, and the temporary impacts are within previously disturbed areas at the site and the capacity of the plant systems. As discussed in the EA, if any new land disturbances are required to support the proposed EPU, those activities will be conducted in accordance with State and Federal permits to ensure the potential impacts are not significant. Accordingly, the NRC has determined it is not necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action. A final determination to prepare an environmental impact statement or a final finding of no significant impact will not be made until the public comment period expires.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of May 2012.

Alan B. Wang,

Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch IV, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
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Model Safety Evaluation for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF–432, Revision 1, “Change in Technical Specifications End States (WCAP–16294)” Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of the model safety evaluation (SE) for plant-specific adoption of Technical Specifications (TSs) Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF–
The proposed change revises the Improved Standard Technical Specification (ISTS), NUREG–1431, “Standard Technical Specifications Westinghouse Plants,” to permit, for some systems, entry into a hot shutdown (Mode 4) end state rather than a cold shutdown (Mode 5) end state. The model SE will facilitate expedited approval of plant-specific adoption of TSTF–432, Revision 1. This TS improvement is part of the consolidated line item improvement process.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2012–0019 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information in this document. You may access information related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly available, using the following methods:

- NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS): You may access publicly available documents online in the NRC Library at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. To begin the search, select “ADAMS Public Documents” and then select “Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. TSTF–432, Revision 1, is available in ADAMS Accession No. ML103430264, and the model SE for plant-specific adoption of TSTF–432, Revision 1, is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML120200384. The NRC staff disposition of comments received to the Notice of Opportunity for Public Comment announced in the Federal Register on January 30, 2012 (77FR4586), is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12072A159.
- NRC’s PDR: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC’s PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: TSTF–432, Revision 1, is applicable to Westinghouse-designed pressurized water reactor (PWR) plants. The proposed changes revise the ISTS to permit, for some systems, entry into a hot shutdown (Mode 4) end state rather than a cold shutdown (Mode 5) end state. These changes are associated with the implementation of Topical Report WCAP–16294–NP–A, Revision 1, “Risk-Informed Evaluation of Changes to Technical Specification Required Action Endstates for Westinghouse NSSS [nuclear steam supply system] PWRs,” dated June 2010 (ADAMS Package Accession No. ML103430264). These changes reflect the proposed changes that are included.

The NRC staff has reviewed the model application for TSTF–432 and has found it acceptable for use by licensees. Licensees opting to apply for this TS change are responsible for reviewing the NRC staff SE and the applicable technical bases, providing any necessary plant-specific information, and assessing the completeness and accuracy of their license amendment request (LAR). The NRC will process each amendment application responding to the Notice of Availability according to applicable NRC rules and procedures.

The proposed changes do not prevent licensees from requesting an alternate approach or proposing changes other than those proposed in TSTF–432, Revision 1. However, significant deviations from the approach recommended in this notice or the inclusion of additional changes to the license will require additional NRC staff review. This may increase the time and resources needed for the review or result in NRC staff rejection of the LAR. Licensees desiring significant deviations or additional changes should instead submit an LAR that does not claim to adopt TSTF–432, Revision 1.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of May 2012.