

Docket No. 50-255
LS05-85-06-031

June 25, 1985

Mr. David J. Vandewalle
Director, Nuclear Licensing
Consumers Power Company
1945 West Parnall Road
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Dear Mr. Vandewalle:

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ON APPENDIX R EXEMPTIONS

Re: Palisades Plant

Enclosed is a copy of a "Notice of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact" for your information. This notice relates to your application dated July 16, 1984, as supplemented by letters dated July 20, 1984, August 10, 1984, October 1, 1984, December 28, 1984, March 19, 1985, and June 19, 1985 for exemptions from the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50 for the Palisades Plant.

The notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

John A. Zwolinski, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 5
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
Notice

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	OELD
NRC PDR	EJordan
Local PDR	BGrimes
ORB#5 Reading	JPartlow
HThompson	ACRS (10)
JStang	CMiles, OPA
CJamerson	

Retyped by JBrandenburg 6/14/85.

DL:ORB#5
CJamerson
06/15/85

DL:ORB#5
JStang:tm
06/14/85

DL:ORB#5
JZwolinski
06/20/85

OELD
W. Shields
06/11/85

DL:ORB#5
DCrutchfield
06/25/85

as marked

*SEO1
DSU use 04*

8507020484 850625
PDR ADOCK 05000255
F PDR



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

June 25, 1985

Docket No. 50-255

LS05-85-06-031

Mr. David J. Vandewalle
Director, Nuclear Licensing
Consumers Power Company
1945 West Parnall Road
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Dear Mr. Vandewalle:

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ON APPENDIX R EXEMPTIONS

Re: Palisades Plant

Enclosed is a copy of a "Notice of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact" for your information. This notice relates to your application dated July 16, 1984, as supplemented by letters dated July 20, 1984, August 10, 1984, October 1, 1984, December 28, 1984, March 19, 1985, and June 19, 1985 for exemptions from the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50 for the Palisades Plant.

The notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John A. Zwolinski".

John A. Zwolinski, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 5
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
Notice

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

Mr. David J. Vandewalle
Consumers Power Company

Palisades Plant

cc

M. I. Miller, Esquire
Isham, Lincoln & Beale
51st Floor
Three First National Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Nuclear Facilities and Environmental
Monitoring Section Office
Division of Radiological Health
P. O. Box 30035
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Mr. Thomas A. McNish, Secretary
Consumers Power Company
212 West Michigan Avenue
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Judd L. Bacon, Esquire
Consumers Power Company
212 West Michigan Avenue
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Regional Administrator
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region III
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Jerry Sarno
Township Supervisor
Covert Township
36197 M140 Highway
Covert, Michigan 49043

Office of the Governor
Room 1 - Capitol Building
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Palisades Plant
ATTN: Mr. Joseph F. Firlit
General Manager
27780 Blue Star Memorial Hwy.
Covert, Michigan 49043

Resident Inspector
c/o U.S. NRC
Palisades Plant
27782 Blue Star Memorial Hwy.
Covert, Michigan 49043

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONCONSUMERS POWER COMPANYDOCKET NO. 50-255ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ANDFINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from the technical requirements of Appendix P to 10 CFP Part 50 to Consumers Power Company (the licensee), for the Palisades Plant, located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTIdentification of Proposed Action:

The exemption would provide an alternative to the requirement to install fixed suppression systems in the Engineered Safeguards Panel Room and the Corridor on the 590'-0" elevation of the Reactor Building between the Charging Pump Room and the 1-C Switchgear Room. Alternate shutdown capability in accordance with Appendix R has been provided for each area above.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed exemption is needed because the features described in the licensee's request regarding the existing level of fire protection and proposed modifications at the plant are the most practical method of meeting the intent of Appendix R and literal compliance would not significantly enhance the fire protection capability.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The proposed exemption would provide a degree of fire protection equivalent to that required by Appendix R such that there would be no increase in the risk of fires at this facility. Consequently, the probability of fires has not been increased and the post-fire radiological releases would not be

B507020489 B50625
PDR ADOCK 05000255
F PDR

greater than previously determined. Neither does the proposed exemption otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with this proposed exemption.

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

Alternatives to the Proposed Action:

Since we have concluded that the environmental effects of the proposed action are negligible, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemptions. This would not reduce the environmental impacts associated with fire protection modifications and would result in a much larger expenditure of licensee resources to comply with the Commission's regulations.

Alternative Use of Resources:

This action involves no use of resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the Palisades Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's request and did not consult other agencies or persons.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT


The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for exemption dated July 16, 1984, and in supplements dated July 20, 1984, August 10, 1984, October 1, 1984, December 28, 1984, March 19, 1985, and June 19, 1985, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 25th day of June 1985.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


Dennis M. Crutchfield, Assistant Director
for Safety Assessment
Division of Licensing

greater than previously determined. Neither does the proposed exemption otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with this proposed exemption.

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

Alternatives to the Proposed Action:

Since we have concluded that the environmental effects of the proposed action are negligible, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemptions. This would not reduce the environmental impacts of the integrity of safety ^{associated with fire protection} ~~of the integrity of safety~~ ~~resources to comply with~~ ~~being in violation of~~ the Commission's regulations. ^{modifications} ~~systems~~ and would result in the licensee ^{a much larger expenditure of} ~~being in violation of~~ the Commission's regulations.

Alternative Use of Resources:

This action involves no use of resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the Palisades Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's request and did not consult other agencies or persons.

See other EA markup