



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

*Docket*

4 MAR 1987

Docket Nos.: 50-315  
and 50-316

MEMORANDUM FOR: Sholly Coordinator

FROM: B.J. Youngblood, Director  
PWR Project Directorate #4  
Division of PWR Licensing-A, NRR

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION IN BI-WEEKLY FR NOTICE -  
NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT  
TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO  
SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION  
AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316,

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: February 25, 1987

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the  
ice condenser lower inlet door surveillance requirements to allow testing  
in Modes 3 and 4.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The  
current Technical Specifications require the inlet doors to be tested during  
shutdown as defined parenthetical as Modes 5 and 6. This parenthetical  
phrase was added by License Amendments 83 and 64 for Units 1 and 2, respect-  
ively, at the licensee's request to clarify the Modes during shutdown. The  
Standard Technical Specifications make no distinction about modes during shutdown  
for the test; the prohibition for occupational safety is related only to Modes 1  
and 2 or the operating (versus shutdown) modes. By deleting reference to  
Modes 5 and 6, the licensee's proposal would be to allow testing in any mode  
other than Modes 1 and 2. The addition of the Modes 5 and 6 by license

8703060349 870304  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
P PDR

amendments 83 and 64 was considered an administrative change for the convenience of the licensee. The deletion of reference to Mode 5 and 6 is likewise an administrative change to return the surveillance test to the original and acceptable requirement.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for making a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (51 FR 7744). One of these examples (i) is a purely administrative change to technical specifications. The licensee proposes to correct their error in Mode definition for this test which was allowed originally as an administrative change. The proposal returns the surveillance test to current, acceptable requirements and is likewise considered administrative. Therefore, the proposal is directly related to the example.

Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the requested changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Preston Palenske Memorial Library,  
500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts  
and Trowbridge, 2300 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

NRC Project Director: B.J. Youngblood

151  
B.J. Youngblood, Director  
PWR Project Directorate #4  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File  
BJYoungblood Reading

Local PDR  
MDuncan

NRC PDR  
DWigginton

PWR#4 Reading

PWR#4/DPWR-A  
DWigginton/rad  
03/4/87

PWR#4/DPWR-A  
MDuncan  
03/4/87

PWR#4/DPWR-A  
BJYoungblood  
03/4/87