



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 68 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-58
AND AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-74
INDIANA AND MICHIGAN ELECTRIC COMPANY
DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-315 AND 50-316

Background

The standard technical specifications require that if the CO₂ system in a fire area is isolated for maintenance or other activities which require personnel to enter the fire area, a continuous fire watch must be established in the fire areas affected. Due to the configuration of certain plant areas, isolation of the CO₂ system for maintenance in one area may require the isolation of CO₂ systems in several interconnected areas to permit personnel to access the area in which the maintenance is to be performed.

Evaluation

To alleviate the need for a large number of fire watch personnel in such a case, i.e., one for each area as isolated, the licensee has proposed the use of a roving fire watch patrol that would visit each area within 25-35 minutes. We have evaluated this proposal and find that as written, a portion of the proposed changes are unacceptable i.e., the action statements that would only require establishment of a roving fire watch patrol in areas "not occupied by workers". The presence of a worker who is not a qualified fire watch does not provide adequate assurance that an effective fire watch is maintained.

By telephone call on January 10, 1983 the licensee agreed to delete the statement, "which are not occupied by workers" from the action statements, and to refer to the qualifications needed for the roving fire watch patrol in the bases section. With these changes, we find that for the spaces in question, the use of a roving fire watch patrol provides an acceptable level of safety.

In addition, the licensee letter of December 30, 1982 also proposed the use of TV cameras in high exposure areas. Subsequently, the licensee verbally withdrew this proposal. Thus, this aspect of the December 30, 1983 letter has not been evaluated.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendments do not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendments involve an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: February 7, 1983