



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 150 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-58  
AND AMENDMENT NO. 136 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-74  
INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY  
DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS NOS. 1 AND 2  
DOCKETS NOS. 50-315 AND 50-316

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 25, 1990, as amended August 14, 1990, the Indiana Michigan Power Company, requested an amendment to the Technical Specification 6.12.2 for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to provide an alternative method of control of access to high radiation areas in which the dose rate is greater than 1,000 mrem/hr.

2.0 EVALUATION

Technical Specification (TS) 6.12.2 for Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 currently requires that locked doors be provided to prevent unauthorized entry into high radiation areas in which the dose rate is greater than 1,000 mrem/hr. These doors are to remain locked except during periods of access by personnel under an approved radiation work permit which shall specify the dose rate levels in the immediate work areas. Because there are some areas where it is not practicable to provide a locked door, the licensee is requesting approval of an alternative method of controlling access to the high radiation area. That alternative method is to substitute posted, roped-off areas and flashing lights for locked doors in situations in which it is not possible or practicable to provide locked doors because of area size or configuration.

The licensee in proposing the TS changes has followed staff guidance contained in NRC Information Notice 88-79, "Misuse of Flashing Lights for High Radiation Area Controls." They have also committed to only apply this flexibility for areas where a locked door is not a viable solution for controlling access to high radiation areas.

The staff has evaluated the licensee's proposed alternative and has determined that this requested alternative is consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 20.203(c)(5) and of the current standard technical specifications; therefore, the proposed change is acceptable.

9011060032 901024  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
P PNU

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. We have determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendment.

### 4.0 CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) 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.

Date: October 24, 1990

Principal Contributor: John Buchanan  
Tim Colburn

