

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY  
DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-315 AND 50-316  
NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74, issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee), for the operation of the D. C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, in Berrien County, Michigan.

Identification of Proposed Action:

The amendment would consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) that would authorize an increase of the storage capacity of the spent fuel pool from 2050 to 3613 fuel assemblies.

The amendment to the TS is responsive to the licensee's application dated July 26, 1991, as supplemented by letters dated June 7, 1991, February 4, April 1, and October 26, 1992. The Commission's staff has prepared an Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Action dated December 14, 1992.

Need for Proposed Action:

If the amendment were not approved, the licensee would be unable to continue operations beyond 1995, due to reaching the storage capacity of the current spent fuel pool.

9212300315 921214  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
P PDR

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel" (NUREG-0575), Volumes 1-3, concluded that the environmental impact of the interim storage of spent fuel was negligible and the cost of the various alternatives reflects the advantage of continued generation of nuclear power with the accompanying spent fuel storage. Because of the differences in design, the FGEIS recommended evaluating spent fuel pool expansions on a case-by-case basis.

For D. C. Cook, the expansion of the storage capacity of the spent fuel pool will not create any significant additional radiological effects or non-radiological environmental impacts.

The additional whole body dose that might be received by an individual at the site boundary and the estimated dose to the population within an 80 kilometer radius is believed to be too small to have any significance when compared to the fluctuations in the annual dose this population receives from exposure to background radiation. The occupational radiation dose for the proposed operation of the expanded spent fuel pool is estimated to be less than one percent of the total annual occupational radiation exposure for this facility.

The only non-radiological impact affected by the spent fuel pool expansion is the waste heat rejected. The total increase in heat load rejected to the environment will be small compared to the amount of total heat currently being released. There is no significant environmental impact attributed to the waste heat from the plant due to this very small increase.

The staff has reviewed the proposed spent fuel pool expansion to the facility relative to the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based on this assessment, the staff concludes that there are no significant radiological or non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action and that the issuance of the proposed amendment to the license will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed change to the TS involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined by 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 amendment.

#### Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendment. This would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

#### Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Commission's Final Environmental Statement, dated August 1973, in connection with D. C. Cook, Units 1 and 2.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

The staff reviewed the licensee's request. No other agencies or persons were consulted.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT


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. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31, no environmental impact statement needs to be prepared for this action.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment to the Technical Specifications dated July 26, 1991, as supplemented by letters dated June 7, 1991, February 4, April 1, and October 26, 1992, (2) the FGEIS on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel (NUREG-0575), (3) the Final Environmental Statement for D. C. Cook, Units 1 and 2, dated August 1973, and (4) the Environmental Assessment dated December 14, 1992.

These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2121 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555 and at the local public document room located at the Maude Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14 th day of December 1992.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



William M. Dean, Acting Director  
Project Directorate III-1  
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV/V  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation