



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-6

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY

BIG ROCK POINT

DOCKET NO. 50-155

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 25, 1977, and supplement thereto dated June 14, 1977, Consumers Power Company (CPCo) proposed to modify the liquid radioactive waste collection system and change the Technical Specifications to delete references to the components removed from the system (Hazards Summary Report, 11/14/61, Dwgs M-108 and M-132). The proposed modification consists of replacing the radwaste concentrator, feedpump, condenser and associated piping and instrumentation by two cartridge filter units.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

According to CPCo, the modification is required by July 1, 1977, to meet the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 as applied by the State of Michigan in issuing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. CPCo has concluded that the modification will result in lowered suspended solids discharge levels, i.e. less than the permit limits of 30 mg/liter daily average and 100 mg/liter daily maximum, and further reduced liquid waste radioactivity levels.

The new filter assemblies will be monitored and alarmed to assure proper operation of the system for removing suspended solids from liquid waste that is returned to Lake Michigan. Based on Big Rock Point operating experience where liquid waste radioactivity levels have been low, it is expected that the radiation levels at the new equipment will be sufficiently low to permit servicing.

8101120 471

CPCo has reported that the radwaste concentrator that they have proposed to remove has not been used for several years because it has never operated properly. Further, even if the concentrator were working properly, the total man-rem/year reduction would be 0.35.

We have reviewed the information provided by CPCo⁽¹⁾ and have concluded that the proposed system modifications and changes to the Technical Specifications should be made.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does 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 amendment involves 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 this amendment.

CONCLUSIONS

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: June 22, 1977

(1) Additional information - Hazards Summary Report (November 14, 1961), Section 9.2.3.1, 9.2.3.3 and 9.2.5.2.