



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 170 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-6

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY

BIG ROCK POINT PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-155

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 29, 1993, supplemented April 30, 1993, the Consumers Power Company (CPCo, the licensee) requested an amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-6 for the Big Rock Point Plant. The proposed amendment would revise the Administrative Controls Section of the TS. The letter dated April 30, 1993, proposed a minor revision to TS 6.5.1.2 that did not change the initial proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration or affect the notice published March 25, 1993 (58 FR 16222).

2.0 EVALUATION

The January 29, 1993, letter proposed ten changes to the Administrative Controls Section of the TS. Following is an evaluation of these changes.

2.1 Nomenclature Change

Change A changes the "Nuclear Safety Services Department" (NSSD) to the "Nuclear Performance Assessment Department" (NPAD) and Changes B and F change "NSSD" to "NPAD". (Change F also rewords the two paragraphs into one paragraph and adds the term "Nuclear Performance Specialists" to describe the NPAD members.) Change H deletes "Assurance" from Quality Assurance Program for the CPC-2A title. These are only changes in nomenclature and are acceptable.

2.2 Makeup of the Plant Review Committee (PRC)

Change C changes the description of the members of the PRC by deleting specific titles and replacing them with a generic statement which allows the Plant Manager to designate the PRC members. In the January 29, 1993, letter, Change C also specified that PRC members must meet the qualifications of ANSI N18.1-1971. However, at an April 26, 1993, meeting, the licensee was informed that reference to ANSI N18.1-1971 was not sufficient. Thus, by letter dated April 30, 1993, the licensee added the reference to sections 4.2 and 4.4 (Qualifications for Managers and Professional Technical Groups) of ANSI N18.1-1971.

Change D allows an alternate PRC Chairman and alternate PRC members to meet the requirements for a quorum.

These two changes do not alter the number of members or the member qualification requirements of the PRC or a quorum for PRC. Therefore, these two changes are acceptable.

2.3 Reports to Director, NPAD

Change E requires that the Director, NPAD, be forwarded reports covering the investigation of all Technical Specification violations and reports of non-controlled radioactive releases. The Director, NPAD, will then forward these reports to a Nuclear Performance Specialist (NPS), an expert in the area of concern, who will determine if additional review is necessary.

The existing TS required that these reports be forwarded to the NPAD. The proposed change makes more efficient use of personnel, with no decrease in the quality of the review, and is, therefore, acceptable.

2.4 Audit and Reporting Responsibilities of NPAD

Change G specifies that audits shall be performed by the NPAD staff under the cognizance of Nuclear Performance Specialists. The existing TS specified that audit shall be performed under the cognizance of NSSD. This change is consistent with Changes B and F and is, therefore, acceptable.

Change I states that audit reports shall be forwarded to the Director, NPAD, instead of the NSSD. This is consistent with Changes B and E and is, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Michigan State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes administrative procedures and requirements. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (58 FR 16222). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: L. Olshan

Date: May 24, 1993