



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 105 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-6  
CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY  
BIG ROCK POINT PLANT  
DOCKET NO. 50-155

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 15, 1990, Consumers Power Company (the licensee) requested amendment to the Technical Specifications (TSs) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-6 for the Big Rock Point Plant. The proposed change removes the provision of Specification 1.1.4 that limits the combined time interval for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. Guidance on this proposed change to TS was provided to all power reactor licensees and applicants by Generic Letter 89-14, dated August 21, 1989.

EVALUATION

Specification 1.1.4 includes the provision that allows a surveillance interval to be extended by 25 percent of the specified time interval. This extension provides flexibility for scheduling the performance of surveillances and to permit consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting a surveillance at the specified time interval. Such operating conditions include transient plant operation or ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. Specification 1.1.4 further limits the allowance for extending surveillance intervals by requiring that the combined time interval for any three consecutive surveillances not to exceed 3.25 times the specified time interval. The purpose of this provision is to assure that surveillances are not extended repeatedly as an operational convenience to provide an overall increase in the surveillance interval.

Experience has shown that the 18-month surveillance interval, with the provision to extend it by 25 percent, is usually sufficient to accommodate normal variations in the length of a fuel cycle. However, the NRC staff has routinely granted requests for one-time exceptions to the 3.25 limit on extending refueling surveillances because the risk to safety is low in contrast to the alternative of a forced shutdown to perform these surveillances. Therefore, the 3.25 limitation on extending surveillances has not been a practical limit on the use of the 25-percent allowance for extending surveillances that are performed on a refueling outage basis.

Extending surveillance intervals during plant operation can also result in a benefit to safety when a scheduled surveillance is due at a time that is not suitable for conducting the surveillance. This may occur when transient plant operating conditions exist or when safety systems are out of service for maintenance or other surveillance activities. In such cases, the benefit to safety of extending a surveillance interval would exceed any safety benefit derived by limiting the use of the 25-percent allowance to extend a surveillance. Furthermore, there is the administrative burden associated with tracking the use of the 25-percent allowance to ensure compliance with the 3.25 limit.

In view of these findings, the staff concluded that Specification 1.1.4 should be changed to remove the 3.25 limit for all surveillances because its removal will have an overall positive effect on safety. The guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14 included the following change to this specification and removes the 3.25 limit on three consecutive surveillances with the following statement:

...Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25 percent of the specified surveillance interval."

The licensee has proposed changes to Specification 1.1.4 that are consistent with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14, as noted above. On the basis of its review of this matter, the staff finds that the above change to the TS for Big Rock Point is acceptable.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and a change in a surveillance requirement. The staff has determined that the amendment involves 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 this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR section 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 this amendment.

### 4.0 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. The staff therefore concludes that the proposed changes are acceptable.

Principal Contributors: Thomas G. Dunning, OSTB/DOEA  
Armando Masciantonio, PD31/DRP345

Date: January 2, 1991