



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 57 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-6

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY

BIG ROCK POINT PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-155

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 1, 1982, Consumers Power Company (CPC) (the licensee) requested a change to the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-6 for the Big Rock Point Plant. The proposed change would remove certain requirements for area radiation monitors from the TS. We have discussed this change with CPC and made certain revisions to the proposed changes. These changes have been mutually agreed to by the NRC staff and CPC.

2.0 EVALUATION

The proposed TS change would remove the provisions which require area radiation monitors from the TS except for (1) the two monitors on the refueling deck and (2) the monitor in the control room. The requirements in the TSs for these three monitors will remain in the TSs. The other area radiation monitors assist in the important function of signalling personnel when radiation dose rates are changing at certain locations in the plant. However, those monitors do not have the same importance to the safety of the plant as the refueling deck and control room monitors. This regulatory posture is supported by the fact that the refueling deck and control room monitors are addressed by Standard Technical Specifications while the other monitors are not. The operation and calibration of the other monitors will be addressed by plant procedures. Therefore, the staff concludes that the proposed TS change, as revised, is acceptable.

3.0 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.

#### 4.0 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 an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident or a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, 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.

#### 5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This safety evaluation has been prepared by R. Emch.

Date: February 18, 1983