



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 134 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-29  
AND AMENDMENT NO. 129 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-30

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

AND

IOWA-ILLINOIS GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-254 AND 50-265

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 11, 1991, Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo, the licensee) proposed changes to the Technical Specifications for Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2. However, in its letter dated December 13, 1991, the licensee withdrew the first two proposed changes. The NRC approved the request for partial withdrawal by letter dated January 14, 1992 (57 FR 2795.) The remaining proposed change adds two new sections: Radiation Protection Program and High Radiation Area.

2.0 EVALUATION

The first of the two new sections is Section 6.11, Radiation Protection Program, which is replacing Section 6.2.B. The new section is consistent with Section 6.11 of the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) and with the section it is replacing. Thus, the change is administrative, and we find it acceptable.

The second section being added is Section 6.12, High Radiation Area. Quad Cities Station currently complies with 10 CFR 20.203(c)(2) and (4) by requiring that all areas greater than 100 mrem per hour be locked, except during periods of access, or by providing direct surveillance to prevent unauthorized entry. 10 CFR 20.203(c)(5) allows licensees to apply for approval of methods not included in paragraphs (c)(2) and (c)(4) for controlling access to high radiation areas. The staff considers Section 6.12 of the STS to be an acceptable method for controlling high radiation areas. CECo has proposed a new Section 6.12 entitled "High Radiation Area," which is identical to the STS with two exceptions. Section 6.12.c of STS uses the title "Health Physicist." The licensee has changed this to "Health Physics" which is the comparable function at Quad Cities Station. We find this acceptable.

The other change from the STS involves the distance from the source for taking the dose rate measurement. The STS say 18 inches (45 cm), while the licensee proposes 30 cm (11.8 in). The licensee's proposed distance is more conservative than the distance in the STS and is the distance specified in the revised version of 10 CFR 20, published May 21, 1991 (56 FR 23393). Thus, we find it acceptable to use this distance in Section 6.12 for Quad Cities Station.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

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

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change 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. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve 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 the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (56 FR 57693). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). The amendments also involve changes in recordkeeping, reporting or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, with respect to these items, the amendments meet 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 amendments.

### 5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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 amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principle Contributor: L. Olsian, RSM

Date: February 14, 1992