



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 102 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-49

IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY
CENTRAL IOWA POWER COOPERATIVE
CORN BELT POWER COOPERATIVE

DUANE ARNOLD ENERGY CENTER

DOCKET NO. 50-331

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated April 29, 1983, the Commission issued to Iowa Electric Light and Power Company (the licensee) Amendment No. 89 to the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Technical Specifications. Amendment No. 89 was related to the approval of Mark I containment modifications. In the Safety Evaluation for Amendment No. 89, the staff required the licensee to incorporate in the DAEC Technical Specifications the Low-Low Setpoint (LLS) logic test frequency committed to by the licensee in a letter dated April 21, 1983. In the Safety Evaluation for Amendment No. 89, the staff also found that the lowering of the MSIV isolation water level setpoint was acceptable. The licensee, in a letter dated August 26, 1983, submitted the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications arising from its commitments in connection with the LLS relief logic modifications noted in the Safety Evaluation for Amendment No. 89.

2.0 Evaluation

The licensee in its August 26, 1983 letter in connection with LLS relief logic modifications, proposed changes to the Technical Specifications to incorporate the LLS logic surveillance requirements, and to lower the MSIV water level trip from low-low water level to low-low-low water level. These changes were previously approved in the Safety Evaluation for Amendment No. 89, and were submitted by the licensee in its August 26, 1983 letter for the purpose of implementation. We find that the proposed changes are consistent with our requirements and are, therefore, acceptable for incorporation in the Technical Specifications.

3.0 Environmental Considerations

This amendment involves a change in the use of a facility component located within the restricted area. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupation 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

8407100672 840625
PDR ADOCK 05000331
PDR

finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Sec. 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

We have 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: M. Thadani

Dated: June 25, 1984