



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20655

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT No. 113 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-19
AND AMENDMENT NO. 114 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-25
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
DRESDEN NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3
DOCKET NOS. 50-237 AND 50-249

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 24, 1992, Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo, the licensee) proposed changes to the Technical Specifications for Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3. The proposed changes add Section 6.11 - Radiation Protection Program and Section 6.12 - High Radiation Area. A similar amendment issued February 14, 1992, was approved for Quad Cities, Units 1 and 2.

2.0 EVALUATION

Regarding the first of the two new sections, since the change to Section 6.11 (Radiation Protection Program), is consistent with Section 6.11 of the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) it is administrative in nature and, therefore, we find it acceptable.

The second section being added is Section 6.12, High Radiation Area. Dresden 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 alternative method for controlling high radiation areas. CECo has proposed a new Section 6.12 entitled, "High Radiation Area" that is identical to the STS with two exceptions. Section 6.12.c of the STS uses the title "Health Physicist." The licensee has changed this to "Health Physics" which is the comparable function at Dresden Station. We find this acceptable.

The other exception 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 inches). 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 Dresden Station.

The proposed changes to Dresden's Technical Specifications are identical to changes proposed by CECO for Quad Cities in a letter dated October 11, 1991, and approved by the staff in a letter dated February 14, 1992. The only difference within Section 6.11 and 6.12 between the Dresden amendment and Quad Cities amendment is that the keys specified in Section 6.12.2 of the proposed Technical Specifications for areas accessible to radiation doses greater than 1,000 mrem in one hour are maintained under the administrative control of the radiation protection supervisor at Dresden and under administrative control of the shift foreman on duty and/or the health physics supervision at Quad Cities. We find this difference acceptable.

In conclusion, based on the fact that these changes are consistent with the STS and these changes have been previously approved for Quad Cities, the staff finds the proposed changes for Dresden, Units 2 and 3, acceptable.

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 and change administrative procedures or requirements. 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 (57 FR 24668). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9) and 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.

Principal Contributor: B. Siegel

Date: September 11, 1992