



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 95 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-20

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY

PALISADES PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-255

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 30, 1985, the Consumers Power Company (CPC) submitted a request for a change to the Palisades Plant Technical Specifications for primary coolant system leakage.

The amendment clarifies the existing specifications for both unidentified leakage and identified leakage by defining more clearly the action to be taken when the limit for each is exceeded. The amendment also deletes a specification concerning primary to secondary leakage in the steam generators that was only applicable to cycle 2 operation which was completed several years ago.

2.0 EVALUATION

The existing specifications for unidentified leakage and identified leakage from the primary coolant system state that when the limits (1 gpm and 10 gpm respectively) are exceeded the plant shall be placed in the hot shutdown condition within 12 hours and cold shutdown within 24 hours. No time was allowed for identifying or eliminating the source of the leakage. In some cases, the leakage measurements are erroneous because of changing plant conditions. The revised specification allows 6 hours to identify or eliminate the source of leakage or place the plant in hot shutdown in the next 6 hours and cold shutdown within the following 24 hours. This three phase approach is consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications that are applicable to plants currently being licensed. The time allowances for each phase are comparable (4 hrs. for identification and correcting, following 6 hours to hot standby, following 30 hours to cold shutdown in the Standard Technical Specifications). Comparing the revised Technical Specifications to the previous ones, it is noted that the total time allowed prior to hot shutdown remains the same. The basis for the previous Technical Specifications also discussed identifying an unidentified leak and evaluating its effect on safe operation. Additional leakage measurements may be required to do this which are more accurately performed with the plant in a stable condition and not in the process of an immediate shutdown. The basis section has been modified to reflect the specification changes. The staff finds these changes acceptable.

8602120618 860130  
PDR ADOCK 05000255  
P PDR

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. 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 that there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR §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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: January 30, 1986

Principal Contributor:  
Thomas V. Wambach