

review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Wilmington Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481

Attorney for licensee: Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-155, Big Rock Point Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: March 4, 1993, as revised April 14, 1993, as supplemented April 19 and May 31, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to conform to the wording of the revised 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation," and to reflect a separation of chemistry and radiation protection responsibilities. The supplemental submittals provided additional information on the proposed TS change in response to NRC's request for additional information of May 5, 1995. The original submittal was noticed on May 12, 1993 (58 FR 28053), as corrected June 1, 1993 (58 FR 31222).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Will the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change does not affect the probability or consequences of an accident. The proposed change is to the ADMINISTRATIVE and RADIOLOGICAL EFFLUENT RELEASES sections of the facility Technical Specifications, and are administrative in nature.

- Change "Chemistry and Radiation Protection Supervisor" to "Radiation Protection Supervisor."

- The change from "mR/h" to "mrem/h" is solely a change in terminology since the revised 10 CFR 20 does not recognize or define the roentgen as a unit of radiation.

- The Liquid Effluents Concentration section and the associated bases have been revised to conform with 10 CFR 50.36(a) [10 CFR 50.36a] with effluent concentrations limited to 10 times the limits of 10 CFR 20.1001 - 20.2402, Appendix B, Table 2, Column 2.

- The actual instantaneous dose rate limits of the Gaseous Effluents Dose Rate section

have not changed. However, the bases section has. Under the former 10 CFR 20, these dose rates correspond roughly to maximum permissible concentration and dose(s) received by the maximum exposed member of the public if allowed to continue for an entire year. These limits are used more as instantaneous limits (dose rates above which are not allowed to continue for more than one hour at a time) so as to provide assurance not to exceed 10 CFR 50, Appendix I limits.

2. Will the proposed change(s) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

This proposed change is required by the implementation of a new 10 CFR Part 20 requirements (except for the title change) and are administrative in nature (sic). Neither the material condition of the facility nor the accident analyses are affected by this proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a different type of accident than previously evaluated.

3. Will the proposed change involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Each limit that was affected increased the margin of safety by making the limit more conservative; or remained the same.

- The change of distance to "30 centimeters" (12 inches) is more conservative, providing a higher degree of protection for occupationally exposed worker.

- The liquid effluent concentration limits remain essentially the same. The bases have changed to [10 CFR 50.36a] reflect 10 times 10 CFR 20.1001 - 20.2402, Appendix B, Table 2, Column 2 limits as controlled by 10 CFR 50.36(a) [10 CFR 50.36a] dose limits.

- Effluent alarm setpoints were reviewed to determine any necessary changes and were found to be set appropriately. No change will be necessary.

- "The instantaneous release rate limits for airborne releases will not be changed because they are imposed on licensees as a control to ensure that the licensees meet Appendix I requirements." Alarm setpoints for these dose rate limits may change slightly due to changes in scientific data and will be reviewed and changed as appropriate prior to implementation.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201

NRC Project Director: Cynthia A. Carpenter, Acting

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 12, 1995

Description of amendment request: The amendments delete Technical Specification 3/4.3.4, "Turbine Overspeed Protection," and its associated Bases. The deletion of TS 3/4.3.4 and its associated Bases provides Duke Power Company the flexibility to implement the manufacturer's recommendations for turbine steam valve surveillance test requirements. These test requirements will be relocated from the TS to the Selected Licensee Commitments (SLC) Manual. The SLC Manual is Chapter 16 of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Criterion 1

The requested amendments will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Relocation of the affected TS section to the SLC Manual will have no effect on the probability of any accident occurring. In addition, the consequences of an accident will not be impacted since the above system will continue to be utilized in the same manner as before. No impact on the plant response to accidents will be created.

Criterion 2

The requested amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. No new accident causal mechanisms will be created as a result of relocating the affected TS requirements to the SLC Manual. Plant operation will not be affected by the proposed amendments and no new failure modes will be created.

Criterion 3

The requested amendments will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. No impact upon any plant safety margins will be created. Relocation of the affected TS requirements to the SLC Manual in consistent with the content of the Westinghouse RSTS [Revised Standard Technical Specifications], as the NRC did not require technical specification controls for the turbine overspeed protection system in the RSTS. The proposed amendments are consistent with the NRC philosophy of encouraging utilities to propose amendments that are consistent with the content of the RSTS.

Based upon the preceding analyses, Duke Power Company concludes that the requested amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this