May 18, 1988

Docket No. 50-440

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket Files	NRC & Local PDRs
PDIII-3 r/f	KPerkins
GHolahan	PKreutzer
TColburn	OGC-WF1
DHagan	EJordan
JPartlow	TBarnhart(4)
WandaJones	EButcher
ACRS(10)	GPA/PA
ARM/LFMB	PDIII-3 Gray File
FRosa	

Mr. Alvin Kaplan, Vice President
Nuclear Group
The Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Company
10 Center Road
Perry, Ohio 44081

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 12 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1. This amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications responding in part to your application dated February 9, 1988.

This amendment partially grants your request by allowing a one-time waiver of the requirement for performing a complete (emphasis added) diesel overhaul to like-new condition for the purpose of reducing the diesel generator test failure count as allowed by the footnote to Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 of the Perry Unit 1 Technical Specifications. The conditions of the waiver are that it be on a one-time basis for the purpose of reducing only the specific diesel generator failures listed in the staff's Safety Evaluation. Your request for a permanent waiver is denied. The amendment also revises the wording of Technical Specification 4.8.1.1.3 to allow reporting to be on a per-diesel-generator basis. The change to clarify a footnote on Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 related to the testing frequency is being held in abeyance.

The specific request for revision of footnotes to Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 as contained in your February 9, 1988 application is being denied. The reasons for the denial are contained in the staff's Safety Evaluation.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice. A copy of the Notice of Denial is enclosed.

Sincerely, /S/

Timothy G. Colburn, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects - III, IV, V
& Special Projects

8806030215 880518
PDR ADOCK 05000440
P PDR

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 12 to License No. NPF-58
2. Safety Evaluation
3. Notice of Denial

cc: See next page

*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

Office:	LA/PDIII-3	PM/PDIII-3	PD/PDIII-3	BC/SELB	OGC-WF1
Surname:	*PKreutzer	* TColburn/	*KPerkins	*FRosa	*CWoodhead
Date:	05/10/88	05/11/88	05/16/88	05/11/88	05/18/88

Mr. Alvin Kaplan
The Cleveland Electric
Illuminating Company

Perry Nuclear Power Plant
Unit 1

cc:
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

David E. Burke
The Cleveland Electric
Illuminating Company
P.O. Box 5000
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Resident Inspector's Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Parmly at Center Road
Perry, Ohio 44081

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Frank P. Weiss, Esq.
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
105 Main Street
Lake County Administration Center
Painesville, Ohio 44077

Ms. Sue Hiatt
OCRE Interim Representative
8275 Munson
Mentor, Ohio 44060

Terry J. Lodge, Esq.
618 N. Michigan Street
Suite 105
Toledo, Ohio 43624

John G. Cardinal, Esq.
Prosecuting Attorney
Ashtabula County Courthouse
Jefferson, Ohio 44047

Eileen M. Buzzelli
The Cleveland Electric
Illuminating Company
P. O. Box 97 E-210
Perry, Ohio 44081

Mr. James W. Harris, Director
Division of Power Generation
Ohio Department of Industrial
Relations
P.O. Box 825
Columbus, Ohio 43216

The Honorable Lawrence Logan
Mayor, Village of Perry
4203 Harper Street
Perry, Ohio 44081

The Honorable Robert V. Orosz
Mayor, Village of North Perry
North Perry Village Hall
4778 Lockwood Road
North Perry Village, Ohio 44081

Attorney General
Department of Attorney General
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Radiological Health Program
Ohio Department of Health
1224 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Ohio Environmental Protection
Agency
361 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0558

Mr. Phillip S. Haskell, Chairman
Perry Township Board of Trustees
Box 65
4171 Main Street
Perry, Ohio 44081

State of Ohio
Public Utilities Commission
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0573

Mr. Murray R. Edelman
Centerior Energy
6200 Oaktree Blvd.
Independence, Ohio 44131

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

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKET NO. 50-440

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 12
License No. NPF-58

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Duquesne Light Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, and Toledo Edison Company (the licensees) dated February 9, 1988 complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8806030220 880518
PDR ADOCK 05000440
P PDR

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, as revised through Amendment No. 12 are hereby incorporated into this license. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

for Kenneth E. Perkins, Director
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects - III,
IV, V and Special Projects

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 18, 1988

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 12

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58

DOCKET NO. 50-440

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Remove	Insert
3/4 8-9	3/4 8-9
3/4 8-10	3/4 8-10

to standby operation, and (2) automatically energizes the emergency loads with offsite power.

12. Verifying that each fuel transfer pump transfers fuel from the fuel storage tank to the day tank of each diesel.

13. Verifying that the automatic load sequence timers are OPERABLE with the interval between each load block within ± 10% of its design interval for diesel generators Div 1 and Div 2.

14. Verifying that the following diesel generator lockout features prevent diesel generator starting only when required:

    a. For diesel generators Div 1 and Div 2:

        1) Control room switch in pull-to-lock (with local/remote switch in remote).
        2) Local/remote switch in local
        3) Barring device engaged
        4) Inop/Normal switch in inop

    b. For diesel generator Div 3:

        1) Emergency run/stop switch in stop
        2) Maintenance/auto/test switch in maintenance

f. At least once per 10 years or after any modifications which could affect diesel generator interdependence by starting all three diesel generators simultaneously, during shutdown, and verifying that all three diesel generators accelerate to at least 441 rpm for diesel generators Div 1 and Div 2 and 882 rpm for diesel generator Div 3 in less than or equal to 10 seconds.

g. At least once per 10 years by:

    1. Draining each fuel oil storage tank, removing the accumulated sediment and cleaning the tank using a sodium hypochlorite or equivalent solution, and

    2. Performing a pressure test of those portions of the diesel fuel oil system designed to Section III, subsection ND of the ASME Code in accordance with ASME Code Section 11 Article IWD-5000.

4.8.1.1.3 Reports - All diesel generator failures, valid or non-valid, shall be reported to the Commission pursuant to Specification 6.9.2 within 30 days. Reports of diesel generator failures shall include the information recommended in Regulatory Position C.3.b of Regulatory Guide 1.108, Revision 1, August 1977. If the number of failures in the last 100 valid tests of any diesel generator is greater than or equal to seven, the report shall be supplemented to include the additional information recommended in Regulatory Position C.3.b of Regulatory Guide 1.108, Revision 1, August 1977.

TABLE 4.8.1.1.2-1

DIESEL GENERATOR TEST SCHEDULE

Number of Failures in Last 20 Valid Tests*	Number of Failures in Last 100 Valid Tests*	Test Frequency
≤ 1	≤ 4	Once per 31 days
≥ 2**	≥ 5	Once per 7 days

*Criteria for determining number of failures and number of valid tests shall be in accordance with Regulatory Position C.2.e of Regulatory Guide 1.108, but determined on a per diesel generator basis.

For the purposes of determining the required test frequency, the previous test failure count may be reduced to zero if a complete diesel overhaul# to like-new condition is completed, provided that the overhaul including appropriate post-maintenance operation and testing, is specifically approved by the manufacturer and if acceptable reliability has been demonstrated. The reliability criterion shall be the successful completion of 14 consecutive tests in a single series. Ten of these tests shall be in accordance with the routine Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.a.4 and 4.8.1.1.2.a.5, four tests, in accordance with the 184-day testing requirement of Surveillance Requirements 4.8.1.1.2.a.4 and 4.8.1.1.a.5. If this criterion is not satisfied during the first series of tests, any alternate criterion to be used to transvalue the failure count to zero requires NRC approval.

**The test frequency shall be maintained until seven consecutive failure free demands have been performed and the number of failures in the last 20 valid demands has been reduced to less than or equal to one.

#A one-time waiver to the requirement for performance of a complete diesel generator overhaul to like-new condition has been granted in order to rezero four control air related diesel generator failures (valid failures Nos. 3 through 6 which occurred on 8/11/86, 2/27/87, 3/17/87 and 10/15/87 respectively).

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 12 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-440

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 9, 1988, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Duquesne Light Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and Toledo Edison Company (the licensees) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1. The proposed amendment would revise the criteria contained in the footnote to Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 of the Technical Specifications (TS) for rezeroing the failure count on previous tests of the diesel generators. It would also clarify the footnote concerning test frequency for the diesel generators in Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 and would modify the reporting requirements of TS 4.8.1.1.3 to be on a per-diesel-generator basis rather than a per-nuclear-unit basis.

As the basis for their rezeroing the failure count, the licensees have referenced a January 18, 1988 letter from the diesel generator manufacturer, IMO Delaval Inc., to Mr. Tony Pusateri of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company. The letter certifies that the Control Air Panel 1H51P0548 has been restored to like-new condition following reconditioning and/or replacing of control components in conjunction with the panel modification (as described in as-built drawings submitted by the licensees to the manufacturer on January 13, 1988).

2.0 DISCUSSION

TS Table 4.8.1.1.2-1, "Diesel Generator Test Schedule," is a table which defines test frequency of the individual diesel generators based on the number of valid failures in the last 20 and last 100 valid tests. A note to the table explains the criteria for determining the number of failures and number of valid tests. The note also discusses how the previous test failure count can be reduced. The present wording indicates that the failure count may be reduced to zero if a complete diesel overhaul to like-new conditions is completed provided that the overhaul, including appropriate post-maintenance operation and testing, is specifically approved by the manufacturer and if acceptable reliability has been demonstrated. The reliability criterion shall be the successful completion of 14 consecutive tests in a single series. Ten of these tests shall be in accordance with TS 4.8.1.1.2.a.4 and 4.8.1.1.2.a.5, and four tests in accordance with the 184-day testing requirements of TS 4.8.1.1.2.a.4 and 4.8.1.1.2.a.5.

8806030223 880518
PDR ADOCK 05000440
P PDR

If this criterion is not satisfied during the first series of tests, any alternate criterion to be used to transvalue the failure count to zero requires NRC approval.

The proposed revision would allow the failure count to be reduced if an appropriate overhaul/redesign is completed. This overhaul/redesign must be approved by the manufacturer.

The requirements for post-maintenance operation and testing and for demonstration of reliability would still apply. The failure count would then be reduced by the number eliminated by the approved overhaul.

On July 2, 1984, the staff issued Generic Letter 84-15 (G.L. 84-15) to all licensees of operating reactors, applicants for an operating license, and holders of construction permits. The intent of G.L. 84-15 was to provide licensees with guidance on improving diesel generator reliability by reducing the number of cold fast starts for diesel generators, obtaining diesel generator reliability data and attaining and maintaining a diesel generator reliability goal. Enclosure 1 to G.L. 84-15 described the basis for reducing cold fast starts and its resultant improvement in diesel generator reliability and also discussed the correlation between excessive diesel generator testing (other than cold fast starts) and its resultant degradation of diesel engines. This was primarily aimed at some older plants whose TS required testing of diesel generators each time subsystems of the emergency core cooling system became inoperable.

Enclosure 3 to G.L. 84-15 described an acceptable example of a performance program for attaining and maintaining diesel generator reliability above the threshold level of concern. It included increased surveillance frequency where previous testing indicated failure counts in excess of a specified value until restored reliability was demonstrated. It also considered disqualification and subsequent requalification of the diesel generator in accordance with a prescriptive testing program, including 7 consecutive successful demands without a failure within 30 days, and 14 successful consecutive demands within 75 days of the diesel generator being restored to operable status. Certain more restrictive criteria applied should a failure occur during the above testing.

While increased testing frequency was and still is determined by the staff to be an acceptable method to demonstrate restored reliability of the diesel generator, the discussions in Enclosure 1 to G.L. 84-15 regarding reduction of unnecessary testing and changes to the Standard TS as described in Appendix A of G.L. 84-15, such as changing the previous 3-day test frequency to 7 days, clearly indicate that unnecessary diesel generator testing should be avoided if other methods of demonstrating and/or restoring diesel generator reliability exist.

In this regard, the licensees' proposal has merit in that performance of an overhaul to restore components to like-new condition to eliminate failures, followed by an acceptable demonstration of reliability, would be sufficient to rezero the previous testing failure count. In fact, this thought process

formulated the basis for staff approval of the existing TS allowing rezeroing all failures following a complete overhaul of the diesel generator and subsequent demonstration of reliability. However, the staff takes exception to the wording "appropriate overhaul" as contained in the licensees' proposed TS. Without adequate specificity or bounding criteria for the components affected by previous valid failures, or the acceptance criteria employed for determining when an "appropriate overhaul" has been completed, other than "as approved by the manufacturer," the staff has no basis for approval of the proposed TS or subsequent inspection for compliance were it to be approved. On this basis, the staff must deny the licensees' proposed request.

However, as discussed earlier, it is desirable to reduce unnecessary diesel generator testing where restored reliability can be demonstrated by other means. The licensees have provided evidence as to both the scope of work and degree of restoration to like-new condition of certain diesel generator components and root cause analyses which links four previous diesel generator failures which are under consideration for rezeroing to these components. This information is contained in the January 18, 1988 letter from the manufacturer, IMO Delaval Inc., to Mr. Tony Pusateri of the licensees' staff. The failures under consideration (#3 through #6) were all control air related failures as documented in the manufacturer's letter. These involved failure of the air shuttle valve, a defective control air solenoid valve, a failed control air regulator and failure of the field flashing circuitry due to lack of control air to the associated pressure switches.

The scope of the work for restoration/overhaul of the control air components to like-new condition included control panel overhaul with replacement of the pneumatic logic board; cleaning of pneumatic tubing; replacement of engine pneumatic sensors; adding a redundant control air filter and regulator; removing various pneumatic solenoid valves and pressure switches and adding electro/mechanical relays; replacing control air regulators with heavier duty regulators; improvements to the speed sensing circuitry and improvements to the generator field flashing circuitry. The manufacturer has certified that overhaul has restored the engine control panel to the like-new condition. Additionally, the licensees have demonstrated that reliability of the diesel generator has been restored by the successful completion of 14 valid consecutive tests as required by the TS (to date over 20 successful valid consecutive tests have been completed). Based upon the licensees' corrective action to date and the demonstration that diesel generator reliability has been restored, the staff has determined that a complete overhaul of the diesel generator is unnecessary with respect to the failures under consideration. Therefore, the staff partially grants the requested amendment and approves a one-time waiver of the requirement for conducting a complete diesel generator overhaul for the purpose of rezeroing previous diesel generator failures. By their corrective actions to date, the licensees are allowed to rezero the valid diesel generator failures #3 through 6 which occurred on or about August 11, 1986, and February 28, March 17, and October 15, 1987, respectively.

The licensees' request to modify the reporting requirements of TS 4.8.1.1.3 from a per-nuclear-unit basis to a per-diesel-generator basis is in keeping with the guidance of G.L. 84-15 for determining failure rates on each diesel generator at a site. The test failures are determined on a per-diesel-generator basis to avoid excessive testing on otherwise reliable diesel generators because of failures on one generator at a site. The change in reporting criteria to a per-diesel-generator requirement would be consistent with the testing criteria and would avoid the need for a dual counting system, one for failures and one for reports. The staff considers this change acceptable.

The licensees' request to modify the remedial action footnote to Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 for returning to the normal testing frequency (once per 31 days) after having been in the accelerated testing frequency (once per 7 days) would make the footnote applicable to both the case where entrance into the accelerated frequency occurred as a result of having greater than or equal to 5 failures in the last 100 tests as well as the present case of having greater than or equal to 2 failures in the last 20 tests. The licensees' basis for the proposed change was that it would re-establish the acceptance of diesel generator performance (to the 95% reliability goal) without requiring excessive testing. The licensees indicated that they believed this change had been approved for numerous other operating nuclear facilities.

The staff's April 25, 1985 Safety Evaluation (SE) supporting issuance of Amendment No. 48 to the North Anna Unit 2 operating license discusses the reliability goals, the accelerated testing frequency and the incentives for engine overhaul and their relation to improvement in reliability. As stated in the SE, the original accelerated testing frequency for North Anna was based upon number of failures in the last 100 starts. The expansion of the accelerated test frequency table to include the number of failures in the last 20 starts was to provide early indication (of 2 or more failures in the last 20 starts) of a .90 or lower reliability.

To enter accelerated testing at this point would provide a better sensitivity to the possibility of abrupt diesel generator degradation and provide a timely response. Increasing the test frequency would provide a faster accumulation of test data upon which to judge the reliability of the diesel. This additional data could then be used to distinguish between failures which occur close together simply due to random chance and such failures that are indicative of an abrupt decline in the actual reliability. The weekly test schedule would be continued until two conditions have been satisfied. First, seven consecutive successful tests have been accumulated. Second, the failures in the most recent 20 tests have been reduced to one. Seven successful tests indicate a reliability of at least 0.90/demand but at only the 50% confidence level. Continuing the accelerated testing until the number of failures is 1 out of 20 adds further assurance that the diesel generator has not degraded below the 0.90/demand level.

This relaxation to the normal testing interval of once per 31 days upon satisfying the two conditions above was only applicable to the case where 2 or more failures occurred in the last 20 starts, not the case where 5 or more failures occurred in the last 100 starts. Instead, the licensee for North Anna Unit 2 proposed an explicit direct incentive for the utility to take major corrective action on the diesel generator. If the licensee performs a thorough and comprehensive complete overhaul of the diesel that is approved by the manufacturer, the diesel would be rebuilt to like-new conditions. Following such an overhaul, the diesel would become operable after it successfully passed the appropriate surveillance tests one time. However, in return for the overhaul, the utility would receive the benefit of wiping the slate clean of all previous failures on that diesel generator if an acceptable reliability could be demonstrated. With "no previous failures" in the past 20 or 100 tests, the diesel generator would re-enter the test schedule at the monthly test frequency. Accelerated testing (weekly) would not become required until either 2 failures in 20 tests or 5 failures in 100 tests occur. In contrast, when one considers how long it could take to work back up the table after having a series of failures (i.e., many months and possibly years), the magnitude of this incentive becomes more obvious. An engine overhaul would focus on the internal components and therefore not necessarily address the statistically most prevalent failures. Nonetheless, this overhaul is considered worthwhile. In that major repair action for a diesel that has experienced excessive failures has long been the goal, this concept has merit.

The question that remained was how does one demonstrate that the rebuilt diesel generator actually has an improved and acceptable reliability. Statistically, the probability that a diesel with an actual reliability of less than 0.90/demand will satisfy the 14-test criterion is no greater than 20% and decreases rapidly with the actual reliability. The probability that a diesel generator with an actual reliability of less than 0.95 will satisfy the 14-test criterion is 42% or less. Said in the converse, if the rebuilt diesel passes the 14-test criterion, the statistics say that the probability that the actual reliability of the diesel generator is 0.95 or better is about 50% and that the probability that the actual reliability is 0.90 or better is about 90%.

Thus was developed the incentive plan for performance of a major overhaul of a diesel generator that has had excessive failures and subsequent demonstration of reliability. This concept has been incorporated into the TS for a number of plants including Perry, Clinton, River Bend and others. As stated in the North Anna SE "when one considers how long it takes to work back up the table after having a series of failures (i.e., many months and possibly years), the magnitude of the incentive (for overhaul) becomes obvious." In the converse, if it did not take as long to work up the table (i.e., the change requested for Perry were approved), the incentive for overhaul may be diminished. The staff is unable at this time to weigh the relative benefits of reducing what may be unnecessary diesel generator tests against the reduction in incentive for overhaul of a diesel that has experienced excessive failure rates. This is especially true in light of the one-time waiver of the requirement to conduct

a complete overhaul of the diesel generator approved elsewhere in this Safety Evaluation. As it is unlikely that the licensees would experience a return to the accelerated test frequency in the near future, and as additional guidance regarding diesel generator TS is anticipated in the near future with resolution of generic diesel generator reliability issues, the staff chooses to hold in abeyance the licensees' request for modification of the footnote to Table 4 8.1.1.2-1 until such time as it has been able to consider the request in light of pending guidance.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to 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 or a change to a surveillance requirement. 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 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). This amendment also involves 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 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.

Principal Contributor: T. Colburn

Dated: May 18, 1988

7590-01

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKET NO. 50-440

NOTICE OF DENIAL OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has denied in part a request by the licensees for amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58, issued to Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Duquesne Light Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and Toledo Edison Company (the licensees), for operation of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1 (the facility) located in Lake County, Ohio.

The licensees' application for the amendment was dated February 9, 1988. Notice of consideration of issuance of the amendment was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on April 6, 1988 (53 FR 11377).

The amendment, as proposed by the licensees, would consist of the following changes to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58):

1. The proposed amendment to the Perry Nuclear Power Plant Technical Specifications would modify the note to Technical Specification Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 to allow that appropriate overhauls to a like-new condition can be used to reduce the number of previous test failures, if the overhaul performed would correct deficiencies which were directly responsible for past diesel generator test failures. The requirement for having the overhaul, including appropriate post-maintenance operation and testing, approved by the manufacturer and the requirement for a demonstration of reliability by testing would remain intact.

8806030231 880518
PDR ADOCK 05000440
P PDR

2. The proposed amendment would also expand the applicability of a footnote on Table 4.8.1.1.2-1 to apply both to the case where more than 1 failure was experienced in the last 20 starts and the case where more than 4 failures were experienced in the last 100 starts. Presently the footnote applies only in the former case.

3. The proposed amendment would also change the reporting requirements to be on a per-diesel-generator basis rather than a per-nuclear-unit basis.

The portion of the application which would allow an appropriate overhaul to like-new condition as justification for reducing the number of previous test failures has been denied. Without adequate specificity or bounding criteria for the components affected by previous valid failures, or the acceptance criteria employed for determining when an "appropriate overhaul" has been completed, other than "as approved by the manufacturer," the staff has no basis for approval of the proposed TS or subsequent inspection for compliance were it to be approved. The staff instead evaluated the particular case presented by the licensees and granted a one-time waiver to the requirement for performing a complete overhaul to rezero the failure count. The amendment would allow removal of four of the previous six test failures from consideration in the failure count.

The licensees were notified of the Commission's denial of this request by letter dated May 18, 1988. The third change requested by the licensees' application has been approved by Amendment No. 12 . The second change requested is being held in abeyance. Notice of issuance of Amendment No. 12 will be published in the Commission's regular biweekly FEDERAL REGISTER notice.

By June 27 , 1988, the licensees may demand a hearing with respect to the denial described above and any persons whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a written petition for leave to intervene.

A request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date.

A copy of the petition should also be sent to the General Counsel, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., 20555, and to Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20037, attorney for the licensees.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated February 9, 1988, and (2) the Commission's Safety Evaluation issued with Amendment No. 12 to NPF-58 dated May 18, 1988, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio 44081. A copy of item (2) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., 20555, Attention: Division of Reactor Projects - III, IV, V & Special Projects.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 18th day of May, 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Timothy G. Colburn

Timothy G. Colburn, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects - III,
IV, V and Special Projects