



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 27 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-3

TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

AND

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-346

Discussion and Evaluation

By letter dated December 6, 1979, The Toledo Edison Company requested an amendment to the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, operating license. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to reflect changes in the corporate structure of Toledo Edison. The most significant change in the new structure is the consolidation of engineering, Quality Assurance (QA), and operational responsibilities for Davis-Besse under a single vice president. However, the internal functional responsibilities of the three groups has not changed. Clear lines of responsibility have been retained, and the QA organization remains independent from the other organizations.

We find that management control and lines of authority and communication have not been weakened by the proposed changes in the corporate structure. We also find that the QA organization has retained the required independence and authority to carry out the QA program without undue influence from those responsible for costs and schedules. The proposed changes are therefore acceptable.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) 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.

Dated: July 7, 1980