THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

P.O. BOX 5000 - CLEVELAND, OHIO 44101 - TELEPHONE (216) 622-9800 - ILLUMINATING BLDG. — 55 PUBLIC SQUARE

Serving The Best Location in the Nation

MURRAY R. EDELMAN
VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR

September 2, 1983

PY-CEI/NRR-0071 L

Mr. D. G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Washington, D. C. 20555

SUBJECT: Perry Nuclear Power Plant
Docket Nos. 50-440; 50-441
Schedule for Submittals in Response to NRC Generic Letter 83-28

References:
1) Letter, D. G. Eisenhut to All Licensees of Operating Reactors et al, "Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events (Generic Letter 83-28)," July 8, 1983

2) Letter, T. J. Dente to D. G. Eisenhut, "Schedule for Submittals in Response to NRC Generic Letter 83-28," September 2, 1983, BWROG 83-29

Dear Mr. Eisenhut:

This letter requests an extension of the date for submittals in response to NRC Generic Letter 83-28 (Reference 1), for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company is a member of the BWR Owner's Group (BWROG) and an INPO NUTAC, and is participating in their generic evaluations of selected portions of the required actions. We have endorsed the BWROG response (Reference 2) to Generic Letter 83-28, and in order to utilize this BWROG effort most effectively, a time extension is necessary.

In parallel with the BWROG/INPO programs we are assessing the capabilities of our plant with respect to the proposed actions resulting from the Salem ATWS event. We are currently in the construction phase, and are still in the process of drafting our procedures and testing requirements. Therefore, the information learned from the Salem event can easily be incorporated into our programs. In addition, the management concerns raised have been brought to the attention of upper management.

B001
1/0

By the original 120-day time period, we intend to submit a summary of our current assessment on some of the plant-specific items identified in Generic Letter 83-28. The items that will be treated in a manner different from that described in Generic Letter 83-28 will be identified at this time. Because we are in the process of construction, and our plant does not share the design features which failed at the Salem Plant, we feel that a time extension for submittal of plans and schedules for those generic items being treated by the Owners Group will have no significant impact on public health or safety.

While participating in the BWROG/INPO programs, we will continue to assess our plants capabilities in more detail. After completion of the BWROG-developed guidelines for assessing plant capabilities, we will provide the final Perry assessment to the NRC by February 29, 1984.

Please advise us if you wish to discuss our response program in detail.

Very truly yours,

Frank R Stead for

Murray R. Edelman
Vice President
Nuclear Group

MRE:kh

cc: Jay Silberg, Esq.
John Stefano
Max Gildner