



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 99 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-49

IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
CENTRAL IOWA POWER COOPERATIVE  
CORN BELT POWER COOPERATIVE

DUANE ARNOLD ENERGY CENTER

DOCKET NO. 50-331

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated January 27, 1984, the Iowa Electric Light and Power Company (the licensee) requested a number of changes to the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Technical Specifications including a change to meet the staffing requirements established in 10 CFR 50.54(m)(2). This Safety Evaluation relates only to the matter of the licensee's compliance with the staffing rule, 10 CFR 50.54(m)(2). The other Technical Specification changes requested in the licensee's January 27, 1984 submittal will be handled as separate actions.

2.0 Evaluation

The licensee proposes to revise Table 6.2-1 on page 6.2-3 of the Technical Specifications to specify that in all operating modes other than cold shutdown, the minimum shift crew will consist of two licensed senior reactor operators (the "A" Operations Shift Supervisor and the "B" Operations Shift Supervisor), two licensed reactor operators (the Nuclear Station Operating Engineer and the Assistant Nuclear Station Operating Engineer), and a Shift Technical Advisor. For cold shutdown conditions, one licensed senior reactor operator (the "A" Operations Shift Supervisor), one licensed reactor operator (the Nuclear Station Operating Engineer), and one nonlicensed operator (the Second Assistant Nuclear Station Operating Engineer) will constitute the minimum shift crew. In the refueling mode, one senior reactor operator, two reactor operators and two nonlicensed operators will constitute the minimum shift crew in addition to a licensed senior operator or senior operator limited to fuel handling, who is supervising core alterations.

We have examined the licensee's proposed shift crew staffing plan. We find that the proposed plan meets the minimum staffing requirements as set forth in 10 CFR 50.54(m)(2) and is, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 Environmental Considerations

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.

#### 4.0 Conclusion

We have 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: L. Crocker

Dated: May 22, 1984