



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 73 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.
PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-440

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By a letter dated June 1, 1995, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (licensees), proposed an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1. The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to make them more restrictive regarding control rod drive (CRD) scram time testing. CRD scram time testing would be required following maintenance prior to considering the CRD operable, and could be performed at any reactor pressure. Additional testing would be required when reactor coolant pressure is greater than or equal to 950 psig and prior to 40 percent rated thermal power.

2.0 EVALUATION

Following maintenance or modification performed on control rods, current TS require CRD scram time testing in OPERATIONAL CONDITION (mode) 2 with reactor coolant pressure greater than or equal to 950 psig. The proposed TS would require CRD scram time testing to be performed prior to considering the CRD operable; however, the testing could be performed at any reactor pressure and will typically be performed prior to entry into mode 2. Also, additional testing is required to be performed when reactor coolant pressure is greater than or equal to 950 psig and prior to 40% rated thermal power. The proposed requirement is more restrictive than present TS requirements.

The proposed CRD scram time TS requirements are in accordance with the Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) which were issued for Perry by the NRC on June 23, 1995. However, since the ITS will not be implemented until approximately June 1996, the licensee requested this amendment in order to have the new CRD scram time test requirements for the upcoming refueling outage. Even though the proposed requirements are more restrictive, they allow the testing to be performed outside of the critical path for restart.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed TS, and based on the change being more restrictive and in accordance with the approved ITS, finds the change acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Ohio State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 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 effluent 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 (60 FR 39452). Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). 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.

5.0 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) 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: J. Hopkins

Date: September 26, 1995