



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 23 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

As part of the NRC Task Action Plan following the TMI-2 accident (Item 1.D.1, NUREG-0650 and NUREG-0737), all licensees and applicants for operating licenses were required to conduct a detailed control room design review (DCRDR) to identify and correct human engineering deficiencies (HED's). DCRDR's were to be performed in accordance with NUREG-0700, "Guidelines for Control Room Design Review," issued September 1981. Applicants were also required to establish a schedule for staff review and approval for correcting HED's.

By letter dated January 10, 1985, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al., licensees for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, submitted their DCRDR Summary Report. By letters dated October 14 and October 21, 1985, and May 28, July 11, and July 29, 1986, the licensees submitted Supplement 1, Revision 1 to Supplement 1, Supplement 2, the Validation Report and errata sheets to Supplement 2 of the DCRDR Summary Report, respectively. The staff's evaluation of these documents is contained in Section 18 of NUREG-0887, "Safety Evaluation Report related to the operation of Perry Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2," Supplements 7, 8 and 10 dated November 1985, January 1986 and September 1986, respectively. The staff's review concluded that the licensees' program was acceptable and implementation of the commitments contained in the licensees' program was included as Attachment 1 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1.

By letter dated February 10, 1989, the licensees requested an amendment to Attachment 1 to the Perry operating license to document reassessment of the remaining HED's from the DCRDR for Perry Unit 1 which are scheduled for completion during the first refueling outage.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensees had scheduled 64 remaining (non-safety significant) HED's for completion by the end of the first refueling outage. The licensees have recently conducted a reassessment of the remaining HED's to ensure that the proposed fixes were still appropriate. The licensees provided a summary of their reassessment, including revisions to the HED report sheets for the

outstanding HED's, as part of their February 10, 1989 submittal. The proposed amendment would add a reference to their February 10, 1989 letter to the list of reference documents contained in Attachment 1 to the Perry Unit 1 operating license, chronicling the licensees' commitments to resolution of DCRDR HED's. The licensees propose to close 9 of the 64 HED's as unnecessary and have committed to completion of the remaining 55 HED's as described in the revised HED report sheets prior to the end of the first refueling outage. The licensees' submittal also documents various administrative changes to the HED report sheets to clarify the resolution of the HED such as the addition of attachment sheets identifying all of the instruments that will be modified by the HED.

The staff has reviewed the "First Refuel HED Revisions" report contained in the licensees' February 10, 1989 submittal and has determined that each of the proposed revisions is minor, non-safety significant, and consistent with the program approved in Supplements 7, 8 and 10 of NUREG-0887. Further, the staff agrees that the 9 HED's are unnecessary and may be considered closed with no further action. Therefore, the staff has determined that the proposed revisions are acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.21, 51.32, and 51.35 an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact has been prepared and published in the Federal Register on July 3, 1989 (54 FR 27967). Accordingly, based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

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 Contributors:

G. West

T. Colburn

Dated: July 6, 1989