



PECO NUCLEAR

A Unit of PECO Energy

PECO Energy Company
965 Chesterbrook Boulevard
Wayne, PA 19087-5691

October 21, 1996

Docket Nos. 50-277
50-278

License Nos. DPR-44
DPR-56

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

SUBJECT: Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3
Conclusion of Control Room Enhancement Program Pursuant to NUREG-0737

REFERENCES:

- 1) Letter from S. L. Daltroff (PECO Energy Company) to D. R. Muller (USNRC), dated February 26, 1986
- 2) Letter from G. J. Beck (PECO Energy Company) to USNRC, dated February 28, 1992
- 3) Letter from G. J. Beck (PECO Energy Company) to USNRC, dated February 8, 1993
- 4) Letter from J. W. Shea (USNRC) to G. A. Hunger (PECO Energy Company), dated March 26, 1993

Dear Sir:

In accordance with the requirements of NUREG-0737 ("Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements"), Supplement 1, Section 5, PECO Energy Company (PECO Energy) submitted the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3 Control Room Design Review (CRDR) Final Report to the USNRC in a letter dated February 26, 1986 (Reference 1). The report identified numerous human factors enhancements planned for PBAPS. Areas requiring enhancement were identified in Human Engineering Discrepancy (HED) Assessments which were included in the report. A total of 262 HEDs were identified in the CRDR Final Report. Each HED was assigned a priority with respect to safety significance using a scale of 1 to 6. The following table lists the total number of HEDs by priority level. (Note: Three (3) HEDs were assigned dual priorities.)

<u>Priority Level</u>	<u>Safety Significance</u>	<u>Number of HEDs Identified (Unit 2/Unit 3)</u>
1	High Safety Significance	10/10
2	Low Safety Significance	44/44
3	Operational Reliability	26/26
4	No Significant Improvement	94/94
5	Previously Corrected	52/52
6	Not a Discrepancy	39/39

9610300130 961021
PDR ADOCK 05000277
P PDR


10
A403

As committed to in the Reference 1 letter, PECO Energy kept the USNRC informed of the implementation status of control room enhancements through the submittal of annual progress reports, the last report having been submitted February 28, 1992 (Reference 2). By letter dated February 8, 1993 (Reference 3), PECO Energy informed the USNRC that annual progress reports for the implementation of control room enhancements would no longer be submitted. This was due to the completion of all Priority 1 HEDs (High Safety Significance), and the completion of the majority of Priority 2 HEDs (Low Safety Significance). Therefore, the continued submittal of annual progress reports would have provided no significant information to the USNRC. The USNRC approved of this decision by letter dated March 26, 1993 (Reference 4). In that letter, the USNRC stated that periodic PECO Energy/USNRC licensing counterpart meetings were an appropriate forum for providing the USNRC with the status of ongoing implementation of HED resolutions. In addition, the USNRC staff requested that PECO Energy formally notify the USNRC when all HEDs identified in the Reference 1 letter were dispositioned.

As of September 1996, all HEDs identified in the Reference 1 letter have been dispositioned through analysis and implementation of modifications as required. This letter serves as formal notification to the USNRC of the conclusion of the PBAPS control room enhancement program specified in the CRDR Final Report.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,



G. A. Hunger, Jr.,
Director - Licensing

cc: H. J. Miller, Administrator, Region I, USNRC
W. L. Schmidt, USNRC Senior Resident Inspector, PBAPS
R. R. Janati, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania