

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 56

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-53

BALTIMORE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-317

By telephone, confirmed with telecopy dated May 27, 1981, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BG&E or the licensee) made application for a Technical Specification (TS) change to replace the inoperable acoustic flow monitor for pressurizer safety valve RV-201 with once per shift monitoring of quench tank temperature, level and pressure and of the safety valve tail pipe temperatures at Calvert Cliffs, Unit No. 1.

Amendments No. 53 and 36, issued April 21, 1980 for both units added, among other changes, operability and surveillance requirements to TS Table 3.3-10 for four types of instrumentation systems that resulted from our TMI accident review. These new types of instrumentation included, as Item 13 to the existing Table 3.3-10, PORV/Safety Valve Acoustic Flow Monitoring. At the time of issuance of the amendments, the acoustic monitor was inoperable due to a severed cable. This was not recognized as a TS violation until May 27, 1981. BG&E began an orderly shutdown of Unit No. 1 while making the application for a TS change.

We authorized an emergency TS change on May 27, 1981 and confirmed such by letter dated May 28, 1981. This Safety Evaluation provides justification for these previous actions and for a permanent change to the Unit No. 1 TS.

BG&E states that sufficient redundant means for ascertaining flow from the safety valve exists. This includes acoustic flow indication on three other PORV/safety valves, temperature indication down-stream of this valve, and quench tank pressure, temperature and level indications. BG&E also has committed to repair the acoustic monitor for RV-201 prior to June 1, 1981.

Reactor operation without this acoustic monitor is justified on the basis that backup instrumentation is available to detect RV-201 lifting for the interim period of approximately one month. In fact, other facilities, such as Millstone Unit No. 2 (Docket No. 50-336), have TS that allow such substitution as a routine. Therefore, we find this change to TS Table 3.3-10 acceptable.

Environmental Consideration

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.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) 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.

Date: June 23, 1981