BALTIMORE
GAS AND
ELECTRIC

CHARLES CENTER • P.O. BOX 1475 • BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21203

August 4, 1982

Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Attention: Mr. Carl E. Johnson, Jr.
Division of Risk Analysis

Subject: Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant
Unit No. 1, Docket #50-317
Pressurized Thermal Shock Study (USI A-49)

Gentlemen:

In preparing for active participation with your organization and the contractors which you employ, we have raised some questions and developed some procedures which seem to be appropriate:

1) We plan to transmit information directly to you as our official contact within the NRC on A-49. The information will be transmitted in writing to assure its accuracy, to prevent duplication of effort, and to keep each organization fully informed.

   We will not limit verbal communication. Such communication may be necessary to expedite the study, but such verbal communication is to be considered unofficial and must be confirmed by subsequent written communication.

2) We have recently revised our FSAR and Technical Specifications for Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 1. It is felt that it may be appropriate for us to send you a copy of these revised documents to be certain that you have the latest, most accurate information relative to Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 1. Further, it is suggested that you may want to have an extra copy sent to Oak Ridge and/or Los Alamos for their use during the course of this research project. But, distribution must be made with the written understanding that the information within the FSAR and Technical Specifications are for use during the A-49 study exclusively, and the documents in question are to be returned to BC&E upon completion of the A-49 study.

A049

3) You have made a request for some reactor physics and design data which CE considers proprietary. We are reviewing this request with CE personnel to best ascertain how to transmit the information to you and still protect the proprietary nature of the CE design. May we also have your comments as to how to best protect the proprietary nature of the information in question.

4) It is requested that the information requests you made for the A-49 study be reviewed. Some of our people feel that portions of the information are already available to you. They cite the information within the FSAR and Technical Specifications which is available within your organization but, as we mentioned previously, we plan to send duplicate copies. Additionally, our personnel cite the "60-day" and "150-day" responses to the NRC's letter of August 21, 1981, Combustion Engineering's Report CEN-189, answers to additional questions, the Surveillance Capsule Results from Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 1, and the results from the Pressurized Thermal Shock Audit recently held at Calvert Cliffs.

5) It is also requested that members of your study team forward to BG&E a list of all assumptions made during the course of the forthcoming study. We want to review these assumptions to assure their accuracy for our Plant.

6) For the purposes of this study, BG&E is assuming that the auxiliary feedwater modification for Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 1 is in place. We have completed 80% of the engineering design of this feed-train and plan for its installation during the Fall '83 refueling outage. Thus, by making this assumption, your study will accurately reflect the design of Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 1 when the study is complete.

7) It is requested that BG&E receive a copy of all programs developed for the study of pressurized thermal shock of the Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 1 reactor vessel. These programs will be useful to us for our in-house evaluations, and may serve as an effective vehicle for review of input assumptions. We would like to receive this information in both hard copy and on computer tape.

8) A request is also made for a copy of your QA procedures and programs which govern the conduct of this study.

9) An expeditious method must be developed for the release of study results and procedures. We at BG&E want to review such results and procedures in parallel with NRC technical personnel to expedite the study as much as possible. If, on the other hand, the study must be reviewed by your technical personnel prior to our seeing the data and procedures, we envision excessive delay and perhaps inadequate

opportunity for proper interaction between our staffs. Further, we anticipate finding assumptions and/or data inputs which are in variance with actual Calvert Cliffs structures and methods of operation. If such areas are found, it may necessitate redoing significant quantities of work and/or reducing the value of the end product.

10) We would like to understand SAI's role in this study. How will they be supporting Oak Ridge and/or NRC personnel?

Very truly yours,

L. Erik Titland

L. Erik Titland
Supervising Engineer
Fossil Generation Engineering
Electric Engineering Department

LET/lmp

cc - Messrs. V. K. Chexal - EPRI
W. E. Cooper - Teledyne Engineering Services
R. L. Gill, Jr. - Duke Power Co.
D. H. Jaffee - NRC
P. W. Kruse - Combustion Engineering
F. Manning - NRC
R. E. Oliver, II - Carolina Power & Light Co.
J. C. Ventura - Bechtel Power Corp.