



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 19 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-75

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY,  
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, AND  
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-311

Introduction

In a letter dated January 31, 1983, Public Service Electric and Gas Company submitted the results of a Reload Safety Evaluation (RSE) and a request for amendment to the Salem Unit 2 Technical Specifications. The Cycle 2 RSE was performed by Westinghouse using the methodology described in WCAP 9272. The evaluation showed the need for changes to the  $F_{xy}$  and rod insertion limit Technical Specifications.

Discussion

A change to the Technical Specifications on  $F_{xy}$  was requested to remove the cycle dependent values of  $F_{xy}$  as a function of core height and provide these  $F_{xy}$  values by means of a Peaking Factor Limit Report. It is anticipated that  $F_{xy}$  will change from cycle to cycle and this change would eliminate the necessity of making a Technical Specification change for each reload. A similar change has been approved on other plants. A Radial Peaking Factor Limit Report was submitted with the January 31, 1983 letter for Cycle 2. We find this change acceptable. The rod insertion limit Technical Specification is also acceptable.

The dropped RCCA event was analyzed by the new Westinghouse Dropped Rod Methodology. Results show the DNB design basis is met for all dropped rod events initiated from full power for Cycle 2. Since the new Westinghouse Dropped Rod Methodology has been approved, the interim restrictions on power operation above 90 percent power may be removed. The new Westinghouse Dropped Rod Methodology must continue to be used to evaluate the dropped rod event for each cycle.

Summary

Based on our review we find that the proposed Technical Specification changes to the  $F_{xy}$  and rod insertion limit are 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 an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, 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: May 5, 1983