



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 210 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-53
AND AMENDMENT NO. 188 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-69
BALTIMORE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-317 AND 50-318

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 7, 1995, the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE/the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TSs). The requested changes would add the convolution analytical technique for the analysis of the pre-trip main steam line break event to the list of approved core operating limits analytical methods listed in TSs 6.9.1.9, "Core Operating Limits Report." The convolution analytical technique was previously reviewed and approved by the NRC staff and the supporting safety evaluation (SE) was provided to BGE by letter dated May 11, 1995.

2.0 EVALUATION

By letter dated November 1, 1994, BGE requested that the NRC staff review and approve the use of the convolution analytical technique for the analysis of the pre-trip main steam line break event for the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The staff approved the use of the convolution analytical technique and provided its supporting SE as noted above. The May 11, 1995, SE is incorporated herein by reference.

TSs 6.9.1.9.b provides the list of analytical methods which are used to determine the core operating limits and have been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC staff. Since the convolution analytical technique has been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC staff, it is acceptable to include it in TSs 6.9.1.9.b as an approved analytical method.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Maryland State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation and use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined by Part 20. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (61 FR 177). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: D. McDonald

Date: February 5, 1996