



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 30 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 GENERATION STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-311

Introduction

By letter dated October 15, 1984 Public Service Electric and Gas Company requested a revision to Technical Specifications Section 3.2.2 for the Salem Generating Station Unit No. 2. The revision consists of a change to Figure 3.2.2, "K(z) Normalized  $F_Q(z)$  as a Function of Core Height".

The revision to the current K(z) curve is necessary to eliminate the potential violation of the third line segment of the K(z) curve during Cycle 3 operation of Unit 2. Cycle 3 will be the first 18 months cycle for Unit 2. From preliminary analysis, Unit No. 2 Cycle 3  $F_Q(z)$  values will be similar to those of Unit No. 1 Cycle 6 which is also an 18 month cycle. The proposed Technical Specification change is already in effect for Unit No. 1.

Evaluation and Summary

The change to the K(z) curve is allowable because a new small break LOCA analysis was done for Units 1 and 2 in 1979. NRC reviewed and approved this K(z) curve change for Unit 1 as part of the Cycle 2 Reload. The change was never made to the Unit 2 Technical Specifications since it was not needed. We have reviewed the results of the small break analysis and agree with the previous approval. We have also verified the Westinghouse results for the third line segment of the K(z) curve which is the requested Technical Specification change and agree that it is correct.

Based on our review we agree with the licensee that the change does not constitute a significant hazards consideration and approve this requested change to Technical Specification Figure 3.2.2.

8503060830 850222  
PDR ADOCK 05000311  
P PDR

Environmental Consideration

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Sec 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.

Conclusion

We have 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, and (2) 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.

Dated: February 22, 1985

Principal Contributor:

M. Chatterton