

supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of amendments request: July 14, 2003.

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to eliminate Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.6.6.8. This SR is a 10-year flow test to verify that the containment spray nozzles are unobstructed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change eliminates the surveillance requirement to verify that the Containment Spray System spray nozzles are unobstructed every ten years. The spray nozzles are not initiators of any previously analyzed accident. Therefore, this proposed change does not increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

The spray nozzles are assumed in the accident analysis to mitigate design basis accidents. Calvert Cliffs' system design Foreign Material Exclusion practices during maintenance and material accountability following maintenance, and post-maintenance testing practices ensure that the system is free of foreign material that could significantly reduce its ability to perform its

intended function. These controls are considered adequate to ensure continued operability of the spray system. Since the system will be able to perform its accident mitigation function, the consequences of accidents previously evaluated are not increased.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Would not create the possibility of a new or different [kind] of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change eliminates the surveillance requirement to verify that the Containment Spray System spray nozzles are unobstructed every ten years. The proposed change does not introduce a new method of plant operation, does not involve a physical modification to the plant, nor does it introduce any accident initiators.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different [kind] of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Would not involve a significant reduction in [a] margin of safety.

The margin of safety in this case is the assurance of operability of the Containment Spray System. Calvert Cliffs' system design, Foreign Material Exclusion practices during maintenance and material accountability following maintenance, and post-maintenance testing practices ensure that the system is free of foreign material that could significantly reduce its ability to perform its intended function. These requirements, along with the remote physical location and the simple construction of the spray nozzles, provide assurance that the nozzles will remain operable.

Therefore, this proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in [a] margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: James M. Petro, Jr., Esquire, Counsel, Constellation Energy Group, Inc., 750 East Pratt Street, 5th floor, Baltimore, MD 21202.

NRC Section Chief: Richard J. Laufer.

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of amendments request: May 29, 2003.

Description of amendments request: The proposed license amendments request approval to remove the current Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP) reactor material specimen surveillance schedule from the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report and specify that BSEP,

Units 1 and 2, will participate in an integrated surveillance program (ISP) developed by the Boiling Water Reactor Vessel and Internals Project.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change adopts an integrated surveillance program (ISP) for reactor vessel material specimen surveillances. The ISP ensures that the reactor pressure vessel will continue to meet all applicable fracture toughness requirements. No physical changes to the facilities will result from the proposed change. The initial conditions and methodologies used in accident analyses remain unchanged. The proposed change does not revise the design assumptions for systems or components used to mitigate the consequences of accidents. The accident analyses results are not affected by this proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change adopts an integrated surveillance program (ISP) for reactor vessel material specimen surveillances. The ISP ensures that the reactor pressure vessel will continue to meet all applicable fracture toughness requirements. No physical changes to the facilities will result from the proposed change. The proposed change does not affect the design or operation of any system, structure, or component in the facilities. The safety functions of the related systems, structures, or components are not changed in any manner, nor is the reliability of any system, structure, or component reduced. The change does not affect the manner by which the facilities are operated and does not change any facility, structure, or component. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change has no impact on the margin of safety of any Technical Specification. There is no impact on safety limits or limiting safety system settings. The proposed change does not affect any plant safety parameters or setpoints. No physical or operational changes to the facilities will result from the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this