

April 11, 2001

Mr. W. R. McCollum, Jr.  
Vice President, Oconee Site  
Duke Energy Corporation  
7800 Rochester Highway  
Seneca, SC 29672

SUBJECT: OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3 RE: PROPOSED  
TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS AMENDMENT - SPENT FUEL STORAGE  
RACKS (TAC NOS. MB0894, MB0895, AND MB0896)

Dear Mr. McCollum:

By letter dated December 28, 2000, Duke Energy Corporation submitted a request to revise the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Technical Specifications related to the administrative controls used to ensure the acceptable margins of subcriticality in the spent fuel pools (SFP) to account for Boraflex degradation. The proposed changes include credit for soluble boron in the SFP water, but do not take credit for boron remaining in the fuel storage rack Boraflex panels. Also, revisions to the SFP storage configurations, storage criteria, fuel enrichment, fuel burnup requirements, and surveillance requirements are proposed.

During our review, we have identified the need for additional information as shown in the enclosure. These questions have been discussed with Mr. Robert Douglas of your staff, and a target date of April 20, 2001, has been established for your response to them.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

David E. LaBarge, Senior Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

April 11, 2001

Mr. W. R. McCollum, Jr.  
Vice President, Oconee Site  
Duke Energy Corporation  
7800 Rochester Highway  
Seneca, SC 29672

SUBJECT: OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3 RE: PROPOSED  
TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS AMENDMENT - SPENT FUEL STORAGE  
RACKS (TAC NOS. MB0894, MB0895, AND MB0896)

Dear Mr. McCollum:

By letter dated December 28, 2000, Duke Energy Corporation submitted a request to revise the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Technical Specifications related to the administrative controls used to ensure the acceptable margins of subcriticality in the spent fuel pools (SFP) to account for Boraflex degradation. The proposed changes include credit for soluble boron in the SFP water, but do not take credit for boron remaining in the fuel storage rack Boraflex panels. Also, revisions to the SFP storage configurations, storage criteria, fuel enrichment, fuel burnup requirements, and surveillance requirements are proposed.

During our review, we have identified the need for additional information as shown in the enclosure. These questions have been discussed with Mr. Robert Douglas of your staff, and a target date of April 20, 2001, has been established for your response to them.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

David E. LaBarge, Senior Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution:

PUBLIC

PD II-1 Rdg.

REmch

CHawes

DLaBarge

AAttard

RidsOgcRp

RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter

RidsRgn2MailCenter

ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML011010211

OFFICE	PM:PDII/S1	LA:PDII/S1	SC:PDII/S1
NAME	DLaBarge:cn	CHawes	REmch
DATE	04/09/2001	04/10/2001	04/10/2001

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
SPENT FUEL STORAGE RACKS  
OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3

1. On page 6 of Attachment 6 of the submittal, it is stated that no axial effects are modeled. How are differences between 2-D and 3-D differences in burnup effects biases calculated?
2. How were the Methodology Biases and Uncertainties listed in Tables 2 - 5 of the submittal calculated?
3. It is not clear to the staff whether the boron credit analysis was performed by Westinghouse methodology (Reference 8.1 of Attachment 6 of the submittal), Duke Energy Corporation, or both?
4. Referencing page 13 of Attachment 6 of the submittal concerning reactivity equivalence: A recent study conducted at Oak Ridge National Laboratory titled ORNL/TM-2000/230, "A Critical Review of the Practice of Equating the Reactivity of Spent Fuel to Fresh Fuel in Burnup Credit Criticality Safety analyses for PWR Spent Fuel Pool Storage," and published in NUREG/CR-6683, indicates that the present process of calculating the reactivity equivalence uncertainties is non-conservative. Provide quantitative technical justification for not addressing this issue.
5. On Page 15 of Attachment 6 of the submittal, it is stated, "The revised heavy load drop analysis shows that the minimum spent fuel pool boron concentration (currently 2220 ppm) is sufficient to maintain the maximum  $K_{eff}$  ... below 0.95...". The statement seems to indicate only that the existing concentration is sufficient to meet the criteria, but does not state the design limit. What is the minimum spent fuel pool design boron concentration necessary to maintain  $K_{eff}$  below 0.95? How will sufficient margin be assured during all plant evolutions so the boron concentration will not decrease to or below the level?

Oconee Nuclear Station

cc:

Ms. Lisa F. Vaughn  
Legal Department (PBO5E)  
Duke Energy Corporation  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Anne W. Cottingham, Esquire  
Winston and Strawn  
1400 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Manager, LIS  
NUS Corporation  
2650 McCormick Drive, 3rd Floor  
Clearwater, Florida 34619-1035

Senior Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
7812B Rochester Highway  
Seneca, South Carolina 29672

Virgil R. Autry, Director  
Division of Radioactive Waste Management  
Bureau of Land and Waste Management  
Department of Health and Environmental  
Control  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-1708

Mr. L. E. Nicholson  
Compliance Manager  
Duke Energy Corporation  
Oconee Nuclear Site  
7800 Rochester Highway  
Seneca, South Carolina 29672

Ms. Karen E. Long  
Assistant Attorney General  
North Carolina Department of  
Justice  
P. O. Box 629  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. C. Jeffrey Thomas  
Manager - Nuclear Regulatory  
Licensing  
Duke Energy Corporation  
526 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Mr. Richard M. Fry, Director  
Division of Radiation Protection  
North Carolina Department of  
Environment, Health, and  
Natural Resources  
3825 Barrett Drive  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Mr. Peter R. Harden, IV  
VP-Customer Relations and Sales  
Westinghouse Electric Company  
5929 Carnegie Blvd.  
Suite 500  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28209