

March 18, 2002

Mr. William 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: ISSUANCE OF
AMENDMENTS (TAC NOS. MB2757, MB2758 AND MB2759)

Dear Mr. McCollum:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 321 , 321 , and 322 to Renewed Facility Operating Licenses DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55, respectively, for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your application dated August 14, 2001.

The proposed amendments would revise TS Surveillance Requirement 3.3.5.2 by changing the Engineered Safeguards Protective System Analog Instrument channel functional test frequency from 31 days to 92 days.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Leonard N. Olshan, 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

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 321 to DPR-38
2. Amendment No. 321 to DPR-47
3. Amendment No. 322 to DPR-55
4. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

March 18, 2002

Mr. William R. McCollum, Jr.
Vice President, Oconee Site
Duke Energy Corporation
P. O. Box 1439
Seneca, SC 29679

DISTRIBUTION: OGC LOlshan
PUBLIC ACRS RLaufer
PDII-1 R/F GHill (6)
HBerkow COgle,RII
CHawes WBeckner,TSB

SUBJECT: OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3 RE: ISSUANCE OF
 AMENDMENTS (TAC NOS. MB2757, MB2758 AND MB2759)

Dear Mr. McCollum:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 321 , 321 , and 322 to Renewed Facility Operating Licenses DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55, respectively, for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your application dated August 14, 2001.

The proposed amendments would revise TS Surveillance Requirement 3.3.5.2 by changing the Engineered Safeguards Protective System Analog Instrument channel functional test frequency from 31 days to 92 days.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Leonard N. Olshan, 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

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 321 to DPR-38
2. Amendment No. 321 to DPR-47
3. Amendment No. 322 to DPR-55
4. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Accession Number: ML020640268

*No major changes to SE

OFFICE	PDII-1/PM	PDII-1/LA	EEIB*	OGC	PDII-1/(A)SC
NAME	LOlshan	CHawes	EMarinos	RHoefling	RLaufer
DATE	3/ 5 /02	3/ 5 /02	02/26/02	3/ 14 /02	3/ 18 /02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-269

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 321
Renewed License No. DPR-38

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (the facility) Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-38 filed by the Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) dated August 14, 2001, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 3.B of Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-38 is hereby amended to read as follows:

B. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 321 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Richard J. Laufer, Acting Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: March 18, 2002

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-270

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2

AMENDMENT TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 321
Renewed License No. DPR-47

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (the facility) Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-47 filed by the Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) dated August 14, 2001, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 3.B of Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-47 is hereby amended to read as follows:

B. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 321 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Richard J. Laufer, Acting Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: March 18, 2002

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-287

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 3

AMENDMENT TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 322
Renewed License No. DPR-55

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3 (the facility) Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-55 filed by the Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) dated August 14, 2001, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 3.B of Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-55 is hereby amended to read as follows:

B. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 322 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Richard J. Laufer, Acting Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: March 18, 2002

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 321
RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-38
DOCKET NO. 50-269
AND
TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 321
RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-47
DOCKET NO. 50-270
AND
TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 322
RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-55
DOCKET NO. 50-287

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications and associated Bases with the attached revised pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

<u>Remove</u>	<u>Insert</u>
3.3.5-2	3.3.5-2
B 3.3.5-11	B 3.3.5-11

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO
AMENDMENT NO. 321 TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-38
AMENDMENT NO. 321 TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-47
AND AMENDMENT NO. 322 TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-55
DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION
OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3
DOCKET NOS. 50-269, 50-270, AND 50-287

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 14, 2001, Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Technical Specifications (TS). The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 3.3.5.2 by changing the Engineered Safeguards Protective System Analog Instrument channel functional test frequency from 31 days to 92 days.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Justification for the proposed change is included in Babcock and Wilcox (B&W) Owners Group (B&WOG) Topical Report BAW-10182, "Justification for Increasing Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) On-Line Test Intervals," dated February 1994. This report was prepared by B&W Nuclear Services Company for the B&WOG TS Subcommittee and provides the technical basis for increasing the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 Engineered Safeguards Protective System (ESPS) instrumentation channels functional surveillance test interval (STI) from a 31-day to a 92-day interval.

3.0 EVALUATION

The staff reviewed Topical Report BAW-10182, and found it acceptable, as documented in the January 3, 1994, Safety Evaluation Report (SER). This topical report provides generic justifications for extending the on-line STI for the ESFAS instrumentation channels from a 1-month to a 3-month interval for those B&W power plants that participated in the B&WOG program. The Oconee Nuclear Station licensee participated in the B&WOG program;

therefore, the staff generic findings regarding extension of the ESFAS instrumentation channels STI are applicable to the ESPS instrumentation channels at the Oconee Nuclear Station.

The topical report utilized risk analysis and determined that the extension of the ESFAS instrumentation on-line STI from one month to three months had an insignificant effect on the plant risk and was, therefore, acceptable. Since the risk analysis in the topical report did not consider plant-specific effects of the instrument drift, these plant-specific effects should be assessed and factored into the analysis in order to maintain the validity of the assumed failure rates. The staff SER on the topical report required that licensees requesting extension of their plant ESFAS instrumentation STI and referencing BAW-10182 confirm that the instrument drift occurring over the proposed STI would not cause the setpoint values to exceed those values assumed in the plant safety analysis and specified in the plant TS. The licensees must confirm that they have reviewed instrument channel drift information and have determined that this drift over the period of the extended STI will not cause the safety setpoints to be exceeded beyond the allowable value calculated for that channel by the setpoint methodology. Each licensee should have on-site records of the as-found and as-left values showing actual calculations and supporting data for possible staff audit in future. The records should consist of monthly data over a period of at least the last 2 years with a description of the current plant-specific setpoint methodology used to drive the safety margins.

The licensee has evaluated the impact of the plant-specific instrumentation channel setpoint drift on the proposed STI extension and confirmed that the ESPS instrumentation setpoint drift during the extended STI will not cause the instrumentation setpoints to exceed the TS allowable values. This evaluation was based on the review of the as-found and as-left data from the completed test procedures of the monthly online surveillance test of the ESPS instrumentation over a period of two years. The review was a comparison of the as-found and as-left data to determine if the ESPS instrumentation have drift-related problems which could result in the instrumentation setpoint to exceed the TS allowable value during the extended STI. The licensee stated that the review confirmed that the instrument drift for the ESPS during the extended STI is not significant and would have resulted in a substantial margin to allowable values given a quarterly test schedule. The licensee also stated that the copies of the completed test procedures are maintained on microfilm for the life of the plant, and two years of as-left and as-found data was compiled into spreadsheets that are included in the instrument drift calculation OSC-7688, "Drift Study for ES System to Support Technical Specification Change." The proposed revision of the plant TS bases, Section 3.3.5, includes reference to a detailed description of the plant-specific methodology used to calculate the trip setpoints, associated uncertainties, and the safety margins. The staff finds that the licensee has sufficiently addressed, and complied with, all of the three requirements in the staff SER on Topical Report BAW-10182.

Based on the above review and justification for the TS changes, the staff concludes that the licensee's proposed changes to revise the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 TS for ESPS instrumentation channels functional STI from the current 31-day interval to a 92-day interval is consistent with the findings in Topical Report BAW-10182 and the guidance in the staff SER on the topical report, and is, therefore, acceptable.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change requirements with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and change surveillance requirements. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve 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 the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (66 FR 46478). 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 the amendments.

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: I. Ahmed

Date: March 18, 2002

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

Mr. Henry Porter, 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. Michael A. Schoppman
Framatome ANP
1911 North Ft. Myer Drive
Suite 705
Rosslyn, VA 22209

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
6000 Fairview Road
12th Floor
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210