

ACCELERATED DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 9302250335 DOC. DATE: 93/02/18 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL: 50-269 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Power Co. 05000269
50-270 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Power Co. 05000270
50-287 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3, Duke Power Co. 05000287

AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
HAMPTON, J.W. Duke Power Co.
RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk)

SUBJECT: Forwards bases rev & supporting 10CFR50.59 evaluation
concluding that no unreviewed safety questions exist, to
support changes to bases of TS 3.2 re CBAST & associated
flowpaths. Rev 1 to Calculation OSC-4851 also encl.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 2+14
TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	PD2-3 LA	1 1	PD2-3 PD	1 1
	WIENS, L	2 2		
INTERNAL:	ACRS	6 6	NRR/DET/ESGB	1 1
	NRR/DOEA/OTSB11	1 1	NRR/DSSA/SRXB8E	1 1
	NRR/DST/SELB 7E	1 1	NRR/DST/SICB8H7	1 1
	NUDOCS-ABSTRACT	1 1	OC/LEMB	1 0
	OGC/HDS2	1 0	REG FILE 01	1 1
EXTERNAL:	NRC PDR	1 1	NSIC	1 1

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:

PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE! CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK,
ROOM P1-37 (EXT. 504-2065) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM DISTRIBUTION
LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 21 ENCL 19

Duke Power Company
Oconee Nuclear Site
P.O. Box 1439
Seneca, SC 29679

J. W. HAMPTON
Vice President
(803)885-3499 Office
(803)885-3564 Fax



DUKE POWER


February 18, 1993

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: Oconee Nuclear Station
Docket Nos. 50-269,-270,-287
CBAST Technical Specification Bases

On January 14, 1993 a 10CFR50.59 evaluation was completed to support changes to the Bases of Technical Specification 3.2 regarding the concentrated boric acid storage tank and associated flowpaths. Attached for your information is the Bases revision and the supporting 50.59 evaluation which concludes that no unreviewed safety questions exist.

Very Truly Yours,


J. W. Hampton

Attachment

xc: L. A. Wiens, Project Manager
ONRR

S. D. Ebnetter, Regional Administrator
Region II

P. E. Harmon, Senior Resident Inspector

9302250335 930218
PDR ADOCK 05000269
P PDR

Adol
11

This evaluation
Supersedes the
previous 10 CFR 50.59
evaluation dated
7/30/92

Duke Power Company 10 CFR 50.59 EVALUATION

- (1) Station: Oconee Unit(s): 1, 2, 3
- (2) Evaluation for: Proposed CBAST Technical Specification Bases Changes
- (3) FSAR sections consulted: 5.1.1.4.7, 9.3.1.2.2, 9.3.4, 9.3.5, 15.0, Table 9-10
- (4) Technical specifications consulted: 3.2, 3.3, 4.5
- Will technical specification changes be required? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- * Technical specifications affected: _____
- * Station Regulatory Compliance personnel contacted: _____

(5)

USQ EVALUATION APPLICABILITY

Does the modification involve a Structure, System, or Component (SSC) that is evaluated in the FSAR or a smaller SSC that is part of an SSC evaluated in the FSAR, and does the modification do more than replace components with equivalent components?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Will the modification degrade the effectiveness of an SSC important to safety in any design basis accident or event?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Does the modification appear to require inclusion in the FSAR due to the installation of a new system significant to plant operation, or installation of a significant addition to an existing system?

☐ Yes ☒ No

(6)

USQ EVALUATION

May the modification:

USQ EVALUATION NOT APPLICABLE ☐

Increase the probability of an accident evaluated in the SAR?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Increase the consequences of an accident evaluated in the SAR?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Create the possibility for an accident of a different type than any evaluated in the SAR?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Increase the probability of a malfunction of equipment important to safety evaluated in the SAR?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Increase the consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety evaluated in the SAR?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Create the possibility for a malfunction of a different type than any evaluated in the SAR?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Will the modification:

Reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification?

☐ Yes ☒ No

PROVIDE AN ATTACHMENT TO SUBSTANTIATE ALL YES AND NO ANSWERS

Prepared by/date: KW Sander 1/14/93

Reviewed by/date: ED [Signature] 1-14-93