REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8408270339 DOC.DATE: 84/08/15 NOTARIZED: YES 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
TUCKER,H.B. Duke Power Co.
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
DENTON,H.R. Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director
STOLZ,J.F. Operating Reactors Branch 4

SUBJECT: Application for amend to License DPR-38,DPR-47 & DPR-55, revising Tech Specs re reactor bldg purge sys,protection from inadvertent low temp overpressurization & min operator staffing requirements.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A034S COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 8+14
TITLE: OR Submittal: Containment Purging

NOTES:AEOD/Ornstein:1cy. 05000269
OL:02/06/73
AEOD/Ornstein:1cy. 05000270
OL:10/06/73
AEOD/Ornstein:1cy. 05000287
OL:07/19/74

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
	NRR ORB4 BC	01	7	7				
INTERNAL:	ADM-LFMB		1	0	NRR FIELDS,M	12	1	1
	NRR REEVES,E	14	1	1	NRR/DE/EQB	09	1	1
	NRR/DSI/AEB		1	1	REG FILE	04	1	1
	RGN2		1	1				
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	13	6	6	LPDR	03	1	1
	NRC PDR	02	1	1	NSIC	05	1	1
	NTIS		1	1				
NOTES:			1	1				

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 25 ENCL 24

DUKE POWER COMPANY
P.O. BOX 33189
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER
VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE
(704) 373-4531

August 15, 1984

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. John F. Stolz, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 4

Subject: Oconee Nuclear Station
Docket Nos. 50-269, -270, -287

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50, §50.90, please find attached a proposed amendment to the Oconee Facility Operating License and revision to the Oconee Technical Specifications. This proposed license amendment contains changes that address the Reactor Building purge system, protection from inadvertent low temperature overpressurization, and minimum operator staffing requirements. The regulatory issues themselves have been previously reviewed by NRC. These proposed changes constitute the last administrative aspect required for these issues.

Attachment 1 provides a brief discussion of the proposed changes relative to each regulatory issue. Attachment 2 contains the review required by 10 CFR 50, §50.92(2), relative to consideration of significant hazards in this proposed amendment. Attachment 3 contains the actual proposed Technical Specification revision.

As required, a copy of this amendment application is being provided to the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control for review.

Finally, Pursuant to 10 CFR 170, §170.12, a remittance of $150.00 is required to accompany all applications for license amendments. However, the application fee for this amendment request was previously submitted by my July 12, 1984 letter for McGuire Nuclear Station (Docket Nos. 50-369, -370). In the July 12th letter a check in the amount of $1,750.00 was submitted (Duke Power Company check no. 736608). This check included a $1,600.00 relief request application fee for McGuire Nuclear Station as well as the $150.00 license amendment application fee for Oconee Nuclear Station. In as much as the application fee has been previously submitted, a check is not enclosed.

Very truly yours,

Hal B. Tucker

Hal B. Tucker

RLG/PFG/slb

Attachments

A034
1/1

cc: Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. J. C. Bryant
NRC Resident Inspector
Oconee Nuclear Station

Ms. Helen Nicolaras
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Hayward Shealey
Bureau of Radiological Health
S. C. Department of Health and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

HAL B. TUCKER, being duly sworn, states that he is Vice President of Duke Power Company; that he is authorized on the part of said Company to sign and file with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission this request for amendment of the Oconee Nuclear Station Technical Specifications, Appendix A to Facility Operating Licenses DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55; and that all statements and matters set forth therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

Hal B. Tucker, Vice President

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of August, 1984.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:
10/27/84
~~September 20, 1984~~

Attachment 1

Duke Power Company
Oconee Nuclear Station

Proposed License Amendment
Technical Bases

Duke Power Company
Oconee Nuclear Station

Technical Bases

This proposed license amendment contains changes that address the Reactor Building Purge System, protection from inadvertent low temperature overpressurization, and minimum operator staffing requirements. The bases of the proposed changes are provided in the following paragraphs.

The proposed Technical Specifications related to the Reactor Building (RB) Purge System are based on guidance provided by NRC letter dated July 7, 1981. Specification 3.6.3 is revised to reflect a new LCO for the RB Purge System. The RB Purge System is required to be isolated whenever the RCS is above 250°F and pressure is above 300 psig. These values of temperature and pressure were provided in a letter dated May 10, 1983 to NRC which originally proposed such administrative limits on operation of the RB Purge System. The proposed LCO allows one isolation valve to be open on each penetration up to hot shutdown for testing and/or maintenance. An action statement which requires timely plant shutdown, consistent with existing action statements, is also included. New specification 4.4.4 is added to reflect the RB Purge System surveillance requirements and the purge valve seal inspection recommendations provided by the NRC.

The proposed Technical Specifications related to low temperature overpressurization are based on guidance provided in Standard Technical Specifications, and the NRC SER dated August 8, 1983. The NRC required six items in Technical Specifications. Duke considers that three of these are unnecessary in that failure to perform the action does not create an unsafe condition, as shown in the analysis. These three items are maximum tank water level, core flood tank discharge valves, and operation of the lost makeup pump. These are considered to be essentially administrative and an unnecessary burden to the Technical Specifications. Specification 3.1 has been revised to reflect the limiting conditions for operation of the low temperature overpressure protection system. It should be noted that space has been reserved in this specification for later inclusion of a proposed specification that had been previously submitted for NRC approval by Duke letter dated February 10, 1983. Specification 4.2 provides the requisite surveillance requirements for this system.

The final proposed Technical Specification change included in this application addresses minimum operator staffing requirements. The requirements for shift staffing became effective January 1, 1984 as a result of rulemaking. Oconee is in compliance with the rule; however, the Technical Specifications need to be updated. Accordingly, pages 6.1-6 and 6.1-6a are provided to reflect the new staffing requirements and to allow certain temporary deviations as allowed by the rule.

Attachment 2

Duke Power Company
Oconee Nuclear Station

Proposed License Amendment
No Significant Hazards Consideration

Duke Power Company
Oconee Nuclear Station
No Significant Hazards Consideration

10 CFR 50, §50.92(c) provides that the Commission may make a final determination that an operating license amendment for a power reactor involves no significant hazards consideration, if operation of the facility pursuant to the proposed amendment would not:

1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or

2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or

3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

As set forth more fully below, Duke Power submits that the contents of this amendment do not fall within the bounds of the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 50 §50.92 and, accordingly, a finding of no significant hazards consideration is warranted. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 CFR 14870). These examples, as well as the technical assessments, are used as the bases for the above finding.

The contents of this application do not constitute a significant hazard. Example (ii) of the types of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is applicable to this application. This example is "a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications." Each portion of this application contains additional restrictions in operations and additional surveillance not presently contained in the Technical Specifications. Additional limiting conditions of operation are provided for low temperature overpressure protection and the Reactor Building Purge System. Surveillance requirements for both of these are also included.

Changes included in the Administrative section provide additional limitations for operator staffing. Thus, all the proposed changes contained in this application are consistent with example (ii) which tends to support the conclusion that the changes proposed in the application do not constitute a significant hazard. Specific evaluations to the three criteria follow.

1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated:

   Technical Evaluation of the Reactor Building Purge System has been previously completed. Guidance on the operation and surveillance of the system has been previously established. Similar actions have been completed on the low temperature overpressure protection measures.

NRC regulations have been published on minimum operator staffing requirements. As the proposed Technical Specifications reflect the requirements previously promulgated, it is obvious that the additional requirements will tend to increase safety rather than increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated:

In view of the discussions contained in the preceding, the changes contained in this application do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety:

In view of the discussions contained in the preceding, the changes contained in this application constitute no reduction in the margin of safety.

In conclusion, these proposed changes contained in this application clearly do not constitute a significant safety hazard.