

ACCELERATED DISTRIBUTION DEMONSTRATION SYSTEM

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8901120516 DOC. DATE: 88/12/22 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
 TUCKER, H.B. Duke Power Co.
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk)

SUBJECT: Responds to NRC 881108 request for addl info re 861016 application for amend to Licenses DPR-38, DPR-47 & DPR-55.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A017D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 6
 TITLE: OR Submittal: Append J Containment Leak Rate Testing

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	PD2-3 LA	1 0	PD2-3 PD	5 5
	PASTIS, H	1 1		
INTERNAL:	ACRS	6 6	ARM/DAF/LFMB	1 0
	NRR/DEST/PSB 8D	1 1	NUDOCS-ABSTRACT	1 1
	OGC/HDS2	1 1	REG. FILE 01	1 1
	RES TELFORD, J	1 1	RES/DE/SEB	1 1
	RES/DSIR/SAIB	1 1	RES/DSR/RPSB	1 1
EXTERNAL:	LPDR	1 1	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. 20079) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM DISTRIBUTION
 LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 25 ENCL 23

A/A 2
 cc

Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33198
Charlotte, N.C. 28242

HAL B. Tucker
Vice President
Nuclear Production
(704)373-4531



DUKE POWER

December 22, 1988

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

Subject: **Oconee Nuclear Station**
Docket Nos. 50-269, -270, -287
Penetration 22

Gentlemen:

By my letter of October 16, 1986, I submitted a proposed amendment to Technical Specifications to require a Type C local leak test for Penetration 22. By letter dated November 8, 1988 the NRC requested additional information regarding the amendment request. Please find attached (Attachment 1) a response to the request for additional information. Attachment 2 provides a supplement to the subject amendment request in which an inappropriate footnote regarding reverse direction testing has been deleted. The remainder of the October 16, 1986 amendment request including the Technical Justification and no significant hazards consideration evaluation remain valid.

Inasmuch as this change is a supplement to a previous amendment request, no license fees are required.

Very truly yours,

Hal B. Tucker

PJN/452/mm f

xc: M.L. Ernst
Acting Regional Administrator - Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, GA 30323

Helen N. Pastis
Office of Nuclear Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

8901120516 881222
PDR ADOCK 05000269
PDC
P

A017
11

Document Control Desk
December 22, 1988
Page 2

Heyward Shealy
Bureau of Radiological Health
S.C. Department of Health and
Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, SC 29201

P.H. Skinner
Resident Inspector
Oconee Nuclear Station

Duke Power Company
Oconee Nuclear Station

ATTACHMENT 1

Response to November 8, 1988 NRC Request For Additional Information

Response to November 8, 1988 NRC Request for Additional Information

REQUEST

Clarify why for 10CFR 50 Appendix J Type A tests penetration 22 is not vented.

RESPONSE

The piping inside the reactor building on penetrations 21 and 22 form a closed loop which is seismically designed. Each of these penetrations has an electric motor operated containment isolation valve outside the reactor building which closes on an engineered safeguards signal. The redundant means of containment isolation for both penetrations is the closed loop inside.

Since the inside piping is seismic and forms a closed loop, these penetrations need not be vented for a Type A test.

REQUEST

Clarify why footnote 9 which allows reverse direction testing is appropriate for this penetration.

RESPONSE

Upon further review, Duke has determined that footnote 9 does not apply to Penetration 22. Penetration 22 is not currently tested in the reverse direction. The amendment request supplement provided in Attachment 2 deletes footnote 9. The remainder of the October 16, 1988 amendment request including the technical justification and no significant hazards consideration evaluation remain valid.