

**OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3 (ONS)
SUBSEQUENT LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (SLRA)
SAFETY REVIEW**

**REQUESTS FOR CONFIRMATION OF INFORMATION
SET #3**

Regulatory Basis:

Part 54 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," is designed to elicit application information that will enable the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff to perform an adequate safety review and the Commission to make the necessary findings. Reliability of application information is important and advanced by requirements that license applications be submitted in writing under oath or affirmation and that information provided to the NRC by a license renewal applicant or required to be maintained by NRC regulations be complete and accurate in all material respects. Information that must be submitted in writing under oath or affirmation includes the technical information required under 10 CFR 54.21(a) related to assessment of the aging effects on structures, systems, and components subject to an aging management review. Thus, both the general submission requirements for license renewal applications and the specific technical application information requirements require that submission of information material to NRC's safety findings (see 10 CFR 54.29 standards for issuance of a renewed license) be submitted by an applicant as part of the application.

Background:

By letter dated June 7, 2021 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Package Accession No. ML21158A193), as supplemented by letters dated October 22, 2021 (ADAMS Accession No. ML21295A035), October 28, 2021 (ADAMS Accession No. ML21302A208), November 11, 2021 (ADAMS Accession No. ML21315A012), December 2, 2021 (ADAMS Accession No. ML21336A001), December 15, 2021 (ADAMS Accession No. ML21349A005), and December 17, 2021 (ADAMS Accession No. ML21351A000), Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or staff) an application to renew the Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55 for Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS), Units 1, 2, and 3. Duke Energy submitted the application pursuant to 10 CFR Parts 54, "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," for subsequent license renewal.

Between July 26 and October 8, 2021, the NRC staff conducted audits of Duke Energy's records to confirm information submitted in the ONS subsequent license renewal applicaiotn.

Request:

During the audit, the staff reviewed several documents that contain information which will likely be used in conclusions documented in the Safety Evaluation Report (SER). To the best of the staff's knowledge, this information is not on the docket. Any information used to reach a conclusion in the SER must be included on the docket by the applicant. We request that you submit confirmation that the information gathered from the documents and listed below is correct or provide the associated corrected information.

Requests for Confirmation of Information (RCIs)

RCI No.	Description	Duke Energy's Response
B2.1.21-A	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted all buried fire header piping is installed with a high build epoxy primer and a high build coal tar epoxy finish coat external coating.</p> <p>Confirm that in-scope buried fire protection system piping is specified to be externally coated with a high build epoxy primer and a high build coal tar epoxy finish coat.</p>	
B2.1.21-B	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted (a) between 2008 and 2012, 54 samples for soil resistivity were taken during soil corrosivity testing; and (b) all 54 samples had soil resistivity greater than 3,000 ohm-cm.</p> <p>Confirm that the above information is accurate.</p>	
B2.1.21-C	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted (a) between 2008 and 2009, 24 samples for pH were taken during soil corrosivity testing; and (b) samples had a pH ranging from 5.2 to 8.0.</p> <p>Confirm that the above information is accurate.</p>	
B2.1.21-D	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted (a) between 2008 and 2009, 14 samples for redox potential were taken during soil corrosivity testing; and (b) all 14 samples had redox potential greater than positive 100 millivolts.</p> <p>Confirm that the above information is accurate.</p>	
B2.1.21-E	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted (a) between 2008 and 2009, 17 samples for sulfides were taken during soil corrosivity testing; and (b) 14 of the 17 samples were negative for sulfides.</p> <p>Confirm that the above information is accurate.</p>	
B2.1.21-F	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted (a) between 2008 and 2009, 23 samples for soil moisture were taken during soil corrosivity testing; and (b) samples had a moisture content ranging from 7.44 to 40.6 percent.</p> <p>Confirm that the above information is accurate.</p>	

B2.1.21-G	<p>Based on its review of the applicant's response to a breakout question on the ePortal, the staff noted (a) between 2008 and 2009, 24 samples for chlorides were taken during soil corrosivity testing; and (b) all 24 samples had chlorides less than 100 parts per million.</p> <p>Confirm that the above information is accurate.</p>	
-----------	--	--