

July 12, 2000

Mr. M.S. Tuckman
Executive Vice President
Nuclear Generation
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

SUBJECT: OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3 RE: REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NOS. MA5348, MA5349, AND MA5350)

Dear Mr. Tuckman:

By letter dated April 26, 1999, Duke Energy Corporation submitted an amendment request for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 Technical Specifications regarding, among other changes, the methodology for determining the steam generator tube loads following a main steam line break accident. Supplemental information was submitted by letter dated May 15, 2000. During our review, the staff has determined that additional information is needed before we can complete our review. This additional information request has been discussed with Mr. Robert Douglas, of your staff, who indicated a response date of July 24, 2000, would be appropriate.

Sincerely,

/RA/

David E. LaBarge, 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

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

July 12, 2000

Mr. M.S. Tuckman
Executive Vice President
Nuclear Generation
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

SUBJECT: OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3 RE: REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NOS. MA5348, MA5349, AND MA5350)

Dear Mr. Tuckman:

By letter dated April 26, 1999, Duke Energy Corporation submitted an amendment request for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 Technical Specifications regarding, among other changes, the methodology for determining the steam generator tube loads following a main steam line break accident. Supplemental information was submitted by letter dated May 15, 2000. During our review, the staff has determined that additional information is needed before we can complete our review. This additional information request has been discussed with Mr. Robert Douglas, of your staff, who indicated a response date of July 24, 2000, would be appropriate.

Sincerely,

/RA/

David E. LaBarge, 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

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution:

PUBLIC	RidsOgcRp
PII-1 Reading (paper copy)	RidsAcrcsAcnwMailCenter
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii1	RidsRegion2MailCenter
CHawes (paper copy)	DTrimble
RidsNrrPMDLaBarge	Reckenrode

Accession Number ML003731577

OFFICE	PDII-1/PM	PDII-1/LA	PDII-1/(A)SC
NAME	DLaBarge:mw	CHawes	LRaghavan
DATE	07/11/00	07/11/00	07/12/00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
RELATED TO THE DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION
LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST
REGARDING A MAIN STEAM LINE BREAK EVENT
OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2 AND 3

1. The Safety Evaluations (SEs) of May 29, 1986, and March 15, 1988, were related to a small break loss of coolant accident (SBLOCA) and included operator actions to trip the reactor coolant pumps (RCPs). The Babcock and Wilcox Owner's Group SE endorsed Draft ANSI Standard N660 for operator actions. That draft was finalized and published as ANSI/ANS-58.8-1984, "Time Response Design Criteria for Safety Related Operator Actions," and was revised in 1994. Explain why a new application, main steam line break (MSLB), should not be reviewed against the published industry standard.
2. Were the operator actions to isolate emergency feedwater (EFW) flow during a MSLB event (December 7, 1998 SE) reviewed against ANSI/ANS 58.8?
3. Describe the differences (environmental conditions, control room alarms and indications, secondary operator tasks, etc.) between a SBLOCA and a MSLB.
4. Should you plan to take exception to the time criteria of ANSI/ANS-58.8, it is necessary to justify the exception by developing operator action times based on a task analysis and an independent data base. Provide the justification for this exception for both tripping the RCPs and isolating EFW flow. If these issues were addressed in the earlier submittals (1988, 1998), please provide those parts of the analysis as background.
5. Describe the number and type of operator manipulations needed to trip the reactor coolant pumps and to isolate EFW flow to the affected steam generator.

Enclosure

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

Mr. Rick N. Edwards
Framatome Technologies
Suite 525
1700 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852-1631

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

Virgil R. Autry, 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. 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. Steven P. Shaver
Senior Sales Engineer
Westinghouse Electric Company
5929 Carnegie Blvd.
Suite 500
Charlotte, North Carolina 28209