

Docket No. 50-270

APR 2 1976

DISTRIBUTION
 Docket No. 50-270
 NRC PDR
 Local PDR
 ORB Reading
 KR Goller/TJ Carter
 SMSheppard
 GZech
 OELD
 OI&E (2)
 BScharf (2)
 ACRS (16)
 OPA (Clare Miles)
 TB Abernathy, DTIE
 JRBuchanan, NSIC

Duke Power Company
 ATTN: Mr. William O. Parker, Jr.
 Vice President
 Steam Production
 Post Office Box 2178
 422 South Church Street
 Charlotte, North Carolina 29242

Gentlemen:

The Commission has filed the enclosed "Notice of Proposed Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License" with the Office of the Federal Register for publication. This notice relates to your request dated February 25, 1976, for approval to amend License No. DPR-47 for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2, to incorporate operating limits in the Technical Specifications based on analyses conducted for the Unit 2 Cycle 2 reload.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 Robert A. Purple

Robert A. Purple, Chief
 Operating Reactors Branch #1
 Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
 Federal Register Notice

cc w/enclosure:
 See next page

OFFICE >	ORB#1	AR:OR	OELD			
SURNAME >	GZech RAPurple	KRGoller	WDPatras			
DATE >	4/1/76	4/ 176	4/5/76			

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

PD-102

NOTICING OF PROPOSED LICENSING AMENDMENT

LICENSEE: Duke Power Company

REQUEST FOR: Technical Specification changes to reflect the analyses performed for Oconee Unit 2 Cycle 2 reload.

REQUEST DATE: February 25, 1976

PROPOSED ACTION: (X) Pre-notice Recommended
 () Post-notice Recommended
 () Determination delayed pending completion of Safety Evaluation

BASIS FOR DECISION: Changes introduced in the Cycle 2 reload include the following:

- 1) A change in the reactor variable low pressure trip,
- 2) The use of measured primary coolant flow reactor than design flow in the thermal-hydraulic design analysis,
- 3) The application of the BAW-2 Critical Heat Flux (CHF) Correlation rather than the W-3 correlation as used in Cycle 1, and
- 4) Two 17 x 17 Mark C demonstration fuel assemblies.

Item 1) above involves a relaxation of a limiting safety system setting; Items 2) and 3) above involve changes to the bases for the Technical Specifications; and, Item 4) above involves the use of two fuel assemblies significantly different from those being replaced. In view of the above, it is concluded that the proposed amendment involves significant hazards considerations and a Pre-notice is therefore recommended

Concurrence in PD constitutes concurrence in Ltr to Licensee and Federal Register Notice

CONCURRENCES:

DATE:

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | <u><i>[Signature]</i></u> | <u>4/2/76</u> |
| 2. | <u>R. A. Purple</u> | <u>4/2/76</u> |
| 3. | <u>K. R. Goller</u> | <u>4/13/76</u> |
| 4. | <u>OELD</u> | <u>4/6/76</u> |

- PROPOSED NEPA ACTION: EIS Required
- Negative Declaration (ND) and Environmental Impact Appraisal (EIA) Required
- No EIS, ND or EIA Required
- Determination delayed pending completion of EIA

BASIS FOR DECISION: We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) that an environmental statement, negative declaration, or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

PD 167

NOTICING OF PROPOSED LICENSING AMENDMENT

LICENSEE: Duke Power Company

REQUEST FOR: Technical Specification changes to reflect the analyses performed for Oconee Unit 2 Cycle 2 reload.

REQUEST DATE: February 25, 1976

PROPOSED ACTION: (X) Pre-notice Recommended
() Post-notice Recommended
() Determination delayed pending completion of Safety Evaluation

BASIS FOR DECISION: Changes introduced in the Cycle 2 reload include the following:

- 1) A change in the reactor variable low pressure trip,
- 2) The use of measured primary coolant flow reactor than design flow in the thermal-hydraulic design analysis,
- 3) The application of the BAW-2 Critical Heat Flux (CHF) Correlation rather than the W-3 correlation as used in Cycle 1, and
- 4) Two 17 x 17 Mark C demonstration fuel assemblies.

Item 1) above involves a relaxation of a limiting safety system setting; Items 2) and 3) above involve changes to the bases for the Technical Specifications; and, Item 4) above involves the use of two fuel assemblies significantly different from those being replaced. In view of the above, it is concluded that the proposed amendment involves significant hazards considerations and a Pre-notice is therefore recommended

CONCURRENCES:

DATE:

Concurrence in PD constitutes concurrence in Ltr to Licensee and Federal Register Notice

1. *[Signature]*
2. R. A. Purple 4/2/76
3. K. R. Goller PDG 4/13/76
4. OELD *[Signature]* 4/15/76

- PROPOSED NEPA ACTION: () EIS Required
- () Negative Declaration (ND) and Environmental Impact Appraisal (EIA) Required
- (X) No EIS, ND or EIA Required
- () Determination delayed pending completion of EIA

BASIS FOR DECISION: We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) that an environmental statement, negative declaration, or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.