

AGENDA

OPEN REGULATORY CONFERENCE

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION

October 25, 2007

NRC REGION II OFFICE, ATLANTA, GA.

- I. OPENING REMARKS, INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING
 INTENT
 Mr. V. McCree, Deputy, Regional Administrator (RA),
 Operations
- II. NRC REGULATORY CONFERENCE POLICY
 Mr. J. Moorman, Chief, Branch 1, Division of Reactor
 Projects (DRP)
- III. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE WITH RISK PERSPECTIVES
 Mr. J. Moorman, Chief, Branch 1, DRP
- IV. SUMMARY OF APPARENT VIOLATION
 Mr. J. Moorman, Chief, Branch 1, DRP
- V. LICENSEE RISK PERSPECTIVE PRESENTATION
- VI. LICENSEE RESPONSE TO APPARENT VIOLATION
- VII. BREAK/NRC CAUCUS
 Mr. V. McCree, Deputy, RA, Operations
- VIII. CLOSING REMARKS
 Mr. V. McCree, Deputy, RA, Operations

Draft Apparent Violation

10 CFR 50 Appendix B Criterion XVI, Corrective Action, states that measures shall be established to assure that conditions adverse to quality, such as deficiencies, deviations, and nonconformances are promptly identified and corrected. In the case of significant conditions adverse to quality, the measures shall assure that the cause of the condition is determined and corrective action taken to preclude repetition. The identification of the condition, cause of the condition, and the corrective action taken shall be documented and reported to appropriate levels of management. This requirement is implemented through the Duke Quality Assurance Program Topical Report and procedure NSD 208, Problem Identification Process.

Contrary to the above, from approximately June 3, 1996, until September 28, 2006, the licensee failed to adequately correct a significant condition adverse to quality related to the nonconformance identified in PIP M-96-0530 for ECCS injection throttle valve plug-to-seat clearances being smaller than ECCS sump screen openings. Specifically, the licensee's corrective action: failed to adequately implement credited inspections of the inside of the ECCS sump, as evidenced by the September 28, 2006, unrelated discovery of a significant amount of aged yellow duct tape inside the Unit 2 ECCS sump around the suction and guard pipe of both ECCS trains; failed to process the resolution documented in PIP M-96-0530 as an "accept-as-is" design change per the McGuire design control program; failed to evaluate the resolution/change under 10 CFR 50.59; and failed to process a licensing basis change under 10 CFR 50.71(e) to revise the UFSAR.

Note: The apparent violation discussed at this Regulatory Conference is subject to further review and change prior to any resulting enforcement action.