

Oconee Flood Licensing Basis Evaluation Open Items

B-6

Item	Questions to be further addressed	Response
Section 3.1 of Oconee's FSAR Revision (31 Dec 1999) states Conformance with 10CFR General Design Criteria	Does this mean that GDC are part of the licensing basis?	
FSAR Section 3.1.2 includes "flooding" in its list of natural phenomena. This is only a "commitment" and not a GDC 2 regulatory requirement	Is such a commitment part of the licensing basis?	
Following its 1983 PRA study, DPC built a 5-ft high wall to protect the entrance doors to the SSF and referenced it in FSAR Section 9.6.3	Was this done to satisfy design and licensing bases?	
In 1992, based on input from FERC and in response to FERC's Emergency Action Plan (EAP), DPC performed a second flood analysis	Does DE have a copy of FERC EAP to reference the original reason for performing the study?	

Oconee Flood Licensing Basis Evaluation Open Items

<p>Based on its memo to file of December 1993, DPC decided to not increase the height of the 5-ft wall, citing its assessment of a low probability of dam failure</p>	<p>What is the licensing basis-related portion of their decision on not to increase wall height?</p> <p>[Note clear on what this question is getting at.]</p>	
<p>In 1994 DPC performed a 50.59 and deleted reference to the 5-ft high wall in subsequent FSAR revision</p>	<p>What was the agency response or review to this? Is the entire Nuclear Safety Evaluation the licensee prepared for the 50.59 available? Do we believe the 50.59 conclusion is appropriate?</p>	
<p>In 1995 DPC submitted its response to IPEEE (GL 88-20 Supplement 4) showing a CDF of 7E-6</p>	<p>Note that IPEEE is not part of licensing basis.</p>	
<p>Recommendation to perform a backfit utilizing DPC's second flood analysis</p>	<p>What kind of backfit – compliance? What is the basis for this recommendation? (Note understanding answers to previous questions should inform this question.)</p>	