November 18, 1998

Mr. William R. McCollum, Jr.
Vice President, Oconee Nuclear Site
Duke Energy Corporation
P. O. Box 1439
Seneca, SC 29679

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

Dear Mr. McCollum:

By letter dated July 6, 1998, Duke Energy Corporation (Duke) submitted for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) review an application pursuant to 10 CFR Part 54, to renew the operating licenses for the Oconee Nuclear Station (Oconee), Units 1, 2, and 3. Exhibit A to the application is the Oconee Nuclear Station License Renewal Technical Information Report (OLRP-1001), which contains the technical information required by 10 CFR Part 54. The NRC staff is reviewing the information contained in OLRP-1001 and has identified, in the enclosure, areas where additional information is needed to complete its review. Specifically, the enclosed questions are from the Mechanical Engineering Branch regarding the following Sections of OLRP-1001: 3.5.6, 3.5.7, and 3.5.13.

Please provide a schedule by letter, electronic mail, or telephonically for the submittal of your responses within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. Additionally, the staff would be willing to meet with Duke prior to the submittal of the responses to provide clarifications of the staff's requests for additional information.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

Joseph M. Sebrosky, Project Manager
License Renewal Project Directorate
Division of Reactor Program 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: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME:G:\SEBROSKY\RAI6.WPD

OFFICE	LA	PDLR	PDLR:D
NAME	LBerry	JSebrosky	CIGrimes
DATE	11/17/98	11/17/98	11/18/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

1/1

DF01

Oconee Nuclear Station (License Renewal)
cc:
Paul R. Newton, Esquire
Duke Energy Corporation
422 South Church Street
Mail Stop PB-05E
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esquire
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

Regional Administrator, Region II
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 23T85
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

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

County Supervisor of Oconee County
Walhalla, South Carolina 29621

Chattooga River Watershed Coalition
P. O. Box 2006
Clayton, GA 30525

Mr. J. E. Burchfield
Compliance Manager
Duke Energy Corporation
Oconee Nuclear Site
P. O. Box 1439
Seneca, South Carolina 29679

Ms. Karen E. Long
Assistant Attorney General
North Carolina Department of Justice
P. O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

L. A. Keller
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

Gregory D. Robison
Duke Energy Corporation
Mail Stop EC-12R
P. O. Box 1006
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Robert L. Gill, Jr.
Duke Energy Corporation
Mail Stop EC-12R
P. O. Box 1006
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006
RLGILL@DUKE-ENERGY.COM

Douglas J. Walters
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708
DJW@NEI.ORG

Distribution: Hard copy
PUBLIC
Docket File
PDLR RF
M. El-Zeftawy, ACRS T2E2

E-mail:
F. Miraglia Y. Li
J. Roe
D. Matthews
C. Grimes
T. Essig
G. Lainas
J. Strosnider
G. Bagchi
H. Brammer
T. Hiltz
G. Holahan
S. Newberry
C. Gratton
L. Spessard
R. Correia
R. Latta
J. Peralta
J. Moore
R. Weisman
M. Zobler
E. Hackett
A. Murphy
T. Martin
D. Martin
W. McDowell
S. Droggitis
PDLR Staff

H. Berkow
D. LaBarge
L. Plisco
C. Ogle
R. Trojanowski
M. Scott
C. Julian
R. Architzel
J. Wilson
R. Wessman
E. Sullivan

R. Gill, Duke
D. Walters, NEI

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION, EXHIBIT A

OLRP-1001 Section No.

3.5.6 Auxiliary Systems

3.5.6-1 Based on the staff's experience, degradation of piping systems (e.g., cracking of weld) may potentially be caused by vibration (mechanical or hydrodynamic) loading. Clarify whether this loading effect has been considered in the aging review for the auxiliary systems discussed in Section 3.5.6, and, if this effect is excluded, provide the basis for its exclusion.

3.5.6-2 Section 2.5.6 indicates that some portions of the auxiliary systems within the scope of license renewal are not designed to withstand the effects of a design basis earthquake. Clarify which components and piping segments within the category of "Seismic II over I" (a nonseismic Category I system, structure, or component whose failure could cause loss of safety function of a seismic Category I system, structure, or component) would be subject to aging management review. Additionally, clarify which aging management program will address these components and piping segments and specifically discuss implementation of the program to manage the applicable aging effects during the period of extended operation.

3.5.7 Process Auxiliaries

3.5.7-1 Based on the staff's experience, degradation of piping systems (e.g., cracking of weld) may potentially be caused by vibration (mechanical or hydrodynamic) loading. Clarify whether this loading effect has been considered in the aging review for the process auxiliaries discussed in Section 3.5.7, and, if this effect is excluded, provide the basis for its exclusion.

3.5.7-2 Section 2.5.7 indicates that some portions of the process auxiliaries within the scope of license renewal are not designed to withstand the effects of a design basis earthquake. Clarify which components and piping segments within the category of "Seismic II over I" (a nonseismic Category I system, structure, or component whose failure could cause loss of safety function of a seismic Category I system, structure, or component) would be subject to aging management review. Additionally, clarify which aging management program will address these components and piping segments and specifically discuss implementation of the program to manage the applicable aging effects during the period of extended operation.

3.5.13 Keowee Hydroelectric Station

3.5.13-1 Based on the staff's experience, degradation of piping systems (e.g., cracking of weld) may potentially be caused by vibration (mechanical or hydrodynamic) loading. Clarify whether this loading effect has been considered in the aging review for the

Keowee Hydroelectric Station discussed in Section 3.5.13, and, if this effect is excluded, provide the basis for its exclusion.

3.5.13-2 Section 2.5.13 indicates that some portions of the Keowee Hydroelectric Station piping systems within the scope of license renewal are not designed to withstand the effects of a design basis earthquake. Clarify which components and piping segments within the category of "Seismic II over I" (a nonseismic Category I system, structure, or component whose failure could cause loss of safety function of a seismic Category I system, structure, or component) would be subject to aging management review. Additionally, clarify which aging management program will address these components and piping segments and specifically discuss implementation of the program to manage the applicable aging effects during the period of extended operation.