



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 100 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-38

AMENDMENT NO. 100 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-47

AMENDMENT NO. 97 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-55

DUKE POWER COMPANY

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS NOS. 1, 2 AND 3

DOCKETS NOS. 50-269, 50-270 AND 50-287

Introduction

By letter dated August 19, 1981, Duke Power Company (Duke) submitted an application to amend the Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 2 License (DPR-47) by a change to the common Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2 and 3. This requested change would revise the control rod insertion limits Specification figure title blocks, related to Unit 2, to indicate that operation to 390 effective full power days (EFPD) is acceptable. Since this request involves a change to the common TSs an amendment to all three Units is necessary even though only Unit 2 will be affected.

Evaluation

The Commission issued Amendments 83, 83 and 80 for the Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2 and 3 on June 12, 1980, which revised the common TSs related to the full power operation of Unit 2 during Cycle 5. The changes to the TSs with that amendment contained revised figures related to Rod Position Limits for four, three and two reactor coolant pump operation, Power Imbalance Envelop and Axial Power Shaping Rod limits to be effective from $150 + 10$ to $360 + 10$ EFPD. By letter dated August 19, 1981, Duke requested that the title blocks for these figures be revised to indicate their acceptability from $150 + 10$ to $390 + 10$, - 30 EFPD to allow for extended operation of Unit 2.

By Amendments 93, 93 and 90, which were issued on February 10, 1981 to support operation of Unit 3 during Cycle 6, a new Specification (3.5.2.9) was included in the common TSs requiring that an evaluation be performed to verify that operational limit curves remain valid for extended operation beyond the nominal design cycle length. In the August 19, 1981 application, Duke informed us that the evaluation required by Specification 3.5.2.9 had been completed and had confirmed that the existing Oconee 2 operating limits remain valid for operation to $390 + 10$, - 30 EFPD.

8110020158 810911
PDR ADDCK 05000269
PDR

We have reviewed the August 19, 1981 application and have determined that the evaluation of the extended operation of Oconee Unit 2 was performed by methods previously approved. We, therefore, conclude that the proposed changes to the TSs are acceptable.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendments do 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 amendments involve an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: September 11, 1981