JANUARY 1 8 1980

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File (3) OELD

NRC_PDR (3) ACRS (&16)

L PDR I&E (5)

ORB#4 Rdg JHeltemes-

ORB#4 Rdg NRR Rdg DEisenhut HDenton

JHeltemes-AEOD Gray File +4 VNoonan STSGroup

RVollmer TJCarter WRussell WGammill RCapra CMiles-OPA RDiggs BJones (12)

Mr. William O. Parker, Jr.
Vice President - Steam Production
Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 2178
422 South Church Street

LShao BScharf (10)
JRMiller TERA (3)
BGrimes NSIC (1)

RReid MFairtile 'SWookey

RIngram

Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dockets Nos. 150-269, 50-270

Dear Mr. Parker:

By letter dated July 18, 1974 we initially requested that Duke Power Company (DPC) submit proposed Technical Specifications (TS) that would establish a program for steam generator tube inspection. Since that time, as outlined in the Background Section of the enclosed Safety Evaluation, there have been extensive correspondence and staff discussions between DPC and NRC resulting in your submittal of October 16, 1979. This submittal contained a proposed amendment to the October 16, 1979. This submittal contained a proposed amendment to the October 16th submittal there have been discussions between our staffs where we indicated that the proposal was unacceptable, specifically in the manner proposed by DPC in Table 4.17-1 to take three sample inspections at the C-3 results level when the inspection results of the second sample (C-2) level indicate that more than 10% of the total tubes inspected are degraded tubes or more than 1% of the inspected tubes are defective. The NRC position is that if the C-2 results are as above, all tubes in the affected steam generator (SG) should be inspected.

We recognize that in the past DPC has performed an initial sampling program in excess of the minimum Standard TS first sample of 3% per SG. In addition, you have submitted your inspection programs in advance when requested by our staff and you have provided extensive and timely results to us of your inspections.

The SG tubes are both the primary system and containment boundaries. The tubes in certain of the ONS SG have a past history of excessive degradation, the rate of which has not been positively established. We recognize that in the past 18 months tube leakage incidents have diminished.

However, because of the potential adverse effects on public health and safety which could result from an accident while operating with a significant number of SG tubes either leaking or susceptible to accident-induced leakage, we believe that appropriate changes to TS are needed to assure a high degree of SG tube integrity. The basis for this position is provided in our Safety Evaluation, a copy of which is enclosed. Accordingly, please inform us in writing within

···

twenty (20) days of the date of this letter or five (5) days before startup of Oconee, Unit No. 1, whichever occurs first, if you do not agree with this course of action, including your reasons.

Sincerely.

Original signed by

W. B. Gammill, Acting Assistant Director for Operating Reactor Projects Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:

1. Proposed TS

Safety Evaluation 2.

cc w/enclosures: See next page

*See previous yellow for concurrences

C-EB:DOR

STS Group: DOR

DBrinkman* VNoonan*

				1/16/20		
OFFICE	ORB#4:DOR	ORB#4:DOR	C-ORB#4:DOR	A-AD-OP DO	R OELD	
SURNAME	RIngram*	Slookey	RREID	WGammill	Ketchen 🛠	
DATE	1/15/80	1/18/80 EBS	1/1/4/80	18/80	1/15/80 3	3
. DATE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			8002		<u> </u>

Mr. Robert H. Groce

not agree with this course of action, including your reasons, we plan to initiate steps to issue the enclosed (TS for ONS.

Sincerely,

W. P. Gammill, Acting Assistant Director for Operating Reactor Projects Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:

1. Proposed TS

2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures: See next page

> C-EB:DOR VNoonan

1//3/80

STS Group:00

OFFICE	ORB#4:DOR.	ORB#4:DOR	ORB#4:DOR	C-ORB#4:DOR	Λ-AD-ORP:DOR	y oerd
		SWookey/cb	MFairtile	RReid	WGammill \	AFFILHEN
DATE	1/ 15 /80	1/ /80	1/ /80	1/ /80	1/ /80	1//5/80

twenty (20) days of the date of this letter or five (5) days before startup of Oconee, Unit No. 1, whichever occurs first, if you do not agree with this course of action, including your reasons.

Sincerely,

W. P. Gammill, Acting Assistant Director

W. P. Gammill, Acting Assistant Director for Operating Reactor Projects Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:

1. Proposed TS

2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures: See next page



NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

January 18, 1980

Dockets Nos. 50-269, 50-270 and 50-287

Mr. William O. Parker, Jr.
Vice President - Steam Production
Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 2178
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dear Mr. Parker:

By letter dated July 18, 1974 we initially requested that Duke Power Company (DPC) submit proposed Technical Specifications (TS) that would establish a program for steam generator tube inspection. Since that time, as outlined in the Background Section of the enclosed Safety Evaluation, there have been extensive correspondence and staff discussions between DPC and NRC resulting in your submittal of October 16, 1979. This submittal contained a proposed amendment to the Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS) common TS which would add a new TS 4.17, Steam Generator Tubing Surveillance. Subsequent to the October 16th submittal there have been discussions between our staffs where we indicated that the proposal was unacceptable, specifically in the manner proposed by DPC in Table 4.17-1 to take three sample inspections at the C-3 results level when the inspection results of the second sample (C-2) level indicate that more than 10% of the total tubes inspected are degraded tubes or more than 1% of the inspected tubes are defective. The NRC position is that if the C-2 results are as above, all tubes in the affected steam generator (SG) should be inspected.

We recognize that in the past DPC has performed an initial sampling program in excess of the minimum Standard TS first sample of 3% per SG. In addition, you have submitted your inspection programs in advance when requested by our staff and you have provided extensive and timely results to us of your inspections.

The SG tubes are both the primary system and containment boundaries. The tubes in certain of the ONS SG have a past history of excessive degradation, the rate of which has not been positively established. We recognize that in the past 18 months tube leakage incidents have diminished.

However, because of the potential adverse effects on public health and safety which could result from an accident while operating with a significant number of SG tubes either leaking or susceptible to accident-induced leakage, we believe that appropriate changes to TS are needed to assure a high degree of SG tube integrity. The basis for this position is provided in our Safety Evaluation, a copy of which is enclosed. Accordingly, please inform us in writing within

cc w/enclosure(s):
Mr. Filliam L. Porter
Duke Power Company
Post Office Box 2178
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esquire DeBevoise & Liberman 700 Shoreham Building 806 15th Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20005

Oconee Public Library 201 South Spring Street Walhalla, South Carolina 29691

Honorable James M. Phinney County Supervisor of Oconee County Walhalla, South Carolina 29621

Director, Technical Assessment
Division
Office of Radiation Programs
(AW-459)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IV Office ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR 345 Courtland Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Mr. Francis Jape U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission P. O. Box 7 Seneca, South Carolina 29678 Mr. Robert B. Borsum
Babcock & Wilcox
Nuclear Power Generation Division
Suite 420, 7735 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Manager, LIS NUS Corporation 2536 Countryside Boulevard Clearwater, Florida 33515

cc w/enclosure(s) and incoming
 dtd.: 10/16/79

Office of Intergovernmental Relations 116 West Jones Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27603