



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

August 6, 1996

Mr. J. W. Hampton  
Vice President, Oconee Site  
Duke Power Company  
P. O. Box 1439  
Seneca, SC 29679

SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT OF DUKE POWER COMPANY RESPONSE TO GENERIC LETTER 92-01,  
REVISION 1, SUPPLEMENT 1 FOR THE OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION  
UNITS 1, 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. M92704, M92705, M92706)

Dear Mr. Hampton:

On May 19, 1995, the NRC issued Generic Letter 92-01, Revision 1, Supplement 1 (GL 92-01, Rev. 1, Supp. 1), "Reactor Vessel Structural Integrity." In GL 92-01, Rev. 1, Supp. 1, the NRC requested that licensees perform a review of their reactor pressure vessel structural integrity assessments in order "to identify, collect, and report any new data pertinent to [the] analysis of [the] structural integrity of their reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) and to assess the impact of that data on their RPV integrity analyses relative to the requirements of Section 50.60 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR 50.60), 10 CFR 50.61, Appendices G and H to 10 CFR Part 50 (which encompass pressurized thermal shock (PTS) and upper shelf energy (USE) evaluations), and any potential impact on low temperature overpressure (LTOP) limits or pressure-temperature (P-T) limits."

More specifically, in GL 92-01, Rev. 1, Supp. 1, the NRC requested that addressees provide the following information in their responses:

- (1) a description of those actions taken or planned to locate all data relevant to the determination of RPV integrity, or an explanation of why the existing database is considered complete as previously submitted;
- (2) an assessment of any change in best-estimate chemistry based on consideration of all relevant data;
- (3) a determination of the need for the use of the ratio procedure in accordance with the established Position 2.1 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.99, Revision 2, for those licensees that use surveillance data to provide a basis for the RPV integrity evaluation; and
- (4) a written report providing any newly acquired data as specified above and (1) the results of any necessary revisions to the evaluations of RPV integrity in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.60, 10 CFR 50.61, Appendices G and H to 10 CFR Part 50, and any potential impact on the LTOP and P-T limits in the technical specifications, or (2) a certification that previously submitted evaluations remain valid.

1/0  
PFD

9608080256 960806  
PDR ADOCK 05000269  
PDR

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

Revised evaluations and certifications were to include consideration of Position 2.1 of RG 1.99, Revision 2, as applicable, and any new data. The information in Reporting Item (1) was to be submitted within 90 days of the issuance of the GL. The information in Reporting Items (2) — (4) was to be submitted within 6 months of the issuance of the GL.

The NRC staff has noted that Duke Power Company submitted the information requested in Reporting Item (1) on August 16, 1995, and requested in Reporting Items (2) — (4) on November 16, 1995. Since Duke has submitted the requested information and has indicated that the previously submitted evaluations remain valid, the staff considers the RPV integrity data for the Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2, and 3 to be complete at this time and have closed TAC Nos. M92704, M92705 and M92706, respectively.

As a separate issue, the staff has noted that the most recent reactor vessel integrity assessment for the Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2, and 3 is covered by the scope of Babcock and Wilcox Topical Evaluation BAW-2257, Revision 1. This topical report was the subject of an April 30, 1996, meeting between the NRC staff and representatives of the Babcock and Wilcox Owners Group (BWOOG). The topical report indicates that all licensees addressed in the report have determined the best estimate copper and nickel contents of their plant's beltline and surveillance welds. The report also indicates that the ratio procedure described in Position 2.1 (pages 1.99-3 and 1.99-4) of RG 1.99, Rev. 2, need not be applied to the PTS assessments and USE assessments of RPV beltline welds made from Linde 80 fluxes.

At a meeting on April 30, 1996, representatives of the BWOOG provided the bases for the conclusions in the topical report. The staff informed the BWOOG personnel that the information presented was insufficient to support the owners group's proposal. The BWOOG representatives indicated that the owners group would consider performing additional work to address the staff's concerns, and would consider submitting another topical report for NRC review. The staff does not consider the BWOOG proposal to be acceptable at this time.

The topical report also included analyses to demonstrate that application of the ratio procedure would not cause the  $RT_{pts}$  values for the limiting materials in B&W fabricated RPVs to exceed the PTS screening criteria specified in 10 CFR 50.61. However, the report did not address the potential impact of applying the ratio procedure to the development of pressure-temperature limit curves and LTOP limits. Therefore, you are requested to provide an assessment of the application of the ratio procedure, as described in Position 2.1 of RG 1.99, Revision 2 (May 1988), to your pressure-temperature limit curves and LTOP limits. This assessment should

J. W. Hampton

-3-

August 6, 1996

include an evaluation relative to the margins specified in applicable codes and standards (i.e., Appendix G to Section III of the ASME Code). You are requested to provide this assessment by December 31, 1996. Since this issue is outside the scope of GL 92-01, it is being addressed separately and does not affect the closeout of GL 92-01.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



David E. LaBarge, Senior Project Manager  
Project Directorate II-2  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

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

cc: See next page

August 6, 1996

include an evaluation relative to the margins specified in applicable codes and standards (i.e., Appendix G to Section III of the ASME Code). You are requested to provide this assessment by December 31, 1996. Since this issue is outside the scope of GL 92-01, it is being addressed separately and does not affect the closeout of GL 92-01.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

original signed by  
David E. LaBarge, Senior Project Manager  
Project Directorate II-2  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

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

cc: See next page

Distribution:

<del>Docket File</del>	ACRS
PUBLIC	RCrlenjak, RII
PD II-2 Rdg.	EMerschhoff, RII
SVarga	
JZwolinski	
HBerkow	
LBerry	
OGC	
DMcDonald	

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box:

"C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure

"N" = No copy

OFFICE	PDII-2/LA	PDII-2/PM	PDI-1/LPM	PDII-2/D
NAME	LBerry	DLaBarge	DMcDonald	HBerkow
DATE	8/1/96	8/1/96	8/1/96	8/6/96

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\OCONEE\OC092704.CL

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Mr. J. W. Hampton  
Duke Power Company

Oconee Nuclear Station

cc:  
Mr. Paul R. Newton  
Legal Department (PB05E)  
Duke Power Company  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242-0001

Mr. Ed Burchfield  
Compliance  
Duke Power Company  
Oconee Nuclear Site  
P. O. Box 1439  
Seneca, South Carolina 29679

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esquire  
Winston and Strawn  
1400 L Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20005

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

Mr. Robert B. Borsum  
B&W Nuclear Technologies  
Suite 525  
1700 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, Maryland 20852-1631

Mr. G. A. Copp  
Licensing - EC050  
Duke Power Company  
526 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242-0001

Manager, LIS  
NUS Corporation  
2650 McCormick Drive, 3rd Floor  
Clearwater, Florida 34619-1035

Mr. Dayne H. Brown, Director  
Division of Radiation Protection  
North Carolina Department of  
Environment, Health and  
Natural Resources  
P. O. Box 27687  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687

Senior Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Route 2, Box 610  
Seneca, South Carolina 29678

Regional Administrator, Region II  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
101 Marietta Street, NW. Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Max Batavia, Chief  
Bureau of Radiological Health  
South Carolina Department of Health  
and Environmental Control  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

County Supervisor of Oconee County  
Walhalla, South Carolina 29621