



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NOS. 46, 46 AND 43

TO FACILITY LICENSE NOS. DPR-38, DPR-47 AND DPR-55

DUKE POWER COMPANY

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

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

Introduction

By letter dated July 5, 1977, Duke Power Company (licensee) requested changes to the common Technical Specifications incorporated in the operating licenses of Units 1, 2 and 3 of the Oconee Nuclear Station. The changes would permit the extended operation of Oconee Unit 3 Cycle 2 from 265 effective full power days (EFPD) to 282 EFPDs.

Discussion

The Oconee Unit 3, Cycle 2 reload was approved on October 22, 1976, for a cycle length of 265 EFPDs. To provide flexibility in the scheduling of refueling operations at Oconee Nuclear Station, the licensee has proposed to extend Cycle 2 by 17 EFPDs to 282 EFPDs.

Evaluation

The Oconee Unit 3 Cycle 2 was approved by NRC on the basis of a review of an analysis performed by the licensee which justified Cycle 2 operation at the rated core power of 2568 MWt.

Based on the Cycle 2 reload analysis, Technical Specifications were proposed which provided operational control rod position limits and power imbalance limits for a cycle of 265 EFPDs. These limits assured that operation of Cycle 2, would not result in any Technical Specifications Safety Limits or Limiting Conditions for Operation being exceeded.

The licensee assessed the applicability of the existing Technical Specification limits for the extended Cycle 2 in a manner similar to that performed for the Cycle 2 reload. As a result of this assessment, it was determined that the operational control rod position limits (Technical Specification Figures 3.5.2-1C3 and 3.5.2-2C3) and the power imbalance limits (Technical

791216094

Specification Figure 3.5.2-3C3) would require slight modifications to account for limiting conditions which would exist in the extended part of the cycle.

We have reviewed the licensee's submittal and have concluded that with the slight modifications proposed by the licensee the Technical Specifications for Oconee Unit 3 will remain valid for the 17 EFPD extension of Cycle 2 to 282 EFPDs.

#### 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 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 of 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.

Date: September 9, 1977