



UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

JUN 25 1970

Richard C. DeYoung, Assistant Director for PWR's, Division of Reactor
Licensing
THRU: Charles G. Long, Chief, PWR-2, Division of Reactor Licensing *CGL*

MEETING WITH DUKE POWER COMPANY JUNE 18, 1970 RE OCONEE NUCLEAR
STATION TECH SPECS (DOCKET NOS. 50-269, 50-270 AND 50-287)

SUMMARY

At the request of Duke Power Company, we scheduled the initial tech spec meeting for June 18 and 19 contingent upon availability of substantially improved draft tech specs using Palisades and H. B. Robinson tech specs as references reflecting the scope of coverage expected from Duke.

Since many of the draft tech spec revisions were not available until a few days before the meeting and since several of the available tech specs cannot be resolved until Duke answers outstanding questions, the meeting time was reduced from two days to one day.

An attendance list is enclosed.

The staff reviewers offered preliminary comments on a majority of the revised draft specs available at the meeting. Duke said they were further revising several specs and were not prepared to discuss them. They included:

- 15.3.1.4 - Reactor Coolant Leakage
- 15.3.1.6 - Minimum Conditions for Criticality
- 15.3.5.2 - Control Rod Group Limits
- 15.3.5.3 - Engineered Safeguards System Initiation
- 15.3.5.4 - In Core Instrumentation

We also stated that, due to lack of answers from Duke certain tech specs could not be discussed in a meaningful way at this meeting.

They included:

- 15.2.3 - Limiting Safety System Setting
- 15.4.3.1 - Containment Leakage
- 15.3.3 - Emergency Core Cooling, Reactor Building Cooling, Building Spray & Penetration Room Ventilation Systems
- No spec - Plant Reporting Requirements.

7912110 594

A

Future Tech Spec Meetings

Duke was told that the next tech spec meeting could not be scheduled until they have revised those tech specs not yet available for our review, supplied missing information needed for the bases of several tech specs and made substantial improvements to raise the quality of their tech specs to that achieved in the H. B. Robinson and Palisades tech specs. Upon receipt of such information we will then schedule a meeting which affords adequate lead time for review and establishment of tentative or final positions where warranted.

Discussion

General

Duke was told that the tech specs would be for Unit No. 1 only in as much as the first operating license will cover only that unit.

Duke was made aware that in a majority of the tech specs discussed, they have a need to further examine the Palisades and H. B. Robinson tech specs since these two most recent tech specs largely reflect minimum acceptable tech spec coverage.

Problem Areas Identified

Licensed Power Level

Duke does not want to be restricted by tech specs to operating at the CP approved core power level of 2452 MWt. We said that for this unproven first-of-a-kind reactor it would be difficult to justify licensing at the stretch core power level of 2568 without substantial operating experience.

Automatic Reduction of Crew Size

Duke was told there is no basis to decide now to reduce the crew size from five to four upon future completion of 500 hours of operation. We have not changed our intention to review the adequacy of such a change based on added experience before permitting it.

Minimum Emergency Power Sources

When told we are considering requiring as a startup prerequisite, automatic availability of both hydro generators and one offsite power source, Duke objected. Their position was that they had openly discussed the need to remove both hydro units from service for a short time once a year to inspect the common water tunnel and that

the staff had accepted as adequate for these short time intervals a gas turbine emergency power source which Duke has arranged to make available to Oconee through a special 100 kV switchyard and transmission line. We acknowledged that this was a major review item at the CP stage and stated that we have not yet arrived at a final staff position on this matter.

Charcoal Filter Efficiency Tests

Duke was told that if they insist on testing to a 90% efficiency we will have to lower the assumed degraded efficiency in our accident analyses. If they wish to have credit for 90% efficiency under accident conditions then they must show a higher efficiency under tests on the order of 99%. Duke maintained that this "factor of 10" penalty is unrealistic, that available tests show only a 1 or 2% loss in efficiency due to aging.

Reactor Coolant System Leakage

Duke was not prepared to discuss this area but asked for our concerns. They were told that we have a concern that the sensitivity of leak detection means should be covered in the tech specs or in their bases. Further, we believe all detected leaks must be given a timely and adequate safety evaluation regardless of how small they may be. Recent experience with incipient failures of stainless steel components was cited. We told them that simply copying the H. B. Robinson or Palisades tech specs would not be adequate (1 gpm unidentified, 10 gpm identified as allowable leakage). (Note- the PWR Branches are presently developing a "standard" tech spec in this area which we hope to apply to the Oconee application)

Irradiation Specimen Program

We said we would have to have a specimen withdrawal schedule for the Oconee Station Unit No. 1. We do not expect to permit relaxation of specimen evaluations based on results obtained in other reactor vessels.

Reporting Requirements

In addition to requesting that they add a section on plant reporting requirements we called attention to the specific reporting requirements on liquid and gaseous releases and environmental monitoring as set forth in the May 26, 1970 "Standard Reporting Requirements w/Guide" made available to DRL by RPS. We said we thought these requirements

were all applicable to Duke and unless they had a substantial reason for not using them they should be incorporated in the Oconee tech specs.



A. Schwencer
Senior Project Leader

Enclosure:
List of Attendees

Distribution:
Docket files
DRL Reading
Branch Reading
P. A. Morris
F. Schroeder
T. R. Wilson
R. S. Boyd
R. C. DeYoung
D. Skovholt
E. G. Case, DRS
R. R. Maccary
Compliance (2)
DRL and DRS Branch Chiefs
Project Leader:
F. Karas
R. W. Klecker
W. N. Thomasson
O. Parr
J. M. McGough
M. Fairtile
R. Pollard
M. Chatterton
M. Dunnenfeld

OCONEE TECH SPEC MEETING - JUNE 18, 1970
LIST OF ATTENDEES

Duke Power Company

Paul Hodges Barton
Austin Cole Thies
William Oscar Parker
Kenneth Sink Canady
Lionel (NMN) Lewis
Arthur Lowell Snow
Raymond Hugh Waltman
Carl Amos Price
Bill Morrell Rice
Charles Alexander Dewey, Jr.
Stephen Thomas Apple
John Edwin Smith
Ollie Samuel Bradham, Jr.
Maurice Daniel McIntosh
Lyman Earl Summerlin
James Wyatt Hampton
Robert Marshall Keohler

Babcock & Wilcox

George Eugene Kulynych
Ronald Clyde Hutto
Rudy Vaughn Straub
Clifford Douglas Russell
Charles Evans Parks
James Francis Mallay
Henry Amos Bailey
David Warren Berger
Robert Allen Turner
Thomas McKinley Shuler, Jr.

AEC CO:II

C. E. Murphy

AEC-DRL

A. Schwencer
W. N. Thomasson
O. Parr
J. McGough

AEC-DRS

M. Fairtile
R. Pollard
M. Chatterton
M. Dunnenfeld