AUG 15 1977

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

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

Gentlemen:

We are reviewing your request dated November 30, 1976, to change the Oconee Nuclear Station Technical Specifications to incorporate the provisions of Appendix J of 10 CFR 50. We find that we need additional information, identified in the enclosure, to continue our review.

In your submittal of November 30, 1976, you listed valves associated with five penetrations which would be tested in a direction opposite to its safety functions. The penetrations are:

a. Penetration No. 5, RB normal sump drain line;

b. Penetration No. 7, RC pump seal outlet line;

c. Penetration No. 18, quench tank vent line;

d. Penetration No. 29, quench tank drain line; and

e. Penetration No. 54, component cooling water outlet line.

We find that exemptions are not required for these valves since Appendix J allows reverse direction testing of these classes of valves.

Also, with regard to air lock testing, we have reviewed your exemption request dated September 6, 1975 and your letter dated February 15, 1977, which responded to our letter of November 23, 1976. Our November 23, 1976 letter provided an acceptable approach to meeting the objectives of Appendix J for air lock testing. Your letter of February 15, 1977, stated that to perform the air lock tests in accordance with Appendix J,

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

7911190643 P

the addition of test clamps to the inner air lock door would be necessary. You also stated that it is not practical to perform testing of the door seals within 72 hours of each of a series of openings. We believe there are acceptable measures to take to meet the intent of Appendix J, and in this regard, the guidelines delineated in our November 23, 1976 letter remain applicable. We therefore request that you state your intent to adopt air lock testing in accordance with our position of November 23, 1976.

Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

/s/

A. Schwencer, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

cc w/encl:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION
Docket
NRC PDR
LOCAL PDR
ORB#1 Reading
ASchwencer
SMShepaprd
[illegible]
DNeighbors
OELD
OI&E(3)
ACRS(16)
TBAbernathy
JRBuchanan
VStello
DEisenhut
C. Grimes
R. Butler

OFFICE	DOR:ORB#1	DOR:ORB#1				
SURNAME	DNeighbors:lb	ASchwencer				
DATE	8/10/77	8/15/77				

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
ON DUKE POWER COMPANY
LETTER OF NOVEMBER 30, 1976

1. In Table 4.4.1, valves Nos. 4, 43, 47, 53, 59, 55, and 51 were identified as not being required to be leak tested. Provide additional justification why these valves should not be leak tested.

2. Table 5-4 of the FSAR lists twenty-three penetrations which were not listed in your submittal as requiring leak testing. The penetrations are:

   a. Penetration No. 8, loop nozzle warming lines;

   b. Penetration No. 9, normal make-up to RC system;

   c. Penetration No. 10, RCP seal injection lines;

   d. Penetration Nos. 13 and 14, RB spray inlet lines;

   e. Penetrations Nos. 15 and 16, LPI and decay heat removal lines;

   f. Penetration No. 17, emergency feedwater inlet line;

   g. Penetration No. 23, RCP seal injection line;

   h. Penetrations Nos. 25, 26,27 and 28, feedwater and steam lines;

   i. Penetration Nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35, RB emergency cooler outlet and inlet lines;

   j. Penetration Nos. 36 and 37, RB sump recirculation lines;

   k. Penetration No. 50, emergency feedwater inlet line; and

   l. Penetration No. 52, emergency reactor injection line.

For those penetrations listed, provide further justification why the valves will not be required to perform a containment isolation function and leak testing is not required.