

OCT 19 1972

Docket No. 50-269

J. M. Hendrie, Deputy Director for Technical Review
Directorate of Licensing

OCONEE UNIT 1 LICENSING

Except as noted below the safety review and evaluation for Oconee Unit 1 has been completed. An ACRS letter was received September 23, 1970, Safety Evaluation Report issued December 29, 1970 and Technical Specifications approved August 28, 1972. An ECCS Supplement (Supplement No. 1) to the Safety Evaluation Report was issued March 24, 1972.

Since the original Safety Evaluation Report several areas have required additional review and evaluation. They are:

1. Oconee Unit 1 suffered damage to the primary system during hot functional testing as a consequence of flow induced failures of internal components. This area is being reviewed by Technical Review on a schedule commensurate with fuel loading in January of 1973.
2. Questions arising from ECCS hearings have resulted in the analysis of postulated small breaks in the primary system and the analysis of the postulated rupture of a flood tank line, both causing a LOCA. These areas are being reviewed by Technical Review but the schedule for completion is uncertain.
3. The commitment by Licensing to reach a position regarding post LOCA hydrogen control equipment in Oconee has existed since December 29, 1970 (see original Safety Evaluation Report). In this area Technical Review has evaluated the potential sources of hydrogen within the containment, the time that purging must begin, the required purging rate and the resulting radiological consequences following a MHA for the case where containment purging is the only means of hydrogen control.

We anticipate that the first area above will be resolved in sufficient time to present our evaluation to the ACRS in December 1972 and license Oconee Unit 1 in January 1973.

OFFICE ▶									
SURNAME ▶									
DATE ▶									

8001060 007 A

OCT 19 1972

The second area is uncertain with regard to complete resolution. Therefore, we need Technical Review's recommendation as to whether or not we should (1) wait for complete resolution before licensing, (2) proceed on the basis of a partial power license, or (3) proceed on the basis of a full power license. Obviously because of the tight schedule the earlier this recommendation can be made the better.

The third area does not affect the decision to license but rather the conditions of licensing. We need Technical Review's recommendation, in light of the analyses and evaluations already performed, as to whether Licensing should propose backfitting Oconee with hydrogen control means (other than purging) to provide a significant improvement in safety to the public.

Since a backfitting proposal will require Commission review an early recommendation is desirable in this area.

Your early response to this memo will be appreciated. If you have any questions regarding these matters please contact us.

Original signed by
R. C. DeYoung

R. C. DeYoung, Assistant Director
for Pressurized Water Reactors
Directorate of Licensing

- cc: R. R. Maccary
- H. Denton
- D. Knuth /
- R. Tedesco
- W. McDonald
- J. Gallo
- R. C. DeYoung
- A. Schwencer
- I. A. Peltier

DISTRIBUTION
 Docket
 RP Reading
 PWR4 Reading

OFFICE ▶	L:PWR-4	L:PWR-4	L:AD/PWRs		
SURNAME ▶	IAPeltier:emp	ASchwencer	RCDeYoung		
DATE ▶	10/12/72	10/18/72	10/18/72		