

November 2, 1999

LICENSEE: Duke Energy Corporation (Duke)

FACILITY: Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 13, PHONE CALL BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (NRC) STAFF AND DUKE REPRESENTATIVES TO DISCUSS THE OCONEE LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

On October 13, 1999, representatives of Duke had a phone call with the NRC staff in Rockville, Maryland, to discuss the Oconee license renewal application. The purpose of the phone call was to discuss questions the staff had regarding the secondary shield wall tendons. Enclosure 1 contains the staff's questions. The Duke participants for the phone call were Robert Gill, Debbie Ramsey, and Robert Hester. The staff participants were David Jeng, Syed Shaukat, Hans Ashar, Kamal Manoly and Joe Sebrosky.

During the phone call Duke provided verbal answers to the Enclosure 1 questions that the staff asked regarding the secondary shield wall tendons. A summary of the answers can be found in Enclosure 1. The staff stated that Duke had the following 3 options regarding documenting the results of the phone call: Duke could amend its response to safety evaluation report (SER) open item 3.8.3.2.5-1, Duke could address the issue in the cover letter to SER open item responses that are due by October 15, 1999, or Duke could amend its response to request for additional information 4.28-1. Duke stated that it would consider the options and inform the staff which option it would choose. Subsequent to the phone call Duke informed the staff that it will not have all the information in time to support providing the staff with a response by October 15, 1999. The staff will track the resolution of the issues in the phone call under SER open item 3.8.3.2.5-1. A draft of this meeting summary was provided to Duke to allow them the opportunity to comment on the summary prior to issuance.

**Original Signed By**

Joseph M. Sebrosky, Project Manager  
License Renewal and Standardization Branch  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

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

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encs: See next page

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME:G:\RLSB\SEBROSKY\10-13PHNS.WPD

OFFICE	LA	EMEB/DE <sup>11/2/99</sup>	RLSB/DRIP:PM	RLSB:D
NAME	EHyton	HAshtar <sup>11/2/99</sup>	JSebrosky <sup>10/19/99</sup>	CIGrimes <sup>11/2/99</sup>
DATE	11/2/99	11/2/99	10/19/99	11/2/99

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DF01

PDR ADOCK.

Oconee Nuclear Station (License Renewal)

cc:

Ms. Lisa F. Vaughn  
Duke Energy Corporation  
422 South Church Street  
Mail Stop PB-05E  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Anne W. Cottingham, Esquire  
Winston and Strawn  
1400 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Mr. Rick N. Edwards  
Framatome Technologies  
Suite 525  
1700 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, Maryland 20852-1631

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

Senior Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
7812B Rochester Highway  
Seneca, South Carolina 29672

Regional Administrator, Region II  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Atlanta Federal Center  
61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 23T85  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Virgil R. Autry, Director  
Division of Radioactive Waste Management  
Bureau of Land and Waste Management  
Department of Health and  
Environmental Control  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-1708

W. R. McCollum, Jr., Vice President  
Oconee Site  
Duke Energy Corporation  
P. O. Box 1439  
Seneca, SC 29679

Mr. Larry E. Nicholson  
Compliance Manager  
Duke Energy Corporation  
Oconee Nuclear Site  
P. O. Box 1439  
Seneca, South Carolina 29679

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

L. A. Keller  
Manager - Nuclear Regulatory Licensing  
Duke Energy Corporation  
526 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Mr. Richard M. Fry, Director  
Division of Radiation Protection  
North Carolina Department of  
Environment, Health, and  
Natural Resources  
3825 Barrett Drive  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Gregory D. Robison  
Duke Energy Corporation  
Mail Stop EC-12R  
P. O. Box 1006  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Robert L. Gill, Jr.  
Duke Energy Corporation  
Mail Stop EC-12R  
P. O. Box 1006  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006  
RLGILL@DUKE-ENERGY.COM

Douglas J. Walters  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
1776 I Street, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006-3708  
DJW@NEI.ORG

Chattooga River Watershed Coalition  
P. O. Box 2006  
Clayton, GA 30525

Secondary Shield Wall  
Phone call of 10/13/99

**Staff question 1**

A review of your response to Open item 3.8.3.2.5-1 indicates that to assess the adequacy of your secondary shield wall (SSW) Surveillance Program, the staff needs information regarding the parameter monitored (in this case the SSW prestressing force). Please provide information regarding the monitoring of prestressing forces in the SSW tendons with the corresponding acceptance criteria for each group of tendons in SSWs.

**Discussion regarding question 1**

Duke stated that it could provide the information requested by the staff. The staff stated that it was only interested in the prestressing forces because it had found the details related to the management of the aging effects of corrosion as described in the license renewal application acceptable.

**Staff question 2**

NRC Inspection Report (IR 50-269/270/287/99-12) issued on September 21, 1999, indicates that currently you are performing reduced surveillance (as compared to that described in your LRA). Please provide basis for the reduced inspection and your plans to perform inspections during the extended period of operation.

**Discussion regarding question 2**

Duke stated that its sample size is decreasing from that discussed in the response to request for additional information 4.28-1 dated February 8, 1999. In the February 8, 1999 response Duke states that "testing is performed every other refueling outage on at least ten randomly selected tendons for each unit which is approximately 14% of the tendons in scope for each unit." As documented in the September 21, 1999, inspection report the inspection team determined that the practice of inspecting tendons every other outage had been reduced to 3 tendons.

Duke stated that it believed that reducing the number of tendons that were tested was appropriate based on a comparison of the SSW tendon surveillance program to the containment tendon surveillance program and based on the results of recent inspections of the SSW tendons. Specifically, Duke stated that testing 14% of the SSW tendons was above and beyond the 2% of containment tendons that are normally tested. The containment tendon testing program is done in accordance with Subsection IWL of ASME Section XI. In addition, Duke stated that recent testing of the SSW tendons had shown no problems regarding the tendons.

The staff stated that it does not see a problem with reducing the sample size of the tendons. However, the staff believes that Duke needs to document the fact that it is reducing the sample size and the basis for reducing the sample size.

T5C3

Distribution:

Hard copy

PUBLIC

Docket File

RLSB RF

N. Dudley, ACRS - T2E26

E. Hylton

E-mail:

- R. Zimmerman
- D. Matthews
- S. Newberry
- C. Grimes
- C. Carpenter
- B. Zalcmn
- J. Strosnider
- R. Wessman
- E. Imbro
- W. Bateman
- J. Calvo
- M. Tschiltz
- G. Holahan
- T. Collins
- C. Gratton
- B. Boger
- R. Correia
- R. Latta
- J. Moore
- J. Rutberg
- R. Weisman
- M. Mayfield
- S. Bahadur
- N. Chokshi
- J. Vora
- A. Murphy
- D. Martin
- W. McDowell
- S. Droggitis
- M. Modes
- RLSB Staff

- 
- R. Emch
  - D. LaBarge
  - L. Plisco
  - C. Ogle
  - R. Trojanowski
  - D. Billings
  - M. Shannon
  - C. Julian
  - J. Peralta
  - J. Wilson
  - C. Sochor