

March 24, 2000

LICENSEE: Duke Energy Corporation (Duke)
FACILITY: Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS), Units 1, 2, and 3
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MARCH 20, 2000, PHONE CALL BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (NRC) STAFF AND DUKE REPRESENTATIVES TO DISCUSS STRUCTURAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE OCONEE LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA)

On March 20, 2000, 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 the staff comments on the content of the supplement to the updated final safety analysis report (UFSAR) in the structural area that were given to Duke in a March 17, 2000, letter. The Duke participants were Debbie Keiser and Robert Gill. The staff participants were David Jeng, Hans Ashar, and Joe Sebrosky.

The first comment that was discussed related to the crane inspection program. The staff commented in the March 17, 2000, letter that the inspection program contained in draft UFSAR Section 18.3.5 should be augmented by (a) listing of specific inspection frequencies for each of the cranes listed in the table contained in Section 18.3.5 and (b) the discussion of Oconee experience briefly mentioned under "Frequency" should be further elaborated. Duke stated that it did not believe that the inspection frequencies needed to be explicitly stated because Duke references the applicable guidance documents (i.e., ANSI B30.2.0 and B30.16) under "Frequency" in Section 18.3.5. Duke also stated that all of the crane inspections listed in the table occur at least once every 18 months. Based on the reference to the ANSI standards, and based on the inspection occurring at least once every 18 months, the staff agreed that adding inspection frequencies to the table in draft UFSAR Section 18.3.5 was not necessary. Regarding the second part of the staff's comment, Duke stated that the operating experience should not have been referenced under the "Frequency" Section in 18.3.5. Duke stated that the regulatory basis cites the license renewal application (LRA) and the staff's safety evaluation report (SER) both of which discuss operating experience. Therefore, Duke stated that the sentence discussing operating experience was redundant and should be removed. The staff agreed with removing the sentence because the SER and the LRA are cited in the regulatory basis section of 18.3.5.

The staff's comment on draft UFSAR Section 18.2.4, "Once Through Steam Generator (OTSG) Upper Lateral Support Inspection" contained in the March 17, 2000, letter was then discussed. The staff commented that the "Sample Size" portion should be changed to note that the pads that will be chosen will be randomly selected from a population of 10 pads. Duke stated that one OTSG contains 5 pads and that the pads from one OTSG will be selected for the inspection. Therefore, the total population of pads at Oconee is 30 (5 pads per steam generator and 6 steam generators at the site). If problems are found then other pads in other OTSGs may be

inspected. The staff and Duke agreed that the following sentence should be added to the "Sample Size" discussion contained in Section 18.2.4: The OTSG containing these pads will be randomly selected from the total population of six OTSGs at Oconee.

One of the comments that was discussed related to the containment post-tensioning system. In the comment that was provided to Duke in the March 17, 2000, letter the staff stated that Duke should augment the description of the aging management program in the UFSAR in this area to be consistent with Duke's response to safety evaluation report open item 4.2.2.3-1. Duke stated that one of the items that it references for the disposition of this issue in table 18.1 of the draft UFSAR is selected licensee commitment (SLC) 16.6.2. Duke stated that the "bases" for SLC 16.6.2 contained the information that Duke believed would resolve the issue. Furthermore, Duke stated that the SLCs are considered to be part of the UFSAR and therefore, they have the regulatory controls associated with the UFSAR. The staff reviewed the "bases" section of SLC 16.6.2 and agreed with Duke that it resolves the issue. The staff and Duke agreed that the LRA and its associated SER would be referenced in section 16.6.2 of the SLC. In addition, the staff pointed out that section 16.6.2 of the SLC references Regulatory Guide 1.35 revision 3. This reference is no longer applicable and the correct reference should be to IWL of ASME section XI. Duke acknowledged that a change to section 16.6.2 was necessary and stated they would ensure that such a change was identified to the appropriate personnel.

Subsequent to the phone call, Duke provided the staff with updated text for Section 16.6.2 of the SLCs. This Section was recently updated to be consistent with a technical specification change that was approved by the NRC on January 18, 2000. The new SLC 16.6.2 states that inservice examination of post-tensioning systems of concrete containments are performed in accordance with Section XI, Subsection IWL of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable addenda as required by 10 CFR 50, Section 55a(b)(2)(viii)(B). The SLC also states that Oconee has implemented a Containment Inservice Inspection Plan to comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a. Duke also provided the staff with page 24 and 25 of the Containment Inservice Inspection Plan (Document #O-62-CISI-0001, Rev 1) that provides details on how Duke complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a. Based on its review of this material, the staff determined that Duke's reference to Sections 18.3.3, 3.8.1.5.2, and SLC 16.6.2 of the UFSAR and its reference to 10 CFR 50.55a, has resolved the comment contained in the March 17, 2000, letter.

The staff's comments regarding draft UFSAR Section 18.3.23, "Tendon - Secondary Shield Wall - Surveillance Program" contained in the March 17, 2000, letter were then discussed. The staff believed that Duke should incorporate prestressing force monitoring of three randomly selected tendons, and provide corresponding acceptance criteria in this surveillance program. Duke stated that it would add the term "randomly selected" under the Method and Frequency Section of the program to address the staff's concern. In addition, Duke stated that it would provide a range of values for the lift-off forces under the acceptance criteria portion of the program to be consistent with a phone call summary dated December 10, 1999. The staff then asked Duke if the program would cover vertical tendons as well. Duke stated that it would not because Duke reviewed the structural analysis for the secondary shield wall tendons and determined that the vertical tendons are not relied upon to withstand the postulated loadings. Therefore, no lift-off surveillance program is required for the vertical tendons. The staff agreed that based on Duke's review a surveillance program for the vertical tendons was not necessary.

A draft of this meeting summary was provided to Duke to allow them the opportunity to comment on the summary prior to its issuance.

/RA/

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

cc: See next page

A draft of this meeting summary was provided to Duke to allow them the opportunity to comment on the summary prior to its issuance.

/RA/

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

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME:C:\3-20 structural sum.WPD

*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	LA	EMEB/DE	EMEB/DE	RLSB/PM	RLSB:BC
NAME	EHylton*	HAshar	DJeng*	JSebrosky	CIGrimes
DATE	3/21/00	03/24/00	3/22/00	03/24/00	03/24/00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution:

Hard copy

File Center

PUBLIC

RLSB RF

S. Duraiswamy, ACRS - T2E26

E. Hylton

E-mail:

R. Zimmerman

J. Johnson

D. Matthews

S. Newberry

C. Grimes

C. Carpenter

B. Zalcman

J. Strosnider

R. Wessman

G. Bagchi

E. Imbro

W. Bateman

J. Calvo

S. Peterson

G. Holahan

T. Collins

C. Gratton

B. Boger

J. Peralta

J. Moore

J. Rutberg

R. Weisman

B. Poole

M. Mayfield

S. Bahadur

A. Murphy

D. Martin

W. McDowell

S. Droggitis

RLSB Staff

R. Emch

D. LaBarge

L. Plisco

C. Ogle

R. Trojanowski

D. Billings

M. Shannon

C. Julian

J. Wilson

C. Sochor

J. Vora

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
7800 Rochester Highway
Seneca, SC 29672

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

Jeff Thomas, Manager
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