

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 ***

5 BRIEFING ON OCONEE LICENSE RENEWAL

6 ***

7 PUBLIC MEETING
8

9 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
10 One White Flint North
11 Commissioner's Conference Room
12 11555 Rockville Pike
13 Rockville, Maryland
14 Tuesday, May 2, 2000
15

16 The Commission met in open session, pursuant to
17 notice, at 9:35 a.m., the Honorable RICHARD A. MESERVE,
18 Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

19 COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

- 20 RICHARD A. MESERVE, Chairman of the Commission
- 21 GRETA J. DICUS, Member of the Commission
- 22 NILS J. DIAZ, Member of the Commission
- 23 EDWARD McGAFFIGAN, JR., Member of the Commission
- 24 JEFFREY S. MERRIFIELD, Member of the Commission

25 ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 STAFF AND PRESENTERS SEATED AT THE COMMISSION TABLE:
2 FRANK MIRAGLIA, Deputy EDO
3 KAREN D. CYR, General Counsel
4 ANNETTE L. VIETTI-COOK, Assistant Secretary
5 SAMUEL COLLINS, Director, NRR
6 JOSEPH SEBROSKY, Safety Project Manager, NRR
7 CHRISTOPHER GRIMES, Chief, License Renewal &
8 Standardization Branch, NRR
9 JIM WILSON, Environmental Project Manager, NRR
10 VICTOR McCREE, Deputy Director, Division of
11 Reactor Projects, Region II
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

[9:35 a.m.]

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good morning. On behalf of the Commission I am very pleased to welcome you to this briefing by the NRC Staff.

The Staff today will discuss the review process and provide its recommendations related to Duke Power Company's application to renew the licensees for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3. This is an application for a license extension for an additional 20 years for units that otherwise would have their licenses terminated in 2013 and 2014.

As I am sure everyone in the audience knows, Oconee is the second plant to go through the license renewal process and the first Babcock & Wilcox plant to do so.

Duke Power filed its application in July 1998 and the Staff completed its review and published its Safety Evaluation Report in March of this year, concluding, as in the case of Calvert Cliffs that the Staff had the capability to meet the demanding target schedule for the process of performing a comprehensive review of the technical issues. I would like to compliment the Staff on its ability to abide and even exceed the scheduled time that it had allocated for the performance of this review.

If there are no comments by my colleagues, why
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 don't we proceed.

2 MR. MIRAGLIA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
3 Commissioners.

4 As you indicate, Mr. Chairman, this is a meeting
5 to inform you of the results of our review of the Oconee
6 License Renewal Application.

7 This again was a team effort with the Office of
8 NRR, Research and Region. We are here to request the
9 Commission authorize the Director of NRR to renew the
10 operating licenses for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1,
11 2 and 3.

12 With me at the table today is the Director of NRR,
13 Sam Collins, to my immediate right. To his right is Joe
14 Sebrosky, the Safety Project Manager for the Oconee review,
15 and to Joe's right is Jim Wilson, the Environmental Project
16 Manager. To my immediate left is Chris Grimes, who has led
17 both of these efforts to date. He is the Branch Chief of
18 the License Renewal Branch. To Chris's left is Victor
19 McCree, from Region II, the Deputy Director, Reactor
20 Projects.

21 With that I will turn the review and briefing over
22 to Sam Collins.

23 MR. COLLINS: Good morning. Before I proceed in
24 Slide 3 I would like to acknowledge the Staff efforts and
25 those of the contributing offices, including the Office of
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 Research, which we depend on heavily as part of the team to
2 provide technical support to NRR, and also OGC, which
3 provides counsel, and of course the Region, which implements
4 the program including the inspection program.

5 We will cover that during the course of the
6 presentation.

7 Slide 3 indicates the performance goals. The
8 Office of NRR uses these in our operating plan, of course.
9 What you see in front of you are the four outcome measures
10 that we focus on. Our expectations are to meet these four
11 outcome measures as defined by the performance goals and
12 including defining success for each of those and adhering to
13 the schedule, as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman.

14 Under Maintaining Safety we ensure that we are
15 focused on ensuring that the aging effects are adequately
16 managed in the course of the review by the Staff themselves.

17 Public confidence is met to a large measure by
18 increased public participation including those of the
19 stakeholders, the licensees and the industry groups.

20 Specifically in the course of the Oconee review,
21 the Staff presented information in what we believe is a more
22 understandable manner, and we made public participation more
23 accessible. We added a new summary to the Oconee SER that
24 is written in accordance with the plain English principles.

25 We held monthly public meetings with Duke, the licensee,

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 bimonthly public meetings with the industry to improve the
2 renewal process itself. We held public meetings near the
3 Oconee site and after hours to allow for full participation
4 by the public, particular in the Environmental Impact
5 Assessment Review.

6 We utilized a facilitator to elicit public
7 participation and we addressed public concerns in what we
8 believe is a more timely manner.

9 We reduced unnecessary regulatory burden by
10 process improvements including working with the industry to
11 establish a standard format for licensing renewal
12 activities. As a result of lessons learned from the Oconee
13 review we provided additional guidance on these for
14 follow-on plants.

15 The Staff has also begun using experience gained
16 through Oconee to review and update the Standard Review Plan
17 in the Generic Aging Lessons Learned Report, and that is
18 referred to as the GALL report.

19 In the efficiency and effectiveness area, again we
20 focused on schedule and we met all of our milestones.

21 Slide 4 talks about program monitoring and
22 oversight. As you know, the first two plants themselves are
23 receiving an enhanced level of oversight, not only by the
24 Staff but by the Commission. Participation includes the
25 Executive Council oversight. The EC contributed to the

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 Oconee reviews by focusing the effort primarily in three
2 areas -- first, periodically reviewing the progress, that's
3 monitoring schedule and Staff activities; second,
4 facilitating cross-office cooperation in those areas that
5 require interdependency in the license renewal team; and
6 thirdly, the EC identified longer term issues which could
7 affect desired outcome of Oconee review and the NRC's
8 ability to effectively and efficiently implement the program
9 for the future.

10 EC reinforced the fundamental responsibility and
11 the accountability of the NRR line management process.

12 In addition to EC oversight, the License Renewal
13 Steering Committee guidance and coordination was important.
14 Bimonthly public management meetings were conducted with
15 pre-established agendas to review status and ensure that
16 public cooperation was facilitated.

17 Monthly public management meetings were held with
18 Duke to identify potential issues impacting continued
19 progress and to collectively reach solution paths to ensure
20 progress was maintained.

21 With that broad overview I would at this time like
22 to move to Slide 5 and turn the details of the meeting over
23 to Chris Grimes.

24 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Sam.

25 Slide 5 summarizes the two key principles of

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 license renewal that guided us during the course of the
2 evaluation of the Oconee review.

3 As Frank mentioned, Joe Sebrosky, who is the
4 Safety Project Manager for the Oconee review, is going to
5 describe some of the unique details of the Oconee review.
6 Jim Wilson is going to describe some of the unique details
7 of the environmental review and Victor McCree is going to
8 describe the inspection activities that were conducted as it
9 related to the renewal review for Oconee.

10 The same purpose applies for the Oconee as that
11 for the Calvert Cliffs review that we described to you in
12 the Commission briefing on March 3rd. The objective of Part
13 54 is to determine whether the detrimental effects of aging
14 will be adequately managed for the period of extended
15 operation, and that is the thrust and focus of the safety
16 evaluation that we performed.

17 The license renewal review is intended to identify
18 any additional actions that will be needed in order to
19 maintain the functionality of systems, structures and
20 components during the period of extended operation. The
21 review was conducted to ensure that the plant-specific
22 licensing basis will be maintained during the renewal
23 period.

24 The Staff presentations are going to focus on some
25 of the unique aspects, but very broadly I would say that the
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 lessons that we learned during the Oconee review were
2 essentially the same as those that we had learned during the
3 Calvert Cliffs review and they have been reflected in the
4 standard form and content that we sent to the Nuclear Energy
5 Institute and that we promoted as part of our process
6 improvement.

7 These reviews were conducted contemporaneously so
8 as lessons were learned on Calvert Cliffs and Oconee they
9 had a synergistic effect in terms of assisting our ability
10 to improve the quality of our work and at the same time to
11 exceed the milestones.

12 I will turn to Slide 6 now. Slide 6 highlights
13 some of the significant aspects of the renewal review
14 process. The Oconee plan was set up with the same 585-day
15 review schedule as we set up for Calvert Cliffs and they
16 were separated by approximately three months. The review
17 guidance and the experience from Calvert Cliffs were used to
18 ensure that the evaluation scope was disciplined and focused
19 to the desired outcome -- that is, the adequacy of aging
20 management and the identification of time limited aging
21 analysis or time limited design analysis.

22 The Oconee renewal review also had the benefit of
23 other regulatory process improvements -- a single round of
24 questions before identifying issues requiring resolution;
25 weekly internal staff meetings to discuss the progress of

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 the review; monthly public management meetings to ensure
2 that issues were communicated and actions were assigned to
3 ensure that the milestones could be met; and accountability
4 to ensure that responsible parties for actions met their
5 responsibilities.

6 Similarities and differences existed in Oconee
7 largely because of difference in the -- excuse me.
8 Differences in the review arose largely from the plant
9 design and the vintage but mostly we found that the same
10 process lessons were learned in terms of being able to
11 maintain a focus on aging management programs and that
12 experience has fed back into our efforts to identify
13 adequate aging management programs in the generic aging
14 lessons learned and the Standard Review Plan improvements
15 that we are going to continue with this summer.

16 With that, I will turn the presentation over to
17 Joe Sebrosky.

18 MR. SEBROSKY: May I have Slide 7, please.

19 Good morning. My name is Joe Sebrosky and I am
20 the NRC Project Manager for the Safety Review of the Oconee
21 license renewal application.

22 Slide 7 highlights 11 of the more significant
23 milestones for the safety review that occurred over a
24 21-month period including related inspection activities that
25 will be discussed later by Victor McCree.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 The detailed safety review of Duke's renewal
2 application began upon receiving their application on July
3 6, 1998 and concluded with the issuance of NUREG-1723,
4 documenting the Staff's review and conclusion that the
5 effects of aging for the systems, structures and components
6 within the scope of license renewal would be managed during
7 the renewal period.

8 Over this 21-month period the Staff held 37 public
9 meetings with Duke and the ACRS to ensure continual progress
10 on the review and to resolve safety issues. There were two
11 safety meetings at the site and the Staff supported an ACRS
12 subcommittee meeting near the site on February 24th, 2000.

13 These meetings were in addition to the public
14 meetings related to the inspection and environmental
15 efforts. The safety review benefitted from team work.
16 Research staff assisted with the resolution of technical
17 issues and assisted with the inspections.

18 Technical specialists in Headquarters worked
19 closely with the renewal and regional staff to ensure that
20 issues were clearly identified and resolved on a sound
21 technical basis. Next slide, please.

22 Slide 8 presents three of the significant areas of
23 the Oconee Safety Evaluation Report. Chapter 2 of the
24 Safety Evaluation Report describes the results of the
25 Staff's scoping and screening review of Duke's license

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 renewal application.

2 Scoping is the method for determining what
3 structures and components are within the scope of license
4 renewal. Screening is the method for determining which of
5 those structures and components require an aging management
6 review.

7 The Calvert Cliffs methodology had been reviewed
8 and approved by the Staff prior to the submittal of the
9 application. Oconee was not.

10 During the review the Staff was concerned whether
11 Duke's methodology had identified all systems, structures
12 and components within the scope of license renewal. Duke
13 performed further evaluations to address the Staff's concern
14 and did not identify any additional structures or components
15 that would require an aging management review. Therefore,
16 the Staff concluded that the structures and components
17 within the scope of Part 54 had been appropriately
18 identified. Next slide, please.

19 Slide 9 highlights the two areas of the Safety
20 Evaluation Report where the majority of the Staff's efforts
21 were expended.

22 First is aging management, which is covered in
23 Chapter 3. In this chapter the Staff evaluated Duke's
24 identification of the applicable aging effects and proposed
25 aging management programs to ensure the intended functions

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 for the relevant equipment would be maintained through the
2 period of extended operation.

3 The next significant area was the evaluation of
4 the time-limited aging analysis discussed in Chapter 4. In
5 this chapter the Staff evaluated Duke's methods to determine
6 how analyses with time-limited assumptions have been or
7 would be managed for the period of extended operation.

8 Time-limited aging analysis includes pressure
9 temperature limits for the reactor coolant system, various
10 fatigue analyses, and environmental qualification which
11 establishes a qualified life for each electrical component.

12 The Staff determined that the time-limited aging
13 analysis would be adequately managed during the renewal
14 term. Next slide, please.

15 Slide 10 highlights the unique aspects of the
16 Oconee review. The Staff reviewed aging management programs
17 related to unique features of the Oconee plant, such as the
18 Kewee Hydroelectric Station, and the standby shutdown
19 facility.

20 The Kewee Hydroelectric Station is the onsite
21 emergency power source for Oconee. The standby shutdown
22 facility is designed as a standby system for use under
23 certain emergency conditions.

24 It provides additional defense-in-depth protection
25 by serving as a backup to existing safety systems. The

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 standby shutdown facility is designed to achieve and
2 maintain hot shutdown conditions following an Appendix R
3 fire, sabotage, turbine building flood, station blackout or
4 tornado or missile event.

5 The Kewee Hydroelectric Station and standby
6 shutdown facility presented challenges in determining what
7 structures and components are subject to an aging management
8 review for these facilities. However, there were no unique
9 aging effects identified for these facilities.

10 The review of the application required resolution
11 of issues associated with the electrical cabling aging
12 management program and plant-specific resolutions to Babcock
13 and Wilcox owners groups license renewal topical reports on
14 the pressurizer, reactor coolant system piping, reactor
15 vessel, and reactor vessel internals.

16 An inspection found evidence of aging of insulated
17 cables which was not identified as an aging effect in the
18 application.

19 As a result of the inspection and interaction with
20 headquarters Staff, Duke provided an insulated cable and
21 connections aging management program for cables and
22 connections within the scope of license renewal that are
23 installed in adverse localized environments in the reactor
24 buildings, auxiliary buildings, turbine building, standby
25 shutdown facility, the Kewee Hydroelectric Station, and

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 inaccessible cabling which could be subject to aging effects
2 from heat, radiation, or moisture.

3 The program does not include insulated cables and
4 connections that are in the Environmental Qualification
5 Program.

6 The Staff encourages the use of topical reports,
7 however, the generic review and plant-specific resolutions
8 of issues were performed in parallel in some cases.

9 In addition, the reactor vessel internals
10 inspection program involves an approach that allows
11 activities to continue that will develop and qualify the
12 inspection methods and acceptance criteria later.

13 Next slide, please. Slide 11 lists some
14 significant observations and accomplishments from the
15 Staff's safety review. The Staff confirmed that many
16 existing programs provided adequate aging management.

17 Some programs required augmentation, and new
18 programs were created. For example, Duke will augment the
19 Oconee Station thermal fatigue management program to provide
20 a plant-specific resolution for Generic Safety Issue 190, or
21 adopt the NRC's generic resolution.

22 Duke also developed a new aging management program
23 for non-environmentally-qualified insulated cables and
24 connections.

25 Additional inspections were proposed by Duke. In

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 some cases, these inspections were one-time inspections, and
2 in other cases, the additional inspections were periodic.

3 One-time inspections were aimed at verify aging
4 effects are not occurring. Any aging effects identified
5 will require engineering evaluation and could result in
6 further programmatic action.

7 Examples of one-time inspections include Kewee air
8 and gas system inspection, and the reactor coolant pump
9 motor oil collection tank inspection.

10 Periodic additional inspections have been
11 developed for the reactor vessel internals, and the Alloy
12 600 Aging Management Program.

13 The last bullet in this slide pertains to the
14 updated final safety analysis report supplement. The UFSAR
15 supplement contains a summary description of the programs
16 and activities for managing the effects of aging, and the
17 evaluation of time-limited aging analysis for the period of
18 extended operations.

19 The Staff reviewed the UFSAR supplement and found
20 that it meets the requirements of the license renewal rule.
21 The proposed renewed license conditions require that Duke
22 include the UFSAR supplement in the update to the UFSAR
23 scheduled for July of 2001, and control changes to the
24 program described in the supplement under 50.59 until then.

25 The Oconee proposed renewed licenses also contain

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 a license condition stating that future inspection
2 activities will be completed before the period of extended
3 operation, similar to the Calvert Cliffs licensing
4 condition.

5 Slide 12, please. In conclusion, all of the aging
6 management issue and identification of time-limited aging
7 analysis have been resolved as documented in NUREG 1723, and
8 on the basis of its evaluation of the Oconee license renewal
9 application, the Staff concludes that the standards for
10 issuance of a renewed license as specified in 10 CFR 5429,
11 have been met, which are summarized on this slide.

12 Specifically:

13 One, actions have been identified and have been or
14 will be taken with respect to managing the effects of aging
15 during the period of extended operation on the functionality
16 of structures and components that have been identified to
17 require an aging management review under 10 CFR 54.21
18 (a)(1), and;

19 Two, actions have been identified and have been or
20 will be taken with respect to time-limited aging analyses
21 that have been identified to require review under 10 CFR
22 54.21(c).

23 Therefore, the Staff finds that there is
24 reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by a
25 renewed license will continue to be conducted in accordance

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 with the licensing basis for the Oconee Nuclear Station,
2 Units I, II, and III, as revised by the renewal
3 commitments.

4 That ends my portion of the presentation. I'd
5 like to turn it over to Jim Wilson for the Environmental
6 Review.

7 MR. WILSON: I'm Jim Wilson, and I'm the Project
8 Manager responsible for the environmental portion of the
9 Staff's review of the Oconee license renewal application.

10 The NRC Staff has the responsibility to implement
11 the requirements of NEPA for the nuclear power plants under
12 its purview. Under NEPA, and Environmental Impact
13 Statement, or EIS, is required for major federal actions
14 significantly affecting the human environment.

15 Renewal of a nuclear power plant license is
16 considered such a major federal action. In 1996, the Staff
17 promulgated revisions to 10 CFR Part 51 to implement the
18 requirements of NEPA as it applies to license renewal.

19 The rule reflects the findings of the Generic
20 Environmental Impact Statement, or GEIS, and established a
21 framework for addressing environmental issues.

22 These issue were separated into two categories:
23 Those that were generically resolved, Category I issues; and
24 those that required a site-specific evaluation, Category II
25 issues.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 In addition, two issues, environmental justice and
2 chronic effects of electromagnetic fields, were not
3 categorized, but were specifically examined.

4 The rule requires that the NRC issue a
5 site-specific supplement to the GEIS for each application.

6 During the review, the Staff considers whether
7 there is new and significant information on any issue.

8 Slide 14, please. The Staff followed the review
9 process necessary to meet the requirements of NEPA, and the
10 environmental review requirements of 10 CFR Part 51.

11 During the review process, the Staff visited the
12 site and provided members of the public with two public
13 comment opportunities; the first at the beginning of a
14 review period of 60 days, which was the scoping period; and
15 the second public opportunity for comment was after the
16 draft supplement to the Generic Environmental Impact
17 Statement was issued.

18 The Staff had public meetings, both during the
19 scoping period and the comment period on the draft
20 supplement to the GEIS, and to outline NRC's process for
21 license renewal, and to help the public focus on the issues.

22 The Staff issued its final plant-specific
23 supplement to the GEIS for Oconee in December of 1999. No
24 significant new information was identified during the Oconee
25 review that would change the Category I findings, the 69

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 generically-resolved issues identified in the GEIS.

2 Consequently, the Staff adopted the conclusions in
3 the GEIS into the plant-specific supplement for Oconee for
4 those issues that were applicable to that action.

5 Of the remaining 23 issues in the GEIS, 21 were
6 classified as being in Category II, requiring plant-specific
7 analysis. Five of these were not applicable because they
8 are related to plant design features or characteristics not
9 found at Oconee.

10 Four were not discussed because they relate to
11 refurbishment, of which there will be none at Oconee.

12 The two un-categorized issues, the Staff found
13 that no minority or low income groups would experience
14 disproportionately high and adverse impacts. This is an
15 environmental justice consideration.

16 Second, since a consensus has not yet been reached
17 by appropriate federal health agencies on the chronic
18 effects of electromagnetic fields, the Staff relies on the
19 initial findings in the GEIS that there is no evidence
20 linking harmful effects with field exposures.

21 Next slide, please. This next slide highlights
22 two of the unique issues in the Oconee environmental review:
23 For the first the Staff determined that the transmission
24 line maintenance impact on endangered species should be
25 considered for the 330 total miles that were constructed for

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 the purpose of connecting the plant to the grid.

2 After consultation under Section 7 of the
3 Endangered Species Act, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4 concurred with the Staff's conclusion that routine
5 maintenance activities would not adversely affect threatened
6 or endangered species living within the transmission line
7 rights of way.

8 The second issue came about as a result of a
9 comment on the Oconee-specific draft supplement to the GEIS,
10 and the Staff, as a result of that comment, evaluated yet
11 another alternative action. The Staff considered a
12 combination of alternative energy sources, including
13 conservation, and determined that the environmental impacts
14 of a combination of alternatives is unlikely to be smaller
15 than the small impacts associated with license renewal.

16 Finally, the Staff did consider severe accident
17 mitigation alternatives in this application. After the
18 Staff's independent review, no cost-beneficial SAMAs were
19 identified that had not already been identified by Duke.

20 Slide 16. Therefore, it's the Staff's conclusion,
21 based on its review, that the environmental impacts of
22 renewing Oconee's nuclear station licenses are acceptable
23 for the purpose of license renewal.

24 MR. McCREE: Slide 17, please. Good morning, Mr.
25 Chairman, Commissioners.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 Region II performed three license renewal
2 inspections at Oconee. Carl Julian, a Senior Reactor
3 Inspector in the Division of Reactor Safety led all three
4 teams, and he is also here today, sitting behind me.

5 I will note at this time that Carl participated in
6 the two license renewal inspections at Calvert Cliffs which
7 allowed us to use some of the lessons learned there.

8 In addition, Staff from Region I and Headquarters
9 participated in the Oconee inspections, which contributed to
10 consistency and promoting of lessons of learned.

11 The bullets on the first slide summarize the
12 objectives of the first two inspections that were based on
13 the inspection procedure for license renewal.

14 The first inspection was a one-week inspection
15 that took place in April, 1999. The inspection focused on
16 Duke's scoping and screening process that was used to
17 identify the plant equipment that would be subject to an
18 aging management review.

19 Our inspection also included an evaluation of
20 several systems, structures, and components that were
21 excluded from the scope of license renewal.

22 The second inspection, a two-week inspection in
23 June and July, 1999, involved an inspection of Duke's aging
24 management programs to verify that the programs had been
25 implemented in accordance with the application and the

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 safety evaluation report.

2 This involved a sample inspection of maintenance
3 records, system walkdowns, and visual inspections to
4 identify credible aging mechanisms, and to ensure that
5 ongoing aging was identified in Duke's aging management
6 program.

7 The third and final inspection that occurred in
8 early March of this year, was used primarily to follow up on
9 open items from the first two inspections.

10 Next slide, please. The team selected the scoping
11 and screening inspection sample set based on the risk
12 significance of the equipment, and after a detailed Regional
13 inspection plan was developed.

14 For example, the 4160 volt auxiliary power system,
15 the emergency feedwater system, high pressure injection
16 system, and the Kewee Hydroelectric Station subsystems were
17 among those systems and structures chosen to evaluate the
18 scoping process.

19 In addition, the team selected a group of plant
20 systems and structures that Duke did not include within the
21 scope of license renewal. For example, the spent fuel pool
22 cooling system, the decay heat removal system, and the
23 electric supply were selected, using insights from the
24 Oconee probabilistic risk assessment.

25 The team found that scoping and screening was

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 conducted as described in the application, and that
2 documentation supporting Duke's application was in an
3 auditable and retrievable form.

4 However, it was also the team's view that the
5 function of spent fuel cooling and the postulated plant
6 events of loss of decay heat removal and pipe rupture should
7 have been addressed in mechanical scoping.

8 This issue was related to the broader concern
9 regarding the scoping methodology that was resolved by
10 Duke's additional evaluation, as Joe Sebrosky discussed
11 earlier.

12 The second inspection revealed that in most cases,
13 Duke had properly implemented the aging management programs
14 as approved by the Staff in its Safety Evaluation Report.

15 The team determined that the existing aging
16 management programs credited by Duke in its application were
17 adequate for the applications examined. For those aging
18 management programs that Duke planned to develop before the
19 license term is completed in 2013, the team noted that there
20 was no aging management program or tracking mechanism in
21 place to ensure that the programs were developed and
22 implemented.

23 Since then, however, Duke has developed an
24 internal document to track license renewal program
25 commitments, and plans to include these in the update of the

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 updated final Safety Analysis Report.

2 As part of the second inspection, the team
3 reviewed documentation that Duke had developed that
4 indicated that the aging effects for certain electrical
5 components did not require an aging management program.

6 However, based on the team's review of correction
7 action documents, maintenance records and system walkdowns
8 of the auxiliary building, turbine building, and Unit I
9 reactor building, the team concluded that the potential
10 aging effects of heat, moisture, and radiation were
11 applicable at Oconee.

12 In response, Duke developed an insulated cable
13 aging management program for electrical cables and
14 connectors that includes required inspections, parameters to
15 be monitored, and the requirement for corrective actions.

16 As I mentioned, the third inspections focused on
17 open items identified during the screening and aging
18 management inspections.

19 The inspection was also used to examine any plant
20 equipment or programs added to the scope of license renewal
21 since the original application.

22 The team included as a result of this final
23 inspection that all open issues had been resolved.

24 Next slide, please. Overall, the Region
25 concluded, in a memo dated March 16th of this year, from
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 Luis Reyes, that the scoping and screening process was
2 implemented in conformance with Duke's license renewal
3 application, that applicable aging mechanisms were
4 identified, that required documentation was auditable, and
5 that Duke's aging management programs provide reasonable
6 assurances for renewing the licenses for the Oconee units.

7 Next slide, please. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman
8 and Commissioners, the conclusions of the safety review and
9 evaluation of the environmental impacts and inspection
10 verifications support renewal for the licenses for Oconee
11 Nuclear Stations, Units I, II, and III.

12 The Staff requests that the Commission authorize
13 the Director of NRR to renew the licenses DPR-38, DPR-47,
14 and DPR-55, with the expiration dates of February 6, 2033;
15 October 6, 2033; and July 19th, 2034, respectively.

16 This completes the Staff's presentation, and we'll
17 take questions. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you for a very helpful
19 presentation. Let me turn to my colleagues to see if they
20 have some questions.

21 First, Commissioner Merrifield.

22 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 First, I'd like to turn back to the Slide Number 15.

24 You've got two issues here that you're referring
25 to as unique aspects, the first one being the transmission
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 line impacts; and the second being the combined generation
2 alternatives.

3 Now, when you use the word, unique, it would lead
4 one to the conclusion that this is something that is not
5 very often and we aren't likely to see very much in the
6 future.

7 Obviously there are a lot of other plants out
8 there with very extensive transmission lines, and there may
9 be other individuals who comment on future license renewals
10 who may want to have us look at a combination of generation
11 alternatives.

12 So what about these is unique to Oconee, and how
13 are we going to deal with these issues as it relates to
14 future license renewal applications?

15 MR. GRIMES: Commissioner, I'll take the first
16 stab at that. And to clarify that, when we explained
17 uniquenesses, they were unique from the standpoint of the
18 experience that we had on Calvert Cliffs, and they aren't
19 provided for in our general review guidance.

20 And I'll ask Jim Wilson to explain the extent to
21 which we think the transmission quarters may be unique
22 amongst all plants. But I think that we will learn a lesson
23 from the comment regarding the alternative sources that we
24 can reflect on. But it wasn't one that we had anticipated,
25 so in that sense, it was unique.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 Jim, would you like to comment on the transmission
2 quarters?

3 MR. WILSON: Up until sometime last Spring, the
4 industry had been taking the position that because
5 transmission lines will remain energized even if the
6 licenses are not renewed, that the impacts of transmission
7 line maintenance activity should not be considered during
8 the scope of the environmental review for license renewal.

9 After consulting with OGC, the Staff has taken the
10 position that because the rule specifies the scope to be
11 considered for transmission line impacts for electromagnetic
12 fields acute effects, that is, those transmission lines that
13 were constructed for the purpose of connecting the plant to
14 the grid when the plant was initially licensed as specified
15 in the rule, the same scope should be applied to other
16 impacts involving transmission lines, in this case, the
17 potential effects on endangered species due to maintenance
18 activities.

19 At Calvert Cliffs, the connection took place at
20 the switch yard, because the grid was essentially in place
21 when the plant was built. For Oconee, however, the plant
22 was built at the same time as approximately 330 miles of
23 transmission lines that comprise the grid, once Oconee was
24 installed, in place, and operating.

25 And that was part of the initial licensing basis.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 The Staff's position now is that the impacts considered for
2 transmission lines should consider all those lines that were
3 originally constructed for the purpose of connecting the
4 plant to the grid, and we'll be using that position for
5 future reviews.

6 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: So it's different. It's
7 not really unique; it's different.

8 MR. WILSON: It's in contrast to the way we did it
9 at Calvert Cliffs, and the way the industry --

10 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: But this is more typical
11 of what we're going to see in the future, is what you're
12 saying?

13 MR. WILSON: I think we're going to be using that
14 position in the future.

15 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Okay, what about
16 combined generation alternatives; is that going to be
17 typical?

18 MR. WILSON: That was unique because that was the
19 first time we had seen it. We had -- in the past, the Staff
20 has only considered alternatives that were direct
21 replacements for large baseload units such as the nuclear
22 plants. And as a result of a comment at a public meeting,
23 they said why don't you consider a combination of
24 alternatives, and the Staff thought that was a reasonable
25 comment, and, indeed, we considered a mix of alternatives.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 And we will likely use that as an alternative in
2 future renewal applications. It's one of our lessons
3 learned.

4 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: You may want to avoid
5 the use of the word, unique, if it's something we intend to
6 use, typically, in the future.

7 MR. MIRAGLIA: I don't think we'll be using it in
8 the broad sense, Commissioner. I think we were trying to
9 present in terms of the uniqueness of this review in
10 contrast to the Calvert Cliffs, in that more limited sense
11 that we were using the term, unique, not to say that we
12 wouldn't see similar things in future reviews.

13 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: On the paper, I'd like
14 to turn to page 8. We have -- hold on a second. Under (g),
15 the licensee's USFAR Supplement submitted pursuant to 10 CFR
16 54.21(d) was revised on March 27th, 2000, and describes
17 certain future inspection activities to be completed before
18 the end of the extended operation. The licensee shall
19 complete these activities no later than February 6, 2013.

20 We have obviously different dates for which these
21 licenses are being extended to, and so I'm wondering why we
22 fixed upon this particular date.

23 MR. GRIMES: There are two reasons for that: The
24 first is as a matter of convenience. Duke felt that having
25 one milestone to meet would be more convenient in managing

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 their three units.

2 The other aspect is that there are shared features
3 amongst the units that would make it very difficult to
4 manage the completion of three successive dates. And so
5 after discussing it with Duke, we framed the licenses with a
6 single milestone to meet.

7 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: All right, Sam, I've got
8 a series of questions. There are actually nine of them and
9 they all require a yes or no answer. If you don't feel
10 comfortable giving a yes or no answer, you can say you
11 don't. But this is not difficult.

12 MR. COLLINS: And they're all for me?

13 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: They're all for you.

14 Number One: Do you think the licensee, Duke Power,
15 would describe our relicensing process as a piece of cake?
16 Yes or no?

17 MR. COLLINS: No.

18 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Okay, Number Two: Was
19 the Staff vigorous and thorough in its questioning of the
20 licensee?

21 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Yes. Was the Staff able
23 to ask questions of the licensee to resolve outstanding
24 safety concerns?

25 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Did the Staff utilize a
2 questioning attitude in this relicensing process?

3 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Was the outcome of this
5 relicensing effort predetermined?

6 MR. COLLINS: No.

7 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Are you comfortable with
8 the Staff recommendation to provide for a 20-year license
9 extension?

10 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Would you have been
12 willing to provide a negative recommendation to the
13 Commission if you were convinced that this plant could not
14 be operated safely for an additional 20 years?

15 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Should any licensee take
17 from this review that the NRC is going to rubber-stamp
18 future applications for license extension?

19 MR. COLLINS: No.

20 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Has the Commission taken
21 any action or given you any instruction that would prevent
22 you from recommending in the future, that a license renewal
23 application not be approved?

24 MR. COLLINS: No.

25 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1
2 MR. MIRAGLIA: I would like the record to show
3 that I would concur with all those answers.

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner McGaffigan?

5 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: There is one comment
6 I'll make in terms of the slides. I think that you probably
7 should have an ACRS slide in the future. It's a very
8 important document, the letter from the ACRS, statutorily
9 required, and I think you had one for Calvert Cliffs that
10 just sort of summarized the ACRS letter.

11 But the ACRS is an important part of the process,
12 and is an additional check. If there were an ACRS member in
13 front of us at the moment, he probably could have answered
14 appropriately to most of those questions that are applicable
15 to ACRS.

16 But turning to the ACRS letter -- and this gets
17 more into the future -- they suggest in their letter that
18 there are several issues that came up in the Ocone license
19 renewal that are really generic.

20 They mentioned the completeness of the methodology
21 used to identify SSCs that are within the scope of Part 54;
22 consideration of the effects of the reactor coolant
23 environment on fatigue life.

24 Are those issues that they identified in their
25 March 13th letter being treated in the GAL report?

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 MR. GRIMES: Yes, either the GAL report or the
2 Standard Review Plan. The issue about expanding guidance in
3 order to ensure the completeness of the methodology to
4 capture all the systems, structures, and components that are
5 relied upon by the licensing basis, is an experience that
6 will reflect in the Standard Review Plan. It does not
7 really relate to the credit for existing programs that we're
8 trying to accomplish under GAL.

9 But we are continuing a dialogue with the
10 assistance of the Office of Research to pursue this issue
11 about what is the appropriate way to manage environmental
12 effects on fatigue.

13 And that is still an area that requires some
14 further work, generically. And the ACRS has been assisting
15 us in those efforts as well, and providing feedback that
16 will contribute to generic process improvements.

17 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: They imply in here that
18 some of these issues are taking significant resources
19 between the Staff and the licensee to resolve during the
20 process.

21 I'm trying to find the -- you know, it's the issue
22 of the completeness of the methodology for bounding the
23 SSCs.

24 MR. GRIMES: That gets to the benefits of being
25 able to have a generic resolution to improve the efficiency
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 of future renewal efforts, and we fully support this
2 experience and feedback. To the extent that it can be
3 resolved generically, we'll further streamline and improve
4 the efficiency of renewal reviews.

5 And the ACRS is -- we're arranging to continue to
6 work with the ACRS, generically, to reflect on appropriate
7 guidance that we could include in the Standard Review Plan,
8 GAL, or recommend that NEI include it in their Guide 95-10.

9 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: There is a bit of a
10 pause here at the moment because ACRS -- not for you guys.
11 You've got two applications in front of you.

12 But for ACRS, there will be little for them to do
13 in this area, specifically, for about a year or two,
14 whenever you've got the schedule for the Arkansas Nuclear I,
15 and Hatch items come before them.

16 Are they involved in these generic issues? Is
17 that an important element of their work effort for the next
18 year?

19 MR. GRIMES: Yes. As a matter of fact, we've
20 identified milestones for the ACRS, leading up to the
21 presentation of GAL and an SRP for Commission approval in
22 accordance with the plan that we've established to develop
23 GAL, send it out for public comment.

24 We're making arrangements to meet with the ACRS
25 Subcommittee this summer in order to keep them engaged and

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 to maintain a dialogue with them to ensure that their views
2 are reflected in GAL and the Standard Review Plan.

3 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Just a quick item on the
4 UFSAR. The UFSAR supplement being incorporated by July
5 2001, and then the interim that they have to sort of treat
6 it as if it's already in UFSAR; is that a matter of
7 convenience?

8 You have a license condition that basically says
9 they have to submit the supplement by July, 2001. That's
10 what Viewgraph 11 said, and that's what the documents say.

11 But in the interim, it's almost as if the material
12 they have already submitted is already in the FSAR. So, why
13 didn't we just -- they're going to get a new license
14 whenever the approval is granted.

15 Why isn't that FSAR -- why wasn't this all put
16 together at one point? Is it just a matter of convenience?

17 MR. COLLINS: It's mostly a matter of proces.
18 Although they proposed a UFSAR supplement with the
19 application, and the have proposed changes to it to comport
20 with our safety evaluation basis, there is still a lot more
21 work that needs to be done before the programs that are
22 described in the FSAR supplement can be fully implemented.

23 And so there is administrative work on their end
24 in order to take the supplement and roll it into the FSAR,
25 and to make sure that they satisfy all of the provisions in

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 the FSAR.

2 So it's a little bit more than a matter of
3 convenience. We realize that there would need to be a time
4 provide where they could bring all the documentation
5 together.

6 And that's why we believe that Part 54 provided
7 that the application would depend on a supplement that could
8 then be integrated within a reasonable period of time.

9 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay, the final question
10 is Mr. Collins. You were quoted in Nuclear News Flashes
11 last week, last Thursday as expressing some disappointment
12 or transmitting some disappointment -- maybe I should keep
13 on Mr. Grimes here -- from your staff as to the depth and
14 scope of the license renewal submittals from Arkansas
15 Nuclear I and Hatch.

16 Could you tell us what's involved there? Do they
17 not -- you know, Hatch is a very new unit, the first BWR;
18 Arkansas Nuclear I, presumably, could have learned a lot
19 from Oconee since they're similar plants.

20 What did you have in mind in that statement, and
21 does it affect your schedule for those plants?

22 MR. COLLINS: There are two questions there. One,
23 it doesn't appear to affect the schedule at this time.

24 The first question: There was a general
25 admonition that came up as a result of the NEI meeting of

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 last week. Hatch and ANO are currently in the process, as
2 you well know. We're performing the review for Hatch first
3 BWR. We have a lot of contract support for ANO.

4 We're further ahead on ANO than we are Hatch right
5 now as far as review and RAIs are concerned. The submittals
6 for ANO, when you look at the amount of information, is less
7 than what we have seen in the past.

8 There are various reasons for that. Some of it is
9 to remove duplicative information; some of it is to take
10 advantage of efficiencies and lessons learned in the
11 process.

12 The statement -- I think Chris's statement in that
13 April 26th Nuclear Flash Notes is probably more accurate
14 than mine was depicted to be. It is a general caution that
15 the scope and depth of the followon applications should be
16 sensitive to the amount of information that the Staff needs
17 to perform an appropriate review with minimum requests for
18 additional information in that any attempt -- and it might
19 be a good will attempt -- to take advantage of past reviews
20 ahead of the finalization of the Standard Review Plan and
21 the generic aging lessons learned, has some risk with it if
22 it's not well coordinated with the Staff.

23 It's premature at this time to say that that is
24 the case for either Hatch or ANO.

25 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: One final question: When

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 does these three documents -- there are three critical
2 documents here. There's an NEI document; there's the SRP
3 and there's the GAL report. When does stability arrive for
4 those three documents? What is the schedule for when we
5 have -- two of which are in your control, and one of which
6 is not, the NEI.

7 MR. GRIMES: Well, to a certain extent, the NEI
8 document is within our control to the extent that if we're
9 not satisfied that NEI has been responsive to our needs,
10 we'll take exception to that in a Regulatory Guide.

11 But you're correct in pointing out that trying to
12 maintain coordination between the three documents is
13 presenting a challenge to us. But we're working to have
14 those documents ready for public comment in August, and then
15 to brief you in November on the results of the public
16 comment process, and then present documents for the
17 Commission's approval in March of next year.

18 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: That is a good schedule.
19 I hope we can keep it, given all the other things you are
20 working on. It would be awful nice if by mid-2001 there was
21 a great deal of stability, because I think there are a lot
22 of applications coming in soon thereafter. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Diaz.

24 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Turning to the issues of -- technical issues --

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 was there any very serious of more difficult than expected
2 technical issues encountered during the scope of the review?
3 MR. GRIMES: I would say that they were
4 comparable. As a matter of fact there were elements of the
5 same technical issues at Oconee.

6 For example, the issues that we are pursuing
7 generically on reactor vessel internals, the underlying
8 aging effects that are associated with that; the issue on
9 cable insulation aging effects and how those will be
10 managed. They were treated with some differences but they
11 were slight differences. I would say that all of the issues
12 were comparable.

13 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: No new issues?

14 MR. GRIMES: We found no new technical issues.

15 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: No new technical issues -- and
16 to satisfy Commissioner Merrifield, the atypical aspects
17 identified under Item 10, do those present a different
18 challenge to the Staff or was it treated within the same
19 scope and you were able to handle them in the same manner
20 that you now have developed?

21 MR. GRIMES: Well, at the risk of abusing "same"
22 in the same way we abused "unique" I would say that they
23 were sufficiently similar.

24 [Laughter.]

25 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Aha. That sounds excellent to

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 me. Sounds excellent. Very good.

2 I do have one further question. We area always
3 looking for efficiencies. Have there been an efficiency
4 achieved between these two licenses right now regarding the
5 FTEs that are being used for Calvert Cliffs and Oconee?

6 MR. GRIMES: We attempted to determine that, and I
7 would say that there is a very small efficiency observed in
8 the level of effort but unfortunately it is difficult to
9 pull out because there was a lot of effort on Oconee in
10 reviewing the topic reports.

11 We will see a benefit for that in the subsequent
12 B&W applications because we made that investment but the
13 level of effort for Calvert Cliffs and Oconee was fairly
14 comparable. It was in the same range as the estimate that
15 we provided in our planning assumptions and we are going to
16 continue to monitor that. As a matter of fact, the issue
17 that we raised with respect to the content of the Arkansas
18 and Hatch applications was a reflection of a disappointment
19 that we were not seeing as large an improvement in
20 efficiency as we had hoped from the new standard form and
21 content.

22 To be more specific to your question, the numbers
23 are comparable and there's a very small improvement on
24 Oconee.

25 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: You are still expecting when

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 the GALL is finished and we get a couple more of these under
2 our belt that both the licensees and us will be able to
3 achieve efficiencies in the process?

4 MR. GRIMES: Yes.

5 MR. COLLINS: Our operating plan assumes 2002 and
6 out that there are efficiencies in order to maintain
7 schedule. Our resources are predicated on achieving those
8 efficiencies.

9 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Dicus.

11 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 I have really just one rather general, probably
13 generic, question. It really has to do with the going
14 forward for these future applications. Obviously we have
15 two in now and we know we are going to have move, and you
16 have discussed the lessons learned.

17 You mentioned it in general terms that specific
18 lessons learned have been brought forward and I guess my
19 question goes to we are going to have these lessons learned
20 and I know you are aware of them. You are incorporating
21 them into what we do in the future, but how?

22 I guess little more specifics on exactly how we
23 are dealing with these and what other lessons, if we have
24 more lessons learned, how are we going to use these as we
25 get more and diverse applications in, because I don't want

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 to -- you know, the two applications we have in now you have
2 indicated perhaps did not go into the depth that you thought
3 perhaps they would simply because maybe they assumed
4 efficiencies and effectiveness that was already available to
5 us, and so I can see maybe down the road, so how are we
6 going to deal with this?

7 MR. GRIMES: First, I would like to point out that
8 although we were somewhat disappointed we saw a substantial
9 improvement in Arkansas and Hatch as far as we have gone so
10 far, but we have a procedure that essentially collects
11 experience of different types and then focuses it.

12 We had a collection or an inventory of generic
13 renewal issues and we sorted that out and abandoned that
14 inventory in favor of directing specific experience to GALL
15 where it applies to credit for existing programs and
16 adequacy of aging management.

17 Other lessons related to the review process we
18 have directed to the SRP, and that experience that gets to
19 the content of the application, standardization and
20 consistency in order to minimize the extent to which future
21 applications divert from a plan would go into NEI-9510 or
22 would be exceptions in a Regulatory Guide.

23 Finally, the most important key I think is we have
24 been feeding experience back into our planning and budgeting
25 process that identifies where we need to focus on

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034

1 efficiencies in the level of effort resources, the planning
2 assumptions, the 585-day schedule. All of those things that
3 are reflected from the strategic plan all the way down to
4 the operating plan as the Commission, you know, reflects in
5 its request to Congress, all of that is fed back into the
6 planning and budgeting process.

7 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I would
8 just -- it occurs to me on the 585-day schedule, just for
9 the public, is the schedule for the Staff to complete its
10 work from the date of receipt on the SER and the EIS. We
11 are not announcing a new goal for the overall process, which
12 has an ACRS component, a Commission component and perhaps an
13 adjudicatory component, but just to make sure that that is
14 understood.

15 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you for that
16 clarification.

17 I just have two questions of a very specific
18 nature.

19 You indicate on Slide 10 that one of the unique
20 aspects of this plan, and I think this is truly unique, is
21 the Keowee Hydro-Electric Station. My understanding is that
22 they don't have emergency diesels at this facility and they
23 rely on this dedicated station.

24 Could you say a little bit more about the sorts of
25 issues that you had to confront in dealing with that element

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 of the --

2 MR. GRIMES: Joe, would you like to describe some
3 of what went on with Keowee?

4 MR. SEBROSKY: It presented a challenge more from
5 the scoping and screening perspective, that when you look at
6 that there's very few people in the agency that have
7 expertise on how a dam operates, a hydro-electric station
8 operates to produce power.

9 With Keowee when we asked questions, Duke had
10 referred us to previous documentation, previous docketed
11 material, on how that worked.

12 As an example they did a probabilistic risk
13 assessment on Keowee that gave us --

14 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: On dam failure or what?

15 MR. SEBROSKY: No, actually on failure of the
16 hydro-electric station. Dams are not unique. There's dams,
17 impoundment dams for ultimate heat sinks, but to use them to
18 generate electricity as your emergency power supply, that is
19 unique. I don't know of another plant that does that.

20 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Oh, no, there are several
21 plants in the world that do that.

22 MR. SEBROSKY: I guess I was limiting it to the
23 United States, to the 103 operating plants and I don't know
24 of any other that uses a dam as an emergency power supply.

25 But anyway, we went to that information, the

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 previously docketed material, and we asked some questions of
2 Duke about the scoping and screening to make sure that we
3 got all of the systems, structures and components. Once
4 that was identified, really the aging effects for different
5 components in there aren't unique.

6 You deal with concrete and water, for example, in
7 the intake structure, so the aging effects -- and that is
8 what I tried to say during that slide presentation -- the
9 aging effects really didn't present a challenge. It was
10 more from the scoping and screening perspective.

11 MR. MIRAGLIA: There was a substantive review of
12 the operation at Keowee in performing the emergency function
13 and there was a probabilistic risk assessment that Joe
14 talked about previously, and not part of the license renewal
15 but part of the licensing review of Oconee, and that was the
16 basis for the acceptability of the understanding of the
17 operation of the Keowee Hydro-Electric Station.

18 As Joe said, the renewal was looking at the aging
19 management associated with those components and structures.

20 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: My other question relates to
21 the same slide. In discussing the insulated cables in
22 connection to the aging management program you emphasized
23 that you excluded from that analysis the cables that were
24 covered by the Environmental Qualification Program.

25 I assume that is because you had determined that

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 that program by itself was sufficient to deal with any aging
2 phenomena?

3 MR. GRIMES: Yes, that's correct. Joe, do you
4 want to add anything to that?

5 MR. SEBROSKY: The only thing that I would have to
6 add is the Environmental Qualification Program for the
7 cables is covered under a time-limited aging analysis which
8 was reviewed separately and accepted by the Staff, so it is,
9 as you said, we didn't have a problem with how they were
10 addressing environmentally qualified cabling. It was
11 limited to non-environmentally qualified cable.

12 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: And the moisture problem here
13 is buried cables, or what was the --

14 MR. SEBROSKY: Moisture isn't limited to buried
15 cables but there was experience at Davis-Besse and it was
16 something that was brought up late in the Calvert review and
17 we wanted to make sure that that was captured, and Duke
18 provided a program for that.

19 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. That's all of my
20 questions.

21 Let me just say on behalf of the Commission that I
22 want to thank you for both an excellent briefing and for
23 your capacity to abide by the schedule for the performance
24 of your work in this case.

25 When we had our briefing in Calvert Cliffs' case I

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 said that I thought that there was going to be a challenge
2 for the Staff in continuing to be able to meet the high
3 standards that it set for itself in that case, and it
4 appears to me that you have done that in this instance, and
5 I want to, on behalf of the Commission, I want to express my
6 appreciation to you.

7 Let me turn to my colleagues and see if they have
8 any comments to make in conclusion?

9 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: I have a brief comment
10 to make, Mr. Chairman.

11 First, I would like to join in your compliments to
12 the Staff. They did a terrific job on this and it is
13 certainly going to make our decision, I think my decision
14 very easy.

15 I want to thank Sam for answering my series of
16 questions. There was a point that I wanted to make with
17 that and the point was that I think licensees in the future
18 will be at their peril if they believe that this Commission
19 and this Staff are going to rubber stamp future license
20 applications.

21 This is not a pro forma process and one which I
22 think licensees will have to treat very seriously and should
23 do the application, should prepare the applications that are
24 adequate to do that.

25 For my own part, I believe that if this Staff in

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 842-0034

1 the future makes a well-reasoned argument that an individual
2 licensee should not be relicensed for a 20-year extension, I
3 am comfortable with that process and I would be willing to
4 vote to accept that kind of a Staff recommendation. I
5 certainly want licensees to know that for my part. Thank
6 you.

7 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. With that, we stand
8 adjourned. Thank you.

9 [Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., the briefing was
10 concluded.]

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034