

August 11, 2000

ORGANIZATION: Nuclear Energy Institute

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING WITH THE NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE (NEI) ON INDUSTRY'S COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 2, "STRUCTURES AND COMPONENTS SUBJECT TO AGING MANAGEMENT REVIEW" OF THE DRAFT STANDARD REVIEW PLAN FOR THE REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL (SRP-LR) APPLICATIONS FOR NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

On July 18, 2000, representatives from NEI met with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff in Rockville, Maryland. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss industry's comments on Chapter 2, "Structures and Components Subject to Aging Management Review" of the April 21, 2000, Draft Standard Review Plan for the Review of License Renewal Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (SRP-LR). NEI provided their comments as a handout at a June 26, 2000, public meeting. A list of meeting attendees is attached.

During the meeting the staff asked the industry to clarify certain of NEI's comments. NRC Staff and NEI representatives discussed comments on each section of Chapter 2. The staff will take following actions as a result of the discussion;

- Scoping and Screening Methodology (Section 2.1):
 - The staff will reconsider industry's comment about reviews of facility's Probabilistic Risk Analysis (PRA) and results of facility's Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE)
 - The staff will clarify that paragraph 2.1.3.1 on page 2.1.4 does not imply that a compilation, review and submission of documents that may comprise CLB is required.
 - The staff will reconsider whether the subject "Piece Parts" in the Table 2.1.3 is necessary based on the experience from the initial application reviews.
- Plant Level Scoping Results (Section 2.2), System Scoping and Screening Results: Mechanical (Section 2.3), Scoping and Screening Results: Structures (Section 2.4), Scoping and Screening Results: Electrical and Instrumentation and Control Systems (Section 2.5)
 - NEI's comments generally reflect a need for clarifying the staff's review approach. The staff review approach is to sample the applicant's scoping results. To come to a "reasonable assurance" finding, the staff should find no omission of components and structures identified by the applicant as subject to an aging

management review (AMR). This is consistent with the staff review of the initial license renewal applications.

- . NEI suggested that the staff should use applicant's scoping methodology to review scoping and screening results. However, the staff performs an independent review of the applicant's scoping and screening results. The purpose of the independent review is to verify the adequacy of the applicant's scoping methodology.
- . The SRP provides guidance to the staff to perform review. NEI comments would delete most of the guidance under staff review procedures. This is not consistent with the purpose of the SRP.
- . The staff will consider whether to delete the last example in Table 2.5-1 because it does not describe a "space" approach and is not consistent with the rest of the information in the table.

The Staff stated that it would consider NEI's comments in preparing the draft SRP-LR for issuance for public comment in August.

/RA/

Sikhindra Mitra, Project Manager
License Renewal and Standardization Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 690

Attachment: As stated

cc: See next page

- . NEI suggested that the staff should use applicant's scoping methodology to review scoping and screening results. However, the staff performs an independent review of the applicant's scoping and screening results. The purpose of the independent review is to verify the adequacy of the applicant's scoping methodology.
- . The SRP provides guidance to the staff to perform review. NEI comments would delete most of the guidance under staff review procedures. This is not consistent with the purpose of the SRP.
- . The staff will consider whether to delete the last example in Table 2.5-1 because it does not describe a "space" approach and is not consistent with the rest of the information in the table.

The Staff stated that it would consider NEI's comments in preparing the draft SRP-LR for issuance for public comment in August.

/RA/

Sikhindra Mitra, Project Manager
 License Renewal and Standardization Branch
 Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 690

Attachment: As stated

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\July18meeting sum.wpd

*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	LA	RLSB	RLSB:SC	RLSB:BC
NAME	EHylton	SKMitra	PTKuo	CGrimes
DATE	08/ 9 /00	08/ 9/00	08/11/00	08/11/00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE

Project No. 690

cc:

Mr. Dennis Harrison
U.S. Department of Energy
NE-42
Washington, D.C. 20585

Mr. Robert Gill
Duke Energy Corporation
Mail Stop EC-12R
P.O. Box 1006
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

Mr. Richard P. Sedano, Commissioner
State Liaison Officer
Department of Public Service
112 State Street
Drawer 20
Montpelier, Vermont 05620-2601

Mr. Charles R. Pierce
Southern Nuclear Operating Co.
40 Inverness Center Parkway
BIN B064
Birmingham, AL 35242

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

Mr. David Lochbaum
Union of Concerned Scientists
1616 P. St., NW
Suite 310
Washington, DC 20036-1495

National Whistleblower Center
3238 P Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007-2756

Mr. Garry Young
Entergy Operations, Inc.
Arkansas Nuclear One
1448 SR 333 GSB-2E
Russellville, Arkansas 72802

NRC MEETING WITH THE NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE
ON CHAPTER 2 OF THE DRAFT SRP-LR
ATTENDANCE LIST
JULY 18, 2000

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
DOUG WALTERS	NEI
JOHN RYCYNA	CNS
DAVID HOSTETLER	VA POWER
KEN KARCHER	EPRI
ROUNETTE NADER	DUKE
ROGER NEWTON	WEPCO
PAUL COLAIANNI	DUKE
JUAN PERALTA	NRC/NRR/DIPM/IQMB
CHRIS GRATTON	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPLB
NOEL DUDLEY	ACRS
CORNELIUS HOLDEN	NRC/NRR/DIPM/IIPB
PT KUO	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
SAM LEE	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
S. K. MITRA	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
PAUL SHEMANSKI	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB

Enclosure