



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

February 15, 2001

LICENSEES: VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

FACILITIES: NORTH ANNA POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
SURRY POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING TO DISCUSS SUBMITTAL OF FUTURE LICENSE
RENEWAL APPLICATIONS

On January 24, 2001, representatives of Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCO) met with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff to discuss its planned submittal of concurrent license renewal applications for Surry and North Anna Nuclear Stations. VEPCO presented examples of the current format and level of detail for the applications which continues the dialogue begun with the staff in meetings on January 12 and July 18, 2000. The goal is to identify a format that will achieve efficiencies both for the applicant's preparation and the NRC staff's review of the renewal applications. Attendees at the meeting are listed in Attachment 1. VEPCO discussion materials are contained in Attachments 2 and 3.

VEPCO informed the staff that it has been able to improve the schedule for submitting the Surry and North Anna renewal applications and it now plans to submit the applications in June 2001, rather than August 2001. This is the same month that Duke Energy plans to submit concurrent renewal applications for its McGuire and Catawba stations. With the simultaneous receipt of the VEPCO and Duke applications, the staff is considering adjusting intermediate milestones for the VEPCO and Duke application reviews from the standard schedule model used for past application reviews. This would allow the staff to more efficiently use its resources while still maintaining the overall schedule for completing the review.


From the environmental review perspective, North Anna and Surry are two separate projects. VEPCO expressed a preference for one NRC project manager and a single review team for both sites with the reviews held consecutively. VEPCO is using one project team for the environmental reviews at both sites. Considering the environmental reviews previously scheduled for McGuire and Catawba (June 2001) and for Peach Bottom (July 2001), the staff plans to use two separate environmental review teams for the VEPCO plants. The reviews will be performed in parallel; the staff will take advantage of efficiencies that can be gained because of common designs (for example, the mitigation alternatives consideration for severe accidents) and because of similar interactions with public officials. Key milestones will be staggered to minimize resource competition; these include the public meetings, site audits, and issuance of the draft supplemental environmental impact statements. This should avoid the need for the VEPCO team to support simultaneous activities for both sites.

The applications will follow the format in the draft standard review plan for license renewal (SRP-LR) with the three exceptions noted on Slide 5 of Attachment 2. The staff stated that no changes in the standard format were expected in the final SRP-LR. VEPCO plans to group the systems within the Auxiliary Systems section of the application in accordance with Attachment 3. This sub-grouping of systems is below the level of detail in the SRP-LR and the staff had no objections.

Because the SRP-LR and the Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) report are still draft and undergoing revision, renewal applications to be submitted in 2001 are not expected to reference the GALL report. Thus, the future efficiencies expected to be gained by the use of the GALL report cannot be fully obtained for the 2001 applications. The Surry and North Anna applications will not reference the GALL report and will continue to include a complete discussion of each aging management program. However, in preparing its application, VEPCO will compare its programs to the GALL report and will look at the aging management programs in the GALL report where the need for further evaluation is indicated. The staff intends to use the GALL report and SRP-LR for guidance in reviewing the VEPCO applications.

The applications will incorporate by reference the license renewal topical reports prepared by the Westinghouse Owners Group for license renewal. These reports have been approved by the staff or are in the process of being reviewed in conjunction with the Turkey Point renewal application review. VEPCO will include a table to clearly address the applicant action items identified in the reports.

VEPCO still plans to submit separate, complete applications for Surry and North Anna in electronic format. The majority of the information is expected to be the same in both applications. Information that is unique to a site will be identified by a dark border. The CD-ROMs to be submitted will contain the license renewal safety and environmental reviews, updated final safety analysis report, and the boundary drawings used for scoping.



Stephen T. Hoffman, Senior Project Manager
License Renewal and Standardization Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos: 50-338, 50-339, 50-280, and 50-281

Attachments: As stated

cc w/atts: See next page

The applications will follow the format in the draft standard review plan for license renewal (SRP-LR) with the three exceptions noted on Slide 5 of Attachment 2. The staff stated that no changes in the standard format were expected in the final SRP-LR. VEPCO plans to group the systems within the Auxiliary Systems section of the application in accordance with Attachment 3. This sub-grouping of systems is below the level of detail in the SRP-LR and the staff had no objections.

Because the SRP-LR and the Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) report are still draft and undergoing revision, renewal applications to be submitted in 2001 are not expected to reference the GALL report. Thus, the future efficiencies expected to be gained by the use of the GALL report cannot be fully obtained for the 2001 applications. The Surry and North Anna applications will not reference the GALL report and will continue to include a complete discussion of each aging management program. However, in preparing its application, VEPCO will compare its programs to the GALL report and will look at the aging management programs in the GALL report where the need for further evaluation is indicated. The staff intends to use the GALL report and SRP-LR for guidance in reviewing the VEPCO applications.

The applications will incorporate by reference the license renewal topical reports prepared by the Westinghouse Owners Group for license renewal. These reports have been approved by the staff or are in the process of being reviewed in conjunction with the Turkey Point renewal application review. VEPCO will include a table to clearly address the applicant action items identified in the reports.

VEPCO still plans to submit separate, complete applications for Surry and North Anna in electronic format. The majority of the information is expected to be the same in both applications. Information that is unique to a site will be identified by a dark border. The CD-ROMs to be submitted will contain the license renewal safety and environmental reviews, updated final safety analysis report, and the boundary drawings used for scoping.

/RA/

Stephen T. Hoffman, Senior Project Manager
License Renewal and Standardization Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos: 50-338, 50-339, 50-280, and 50-281

Attachments: As stated

cc w/attns: See next page

Distribution: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\RLSB\HOFFMAN\Mtg1-24.wpd

OFFICE	LA	RLSB	RLSB:BC
NAME	ESilton (name only)	SHoffman	CGrimes
DATE	02/14/01	02/14/01	02/15/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY

RLSB RF

E. Hylton

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

R. Zimmerman

J. Johnson

D. Matthews

S. Newberry

C. Grimes

C. Carpenter

B. Zalcman

J. Strosnider

R. Wessman

G. Bagchi

K. Manoly

W. Bateman

J. Calvo

J. Shea

G. Holahan

T. Collins

B. Boger

J. Peralta

J. Moore

J. Rutberg

R. Weisman

J. Euchner

M. Mayfield

S. Bahadur

A. Murphy

W. McDowell

S. Droggitis

RLSB Staff

S. Duraiswamy

G. Edison

S. Monarque

Mr. W. R. Matthews
Virginia Electric and Power Company

North Anna & Surry Power Stations
Units 1 and 2

cc:

Mr. C. Lee Lintecum
County Administrator
Louisa County
P.O. Box 160
Louisa, Virginia 23093

Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
4201 Dominion Blvd.
Glen Allen, Virginia 23060

Mr. W. R. Matthews
Site Vice President
North Anna Power Station
P.O. Box 402
Mineral, Virginia 23117

Mr. J. H. McCarthy, Manager
Nuclear Licensing & Operations Support
Virginia Electric and Power Company
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Blvd.
Glen Allen, Virginia 23060

Mr. Donald P. Irwin, Esquire
Hunton and Williams
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 E. Byrd Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Office of the Attorney General
Commonwealth of Virginia
900 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. E. S. Grecheck
Site Vice President
Surry Power Station
Virginia Electric and Power Company
5570 Hog Island Road
Surry, Virginia 23883

Senior Resident Inspector
North Anna Power Station
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1024 Haley Drive
Mineral, Virginia 23117

Dr. W. T. Lough
Virginia State Corporation
Commission
Division of Energy Regulation
P.O. Box 1197
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Mr. William Corbin
Virginia Electric and Power Company
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glenn Allen, Virginia 23060

Robert B. Strobe, M.D., M.P.H.
State Health Commissioner
Office of the Commissioner
Virginia Department of Health
P. O. Box 2448
Richmond, Virginia 23218

Mr. Douglas J. Walter
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street NW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006


Senior Resident Inspector
Surry Power Station
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
5850 Hog Island Road
Surry, Virginia 23883

Chairman
Board of Supervisors of Surry County
Surry County Courthouse
Surry, Virginia 23683

ATTENDANCE LIST
LICENSE RENEWAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 24, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
1. Steve Hoffman	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
2. Bill Corbin	Dominion
3. Ben Rodill	Dominion
4. Marc Hotchkiss	Dominion
5. Michael Henig	Dominion
6. Goutam Bagchi	NRC/NRR/DE
7. Duc Ngyuen	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB
8. Paul Shemanski	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB
9. Chris Grimes	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
10. Robert Gill	Duke Energy
11. Jerry Phillabaum	Exelon Corp
12. Kate Barber	NRC/OGC
13. Gordon Edison	NRC/NRR/DLPM
14. Stephen R. Monarque	NRC/NRR/DLPM
15. Meena Khanna	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
16. Carolyn Lauron	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
17. Barry Zalzman	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RGEB
18. Chang-Yang Li	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPLB
19. Greg Galletti	NRC/NRR/DIPM/IQMB
20. Thomas Kenyon	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RGEB
21. Andrew Kugler	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RGEB
22. P. T. Kuo	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
23. James Medoff	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
24. Carl Berlinger	NRC/NRR/DSSA
25. Brian Thomas	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPLB


License Renewal Application Update



DominionSM


January 24, 2001

Purpose of Meeting




- Environmental Review
- Resolution of NRC comments from July presentation
- Demonstrate format and level of detail for:
 - ✓ Section 4 (TLAA Evaluations)
 - ✓ Appendix B (Aging Management Activities (AMA) Summaries)
 - ✓ Appendix A (UFSAR Supplement)
- Identification of site specific differences
- Discuss the use of GALL Report and SRP

Environmental Review




- Two Environmental Reviews have been prepared per the requirements of 10CFR51.
- One for Surry; one for North Anna.
- NRC approved electronic submittals per letter dated September 21, 2000.

Environmental Review




- Because we have one project team for all of the work, we face a significant challenge in supporting two simultaneous reviews.
- We would prefer one project manager for both reviews to better coordinate issues and priorities.
- We prefer concurrent reviews with inspections and public meetings held consecutively; not at the same time.

Comment Resolution from 7-18-00 NRC Meeting




- LRA format will be consistent with the SRP to facilitate the review of the application with the following exceptions:
 - ◆ Containment Isolation System
SRP - ESF Dominion - With Process System
 - ◆ New and Spent Fuel Storage
SRP - Auxiliary Systems Dominion - Structures
 - ◆ Overhead Load Handling System
SRP - Auxiliary Systems Dominion - Structures

Comment Resolution from 7-18-00 NRC Meeting



- Exception letter for electronic submittal approved.
- Auxiliary systems regrouped.
- Boundary drawings:
 - ✓ Passive in-scope components highlighted
 - ✓ Notes clarified

Comment Resolution from 7-18-00 NRC Meeting



- WCAP differences and Applicant Action Item Responses provided in LRA.

WCAP-14575 - Class I Piping


WCAP-14422 - RCS Supports

WCAP-14574 - Pressurizer

WCAP-14577 - RV Internals

- Identification of site specific information.


Format and Level of Detail



Time-Limited Aging Analyses (Section 4)

- TOC aligns with SRP
- Level of detail consistent with Turkey Point Application
- Review Surry LRA Section 4


Format and Level of Detail (continued)



Aging Management Activities (Appendix B)

- Chemistry Control for Secondary Systems
- Boric Acid Corrosion Surveillance


Format and Level of Detail (continued)




UFSAR Supplement (Appendix A)

- Chemistry Control for Secondary Systems
- Boric Acid Corrosion Surveillance


Dual Application Submittal



One set of binders for each station
with plant-specific information identified




Identification of Site Specific Differences



Scoping

- System/Structure in scope at one site and not the other are bordered.
- System/Structure name difference identified, but not bordered.
- Different reason in scope are bordered.


Identification of Site Specific Differences



Screening

- System/Structure name difference identified, but not bordered.
- Unique System/Structure bordered.
[Screening Results Table bordered]
- Unique component groups bordered in Screening Results Tables.


Identification of Site Specific Differences



AMR Results


- Scoping and screening differences not identified.
- Unique items bordered in text and tables:
 - ✓ Material
 - ✓ Environment
 - ✓ Aging Effect Requiring Management
 - ✓ Aging Management Activity

Use of GALL/SRP




- Meeting with NRC held on November 9 to discuss use of the GALL report.
- Class of '01 not expected to use the GALL report.
- Review thoroughness and efficiencies by comparing to GALL cannot be realized.
- Review thoroughness and efficiencies are important!

Use of GALL/SRP




- Consider two areas of comparison:
 - ✓ Items where Further Evaluation = Yes
 - ✓ Plant Programs vs. GALL Programs
- Information will not be explicitly identified in the application with a reference to the GALL report.

Use of GALL/SRP



- How could information be provided to promote a thorough and efficient review?
 - ✓ Comparison to GALL will not be required,
 - ✓ Responses to individual RAIs, if required,
 - ✓ Compiled information in a single separate submittal, or
 - ✓ Other?

Conclusion



- Questions
- Comments
- Feedback
- Recommendations

From: <Bill_Corbin@dom.com>
To: <sth@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jan 11, 2001 1:14 PM
Subject: Table of Contents for Aux Systems

(Embedded image moved to file: pic27695.pcx)

From: Bill Corbin@VANCPower on 01/11/2001 01:12 PM

To: sth@nrc.gov
cc: Michael Henig/NUC/VANCPower@VANCPower, Ben
Rodill/NUC/VANCPower@VANCPower,
Marc Hotchkiss/NUC/VANCPower@VANCPower, Diane
Aitken/NUC/VANCPower@VANCPower
Subject: Table of Contents for Aux Systems

Steve,

Attached please find a proposal on ordering systems within the Auxiliary Systems portion of the license renewal application for Surry and North Anna. We can set this up in any order desired to make your review more efficient. Please advise if you would prefer to see any changes. If you are not clear on the function of some of the systems by only having their names available, please give me a call.

Bill Corbin

(See attached file: TOC Aux Sys Grouping.pdf)

CC: <Michael_Henig@dom.com>, <Ben_Rodill@dom.com>, <Ma...

SYSTEM SORTING LIST

Section 2.3.3 Auxiliary Systems

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>
2.3.3.1	Containment Penetrations (PEN)
2.3.3.2	Reactor Building Penetrations (PEN)
2.3.3.3	Chemical and Volume Control (CH)
2.3.3.4	Incore Instrumentation (IC)
2.3.3.5	Reactor Cavity Purification (RL)
2.3.3.6	Pressurizer Heaters (HS)
2.3.3.7	Sampling System (SS)
2.3.3.8	High-Radiation Sampling System (HRS)
2.3.3.9	Circulating Water (CW)
2.3.3.10	Service Water System (SW)
2.3.3.11	Plumbing (PL)
2.3.3.12	Bearing Cooling (BC)
2.3.3.13	Component Cooling (CC)
2.3.3.14	Chilled Water (CD)
2.3.3.15	Neutron Shield Tank Cooling (NS)
2.3.3.16	Primary Grade Water (PG)
2.3.3.17	Alternate AC Diesel (AAC)
2.3.3.18	AAC Diesel Cooling Water (BCW)
2.3.3.19	AAC Diesel Fuel Oil (BFO)
2.3.3.20	AAC Diesel Lube Oil (BLO)
2.3.3.21	AAC Diesel Starting Air (BSA)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>
2.3.3.22	Emergency Generator (EG)
2.3.3.23	Emergency Diesel Generator Cooling (EC)
2.3.3.24	Emergency Diesel Generator Starting Air (EB)
2.3.3.25	Emergency Diesel Generator Lubrication (EL)
2.3.3.26	Fuel Oil (FO)
2.3.3.27	Security Diesel (SE)
2.3.3.28	Compressed Air (CA)
2.3.3.29	Primary and Secondary Plant Gas Supply (GN)
2.3.3.30	Instrument Air (IA)
2.3.3.31	Service Air (SA)
2.3.3.32	Hydrogen Gas (HG)
2.3.3.33	Containment Vacuum (CV)
2.3.3.34	Ventilation (VS)
2.3.3.35	Leakage Monitoring (LM)
2.3.3.36	Vacuum Priming (VP)
2.3.3.37	Secondary Vent (SV)
2.3.3.38	Boron Recovery (BR)
2.3.3.39	Drains - Aerated (DA)
2.3.3.40	Drains - Gaseous (DG)
2.3.3.41	Liquid and Solid Waste (LW)
2.3.3.42	Radwaste (RW)
2.3.3.43	Drains - Building Services (DB)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>
2.3.3.44	Gaseous Waste (GW)
2.3.3.45	Vents - Aerated (VA)
2.3.3.46	Vents - Gaseous (VG)
2.3.3.47	Radiation Monitoring (RM)
2.3.3.48	Post-Accident Hydrogen Removal (HC)
2.3.3.49	Fire Protection (FP)