

January 24, 2003

NOTE TO: FILE

FROM: Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager */RA/*  
Environmental Section  
License Renewal & Environmental Impacts Program  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE WITH CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT  
IN SUPPORT OF THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE H. B. ROBINSON, UNIT 2  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. MB5226)

On Wednesday, January 22, 2003, the NRC conducted a teleconference with representatives of the Carolina Power and Light (CP&L) to obtain clarification of certain information related CP&L's severe accident management alternatives evaluation. The following people participated in the teleconference:

Richard Emch, NRC  
Robert Palla, NRC  
Tomy Nazario, NRC  
Kim Green, Information Systems Laboratories, Inc.(ISL)  
Jan Kozyra, CP&L  
Talmage Clements, CP&L  
Brad Dolan, CP&L  
Steve Laur, CP&L  
Bruce Morgen, CP&L  
Jon Cudworth, Tetra Tech NUS  
Jeff Gabor, Erin Engineering  
Don MacLeod, Erin Engineering

Based on a review of CP&L's severe accident management alternatives (SAMA) evaluation presented in the Environmental Report submitted on June 14, 2002, the NRC issued a request for additional information (RAI) to CP&L by letter dated October 23, 2002. By letters dated January 2 and 20, 2003, CP&L submitted responses to this RAI. After review of these responses, the NRC staff and its contractor, ISL, needed clarification of some of the information.

The first issue requiring clarification related to CP&L's calculation of the maximum attainable benefit (MAB). CP&L indicated that the value of \$13,584 for the non-discounted offsite economic cost risk had not been provided in the RAI responses. The staff indicated that this information provided the necessary clarification on this issue to allow the staff to duplicate CP&L's calculation of the MAB.

The second issue requiring clarification related to the values of the TE2 release fraction for release categories RC-3 and RC-3B as specified in Table 4-55 of the Individual Plant Examination (IPE) for Robinson. It appeared to the staff that CP&L had reduced the values for

this release fraction in the SAMA evaluation. CP&L indicated that the value of 10.66% shown in Table 4-55 of the IPE was a typographical error. The correct value is 0.06% as shown in Table 4-52 of the IPE and in the SAMA evaluation. The staff indicated that this information provided the necessary clarification on this issue.

The third issue requiring clarification related to CP&L's reactor coolant pump (RCP) seal leakage model. The staff asked what plans CP&L had for resolving the probabilistic risk assessment peer review comment concerning the RCP seal leakage model. CP&L indicated that the issue had been entered into the Corrective Action Program for the Robinson plant. In the process of deciding how to resolve the corrective action, CP&L is examining a number of RCP seal leakage models including the WOG 2000 model, the Rhodes model, and the Brookhaven model. The staff indicated that this information provided the necessary clarification on this issue.

The fourth issue requiring clarification related to the total number of SAMAs evaluated. CP&L indicated that the correct number of SAMAs evaluated was 266.