

February 26, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: Allen G. Howe, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Eva A. Brown, Project Manager, Section 2/**RA**/
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SAINT LUCIE UNIT 2 - SUBMISSION OF DRAFT REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING RISK INFORMED
INSERVICE INSPECTION (MB5698)

On February 3, 2003, through February 7, 2003, the attached clarification questions were forwarded to Florida Power and Light (FPL). The clarifications are related to FPL's request for relief dated July 23, 2002, from the American Society of Mechanical Engineering Code inservice inspection requirements for Class 1 piping. These clarifications concerned FPL's January 16, 2003, response to NRC's request for additional information issued on December 17, 2002. The licensee has indicated its intent to submit a reply to these clarifications.

Docket No. 50-389

Attachment: Clarification Questions

February 26, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: Allen G. Howe, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Eva A. Brown, Project Manager, Section 2 */RA/*
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SAINT LUCIE UNIT 2- SUBMISSION OF DRAFT REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING RISK INFORMED
INSERVICE INSPECTION (MB5698)

On February 3, 2003, through February 7, 2003, the attached clarification questions were forwarded to Florida Power and Light (FPL). The clarifications are related to FPL's request for relief dated July 23, 2002, from the American Society of Mechanical Engineering Code inservice inspection requirements for Class 1 piping. These clarifications concerned FPL's January 16, 2003, response to NRC's request for additional information issued on December 17, 2002. The licensee has indicated its intent to submit a reply to these clarifications.

Docket No. 50-389

Attachment: Clarification Questions

Distribution

PUBLIC BMoroney EBrown BClayton (Hard Copy) AHowe
PDII-2 R/F

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML030580605.wpd

ADAMS ACCESSION NO. ML030580605

OFFICE	PDII-2/PM	PDII-2/LA	PDII-2/SC
NAME	EBrown	BClayton	AHowe
DATE	02/20/03	02/20/03	02/23/03

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

CLARIFICATIONS ON A REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
RISK-INFORMED INSERVICE INSPECTION (RI-ISI) RELIEF REQUEST

FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT

ST. LUCIE UNIT 2

DOCKET NO. 50-389

Clarification of Reply to Question 5: If the topical definition of postulated degradation mechanism was used in lieu of using an active degradation mechanism, then explain why there are no locations in Region 1A?

Clarification of Reply to Question 11 e): Where did the estimate of 0.25 probability of in-vessel recovery due to ex-vessel cooling come from. How does this value impact the results of the RI-ISI submittal?

Clarification of Reply to Question 13: In the response to question 13 a) you stated that, the segment that resulted in the difference between the current Section XI and the RI-ISI program for the chemical and volume control system was not credited in Table 3.10-1, since the segment was not determined to be high safety significance (HSS) and was not specified as an RI-ISI examination.

In the RI-ISI analysis, how did you calculate the change in risk for low safety significance segments whose number of inspection locations changed between the Section XI program and the RI-ISI program? How did you calculate the change in risk for HSS segments?

Clarification of Reply to Question 9: What are your intentions regarding resubmission of the RI-ISI program, if industry experience determines that there is a need for significant revision to the program as described in the original submittal for that interval?