

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards  
Plant License Renewal Subcommittee

Docket Number: (not applicable)

PROCESS USING ADAMS  
TEMPLATE: ACRS/ACNW-005

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, November 4, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-1153

Pages 1-190

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 234-4433

TR04

**ACRS OFFICE COPY  
RETAIN FOR THE LIFE OF THE COMMITTEE**

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
+ + + + +  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS  
(ACRS)  
PLANT LICENSE RENEWAL SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +  
TUESDAY,  
NOVEMBER 4, 2003  
+ + + + +  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, Room T2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, at 12:30 p.m., Mario V. Bonaca, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

MARIO V. BONACA, Chairman  
F. PETER FORD, Member  
GRAHAM M. LEITCH, Member  
STEPHEN L. ROSEN, Member  
GRAHAM B. WALLIS, Member

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

ACRS STAFF PRESENT:

MARVIN D. SYKES

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

RUSSELL J. ARRIGHI, NRR

BARRY ELLIOT, NRR

FRANK GILLESPIE, NRR

SAM LEE, NRR

MICHAEL MODES, Region I

JONATHAN ROWLEY, NRR

ALSO PRESENT:

GERRY GEIKEN

GEORGE HERRICK

JARRED JACKSON

MARY ELLEN MCGRAW

ROBERT C. MECREDY

DAVID WILSON

GEORGE WROBEL

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

OPENING REMARKS

Chairman Mario Bonaca . . . . . 4

STAFF INTRODUCTION

Dr. Sam Lee . . . . . 6

OVERVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

George Wrobel, Project Manager . . . . . 7

OVERVIEW OF SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT

Resolution of Open Items, Staff Conclusion

R. J. Arrighi, NRR . . . . . 83

Review Results of Scoping Methodologies,

Inspections and ROP findings, SBO

Michael Modes, Region 1 . . . . . 103

Aging Management Programs and Review Results

R. J. Arrighi, NRR . . . . . 116

Time Limited Aging Analyses Overview

Jim Rowley . . . . . 144

SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION . . . . . 154

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

12:32 a.m.

CHAIRMAN BONACA: The meeting will now come to order. This is a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee on Plant License Renewal.

I am Mario Bonaca, Chairman of the Subcommittee.

ACRS members in attendance are Graham Wallis, Peter Ford, Steve Rosen and Graham Leitch.

Marvin Sykes is the designated federal official for this meeting.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the license renewal application for the Robert E. Ginna nuclear power plant and the associated NRC separate evaluation report with open items.

During this meeting we will hear presentations by the applicant, Rochester Gas and Electric and the NRC Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation.

The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts and formulate report positions and actions as appropriate for deliberations by the full Committee.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   The rules for participation in today's  
2 meeting have been announced as part of the notice  
3 of this meeting previously published in the *Federal*  
4 *Register* on October 22, 2003. We have received no  
5 other written comments or requests for time to make  
6 oral statements from members of the public regarding  
7 today's meeting.

8                   A transcript of the meeting is being  
9 kept, and will be made available as stated in the  
10 *Federal Register* notice.

11                   It is requested that speakers first  
12 identify themselves and then speak with sufficient  
13 clarity and volume so that they can be readily  
14 heard.

15                   We will now proceed with the meeting,  
16 and I call upon?

17                   DR. LEE: Yes. My name is Sam Lee.

18                   CHAIRMAN BONACA: Lee.

19                   DR. LEE: I am the Section Chief in the  
20 License Renewal Program. Dr. PT Kuo, Program  
21 Director, she is not able to here today. And we  
22 expect our Deputy Division Director.

23                   CHAIRMAN BONACA: Mr. Gillespie?

24                   DR. LEE: Mr. Frank Gillespie, he should  
25 be here shortly.

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. But you can  
2 start the meeting?

3 DR. LEE: I will start. I would like to  
4 you know, I guess, for ACRS continue support of the  
5 license renewal activities.

6 And there's a lot of activity going on  
7 in License Renewal. I guess, about a half an hour  
8 ago Jim Dyer just signed the renewal license for  
9 Fort Calhoun. So now we have, I guess, with that 21  
10 approved units for license renewal and 16 under  
11 review.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

13 DR. LEE: With that today, the purpose  
14 today is to discuss the staff review of the Ginna  
15 application for license renewal. And the Project  
16 Manager is Russ Arrighi, and he is supported by John  
17 Rowley. And we have eight open items, and John is  
18 going to go over the status with you.

19 And I guess we will turn over to RG&E,  
20 the licensee, to make their presentation.

21 MR. WROBEL: Shall I start?

22 DR. LEE: Yes.

23 MR. WROBEL: Okay. My name is George  
24 Wrobel. I am the license renewal project manager  
25 for Ginna Station. I'd like to have the other

1 people that worked on the license renewal project  
2 introduce themselves from RG&E.

3 MR. HERRICK: George Herrick, license  
4 renewal engineer from RG&E.

5 MR. MECREDY: Bob Mecredy, Vice  
6 President of Nuclear Operations, RG&E.

7 MR. WILSON: David Wilson, license  
8 renewal engineer at RG&E.

9 MR. GEIKEN: Gerry Geiken, general  
10 engineer at RG&E.

11 MS. MCGRAW: Mary Ellen McGraw,  
12 mechanical engineer at RG&E.

13 MR. JACKSON: Jarred Jackson, electrical  
14 engineer support at RG&E.

15 MR. WROBEL: Thank you.

16 This is the plan we're talking about,  
17 it's the review. The contents of today's  
18 presentation with RG&E. We are going to go over the  
19 background and history of the plant a little bit.  
20 Talk about some of the unique features, issues that  
21 are in the works now. Some current issues.

22 MR. LEITCH: Just while we're getting  
23 that set up, George, I was looking at the  
24 photograph. It doesn't show so well on the one that  
25 you have, but there is a odd looking building, I

1 guess, in the foreground of the picture. I was just  
2 curious as to what that is? It's a brick building,  
3 is it? I was just curious as to what --

4 MR. WROBEL: The simulator building is  
5 here.

6 MR. LEITCH: I was asking about the one  
7 to the right.

8 MR. WROBEL: That's the training center.

9 MR. LEITCH: Oh, that's the training  
10 center?

11 MR. WROBEL: That's the beginning of the  
12 training center. There's been an addition put on  
13 since then.

14 MR. LEITCH: I see.

15 MR. MECREDY: That was the original  
16 visitor center, information center on the site. The  
17 first structure on the site.

18 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Thank you. Just a  
19 curiosity question.

20 MR. WROBEL: Okay. We thought we'd talk  
21 about some of the current issues of interest right  
22 now. I know there's a lot of the interest in the  
23 cracked vessel head and the bottom head inspections  
24 that we did this past outage. And then some issues  
25 on the containment recirculation sump.

1           If there's any other current issues that  
2 could be considered, we can talk about those also.

3           I want to talk a little bit about how we  
4 put the licensed renewal application together. And  
5 then talk about some of the specific results,  
6 particularly in the TLAA's programs. We have several  
7 commitments that we have made that we'll implement  
8 in the future. And we do have a couple of open  
9 items to be talked about mostly by the NRC.

10           So, back to the background and history.  
11 Most of you probably know, it's a Westinghouse two  
12 loop 1520 megawatt PWR, upstate New York.

13           The initial license was granted in  
14 September 18, 1969. We were one of the Systematic  
15 Evaluation Program plants. We'll talk about that on  
16 the next slide a little bit.

17           We did have our provisional operating  
18 license to full-term operating license that was as a  
19 result of the Systematic Evaluation Program. It  
20 started in '72 and ended in '84; a 12 year process  
21 then. So license renewal seems pretty quick now.

22           We also had our CP-OL recapture that was  
23 done. Construction permit was 41 months for Ginna.  
24 And that changed our operating license from 4-25-06  
25 to the current 9-18-09.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEITCH: George, I'm a little  
2 confused by the history, I guess. I don't quite  
3 understand the process that was used at that time.  
4 Basically my question is the 40 years dates from  
5 1969, not 1984, is that correct?

6 MR. WROBEL: That's correct.

7 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

8 MR. WROBEL: The 1984 was when we got  
9 our full-term operating license. We were operating  
10 under a provisional operation license, which is how  
11 we got into the Systematic Evaluation Program in the  
12 first place.

13 MR. LEITCH: I see.

14 MR. WROBEL: So we had, I think it was  
15 year-to-year, we got the provisional operating  
16 license extended.

17 MR. LEITCH: Oh, okay.

18 MR. WROBEL: And then since then -- so I  
19 guess we could have just stayed with that forever,  
20 continued forever.

21 MR. LEITCH: Yes. Yes.

22 MR. WROBEL: And the recapture was just  
23 the construction period.

24 MR. LEITCH: Construction period, yes.

25 MR. WROBEL: Some of the major projects

1 that we've had Ginna Station, there were a lot of  
2 them before '96. But the more recent ones, we  
3 replaced our steam generators in 1996. One of the  
4 side benefits of that was that we were able to  
5 reduce our TF, which has helped in subsequent issues  
6 from 573½ down to 561 currently that we're operating  
7 at.

8 We were, I believe, the first  
9 Westinghouse plant to convert to improved standard  
10 technical specifications. We did that in 1996 also.

11 DR. WALLIS: Did you have power uprates,  
12 totally new ones?

13 MR. WROBEL: The only power uprate that  
14 we had was from the initial 1300 megawatts in 1520.  
15 We have not had one since then.

16 In 1999 as part of the reactor vessels  
17 internal inspection, we did a baffle-bolt  
18 inspection. We inspected a large number of the  
19 baffle bolts and we replaced enough to -- there was  
20 plant specific analysis done by Westinghouse and we  
21 added a lot of baffle variables to the internals.

22 And then this year we just finished  
23 replacing our reactor vessel head.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: This thing with the  
25 baffle-bolt.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WROBEL: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: You did that as a  
3 replacement. Now, if I remember in the application  
4 you stated you don't have to make any further  
5 inspections of the bolts?

6 MR. WROBEL: Well, we feel at this point  
7 that with the number of bolts that we put on and the  
8 very, very small number of failures that we  
9 experienced, I believe it was less than one percent  
10 of the bolts that we evaluated actually were  
11 degraded.

12 Between that and the fact that we have  
13 link-before-break completed for all of our 10 inch  
14 lines. So the next larger line that does not have  
15 link-before-break analysis on the primary system is  
16 a 4 inch line. So the forces resulting from that  
17 with the number of new bolts we have and the number  
18 of bolts that we inspected that were good, we don't  
19 believe that we need to do any additional work in  
20 baffle-barrel bolt inspections and/or replacement.  
21 That's our current position.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So no further  
23 inspections? And we'll hear from the staff later  
24 on? Yes. During your presentation, that's fine.

25 MR. WROBEL: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Let's remember that.  
2 Okay.

3 MR. WROBEL: Okay. Again, we replaced  
4 our reactor vessel head with the Inconel 690  
5 penetrations including -- and we also added new  
6 control rod drive mechanisms. That was just  
7 completed in 2003, last month.

8 And I guess it's not a  
9 background/history, but we do anticipate selling the  
10 plant in the middle of next year.

11 I said I wanted to talk a little bit --

12 MR. LEITCH: Has a deal been struck and  
13 it's just a matter of implementation or is --

14 MR. WROBEL: It's not struck yet. The  
15 bids are due mid-November.

16 MR. LEITCH: I see. Thank you.

17 MR. WROBEL: Systematic Evaluation  
18 Program has got an interesting program that  
19 developed.

20 All of the plants that have original  
21 operating licenses and I believe a couple of the  
22 older plants that might have had full term operating  
23 license, we're evaluated under what's called the  
24 Systematic Evaluation Program which began in 1977.  
25 The project there was, was to review Ginna against

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the then current Standard Review Plan, which is  
2 75087. If you look at that compared to the current  
3 0800, they're pretty comparable. So it's almost a  
4 review against the current Standard Review Plan.

5 It wasn't against the whole plan. There  
6 were 92 risk topics that were reviewed. Sometime or  
7 later, whenever, if you want to know what the topics  
8 were, I can highlight those also. But there was  
9 pretty extensive review of the plant against the  
10 Standard Review Plan.

11 And what happened there is that we  
12 really ended up with a very good short licensing  
13 basis. We got SERs on 92 topics, and some of the  
14 topics like seismic had multiple SERs written  
15 against them because there were structures, systems,  
16 tanks. So our FSAR was substantially upgraded with  
17 all the SERs that we out of the Systematic  
18 Evaluation Program. So it was a major benefit. It  
19 helped us define our current licensing basis and,  
20 therefore, helped us to define which structure  
21 systems and components would be in the scope of  
22 license renewal because we had such good  
23 documentation. It made scoping much easier.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The reason why I asked  
25 the question to put on the agenda was, I'd like to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand what changes you have to make physically  
2 to the plant, if any. For example, other SEP  
3 plants, they were plants that started up without any  
4 CCS system, without low-pressure injection systems.  
5 You know, Conn Yankee was one. Without safety  
6 injection tanks.

7 MR. WROBEL: Yes. We kind of lucked out  
8 there. We had all of those systems, but we did make  
9 some improvements in the systems. Many of the  
10 changes that we made were related to natural  
11 phenomena.

12 The Ginna Station design for tornadoes,  
13 for example, we don't get many. We're stuck with  
14 snow a lot, but we don't get many tornadoes and so  
15 the tornadoes design was almost none existent. We  
16 beefed up critical structures for tornado  
17 protection. We did an extensive review of the  
18 seismic analysis of Ginna. We made a quite a few  
19 changes both as a result of Bulletin 7902 and 14  
20 NSEP. So we made quite a few seismic modifications  
21 to Ginna.

22 Flood protection, quite a bit of flood  
23 protection. And we relooked at high-energy line  
24 breaks both inside and outside containment. We  
25 changed the definition of high-energy and moderate-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 energy consistent with the O'Leary letter, the '73  
2 O'Leary letter where if it was either 212 or 200  
3 pounds, it became a high-energy line. So that added  
4 some additional lines like steam heating lines into  
5 the scope of high-energy lines. And we did it both  
6 inside and outside containment. And we made a far  
7 number of modifications to improve separation from  
8 physical effects.

9 Those are the main ones.

10 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Well, for example, I  
11 was reading through that you have a two-train  
12 auxiliary feedwater system. And you have a  
13 separation between the two of them. And for SEP  
14 purposes you could not exclude the possibility that  
15 an external event would eliminate with a common  
16 cause both trains.

17 MR. WROBEL: Yes, that was --

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So you have a reliance  
19 on a third train now that is an independent train  
20 that ran somewhere else. And, you know, my question  
21 when I was reading was how do you treat methodology  
22 wise, how do you treat this third train? I mean, is  
23 it self-degrading.

24 MR. WROBEL: Yes, it's situated in  
25 scope. That really occurred, background, 1974 when

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it was determined that the high-energy line break  
2 criteria was such that the main steam and feedwater  
3 lines are in what's called our intermediate  
4 building. Intermediate building also on another  
5 floor had both motor driven aux feed pumps and a  
6 turbine driven aux feed water pump. So  
7 approximately the 102 line break intermediate  
8 building we could not guarantee the operability of  
9 those three pumps. So we added, basically, a bunker  
10 at our separate standby aux feedwater system  
11 completely separate from the main steam and  
12 feedwater lines. The penetrations didn't go through  
13 the intermediate building. It was all completely  
14 separate. We would use that in the event -- at the  
15 time it was in the event of a high-energy line  
16 break.

17 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

18 MR. WROBEL: Subsequent to that we were  
19 able to take credit for the standby aux feedwater  
20 system for additional phenomena, for example tornado  
21 protection for the original aux feedwater system was  
22 not tornado, but the standby system was. And so we  
23 didn't have to modify anything.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Those fuel aux feed  
25 lines, they're both steam driven by the pumps?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WROBEL: Motor driven.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Both?

3 MR. WROBEL: Both motor driven.

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The design one and the  
5 backup?

6 MR. WROBEL: We have 200 percent turbine  
7 driven.

8 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

9 MR. WROBEL: Two separate 100 percent  
10 motor driven. And then two 100 percent motor driven  
11 backups. We have 600 percent capacity.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

13 MR. WROBEL: And aux feedwater never  
14 seems to show up in our risk equation very high  
15 because of that.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: No. All right. It  
17 wasn't clear in the application. I mean, I'm not  
18 saying -- I thought it was a very clear application  
19 in general, but I just couldn't understand how many  
20 systems you had in the aux system. All right.

21 MR. WROBEL: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Any other changes of  
23 substance? I mean, you pointed out the design basis  
24 is better than modern one because you went through  
25 the SEP. Yes, but your design maybe is not as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 robust as, you know, as a plant where you don't have  
2 to worry about that wall in between two trains to  
3 collapse and take out both.

4 MR. WROBEL: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So I just, I was  
6 looking for some insights that you may have outside  
7 of that specific system I describe. Anything else  
8 that --

9 MR. WROBEL: Most of the changes that we  
10 made, we did make some changes for high-energy line  
11 breaks with osculated breaks, not just in the  
12 intermediate building but wherever there was a high-  
13 energy line break and assured ourselves that we  
14 would have a system that's available to mitigate  
15 that high-energy line break separate from the break  
16 itself. And we did have to do a fair amount of  
17 separation in that area.

18 We did some, and for say tornado  
19 protection or block wall protection. That was  
20 another big issue.

21 We had to protect individual components,  
22 like our main steam isolation valve. Actuators were  
23 separated -- were protected, we build enclosures  
24 around those that that if a block wall fell them, it  
25 would not impact them. So we could do that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRMAN BONACA: Now I have a question.  
2                   So for those components that serve as a backup to  
3                   makeup for the fact that you could not meet the SLP,  
4                   okay, like you know the extra auxiliary for those  
5                   trains.

6                   MR. WROBEL: Right.

7                   CHAIRMAN BONACA: So did you treat them  
8                   as safety grade systems or are some of them are non-  
9                   safety grade.

10                  MR. WROBEL: Some are safety grade and  
11                  some are what we call safety significant or  
12                  augmented quality.

13                  CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Okay.

14                  MR. WROBEL: If it was done purely for  
15                  tornado or flood protection, then those components  
16                  did not necessarily become safety related. They  
17                  became augmented quality or safety significant. But  
18                  we did treat them in the scope of license renewal as  
19                  (a) (2) components.

20                  CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. So you did  
21                  include in the scope?

22                  MR. WROBEL: Yes.

23                  CHAIRMAN BONACA: That was your  
24                  methodology?

25                  MR. WROBEL: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. That's it.

2 MR. WROBEL: The other thing that we got  
3 out of the Systematic Evaluation Program is early  
4 use of risk perspective. Just after WASH 1400 was  
5 used, it wasn't a global PSA for the plant but on an  
6 individualized basis the NRC did use cost benefit  
7 analysis to determine whether or not or to what  
8 extent we should make some modifications. One of  
9 the ones that comes to mind particular containment  
10 isolation valves. Our containment isolation valve  
11 arrangement is not consistent with the current GDC  
12 53 through 57. And on another defined basis we're  
13 able to show that for the most -- except for one  
14 case, I believe, all our containment isolation  
15 valves or the differences from the GDC did not make  
16 them risk significant if we maintained them as it  
17 was.

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

19 MR. WROBEL: So that was a good insight  
20 on risk perspective.

21 And like I mentioned, we did make some  
22 cost beneficial plant changes, primarily the ones  
23 that I already talked about.

24 MR. FORD: Could we go back to the risk  
25 perspective aspect? The topic that will come for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conversation is the justification for one time  
2 inspections. When you are making those  
3 justifications, did the whole question of the risk  
4 perspective come in? What if you are wrong? Did  
5 you ask the questions what if in terms of the risk  
6 perspective?

7 MR. WROBEL: On the one time  
8 inspections, what we did is we tried to pretty much  
9 follow the guidance that was in the Generic Aging  
10 Lessons Learned. We looked at the types of  
11 inspections that we felt there was a material  
12 environment combination that could result in  
13 potential damage. And so we looked at what type of  
14 current procedures we had, our preventive  
15 maintenance program, we looked at that. If we  
16 didn't have something there and there was like a  
17 water chemistry and the only program that we had was  
18 water chemistry and there was potential for damage,  
19 then we added that into the scope for our one time  
20 inspection. And the way that we determined which  
21 components to inspect had some risk significance to  
22 it.

23 Now, Gerry, if you want to go into a  
24 little more detail as to how we picked the  
25 particular one time inspection components, but it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 did have elements of risk.

2 MR. FORD: The reason for my question  
3 is, maybe it's out of turn here in the discussion,  
4 but much of your justification for some of the one  
5 time inspection source, well at such-and-such a date  
6 we looked, we saw no problem, therefore essentially  
7 we won't again. Now, that's a one time look in a  
8 time dependent aging mechanism, which is not  
9 necessarily linear with time. So if your rational  
10 was wrong, what would the impact be on the safety of  
11 your plant? That's why I'm bringing it up under the  
12 risk perspective?

13 MR. WROBEL: All right. Well, that  
14 certainly didn't come up in SEP.

15 MR. FORD: Right.

16 MR. WROBEL: Not to that level anyway.

17 I believe that the one time inspections  
18 that we committed to do are quite extensive and  
19 they're really only in the areas where we thought  
20 that the degradation mechanisms were either very  
21 slow or nonexistent, but we thought we would look  
22 anyway.

23 A lot of the inspections that we have  
24 focused on for the next 33 years, we put them in  
25 what we call our PSPM program, periodic surveillance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and preventive maintenance program. So what a lot  
2 of people might have put into one time inspections,  
3 we thought this is worth repeating. And so we  
4 actually have a lot of the inspections that are part  
5 of our PSPM program, the ones that we thought are  
6 low risk significance, we put in --

7 MR. FORD: Okay.

8 MR. WROBEL: The nice thing about being  
9 this old, not me but the plant, was that we actually  
10 have a lot of operating time on the equipment. So if  
11 we do not see anything, we're talking about not  
12 seeing anything after 35, 36, almost 40 years of  
13 operation. So, you know, the aging would have had a  
14 good chance to envision itself, or come about  
15 already. So that's how we picked those.

16 Anybody else wants to pick up more.

17 MR. ROSEN: Let me ask you a little bit  
18 more about the risk perspective. Do you have an  
19 internal events PRA?

20 MR. WROBEL: Yes. Our current PRA  
21 includes internal events, external events but not  
22 seismic. Fire and shutdown.

23 MR. ROSEN: It does.

24 MR. WROBEL: We've a very comprehensive  
25 PSA. We've just gone through our peer review and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make a few adjustments, but nothing spectacular.

2 But, yes, it's quite a full PSA.

3 MR. ROSEN: Good.

4 MR. LEITCH: Was it this early use of  
5 risk perspective that led you to see the need for  
6 the installation of the backup aux feed pumps or was  
7 that some other kind of regulatory action?

8 MR. WROBEL: No, that was purely  
9 deterministic.

10 MR. LEITCH: Yes, the SEP?

11 MR. WROBEL: Yes, it was pre-SEP even.  
12 You have a steam line in the same room as your  
13 protection system, it didn't seem like a good idea  
14 at the time.

15 MR. LEITCH: Yes. Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I still am surprised,  
17 pleasantly surprised about the capacity of the  
18 pumps, that you have two additional 100 percent  
19 capacity pumps.

20 MR. LEITCH: And you have some kind of a  
21 wall or a moat or something that divides the  
22 circulating water pump house? Was that a result of  
23 this perspective?

24 MR. WROBEL: A flood dam.

25 MR. LEITCH: Yes, a flood dam. Was that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a result of risk perspective.

2 MR. WROBEL: No. That was as a result  
3 of the condenser failure at Brunswick, I think back  
4 in '72.

5 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

6 MR. WROBEL: Where we decided that if it  
7 could happen there, it could happen to us.

8 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

9 MR. WROBEL: So we did an analysis on  
10 what would be the result of a condenser failure and  
11 we added some flooding failures to the plant as a  
12 result of that.

13 MR. LEITCH: So I guess I'm trying to  
14 understand if the early use of risk perspective led  
15 you to any physical modifications of the plant back  
16 in that time frame?

17 MR. WROBEL: Yes, it did. It either  
18 both led us to some additional modifications. I  
19 believe there were some penetrations that had  
20 thermal overload that it didn't have, and we checked  
21 the risk perspective and put them in there. So  
22 there's thermal overload protection, I believe, on  
23 two to four containment electrical penetrations that  
24 were put in.

25 There was also, like I said, the risk

1 perspective showed we'd have to do some  
2 modifications, like modify our containment isolation  
3 valve arrangement.

4 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

5 MR. WROBEL: And these were all early  
6 PSA analysis that were done by the staff and  
7 reviewed by us. But really it was their call on  
8 those.

9 MR. LEITCH: Yes. So this was mid-'70s  
10 time frame?

11 MR. WROBEL: This was about 1980 by the  
12 time we got to that point.

13 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

14 MR. WROBEL: It started in '77. By the  
15 time we got to the NUREG-0821 it was 1981 or '92.

16 MR. LEITCH: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. ROSEN: You've done an interesting  
18 job talking about the early use of your risk  
19 perspectives. Can you update us a little bit about  
20 what you're doing with the risk perspectives now?  
21 Are you risk, for example, for configuration risk  
22 management or --

23 MR. WROBEL: Yes. We have online risk  
24 monitor called EOS at Ginna. And evolutions that  
25 are done at Ginna Station are punched into what we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 call EOS to determine whether or not the risk  
2 profile changes significantly. If we get to a  
3 profile level of an orange, what's equivalent to an  
4 orange, I'm not sure exactly what level our first  
5 step is, but you hit an orange you have to go  
6 through PORV review in order to even make the  
7 evolution. And you don't make an evolution that  
8 goes to red. So that's on a daily basis, any MODs,  
9 maintenance get done that way.

10 MR. ROSEN: So you're using this to  
11 comply with 56.65(a)(4)?

12 MR. WILSON: Partly, yes. It is part of  
13 the stuff we use for 84, but it goes beyond what 84  
14 requirements are.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: You need to come up to  
16 the microphone. Thank you. And speak with  
17 sufficient clarity and volume.

18 MR. WILSON: David Wilson, RG&E.

19 The risk monitor and EOS is used for  
20 maintenance rule determinations, but it's also used  
21 in addition to that for normal ways of doing  
22 business just to make sure that even though it's not  
23 a maintenance activity, that we're not putting  
24 ourselves in an unsafe configuration.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So it's capable of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 quantifying multiple components out of service?

2 MR. WILSON: That is correct.

3 MR. ROSEN: So would you characterize  
4 your current risk, use of risk tools as aggressive  
5 or part of a--

6 MR. WROBEL: I would say fairly  
7 aggressive. I don't know what else we would use it  
8 for. I guess day-to-day operation --

9 MR. ROSEN: Risk-informed in-service  
10 inspection?

11 MR. WROBEL: We have not done risk-  
12 informed in-service inspection yet. However, we  
13 have used it in quantification designs or in  
14 evaluating modifications.

15 We have looked at a risk-informed ISI at  
16 one point, have not done it. Probably looking at it  
17 again now that we have, hopefully, another 20 years  
18 of capable operation.

19 I think Gerry Geiken wants to say  
20 something.

21 MR. GEIKEN: I'm Gerry Geiken with Ginna  
22 Station.

23 We have looked at the cost benefit  
24 analysis of going to risk-informed inspections. And  
25 at the present time have concluded that there isn't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sufficient savings economically to justify the  
2 analysis that would be required to going to risk-  
3 informed inspections. As a result, we continue to do  
4 ISI as under the current requirements of ASME  
5 Section XI.

6 MR. WROBEL: This is going to go quite a  
7 bit faster, I believe, because we have covered quite  
8 a few of these already.

9 Again, we're the oldest operating PWR.  
10 We talked about the standby auxiliary feedwater  
11 system as a unique feature.

12 We do have -- this is actually fairly  
13 comparable to what you heard at Robinson last month.  
14 We do have grouted containment tendons, but we have  
15 rock anchors that are grouted right into the -- so  
16 the tendons go right into the ground block. And we  
17 have the rock anchors and tension bars that are at  
18 the base of our containment.

19 I don't know if this is a good time to  
20 talk about it, but also have station blackout  
21 recovery. We do have a sketch. I think that's  
22 next. I don't know if you want to ask questions  
23 about the level of --

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: You have an open item,  
25 is that correct?

1 MR. ROSEN: We do want to hear about  
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes, when we get  
4 there.

5 MR. WROBEL: Okay. We can wait on that.  
6 The sketch is next. We'll go back to that sketch  
7 when we get to station blackout recovery.

8 MR. ROSEN: It's apparently a phenomenon  
9 that happens in upstate New York.

10 MR. WROBEL: Yes.

11 MR. ROSEN: Were you affected by it?  
12 Were you one of the sections of the trip, by the  
13 way?

14 MR. WROBEL: Yes. We did get an  
15 automatic trip, but we didn't have a station  
16 blackout. Our diesels worked fine.

17 MR. ROSEN: You have two of them, right?

18 MR. WROBEL: Yes.

19 MR. ROSEN: They both started and ran  
20 and loaded?

21 MR. WROBEL: Yes. So we didn't get a  
22 station blackout.

23 MR. ROSEN: No. No blackout.

24 MR. WROBEL: We just have snow.

25 I just wanted to let you know, our

1 performance indicators are green, inspections  
2 findings are all green so I didn't put a slide on  
3 that. But I think the NRC has one. It looks kind of  
4 a like a metal --

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

6 MR. WROBEL: Skip this until we get to  
7 station blackout.

8 We're going to talk a little bit about  
9 what currently is happening at Ginna Station or has  
10 just happened.

11 We just changed our reactor vessel head.  
12 It's a one piece construction. And we put in new  
13 controller rod mechanisms. We have the old ones as  
14 spares. We did put those in while we were at it.

15 I'll go to the next slide just to show a  
16 couple pictures of it. That's the head in the shot.  
17 The next one is with the ventilation installed. And  
18 we have 400 more slides of that, but we won't show  
19 you those today.

20 MR. ROSEN: Do you have an access patch  
21 big enough to get --

22 MR. WROBEL: Yes, and it was really a  
23 good picture. Should have brought that one in. As  
24 it was going through the equipment hatch, did not  
25 have to modify it as opposed to when we did steam

1 generators and had to cut a hole in top of the  
2 containment.

3 MR. ROSEN: Pardon me. I didn't  
4 understand what you said.

5 MR. WROBEL: Oh, as opposed to when we  
6 replaced steam generators, we had to cut holes on  
7 top of containment. This came in through the  
8 equipment hatch.

9 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Now you use 690 TT if  
10 I remember, correct?

11 MR. WROBEL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And CRDM, I mean are  
13 they now differently than in the design that we had  
14 on the 600, or is there a different --

15 MR. WROBEL: No, I believe they're the  
16 same. Gerry, are they any different than -- I mean,  
17 they 304 stainless steel, but I don't think the  
18 designs any different than we had before.

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Because the weld  
20 material is different, if I remember, too.

21 MR. GEIKEN: Yes. This is Gerry Geiken.  
22 The weld material is Inconel 52.

23 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Right.

24 MR. GEIKEN: Joining the penetration to  
25 the head. It's all I-52. Bare wire cake.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

2 MR. WROBEL: In addition to replacing  
3 the upper reactor vessel, we did a detailed lower  
4 reactor vessel head inspection. We took off the  
5 insulation off the bottom or lowered the insulation  
6 so we could look at it. We did detailed visual, VT-1  
7 examinations at all 36 nozzles. And there were no  
8 indications of any boric acid.

9 MR. ROSEN: Taking the insulation off,  
10 was it designed to have come off or --

11 MR. WROBEL: No. No. We had to take it  
12 off. And we have a new system put in now that makes  
13 access easier. There's room where you can put a  
14 snake through a camera for future inspections. So  
15 we've redesigned the bottom of head insulation.

16 MR. FORD: I'm assuming that with the  
17 lower T, that temperature, that you are a low  
18 susceptibility plant, is that correct?

19 MR. WROBEL: That's correct. For the  
20 bottom, and as well as the top.

21 MR. FORD: The top?

22 MR. WROBEL: Because of the material  
23 differences also.

24 MR. FORD: But even without the change  
25 of material, it would still be a low susceptibility

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant, is that right?

2 MR. WROBEL: Bottom or top?

3 MR. FORD: The top?

4 MR. WROBEL: I think we would be medium.

5 MR. GEIKEN: George, it would have been  
6 medium.

7 MR. FORD: So you changed it purely just  
8 for insurance purposes, technical insurance?

9 MR. WROBEL: We did an economic analysis  
10 of how much it would take to -- every outage gear  
11 for it just in cases and it was economically viable  
12 to replace it other than do that every year. And we  
13 will still being inspections, but on less frequent  
14 basis.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. So now the head  
16 has been replaced and the plant is running now?

17 MR. WROBEL: Yes. Yes, it went quite  
18 smoothly.

19 MR. MECREDY: This is Bob Mecredy.

20 On the reactor vessel head replacement,  
21 there were really two pieces. One was the economics  
22 in looking at the costs of inspections between 2003  
23 and the end of the current license, 2009.

24 The other piece is intangible, which is  
25 with replacing the head we're in control of our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 destiny. With overhead and inspection techniques,  
2 one could envision going in and looking at the CRDM,  
3 identifying things that might be real, might not be,  
4 might be an artifice of the examination techniques  
5 and the impacts on outages. So, it really made  
6 sense from several standpoints to replace the head.  
7 And so we made that decision early on to do that.

8 MR. FORD: You're one of the stations,  
9 few stations that have come in front of us, who have  
10 actually gone through this head replacement. Just  
11 for our interest, what sort of quality control was  
12 applied for welding Alloy 52? Do you know that  
13 answer offhand

14 MR. MECREDY: I don't, but Gerry Geiken.

15 MR. GEIKEN: Yes. This is Gerry Geiken.

16 The head was fabricated at Babcock &  
17 Wilcox in Cambridge, Ontario.

18 MR. FORD: Okay.

19 MR. GEIKEN: Their own internal quality  
20 organization is very good. And we augmented that by  
21 multiple visits to the plant. We had our own NDE  
22 people providing some oversight to various critical  
23 activities. And we had a constant presence of our  
24 welding engineer during the entire fabrication  
25 process. So I would say we didn't necessarily rely

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the quality control measures that they could or  
2 would apply and use, but we tried to exercise some  
3 of our oversight. And I think the overall quality  
4 of the fabrication is excellent.

5 MR. FORD: True.

6 MR. MECREDY: The other advantage we had  
7 was with purchasing new control rod drive  
8 mechanisms. We were able to get those on site prior  
9 to the outage and complete the welding of those onto  
10 the new head outside, you know prior to the outage.  
11 So we had the advantage of more accessible  
12 environment and really a better environment for  
13 people working on it, inspections oversight. And so  
14 that was done. And, of course, it was facilitated  
15 by the size of our head, being able to go in through  
16 the equipment hatch.

17 MR. WROBEL: The other major issue that  
18 we looked at was on the lower reactor vessel head  
19 inspection. This detail of the penetration, as you  
20 can see, the paint and weld pad, everything was in  
21 excellent condition. There was no leakage, no  
22 indication of leakage through the nozzles, boric  
23 acid and, again, it came out as good as we would  
24 expected on the bottom head.

25 MR. ROSEN: You know, that's not the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dialogue I would have given, given this picture. I  
2 would have said there was some indication or leakage  
3 from it. Or what am I looking at when I look right  
4 on top of that nozzle?

5 MR. GEIKEN: I think it's the paint.

6 MR. WROBEL: Right there?

7 MR. ROSEN: Go a little to your left.  
8 Put the dot back on. Yes, what's that stain there?

9 MR. WROBEL: Paint.

10 MR. ROSEN: And that's paint also above  
11 that? There's no --

12 MR. GEIKEN: It's zinc-rich paint. It's  
13 painted with a zinc-rich Carbozinc-11. They got a  
14 little sloppy and they got some of it onto the  
15 penetration.

16 MR. ROSEN: Okay.

17 MR. WROBEL: We'll have a better picture  
18 for the next presentation.

19 MR. FORD: Given the observations at  
20 South Texas, you could be awkwardly minded, if you  
21 like, and say here you just painted over the annulus  
22 with paint and there's boric acid on top of that.  
23 Is that a reasonable question?

24 MR. WROBEL: That would not be allowed.

25 No.

1 MR. FORD: You mean it wouldn't be  
2 allowed to have occurred or not a good --

3 MR. WROBEL: You can't cover up  
4 something like that. Now if we found any -- we  
5 looked real well for boric acid there, because we  
6 knew what happened out at South Texas. So we really  
7 wanted to know if there was anything. We were  
8 prepared to make repairs, if necessary. But we  
9 didn't find anything to make repairs to.

10 I'm not sure exactly the frequency at  
11 which we'll be inspecting these in the future. I  
12 think it's very outage.

13 MR. GEIKEN: Every outage.

14 MR. WROBEL: We'll be looking. So next  
15 year's picture is really going to look good.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

17 MR. WROBEL: The other issue that is a  
18 more recent issue that came up is in our containment  
19 sump, what we call our B sump. That's a depiction  
20 of what it looks like. The sump is -- a wire mesh  
21 screen. And the RHR entrance with a bell mouth  
22 entrance piping at the bottom. And we did do an  
23 inspection of that this outage, and we did find  
24 things. We did find some minor bypass flow issues.  
25 We did find some openings that were greater than the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 size of the mesh, the 3/16" by 9/16'.

2 Foreign materials we found dried boric  
3 acid in the bottom of the sump where there had been  
4 leakage in the past and then just evaporated. And  
5 that was not of any safety significance.

6 We did find some metal parts in there,  
7 clamps a file. And less than 6 ounces of some other  
8 foreign material.

9 So there was some foreign material in  
10 the bottom of the sump. We had a detailed NRC  
11 inspection that concluded last week. Preliminary  
12 findings are that we had 2 non-cited green  
13 violations of our corrective action program as a  
14 result of that inspection.

15 MR. ROSEN: Because of the materials  
16 found in the sump or --

17 MR. WROBEL: One was materials found in  
18 the sump and one was the bypass flow. If you want  
19 to point to the next picture. That's the mesh size  
20 that it was supposed to be.

21 MR. ROSEN: Yes.

22 MR. WROBEL: That's an opening that  
23 clearly is larger than that. That's inside the sump  
24 underneath the floor.

25 So, next picture is our repair as well

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as the plates over that. So there are no more  
2 openings greater than that mesh size. So you can  
3 see that less than a day later that was done. So  
4 there were several openings like that that were  
5 found.

6 The NRC, at least preliminary indication  
7 from the inspection, was that they were very low  
8 safety significance, but we did get two non-cited  
9 green violations. Preliminary.

10 MR. LEITCH: Absent that bypassing, can  
11 you make any comment on the adequacy of the screens  
12 that do exist? In other words, have you revised  
13 your operating procedures or is there ongoing  
14 analysis to confirm that?

15 MR. WROBEL: Yes, we did a detailed  
16 analysis in accordance with, I believe, it's Reg  
17 Guide 182, Rev 2 or 3 when we did a steam generator  
18 replacement in 1996. We did a transport analysis  
19 with the current state of the art then, which I  
20 think still is pretty close to what we are now given  
21 that it's still evolving. And we did analysis of  
22 the screen as it was supposed to be, and it did  
23 indicate that there would be some head loss. I think  
24 we modified the bottom of the fibrous insulation  
25 from reflective metal insulation to a type of more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fibrous insulation that insulated better. We did  
2 put catchers up by the steam generator so that it  
3 wouldn't get into the sump, but then we also did an  
4 analysis of what the transport analysis would be to  
5 the sump, how much head loss there would be, did all  
6 the NPSH calculations for our HR. And, obviously,  
7 we found that there is margin there.

8 The latest analysis was did was in '96,  
9 to my recollection, unless somebody can remember.

10 MR. ROSEN: That's a curious discussion,  
11 George. You say you went from reflective metal  
12 insulation to a more fibrous insulation?

13 MR. WROBEL: In that one, in the bottom  
14 of the steam generators. There's more efficiency.  
15 That reflective metal was just allowing too much  
16 heat out. But we did compensate for that by putting  
17 a fibrous debris screen right underneath the steam  
18 generators, right in that vicinity. So we didn't  
19 just willy-nilly change it. We thought about it,  
20 changed it out with a better insulating properties,  
21 but we didn't compensate for it by putting the  
22 screens down underneath the generators.

23 MR. LEITCH: Well, I guess my question,  
24 it seems to me that there's some kind of an NRC  
25 correspondence to all PWR licensees. I don't know if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's a generic letter or just what the document is,  
2 that requires a response. And I guess what I'm  
3 saying is have you responded to that, and if so, how  
4 did you respond.

5 MR. WILSON: This is David Wilson, RG&E.

6 MR. WROBEL: The responder will respond.

7 MR. WILSON: In fact, these inspections  
8 that identify the bypass flows were done in  
9 accordance to our response. The Bulletin 2003-01  
10 requires to look at certain attributes and try and  
11 determine what we could do right now to reduce the  
12 risk consequences of screen fouling. And there were  
13 several things that we committed to doing, including  
14 these inspections that we are in fact doing right  
15 now. They're not all required to be done at this  
16 instant.

17 One of the Bulletin key items was to  
18 modify your operating procedure such that perhaps  
19 you would refill your RWIC or add more water volume  
20 to containment. Within our current licensing basis  
21 and accident analysis that would be something that  
22 would not be allowed under 50.59. In fact, may have  
23 more detrimental effects than positive effects.

24 But what we committed to in that  
25 Bulletin response, and what we are doing, is working

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with the industry, with particularly the  
2 Westinghouse Owners Group in order to analyze and  
3 evaluate the consequences and possibilities of  
4 adding more water or reducing ECCS flow, or securing  
5 a train of spray if you didn't reach a certain  
6 volume in order to delay the injection times to  
7 minimize the sump volume and increase the transport  
8 times.

9 All that being said, the jury's still  
10 out from an analysis standpoint. We're  
11 participating. And we committed to in our Bulletin  
12 response was that we would follow through. And once  
13 the science is done, we would evaluate whether or  
14 not we can actually execute those changes. Because  
15 just because it comes out of a Westinghouse Owners  
16 Group or some generic emergency response guidelines  
17 does not necessarily mean it's still appropriate for  
18 your facility. You still have to do individual.

19 The other things that we looked at were  
20 debris in containment. Not just how to filter the  
21 debris out, but what the debris source terms.

22 We took detailed high resolution videos  
23 and walk downs and measurements of the insulation  
24 sources for the loop areas and for those  
25 connections.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We don't know necessarily what the  
2 generic letter that's going to come out will look  
3 like with respect to what we have to protect  
4 against. There's issues right now with water  
5 chemistry. There's issues with flocculents and  
6 things like that.

7                   So our thrust this outage was to reduce  
8 the risk. And the things we could do to reduce the  
9 risk that were most appropriate were evaluate and  
10 then, unfortunately in our case, repair our screens  
11 to be consistent with our design basis and to remove  
12 debris.

13                   And the debris sources that we found  
14 that were removable, we found paper tags. We made  
15 significant and major modifications to our  
16 procedures for closing out containment and for  
17 modifying our debris control as we escalated the  
18 modes from a refueling mode up towards power  
19 operation.

20                   And beyond that, you know, it's business  
21 as usual. We've got the commitment letters in and  
22 we're following through on them.

23                   CHAIRMAN BONACA: What's the volume of  
24 your RWST?

25                   MR. WILSON: About 300,000 gallons.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WROBEL: We might as well talk a  
2 little bit about the license renewal application  
3 now, since we're mostly done with the presentation.

4 The preparation, we did not have too  
5 many contractors. We primarily did the application  
6 in-house. We have matrixed staff, everybody  
7 participated in here except me. Because I worked  
8 part time on license renewal and part time on other  
9 jobs, like looking through sumps.

10 We did use specialty contractors where  
11 we needed to. We had several areas that we didn't  
12 have the expertise in-house to do the work, so we  
13 had Framatome, for example, do some analyses.  
14 Westinghouse did analyses. And we did not a fatigue  
15 monitoring program, and we had a contractor come in  
16 and install, initiate a fatigue monitoring program  
17 for us which turned out to have great results.

18 So, we do 95-10, Standard Replant  
19 format. We were the third plant to do that. And, of  
20 course, all three plants came pretty closely after  
21 each other, so there was not much opportunity for  
22 lessons learned. But we did use the Standard  
23 Replant format.

24 One of the bigger portions of our  
25 application, as you might have seen, is the GALL

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 3.x-2 tables. Those are tables that are  
2 material/environment combinations, programs that are  
3 not consistent with the GALL. For the most part, or  
4 almost completely, they were additional  
5 material/environment combinations that were not in  
6 the GALL, possibly due to the fact that the lessons  
7 learned were from problems and if there were  
8 material/environment combinations that had no  
9 problems, then they wouldn't be in the GALL. So we  
10 ended up putting them in a 3.x-2 table. And that  
11 added many pages to our application.

12 Also, the use of systems. When we had a  
13 material/environment combination in one pipe system  
14 and it wasn't in the GALL, then we put it in a 3.x-2  
15 table, even though we could have gone to another  
16 system, FECCS system or something, but we found it  
17 in the CBCS, so that's why we put it in that format.

18 We did all the interim staff guidance  
19 that were available at the time. We addressed those  
20 in the application. And all the interim staff  
21 guidance documents that were out.

22 Subsequent to that we appear to have  
23 answered to in RAI space, so I believe we're up to  
24 date on all of our interim staff guidance documents.

25 We do have some scoping open items, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we'll be talking about that when the NRC makes their  
2 presentation.

3 MR. LEITCH: Without getting into the  
4 details of those open items, I guess I had the  
5 impression that a number of these open items had  
6 somewhat more substance and still somewhat more  
7 areas of disagreement than we normally see at this  
8 stage in the process.

9 I mean, frequently at this stage the  
10 staff comes and tells us well there's so many open  
11 items, but they're all basically resolved. We're  
12 awaiting formal documentation of the resolution and  
13 so forth. It seems like some of these, although  
14 there are only eight, but I think there are about 5  
15 or 6 that seem to me to represent some significant  
16 areas of disagreement. Is that a correct  
17 perception?

18 MR. WROBEL: I think when we go through  
19 that we'll find that we're significantly reduced  
20 from 8 to possibly 1 by now.

21 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

22 MR. WROBEL: But let me go over them  
23 when Russ goes through them.

24 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Fine. Yes, that's  
25 good.

1 MR. WROBEL: We'll be available for  
2 comment also.

3 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

4 MR. WROBEL: In case you want to ask us  
5 what we think of them.

6 Selected TLAAs. I just wanted to provide  
7 a few of them that I thought were more interesting.  
8 If you have any questions on the rest of them,  
9 that's fine.

10 Pressurized thermal shock, we thought  
11 that would be an important issue. We did analyze the  
12 Ginna reactive vessel with outline materials, both  
13 the plate and the weld out to the end of the  
14 extended period of operation. You can see that the  
15  $RT_{PTS}$  value where the beltline is 270.6, which is  
16 significantly below 300. We've done the analysis  
17 out to 80 years, and still quite a bit below 300  
18 degrees. And the plates, you can see there's a lot  
19 of margin over there.

20 This is one of the open items that staff  
21 is independently reviewing. I think they'll be done  
22 relatively soon and, hopefully, agree with us.

23 MR. ROSEN: To what do you attribute all  
24 that margin, given this is an old plant and the  
25 technology for building vessels was somewhat less

1 mature at the time?

2 MR. WROBEL: Yes. I think we got a  
3 really good vessel from B&W. It was all fabricated  
4 at the -- where was? Mount Vernon, Indiana  
5 facility. It wasn't moved around. A lot of the B&W  
6 vessels back then were moved from one place to  
7 another.

8 And I think the cooper and nickel  
9 content that we had is relatively low, .25 and .36  
10 percent. So we were able to -- so those values  
11 indicated relatively low -- fluence isn't  
12 particularly high either, so that helps us out.

13 MR. ROSEN: And why is the fluence low?

14 MR. WROBEL: We went to a low leakage  
15 back in the mid-'80s, I believe. And we've  
16 maintained that since that time.

17 We did the analysis out to, I believe,  
18 54 EFPY just in case there might be an upgrade.  
19 Certainly 80 percent used to be the standard  
20 capacity factor, but it certainly isn't anymore.  
21 More like 95 percent now. So rather than 48, we  
22 went out to 54 EFPY with these analyses. And so it  
23 seems to be holding true.

24 MR. ROSEN: So 54 would represent a 90  
25 percent capacity factor averaged over the life of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the vessel?

2 MR. HERRICK: That's correct. Now, say,  
3 if we do an upgrade, that will bump that up a little  
4 bit. So then it might be 85 percent with an upgrade  
5 or something. And, obviously, if we have to redo the  
6 calculation with a higher fluence rate, then we'll  
7 do that also. But it looks like we have significant  
8 amount of margin.

9 Also it helped that we had credible  
10 surveillance data. If we had used simply the Reg  
11 Guide 199 Revision 1.1, the generic data, I think  
12 that our PBS value is about 290. But having  
13 credible surveillance data got it 270.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: You have an open item  
15 on the specimen, right?

16 MR. HERRICK: That's right. But it's  
17 not related to the analysis, it's related to when we  
18 test it.

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Right.

20 MR. HERRICK: We'll go over that later.

21 MR. WROBEL: Factor toughness of the  
22 reactor vessel, we have taken four capsules out, we  
23 have two left to go. Some of the capsule Charpy V-  
24 notch data would indicate that our upper shelf  
25 energy was approaching or could be below 50 foot

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pounds. So rather than the next time we do the test  
2 to find out that maybe it actually is below 50, we  
3 decided we would contract with the reactive vessel  
4 manufacturer and do a fracture mechanics, a detailed  
5 fracture mechanics evaluation called equivalent  
6 margins analysis, which is an alternative to the  
7 code analysis for upper shelf energy. We had that  
8 performed for this reactor vessel for license  
9 renewal out to 54 EFPY. And there's significant  
10 margin under Section XI Appendix K. If you want more  
11 details on that, Gerry will answer them. But there  
12 is significant margin in the fracture toughness of  
13 the reactor vessel from an upper shelf energy  
14 standpoint.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

16 MR. WROBEL: But we did use that, but  
17 equivalent margins analysis.

18 MR. FORD: And that question will also  
19 be covered later and the whole question of us of the  
20 specimens.

21 MR. WROBEL: Yes.

22 MR. GEIKEN: George, you ought to pull  
23 out that we don't know that the upper shelf energy  
24 is below 50.

25 MR. WROBEL: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. GEIKEN: The last capsule we tested,  
2 the Chaprys came in at 55. And they seemed to  
3 plateau out at 55. The last three capsules, the  
4 upper shelf energy was nearly the same balance  
5 between 52 and 55.

6 MR. WROBEL: Right. Yes. So we don't  
7 know if it'll be below 50, but we did the analysis  
8 just in case.

9 MR. FORD: But it's fair to say that  
10 these are two open items which have not been  
11 secured?

12 MR. WROBEL: As far as I know, this one  
13 is closed. There's nothing open on this one.

14 MR. ARRIGHI: I'm sorry, which open item  
15 was it?

16 MR. WROBEL: Fracture toughness  
17 equivalent margins analysis. Hopefully, that's an  
18 open item.

19 MR. ARRIGHI: When I get there, we'll  
20 address it.

21 MR. WROBEL: Gerry said it's not.

22 MR. GEIKEN: No, shelf energy is closed.

23 MR. WROBEL: The other major TLAA that  
24 we did is we did the T calculations for all of the  
25 RCS and put the details. We did do these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 calculation in accordance with the ISG. At 15, it  
2 talks about the environmental effects. We did use  
3 15.35 for stainless steel and 2.53 for carbon steel.  
4 We did these for 60 years, and you can see that all  
5 the values are quite a bit below 1.0, even for 60  
6 years including maximum environmental effects. So we  
7 did surge line, nozzle, charging nozzle; we did all  
8 those detailed analyses because of the fatigue  
9 monitoring program that we had installed. And did  
10 all the calculations.

11 So there's no open items on fatigue of  
12 the RCS.

13 In terms of programs, we have 33 aging  
14 management programs that we took credit for; 20 of  
15 them were consistent with the GALL. I'm sure we'll  
16 hear more about that.

17 Twenty were consistent with the GALL.  
18 Ten were consistent with exceptions. Of those 10,  
19 probably 5 or 6 the exceptions were quite minor.  
20 They were possibly a different addition of a  
21 reference, but there were no major exceptions taken  
22 through the vast majority of the programs that took  
23 exception to the GALL.

24 All the exceptions were discussed with  
25 the NRC staff. We have plant specific operating

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 experience and results, and I don't believe there's  
2 any open items left on programs that are consistent  
3 with GALL. They've been reviewed several times and  
4 all the differences are justified.

5 We did have 3 plant specific programs  
6 that were not GALL programs, mentioned earlier. The  
7 periodic surveillance maintenance program, thimble  
8 tube inspection program and systems monitoring  
9 program. Those are programs we already had in place.  
10 They weren't in the GALL, but we do take credit for  
11 those for aging management so we described those in  
12 our application.

13 The vast majority of programs we already  
14 had. We either made minor enhancements to them; 6  
15 programs that we enhanced. A lot of it was like the  
16 boric acid corrosion program, which we had a boric  
17 acid corrosion program but it didn't extend to the  
18 same level that the current guidance would have you  
19 go to. So we added not just reactive cooling system  
20 in the vicinity of coolant leaks, but anything --  
21 but any carbon steel that could get leaked on by  
22 boric acid, whether it's in the CVCS line, whether  
23 it's electrical conduit, whatever it is that could  
24 leak onto boric -- boric acid could leak onto carbon  
25 steel is covered on our current boric acid program.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ROSEN: Does it include, for  
2 instance, the pressurizer nozzles? Pressurizer  
3 heater?

4 MR. WROBEL: Yes. Yes. I mean, if it  
5 can leak from there, then it's covered.

6 MR. ROSEN: And you looked at the  
7 pressurizer heater, the bottom of the pressurizer?

8 MR. WROBEL: I don't know if we've  
9 looked at -- did we look at that?

10 MR. GEIKEN: Yes, we looked on this  
11 outage. We took the insulation off.

12 MR. ROSEN: Pardon me? Again?

13 MR. GEIKEN: Sorry. I'm Gerry Geiken.

14 We did ISI examinations this outage on  
15 the pressurizer surge nozzle.

16 MR. WROBEL: Oh, that's right.

17 MR. GEIKEN: And we uncovered the bottom  
18 head, a significant portion of it.

19 MR. ROSEN: You covered the bottom head,  
20 is that what you said?

21 MR. GEIKEN: We uncovered.

22 MR. ROSEN: Okay. And you looked at the  
23 bottom head, you looked at the pressurizer heater?

24 MR. GEIKEN: We looked at -- yes. The  
25 bottom head is where the pressurizer heaters

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 penetrate. And we looked all around there. Yes.

2 We don't have any Inconel 82/182 welds  
3 in our pressurizer. So if the issue is primary  
4 water stress corrosion cracking, which I suspect  
5 you're thinking of, what you may be thinking of, we  
6 don't have that. All our pressurizer penetrations  
7 are stainless steel, welded with stainless steel  
8 weld metal.

9 MR. WROBEL: We did generate four new  
10 programs that we didn't have before. We have a  
11 fatigue monitoring program, cable condition  
12 monitoring program.

13 We did make a commitment to look at  
14 reactor vessel internals in the future and to try to  
15 look at finer cracks than we have currently  
16 expertise to do that. And we're committed to do  
17 that by 2009 or have a program sent in, I believe,  
18 by 2007 and approved by the NRC. We don't feel that  
19 that's going to be a major issue.

20 Reactive vessel head penetration, we  
21 were looking and we now have a formal program. It  
22 was committed to more from the current Bulletins  
23 than from license renewal, but the two intersected  
24 and we took credit for those.

25 MR. LEITCH: I have a numbers question,

1 I guess. I am not sure if this should go to the  
2 licensee or the staff. But in an inspection report  
3 the staff said they looked at 28 programs of 33 that  
4 the licensee claimed were consistent with GALL.

5 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. This is Russ  
6 Arrighi.

7 During our aging management program  
8 audit we did look at 28 of the 33. For those other  
9 2 programs there were some differences. And in the  
10 application the licensee had the ten attributes for  
11 that program. And that was reviewed in-house by the  
12 staff.

13 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

14 MR. ARRIGHI: So when we said we  
15 reviewed those 28, Mr. Wrobel is correct, there were  
16 only 3 that are plant specific, but the wording on  
17 that may have been misleading in the report. Again,  
18 any attribute that was different than GALL was  
19 reviewed in headquarters by the staff.

20 MR. LEITCH: Now, I'm still not sure I  
21 understand. I guess my question is going into this  
22 inspection we thought that 28 programs were  
23 consistent with GALL and coming out of the  
24 inspection we found that there were only 20  
25 consistent with GALL. Is that correct or am I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 missing the point here?

2 MR. ARRIGHI: When I put the report  
3 together, looking at the spent fuel pool neutron  
4 absorber program, Ginna's program, it covers the ten  
5 attributes but it doesn't match the attributes  
6 explicitly. So when I was reviewing it, I didn't  
7 consider that a GALL program when actually, already  
8 when I sit back and reevaluate it and talking with  
9 George, you know, for consistency I should probably  
10 should have put that that program is a GALL program  
11 and even though they have the 10 attributes  
12 discussed in the application, I should have said  
13 that it wasn't a plant specific program, it was a  
14 GALL program. However, that program was viewed by  
15 the staff, because again the attributes were  
16 included in the application. And in the in-house  
17 the NRC staff could review that here because the  
18 applicant, again, the information regarding the  
19 attributes in the license renewal application. And  
20 that's the same for the other programs also.

21 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

22 MR. FORD: I have a more technical  
23 question. I must admit, reading through the  
24 application and the SCR I was a good deal frustrated  
25 by the lack of detail, factual detail.

1 For instance, in your fuel oil  
2 chemistry, the AMP, you are not going to put any  
3 biocide or corrosion inhibitors to protect the  
4 internals of that tank. No justification is given  
5 it, apart from the fact that you haven't seen MIC or  
6 any other corrosion event there.

7 There are a few questions asked by the  
8 staff regarding to your thimble tube AMP. And all  
9 the aspects of the justifications for the one time  
10 inspection. And, unfortunately, in both the SER and  
11 the application the justifications for the actions  
12 that are going to be taken, are supposed to be taken  
13 are all verbal. There is no data to support your  
14 assertions.

15 Can you give us a feeling as to the  
16 extent of the actual engineering data driven  
17 discussions that went on between your organization  
18 and the NRC to back up those?

19 MR. WROBEL: Yes. The actual data --

20 MR. FORD: Were the graphs people were  
21 looking at, or the data meet your justifications?

22 MR. WROBEL: I think a lot of it was  
23 operating experience. We did rely heavily on  
24 operating experience. Some of it we did rely on  
25 science.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   A lot of the information that was  
2 actually useful in documentation is in what we call  
3 our program basis documents. Program basis  
4 documents are where were we implement all the  
5 programs. Those were available to the staff for  
6 detailed review, but they did not go into the  
7 application. They're all about 30 pages long, have  
8 all the procedures that implement the programs and a  
9 lot more of the operating experience and history.

10                   MR. FORD: So they did do more than  
11 Appendix B, the AMPs?

12                   MR. WROBEL: Oh, my goodness, yes. I  
13 mean, everyone of those programs has a 30 pages  
14 program basis document behind it.

15                   MR. FORD: And there's data,  
16 extrapolations of data?

17                   MR. WROBEL: Yes.

18                   MR. FORD: Uncertainties, all of these  
19 are what happens if?

20                   MR. ELLIOT: Barry Elliot.

21                   I thought restricted at thimble 2?

22                   MR. WROBEL: Yes.

23                   MR. ELLIOT: They had done a whole lot  
24 of inspections of the thimble 2 for wear. And they  
25 have data from the early '90s on. And they based

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their inspections based on that actual data from  
2 inspections on the thimble 2. So they actually have  
3 data there from their previous inspections, which  
4 they base their inspection program for the thimble  
5 2. So the guide tube, that was an issue  
6 that we brought up that they had originally had a  
7 mitigation program, but no monitoring program. And  
8 we've discussed that with them with great detail,  
9 and you can see in our SER. And it's still open,  
10 but they have proposed a monitoring program now.

11 MR. FORD: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I had some similar  
13 questions, because for example I ask them now.  
14 Above ground carbon steel tanks says that you will  
15 perform a one time inspection on the reactor makeup  
16 water tank. It doesn't say what inspection you're  
17 going to perform. I would like to know is it  
18 automatic inspection, visual?

19 MR. WROBEL: Gerry's got the details on  
20 that.

21 MR. GEIKEN: This is Gerry Geiken. I  
22 can offer the details on that.

23 We've already done that inspection. We  
24 drained the tank completely. Did a 100 percent  
25 visual inspection of the painted interior of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 vessel and an ultrasonic examination of the bottom,  
2 flat bottom of the tank.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. And you found?

4 MR. GEIKEN: We found no evidence of  
5 degradation whatsoever.

6 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. All right.

7 MR. FORD: I can understand your  
8 rational. Let me give you a hypothesis and then you  
9 shoot it down.

10 You find no corrosion in your fuel  
11 tanks, presumably because your fuel supplier has met  
12 certain specification limits. Assume that you get a  
13 bad lot and you get an attack of bacterial-assisted  
14 corrosion, induced corrosion, that can go extremely  
15 fast locally.

16 Now the way you've justified the one  
17 time inspection, which I believe is what the fuel  
18 oil tank you've got because you haven't seen any  
19 corrosion, what happens if next year you get this  
20 rapid corrosion? You've got no process apart from I  
21 understand it a ten year inspection periodicity for  
22 that tank. You're not going to catch that.

23 And then the follow question is what the  
24 consequences?

25 MR. GEIKEN: Well, actually our diesel

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fuel oil, every batch is tested by various ASTM  
2 methods.

3 MR. FORD: Okay.

4 MR. GEIKEN: As in accordance with the  
5 requirements of the GALL program.

6 MR. FORD: Yes.

7 MR. GEIKEN: Prior to being delivered to  
8 the site and prior to being dumped into the tanks,  
9 or prior to the tanks being filled.

10 In addition, I think our frequencies now  
11 for internal inspections.

12 MR. WROBEL: Nine years.

13 MR. GEIKEN: They're still every 9  
14 years.

15 We just went into them this outage and  
16 they're pristine. But in terms of the potential for  
17 getting a bad batch, we're as proactive as we feel  
18 we can be in terms of inspecting every load of fuel  
19 oil. And we do multiple inspections. We inspect  
20 not only before the tanks are filled, but after  
21 they're filled from three locations. We follow all  
22 the guidance that's in the GALL, and I think we've  
23 committed to some additional particulate testing.

24 But your concern is biocides?

25 MR. FORD: Well, biocides, corrosion

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inhibitors. I'm just bringing up those as for  
2 instances.

3 My concern is that not just your  
4 stations, all the previous stations we've had  
5 exactly the same discussion about what is your  
6 justification for a one time inspection for a  
7 possibly nonmelior degradation mechanism. So you  
8 find no corrosion of degradation today? And that's  
9 20 years into the process. But what's to say that  
10 you're not going to have a MIC problem or pitting  
11 problem because you don't have inhibitors or don't  
12 have biocides in next year?

13 MR. GEIKEN: Well, actually --

14 MR. FORD: And you haven't done your  
15 consequence analysis, but that's what you told me in  
16 the very beginning.

17 MR. GEIKEN: Actually, the diesel fuel  
18 oil testing program and the internal inspections of  
19 the diesel fuel oil tanks, they're not one time. I  
20 mean, they're periodic.

21 MR. FORD: Okay.

22 MR. GEIKEN: So we've been into the  
23 diesel fuel oil tanks once every outage, up to 1990  
24 -- what was it, George?

25 MR. WROBEL: '92.

1 MR. GEIKEN: '92. So for 20 some years  
2 we had a history of data there that showed that  
3 there was no internal degradation of the vessels.  
4 And we've done the first 9 year inspection since  
5 then this outage, and found the same thing.

6 MR. FORD: I guess I'm excessively  
7 susceptible to this having worked in this industry  
8 in the cracking side. And you can bet your bottom  
9 dollar, tomorrow figuratively speaking you're going  
10 to have an "oh, heck" hitting you, which you never  
11 realized you were going to happen, because you've  
12 had a good 20 years experience beforehand. That's  
13 what I'm pushing to.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Just operating  
15 experience is not, by itself, a good --

16 MR. FORD: A good measure necessarily.

17 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Necessarily a good  
18 project for the next 20 years when you get from 40  
19 to 60. And, of course, it's uncharted territory.  
20 I mean, nobody's gone that far.

21 On the other hand, I think that some of  
22 the issues for the tank, you would measure leakage  
23 from it before you get to the point where you have  
24 no sufficient inventory, I would suspect. I mean,  
25 and I will expect that you would have a corrective

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 action program taking -- because, I mean, you have  
2 spec restrictions of those tanks. And you have the  
3 fuel levels that you have maintain, right?

4 MR. WROBEL: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And so you would have  
6 to have -- I mean, if you get below a certain level  
7 and you cannot maintain it, you have to shutdown the  
8 plant and fix it.

9 MR. ROSEN: Well, it's also true I  
10 think, Mario, that you wouldn't expect to have both  
11 tanks leak at the same time.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Absolutely. So you  
13 have a number of --

14 MR. FORD: Okay, guys. But you're making  
15 the answer for them, and I asked them have you a  
16 done a consequences?

17 CHAIRMAN BONACA: No, no. I think there  
18 are issues where this is very significant because  
19 you have much less margin. Here is an example where  
20 you do have more margin than most cases, because you  
21 have two and you do have probably small leakage in  
22 the beginning. If that is to happen, you probably  
23 can monitor it.

24 But I agree with you, the issue in  
25 general, it's a significant issue for the whole

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 industry, making these projections based on past  
2 experience.

3 I had some other questions here. One I  
4 would like to ask is about your neutron noise  
5 monitoring system. Now, that's a system that is in  
6 place to detect and monitor significant loss of  
7 axial preload and core support barrel -- we just  
8 heard from another applicant for license renewal,  
9 that program was very significant on their site to  
10 identify in time thermal shield problems. They  
11 fixed those problems. And they're using it to  
12 prevent further problems to develop.

13 I see that you're not including this  
14 program in your license renewal or crediting the  
15 program for it?

16 MR. WROBEL: No, we did not credit that  
17 program for license renewal the way we do our 10  
18 year ISI and our internals. We haven't really had  
19 any comparable issues --

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: But you still have  
21 this program implemented on site?

22 MR. WROBEL: I don't believe there is a  
23 program on site.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Well, it's called  
25 neutron noise monitoring.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WROBEL: Neutron noise monitoring.

2 No, we don't.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: D2-120.

4 MR. WROBEL: Yes, we don't have that. I  
5 think the application should have said that that's  
6 the name of the program but we don't have it and we  
7 don't credit it.

8 MR. ARRIGHI: This is Russ Arrighi the  
9 program manager.

10 In Ginna's application I think every  
11 GALL program, I think the applicant had a bullet  
12 that there is such a program. But in Ginna's case,  
13 even though they mention the program, they said it's  
14 not utilized at Ginna. So it's essentially a place  
15 holder.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. So you do not  
17 have it at all. I misunderstood.

18 MR. WROBEL: Sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I thought that still  
20 you had the program and I just -- all right. So you  
21 do not have that program?

22 MR. WROBEL: We don't have a program  
23 like that.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. And you do have  
25 a thermal shield?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WROBEL: Yes, and it's in scope.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Yes, I imagine  
3 so.

4 Several more questions I wanted to ask  
5 at this stage.

6 Okay. A couple of questions for my  
7 consultant that performed the review here and sent  
8 some comments out. One is relating to the special  
9 blackout and the confidence that we have that based  
10 on the experience -- I think we'll hear from that  
11 from the staff.

12 Fire protection. We noted that you do  
13 not include jockey pumps, for example, in scope.

14 MR. WROBEL: That's correct. That's one  
15 of the open items.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: That's right. And I  
17 just am trying to understand the logic. If I  
18 understand it, NFPA requires that you have jockey  
19 pumps. They maintain pressure, doesn't it?

20 MR. WROBEL: It recommends that you have  
21 them, it doesn't require it. We have a large  
22 pressure maintenance tank that we feel is enough --  
23 has enough of a size that we don't need really need  
24 the jockey pumps to maintain pressure. And, again,  
25 the intended function is for the pumps to operate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just fine without a jockey pump.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: But essentially the  
3 function of jockey pumps was the one of maintaining  
4 pressure maintenance function.

5 MR. WILSON: This is Dave Wilson,  
6 Rochester Gas & Electric.

7 Our configuration at Ginna Station,  
8 although includes a pump that could be considered as  
9 a jockey pump. It's actually a key filled pump for  
10 this tank. And the way the system is configured I  
11 think is unique in that the staff hasn't recognized,  
12 necessarily, how the physically plant is laid out.

13 What we have is a 15,000 gallon over  
14 pressure tank on the discharge of the pumps.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

16 MR. WILSON: And that tank maintains  
17 10,000 gallons of water which makes up for system  
18 leakage, or whatnot. The tank has a couple of ways  
19 of being refilled. One is this, what we call a  
20 booster pump which the staff calls a jockey pump.  
21 So if the tank gets a low level, it can be through  
22 that.

23 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

24 MR. WILSON: The other method is when we  
25 run our fire pumps for maintenance, particularly the

1 motor driven fire pump, we can refill the tank  
2 during that running evolution.

3 And so the position that the staff has  
4 taken is because we have something called a jockey  
5 pump, and we're reviewed against Branc Technical  
6 Position 951, which is the early fire protection  
7 requirements, they've said that because Branch  
8 Technical Position 951 endorses NFPA 20, then  
9 therefore we must endorse NFPA 20 even those  
10 configuration is not an NFPA 20 configuration.

11 So that the argument there is not that  
12 we need a pressure maintenance source. It's whether  
13 or not this key filled pump is in fact a jockey pump  
14 required by NFPA 20 --

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I understand now. But  
16 it's still an open issue?

17 MR. WILSON: It's still an open issue.

18 MR. HERRICK: We'll go into that.

19 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, we'll discuss it.

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Okay.

21 MR. LEITCH: While you're on the  
22 protection of fire protection -- go ahead, Mario,  
23 you finish.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: No, no. You go ahead.

25 MR. LEITCH: I guess I had a couple of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions about fire protection that related to the  
2 inspection of June 23 through 26th. Is the staff  
3 going to cover that? There were a couple of issues  
4 with respect to frequency of Halon testing,  
5 frequency of fire door inspections, frequency of  
6 hydrant inspections?

7 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. This is Arrighi, the  
8 program manager --

9 MR. LEITCH: There seem to be a lot of  
10 lacking areas there in the fire protection.

11 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, we have a slide on  
12 that. If you want, I'll discuss it now or later.

13 MR. LEITCH: No, we can wait until that  
14 part of the presentation.

15 Excuse me, Mario.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Oh, no. No problem.

17 The other question I had was relating to  
18 the all volatile water treatment building. That  
19 building houses the tech support center it says.

20 MR. WROBEL: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And it is not designed  
22 to resisted high winds or tornado/missiles. And the  
23 question that this consultant had when he reviewed  
24 was, in fact there is a requirement for the tech  
25 support center to be designed to withstand. So how

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do you have this tech spec? Do you have a backup --

2 MR. WILSON: This is Dave Wilson, RG&E.

3 The technical support center is an  
4 addition to our treatment water building and it was  
5 added to satisfy the requirements of NUREG-0737 in  
6 order to have an emergency planning space, so to  
7 speak, and we put a diesel in there for backup power  
8 and whatnot. There were no requirements to make  
9 that seismic or to tornado missile protect it. If  
10 we had a seismic event or a tornado event, then the  
11 control room is where we operate from.

12 So the building is non-seismic and  
13 nonsafety related. It is, however, important enough  
14 to be within the scope of license renewal.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I thought --

16 MR. WROBEL: I'm not sure where the  
17 qualification is. I know that it's required to be  
18 habitable, as habitable as a control room. But I  
19 don't believe that it need to be designed for  
20 external phenomena.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I thought the  
22 emergency plan required that, but maybe I'm wrong.

23 MR. WROBEL: Not to our knowledge.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So you have a tornado,  
25 you got a missile and it gets knock out, you have to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rely on the control room?

2 MR. WILSON: Yes, sir, that is correct.w  
3 We also have an EOF facility that's about 25 miles  
4 away that probably the same tornado wouldn't hit it.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. Okay. I'd like  
6 to find out more if it was a requirement, in fact,  
7 of the emergency plan or not.

8 MR. ARRIGHI: This is Russ Arrighi.

9 I don't have the answer for that right  
10 now, but I'll write it down and get back to you.

11 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Yes.

12 At this stage, I don't have anymore  
13 questions for you.

14 MR. WROBEL: I'm over my hour, so let me  
15 get through this last one.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

17 MR. WROBEL: We had 29 how level  
18 commitments. It was actually 31. There were 2 more  
19 that were added that were not the docket yet. So  
20 these were 29 that were dockets. There's actually  
21 31 commitments.

22 All of the commitments have been put  
23 into what we call our CAT system, our commitment  
24 action tracking system. They've all been assigned  
25 responsible personnel.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I would say about one-third to one-half  
2 of the commitments have already been completed. We  
3 plan on completing the vast majority of the  
4 commitments within the next couple of years. We're  
5 not going to wait until 2009.

6 Some of the commitments, and George can  
7 explain this even better, he sequenced them between  
8 now and 2009 to fall within a natural, like the  
9 tendon testing for 2005. We picked 2005 because  
10 that's when our next tendon testing test is  
11 scheduled. So, well, we're doing a lift off test  
12 that we would retention them at the same time. So  
13 that's why 2005 was picked. We probably could have  
14 done it out to 2007 or eight or nine.

15 So they're all assigned. They're  
16 internal documents. The fact that we had a matrixed  
17 organization, we don't really have a license renewal  
18 project person to turn over, because all the  
19 commitments were made in concert with the primarily  
20 engineering people that were assigned to the  
21 project. So there's not a major turnover process  
22 developed.

23 We do have a program to configuration  
24 management process that we're developing now. We're  
25 finding some of the ones that are not specifically

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assigned, but in detail. We have that process. We  
2 haven't written a procedure yet, but we're following  
3 them on an individual basis for now until we get the  
4 whole program integrated with our configuration  
5 management information system. And we don't -- you  
6 know, they're all being followed in CATS right now,  
7 so I don't see any real issues in long term  
8 maintenance and meeting all of our commitments.

9 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

10 MR. WROBEL: They're all scheduled with  
11 due dates.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And one last question.  
13 If you look at the SER on number of systems, the  
14 staff performed the review of the application,  
15 looked at your methodology for the defined  
16 components in scope. And then they identified cases  
17 where they disagree with you. They informed you,  
18 and you agreed that something else had to be added  
19 to the scope, there were a number of changes that  
20 were identified by the staff.

21 And, you know, we have to make a  
22 determination, as the staff has to do, that there is  
23 reasonable assurance that the items in scope have  
24 been identified. So I have the question also for  
25 the staff later on. You know, how based on the fact

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the staff, every time they perform the review  
2 of an LRA they find enough additional items that are  
3 in scope, and the applicant agrees. A thorough  
4 reviewer like yourself is left with the question in  
5 the mind, you know, do we have reasonable assurance  
6 to the fact that items in scope have been identified  
7 and proper programs have been implemented. And I  
8 would like to have your comments.

9 MR. WROBEL: Sure. We did a review again  
10 today looking at all the RAIs. We identified three  
11 items that were put into scope because of the staff  
12 review to date. Now, we have a couple of open  
13 items. Those were the house heating boiler in the  
14 screen house where it as a (a) (2) issue. We have a  
15 safe shutdown methodology that includes being able  
16 to safely shutdown without the screen house at all.  
17 We have a separate independent system that we can  
18 shut down. So we felt that even if the boiler  
19 degraded under (a) (2) and damaged the surface water  
20 system, that we could still safely shutdown.

21 What the staff pointed out in their  
22 review is that if the boiler degraded at the time  
23 that we were having recovery from a loss of coolant  
24 accident, that we would not be able to. So we  
25 hadn't put a house heating boiler degradation from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 aging management program together with the recovery  
2 from loss of coolant accident together. We didn't  
3 do the analysis. But I think we have a pretty low  
4 probably. From a strictly(a) (2) reading it would  
5 have fallen in scope. And so we decided we would  
6 put that in scope.

7 The other two we were disagreeing with  
8 the staff for a while. We currently agree that we  
9 would have spent fuel pool makeup from the refueling  
10 water storage tank. We had called that a  
11 hypothetical event, and we didn't feel a  
12 hypothetical event needed to be in scope. We  
13 decided it would be prudent to put that into scope.  
14 It was a very minor amount.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

16 MR. WROBEL: And the CCW, the rest of  
17 the component cooling water system, was really  
18 already being covered by component cooling water  
19 system program.

20 So those are the only three, other than  
21 some typographical errors. And I think that's what  
22 you're finding in the RAI responses is that there  
23 were some errors that were -- when we did our  
24 initial drawings that we sent in, and there were  
25 some errors when we were translating the magenta

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lines to cyan lines. There were some errors that  
2 were made there. And they were covered very quickly.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. In fact, don't  
4 worry about those. Because, I mean, I don't worry  
5 about where you have a logical disagreement. I  
6 mean, you may be right. And I think you have to  
7 present your perspective and position, and that's  
8 only fair.

9 I'm worrying more about where there, for  
10 example, the ends of pipe missed purely because  
11 somebody made a mistake and then they're excluded.  
12 And that's really where --

13 MR. WILSON: This is David Wilson,  
14 Rochester Gas & Electric.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

16 MR. WILSON: I'd like to field that for  
17 a second.

18 There's really two administration issues  
19 that happened, I think just because of the timing of  
20 our application.

21 The first one and most significant to  
22 your question or comment was when we originally had  
23 discussed with the staff how to prepare and package  
24 and transmit the application, we had prepared and  
25 packaged the application with a set of drawings that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 had the colors of magenta showing the scope. And  
2 about 5 days before we were scheduled to submit, the  
3 staff realized that magenta was not a color that  
4 they could use for the rank and file reviewers that  
5 would print out on a laser jet printer. It would  
6 show no color, and they wouldn't be able to see the  
7 boundary. So we had to go back very quickly and  
8 modify the drawings, which was a total redraw. And  
9 errors were introduced in that. Those errors were  
10 not reflected in the actual analysis that was in the  
11 application.

12 And we had had a discussion with the  
13 staff. And, in fact, put in our application that  
14 this was going to happen. Everybody recognized it.  
15 But we felt at the time because of the data in the  
16 application was correct and reflected the correct  
17 boundaries, that we would be able to quickly  
18 navigate and get through this. And, in fact, we  
19 did. It was not a significant issue with the issue.

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

21 MR. WILSON: The second administrative  
22 issue was purely GALL related, and that's in that we  
23 had to both educate ourselves and we had a staff  
24 learning how to use the GALL. And when we were  
25 translating components that were within the scope of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 license renewal -- see, the way it works, is a  
2 reviewer actually has a drawing in front of him. He  
3 can put his finger on a component and say tell me  
4 about valve 123. But nowhere in the application do  
5 you see valve 123. You see carbon steel components  
6 and spent fuel systems.

7 And so there's a lot of discussion that  
8 goes back and forth using the standard review plan  
9 on where is that component exactly in your  
10 application. And because we had to do this in a  
11 public venue, the discussion takes the form of an  
12 RAI.

13 But, you know, they're easy enough to  
14 work through. And, in fact, we found very few  
15 other than what was discussed omissions. And, of  
16 course, then the region comes in after the NRR staff  
17 is done and does their own review.

18 And so we understand what you're seeing,  
19 but we don't think it's representative of a  
20 technical problem.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I appreciate it.

22 MR. WROBEL: All right. That was our  
23 last slide.

24 You have station blackout covered in  
25 yours?

1 MR. ARRIGHI: I have a slide I'll put up  
2 if they need to see the boundaries.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: We're going to take a  
4 break. We are due for a break at 2:45. I don't know  
5 if we want to break now and then go through the  
6 staff presentation?

7 MR. ROSEN: I'd like a break.

8 CHAIRMAN BONACA: You would like a  
9 break? Let's take a short break. Let's together  
10 here again in ten minutes, would you say?

11 (Whereupon, at 2:00 p.m. a recess until  
12 2:15 p.m.)

13 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Let's get back  
14 into the session.

15 And now we have Mr. Arrighi that is  
16 going to summarize for us the SER.

17 MR. ARRIGHI: Good afternoon. My name is  
18 Russ Arrighi, I'm the project manager for the safety  
19 review of Ginna plant license renewal application.

20 With me is John Rowley. John assisted  
21 me in putting together the SER, and he's going to  
22 make the presentation on Section IV.

23 Also we have Mike Modes from Region 1.  
24 He's a team leader at the region 1 Inspection Teams,  
25 and he'll present the section on those inspections.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

2 MR. ARRIGHI: The application for Ginna  
3 was submitted in July 2002. Ginna is a two loop PWR  
4 located in Wayne County, New York. As one of the  
5 oldest PWRs, Ginna did go through the Systematic  
6 Evaluation process review by the NRC. The  
7 Systematic Program was utilized by the staff, the  
8 review that document. It was utilized during the  
9 scoping and screening methodology audit. Also the  
10 staff review of scoping and screening in  
11 headquarters and during the regional inspection.

12 That Systematic Evaluation Program, SER,  
13 was used in the same manner as the UFSAR in that it  
14 established the current licensing basis of the  
15 plant.

16 RG&E requested a 20 years extension for  
17 Ginna through September 18, '29. Ginna's the third  
18 plant that implemented the GALL process with Fort  
19 Calhoun being one and Robinson being the other.

20 The staff review of the license renewal  
21 application resulted in eight open items. Four of  
22 those open items are presently resolved. The  
23 applicant has provided responses for the other open  
24 items. Preliminary review indicates that two or  
25 three of those other open items can be resolved in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this preliminary review. So, that's why we did not  
2 show that they are resolved.

3 There are seven confirmatory items. One  
4 of the confirmatory items, and we'll talk about  
5 these, based on a response the applicant provided to  
6 one of the open items, this confirmatory item is now  
7 considered essentially an open item. And when I get  
8 there in the application, I'll talk about that in a  
9 little detail.

10 The LRA resulted in several components  
11 being in scope. The applicant mentioned those. The  
12 heating steam boiler, the component cooling water  
13 piping and the fueling water storage tank, the  
14 makeup supply to the spent fuel pool.

15 As the applicant stated, a lot of the  
16 other components that you indicated, we had a number  
17 of RAIs bringing stuff into scope. Our questions  
18 with the applicant, they said they are in our  
19 database on site. They are already in scope. But,  
20 again, we had to get that on the docket, so that's  
21 where a lot of those things are that made the review  
22 seem like there was a lot of additional components  
23 added.

24 MR. LEITCH: Russ, is that house heating  
25 boiler sometimes referred to as the screen house

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 steam heating boiler or is there a difference?

2 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, steam heating boiler.  
3 I think we might have used the term steam heating  
4 boiler in the SER. I don't know all the  
5 terminology.

6 MR. LEITCH: I thought I saw it a screen  
7 house.

8 MR. WROBEL: It's in the screen house.  
9 Yes, it is the same boiler. It's physically in the  
10 screen house.

11 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Same boiler.

12 MR. WROBEL: Yes.

13 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. ARRIGHI: Also, as result of the  
15 SER review there was one new aging management  
16 program added, and that was in the electrical  
17 section. It had to do with electrical cables not  
18 subject to EQ requirements, used an I&C circuit.  
19 That's using circuits with sensitive low voltage  
20 signals, and that program was added based on staff  
21 questions.

22 For Ginna, we did have 224 RAIs were  
23 issued at Ginna. This is a reduction from the  
24 previous applications, however it is still a high  
25 number. Again, due to the three GALL applications

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 being submitted relatively close together, the full  
2 benefits of GALL weren't realized.

3 MR. ROSEN: When is that going to wear  
4 out?

5 MR. ARRIGHI: Probably after at least  
6 Summer.

7 MR. ROSEN: Summer. We get another pass  
8 on Summer and then after Summer?

9 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, we'll see what  
10 happens then. But with the new process, we expect  
11 that the number of RAIs should be reduced.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. We review Summer  
13 in the winter. In mid-December. And then --

14 MR. ROSEN: To warm us up.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: -- that no open items,  
16 I understand.

17 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. Summer has no open  
18 or confirmatory items.

19 All right. The NRC audits and  
20 inspections, there were two inspections and two  
21 audits performed at Ginna. Each of these will be  
22 discussed as we progress through the presentation.

23 Structures and components. The staff  
24 review and audit determine that the applicant's  
25 scoping and screening methodology satisfied the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rule. During the audit, again, as a result of the  
2 audit we did bring in the screen house, the heating  
3 steam boiler in scope. And, again, the applicant  
4 discussed that based on the SEP seemed to have an  
5 alternate means to shut down the plant. Alternate  
6 service water supplied to the diesels.

7 Plant level scoping results. A staff  
8 review of this section determined there were no  
9 plant level systems, structures or commodities  
10 omitted from the application.

11 Scoping and screening of mechanical  
12 systems. Before I go a little further on this  
13 slide, I know a question normally arises regarding  
14 the pressurized spray head. The pressurizer spray  
15 head at Ginna is not in scope. The defuser portion.  
16 The spray nozzle --

17 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The spray nozzle is?

18 MR. ARRIGHI: -- is in scope and that's  
19 the pressure boundary portion.

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Now, is this normal?

21 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The nozzle is in  
23 scope?

24 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. The pressure  
25 boundary function of the spray is always in scope at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all applications.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

3 MR. ARRIGHI: Again, at Ginna and I  
4 think at the previous applications, the failure of  
5 the pressurizer spray head wouldn't prevent the  
6 safety accomplish to depressurize the plant. As part  
7 of Ginna's current licensing basis, they rely on an  
8 alternate means to depressurize a plant for fire  
9 protection safe shutdown analysis. And the way they  
10 depressurize would be through their PORVs. Again,  
11 normal plant operation, they would use the  
12 pressurizer. And, again, any indication that they  
13 had a problem with the pressurizer function, again,  
14 normal plant operations the operators would be aware  
15 of it, it would go in their corrective action  
16 process and they would fix it. But for the purpose  
17 of license renewal, again, the current licensing  
18 basis to depressurize during a cool down is the  
19 PORVs.

20 Okay. Section 2.3 Scoping and --

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Could you go back to  
22 that? This is for the fire, right?

23 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. For the fire  
24 protection safe shutdown analysis.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ARRIGHI: They rely on the PROVs.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The PROV.

3 MR. ARRIGHI: Okay.

4 MR. LEITCH: I guess there's one issue  
5 that I find just a little confusing in the SER in  
6 page 1-10 there's a statement made that redundancy  
7 is not an adequate basis in itself to exclude a  
8 system from the aging management review. And I  
9 guess --

10 MR. ARRIGHI: If the current licensing  
11 basis specifies it be redundant equipment, then all  
12 that equipment if it's part of the CLB, would need  
13 to be in scope. Just because there are other  
14 components that can perform the same function, those  
15 types of components, you know, you might have ten  
16 means to fill up a tank. If the CLB relies on two  
17 of them, both of those means have to be in scope,  
18 not the remaining ten. Or in the case of the CLB  
19 only requires one method, just because you have  
20 other methods to perform that function if you're not  
21 managing the aging, we can't credit those and we  
22 have to rely on the CLB. And therefore, those  
23 systems that are defined by the CLB have to be in  
24 scope.

25 MR. LEITCH: So I'm just trying to go

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back to this pressurizer spray nozzle. There are  
2 other methods of depressurizing, but --

3 MR. ARRIGHI: And the licensing basis of  
4 this plant relies on the PORV, the power operated  
5 relief valve.

6 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

7 MR. ARRIGHI: So therefore the staff,  
8 since it's part of the CLB, can require that that  
9 component be in scope. And if that component is not  
10 part of the design in the CLB, then we can't rely on  
11 it and it would essentially be -- we can't force the  
12 applicant to put it in license renewal.

13 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Normally the position  
15 taken is that if the spray head fails, you can still  
16 depressurize with a spray at a lower rate, but still  
17 adequate to get into closer down with 24 hours, or  
18 whatever the requirement is. And now this is a new  
19 one, I haven't seen before, you use a PORV to  
20 depressurize as a means. I guess I hang my hat more  
21 on still using the pressurizer.

22 MR. ARRIGHI: I'm sure the applicant  
23 could probably perform that same analysis and make  
24 the same case.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Right. Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ARRIGHI: But their licensing basis  
2 was clear in this regard.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. Okay.

4 MR. GILLESPIE: Frank Gillespie with  
5 NRR.

6 This comes up. The safety case is first  
7 versus the compliance case. And part of that safety  
8 case is, it wasn't relied upon in the CLB for a  
9 reason. And the reason it wasn't relied upon is  
10 some of the things you articulated.

11 The other thing is the spray heads, and  
12 this is only the heads, it's a low-DP system and  
13 it's used frequently. So while it is a passive  
14 component, it's kind of in active use. And so now  
15 you have to postulate the sudden degradation of this  
16 head falling off, not in daily use. At the same  
17 time you have the accident that needs it, and you  
18 still have water flow through a depressurizing the  
19 pressurizer anyway.

20 So the safety reason is the first reason  
21 why it's out, but that manifests itself in not being  
22 in the current licensing basis. So it's not just  
23 compliance, it is safety.

24 MR. ARRIGHI: Again, Section 2.3,  
25 mechanical system review. The staff review of this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 section resulted in three open items and three  
2 confirmatory items. Three of those open items have  
3 been resolved.

4 Several components that were initially  
5 omitted from the scope, again, we stated these  
6 earlier. Steam heating boiler, component cooling  
7 water piping and spent fuel pool makeup path were  
8 all added to scope based on the staff review.  
9 Again, the steam heating boiler was brought in as a  
10 result of the scoping and screening methodology  
11 audit questions that were asked them. The other two  
12 components, CCW piping and spent fuel pool makeup.  
13 they were added as a result of applicant's response  
14 to these open items that follow.

15 Open item 2.3.3.2-1 is resolved. The  
16 staff identified that failure of out-of-scope CCW  
17 piping could result in failure of the system and the  
18 ability to cool down the plant.

19 The piping in question here is nonsafety  
20 related piping that is subject to AMR and review  
21 that ends at an open boundary valve. In this case  
22 it's a 3 quarter inch valve piece of pipe that the  
23 applicant had an open boundary valve. And initially  
24 they deemed that they would sufficient time to  
25 isolate those valves prior to losing the component

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cleaning water surge tank and have sufficient  
2 capacity to water. The staff asked the applicant to  
3 address the basis to support that information; what  
4 size leak, etcetera.

5 Preliminary review of different types of  
6 failure, the applicant came back and said as a  
7 result of your question, we will add in whole  
8 component cooling water system piping down stream of  
9 that valve. So the CCW system is in scope of  
10 license renewal at this point in time.

11 Open item 2.3.3.3-1. The staff  
12 identified that the spent fuel pool makeup source  
13 was not in scope. Again, the applicant's position  
14 was initially that it would take over 5 hours. If  
15 the hypothetical event, it would take over 5 hours  
16 to initiate boiling and then over 2 days before you  
17 need to add water. The applicant didn't account for  
18 potential leaks in the spent fuel pool liner. And,  
19 again, the rerack of the spent fuel was based in  
20 part on having a makeup water supply to the spent  
21 fuel pool.

22 As a result of communications with the  
23 applicant, they agreed that they would add in the  
24 feeding water storage tank into scope, and therefore  
25 this item has been resolved.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So the issue was  
2 whether or not a leak from the pool had to be  
3 addressed?

4 MR. ARRIGHI: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: All right.

6 MR. ARRIGHI: Exactly.

7 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I mean, the design  
8 basis of the spent fuel pool was not clear about  
9 that?

10 MR. ARRIGHI: In some of the  
11 documentation it talks about a hypothetical failure  
12 and whatnot. And it doesn't really address leakage.  
13 During our review of some, you know, rerack analysis  
14 and just the staff thought it was needed, that they  
15 needed to address leakage.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Has this been done for  
17 the other previous applications?

18 MR. ARRIGHI: I believe all the other  
19 applicants have a makeup source to the pool. I'd  
20 have to ask the reviewer.

21 MR. JONES: This is Steve Jones, Plant  
22 Systems Branch of NRR.

23 In the case of Ginna, the earlier  
24 amendments regarding spent fuel capacity or pool  
25 expansion did address leakage through the liner and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 relying on makeup to maintain pool level.

2           Ginna has a somewhat different licensing  
3 basis, in that they have a temperature limit on the  
4 pool below boiling, so they rely on the cooling  
5 system to maintain the temperature limit. And I  
6 think that's the -- in general we bring the makeup  
7 systems into scope based on boiling. In this case it  
8 was to address leakage that could render the cooling  
9 system inoperable and then you would not be able to  
10 maintain the temperature below the design  
11 temperature.

12           CHAIRMAN BONACA: All right. Okay.

13           MR. LEITCH: Can we talk about the steam  
14 heating system in the diesel generator building? It  
15 seems as though what they did was see where the  
16 steam heating system could fail in such a way that  
17 it would damage safety related system. Even though  
18 the steam heating system in itself is not safety  
19 related, it could fail in such a way that it would  
20 damage the building or damage safety related  
21 equipment. And those parts of it that could fail  
22 were brought into scope.

23           Now, I guess a number of applicants that  
24 we've see in the past have said, well, basically if  
25 you have a two over one kind of a situation if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anything in that building would be brought into  
2 scope. It sounds like what they did here was part  
3 of the steam heating system and the diesel generator  
4 was brought into scope and other parts of it were  
5 not. I mean, I would think that in that kind of a  
6 situation, I think what we've seen most previous  
7 applicants do is just bring the whole steam heating  
8 system in the diesel generator building into scope?

9 MR. WILSON: This is David Wilson,  
10 Rochester Gas & Electric.

11 And, in fact, that is what occurred. I  
12 think what you're seeing in our case is we're the  
13 first applicant to actually address the nonsafety  
14 specs safety ISG in their application.

15 And so the original thrust, when we did  
16 our original reviews, we did an analytical review  
17 based on our current licensing basis, which did not  
18 identify house heating steam as being in scope.  
19 Then we did a spacial analysis that identified in  
20 certain areas of the plant house heating steam could  
21 in fact cause a failure that would affect the safety  
22 function. That brought the entire house heating  
23 steam system into scope, but you screened out the  
24 components that didn't cause that failure.

25 So, the system, house heating steam, was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in scope but only the components in the diesel rooms  
2 initially were within the scope of license renewal.

3 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

4 MR. WILSON: And then later on, based on  
5 RAIs and the audit which identified that post-  
6 accident we could have a failure in the screen house  
7 that would affect our ability to manage the  
8 accident, we bought in additional components. But  
9 the system was already in scope in the original  
10 application.

11 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Okay. thanks. I  
12 understand.

13 MR. ARRIGHI: Item 2.3.3.6-1 is the  
14 jockey pump. The staff identified that the fire  
15 service water booster pump of the jockey pump was  
16 not in scope. Loss of this function could cause of  
17 the fire pumps and damage them, therefore the staff  
18 thought it should be in scope of the rule.

19 And you heard the applicant state that  
20 they do have the pressurized storage tank, which is  
21 a 1,000 gallon tank pressurized with 100 pound air.  
22 And that's what they state maintains the pressure in  
23 the system.

24 Again, initial discussions the applicant  
25 included the tank for personal safety reasons and it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wasn't initially because of maintaining the pressure  
2 in that tank.

3 The staff's review is that the  
4 applicant's 1979 submittal for the fire protection  
5 evaluation and the FSAR are both clear, and they  
6 both state that both the jockey pump and the storage  
7 tank maintain system pressure, not just one.  
8 Therefore, it's the staff's position that both the  
9 jockey pump and the storage tank need to be in scope  
10 of the rule.

11 Again, the applicant and the staff are  
12 in a little disagreement at this time. And we're  
13 working toward resolution on this item.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Is this one of the  
15 outstanding?

16 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, this item is not  
17 resolved and this is still --

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: One of the two?

19 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. This is essentially  
20 one of two open items that we have that we're still  
21 evaluating.

22 Confirmatory item. This has to do with  
23 the component water surge tank, the makeup not being  
24 in scope. It was the initial response from the  
25 application on the docket said that the makeup water

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 source would be included in scope. However, due to  
2 the open item regarding the component cooling water,  
3 the -- related to open boundary valves. By putting  
4 the whole component cooling water system in service  
5 in scope.

6 It's the applicant's position that the  
7 makeup water supply to the surge tank does not need  
8 to be in scope and that the component cooling water  
9 surge tank has adequate capacity to accommodate for  
10 any leaks.

11 It's the staff position that it's the  
12 USSAR and the safety evaluation review of the  
13 Systematic Evaluation report both specify that you  
14 can postulate a leak following an accident. And in  
15 there it goes on to state that the makeup capability  
16 should be able to cope with normal system leakage  
17 post accident. Therefore, it's the staff's position  
18 that the makeup water is part of the current  
19 licensing basis and that makeup supply is required  
20 to be in scope.

21 And, again this is a second item that  
22 the staff and the application are discussing.

23 CHAIRMAN BONACA: But you say though  
24 there, was initially brought into scope and now?

25 MR. ARRIGHI: Well, again, when we put

1 the SER on the, with open arms in the docket, at  
2 that time we had a response on author affirmation  
3 from the applicant that said yes we will include the  
4 makeup supply. But at that point in time they  
5 didn't have an aging management program to monitor,  
6 to mitigate aging of the whole component cooling  
7 water system. So they thought, all right, to  
8 accommodate any leakage, since that piping's not in  
9 scope, we'll have the makeup. But now that they've  
10 added the whole system in scope, they said that  
11 packing leakage would be small and therefore our  
12 surge tank would have adequate capacity.

13 Section 2.4 structures and structural  
14 components. There were no open or confirmatory items  
15 in this area.

16 For Section 2.5 electrical systems and  
17 instrumentation and controls. The electrical  
18 components were evaluated on a plant wide basis  
19 versus system basis. There was one open item in  
20 this area. The staff identified that two cables  
21 from off-site power that brings power to safety  
22 buses which power the service water pumps were not  
23 in scope of license renewal. And the staff asked  
24 can the applicant get to cold shutdown without the  
25 use of service water pumps.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The applicant stated that they have the  
2           capability to get to a safe shutdown condition  
3           without the use of service water. On a station  
4           blackout, they would essentially use the aux  
5           feedwater to supply water to the steam generator to  
6           go solid and cool down through a feed and bleed on  
7           the secondary side. And use the PORVs, essentially,  
8           to depressurize.

9           So it's the applicant's position that  
10          those components are not relied on. The service  
11          water pumps are not relied on as part of the current  
12          licensing basis to get to a cold shutdown condition.

13                 MR. ROSEN: Are the PORVs qualified at  
14          passing water, solid water?

15                 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Good question.

16                 MR. ARRIGHI: I don't know. PORVs  
17          qualified?

18                 MR. WILSON: This is Dave Wilson,  
19          Rochester Gas & Electric.

20                 The PORVs in the pressurizer, they're  
21          only used to depressurize the RCS later on in  
22          determination of this evolution. The feed and bleed  
23          actually occurs using auxiliary feedwater into the  
24          steam generator and then draining the water out of  
25          the steam generator through manual valves, not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through main steam safety valves or main steam  
2 atmospheric relief valves.

3 MR. ROSEN: So it's the secondary side?

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: It's a secondary.

5 MR. WILSON: Secondary side. Correct,  
6 sir.

7 MR. ARRIGHI: And the PORVs would just  
8 maintain the depressurization for the primary,

9 And the applicant did supply the  
10 response to that. And the staff is currently  
11 reviewing this issue.

12 Scoping and screening summary. Pending  
13 the final resolution of the four open items, being  
14 the docketed information and resolving the other  
15 open item, the scoping and screening results include  
16 all structure system component within the scope of  
17 license renewal and subject to an AMR.

18 At this point of the presentation, I  
19 would now like to turn it over to Mikes Modes. He's  
20 with Region 1. He was the team leader that did the  
21 inspections at the site, the scoping inspection and  
22 the aging management review inspections.

23 MR. MODES: This is Michael Modes.

24 We followed the prescribed license  
25 renewal guidance insofar as the inspections were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concerned using primarily IP 71008. And the  
2 inspection plan was developed specifically for that  
3 site. It was the first goal at Region 1 I've ever  
4 done. So the inspection started with what the goal  
5 called for and worked its way completely through to  
6 the actual procedure reviews and aging reviews at  
7 the plant, interviews with individuals and  
8 walkdowns.

9 And we used a number of individuals in  
10 the plant in the region. We tried to use a  
11 structural individual with that kind of --  
12 metallurgical, mechanical and operations. We's  
13 borrow heavily from the experience of the resident  
14 inspector.

15 Next slide.

16 For the scoping and screening, for  
17 example, it was a pretty clean inspection. It seemed  
18 to be more a matter of timing. We appeared to have  
19 arrived when there was a review being performed, for  
20 example, by the fire protection engineer to  
21 determine whether or not the right number of valves  
22 and stuff were being called out in the scoping.  
23 There was a corrective action generated as a  
24 consequence of the inspection to bring closer  
25 correspondence between the two databases.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We also found in example for the  
2 screening for the aging inspection that a lot of the  
3 stuff was more a degree of refinement. We had sort  
4 of caught them in a point where they were  
5 transitioning from the processing of being  
6 philosophical about aging license to the actual  
7 implementation. So there were a number of  
8 corrective actions that were identified in the  
9 nature, per se.

10                   They were taking advantage of a certain  
11 program that contained a procedure that didn't  
12 clearly identify, for example, what aging mechanisms  
13 ought to be regularly reviewed for bolting. So in  
14 that regard, we had to dig pretty deeply to come up  
15 with any issues. The documentation was  
16 comprehensive. They have excellent database. And  
17 it's been my personal experience with Ginna there's  
18 a lot of pride in craftsmanship. You don't see a  
19 large turnover in personnel, so you get a lot of  
20 corporate knowledge answers. Pretty good  
21 inspection.

22                   MR. LEITCH: Mike, were you involved  
23 with the June inspection? I'm a little confused. I  
24 have some questions regarding the June inspection.

25                   MR. MODES: The scoping?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

2 MR. MODES: Yes.

3 MR. LEITCH: Okay. It seemed to me that  
4 there were a number of issues there dealing with  
5 fire protection and with the fire program.

6 MR. MODES: Yes.

7 MR. LEITCH: I guess a number of those  
8 had to do with frequency, that is the frequency of  
9 Halon testing, the frequency of fire door  
10 inspection, the frequency of hydrant inspection.  
11 Also some issues concerning the frequency of flow  
12 testing, qualification of personnel and so forth.

13 I guess I came away with a little bit of  
14 an uneasy feeling regarding the fire protection  
15 program. And I don't know if that's justified or  
16 not, or --

17 MR. ARRIGHI: Can I answer that?

18 MR. LEITCH: Go ahead.

19 MR. ARRIGHI: I think the inspection  
20 you're talking about is the aging management program  
21 audit, which is a little later, which the staff  
22 reviewed the project manager and a number of people  
23 from the staff.

24 MR. LEITCH: Right.

25 MR. ARRIGHI: And, again, I'll be

1 getting to this. But we were doing a consistency  
2 with GALL audit to make sure that the applicant's  
3 ten attributes meet the GALL attributes.

4 It was, as you state, in the application  
5 they said these two fire protection programs were  
6 consistent with GALL.

7 MR. LEITCH: Right.

8 MR. ARRIGHI: When we went on site and  
9 looked at the basis document, those issues that you  
10 brought up were clearly stated in the applicant's  
11 basis document that they had exceptions for these  
12 specific attributes. And I believe it was, I guess,  
13 an oversight on the applicant's part. I don't know  
14 if these programs were developed after the submittal  
15 of the application, but they didn't -- once they  
16 identified these exceptions, due to an oversight or  
17 whatnot on their part, they didn't inform the staff  
18 of those exceptions. So during the aging management  
19 program audit we identified them. Again, they jumped  
20 out off the page. And we issued a RAI request of  
21 information to the applicant. And they forwarded  
22 those responses to the staff. And they were  
23 subsequently reviewed and approved.

24 But, again, the applicant was aware of  
25 those exceptions. But, again, you'd have to put the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SM why it wasn't forwarded.

2 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Well, the inspection  
3 report seems to indicate that in some cases these  
4 exceptions have been identified, but in other cases  
5 they weren't identified.

6 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. There were eight  
7 exceptions. Six or seven of those exceptions were  
8 clearly called out in their basis document. There  
9 was one, I can't recall which specific one it was, a  
10 frequency test of 6 months versus 2 years; I can't  
11 recall off the top of my head which exception wasn't  
12 clearly called it.

13 MR. LEITCH: I think there was one  
14 related to the qualification of personnel doing--

15 MR. ARRIGHI: It may be the one that the  
16 staff identified on their own. And, again, the  
17 applicant included that as an exception and put that  
18 response on the docket. And that exception was  
19 reviewed by the staff.

20 MR. LEITCH: So these frequencies were  
21 then brought into compliance with GALL or they stand  
22 as exceptions?

23 MR. ARRIGHI: They stand as exceptions  
24 and the staff reviewed those exceptions. And based  
25 on surveillance test or results, the staff approved

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those exceptions based operating history and  
2 whatnot. I'd have to go to --

3 MR. LEITCH: I guess my question is that  
4 perhaps one or two of these exceptions may be  
5 understandable, but it seems to me that there's so  
6 many exceptions all related to the frequency of  
7 doing certain testing with respect to fire  
8 protection equipment, which is real important stuff.  
9 I mean, I just wonder why there are so many  
10 exceptions in this one particular area?

11 MR. WROBEL: George Wrobel.

12 We refined the program basis document  
13 quite a bit, and we had a lot more extensive review  
14 of the docket when we submitted the application.  
15 Subsequent to that, we did a lot more analysis and  
16 evaluation of the attributes.

17 We have a plant specific design analysis  
18 that was done was specifically for the exceptions  
19 that were taken there. And so those particular  
20 exceptions were justified based on the information  
21 that was plant specific. We're doing all of the  
22 testing and surveillances that are requested by the  
23 GALL, but aren't the specificity of the -- you know,  
24 the timing is different, but we have a plant  
25 specific design analysis that justified that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   So some of that was just caught as we  
2                   were going through a more detailed review developing  
3                   our program basis document that we had when we did  
4                   the application. And we didn't supplement our  
5                   application when we found those, because we knew  
6                   there audits coming and they would be developed at  
7                   that point.

8                   So, there's no open items and there's no  
9                   inconsistencies. I mean, they're different, but  
10                  they're not bad for us.

11                  MR. LEITCH: Yes. But I guess all the  
12                  frequencies that -- I mean, there are a number of  
13                  things where the frequencies are just less than that  
14                  prescribed in GALL.

15                  MR. FRUMKIN: This is Dan Frumkin from  
16                  the staff.

17                  I think what we found in reviewing  
18                  these, for example, the fire doors and the Halon  
19                  system frequencies, is the frequencies for aging  
20                  management does not need to be nearly as strict as  
21                  the frequencies for the wear and tear on the active  
22                  component wear and tear.

23                  So a fire door might be inspected every  
24                  week or every day that they might walk through a  
25                  fire door. But to go look at the door for aging

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 features like aging degradation, that could be done  
2 on a less frequent basis.

3 So as far as operability, those things  
4 are being analyzed and are going to be done on a  
5 fairly code compliant basis, whereas aging  
6 management type inspections, which can be much more  
7 intense, are going to be done on less frequent  
8 basis.

9 MR. LEITCH: Okay. That's good. That  
10 answer make sense to me, although it perhaps raises  
11 the question about there's nothing really different  
12 about Ginna. Perhaps the GALL is overly restrictive  
13 in what it's suggesting as far as aging management  
14 frequency.

15 MR. WILSON: This is Dave Wilson,  
16 Rochester Gas & Electric.

17 One of the things we found in both fire  
18 protection and service water systems that comes into  
19 play here is the water chemistry of the water source  
20 lead for our fire water system. It's either city  
21 water or its Lake Ontario water. And Lake Ontario  
22 water's got a pH of 7 and very low chemical content.  
23 And that actually does come into play when you look  
24 at how you system degrades.

25 And so a plant that might use a

1 different type of water or have different water  
2 chemistry for their water source would have, by  
3 necessity perhaps, a different frequency of  
4 inspections.

5 So for our facility being fed from Lake  
6 Ontario or having treated water, one of the two,  
7 we're able to have lots and lots of operating  
8 experience that shows how often we need to go in to  
9 flush or whatever process we need to do. And it may  
10 be different for every facility.

11 Not that I want to defend the GALL.

12 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Thank you.

13 MR. FORD: I have a question for you,  
14 Michael. You said a curious phrase. You said that  
15 the aging management programs were conceived and  
16 they're full in philosophical sense, I think it is.

17 MR. MODES: Yes.

18 MR. FORD: But the intimation, the  
19 reduction to practice wasn't what it should be. IS  
20 what you meant?

21 MR. MODES: No. When you do the  
22 inspections from the viewpoint of if you will, where  
23 the rubber actually meets the road versus the  
24 esoteric reviewing a license application, what you  
25 find out is many times the timing of the inspection

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to support the NRR review process does not, in fact,  
2 arrive at a period of time when the programs have  
3 been fully revised or fully implemented. So  
4 although they may in the application identify a  
5 certain program, when you get down to the procedure  
6 level you find out that certain nuances haven't been  
7 included. That's what I meant; the difference  
8 between a philosophical approach and -- I'm speaking  
9 from a very pragmatic viewpoint.

10 MR. FORD: Yes. So this question the  
11 details --

12 MR. MODES: Yes. Right.

13 MR. FORD: -- as you say, it's precisely  
14 those details that I'm questioning. For instance,  
15 on the one time inspection and many others. It's  
16 the details that I'm concerned about. And are you  
17 saying that from your view they haven't yet reached  
18 those level of details?

19 MR. MODES: No. I'm saying in a number  
20 of cases that's what we identified.

21 MR. FORD: Okay.

22 MR. MODES: Or to put it another way,  
23 the things that we did identify were the nuances.  
24 It's supposed to be a positive comment, not a  
25 negative one.

1 MR. FORD: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. MODES: And the last slide, what did  
3 you call that "a meadow?" I don't know if I like  
4 that. Being from the region and working so  
5 arduously on that set of green indicators. But,  
6 yes, it is a meadow.

7 DR. WALLIS: Well, there are unexpected  
8 things to be found in meadows.

9 MR. FORD: It looks more like a lawn to  
10 me. A meadow has flowers in it.

11 MR. MODES: Although I will quote him.

12 MR. ARRIGHI: All right. Moving on.

13 MR. LEITCH: Just another question for  
14 Mike regarding plant security, the inspection report  
15 states the plant security is not within the scope of  
16 license renewal, yet I think we have seen certain  
17 elements of plant security, particularly those  
18 elements necessary to support emergency planning  
19 activities in the scope of other license renewal  
20 applications.

21 MR. MODES: Well, there were some  
22 components. I believe the whole security -- I don't  
23 remember how the break is. If you could help me  
24 here, Dave. I did assign one of the inspectors the  
25 task of looking at the security system. And I don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recall if it was because that part of the system was  
2 out of scope or in scope, but we did review it and  
3 it was appropriate.

4 MR. LEITCH: Yes. Okay. I wasn't  
5 thinking so much about this security system, per se.

6 MR. MODES: It's not that it's in the  
7 GALL.

8 MR. LEITCH: As perhaps the building.

9 MR. MODES: Right.

10 MR. LEITCH: And the ventilation system  
11 is okay with the building, and things of that nature  
12 where you need to maintain that functional.

13 MR. MODES: And the parts, for example--

14 MR. LEITCH: For example, the planning  
15 sense, not necessarily the --

16 MR. MODES: The UPS, the uninterruptable  
17 power source to the security computer system,  
18 etcetera?

19 MR. LEITCH: Right.

20 MR. MODES: That was all looked at.

21 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

22 MR. MODES: Yes. It's not like we  
23 didn't look at it.

24 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. MODES: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ARRIGHI: Okay. Moving on to  
2 Section 3, the aging management review of a GALL  
3 divides a system, the system into six groups.

4 Aging management programs. There are a  
5 total of 33 aging management programs and 30 were  
6 consistent with some deviation, and three were non  
7 GALL AMPs. Again, in the application enhancements  
8 means that those that augment the GALL and  
9 deviations are those that do not agree with GALL.

10 And again, we had AMP, one aging  
11 management program was added. And in this section  
12 of aging management programs, there were two open  
13 items and one of those is currently resolved.

14 You brought up the June inspection or  
15 audit here. This is the staff's aging management  
16 program audit. Again, the purpose of the audit was  
17 to verify consistency with GALL. The bottom line  
18 was that the staff concluded that AMPs were  
19 consistent with GALL except with those two  
20 exceptions on the fire protection program and the  
21 fire water systems programs. And we discussed those  
22 a little earlier.

23 In the reactor system, Section 3.1,  
24 systems are broken down into --

25 MR. LEITCH: I just noticed that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fire protection requirements had originally been  
2 specified in the technical specifications. And then  
3 I think they were moved to the FSAR?

4 MR. ARRIGHI: Or the Technical  
5 Requirements Manual.

6 MR. LEITCH: And now they're in the  
7 Technical Requirements Manual. Do you see any  
8 connection, I mean between -- I don't know of the  
9 Technical Requirements Manual is less rigorous from  
10 the licensee's viewpoint in the tech specs, but I  
11 mean does that suggest, perhaps, why some of these  
12 differences in frequencies and so forth crept into  
13 the fire protection program?

14 MR. ARRIGHI: In my experience as an  
15 inspector in my past life, I would say no. Even if  
16 the systems in tech specs are not in tech specs, you  
17 know my experiences that the applicant, you know,  
18 implements those requirements. You know, I think by  
19 putting them in the Techs Requirement Manual they  
20 can make changes easier than getting a tech spec  
21 amendment. But from my experience, I wouldn't  
22 attribute it to that.

23 I don't know if you have a --

24 MR. WILSON: This is Dave Wilson, Ginna  
25 Station.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   In fact, the equipment that's in the  
2                   scope in our application for fire protection, it's  
3                   greater than the sum of the equipment described in  
4                   our Technical Requirements Manual or UFSAR. And the  
5                   reasoning behind that is pretty straight forward.  
6                   The staff had a lot of early issues that resulted in  
7                   an ISG which had to do with the identification of  
8                   equipment required for 10 CFR 50.48, I think it is,  
9                   fire protection rule, and Appendix R. And the staff  
10                  had, you know in my opinion or our opinion, a pretty  
11                  reasonable position on some utilities having a  
12                  complex and hard to understand licensing basis. I  
13                  believe the early applicants had just Appendix R  
14                  equipment in scope for the rule, and later on went  
15                  back and adjusted.

16                         We did not fall into that trap. When we  
17                         scoped our fire protection system, we laid out our  
18                         entire licensing basis, you know, original  
19                         construction up through Appendix R and today, and  
20                         put all of that equipment in scope, regardless of  
21                         whether or not it was TRM. Where we differentiated  
22                         was, you know, it's clear in the application that  
23                         certain fire protection features are included for  
24                         insurance purposes in out buildings and things like  
25                         that. So that did not come into play in these fire

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 protection questions.

2 I am a little bit you know not taken  
3 back but concerned, I guess, if we're leaving you  
4 with an impression of the utility that we're not  
5 managing our fire protection system. I think what  
6 we're seeing here is more growing pains in the GALL  
7 and the Standard Review Plant format than any  
8 technical issues.

9 We put a lot of stuff into scope. And,  
10 you know, the really argument that we have really  
11 with the staff is over the jockey pump, which costs  
12 \$274.

13 MR. LEITCH: Okay. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I have a question  
15 before we move on. I asked the question before  
16 regarding the battle former bolts, you know, they  
17 replaced 56 out of 728. And that's because they  
18 found defect-like. And what I found is that they  
19 have committed no further inspections to be  
20 performed. And I was asking the question of why  
21 would it be a logic that says you know, you don't  
22 need to inspect them anymore. Any comment on how  
23 you accepted? This is not an open item, I  
24 understand.

25 MR. ARRIGHI: Barry Elliot.

1 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. This is the  
2 baffle former bolts where they in 1999 after 30  
3 years of operation they found a number of them were  
4 defective. They replaced them. There were 56 out  
5 of 700 plus.

6 MR. ELLIOT: I'd say our position on the  
7 baffle bolts were --

8 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I would like to  
9 understand what your views of, you know, the fact  
10 that they don't need to inspect anymore this baffle  
11 former bolts.

12 MR. ELLIOT: Okay. We don't agree with  
13 that entirely, that they don't have to inspect.

14 Our position on the baffle former bolts  
15 is that they're part of the reactor vessel internals  
16 program.

17 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Right.

18 MR. ELLIOT: And the industry through  
19 the MRP is developing data on baffle former bolts,  
20 aging effects like irradiation assisted stress  
21 corrosion cracking, fracture toughness. And from  
22 this data they are going to propose a program for  
23 industry.

24 As far as this particular application is  
25 concerned, they have committed to implement the MRP,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whatever that program is. Our concern is that this  
2 application, this particular applicant is going to  
3 go into license renewal in 2009 and that the MRP  
4 program may not be completed by then. So we've asked  
5 them to commit that prior to entering the license  
6 renewal program, that they will have either the MRP  
7 program or submit one of their own for all the  
8 internals. And that's our position; that there  
9 needs to be part of the license renewal term an  
10 internals inspections program. And, of course,  
11 baffle former bolts would be part of that.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And they have agreed  
13 to that? They have agreed to that?

14 MR. ELLIOT: Yes, they have.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

16 MR. ELLIOT: Well, they could talk for  
17 themselves.

18 MR. WROBEL: Yes. George Wrobel from  
19 RG&E.

20 We agreed that we would submit an  
21 internals inspection program prior to the period of  
22 extended operation. We haven't decided exactly what  
23 we're going to do on baffle former bolts. We're one  
24 of the four plants in the country that have looked.  
25 No one else has even looked yet. And we found so

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 little degradation, and we feel that there's so much  
2 margin that at this point we're not ready to commit  
3 to actually doing more detailed inspections of the  
4 bolts. But, you know, that could change. Right now  
5 we don't see the need for it. And I'm not sure what  
6 the schedule for MRP is on that.

7 I'll pass that along.

8 MR. ELLIOT: I'll pass that along.

9 I want to give you some information. We  
10 had a meeting with the MRP within, I don't know, a  
11 week or two ago. And I told them that you needed  
12 this stuff by 2009. And I think you better get on  
13 them, because they were under the impression the  
14 lead plant was Oconee. And they could use Oconee as  
15 a lead plant. But I think you come before Oconee as  
16 far as needing this program.

17 So, I think you need to talk to them.

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Well, I hear two  
19 things here. I hear that they need to do this, and I  
20 hear you saying that you're not committing to  
21 anything particular? Are you committing to a list,  
22 say with MRP, and follow industry insights and  
23 recommendations?

24 MR. WROBEL: We do that as a matter of  
25 course, so we'll continue following MRP and what's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going on.

2 The internal commitments that we made  
3 were a little bit different than that. We did commit  
4 that we would look. Before 2009 that we would have  
5 a program that could detect cracking .0005 mil or  
6 something like that. That's a program that we're  
7 more actively pursuing, because we haven't done that  
8 one before.

9 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

10 MR. WILSON: And we're following what  
11 the boilers are doing in that area. The baffle  
12 bolts, like we say, we had one percent degradation  
13 so it seems to be a lower priority. But we will  
14 continue working with MRP and if they develop an  
15 industry position, then we'll be evaluating that.

16 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Why did you replace  
17 those 56 bolts if you didn't find there was a  
18 problem with those?

19 MR. GEIKEN: This is Gerry Geiken.

20 Actually, I'd like to clarify one thing.  
21 We found one bolt, out of all of those bolts that we  
22 inspected, that exhibited evidence of ISACC.

23 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

24 MR. GEIKEN: All the other indications,  
25 UT indications were false/positives. We extracted a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 number of bolts and tested them to distraction of  
2 the Westinghouse hot cell. We couldn't verify one  
3 indication.

4 So we really saw very, very little  
5 evidence of IASCC.

6 The other thing is, we did a proactive  
7 replacement. Those 56 we decided to proactively  
8 simply extract and replace with 316.

9 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Hopefully, by the time  
10 we get to the final Committee meeting, there will be  
11 some particular understanding of how this is going  
12 to be handled. I think I understand it. But, you  
13 know, if you have expectations, there has to be  
14 responding willingness to meet the expectation.

15 So, okay.

16 MR. GILLESPIE: Hey, Russ. Frank  
17 Gillespie.

18 What is the expectation today? Because  
19 it's not zero.

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I'm asking, you know,  
21 you have stated an expectation that 2009 there will  
22 be in fact a clear commitment of what they're going  
23 to do.

24 MR. ELLIOT: No. The commitment is now.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ELLIOT: But prior to 2009 they have  
2 to have given us a program for the reactive vessel  
3 internals for inspection for what they think needs  
4 to be inspected, the frequency of inspection, the  
5 acceptance criteria; all of their requirements for  
6 an inspection program has to be submitted and  
7 approved by us by 2009.

8 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And that will have to  
9 include the baffle --

10 MR. ELLIOT: And the baffle bolts will  
11 be part of that program.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Now, they may still  
13 convince you by that time that they don't need to  
14 inspect those baffle bolts. Can they convince you  
15 of that?

16 MR. ELLIOT: Have they convinced us that  
17 they don't have to inspect them?

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Can they convince you  
19 by the time they submit the program?

20 MR. ELLIOT: Well, see, the MRP is  
21 looking at the bolts.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: All right.

23 MR. ELLIOT: And I think if I was them,  
24 I would look and say certain amount of radiation  
25 causes a certain amount of degradation, and then I'd

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just look at my core and say, okay, how many of  
2 those do I have to look at before -- you know, and  
3 that's it. And then you would say I would inspect  
4 so often to assure that it doesn't degrade.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

6 MR. ELLIOT: And that's what I'm hoping  
7 the MRP is going to come up with. Right now they're  
8 just generating the data about what it takes to get  
9 irradiation assisted stress corrosion cracking of  
10 baffle former bolts.

11 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes, I understand.

12 MR. ELLIOT: So we don't have that data  
13 yet.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Have more data that  
15 aspire of this MRP program, they will come up  
16 recommendations on what need to be inspected and how  
17 frequently?

18 MR. ELLIOT: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Now their  
20 recommendation may not include a recommendation for  
21 inspection of baffle former bolts, right?

22 MR. ELLIOT: It might not. That's  
23 right.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Might not, and you  
25 would leave that?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ELLIOT: Right, and we'll review it.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And I think you both  
3 agree on this issue. So I don't see disagreement of  
4 that. No, I'm trying to understand it.

5 MR. ELLIOT: That's good. Because I hear  
6 --

7 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I hear this  
8 professional side, and I'm waiting to hear some  
9 other things from the other side.

10 MR. GILLESPIE: So right now they're  
11 committed to following the MRP when the MRP results  
12 come out. And if the MRP don't come out by 2009,  
13 they're committed to submitting a plan for NRC  
14 approval?

15 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes.

16 MR. GILLESPIE: Is that a condition of  
17 the license?

18 MR. ARRIGHI: That's a commitment. It  
19 is a commitment at this time.

20 MR. GILLESPIE: Okay. And there's a  
21 commitment that they'll submit it. That's not  
22 review and approval. So what we have --

23 MR. ARRIGHI: Pretty straight. No, it  
24 was a commitment to review and approval.

25 MR. GILLESPIE: Okay. So that that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 limit is on there.

2 Mario, because we're not going to know  
3 any more technically between now and the full  
4 Committee meeting.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: That's right.

6 MR. GILLESPIE: So what we've got is a  
7 process in place that the licensee is going to  
8 submit for approval a plan prior to 2009 or MRP,  
9 whichever comes first.

10 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Well, it took me this  
11 long to understand --

12 MR. GILLESPIE: And --

13 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Now I understand it,  
14 and I think we can go to the full Committee meeting  
15 with that.

16 MR. ARRIGHI: Okay. All right. I'll  
17 move forward.

18 Again, Section 3.1, reactor systems.  
19 There were two open items. One was resolved.

20 Item B2.1.28-1 had to do with the  
21 reactor vessel surveillance program. This item  
22 involved testing of the surveillance capsule in the  
23 core after it received a neutron fluence of 60  
24 years. Initially the applicant wasn't planning on  
25 testing the capsule. Again, this was not consistent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with GALL. The applicant subsequently came back and  
2 agreed that they will test the capsule once it  
3 reaches a fluence for 60 years.

4 The open item B2.1.36-1 thimble tube  
5 inspection program. GALL doesn't have a  
6 corresponding program and this was reviewed the  
7 Standard Review Plan. Several of the attributes, I  
8 think five of the eight attributes the staff needed  
9 further clarification and information to approve  
10 this program.

11 The applicant has subsequently provided  
12 the information. Again, preliminary information  
13 looks like the information is okay, however it's  
14 still under staff review. So this item is not  
15 resolved, but we're evaluating the information they  
16 provided.

17 MR. FORD: Now that information included  
18 things such as the qualification of inspection  
19 techniques for cracking and things of this nature?

20 MR. ARRIGHI: Barry Elliot.

21 MR. ELLIOT: This is Barry Elliot.

22 I'm just going to give you a whole  
23 picture of the thimble tube programs.

24 There's two parts of the thimble tube.  
25 There's a thimble tube and the guide tube. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 original thimble tube inspection program was for  
2 flow induced vibration. And when the applicant made  
3 the evaluation of the thimble tube and the guide  
4 tube, they also identified that cracking was an  
5 aging effect for both the thimble tube and the guide  
6 tube because they're stainless steel and they're in  
7 a PWR environment water.

8 The problem is they didn't have an  
9 inspection program for cracking. So we asked them  
10 to provide the ten attributes that we have in our  
11 review plan for programs and to identify how the  
12 existing thimble tube inspection program would  
13 satisfy for cracking. The existing one was for flow  
14 induced in vibration.

15 They modified the thimble tube  
16 inspection program to use eddy current inspection,  
17 use the same eddy current but look for cracking,  
18 qualify it to their experience with inspection by  
19 eddy current, their eddy current in the plant. And  
20 the acceptance criteria, since you can't really  
21 detect the depth using eddy current, any defect  
22 would be considered to be unacceptable and they  
23 would do whatever was necessary.

24 Now, they do not do a eddy current  
25 inspection of the guide tube. So what they're doing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is for the thimble tube -- for the guide tube is the  
2 thimble tube will be a precursor for the guide tube  
3 because it's inside the thimble tube. It's  
4 surrounded by reactor coolant water and is just the  
5 same temperature as the inside of the guide tube. So  
6 that would be a precursor.

7 The small problem we had with that is  
8 that there is a weld on the outside of the guide  
9 tube between the penetration and the guide tube. And  
10 there's no any current would inspect that.

11 So they agreed to do so far is to do the  
12 VT-1 examination of that location at the same time  
13 they do the bottom head location. And the VT-1  
14 would be looking for cracks. Normally this location  
15 wouldn't even be in the ISI program. So this would  
16 be an enhancement of the ISI program.

17 And as far as the VT-1, the ASME code  
18 specified the qualification that is necessary to  
19 ensure that you detect cracks using the VT-1.

20 And right now we're going through that.  
21 We haven't finished the review of it, but that's  
22 basically where they are right now.

23 MR. FORD: Now in the SER it talks about  
24 eddy current also. Is that no longer a monitoring  
25 technique or to be used for this particular

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 degradation?

2 MR. ELLIOT: Excuse me? What.

3 MR. FORD: In the SER you talk about  
4 eddy current.

5 MR. ELLIOT: Yes. Eddy current is going  
6 to be used on the thimble tube and the inspection of  
7 the thimble tube will be for cracking and flow  
8 induced vibration. And if any cracking is observed  
9 on any thimble tube, it will be replaced, the  
10 thimble tube. But also that would mean that the  
11 guide tube that is surrounding it would also become  
12 within inspection, and they would have to develop  
13 some kind of inspection for the guide tube at that  
14 time.

15 MR. FORD: Okay.

16 MR. ARRIGHI: Alloy 600. Again, the  
17 reactive vessel head, the control rod drive  
18 mechanisms and the penetrations were placed on the  
19 past refueling outage with Alloy 690 thermally  
20 treated penetration. The Alloy 600 components in the  
21 vessel include the bottom mounted instrument  
22 penetrations and the radial core support pads.

23 Barry mentioned earlier the reactive  
24 vessel internal programs. This slide is just to  
25 indicate that they have committed to submit this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 program for review and approval to the staff prior  
2 to a period of extended operation.

3 Section 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, those three  
4 systems resulted in one confirmatory items, and this  
5 was in the auxiliary system regarding the need to  
6 make a tech spec change to incorporate particular  
7 testing requirements for the diesel fuel oil.

8 MR. FORD: Now, on this particular one,  
9 they've confirmed that they were looking for  
10 particulates in the fuel oil, is that correct?

11 MR. ARRIGHI: I want to ask --

12 MR. FORD: And they're looking for  
13 exception on biocides and corrosion inhibitors.

14 MR. ARRIGHI: Krzystof?

15 MR. PARCZEWSKI: I didn't hear the  
16 question.

17 MR. FORD: On this confirmatory item.

18 MR. PARCZEWSKI: Yes?

19 MR. FORD: On the confirmatory item  
20 associated with the fuel oil, there's a tech spec.  
21 My understanding is that they are confirming that  
22 they will monitor for particulates, but they will  
23 not asking for an exemption on the goal requirement  
24 that you will have biocides and corrosion  
25 inhibitors. I think that's essentially the essence

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of this particular AMP.

2           Could you give us an idea of, first of  
3 all, factually why did you agree with their  
4 statement that they do not need biocides and  
5 corrosion inhibitors? I just want your thought  
6 process.

7           MR. PARCZEWSKI: Well, I really don't --  
8 I'm sorry. Repeat the question. I did not  
9 understand it.

10           MR. FORD: Well, maybe also the  
11 applicant can tell me if I'm stating it incorrectly.

12           On this issue about the corrosion of the  
13 internals of the diesel fuel oil tanks.

14           MR. PARCZEWSKI: Yes.

15           MR. FORD: They ask for an exemption  
16 from GALL in that they would not be using biocides  
17 or corrosion inhibitors. But they confirm that they  
18 would look for particulates.

19           Now my question here is, just for my  
20 information --

21           MR. PARCZEWSKI: Yes.

22           MR. FORD: -- what was your thought  
23 process in terms of factual data to back up their  
24 exemption request that they do not content biocides  
25 and corrosion inhibitors?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. PARCZEWSKI: They didn't have any  
2 MIC during their operation. So they felt they  
3 probably don't need to biocide, because the  
4 microbiological degradation during this operation  
5 period. So I felt that they're justified not to  
6 have a biocide.

7 MR. FORD: And corrosion inhibitor,  
8 presumably that's because of the tech spec requiring  
9 some control of the water content of the --

10 MR. PARCZEWSKI: Again, this is similar,  
11 you know. They didn't have any significant  
12 degradation due to corrosion. Therefore, I felt that  
13 since they have this operational experience.

14 MR. FORD: Okay.

15 MR. PARCZEWSKI: I felt that we can  
16 accept their request for not including that in their  
17 program.

18 MR. FORD: It just makes me feel  
19 uncomfortable a little bit that we are blindly  
20 looking to the future, as you as you said Mario,  
21 looking into the future and making judgments based  
22 on what you see today, especially for nonlinear  
23 degradation processes, time dependent processes.

24 MR. PARCZEWSKI: Yes.

25 MR. FORD: But thank you for your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 answer.

2 MR. PARCZEWSKI: Yes.

3 MR. FORD: It doesn't make me feel good.

4 MR. WILSON: This is David Wilson from  
5 Rochester Gas & Electric.

6 I just can chime in that as an  
7 applicant, as a licensee we're not opposed to  
8 modifying aging management programs when they make  
9 sense. But it's important to note that adding  
10 biocides and additives to your fuel oil also have  
11 unintended consequences, just like not adding them.

12 MR. FORD: That's true.

13 MR. WILSON: So if you look in the  
14 aggregate over the industry, which we've done, and  
15 you say well what's the right thing to do at this  
16 instant? Well, the right thing to do is continue on  
17 with what's been successful, that's operating  
18 experience, trust but verify and keep looking.

19 MR. FORD: I accept that entirely. We  
20 are pragmatic. You've got to be pragmatic about all  
21 these things. That's the answer I would have liked  
22 to have heard. I've been asking these questions for  
23 quite some time now and that is, if you like, the  
24 correct answer. But I want some rational, technical  
25 rational.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. GEIKEN: Yes. This is Gerry Geiken.  
2 We did actually investigate fairly  
3 extensively those utilities which do add biocides  
4 and corrosion inhibitors.

5 MR. FORD: Right.

6 MR. GEIKEN: And looked at their  
7 geographical distribution in the United States, and  
8 we found that they're mostly in the south. And  
9 those nuclear power plants that are in the northern  
10 climes with cooler weather have not, typically, been  
11 required or found it necessary to make those  
12 additives.

13 And the other part of that whole issue  
14 is, just as Dave said, we've seen that there are  
15 some other negative consequences for making these  
16 additives.

17 So in the sum total of our  
18 investigation, the research, we thought the best  
19 course to take is the course we're on.

20 MR. FORD: I'm happy that there's a  
21 quantity to judgment being made rather than we  
22 haven't seen a problem so far. Good.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. ARRIGHI: In Section 3.5,  
25 containment structures and components. There were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 no open or confirmatory items identified in this  
2 section.

3 Aging management of in-scope  
4 inaccessible concrete. You can see from the chart  
5 here, ground water samples indicate that the below  
6 grade environment is non-aggressive at Ginna.  
7 Therefore, a plant specific program is not required  
8 by GALL.

9 The applicant will inspect areas when  
10 excavations allow and when aging effects on  
11 accessible portions indicate detrimental effects are  
12 occurring.

13 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. I think they're  
14 doing the right thing of using opportunistic  
15 inspections.

16 What surprises me, of course, they have  
17 true non-aggressive environment. What surprises me  
18 is that we have the same requirement, essentially  
19 the opportunistic inspection also for very  
20 aggressive sites.

21 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: That maybe it's a  
23 problem. I mean, we discuss this issue.

24 MR. MUNSON: Cliff Munson, civil  
25 engineering.

1 For aggressive sites we do more, require  
2 more than -- and Ginna is not an aggressive site, as  
3 we have established.

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Right.

5 MR. MUNSON: But we require that they  
6 enhance their aging management programs for  
7 aggressive sites. And I don't know if we want to  
8 get into that now.

9 CHAIRMAN BONACA: No, no. It's true  
10 that you have more inspections or at least inferring  
11 potential degradation from accessible locations.  
12 That's true. Okay.

13 MR. ARRIGHI: And the last section in  
14 aging management review Section 3, there was one  
15 open item and one confirmatory item in this area.  
16 The open item has been resolved and it had to do  
17 with thermal relaxation of the bus duct bolt  
18 connections. And the applicant has committed to  
19 perform those in sections. So that item is  
20 resolved.

21 And, again, there was one aging  
22 management program added as a result of staff  
23 questions.

24 That concludes my presentation on --

25 MR. FORD: I have a question on this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one, too.

2 In the SER it states for this particular  
3 item, 3.6.1, which was the first item, I believe, it  
4 says that there's reasonable assurance that in this  
5 case the insulting materials and antioxidants will  
6 be sufficient to not give degradation. How do you  
7 agree with the phrase "reasonable assurance?"  
8 What's your metric?

9 MR. ARRIGHI: I'm going to have Jim  
10 Lazevnick, the reviewer --

11 MR. FORD: It also appears in other  
12 areas in this SER, the words "reasonable assurance."

13 MR. LAZEVNICK: This is Jim Lazevnick.  
14 I'm the electrical reviewer from the electrical  
15 branch.

16 Yes, I think your statement is with  
17 regard to the bus duct insulation.

18 MR. FORD: Yes.

19 MR. LAZEVNICK: Internal bus duct  
20 electrical insulation.

21 MR. FORD: Yes.

22 MR. LAZEVNICK: They committed to do a  
23 visual inspection of the bus duct. Essentially  
24 consistent with other visual inspections we've  
25 approved for things cable insulation, degradation,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 etcetera.

2                   There's an industry aging management  
3 guide that deals with that and deals with the  
4 inspections. And it's on the basis that operating  
5 experience and the industry work that was done on  
6 license renewal has determined that in effect these  
7 inspections will provide reasonable assurance.

8                   MR. FORD: Speaking just as an informed  
9 member of the public and not as an expert in this  
10 particular area, I think it might help in the SER,  
11 because I assume it's an open document, that that  
12 rational is stated. Well, and just looking on  
13 reasonable assurance as the reason for your  
14 approving. Purely perception.

15                   MR. LAZEVNICK: Okay.

16                   MR. FORD: Thank you.

17                   DR. LEE: Russ, just a reminder. Earlier  
18 ACRS has a question about station blackout. Okay.  
19 So since Jim is here, can you put up the station  
20 blackout drawing?

21                   MR. ARRIGHI: This is the applicant's  
22 diagram of the electrical components in the  
23 application.

24                   The evaluation boundary begins at the  
25 first isolation device that's in the -- which is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right here. This green portion is the off-site power  
2 system subject to aging management review. But just  
3 upstream of the disconnect switch here and the other  
4 train, is in scope of license renewal.

5 And the blue portion is a 4160 portion  
6 to the safety buses.

7 So for station blackout, again, the  
8 boundary is at the isolation devices.

9 I don't know what specific questions you  
10 may have that myself or a reviewer could answer.

11 If there are none --

12 MR. ROSEN: What page are you on?

13 MR. ARRIGHI: Oh, this was just a  
14 handout.

15 MR. FORD: Yes, it was in the very  
16 beginning, I think.

17 MR. ARRIGHI: The licensee had a  
18 diagram, but due to time --

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: They had an open item  
20 on --

21 MR. ROSEN: Well, I don't have it.

22 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes. The open item we had  
23 had to deal with this --

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The cables.

25 MR. ARRIGHI: -- cabling to the safety

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bus. This was the bus that ties on the service  
2 water bus. Again, the cabling for the normal ESF  
3 component, safety components is in scope. And, of  
4 course, in the diesel you can power that bus and the  
5 diesels. But what we had in the open item was that-  
6 - that cabling.

7 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And now they're  
8 included?

9 MR. ARRIGHI: And that is not included.  
10 And, again, we're reviewing the response from the  
11 applicant to see if that's adequate.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. The concern is  
13 that you have is that you cannot go to cold shutdown  
14 without the --

15 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes, what was in that  
16 knowledge, the cold shutdown without the service  
17 water pump, correct.

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

19 MR. ARRIGHI: How long they could stay  
20 in that condition.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: All right. And it is  
22 still an open item. Okay.

23 MR. ARRIGHI: I do have a slide of that.  
24 I don't know if you want it for -- yes, the  
25 applicant had it in their handout.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ROSEN: It's very hard to see in  
2 their handout. It's just blurry and fades away. You  
3 have a better slide than this, you say?

4 MR. ARRIGHI: No. Mine is probably the  
5 same thing as the applicant had. We had a big  
6 drawing that we had to reduce.

7 CHAIRMAN BONACA: The applicant has only  
8 the upper portion of that slide. Here it is. It's  
9 the upper portion.

10 MR. ARRIGHI: And mine is probably a  
11 reduction of the larger document. I'll give this to  
12 you to see if it's any better.

13 MR. ROSEN: This is substantially  
14 better, actually.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

16 MR. ARRIGHI: If there's no further  
17 questions, and if you want to come back to this  
18 later, we will. If there's no further questions, I'd  
19 like to turn it over to John Rowley to discuss the  
20 time limiting aging analyses.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

22 MR. ROWLEY: Good afternoon.

23 Section 4 dealt with time limited aging  
24 analyses, also know as TLAAs.

25 The applicant indicated that six TLAAs

1 were in accordance with criteria specified in 10 CFR  
2 54.3. They include reactor vessel neutron  
3 embrittlement, metal fatigue, environmental  
4 qualification of electrical equipment, concrete  
5 containment of tendon pressures, containment liner  
6 plate and penetration fatigue and other plant  
7 specific TLAAs.

8 Section 4.2 was reactor vessel neutron  
9 embrittlement. The analysis affected by irradiation  
10 embrittlement identified as TLAAS. They were  
11 reactor vessel upper-shelf energy, pressurized  
12 thermal shock and PT curves.

13 Appendix G CRF 50 requires that the  
14 reactor beltline materials have sharp USE values  
15 throughout the life of the vessel less than 50 foot  
16 pounds.

17 As you see in the chart, screening  
18 criteria is 50, but Ginna's project to be less than  
19 50. A foot value less than 50 is acceptable if it  
20 is determined that lower values of the USE provide  
21 marginal safety against fracture required ASME Code  
22 Appendix G.

23 DR. WALLIS: Could you remind us how  
24 much less than 50?

25 MR. ROWLEY: Well, it's projected to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 less than 50 during that period of extended  
2 operation. As of right now it's now.

3 DR. WALLIS: This is calculated?

4 MR. ROWLEY: Yes.

5 DR. WALLIS: Well, what's the calculated  
6 figure?

7 MR. ROSEN: What's the number?

8 MR. ELLIOT: This is Barry Elliot.

9 I don't know the actual number, but the  
10 calculation method is Reg Guide 1.99 Rev. 2. I  
11 don't know what number you get, but the number is  
12 not what's important. What's important is once you  
13 go below that, that you do the analyses.

14 Now, the analyses is a fracture  
15 fractures mechanics evaluation, elastic/plastic  
16 fracture mechanics evaluation. And that material  
17 properties for that is a J-value of fracture  
18 toughness. And that is dependent upon the cooper and  
19 the fluence. And that material property is what  
20 goes into the evaluation. It isn't the upper shelf  
21 energy. It's the fluence and the cooper that goes  
22 into the material property.

23 MR. ROSEN: We complimented the staff  
24 last time, I think it was on the Robinson review,  
25 when you gave this chart with the number.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ELLIOT: We gave you a number of  
2 how--

3 MR. ROSEN: And you said that answers  
4 all the questions.

5 MR. ELLIOT: Okay.

6 MR. ROSEN: And now what you've done is  
7 left them all on the table again.

8 MR. ELLIOT: Well, our answer today is  
9 that there is a J-value that is function of cooper  
10 in fluence --

11 MR. ROSEN: Don't go through it again,  
12 Barry. We know --

13 MR. ELLIOT: And that's what's  
14 important.

15 MR. ROSEN: We know that. We just want  
16 to be shown a chart that tells us that there is 49.6  
17 or 29.6.

18 MR. ELLIOT: No, it's not. It's about  
19 42, because I know the B&W data. So above 42. I  
20 don't know how much above.

21 MR. ROSEN: Come back to the full  
22 Committee with the chart.

23 MR. ELLIOT: I feel bad.

24 MR. ROSEN: Ah, see here you do it.

25 MR. ROWLEY: Licensee is required to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 calculate the -- or RT pressurized thermal shock  
2 value for each material located within the beltline  
3 of the reactor pressure vessel. The materials  
4 provide adequate protection against pressurized  
5 thermal shock events if the referenced temperature  
6 within limits. The criteria is less than 300 degree  
7 fahrenheit, and Ginna's is at 271. So they're  
8 within the criteria and the staff finds that  
9 acceptable.

10 DR. WALLIS: This is all calculated  
11 using a formula with fluence and all that sort of  
12 stuff in it?

13 MR. ROWLEY: Yes.

14 DR. WALLIS: What happens when the  
15 surveillance data take and they don't agree with the  
16 calculation? What do you do?

17 MR. ELLIOT: This is Barry Elliot.  
18 The 271 is from the surveillance data.

19 DR. WALLIS: It comes from the  
20 surveillance data.

21 MR. ELLIOT: It comes from the  
22 surveillance date. The original evaluation from  
23 that licensee didn't have it. They just used the  
24 original, as you said, calculation using the tables  
25 cooper and the fluence. And it turns out that Ginna

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is a very plant in the sense that the actual  
2 limiting material for their vessel beltline is also  
3 in their surveillance program. And so they were able  
4 to actually take the data from their surveillance  
5 program and calculate the amount of embrittlement  
6 followed the guidance in Reg Guide 1.99 Rev. 2.

7 That's the only open issue we have. We  
8 just have to go over that data to see that whether  
9 or not it complies with the guidance in Reg Guide  
10 1.00 Rev. 2.

11 DR. WALLIS: Okay.

12 MR. ELLIOT: If it does, then that's the  
13 number.

14 DR. WALLIS: How do you get  $RT_{PTS}$  from  
15 surveillance data? You take a sample and you test  
16 it at various temperature, or what do you do with  
17 it?

18 MR. ELLIOT: No, no. What you do is you  
19 calculate the amount of embrittlement by the shift  
20 in the 30 foot pound transition temperature. You get  
21 it for the different capsule data for different  
22 fluences. Then fit the data for the different  
23 fluences to --

24 DR. WALLIS: So it's another ASME semi-  
25 curve.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ELLIOT: It's not an ASME semi-  
2 curve. It's a best-fit curve.

3 DR. WALLIS: Okay.

4 MR. ELLIOT: Of the data of shifted 30  
5 foot pound energy versus temperature of fluence.

6 DR. WALLIS: More like the  $RT_{PTS}$  direct.

7 MR. ELLIOT: And that gives you a  
8 transition temperature shift.

9 DR. WALLIS: Okay.

10 MR. ELLIOT: You take that, you add it  
11 to the initial plus to margin value and you get a  
12 total  $RT_{PTS}$  value.

13 MR. ROWLEY: There was one open item,  
14 and Barry just talked about that.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So this open item  
16 really is more like confirmatory item almost. This  
17 open item is more of a confirmatory item?

18 MR. ELLIOT: Right. We have to just go  
19 through the data to see if all the data -- not only  
20 do they have the weld data for their vessel, but  
21 they also have correlation monitor material. We have  
22 to go to check that to see. We have certain parts of  
23 the guidance in the Reg Guide which they have to  
24 comply with.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEITCH: The open item in the SER  
2 says in June 10, 2003 letter the applicant changed  
3 its method of determining the referenced temperature  
4 for pressurized thermal shock. What was that change  
5 all about, or was that different than you're just  
6 describing?

7 MR. ELLIOT: It's just exactly what I  
8 said.

9 MR. LEITCH: Oh, I see. That is what  
10 you're describing.

11 MR. ELLIOT: They originally did it  
12 without the surveillance data.

13 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

14 MR. ELLIOT: And then they said -- in  
15 the original application it was done without  
16 surveillance data.

17 MR. LEITCH: Okay. I understand.  
18 Barry, I wasn't sure if this was some other change.

19 MR. ELLIOT: No, that was the change.

20 MR. LEITCH: That was the change? Okay.  
21 Thank you.

22 MR. ROWLEY: The applicant committed to  
23 updating their pressure/temperature curves prior to  
24 the period of extended operation. And they're going  
25 to either do that in a pressure/temperature limit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report or in technical specifications.

2 The applicant identified metal fatigue  
3 analysis of various components and systems as TLAAs,  
4 of which the reactor cooling system is one of them.  
5 And that's designed to a Class 1 of the ASME Code.

6 Design criteria for a failure of  
7 analysis of ASME Code Class 1 requires a CUF of less  
8 than one. All components at Ginna have a CUF less  
9 than one for the --

10 DR. WALLIS: That's the table we saw  
11 from the applicant earlier?

12 MR. ROWLEY: Correct.

13 DR. WALLIS: They were much less than  
14 one, except for one.

15 MR. ROWLEY: Right. Right.

16 And Ginna is the first applicant to have  
17 CUFs less than one, even when environmental effects  
18 are included. Just something matched with them.

19 There were two confirmatory items, and  
20 both were dealing with updating their UFSAR.

21 Environmental qualification of  
22 electrical equipment. The applicant has adequately  
23 identified the TLAA for EQ components. The EQ  
24 program's consistent with GALL. And staff concluded  
25 EQ program will continue to manage equipment in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 accordance with 10 CFT 50.49 and meets  
2 54>21(c)(1)(i)(ii) and (iii). There are no open or  
3 confirmatory items.

4 MR. LEITCH: As I reviewed these TLAA's,  
5 there's a whole lot of specific TLAA's for various  
6 electrical components, you know, right down to the  
7 details of a discussion of the (1)(a) and (c) ASME  
8 safety injection pump motor and (1)(b) safety  
9 injection pump motor.

10 And I guess I was just curious as to how  
11 these were justified for 60 years of operation. But  
12 when I looked at it, it was like so many of these  
13 things, it ended in a little bit of frustration for  
14 me. Because all it really says, well, in most cases  
15 it says it's just justified -- it's for 40 years now  
16 and by the time the 40 years is up, we'll take a  
17 look at it and see if we can extend the qualified  
18 life for replacement or refurbish it, but it doesn't  
19 really address the methodology for how this will be  
20 done, at least not so far as I can see. And it  
21 seems as though time after time here in all this  
22 qualification of electrical equipment it's another  
23 one of those things where we'll figure it out later,  
24 is basically what it's saying. Is that a fair  
25 assessment of what's going on here?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ARRIGHI: WE did have a meeting with  
2 the applicant where they brought their calculation  
3 for a number of components. They were, again, I  
4 think some of them were originally calculated for 40  
5 years and they recalculated for 60. And the staff  
6 did review those calculations.

7 Our reviewer right now is not here  
8 today. He's on vacation.

9 I don't know if George, if you remember  
10 some of the specifics and can help me out.

11 MR. WROBEL: Yes. George Wrobel from  
12 RG&E.

13 Yes. The EQ calculations that we did,  
14 we've recalculated probably 95 percent of the EQ  
15 components that are on a master list that we want to  
16 extend from 40 years to 60 years. Those calculations  
17 have all been completed. And a vast majority, I  
18 think -- well, 10 to 12 of those were reviewed by  
19 Mr. Saba during that review.

20 We're not putting off any of the  
21 qualification calculations. They should all be done  
22 imminently. The only ones we haven't done were a  
23 few that we feel that we will not extend to 60  
24 years. We're going to replace those anyway.

25 So all the calculations have been

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 completed already. We're not leaving a legacy or a  
2 negative legacy here.

3 MR. LEITCH: So what I'm looking at here  
4 are the exceptions then? I mean, it seems like none  
5 of these are in this section, 4.4, none of these  
6 justified or qualified for 60 years. They all talk  
7 about their existing qualification for 40 years, and  
8 some cases 44 years. And it seems to say that in  
9 the future we'll decide whether that qualification  
10 can be extended or whether we have to replace or  
11 refurbish this.

12 MR. WROBEL: Well, we can provide -- if  
13 there's additional detail needed by the NRC, we can  
14 provide that. But there are very few calculations  
15 left that don't already go to 60 years. So the  
16 final SER should sound different than that.

17 MR. LEITCH: Okay.

18 MR. ARRIGHI: Again, the staff did  
19 review, you know, ten or twelve of those  
20 calculations, look at the methodologies and the  
21 assumptions and they were satisfied with the  
22 calculations.

23 MR. LEITCH: So it is not as though  
24 there is more recent information than exists in this  
25 document?

1 MR. ARRIGHI: And that's the SER or the  
2 application?

3 MR. LEITCH: This is the application.

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Application. Because  
5 the SER says --

6 MR. ARRIGHI: I think the SER, he  
7 specified which calculations he reviewed. I believe  
8 he went in detail and made a listing of those  
9 calculations that were reviewed, again by Saba.  
10 Again, I didn't compare them against what's in the  
11 application, though.

12 MR. ROWLEY: Section 4.5 concrete  
13 containment tendon prestress. Prestress losses  
14 estimated for 40 to 60 years. The applicant did  
15 provide trending analysis. And the staff considered  
16 the applicant's actions adequate during the period  
17 of extended operations and there were no open or  
18 confirmatory items.

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: If I remember, they  
20 had a program to retention some of them?

21 MR. ROWLEY: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: There's a commitment  
23 to go to retentioning?

24 MR. ARRIGHI: I know they were planning  
25 on retentioning them all in 2005, I think the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 remaining ones that weren't retentioned in 1980, I  
2 think. In 1980 they retentioned a 137.

3 I have to look at the commitment list.  
4 I don't know if that was the commitment or not.

5 MR. WILSON: Our commitment was to  
6 retention the remaining 23 tendons into 2005.

7 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I remember that.

8 MR. ARRIGHI: Okay. And that is the SER  
9 in Appendix A.

10 DR. WALLIS: Now is "adequate" a good  
11 grade or is that fairly adequate, or what's the  
12 meaning of "adequate?" Do they do more than is  
13 necessary? Do they do the bare minimum? What does  
14 "adequate" mean?

15 MR. ARRIGHI: Cliff Munson.

16 MR. MUNSON: They're required to sample  
17 5 percent of the population of their tendons, and  
18 they do more than that. I can't remember the  
19 specific percentage, but I think it's above ten  
20 percent.

21 DR. WALLIS: Yes. I think, though, this  
22 is a judgment. There is a metric you and just check  
23 that they have actually met the requirements then?

24 MR. MUNSON: Right. Every five years  
25 they do their lift-off measurements.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ARRIGHI: And again, they do three  
2 times of the requirement. I think the requirement  
3 is four percent, and they do 12 in their  
4 surveillance.

5 MR. ROWLEY: 4.6 is containment liner  
6 plate and penetration fatigue. The staff requested  
7 a list of the design transients and corresponding  
8 cycles that were specified in the design of the  
9 containment liner penetration. The staff finds the  
10 design transients and corresponding cycles  
11 acceptable. They conclude that the TLAAs has been  
12 projected to the end of extended period of  
13 operation. And there were no open or confirmatory  
14 items.

15 And there were seven other plant  
16 specific TLAAs. All demonstrated that the TLAAs  
17 have been projected to the end of the period of  
18 extended operation. Also, there were no open or  
19 confirmatory items.

20 MR. ARRIGHI: Well, that concludes the  
21 staff presentation, unless there are any further  
22 questions.

23 DR. WALLIS: It's interesting. A fly  
24 wheel is a moving part and I thought moving parts  
25 didn't appear in these renewal.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. LEE: Yes. This is Sam Lee. For the  
2 TLAA, the active components are also part of the  
3 TLAA.

4 DR. WALLIS: They are also part. Okay.  
5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. Do we have any  
7 additional questions for the presenters? If none,  
8 then I think what we're going to do is, would you  
9 like to take a break before we go around the table  
10 and talk about two things we have to do. One is  
11 some views by members about where we are, what we  
12 need. And also some expectations for the full  
13 Committee meeting, which is the second.

14 Okay. So, we can go to right now,  
15 actually, and then complete our meeting. Take a  
16 break later.

17 So why don't we go around the table.  
18 Starting with you, Graham, if you could give us your  
19 views?

20 DR. WALLIS: Well, I don't see any  
21 significant issues. These are getting so routine,  
22 these license renewal.

23 I do think that in terms of the  
24 presentation to the full Committee, every time you  
25 can have some numbers or some criteria, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something, or a table, it's more convincing than  
2 saying the staff finds the work adequate, or  
3 something like that. And if you can buttress it  
4 with something quantitative or some metrics, that  
5 always is more convincing.

6 So, I would just suggest that.

7 MR. ARRIGHI: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Peter?

9 MR. FORD: I'm cautiously satisfied with  
10 disposition of all the open items and the  
11 confirmatory items. And I, again, am cautiously  
12 satisfied about the completeness of the review  
13 that's been done by the staff.

14 And the reason why I keep saying  
15 cautious is that I'm being asked to signed off or  
16 approve a memo which really should be based on data.  
17 And, as Graham says, we haven't seen a lot of data  
18 upon which some of these judgments are being made.  
19 And that's maybe because of time.

20 I'd like to see in the future as  
21 appropriate some of the analyses that has been done.  
22 And I'm going to dig into the questioning, I'm  
23 pretty sure that data does exist. It just hasn't  
24 been presented.

25 The one I feel I keep hitting on is

1 these questions of one time inspections and the  
2 opportunistic in terms of place and time and when  
3 you're going to do these one time inspections. And  
4 I think somehow or another we've got to where  
5 appropriate, and that means in the question of the  
6 consequence of the failure of these components  
7 subjected to a one time inspection, I think we have  
8 to tackle that sometime in the future.

9 And, again, as I've said before, it's  
10 not specific to this particular plant. It's specific  
11 to all the plants who we have been doing our LRAs  
12 on.

13 That's my main point.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. Well, let's talk  
15 about briefly. Because, I mean, you're talking  
16 about in the future it could be valuable for us to  
17 have an example, at least of some of the technical  
18 information behind a specific issue.

19 MR. FORD: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: So that the Committee  
21 will have an understanding that in fact, or a  
22 confirmation that the judgments are not based purely  
23 on some quantitative consideration, but also there  
24 is a technical basis behind that. You know, we're  
25 not party to the kind of information normally. So

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it may be a good exercise for us to do. It doesn't  
2 have anything to do with this application.

3 MR. FORD: Exactly.

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: But we may try to look  
5 for a forum. And maybe the next application that  
6 comes, start with that, we could have some specific  
7 example.

8 MR. FORD: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And an example could  
10 be, for example, in a specific one time inspection.  
11 Because this has come up again frequently the  
12 concern the Committee has with the one time  
13 inspections as, you know, what they mean and why are  
14 they adequate rather than a program.

15 Now, I always think that the one  
16 inspection could be the springboard for a problem.  
17 What I mean is that if you expect once and you find  
18 that in fact your expectation is not supported by  
19 the inspection, then you have to respond to the  
20 program. And so I would see that coming through.  
21 But we've had a lot of questions about one time  
22 inspections.

23 One has been should the confirmatory of  
24 the fact that we do not expect to have something  
25 happening, and not vice versa, okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   And that's why I asked the question  
2                   about the former bolts. Because, you know, even in  
3                   case you have no expectations to have a need for it,  
4                   well since you did something before, it may be --  
5                   but anyway, I don't want to get back on that issue  
6                   again.

7                   So that could be helpful to this  
8                   Committee if we took the next application, take one  
9                   of the one time inspections and expand on it so that  
10                  we can see what the logic was behind and have a  
11                  better understanding of it.

12                 MR. GILLESPIE: Yes, I think we can do  
13                 that. In fact, we'll take under consideration.  
14                 Because this whole thing's going to get aggravated  
15                 more and more.

16                 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

17                 MR. GILLESPIE: As we update GALL and  
18                 bring in past practice into GALL. The premise of  
19                 GALL is reference GALL and keep the documentation on  
20                 site.

21                 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

22                 MR. GILLESPIE: So two years from now  
23                 you're going to probably see significantly less in  
24                 an application than you even see today, which is why  
25                 we've got audit teams, and we had an audit team go

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to Ginna to look at the biocabinets full of  
2 background material.

3 So for the audit team to bring some  
4 details back on one of the audits, one of the  
5 issues. We can document it maybe in the audit  
6 report and then we'll have a record.

7 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. And you're  
8 absolutely right. And we are diverging from a  
9 standard process of review of the SERS. For  
10 example, as I mentioned in the presentation to the  
11 Commission, where I'm looking much more at unique  
12 things about this plant that really are not  
13 addressed through GALL, but -- you know, and so if  
14 we have plant where we have a thermal shield failure  
15 with damage, I'm concerned about how to address the  
16 damage in the next 20 years: What kind of  
17 inspection and so on. So this is unique to that  
18 plant. And so we're looking for those kind of  
19 elements.

20 And I think we should do it in a way  
21 that doesn't penalize the licensee that comes as the  
22 next review, see if there's an example of what  
23 you've done.

24 MR. GILLESPIE: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And that would be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 helpful to us.

2 MR. GILLESPIE: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Graham?

4 MR. LEITCH: Well, a couple of things.  
5 I'm a little concerned about the qualification of  
6 electrical equipment. I mean, I see in the license  
7 renewal application a lot of open issues. I see in  
8 the SER some of those are closed, apparently to the  
9 satisfaction of the staff, but not all of them.

10 Now, I'm not sure if I'm just talking  
11 about a timing issue here. In other words, maybe  
12 they are more closed now and it'll become apparent  
13 in the final SER just what the status of those is,  
14 but I'm just not sure about that.

15 But I see, for example, safety injection  
16 pump motors and I see a list in the SER of  
17 calculations that have been reviewed. But the  
18 safety ejection pump motor EQ is not among those  
19 calculations that have been reviewed.

20 Now I don't know. Perhaps in the month  
21 or so since this has been written that's in  
22 progress. I just don't know that. But I just think  
23 that what we're saying here or what the license  
24 renewal application seems to be saying is we'll  
25 worry about that in the future. And I think that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issue, perhaps, could be resolved now.

2 MR. GILLESPIE: Yes. I think the  
3 disconnect that you heard was that the licensee in  
4 parallel with having submitted the application was  
5 doing these calculations. And we reviewed  
6 illustrative applications of his process, but we  
7 didn't review every single one of them. And you're  
8 not going to see a one-to-one correspondence between  
9 the applicant's chart on his submittal in the SE.  
10 So those are illustrative reviews in the SE.

11 MR. LEITCH: So it's to gain confidence  
12 in the methodology, not necessarily a --

13 MR. GILLESPIE: Not a 100 percent  
14 confirmation of each component.

15 MR. JACKSON: Do you mind if I make a  
16 comment on this? This is Jarred Jackson from Ginna.

17 The basic process environmental  
18 qualification is such that you replace the component  
19 when you reach the limit that was previously  
20 analyzed. That's actually the most conservative  
21 state that you could be in.

22 So if we get to a situation where we're  
23 saying we're not analyzing it right now, we're in  
24 the conservative state that the EQ rule is already  
25 going to replace that component.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   So in some of these instances that  
2                   you're bringing up, we may actually be more  
3                   conservative than we need to be for license renewal.  
4                   At any point in the future we may redo that analysis  
5                   such that we say the temperatures are lower or not  
6                   as much irradiation in the field. And those are the  
7                   types of data that comes into consideration for  
8                   these analysis.

9                   MR. LEITCH: Yes. Okay. That's a good  
10                  explanation.

11                  I guess the other more general issue I  
12                  had was related to this issue that was mentioned on  
13                  the first couple slides regarding the sale of the  
14                  plant. I don't know what the NRC's position would  
15                  be if that is in some kind of progress at the time  
16                  that this license renewal application is becoming  
17                  final. In other words, are we dealing with  
18                  Rochester Gas & Electric here or are we dealing with  
19                  the new people, whoever they may be. It seems to me  
20                  it would need to be one or the other, but not  
21                  crossing over someplace in midstream here. Maybe  
22                  that's not a safety issue, it's a legal financial  
23                  kind of an issue. But I just wonder how we would  
24                  deal with that.

25                  MR. MECREDY: It's Bob Mecredy from

1 RG&E.

2 In fact, license renewal will be done by  
3 RG&E because the plant sale is contingent upon a  
4 renewed license.

5 MR. LEITCH: Oh, okay.

6 MR. MECREDDY: So license renewal is  
7 first and then transfer. It makes sense. The new  
8 owner, they're interested in 20 some odd years, not  
9 2009.

10 MR. LEITCH: Sure.

11 MR. MECREDDY: So that's the basis for  
12 the sale.

13 MR. LEITCH: Yes, okay. Well, that  
14 answers that question.

15 MR. ROSEN: And, Graham, the new owner  
16 will have to meet all the certain tests for  
17 financial resources and other things.

18 MR. LEITCH: Right. Understand that.

19 MR. ROSEN: In order to be able to  
20 accept the new license.

21 MR. LEITCH: Yes, I understand that.

22 MR. MECREDDY: Yes, that's right.

23 MR. ROSEN: And it makes logical sense,  
24 and it's a two step process.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I think it's a good

1 question. Because I mean, that owner, I mean so  
2 much of this -- this is a promise of maintaining  
3 this plant to this level. And I think, actually,  
4 that there are a lot of good commitments from this  
5 plant. I mean, you know the commitment to replace  
6 the head at this time, I think is a proactive one.  
7 And so there'll be a new owner, they may think  
8 differently.

9 So, but I agree with you that --

10 MR. ROSEN: The new owner did come in  
11 and say, "Yes, well that was the other guy. That  
12 wasn't us."

13 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Well, you may see  
14 that.

15 MR. LEITCH: Well, I think as long as  
16 it's one side or the other and it's been explained  
17 this will be done before the transfer the ownership-  
18 -

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes, I agree.

20 MR. LEITCH: -- as long as that's clean,  
21 I don't have any problem with that.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. I agree. I  
23 agree.

24 MR. ROSEN: The new owner has to come in  
25 and has to accept all the previous commitments of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the licensee?

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I agree. Right. I  
3 agree.

4 MR. ROSEN: It's just a new licensee for  
5 the old commitments.

6 MR. LEITCH: Yes, and there's no  
7 question about that. It's just that if this process  
8 was someplace midstream when that ownership was  
9 transferred, it could be somewhat confusing. And  
10 that's what was concerning me. But we're hearing  
11 that that will not be the case.

12 I don't know if you wanted us to talk a  
13 little bit about points to be emphasized at the full  
14 Committee meeting.

15 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes. Yes.

16 MR. LEITCH: And one of the things that  
17 I think is important in that context is the  
18 management of these commitments. And I guess RG&E  
19 may be in a little awkward position to defend  
20 exactly how these commitments will be managed with  
21 this transfer of ownership in the offing.

22 But I guess the thing that I would like  
23 to hear addressed more is there are a number of  
24 places here where there are future commitments. And  
25 how are those commitments going to be tracked? Is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there an on-site organization that's going to track  
2 these commitments? As plant modifications over the  
3 years, how does that all factor into the license  
4 renewal program? And just how is this going to  
5 continue to be a dynamic process until the period of  
6 extended operation is entered?

7 And I don't know if you can shed any  
8 light on that at the full Committee meeting or now.  
9 And it may be a somewhat difficult situation because  
10 of the change of ownership.

11 MR. MECREDY: This is Bob Mecredy again.

12 We can address that. George will  
13 address that at the full Committee. But  
14 fundamentally it's the same process we use now to  
15 address commitments we have made in the past for  
16 things we have had to do subsequently or things that  
17 may still need to be done between now and the end of  
18 the current license. So the process for managing  
19 commitments is really just a case of how far in the  
20 future as opposed to anything that's different. And  
21 certainly commitments we have made in the past  
22 remain commitments regardless of change in licensee,  
23 unless the new owner decides to come back to the  
24 staff and change the commitments. There's a  
25 standard process for that -- but we will talk about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 commitments and how we manage them. And we do have  
2 a system and a process on-site that tracks  
3 commitments and ensures that they're done, and  
4 there's various categories with MRP and our sequence  
5 being at the top of the list. And that is actively  
6 managed in accordance with our practices and  
7 industry standards. So we can talk about.

8 MR. LEITCH: What concerns me is not so  
9 much changing the commitments as assuring somehow  
10 what is the process for assuring that the  
11 commitments will be tracked and completed by the  
12 time of entrance into the period of extended  
13 operation.

14 MR. MECREDY: We'll address that.

15 MR. GILLESPIE: Graham, just from our  
16 side since they're making up the list and we have to  
17 check it, the majority of things like participating  
18 in the MRP program and those things are in the FSAR.  
19 So that you've got as a minimum once a new license  
20 is issued, a 50/59 type control on the FSAR. So  
21 there's a safety level -- it redefines the safety  
22 level for the operating facility once they get the  
23 new license.

24 The other thing is we have a custom  
25 inspection procedure for each plant that's written

1 based on that commitment list, which the staff is  
2 then maintaining which will get inspected before the  
3 end of the term. And so that's being done for every  
4 single plant.

5 So you've got the FSAR list, there's  
6 other things, and then you've got a specific  
7 inspection procedure for each plant. And this  
8 actually came out of earlier ACRS staff discussions  
9 on how are you keeping up with the list. So there's  
10 a bit of formality in it. And the industry overall  
11 agreed to put these in the FSARs, which previously  
12 they did not do. So the first couple of plants  
13 didn't necessarily have that.

14 MR. LEITCH: Yes. I guess what I'd like  
15 to hear a little more about how the licensee plans  
16 to manage that.

17 MR. GILLESPIE: Yes.

18 MR. LEITCH: I mean, I know what you're  
19 doing. But I guess there have been some licensees  
20 that have come and told us basically that plant  
21 license renewal is just integrated into their normal  
22 process of doing business. Others have seemed to  
23 indicate that they kind of have a permanent license  
24 renewal organization that manages all these things  
25 and assures that they get done.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   And I guess I'd just like to hear a  
2 little discussion about how Rochester Gas & Electric  
3 plans to do that. And I guess their plans, the  
4 method by which they manage these things are  
5 probably not hard and fast commitments. I mean the  
6 commitments are hard and fast, but the method they  
7 use to manage them are so that they have some  
8 latitude there.

9                   MR. GILLESPIE: Yes.

10                  MR. LEITCH: And perhaps the new owner  
11 may see it a little differently than Rochester Gas  
12 and Electric. But at least I'd like to hear how  
13 Rochester Gas & Electric --

14                  MR. GILLESPIE: Yes. The danger here is  
15 that the onus is now shifted once the license  
16 issued. The onus is kind of shifted to the staff to  
17 confirm it.

18                  MR. LEITCH: Yes.

19                  MR. GILLESPIE: And if a commitment is  
20 not met, then now we're into the compliance arena  
21 relative to any actions we're going to take because  
22 the license is gone.

23                  MR. LEITCH: Right.

24                  MR. GILLESPIE: So there's a kind of  
25 shift of burden once we issue that license.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEITCH: Yes. Yes.

2 MR. MECREDDY: Bob Mecredy again.

3 I would argue also that it's our  
4 commitment and it's our obligation to meet it, so we  
5 still have even with the new license, an extended  
6 period, it's still our nickel and we're obligated to  
7 do it. Staff has the role of inspecting to assure  
8 we've done it, but it's really no different, again,  
9 than any other commitment we've ever made. Once  
10 we've made the commitment, we're obligated to do it  
11 as part of our license where it's part of our normal  
12 correspondence with the staff.

13 MR. LEITCH: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Any other issues?

15 MR. ROSEN: The difference is the  
16 magnitude, Bob. The magnitude of the number of  
17 commitments and the length of time over which they  
18 are operable. You know, it's a question of degree  
19 more than anything else.

20 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Steve, your views?

21 MR. ROSEN: Well, I thought this was a  
22 very well done application and I have only two  
23 questions that remain. One is a commitment I made  
24 earlier, I'll just reenforce it.

25 When you come back to the full

1 Committee, I really would like to reactor vessel  
2 upper shelf energy chart revised to show the value,  
3 just like the pressurized thermal shock chart that  
4 shows the value.

5 And then I'd like to take you back to a  
6 question on the station blackout diagram. Can you  
7 put that back up again?

8 Now, there was a question, an open item  
9 that staff had identified that there were two cables  
10 from the off-site power path that bring power into  
11 the safety buses that were not in scope.

12 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes.

13 MR. ROSEN: Now, are they now in scope?

14 MR. ARRIGHI: No. The applicant's  
15 position is that these two cables that power the --

16 MR. ROSEN: Which two are they?

17 MR. ARRIGHI: These outer two cables  
18 here. Those two cables, their statement is that  
19 they don't need to power the service water pumps  
20 because they can get a cold shutdown within 72 hours  
21 without those. That's their CLB.

22 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Without what?

23 MR. ARRIGHI: Without the service water  
24 pumps.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Without the service

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water pump.

2 MR. ARRIGHI: And those cables supply  
3 the service water. This bus supplies the service  
4 water pump.

5 MR. ROSEN: And the way they will do  
6 that is by feed and bleed of the secondary side into  
7 the containment?

8 MR. ARRIGHI: Correct. Yes, they would  
9 use the standby aux feedwater or the aux feedwater  
10 pumps to --

11 MR. ROSEN: To keep the speed of the  
12 steam --

13 MR. ARRIGHI: -- feed the steam  
14 generators and then dump steam --

15 MR. ROSEN: This is in station blackout  
16 now, right?

17 MR. ARRIGHI: Yes.

18 MR. ROSEN: We're talking about station  
19 blackout conditions where they have steam but no  
20 power.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes, and they -- I'm  
22 sorry.

23 MR. ROSEN: The DC power supplies to  
24 control the turbine driven aux feed pump, refilling  
25 the steam generators with the steam that the steam

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generators are providing as the steam pressure  
2 decays, and dumping water on the floor through  
3 manual valve into the containment?

4 MR. ARRIGHI: Correct.

5 MR. ROSEN: And they've got volunteers  
6 for this?

7 MR. WROBEL: Mr. Rosen, we've mixed up  
8 to licensing conditions here.

9 MR. ROSEN: Okay. Help me unmix them.

10 MR. WROBEL: Okay. Forgive me for this  
11 if I contributed to it.

12 With respect to the 4160 volt cables  
13 going to the buses, should they be lost on a station  
14 blackout event, that's one condition. It's  
15 different than the fire condition that we were  
16 talking about earlier for the water solid steam  
17 generator cool down, although there are issues with  
18 respect to a fire in the screen house that might  
19 drive you to a water solid steam generator cool  
20 down. It's more than loss of just these cables.

21 So the cable itself here, you are  
22 correct in assuming that on a station blackout I  
23 have lots of stored energy in my steam generators  
24 that I'm going to use to run my turbine drive  
25 auxiliary feedwater pump. And in order to refill my

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 water source for the turbine driven aux feedwater  
2 pump, I may elect to use my fire water system to add  
3 water to my storage tanks.

4 MR. ROSEN: And you can do that because  
5 it has a diesel driven fire pump?

6 MR. WROBEL: I can do that because it's  
7 a diesel driven fire pump. So that's one of the  
8 issues.

9 The other --

10 MR. ROSEN: That's one issue. Now I  
11 know how you're going to get sustained water into  
12 the secondary side of the steam generators. Now,  
13 how are you going to --

14 MR. WROBEL: That's not a feed and  
15 bleed.

16 MR. ROSEN: -- get steam to the feed  
17 pumps.

18 MR. WROBEL: That's not feed and bleed.  
19 That particular evolution is normal cool down in a  
20 station blackout using turbine driven aux feed  
21 water.

22 MR. ROSEN: And diesel fire pump.

23 MR. WROBEL: And diesel fire pump.

24 MR. ROSEN: You were telling me?

25 MR. WROBEL: The feed and bleed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evolution is an evolution that would occur if we  
2 lost service water for the component cooling water  
3 system, the ultimate heat sink, so to speak. So I  
4 can run on an accident. I can run my diesel driven  
5 or my emergency diesel generators without service  
6 water. And I do that by virtue of hooking them up  
7 to fire water systems; that's one of those SOP  
8 topics. So I don't need service water in order to  
9 immediately mitigate the consequences of the event,  
10 but long term if I want to go to long term cool  
11 down, because I don't want to stay in hot shutdown,  
12 I want to drive myself to cold shutdown --

13 MR. ROSEN: In a station blackout. No.

14 MR. WROBEL: In a fire event.

15 MR. ROSEN: In a fire, not a station  
16 blackout where you have the diesels running to give  
17 you power, on-site power --

18 MR. WROBEL: I still don't need service  
19 water because I can use this water solid steam  
20 generator cool down method, thereby avoiding the  
21 necessity of having component cooling water for RHR  
22 system, which would be normally feed from the  
23 service water which is lost because of fire.

24 CHAIRMAN BONACA: See, one thing that  
25 concerns me about, and maybe I'm wrong but I want to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bring up, some of this, you know, not orthodox ways  
2 of providing for cooling, etcetera, seems to be  
3 coming from the SEP. Okay. In the SEP you -- now  
4 that was really a program that was tailored for  
5 plants that were supposed to operate 40 years and  
6 did not meet the design basis or requirements of the  
7 SRP, therefore you allow for, let's say, unorthodox  
8 ways of dealing with these issues.

9 Now you're using it to justify 20 more  
10 years of operation. I am not sure that logically  
11 there it's satisfying to me. I just throw it on the  
12 table.

13 MR. ARRIGHI: Again, we do have the open  
14 item on this issue and we're still evaluating it.

15 MR. ROSEN: Is there more to be said or  
16 is that the whole story?

17 MR. WROBEL: In a fire evolution where  
18 you would use the water solid steam generator cool  
19 down method, the turbine drive auxiliary feed water  
20 pump is not the water source. It's the standby  
21 auxiliary feed water pump. Those additional two  
22 pumps that we installed and talked about earlier  
23 today, that's the water source that puts the water  
24 into the secondary system. Those two are fed from  
25 the city water system, if necessary.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           If you lose service water, we have two  
2 places that you can hook up the fire loop. One is  
3 the emergency diesel generators, the other to the  
4 suction of the standby auxiliary feed water pumps.

5           So what we've somehow mixed up here  
6 today is two events; the station blackout and a fire  
7 event.

8           MR. ROSEN: Station blackout is that  
9 event where you --

10          MR. WROBEL: Station blackout --

11          MR. ROSEN: -- lose all the power on  
12 that system right there.

13          MR. WROBEL: Correct. Where I lost my  
14 essentially service water.

15          MR. ROSEN: Yes.

16          MR. WROBEL: And now I run my --  
17 initially I'm running my decayed heat removal via my  
18 turbine driven auxiliary feed water pump. And then  
19 as a remake or a refill capacity for my turbine  
20 driven auxiliary feed water pump, I use fire water  
21 from the diesel driven fire pump and I have an  
22 inventory source at that point.

23          MR. ROSEN: And that's the justification  
24 for not including those two lines in the scope of  
25 license renewal?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WROBEL: That's part of the  
2 justification.

3 MR. ROSEN: What's the down side of  
4 including them in? Anything? Or is this just an  
5 argument, what we used to call academic arguments  
6 here, but we have a highly influential persons who  
7 are in the academics sphere here. And we don't call  
8 them academic arguments, because that's the  
9 pejorative term.

10 MR. WROBEL: In essence, this is just a  
11 discussion for the staff over the breadth and the  
12 scope of our current licensing basis and where it  
13 starts and stops.

14 MR. ROSEN: Okay. So if you are of a  
15 mind to, you could say it's not in our current  
16 licensing basis but we could include -- we will  
17 include these in our license renewal anyway? You  
18 could say that? I mean, that would clarify it?

19 MR. WROBEL: Yes. Yes, sir, we could  
20 say that.

21 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Other licensees that  
22 don't say things of that kind.

23 MR. ROSEN: Well, I would suggest that  
24 you try somehow for the full Committee to make this  
25 clearer. Because even though I've listened to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whole argument, I still am -- it' the fog of war,  
2 maybe. But I don't understand it exactly, and you  
3 know I have I some experience in this area.

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And, again, you know,  
5 I love to point out what I did not like, and I  
6 didn't hear an answer to that. But they're using  
7 some unorthodox ways by SRP that are being allowed  
8 for your plant because you did not meet the SRP  
9 requirements to continue to justify certain  
10 unorthodox ways of getting to cold shutdown to  
11 exclude components from scope. And I say, yes, it's  
12 consistent with your licensing basis. But, you know,  
13 what if the plan now goes to 60 years of life, then  
14 it goes to 80 years of life. You know, I just feel  
15 less comfortable with that. And my concern is that  
16 you know the intent of the SEP was not one -- it was  
17 a grandfathering of older plants to keep them  
18 running for the 40 years of operation.

19 Now, I'm not saying that you're not  
20 justified to go to 60, but I feel uncomfortable. I  
21 got to think about this.

22 MR. JACKSON: I'd like to comment on  
23 that for a moment. This is Jarred Jackson.

24 Part of what we're talking about here is  
25 recovery from a station blackout. I'm sure you guys

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have heard this discussion before.

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Sure.

3 MR. JACKSON: And the industry may have  
4 interrupted recovery different, understanding what  
5 the licensing basis for coping versus recovery. So  
6 as an industry, we did not have or did not feel we  
7 had recovery as a licensing basis issue. So when  
8 the staff had interpreted it in that way such that  
9 we are now addressing recovery, we looked at the CLB  
10 as a whole. So I don't want to misimpression as if  
11 this is an orthodox methodology, because it's also a  
12 differing opinion on interpretation of the CLB.

13 So, it's not as if this is very clear  
14 cut in the CLB and we're using an unorthodox method  
15 of achieving it. You know, we acknowledged the  
16 staff's understanding of recovery, and we've  
17 attempted to address it and in a manner that I think  
18 we both agree on.

19 CHAIRMAN BONACA: I'm saying, however,  
20 that most people to recovery station blackout, they  
21 want to use their service water. And that's what we  
22 have seen from other people; they have to recovery  
23 water or use it. And here you have an exception from  
24 recovery service water based on, I call it  
25 unorthodox when you tie fire water to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 secondaries and you keep generating steam for your  
2 steam driven pumps by pumping fire water in a steam  
3 generator.

4 MR. ROSEN: And draining by manual  
5 valves into the containment.

6 CHAIRMAN BONACA: That's right. Into the  
7 containment. I mean, you know --

8 MR. ROSEN: Is that what I heard?

9 MR. WILSON: Dave Wilson, Rochester Gas  
10 & Electric.

11 But the draining actually happens via  
12 some connections into the yard. So you steam via the  
13 normal method until you get steam pressure. So  
14 you're steaming through the atmospheric relief  
15 valves, main steam atmospheric relief valves. And  
16 then when you get to a certain condition, you can't  
17 get enough steam pressure, then you shift over to  
18 adding water to the secondary side and draining that  
19 water out, basically using a steam generator as a  
20 heat exchanger, you know water-to-water heat  
21 exchanger --

22 MR. ROSEN: Now this is a steam  
23 generator that has no tube leaks, I hope, because  
24 you're not draining --

25 MR. WILSON: That is correct, sir.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ROSEN: -- radioactive material to  
2 the yard.

3 MR. WILSON: No tube leaks.

4 MR. ROSEN: You have the new steam  
5 generators.

6 MR. WILSON: Right.

7 MR. ROSEN: Are they made of impervium?

8 MR. WILSON: They're not made of  
9 impervium, but our licensing basis doesn't account  
10 for having, you know, significant number of beyond  
11 design basis events or unusual things happening at  
12 the same time.

13 MR. ROSEN: Well, this whole thing is  
14 rather curious is all I have. Mario calls them  
15 unorthodox. He has used more stronger words in the  
16 past. But I'll stay with that.

17 MR. WILSON: We're quite capable, I  
18 think, the full Committee of making a nice  
19 presentation on this issue and/or if we don't decide  
20 before that point, just put the cables into scope.

21 MR. ROSEN: Okay.

22 DR. WALLIS: Yes. That would be the  
23 simplest thing to do.

24 MR. WILSON: It's appearing to be that.

25 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Any other issues?

1 Steve?

2 MR. GILLESPIE: That's all.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay.

4 Insofar as my views, first of all what I  
5 think of the application. I think that it was a  
6 very clear application insofar as the documentation.  
7 I thought it was well organized. I mean, I could  
8 follow from table-to-table clearly.

9 So, I thought more highly of GALL after  
10 reviewing this.

11 I think that I'm impressed by the way  
12 that some of the specific commitments have been  
13 implemented. I commented on the auxiliary feed water  
14 system. I've seen other SEP plants that did not go  
15 that far, and so that seems to me like a serious  
16 commitment of the station in the past and present to  
17 improvements to the plant.

18 And I've been impressed by the quality  
19 of the replacements in generators and then the head  
20 being ordered now and implemented in 2003, although  
21 you have no obvious leakage from the head. So there  
22 is, again, I am sure that was driven also by your  
23 intent of selling the plant, but whatever reason it  
24 may be, it meant enough, and it's even better. So  
25 that was significant to me.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   With regard to the presentations to the  
2 full Committee, I think it would be helpful after  
3 you have the Systematic Evaluation Program, since  
4 most people are aware of that, if you could  
5 highlight in your slide the major issues. You know,  
6 you had off feed. You may have some others that you  
7 want to point out.

8                   You do have this bleed and feed on the  
9 secondary side, which I have never seen by any plant  
10 except in Germany where they use it as a standard  
11 way of bleeding and feeding rather than the primary  
12 side. So that was interesting. I haven't seen it  
13 here. So, you may want to point out some  
14 descriptions. Because it was difficult a little bit  
15 for a reviewer to understand exactly how the plant  
16 is configured, and we did not have the benefit of a  
17 FSAR in front of us to look at those features.

18                   And I think that pretty much I just  
19 don't have any additional comments really here. I  
20 think many of them have been by my colleagues here.

21                   So for the full Committee, I think we  
22 should have some clarification of the SEP, as we  
23 said. And otherwise I think that the representation  
24 was good. I think you'll have to collapse it down.  
25 We have much less time than we have at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Subcommittee meeting.

2 MR. ROSEN: Short one side.

3 CHAIRMAN BONACA: What?

4 MR. ROSEN: We need one revised slide.

5 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes, we need revised  
6 slide with some quantitative information.

7 But insofar again at the next renewal, I  
8 think we should have an example of a quantitative,  
9 for example a decision on time inspection that will  
10 give us some comfort insofar as --

11 MR. GILLESPIE: I think the next one on  
12 the schedule is Summer.

13 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Summer.

14 MR. GILLESPIE: And Summer has no open  
15 items right now. And we're not on a schedule for  
16 about 3 months. So we'll come with one example so  
17 we'll have something to talk about.

18 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Okay. I don't have  
19 any other comments on that.

20 So are there any other comments or  
21 questions from the members? Any questions or  
22 comments from the public? If not, then the meeting  
23 is adjourned.

24 Thank you very much.

25 (Whereupon, at 4:23 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CERTIFICATE


This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: Advisory Committee on  
Reactor Safeguards  
Plant License Renewal  
Subcommittee

Docket Number: n/a

Location: Rockville, MD

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.



Rebecca Davis  
Official Reporter  
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

# GINNA STATION

ACRS

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

November 4, 2003



# CONTENTS

- Background/History
- Unique Issues/Features
- Current Issues of Interest
  - Reactor Vessel Head Replacement
  - Reactor Vessel Bottom Head Inspections
  - Containment Recirculation Sump Screen
- License Renewal Application Development/Results
- TLAAs
- Programs
- Commitments
- Open Items

# BACKGROUND/HISTORY

- Westinghouse 2-loop 1520 MWt PWR
- Initial License granted September 18, 1969
  - Systematic Evaluation Program Plant
  - POL-FTOL Conversion 12/10/84
  - CP-OL Recapture 8/9/91
- Steam Generator Replacement - 1996
- Improved Standard Tech Specs - 1996
- Baffle-Barrel Bolt Inspection/Replacement - 1999
- Reactor Vessel Head Replacement - 2003
- Plant Sale Anticipated Mid-2004


# SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION PROGRAM

- Program Included All Plants with Provisional Operating Licenses, began in 1977
- Compare Ginna to Then-Current SRP
- 92 Topics Reviewed
- Resulted in Well-Documented CLB
- Early Use of Risk Perspective
- Cost-Beneficial Plant Changes

# UNIQUE ISSUES/FEATURES


- Earliest Operating PWR
- Standby Auxiliary Feedwater System
- Grouted Containment Tendons/Rock Anchors
- Station Blackout Recovery
- All NRC Performance Indicators Green
- All NRC Inspection Findings Green


Onsite Transformer Yard and Switchgear Area




# CURRENT ISSUES OF INTEREST

- Reactor Vessel Head Replacement
- Reactor Vessel Bottom Head Inspections
- Containment Recirculation Sump Screen





# Lower Reactor Vessel Inspection




- Insulation lowered to accommodate inspection
- 36 Nozzles examined
  - 360 ° around
  - VT-1 Visual

# Lower Reactor Vessel Inspection




- Results:
  - Carbolene zinc based paint on bottom head and weld pad was in good condition
  - No leakage through nozzle penetrations
  - No indication of boric acid or boric acid buildup from operational leakage
  - Cleaning performed to facilitate future inspections

# “B” Sump



- Committed to inspect per NRC Bulletin 2003-01

- Inspection raised 3 issues:
  - Sump screen mesh per UFSAR should filter debris  $> 0.25''$  in diameter. Installed mesh size is  $3/16'' \times 9/16''$ .
  - Bypass flow issue
  - Foreign material found



SEP 21 2003

1:39:38 PM



SEP 22 2003  
10:01:35AM

# LRA PREPARATIONS/RESULTS

- Primarily In-house Matrixed Staff with Specialty Contractors
- LRA prepared following guidance of NEI 95-10 in SRP format (3rd plant)
- Many Additional Material/Environment Combinations not in Gall (3.X-2 Tables)
- Interim Staff Guidance Addressed in LRA
- Scoping Open Items

# SELECTED TLAAs

- **Pressurized Thermal Shock - RV**

**Table 4.2-1 Values of  $RT_{PTS}$  at EOL - Ginna RPV Beltline Materials**

Material	Heat Number	Inner Surface Fluence E19 n/cm <sup>2</sup>	Initial $RT_{NDT}$ °F	Margin °F	Chemistry Factor °F	Inside Surface Fluence Factor	$RT_{NDT}$ °F	$RT_{PTS}$ °F
Intermediate Shell	125S255VA1	4.85	20	34 <sup>1</sup>	44 <sup>1</sup>	1.396	61.4	115.4
Lower Shell	125P666VA1	4.85	40	34 <sup>1</sup>	31 <sup>1</sup>	1.396	43.3	117.3
Circumferential Weld	61782/ SA-847	5.01	-4.8	48.3 <sup>2</sup>	161.9 <sup>2</sup>	1.403	227.1	270.6

<sup>1</sup> Regulatory Guide 1.99, Rev. 2, Position 1.1

<sup>2</sup> Regulatory Guide 1.99, Rev. 2, Position 2.1

The  $RT_{PTS}$  values for the intermediate and lower shell forgings remain below the NRC screening criterion of 270°F and the  $RT_{PTS}$  value for the beltline circumferential weld (SA-847) remains below the NRC screening criterion of 300°F at EOL.

# Fracture Toughness - RV

- Equivalent margins analysis for limiting beltline weld showed substantial margin per ASME Section XI, App. K for ductile flaw extension and tensile stability.

# RCS Fatigue Calculation Results (60 years)

Components:

CUF (with maximum Fen)

– RV Shell and Lower Head Region	0
– RV Inlet and Outlet Nozzles	0.3922
– SI Nozzle to Cold Leg	0.2517
– RHR-to-SI Tee	0.1428
– Charging Nozzle (200 events)	0.338
– Pressurizer Heater Penetration	0.74
– Pressurizer Surge Nozzle	9.633E-06
– RCS Hot Leg Surge Nozzle	0.2022

# PROGRAMS

Total - 33

Consistent with Gall - 20

Plant - Specific - 3

Consistent with Exceptions - 10

New Programs Generated - 4

Enhanced Programs - 6

# COMMITMENTS

- 29 High Level Commitments in Draft SER
- 122 Individual Commitments
- All Included in Commitment/Action Tracking System and Assigned to Plant Staff
- LRA Program to Configuration Management Process Being Developed



---

# R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

License Renewal SER  
with Open Items

Staff Presentation to the ACRS  
RUSSELL ARRIGHI  
Project Manager  
November 4, 2003

---



---

## Overview

- › **RG&E submitted its application for Ginna by letter dated July 30, 2002**
  - › **Westinghouse pressurized water reactor, two loop close cycle, generate 1520 megawatt thermal, and 490 megawatt electrical.**
  - › **Systematic Evaluation Program Plant**
  - › **Plant located on Lake Ontario in the town of Ontario, Wayne County, New York.**
-



---

## Overview (continued)

- › **Current license expires September 18, 2009**
- › **Request license renewal through September 18, 2029**
- › **Application implemented the generic aging lessons learned (GALL) process**

---

November 4, 2003

3



---

## NRC Review Process

- › **8 Open Items (4 resolved)**
- › **7 Confirmatory Items**
- › **Brought into scope and subjected to AMR**
  - › **0 new structures**
  - › **several new components**
- › **1 new AMP**

---

November 4, 2003

4



---

## NRC Audits and Inspections

- › **Scoping and Screening Methodology Audit**
  - › **December 9 - 13, 2002**
- › **Scoping and Screening Inspection**
  - › **June 23 - 27, 2003**
- › **Aging Management Program Audit**
  - › **June 23 - 25, 2003**
- › **Aging Management Review Inspection**
  - › **July 21 -25 and August 4 -8, 2003**

---

November 4, 2003

5



---

## Section 2 – Structures and Components Subject to an Aging Management Review

- › **2.1 - SCOPING AND SCREENING  
METHODOLOGY**
- › **Describes methodology used to identify SSCs that  
are within the scope of the license renewal rule and  
subject to an AMR**
- › **Staff audit determined that the applicant's  
methodology satisfies the rule**

---

November 4, 2003

6



---

## Section 2.2 – Plant Level Scoping Results

- Staff reviewed section 2.2 to determine if any systems, structures or commodities supposed to be within scope were omitted
  
- No Open or Confirmatory Items

---

November 4, 2003

7



---

## Section 2.3 Scoping and Screening of Mechanical Systems

- Includes:
  - Reactor systems
  - Engineered safety features systems
  - Auxiliary systems
  - Steam power conversion systems

3 Open and 3 Confirmatory Items (2 Resolved)

---

November 4, 2003

8



---

## Section 2.3 Scoping and Screening of Mechanical Systems (Continued)

- **SSCs initially omitted from scope. These SSCs met scoping criterion 54.4(a)(2)**
  - **Steam heating boiler and associated components**
  - **CCW piping**
  - **Spent fuel pool make-up path**
  
- **These systems were brought into scope, along with associated aging management information**

---

November 4, 2003

9



---

## Open Items

- **Open Item 2.3.3.2 -1 (Resolved)**
  - **Staff identified that failure of out-of-scope CCW piping could result in the failure of the CCW system and thus the ability to cool down the plant following an accident, and therefore should be in scope of the rule.**
  
  - **All CCW piping is now included in scope and Open Item is resolved.**

---

November 4, 2003

10



---

## Open Items (continued)

- › **Open Item 2.3.3.3 -1 (Resolved)**
  - › **Staff identified that the spent fuel pool makeup source was not in scope. The loss of spent fuel pool inventory could result in the inability to maintain level and temperature, and therefore should be included in scope of the rule.**
  - › **The primary make-up flow path (RWST) was brought into scope and Open Item is resolved.**

---

November 4, 2003

11



---

## Open Items (continued)

- › **Open Item 2.3.3.6 -1**
  - › **Staff identified that the fire service water booster pump (jockey pump) was not in scope. Loss of booster pump could result in loss of fire water header pressure and cycling of fire pump resulting in damage, and therefore should be included in scope of the rule.**

---

November 4, 2003

12



---

## Confirmatory Items

- › **Confirmatory Item 2.3.3.2 -1**
  - › Staff identified that the make-up to the CCW surge tank was not in scope. Damage to pressure boundary could affect the ability to mitigate an accident, and therefore should be in scope of license renewal.
  - › Makeup flow path was initially brought into scope. Need associated aging management information.

---

November 4, 2003

13



---

## SECTION 2.4 STRUCTURES AND STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS

- › Describes structures and structural components
  - › Containment
  - › Other structures (13)
- › No Open or Confirmatory Items

---

November 4, 2003

14



---

## **SECTION 2.5 - ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS, INSTRUMENTATION, & CONTROL SYSTEMS**

- › **These components were evaluated on a plant-wide basis utilizing the “spaces” approach**
- › **8 commodity groups**
- › **One Open Item**

---

*November 4, 2003*

15



---

## **Open Item**

- › **Open Item 2.5-1**
- › **Staff identified that two cables from the offsite power path that brings power into the safety buses were not in scope that could affect the ability to bring the plant to a safe shutdown condition, and therefore should be in scope of the rule.**

---

*November 4, 2003*

16



---

## SCOPING AND SCREENING SUMMARY

- › **The applicant's methodology meets the requirements of the rule.**
- › **Scoping and screening results included all SSCs within the scope of license renewal and subject to an AMR.**

---

November 4, 2003

17



---

## LICENSE RENEWAL INSPECTIONS

- › **Highlights:**
  - › **Scoping and Screening Inspection**
  - › **AMR Inspection**
  - › **Plant ROP**

---

November 4, 2003

18



---

## License Renewal Inspection Program Implementation

- › License renewal manual chapter - MC 2516
- › License renewal inspection procedure - IP 71002
- › Site-specific inspection plan for each applicant
- › Scheduled to support NRR's review
- › Resources - regional inspection personnel

---

November 4, 2003

19



---

## License Renewal Inspections

- › *SCOPING AND SCREENING INSPECTION*
- › Objective: to confirm that the applicant has included all appropriate SSCs in the scope of license renewal as required by the rule.
- › One week in length
- › Conducted June 23 – 27, 2003 at the Ginna site
- › Concluded that scoping and screening process was successful in identifying those SSCs needing aging management review

---

November 4, 2003

20



---

## **SCOPING & SCREENING INSPECTION** *(Continued)*

- › **Inspection Results**
  - › Inconsistent component identification between the fire protection program and the fire protection aging management program.

---

November 4, 2003

21



---

## **AGING MANAGEMENT INSPECTION**


- › **OBJECTIVE:** to confirm that existing AMPs are managing current age related degradation
- › Two weeks in length
- › Conducted July 21- 25 and August 4 - 8, 2003
- › Material condition of plant was being adequately maintained and has improved over time.
- › Documentation was of very good quality supported by a comprehensive computer database.
- › Third (optional) inspection – Not required

---

November 4, 2003

22

## Ginna 2Q/2003 PERFORMANCE SUMMARY



Last Modified: July 22, 2003



## SECTION 3 - AGING MANAGEMENT REVIEW

- › GALL divides systems and structures into 6 broad system/structural groups
- › Reactor systems (3.1)
- › Engineered safety features systems (3.2)
- › Auxiliary systems (3.3)
- › Steam and power conversion systems (3.4)
- › Containments, structures and component supports (3.5)
- › Electrical and instrumentation and controls (3.6)

November 4, 2003

24



---

## AGING MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

- › 11 common aging management programs
- › 22 system/structural group-specific AMPs
  - › Consistent with GALL: 20
  - › Consistent w/GALL, with some deviation: 10
  - › Non-GALL: 3
- › 1 AMP added – system specific
- › 2 Open Items (1 Resolved)

---

November 4, 2003

25



---

## GINNA AMP AUDIT

- › Date of audit – June 23 - 25, 2003
- › Auditors - 5 project managers from license renewal
- › Audited all the attributes of the AMPs claimed to be consistent with GALL
- › Concluded AMPs were consistent with GALL except:
  - › Fire Protection Program
  - › Fire Water System Program
  - › These AMPs were revised and resubmitted to technical staff for review - Staff found them acceptable

---

November 4, 2003

26



---

## SECTION 3.1 - REACTOR SYSTEMS

- › Reactor coolant (class 1)
- › Reactor vessel
- › Reactor vessel internals
- › Pressurizer
- › Steam generators
- › Reactor coolant (non class 1)
  
- › Two Open Items (1 Resolved)

---

November 4, 2003

27



---

## Reactor Vessel Surveillance Program

- › Open item B2.1.28-1 (Resolved)
  - › Staff identified that the applicant is not planning on testing the reactor vessel surveillance capsule after it receives a fast neutron fluence equivalent to the 60-year fluence.
  
  - › Commitment to test capsule; Open Item is resolved

---

November 4, 2003

28



---

## Thimble Tube Inspection Program

- › Open item B2.1.36-1
  
- › Staff identified that several of the program attributes needed further clarification.

---

November 4, 2003

29



---

## ALLOY 600

Reactor vessel head, CRDMs, & CRDM penetrations replaced during the September 2003 refueling outage

Replacement head was fabricated with Alloy 690TT (thermally treated) penetrations. The penetrations are welded with partial penetration J-groove Alloy 52 welds.

No Alloy 82/182 welds in RCS piping – is forged stainless steel

Alloy 600 components: BMI penetrations, radial core support pads

---

November 4, 2003

30



---

## Reactor Vessel Internals Program

- ▶ **Commitment by applicant to submit the reactor vessel internals program to the staff for review and approval.**
- ▶ **The commitment will permit the staff to review the AMP for acceptability against NRC requirements as well as those inspection activities recommended by the EPRI-MRP.**

---

November 4, 2003

31



---

## SECTION 3.2 - ENGINEERED SAFETY FEATURES SYSTEMS

## SECTION 3.3 - AUXILIARY SYSTEMS

## SECTION 3.4 - STEAM AND POWER CONVERSION SYSTEMS

- ▶ **One Confirmatory Item**

---

November 4, 2003

32



## SECTION 3.5 - CONTAINMENT, STRUCTURES, AND COMPONENT SUPPORTS

- › Containment structure
- › 13 other structures
- › No Open or Confirmatory Items

November 4, 2003

33



## AGING MANAGEMENT OF IN-SCOPE INACCESSIBLE CONCRETE

	Aggressive Limit	Ginna
pH	< 5.5	7
Chlorides	> 500 ppm	6 – 8 ppm
Sulfates	> 1500 ppm	20 – 40 ppm

- › Periodic testing to verify chemistry remains non-aggressive
- › Below grade soil/water environment non-aggressive

November 4, 2003

34



---

## SECTION 3.6 – Electrical & I&C

- **8 Component commodity groups subject to AMR**
  - **Bus ducts**
  - **Insulated cables and connections**
  - **Etc.**
  
- **1 Open & 1 Confirmatory Item (Resolved)**
  
- **One AMP added for Electrical Cables not Subject to EQ Used in Instrumentation Circuits**

---

November 4, 2003

35



---

## SECTION 4 - TIME-LIMITED AGING ANALYSES

- **REACTOR VESSEL NEUTRON EMBRITTLEMENT**
  
- **METAL FATIGUE**
  
- **ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT**

---

November 4, 2003

36



---

## **TLAA (CONT)**

- › **CONCRETE CONTAINMENT TENDON  
PRESTRESS**
  
- › **CONTAINMENT LINER PLATE AND  
PENETRATION FATIGUE**
  
- › **OTHER PLANT-SPECIFIC TLAA<sub>s</sub>**

---

*November 4, 2003*

37



---

## **SECTION 4.2 - REACTOR VESSEL NEUTRON EMBRITTLEMENT**

**Three analysis affected by irradiation  
embrittlement identified as TLAA<sub>s</sub>.**

- 1. Reactor Vessel Upper-Shelf Energy**
- 2. Pressurized Thermal Shock**
- 3. Pressure/Temperature Curves**

---

*November 4, 2003*

38



## REACTOR VESSEL UPPER SHELF ENERGY (USE)

Reactor Vessel Upper Shelf Energy (USE)	Screening Criteria (FT-LBS)	Ginna (FT-LBS)
Beltline Welds	50	< 50

- › RV has margins of safety against fracture equivalent to those required by Appendix G, Section XI of the ASME Code; therefore acceptable.
- › Licensee's analysis satisfies ASME code for 54 effective full-power years (EFPY) (60 years at 90% capacity factor)

November 4, 2003

39



## PRESSURIZED THERMAL SHOCK

Beltline Welds	RT <sub>PTS</sub> Criterion, °F	Calculated RT <sub>PTS</sub> , °F
SA - 847	≤ 300	271

- › Materials provide adequate protection against PTS events if reference temperature (RT<sub>PTS</sub>) are within limits
- › Open Item: Applicant is to provide surveillance data, detailed calculations from the surveillance data, and the analysis of the surveillance data

November 4, 2003

40



---

### **Plant Heatup/Cooldown (Pressure/Temperature) Curves**

- › **Current analyses valid for 28 EFPY**
- › **Technical specifications will be updated as required by Appendices G and H of 10 CFR 50**

---

November 4, 2003

41



---

### **SECTION 4.3 METAL FATIGUE**

- › **Reactor coolant system components at Ginna designed to Class 1 of the ASME Code**
- › **All components have projected CUF <1.0 for period of extended operations**
- › **2 Confirmatory Items**

**CUF = Cumulative Usage Factor**

---

November 4, 2003

42



---

## **SECTION 4.4 - ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION**

- › **Applicant has adequately identified the TLAA for EQ components**
- › **Applicant's EQ Program consistent with GALL**
- › **Staff concluded EQ Program will continue to manage equipment in accordance with 10 CFR 50.49, and meets 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(i), (ii) and (iii)**
- › **No Open or Confirmatory Items**

---

*November 4, 2003*

43



---

## **SECTION 4.5 - CONCRETE CONTAINMENT TENDON PRESTRESS**

- › **Prestress losses estimated for 40 and 60 years**
- › **Applicant provided Trending Analysis**
- › **Staff considers the applicant's actions adequate during period of extended operation**
- › **No Open or Confirmatory Items**

---

*November 4, 2003*

44



---

## **4.6 - CONTAINMENT LINER PLATE AND PENETRATION FATIGUE**

- › **Staff finds design transients and corresponding cycles acceptable**
- › **Staff concludes that the TLAA has been projected to the end of period of extended operation**
- › **No Open or Confirmatory Items**

---

*November 4, 2003*

45



---

## **SECTION 4.7 Other Plant-Specific TLAA**

- › **Containment Liner Stress**
- › **Containment Tendon Fatigue**
- › **Containment Liner Anchorage Fatigue**
- › **Containment Tendon Bellow Fatigue**
- › **Crane Cycle Load Limits**
- › **Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel**
- › **Thermal Aging of Cast Austenitic Stainless Steel**
- › **All demonstrate the TLAA have been projected to the end of the period of extended operation**
- › **No Open or Confirmatory Items**

---

*November 4, 2003*

46