

January 9, 2004

LICENSEE: Southern Nuclear Operating Company
FACILITY: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 3, 2003, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND THE SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY CONCERNING DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. MC0774 AND MC0775)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and representatives of Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC or the applicant) held a telephone conference on December 3, 2003, to discuss SNC's proposed responses to draft requests for additional information (D-RAIs) concerning the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP) license renewal application.

The conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's D-RAIs. On the basis of the discussion, the applicant was able to better understand the staff's questions. No staff decisions were made during the conference call. In some cases, the applicant agreed to provide information for clarification. An agreement was reached that these D-RAIs may be formally sent.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the telephone conference participants. Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the D-RAIs discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items. The applicant has had an opportunity to review and comment on this summary.

Samson Lee for */RA/*

Tilda Y. Liu, Project Manager
License Renewal Section A
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos: 50-348 and 50-364

Enclosures: As stated

cc w/enclosures: See next page

January 9, 2004

LICENSEE: Southern Nuclear Operating Company
FACILITY: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 3, 2003, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND THE SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY CONCERNING DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. MC0774 AND MC0775)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and representatives of Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC or the applicant) held a telephone conference on December 3, 2003, to discuss SNC's proposed responses to draft requests for additional information (D-RAIs) concerning the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP) license renewal application.

The conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's D-RAIs. On the basis of the discussion, the applicant was able to better understand the staff's questions. No staff decisions were made during the conference call. In some cases, the applicant agreed to provide information for clarification. An agreement was reached that these D-RAIs may be formally sent.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the telephone conference participants. Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the D-RAIs discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items. The applicant has had an opportunity to review and comment on this summary.

Samson Lee for /RA/
Tilda Y. Liu, Project Manager
License Renewal Section A
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos: 50-348 and 50-364
Enclosures: As stated
cc w/enclosures: See next page
DISTRIBUTION:
See next page
Accession No: ML040120057

Document Name:C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML040120057.wpd

| | | | |
|--------|----------|----------------|---------|
| OFFICE | LA:RLEP | PM:RLEP | SC:RLEP |
| NAME | MJenkins | TLiu SSLee for | SLee |
| DATE | 01 /8/04 | 01/9/04 | 01/9/04 |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

HARD COPY

RLEP RF
T. Liu (PM)
R.Young

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC
J. Craig
D. Matthews
F. Gillespie
C. Grimes
RidsNrrDe
E. Imbro
G. Bagchi
K. Manoly
W. Bateman
J. Calvo
R. Jenkins
P. Shemanski
H. Nieh
J. Fair
S. Black
B. Boger
D. Thatcher
R. Pettis
G. Galletti
C. Li
J. Moore
R. Weisman
M. Mayfield
A. Murphy
S. Smith (srs3)
S. Duraiswamy
Y. L. (Renee) Li
RLEP Staff

C. Julian (R-II)
J. Medoff
T. Johnson (R-II)
D. Cummings (OGC)
J. Cushing
OPA
B. Jain
L. Whitney

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

cc:

Mr. Don E. Grissette
General Manager - Plant Farley
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 470
Ashford, Alabama 36312

State Health Officer
Alabama Department of Public Health
434 Monroe Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-1701

Mr. M. Stanford Blanton
Balch and Bingham Law Firm
Post Office Box 306
1710 Sixth Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. J. D. Woodard
Executive Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Chairman
Houston County Commission
Post Office Box 6406
Dothan, Alabama 36302

William D. Oldfield
SAER Supervisor
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
P. O. Box 470
Ashford, Alabama 36312

Mr. Charles R. Pierce
Manager - License Renewal
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. Fred Emerson
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. William D. Oldfield
SAER Supervisor
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 470
Ashford, Alabama 36312

Mr. B. D. McKinney
Licensing Manager
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7388 N. State Highway 95
Columbia, Alabama 36319

Mr. J. B. Beasley, Jr.
Vice President - Farley Project
Southern Nuclear Operating
Company, Inc.
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCE ON
DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

December 3, 2003

Participants

Affiliation

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Tilda Liu | NRC |
| Angelo Stubbs | NRC |
| Ron Young | NRC |
| Ben Gitnick | ISL |
| Lou Bohn | SNC |
| William P. Evans | SNC |
| Jan E. Fridrichsen | SNC |
| Jon E. Hornbuckle | SNC |
| Michael A. Macfarlane | SNC |
| Charles R. Pierce | SNC |

REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA) FOR FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2 DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (D-RAIs)

Section 2.2: Plant Level Scoping Results

D-RAI 2.2-1

In a comparison of the Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP) units, the staff's review finds that the FNP license renewal application (LRA) does not identify the design differences in the systems and components for FNP Unit 1 compared to Unit 2. The FNP Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Section 1.1.2 states that, "the two units are essentially the same, and the descriptions of one unit are interpreted as applying to both units. Differences between the two units, and particularly structures, systems, and components which are shared between the two units, are specifically pointed out." Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Section 1.2.2 lists the systems, spaces and equipment shared by the two units. A preliminary comparison of the Units 1 and 2 license renewal boundary drawings for certain systems indicates that corresponding components considered within scope of license renewal for one unit is considered out of scope for the other unit. As an example, consider the primary temperature elements 2293I and 2293J at location E6 on both boundary drawings D-175007L (Unit 1) and D-205007L (Unit 2). These elements are considered within scope on boundary drawing D-175007L for Unit 1, but out of scope on boundary drawing D-205007L for Unit 2.

Describe the design differences between the systems and components, together with the associated current licensing bases for Units 1 and 2. Explain how these differences have been addressed in the scoping and screening review process for the corresponding systems of the two units.

Response: SNC stated that the boundary drawing D-175007L (Unit 1) is in error and that it will revise the drawing to indicate the temperature elements are strap-on type monitors which have been excluded from the scope of license renewal for both units. The applicant indicated that the question is clear.

D-RAI 2.2-2

According to the legend of license renewal boundary drawing D-506450L, Sheet 1, components within the scope of license renewal are shown in red highlight. It is also apparent from a comparison of component types subject to an aging management review (AMR), listed in Section 2 tables of the LRA, to those highlighted in the boundary drawings, that many of the components are highlighted in red (i.e., pressure instrumentation) are not subject to an AMR; that is, these components were screened out. The FNP LRA does not provide another means of identifying the specific components, which comprise the component types (or groups) subject to an AMR. Such identifications provide the end results of the scoping and screening review process. This information is needed for the staff to determine whether the specific components (which comprise the component types) have been properly identified as being subject to an AMR. This is in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1).

Provide documentation (either via tables or additional drawings) that would allow the staff to identify the specific components (comprising component types) that are within the scope of

license renewal and subject to an AMR. If tables are used, they should identify the specific components which comprise the component types for each system by component name, identification number, and drawing(s) where they are located.

Response: The applicant stated that it could provide documentation that would allow the staff to identify the commodity groups (i.e., component types) screened out vs. specific components that are within the scope of license renewal as requested by the staff. The staff will review the information that will be provided by the applicant.

D-RAI 2.2-3

In the FNP LRA, systems are identified by "LRA system" name. The LRA systems are identified in Table 2.2-1 and license renewal boundary drawing D-506450L, Sheet 1. The LRA systems (which use the "LRA system" nomenclature) may contain all or part of several FNP systems (which use the "traditional" FNP nomenclature). On page 2.2-1 of the FNP LRA, the applicant states that this change in nomenclature was implemented for ease of review and comparison to NUREG-1801, the GALL report. However, this nomenclature change introduces difficulty in the staff's review of the scoping and screening results, because the FNP UFSAR and other CLB documentation refers to systems by the traditional nomenclature. In addition, P&IDs, and pipe runs and components shown on license renewal boundary drawings are labeled using a three to six letter abbreviation (system code) based on their traditional system designations.

In order to facilitate the staff's scoping and screening review, provide a complete listing of the traditional nomenclature of FNP systems (both in-scope and out-of-scope) and system codes used as piping and component identifiers. This list should identify which LRA system, if any, is evaluated for the purpose of license renewal.

Response: The applicant indicated that the question is clear.

D-RAI 2.2-4

FNP license renewal boundary drawing, D-506447L, identifies by room numbers the locations of safety-related components that have a potential for damage from a spatial interaction for each system. Note 3 of this boundary drawing states that the systems and rooms as identified contain non-safety-related components which may be in proximity of safety-related components. However, the staff cannot identify the corresponding rooms from the room numbers that are given.

In order to facilitate the staff's scoping and screening review, provide drawings or descriptive information that identifies the rooms by room numbers. This information should also identify the safety-related systems that contain safety-related components which may be adversely impacted by failure of non-safety-related components (brought into scope of license renewal in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2)).

Response: The applicant indicated that the question is clear.

Section 2.3.3.2: Spent Fuel Storage

D-RAI 2.3.3.2-1

Section 9.1.2.1 of the FNP UFSAR describes a transport container with a pellet canister trap and a fuel rod storage canister as additional storage containers for spent fuel rods and fuel rod debris. These storage containers provide the intended functions of radiation shielding and debris protection. Justify the exclusion of these components from the scope of license renewal and being subject to an AMR in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4(a) and 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1), respectively.

Response: The applicant indicated that the question is clear. SNC stated that these spent fuel storage components will be included in the scope of license renewal and subject to an AMR.

D-RAI 2.3.3.2-2

- A. License renewal boundary drawings D-175043L (Unit 1) and D-205043L (Unit 2) at location D9 - E10 show the spent fuel pit (spent fuel pool) and transfer canal as outside the scope of license renewal. The spent fuel pool integrity is required to remove decay heat from the spent fuel and provide radiation shielding. Justify the exclusion of these components from the scope of license renewal and being subject to an AMR in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4(a) and 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1), respectively.
- B. License renewal boundary drawings D-175043L (Unit 1) and D-205043L (Unit 2) at location D9 show strainers on the spent fuel pool cooling system suction and supply lines as outside the scope of license renewal. Degraded or blocked strainers could impair the performance of the decay heat removal intended function. Justify the exclusion of these components from the scope of license renewal and being subject to an AMR in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4(a) and 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1), respectively.

Response:

A. The applicant stated that the spent fuel pool is included as concrete slabs and steel liner plates as part of the auxiliary building structure (LRA Tables 2.4.1, and 2.4.2). The staff stated that this question was not necessary to be sent as a formal RAI.

B. The applicant indicated that the question is clear.

Section 2.3.3.20: Oil Static Cable Pressurization System

D-RAI 2.3.3.20-1

Magnetic level indicators are shown on license renewal boundary drawing D-372816L at locations B3 and B9 and are shown to be within the scope of license renewal. However, magnetic level indicators are not listed in LRA Table 2.3.3.20. These components provide a pressure boundary intended function. Clarify whether the pressure retaining boundary of the magnetic level indicators is subject to an AMR. If not, justify the exclusion of these components from being subject to an AMR in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1).

Response: The applicant indicated that the question is clear.

D-RAI 2.3.3.20-2

- A. License renewal boundary drawing D-372816L shows an unidentified component (equipment ID: 1RV2, 1RV1, 2RV2 and 2RV1) at locations D3, D5, D9 and D10 respectively, to be within the scope of license renewal. These components are not listed in the Bechtel Standard P&ID Legend Drawing D-175016, Sheets 1, 2 and 3. Identify these components, and clarify if they are subject to an AMR. If not, justify the exclusion of these components from being subject to an AMR in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1).

- B. License renewal boundary drawing D-372816L shows unidentified components 1RD and 2RD at locations B5 and B10 respectively. These components are not listed in the Bechtel Standard P&ID Legend drawing D-175016 sheets 1, 2 and 3. These components should be within the scope of license renewal and included in LRA Table 2.3.3.20, since they provide a pressure boundary intended function. Identify these components, and clarify if they are within the scope of license renewal and subject to an AMR. If not, justify the exclusion of these components from the scope of license renewal and being subject to an AMR in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4(a) and 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1), respectively.

Response: The applicant indicated that the question is clear.