

July 13, 2004

LICENSEE: Southern Nuclear Operating Company
FACILITY: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCES ON JUNE 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24,
AND JULY 6, 2004, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION AND THE SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY
CONCERNING THE REVIEW FOR THE JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR
PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS.
MC0774 AND MC0775)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff and representatives of Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC or the applicant) held telephone conferences on June 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24 and July 6, 2004, to discuss applicant's response to requests for additional information (RAIs) and other questions concerning the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP) license renewal application.

These conference calls were useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's questions. On the basis of the discussion, the applicant was able to better understand the staff's questions. No staff decisions were made during these telephone conferences. In some cases, the applicant agreed to provide information for clarification.

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

/RA/

Tilda Y. Liu, Senior 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

July 13, 2004

LICENSEE: Southern Nuclear Operating Company

FACILITY: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCES ON JUNE 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24, AND JULY 6, 2004, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND THE SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY CONCERNING THE REVIEW FOR THE JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. MC0774 AND MC0775)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff and representatives of Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC or the applicant) held telephone conferences on June 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24 and July 6, 2004, to discuss applicant's response to requests for additional information (RAIs) and other questions concerning the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP) license renewal application.

These conference calls were useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's questions. On the basis of the discussion, the applicant was able to better understand the staff's questions. No staff decisions were made during these telephone conferences. In some cases, the applicant agreed to provide information for clarification.

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

/RA/

Tilda Y. Liu, Senior 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

ADAMS Accession Number: ML041950509

Document Name: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML041950509.wpd

OFFICE	PM:RLEP	COOP:RLEP	LA:RLEP	SC:RLEP
NAME	TLiu	DChen	MJenkins	SLee
DATE	7/12/04	7/12/04	7/9/04	7/13/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

HARD COPY

RLEP RF
T. Liu (PM)
D. Chen
D. Jeng
G. Morris
J. Medoff
R. Young
G. Galletti
K. Chang

E-MAIL:

RidsNrrDrip
RidsNrrDe
G. Bagchi
K. Manoly
W. Bateman
J. Calvo
R. Jenkins
P. Shemanski
J. Fair
RidsNrrDssa
RidsNrrDipm
D. Thatcher
R. Pettis
G. Galletti
C. Li
M. Itzkowitz (RidsOgcMailCenter)
R. Weisman
M. Mayfield
A. Murphy
S. Smith (srs3)
S. Duraiswamy
Y. L. (Renee) Li
RLEP Staff

C. Julian (R-II)
C. Patterson (R-II)
R. Fanner (R-II)
S. Peters
R. Hoefling (OGC)
OPA
B. Jain
L. Whitney

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCES

June 9, 2004

Participants

Tilda Liu
David Chen
David Jeng
Jan Fridrichsen
Danny Stephens
Mike Macfarlane

Affiliation

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
NRC
NRC
Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC)
SNC
SNC

June 10, 2004

Participants

Tilda Liu
David Chen
George Morris
Jan Fridrichsen
Jeff Mulvehill
Mike Macfarlane
Mark Crisler
Cary Martin

Affiliation

NRC
NRC
NRC
SNC
SNC
SNC
SNC
SNC

June 21, 2004

Participants

Tilda Liu
David Chen
James Medoff
Jan Fridrichsen
Wayne Lunceford
Willie Jennings
Mike Macfarlane
James Agnold

Affiliation

NRC
NRC
NRC
SNC
SNC
SNC
SNC
SNC

June 22, 2004

Participants

Tilda Liu
David Chen
Greg Galletti
Ronald Young
Harvey Abelson
Shazia Faridi
Farideh Saba
Jan Fridrichsen

Affiliation

NRC
NRC
NRC
NRC
Information Systems Laboratories (ISL)
ISL
ISL
SNC

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCES

June 22, 2004 Cont'd

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Bill Evans	SNC
Mike Macfarlane	SNC
Charles Pierce	SNC

June 23, 2004

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tilda Liu	NRC
David Chen	NRC
Ken Chang	NRC
Erach Patel	ISL
Jan Fridrichsen	SNC
Willie Jennings	SNC
Mike Macfarlane	SNC

June 24, 2004

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tilda Liu	NRC
Jimi Yerokun	NRC
Ronald Young	NRC
Jan Fridrichsen	SNC
Bill Evans	SNC
Mike Macfarlane	SNC
Charles Pierce	SNC

July 6, 2004

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tilda Liu	NRC
David Chen	NRC
Jimi Yerokun	NRC
Jan Fridrichsen	SNC
Jeff Mulvehill	SNC
Mike Macfarlane	SNC
Charles Pierce	SNC

**REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA) FOR FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2
DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI)**

June 9, 2004

D-RAI 3.5-15

In its response to RAI 2.3.3.13-2, the applicant asserted that cable fire wrap and fire stops consisting of Kaowool and Maranite situated in an inside environment have no aging effect requiring management, therefore, no AMP is required for the components (refer to the last table provided on page E2-19 of Enclosure 2 to SNC's letter dated April 7, 2004). The applicant is requested to provide additional information including vendor provided or lab tested material aging data of both the Kaowool and Maranite materials, and plant specific operating experience based aging data for the same in order to support the above assertion.

Discussion: The applicant indicated that this question was clear. This D-RAI will be sent as a formal RAI.

D-RAI 3.5-16

In its response to RAI 2.3.3.13-3, the applicant states, as part of its proposed 'Plant specific note 48' (refer to the last paragraph of page E2-20 of the same reference), that the sprayed-on or troweled-on fire resistive material has no aging effects requiring aging management. The applicant is requested to provide pertinent vendor generated or lab tested data as well as plant specific operating experience based aging data for the sprayed-on or troweled-on fire resistive material to further support the above statement.

Discussion: The applicant indicated that this question was clear. This D-RAI will be sent as a formal RAI.

REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA) FOR FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2 FOLLOW UP TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSES

June 10, 2004

The staff sent the following questions via e-mail, on June 8, 2004, to follow-up on certain RAI responses with the applicant. The staff's follow up questions to the particular RAIs and the associated discussions are presented below:

Follow-up to RAI 3.6.2-2

The applicant has stated in its RAI response that Cable Bus will be in the Non-EQ Cable Program. The staff requests the applicant indicate which part of that program. Because the cable in the Cable Bus is not accessible, it is expected to be treated as non-accessible medium voltage cable. The LRA Table 3.6.2-1 has it listed in the low voltage cable program.

Discussion: The applicant stated that the cable is treated under XI.E1, "Electrical Cables and Connections Not Subject to 10 CFR 50.49 Environmental Qualification Requirements," in NUREG-1801, "Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report." The applicant further stated that the cable is not submerged and therefore is not treated under X1.E3, "Inaccessible Medium Voltage Cables Not Subject to 10 CFR 50.49 Environmental Qualification Requirements," in NUREG-1801. Initially, the staff indicated that a supplementary response from the applicant was not necessary at the time. On June 24, 2004, the staff requested that the applicant provide a written response to this question, and the applicant agreed.

Follow-up to RAI 3.6.2-4

The transmission conductors are of aluminum cable-steel reinforced (ACSR). The referenced Ontario-Hydro (O-H) tests acknowledge loss-of-material in the supporting steel reinforcing center of ACSR cables. The applicant is requested to justify why the O-H test envelops the conductors at FNP to demonstrate that the material loss on the FNP ACSR transmission conductors is acceptable for the extended period of operation.

Discussion: The applicant indicated that it understood the question and agreed to provide a supplemental response to this question.

Follow-up to RAI 3.6.2-6

The applicant states the electrical system [neutral] ground as similar to the equipment [safety] ground. Loss of the 4160 volt system ground at either the transformer neutral or at the diesel generators neutral could result in the voltage on the power cables being raised from line-to-neutral voltage of 2400 volts to the line-to-line voltage of 4160 volts. How is loss of the system (neutral) ground detected? What about aging of the grounding resistor? The 4160 volt system is a supporting system for the accident analysis mitigating systems.

Discussion: The applicant indicated that it understood the question and agreed to provide a supplemental response to this question.

**REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA) FOR FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2
FOLLOW UP TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSES**

June 21, 2004

The staff sent the following question via e-mail, on June 21, 2004, to follow up on certain RAI responses with the applicant. The staff's follow up question and the associated discussion are presented below:

Question:

RV Internals AMP did not define what enhanced VT-1 meant. The staff would like to know what SNC's definition is for enhanced VT-1 examination.

Discussion: The applicant indicated the question was clear. The applicant indicated a supplementary response will be provided to address this question.

REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA) FOR FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2 FOLLOW UP TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSES

June 22, 24, and July 6, 2004

The staff sent the following questions via e-mail, on June 18, 2004, to follow-up on the applicant's supplementary response to RAI 2.1-1, dated April 16, 2004, related to information associated with the determination of structures and components within the scope of license renewal under the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2). The staff's follow-up questions and the associated discussions are presented below:

Questions 1 through 5:

1. License renewal boundary drawing, D-506447L identifies the locations of SR components that have a potential for damage from spatial interaction for each system. Clarify whether this drawing needs to be revised as the result of the broaden methodology used for the scoping of NSR components.
2. It appears that the table which was provided in the Farley response to RAI 2.2-4 should be revised, since the SR SSCs (targets) are broaden to include mechanical and structural SR components in addition to the electrical SR components. Clarify whether the Farley response to RAI 2.2-4 needs to be revised.
3. The applicant states that the Roof Drains and Sanitary Drains Systems are added to the scope of license renewal and incorporated into the LW&D system. Roof drains and sanitary drains are not listed as systems within the scope of license renewal in Table 2.2-1g. Therefore, Table 2.2-1c and 2.2-1g should be revised as appropriate.
4. The applicant states that the components types listed in the LRA tables for OCCW, CCCW, DW, P&SW, and RMWS do not change due to the impact of 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2) scoping methodology changes on LRA results. However, in order for the staff to verify that this methodology has been appropriately implemented, provide a list of component types for each of the above systems.
5. The discharge side of the chemical addition pumps of the feedwater system was previously out of scope, but has now been placed within scope because of the 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2) scoping methodology changes. Because of the expanded scope, the component type "Pump Casings" has been added to LRA Table 2.3.4.2. License renewal boundary drawings D-175007L and D-205007L, Sheet 1, indicate that this portion of the system is shown on Sheet 2 of the same drawings. However, Sheet 2 has not been included in the LRA and does not appear to be available in the UFSAR. To assist the staff in verifying that components within scope due to 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2) and subject to an AMR have been accounted for, provide Sheet 2 for the above drawings.

Discussion: As a result of the discussions held on June 22 and 24, 2004, the staff revised the above 5 questions into a single question as follows:

Follow-up to RAI 2.1-1

The staff requests the applicant to summarize how systems and components that were brought into scope due to the implementation of the changed 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2) methodology will be captured in documentation, such that the information will be in a retrievable and an auditable form for future use.

During the phone call held on July 6, 2004, the staff indicated that this follow-up question was not necessary because the staff would be better able to resolve this question with further review of the RAI responses received to date. Therefore, this follow-up question is WITHDRAWN and a supplemental response will not be necessary.

Question 6:

The applicant states that a portion of the Chemical Addition System is affected by the changes in the 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2) scoping methodology. The portion of the Chemical Addition System that is of concern is the portion that is located in the Auxiliary Building on the 100' elevation... When used, the system is operated locally such that any leak in the area containing the SR SSCs would be immediately detected and the operation stopped. Briefly explain whether operator intervention is credited in protecting vulnerable SR SSCs when a leak in the vicinity of the SR SSCs is immediately detected and stopped.

Discussion: During the phone call held on June 22, 2004, the applicant stated that operator intervention is not credited in protecting vulnerable SR SSCs when a leak in the vicinity of the SR SSCs is immediately detected and stopped. The staff indicated that a supplementary response to this question is not necessary.

REVIEW OF LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (LRA) FOR FARLEY UNITS 1 AND 2

June 23, 2004

ASME Class 1 Small Bore Piping Inspection

To support the staff's review of license renewal application (LRA) Section 3.1.2.2.4, Crack Initiation and Growth due to Thermal and Mechanical Loading or Stress Corrosion Cracking, the staff requested the applicant to provide the number of ASME Class 1 small bore piping weld locations that are in the scope of LRA under the Risk Informed Inservice Inspection (ISI), and will be volumetrically examined for FNP, Units 1 and 2. The applicant indicated that it will provide a response to address this question.

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

cc:

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

Mr. B. D. McKinney
Licensing Manager
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

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

Mr. J. B. Beasley, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

Dr. D. E. Williamson
State Health Officer
Alabama Department of Public Health
The RSA Tower
201 Monroe Street, Suite 1500
Montgomery, AL 36130-1701

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

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

Mr. Charles R. Pierce
Manager - License Renewal
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

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

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

Mr. L. M. Stinson
Vice President - Farley Project
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201