

October 29, 2004

LICENSEE: Dominion Connecticut Nuclear, Inc.

FACILITY: Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3

SUBJECT: CORRECTION OF SUMMARY DATED SEPTEMBER 24, 2004, OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE REGARDING SAMA ANALYSES CONDUCTED ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2004, WITH DOMINION CONNECTICUT NUCLEAR, INC. IN SUPPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION FOR MILLSTONE POWER STATION UNITS 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. MC1827 AND MC1828)

This correction to the original telephone conference summary is being issued to include an attachment that was not addressed or included in the original summary when it was mailed to the service list. The ADAMS accession number of the original summary package is ML042710545; the concurrence copy of the summary in that package addressed an electronic message, "E-mail from Dominion Nuclear Connect, dtd: 9/16/04," under ADAMS accession number ML04271222. The signature copy of the summary did not address the electronic message. The electronic message is addressed in the corrected summary below.

On September 13, 2004, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff conducted a telephone conference with Dominion Connecticut Nuclear, Inc. (Dominion) regarding the severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMA) analyses for license renewal at Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3 (Millstone). By letter dated June 22, 2004, the NRC staff sent requests for additional information (RAIs) to Dominion regarding the SAMA analyses for Millstone. By letter dated August 13, 2004, Dominion provided responses to the NRC staff's RAIs. The purpose of the telephone conference was to seek further clarification regarding several of Dominion's RAI responses so that the NRC staff can complete the review. On September 2, 2004, I sent Dominion an electronic message (email) providing a list of questions regarding these RAI responses to be used as an agenda for this telephone conference (Attachment 1) and Attachment 2 is the list of people who participated in the telephone conference.

Each of the questions were discussed, and Dominion explained the answer to each question. In addition, the staff asked Dominion to provide simple descriptions of the PRA model modifications in the response to RAI 7a instead of the event tree designations.

Dominion provided the answers to these clarification questions in an electronic message on September 16, 2004. Attachment 3 is a copy of that electronic message.

/RA/

Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachments: As stated

Docket Nos.: 50-336 and 50-423

cc: See next page

Dominion provided the answers to these clarification questions in an electronic message on September 16, 2004. Attachment 3 is a copy of that electronic message.

/RA/

Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachments: As stated

Docket Nos.: 50-336 and 50-423

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

Adams Accession no.: **ML043030362**

Document name: E:\Filenet\ML043030362.wpd

OFFICE	RLEP:DRIP:LA	RLEP:DRIP:PM
NAME	M. Jenkins	R. Emch
DATE	10/28/04	10/29/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution: Correction of Summary of Telephone Conference, Re: Millstone Power Station,
Units 1 and 2, Dated: October 29, 2004

DMatthews/FGillespie
PTKuo
REmch
AKugler
MSchneider, RGN I
SKennedy, RGN I
KManagan, RGN I
LFields
JTrapp, RGN I
BPoolle, OGC
TMadden, OCA
JDavis
DScrenci, RGN I
VNerses
NSheehan, RGN I
JEads
TDoerr (LANL)
RLEP R/F

Questions on Responses to Millstone SAMA RAIs

1. (U2 & U3) Different revisions of the (PRA) were used for the identification of SAMAs and the quantification of benefits. The response to RAI 6a lists the highest importance basic events from the PRA used for SAMA identification (Rev. 2 for U2; 10/99 for U3) and the importance of the same basic events from the PRA used for quantification (Rev. 3 for U2; 10/02 for U3). Confirm that the highest importance events from the later PRA are included in the list. If not, identify those basic events and the SAMAs that address those events.
2. (U2) The response to RAI 1b (p. 5) mentions results of a PRA model more recent than the version used for SAMA quantification. Confirm the existence of this update, identify the major changes (models/assumptions and results/risk profile), and discuss any potential impact on the SAMA analysis.
3. (U2) Relative to peer review F&O AS-5 (Item A.2 in Table 2), confirm that manual control of AFW after loss of air or loss of DC is credited in the PRA. (For example, is success in manual AFW control included in the top success branch in the event tree provided in response to RAI 2c?) If so, what is the failure probability and its importance? Is unavailability of indications due to dependency on power considered in determining this HEP? How was the evaluation of SAMA 113 performed in response to RAI 6g (i.e., what events were revised)?
4. (U3) Relative to Level A peer review F&Os SY-4 and HR-1 (Items A.2 and A.3 in Table 2), please provide a more detailed discussion and support for the conclusion that the incorporation of model changes in response to this F&O will have a negligible impact on the SAMA analysis.
5. (U3) Relative to peer review F&O TH-8 (Item B.19 in Table 2), the impact in Table 2 says that the DWST will provide only 9 hours of water for the AFW pumps. Considering the high importance of the AFW system (the AFW is involved in 3 of the top 4 CDF sequences and the turbine driven AFW pump has a FV importance of 0.235), and the potential for a dependency between operator action to initiate bleed and feed, justify further why the failure to provide alternate sources of water for the AFW after the DWST is emptied has a negligible impact on the SAMA analysis.
6. (U3) The date provided for Rev. 4 is 10/99. The ER states that the WOG peer review took place in 9/99. What version of the PRA was used in the peer review? The ER implies that it was the version used for the SAMA analysis (10/99). Table G.2-1 indicates a 8/99 version, but this is not included in the response to RAI 1d. Please clarify.
7. (U2 & U3) The truncation value used has a significant impact on the CDF. Please provide the truncation values used for obtaining the CDFs given for U2 PRA Revisions 0, 1, and 2, and U3 PRA Revisions 0 (12/95), 2, and 3.

8. (U2 & U3) Of all of the PRA changes listed in response to RAI 1d, indicate which ones (1 or 2) were the major contributors to the changes in CDF from one revision to the next.
9. (U2) What is meant by the last sentence in the description of the Rev. 0 and Rev. 1 PRAs?
10. (U2) Describe the sequences identified as COOL in the response to RAI 1e.
11. (U3) Regarding the 10/02 revision of the PRA, the response to RAI 1e indicates a total CDF (excluding internal flooding) of $2.57E-5$ with a truncation value of $1E-11$. The response to RAI 1d gives a value of $2.04E-5$ with a truncation value of $1E-9$. The ER provides a value of $2.88E-5$ and states that a truncation value of $1E-11$ was used. Please explain.
12. (U2) The second paragraph of the response to RAI 1h states "The Level 2 portion of the IPE PRA for Millstone Unit 2 has not been updated but there has been some modifications of the individual bin definitions for consistency between the Unit 2 and Unit 3 PRAs." However, page E-F-23 of the ER states "Recent experimental results have shown that certain outcomes on the containment event tree are much less likely than previously thought. These changes were incorporated into the Level 2 model." These statements appear inconsistent. Please clarify and describe in more detail what was done.
13. (U2) An example of how the RC and PDS conversions were made, and how Table F.2-4 was generated would help explain some remaining confusion regarding the conversion process. Take new RC M6, for example. According to Table 1h-3 in the RAI responses, RC M6 is composed of IPE RCs E-LM-R and E-MH-R. In the IPE (Table 4.9-5 of the IPE), TLCH contributes 0.04% and 37.7% to these two RCs. However, in the revised PRA (Table F.2-4 of the ER) TLCH contributes 73.8% of RC M6. It is noted that a number of IPE PDSs are not included in Tables 1h-1 and F.2-4 (for example, TEHA, TEHB, and TEHC, which are the dominant PDS in the IPE. Where are they assigned and is this the source of the difference noted above?
14. (U3) Given that the original Table G.2-4 is incorrect (according to the response to RAI 2.c) and results in incorrect (but high) frequencies in several release categories, is the increase in CDF used in the cost benefit analysis also in error?

LIST OF PEOPLE PARTICIPATING
IN THE SAMA TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3
SEPTEMBER 13, 2004

Attendees

William Watson
Richard Gallagher
David Bucheit
Albert Chyra
Myron Matras
John Caivano
Thomas Hook
Richard Emch
Robert Palla
Jennifer Davis
Kim Green

Affiliation

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (Dominion)
Dominion
Dominion
Dominion
Dominion
Dominion
Dominion
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
NRC
NRC
Information Systems Laboratories (NRC contractor)

Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3

cc

Mr. David A. Christian
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

Mr. J. Alan Price
Site Vice President
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Millstone Power Station
Building 475, 5th Floor
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. Chris L. Funderburk
Director, Nuclear Licensing and
Operations Support
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

Mr. David W. Dodson
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Millstone Power Station
Building 475, 5th Floor
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Ms. Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq.
Senior Counsel
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Building 475, 5th Floor
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Edward L. Wilds, Jr., Ph.D.
Director, Division of Radiation
Department of Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Paul Eccard
First Selectman
Town of Waterford
15 Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385-2886

Mr. John Markowicz
Co-Chair
Nuclear Energy Advisory Council
9 Susan Terrace
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. Evan W. Woollacott
Co-Chair
Nuclear Energy Advisory Council
128 Terry's Plain Road
Simsbury, CT 06070

Ms. Nancy Burton
147 Cross Highway
Redding Ridge, CT 00870

Senior Resident Inspector
Millstone Power Station
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 513
Niantic, CT 06357

Mr. William D. Meinert
Nuclear Engineer
Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale
Electric Company
Moody Street
P.O. Box 426
Ludlow, MA 01056

Mr. Charles Brinkman, Director
Washington Operations Nuclear Services
Westinghouse Electric Company
12300 Twinbrook Pkwy, Suite 330
Rockville, MD 20852

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

Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3

cc

Ms. Roslyn Rubenstein, Director
Waterford Public Library
49 Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385-2899

Mildred Hodge, Director
Three Rivers Community College
Thames River Campus Library
574 New London Turnpike
Norwich, CT 06360

Ralph Bunge
NRC Proceedings Representative
for Waterford, CT
510 Carr Ave
Rockville, MD 20850

Thomas V. Wagner, AICP
Planning Director
Town of Waterford
15 Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

David R. Lewis
Shaw Pittman, LLC
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. William D. Corbin
Director - Nuclear Projects Department
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

Mr. William R. Watson, Jr.
Supervisor - License Renewal Project
Building 475/5
Millstone Power Station
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Robert A. Avena
Town Attorney for Waterford, CT
Kepple, Morgan & Avena, P.C.
Box 3A Anguilla Park
20 South Anguilla Road
Pawcatuck, CT 06379