

From: Roy Mathew
To: D. Ashley
Date: 05/03/2006 1:18:05 PM
Subject: Notes

Mail Envelope Properties (4458E5C6.969 : 13 : 35632)

Subject: Notes
Creation Date: 05/03/2006 1:17:58 PM
From: Roy Mathew

Created By: RKM@nrc.gov

Recipients

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
DJA1 (D. Ashley)

Post Office

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route**Files****Size****Date & Time**

Oyster Creek LRA Safety Review Audit Exit Meeting 4-17-06.wpd 1:16:36 PM	35300	03 May, 2006
---	-------	--------------

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

**Talking Points for the
Oyster Creek Audit and Review
Public Exit Meeting**

Good afternoon. My name is Roy Mathew. I am the NRC Project Team Leader for the Oyster Creek License Renewal Application Audit & Review. This is the exit meeting for that audit and review.

This presentation today, I will address the following:

- ›Purpose**
- ›Team Composition and Activities**
- ›Results of the Audit and Review and Conclusions**
- ›Schedule,**
- ›Wrap-up**

Purpose:

In July 22, 2005, Amergen, the applicant, submitted a license renewal application (LRA) for its Oyster Creek Generating Station to the NRC, requesting a 20 year extension to its current operating license.

- The purpose of the audit and review was to verify that the applicant's license renewal application (LRA) complies with the license renewal regulations, 10 CFR Part 54, "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants"**

***Specifically, the project team must verify that the applicant's aging management activities and programs will adequately manage the effects of aging on structures and components, so that their intended functions will be maintained consistent with the plant's**

current licensing basis for the period of extended operation. The regulatory requirement is defined in 10 CFR 54.21(a)(3).

- **The Project Team activities were focused on the 10 CFR Part 54 safety review.**
 - **The Project Team's LRA audit and review is a six to nine month process**
 - **The Project team was assigned review of LRA aging management programs (AMPs) and aging management review (AMR) line items that the applicant has determined to be consistent with the NRC's Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report, or are based on NRC approved precedents**
 - **The Project Team is responsible for reviewing and verifying that AMPs and AMR line items, assigned to the project team, defined in the LRA satisfy 10 CFR Part 54**
 - The GALL Report is a listing of AMPs and AMR line items that represents one method that the NRC staff has already found to be acceptable to meet 54.21(a)(3).**
- **The Project Team also confirms that the applicant is making appropriate commitments to modify its Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The regulatory requirement defined in 10 CFR 54.21(d).**
- **The Project Team followed the guidance provided in:**

- NUREG-1800, "Standard Review Plan for Review of License Renewal Application for Nuclear Power Plant," (SRP-LR),

- NUREG-1801, "Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report," and

- The NRC Audit Plan for Oyster Creek

- **The remaining LRA AMPs and AMRs line items and the scoping and screening reviews are being reviewed by other NRC technical branches.**

Team Composition and Activities

- **The Project Team consisted of members with technical expertise in structural, mechanical, materials, systems, and electrical engineering.**

- 4 NRC staff and 4 contractor reviewers participated in this audit (team leader, back-up team leader, 2 NRC technical reviewers, 4 BNL technical reviewers)

The audit and review process used by the Project Team is comprised of :

- **In-office audits and reviews**

-This is a multiple faceted activity of preparation and reviews which takes about 2 months of the team's efforts

- **Three one-week on-site audits and reviews**

- **First Audit - Oct. 3-5, 2005 (Focused on AMPs, but we had to do a second week of AMP audit because Amergen did not have adequate LRA supporting documentation for our audit)**

- **Second Audit- January 23-27 (Provided excellent documentation for the auditors' review)**

- **Third Audit - February 13 -17 (Focused on AMRs)**

We also spent yesterday and this morning reviewing the open questions and the applicant's responses from this audit

- **While on-site, the Project Team**

- **Reviewed the applicant's supporting documentation for its LRA AMPs and AMR line items.**
 - **Since the AMPs/AMRs contained in the LRA were structured to address the guidance provided in the January 2005 draft version of GALL and SRP, the team reviewed the reconciliation document that documented the review of Oyster Creek LRA Vs. the guidance contained in September 2005 Revision 1 of NUREG -1800 and NUREG-1801.**
 - **Asked questions concerning the details of the applicant's LRA AMPs and AMR line items through interviews and breakout meetings.**

- **The Project Team audited or reviewed**
 - **49 out of 56 AMPs (87.5%), and**
 - **5189 out of total 5410 AMRs Table 2 line-items (95.9%).**

The AMP and AMR review included review of Forked River Combustion Turbine station black out system and Met Tower Engine Fuel Supply system. The applicant provided this review information needed for this review

- **During the first site audit, at the request of the NRC, a question and answer list (audit data base) was developed by Amergen to track questions and answers, and maintained throughout the subsequent audits. The final data base that consists of questions and responses are publicly available through ADAMS (ML060600344)**

Results of the Audit and Review and Conclusions

- **The results of the audit and reviews will be documented in an Audit and Review Report.**
- **A total of 366 (241 AMP and 125 AMR) questions were asked by the team members. Amergen provided responses to all of our questions. Responses to 7 questions regarding the drywell and torus aging management issues are still under review. Any followup questions if needed to complete our review will be asked to the applicant through the RAI process.**
- **As a result of our audit and review, the applicant identified 43 new or revised existing commitments in letters dated**

December 9, 2005, March 30, April 4, and April 17, 2006.

- **We found the Aging Management Program Basis Documents and Aging Management Review Technical Basis Documents provided to us during the second week of our audit contained adequate information needed for the project team to perform this audit and it provided a good technical basis for the statements in the LRA.**

- **Based on our audit and review and the additional commitments the applicant made during this audit, except for 3 aging management programs, the project team found that the applicant has demonstrated that the effects of aging will be adequately managed so that the intended functions will be maintained during the period of extended operation, as required by 10 CFR 54.21(a)(3). Also, the project team found that it provided an adequate summary description of the program, as required by 10 CFR 54.21(d).**

The aging management programs that needed further evaluation include:

**B3.1, "Metal Fatigue of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary,"
B.1.27, "ASME Section XI, Subsection IWE," for Mark 1
Containment
B. 1.33, Protective Coating Monitoring and maintenance
Program" for drywell and torus corrosion.**

Audit questions and the applicant's responses regarding these programs are publicly available for review.

Schedule

- **Audit report will be peer reviewed by independent NRC staffs who are not involved with the audit. We hope to issue the final report by the second week of next month.**
- **Audit report will be converted to SER inputs for the audit scope and will be issued by the end of May 2006.**
- **SER is the final product of the safety review. Audit input is only one of the inputs used in the SER. Others are from staffs from various NRR technical branches, the Region, and the ACRS.**

Wrap-up **Appreciation**

- **Finally, on behalf of the project team, I would like to thank the Oyster Creek LRA staff for their excellent support during our audit effort.**
- **They provided prompt response to our questions and cooperated fully during our site visits to Oyster Creek.**
- **Their effort and good LRA supporting documents allowed us to more efficiently complete the audit and review process.**
- **This completes my presentation.**
- **Are there any questions from the applicant?**