

**From:** Kimberly Green  
**To:** "MICHAEL D STROUD" <MSTROUD@entergy.com>  
**Date:** 3/19/2008 6:21:26 PM  
**Subject:** Draft Telecon Summaries of 2/12/08 and 3/7/08  
**cc:** <dtynes@entergy.com>,"Bo Pham"  
<BMP@nrc.gov>,<IPNonPublicHearingFile@nrc.gov>

Mike,

Attached are the draft telecon summaries of February 12 and March 7, 2008. Please review and let me know if you have any questions or clarifications.

I will be out of the office from Friday, March 21 through Friday, March 28. If you respond during that time, please copy Bo Pham.

Thanks,  
Kim

**Hearing Identifier:** IndianPointUnits2and3NonPublic  
**Email Number:** 434

**Mail Envelope Properties** (47E78011.HQGWDO01.OWGWPO04.200.2000008.1.18074E.1)

**Subject:** Draft Telecon Summaries of 2/12/08 and 3/7/08  
**Creation Date:** 3/19/2008 6:21:26 PM  
**From:** Kimberly Green

**Created By:** KJG1@nrc.gov

**Recipients**

<dtyneser@entergy.com>  
"Bo Pham" <BMP@nrc.gov>  
<IPNonPublicHearingFile@nrc.gov>  
"MICHAEL D STROUD" <MSTROUD@entergy.com>

**Post Office**  
OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	309	3/19/2008 6:21:26 PM
Telecon Summary 03-07-08 CII BOP and Structures.doc		70144
3/24/2008 10:18:57 AM		
Telecon Summary 02-12-08 LBB.doc	62976	3/24/2008
10:18:57 AM		

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None  
None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 7, 2008, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., CONCERNING RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION—CONTAINMENT INSERVICE INSPECTION, BORAFLEX, AND STRUCTURES

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. held a telephone conference call on March 7, 2008, to obtain clarification on Entergy's response to a request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Indian Point license renewal application (LRA). By letter dated January 4, 2008, Entergy submitted its response to RAI regarding containment inservice inspection and main feedwater system, and by letter dated February 27, 2008, its response to RAI regarding structures. The staff reviewed the information contained therein, and requested additional information/clarification on a few items.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants, and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the items discussed with the applicant, including a brief description of the resolution of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Kimberly Green, Safety Project Manager  
Projects Branch 2  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. Summary of Discussion

cc w/encls: See next page

LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 7, 2008, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., CONCERNING RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION—CONTAINMENT INSERVICE INSPECTION, BORAFLEX, AND STRUCTURES

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. held a telephone conference call on March 7, 2008, to obtain clarification on Entergy's response to a request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Indian Point license renewal application (LRA). By letter dated January 4, 2008, Entergy submitted its response to RAI regarding containment inservice inspection and main feedwater system, and by letter dated February 27, 2008, its response to RAI regarding structures. The staff reviewed the information contained therein, and requested additional information/clarification on a few items.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants, and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the items discussed with the applicant, including a brief description of the resolution of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Kimberly Green, Safety Project Manager  
Projects Branch 2  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286

Enclosures:

3. List of Participants
4. Summary of Discussion

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

**ADAMS Accession No.: G:\ADRO\DLR\RPB2\Indian Point\Safety Review\Telecon Summaries\Telecon Summary 03-07-08 CII BOP and Structures.doc**

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR	BC:RPB2:DLR
NAME		KGreen	RFranovich
DATE	03/ /08	03/ /08	03/ /08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
MARCH 7, 2008**

**PARTICIPANTS**

**AFFILIATIONS**

Kim Green	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
John Burke	NRC
Emma Wong	NRC
Steve Jones	NRC
Stan Gardocki	NRC
Mike Stroud	Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy)
Don Fronabarger	Entergy
Reza Ahrabli	Entergy
Alan Cox	Entergy

**CLARIFICATION ON RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**March 7, 2008**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. held a telephone conference call on March 7, 2008, to discuss and clarify the following responses to a request for additional information (RAI) concerning the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3 license renewal application (LRA).

By letter dated December 7, 2007, the staff requested additional information regarding the Containment Inservice Inspection program and the main feedwater system, among other items. By letter dated January 4, 2008, Entergy responded to the staff's RAI. By letter dated January 28, 2008, the staff requested additional information regarding certain structures, among other items. By letter dated February 27, 2008, Entergy responded to the staff's RAI.

Upon review of the information contained in Entergy's response letters, the staff determined that additional clarification was warranted. The items requiring clarification are discussed below.

1. In response to RAI B.1.8-1, Entergy uses the term "normally inaccessible." The staff asked for clarification on the term "normally inaccessible."

Applicant's clarification:

Entergy stated that "normally inaccessible" means that removal of a barrier would be required in order to perform remote visual inspections.

2. In response to RAI 2.4.3-1, the applicant states that components of the fuel storage building perform a component-level license renewal intended function if they are required to maintain pool water inventory. The staff does not believe that this function aligns with the commodity group intended functions listed in LRA Table 3.5.2-3 for commodities that would be in the fuel storage building. The staff asked the applicant to clarify the intended function of the fuel storage building.

Applicant's clarification:

Entergy stated that it understood the staff's request, and indicated that in the next LRA amendment, it will clarify the response.

3. In response to RAI 3.5A.2-1, Entergy states that the Unit 2 spent fuel pool does not have leak chase channels and therefore, no monitoring of leak chase channels can be performed for Unit 2. The monitoring of the spent fuel pool water level is credited along with the Water Chemistry Control - Primary and Secondary Program for managing the effects of aging on the Unit 2 spent fuel pool liner. The staff believes that in the absence of leak chase channels inconsistency with GALL, and therefore, Entergy should propose an equivalent monitoring and explain why the equivalent is acceptable.

Applicant's clarification:

Entergy stated that the original RAI asked about the liner, and not to what are the long-term effects of borated water leakage on concrete. This would be a different RAI. Entergy stated that it will be sending a letter that would docket the question and answer database, and that its answer to audit item #360 might address the staff's concern with respect to the spent fuel pool. If the staff finds that the answer does not address its concern, the staff will send a new (reworded) RAI.

4. In response to RAIs 2.3A.4.2-1 and 2.3B.4.2-1, Entergy stated that the feedwater system valves, which are located upstream of the containment isolation check valves in nonsafety-related piping, are classified as safety-related because of their active function to provide feedwater isolation. They have no passive intended function for 54.4(a)(1) or (a)(3) since their failure would accomplish the safety function of preventing feedwater flow to the steam generators. The staff does not accept the use of the terms "active" and "passive" with respect to intended function. 10 CFR 54.4 does not include the use of these terms for the purposes of the scoping.

Applicant's clarification:

Entergy's indicated that it understood the staff's concern, and that it would clarify the response in the next LRA amendment.

During further review of the LRA and UFSAR, the staff identified the need for additional information. During the telephone call, the staff briefly discussed the issue with the applicant.

In Section 14.2.1 of the Indian Point 2 UFSAR, it states that projections for the boraflex absorbers are valid through the end of the year 2006. The staff asked Entergy if it has current projections. Entergy stated that it does have current projections. The staff stated that it will send a formal RAI requesting the information.



LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON FEBRUARY 12, 2008, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., CONCERNING RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION—LEAK BEFORE BREAK ANALYSES

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. held a telephone conference call on February 12, 2008, to obtain clarification on Entergy's response to a request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Indian Point license renewal application (LRA). By letter dated January 17, 2008, Entergy submitted its response to RAI regarding leak before break analyses. The staff reviewed the information contained therein, and requested clarification.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants, and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the items discussed with the applicant, including a brief description of the resolution of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Kimberly Green, Safety Project Manager  
Projects Branch 2  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. Summary of Discussion

cc w/encls: See next page

LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON FEBRUARY 12, 2008, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., CONCERNING RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION—LEAK BEFORE BREAK ANALYSES

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. held a telephone conference call on February 12, 2008, to obtain clarification on Entergy's response to a request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Indian Point license renewal application (LRA). By letter dated January 17, 2008, Entergy submitted its response to RAI regarding leak before break analyses. The staff reviewed the information contained therein, and requested clarification.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants, and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the items discussed with the applicant, including a brief description of the resolution of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Kimberly Green, Safety Project Manager  
Projects Branch 2  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286

Enclosures:

3. List of Participants
4. Summary of Discussion

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

**ADAMS Accession No.: G:\ADRO\DLR\RPB2\Indian Point\Safety Review\Telecon Summaries\Telecon Summary 02-12-08 LBB.doc**

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR	BC:RPB2:DLR
NAME		KGreen	RFranovich
DATE	03/ /08	03/ /08	03/ /08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
FEBRUARY 12, 2008**

**PARTICIPANTS**

John Tsao  
Mike Stroud  
Nelson Azevedo  
Walt Wittich

**AFFILIATIONS**

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)  
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy)  
Entergy  
Entergy

**CLARIFICATION ON RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**February 12, 2008**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. held a telephone conference call on February 12, 2008, to discuss and clarify the response to a request for additional information (RAI) concerning the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3 license renewal application (LRA).

By letter dated December 21, 2007, the staff requested additional information leak before break analyses. By letter dated January 17, 2008, Entergy responded to the staff's RAI. Upon review of the information contained in Entergy's response letter, the staff determined that additional clarification was warranted. The items requiring clarification are discussed below.

In its response to RAI 4.7.2-2, page 6 of 13, second paragraph, the applicant stated that "...A fatigue crack growth analysis of the reactor vessel INLET nozzle to safe-end region was performed..." This nozzle was selected because crack growth at this location is representative of the entire primary loop.

In its response to RAI 4.7.2-7(e), page 10 of 13, the applicant stated that the junction of the hot leg and the reactor vessel OUTLET nozzle is the load limiting/bounding. RAI 4.7.2-7(e) is related to which nozzle is representative of the entire primary loop.

In its response to RAI 4.7.2-2, the applicant stated that the INLET nozzle is bounding but the response to RAI 4.7.2-7(e) states that the OUTLET nozzle is bounding.

Therefore, the staff asked the applicant to clarify the potential discrepancy.

Applicant's clarification:

The applicant stated that the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) inlet nozzle is the component for which Westinghouse performed the generic study for the fleet to determine sensitivity of the fatigue crack growth. However, for IP2 and IP3, the plant-specific bounding component is the RPV outlet nozzle.

The staff finds that the applicant's response has clarified the issue.

ENCLOSURE 2

