

May 8, 2008

LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

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

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON APRIL 3, 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 — METAL FATIGUE, BOLTED CONNECTIONS, AND BORAFLEX

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., held a telephone conference call on April 3, 2008, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft request for additional information (D-RAI) concerning the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's D-RAI.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the D-RAI items discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA/

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

May 8, 2008

LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

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

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON APRIL 3, 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 — METAL FATIGUE, BOLTED CONNECTIONS, AND BORAFLEX

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., held a telephone conference call on April 3, 2008, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft request for additional information (D-RAI) concerning the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 2 and 3, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's D-RAI.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the D-RAI items discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA/

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

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML081190059

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR	BC:RPB2:DLR
NAME	YEdmonds	KGreen	RFranovich
DATE	05/05/08	05/06/08	05/08/08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Letter to Entergy from K. Green, dated May 08, 2008

DISTRIBUTION:

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON APRIL 3, 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 — METAL FATIGUE, BOLTED CONNECTIONS, AND BORAFLEX

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDlr

RidsNrrDlrRpb1

RidsNrrDlrRpb2

RidsNrrDlrRer1

RidsNrrDlrRer2

RidsNrrDlrRerb

RidsNrrDlrRpob

RidsNrrDciCvib

RidsNrrDciCpnb

RidsNrrDraAfpb

RidsNrrDraAplb

RidsNrrDeEmcb

RidsNrrDeEeeb

RidsNrrDssSrxb

RidsNrrDssSbpb

RidsNrrDssScvb

RidsOgcMailCenter

RFranovich

BPham

KGreen

JCaverly

RAuluck

KChang

MKowal

JBoska

STurk, OGC

LSubin, OGC

BMizuno, OGC

SBurnell, OPA

DMcIntyre, OPA

TMensah, OEDO

EDacus, OCA

GMeyer, RI

MMcLaughlin, RI

NMcNamara, RI

DScrenci, RI OPA

NSheehan, RI OPA

PCataldo, RI

CHott, RI

DJackson, RI

BWelling, RI

RConte, RI

ECobey, RI

MCox, RI

Indian Point Nuclear Generating
Units 2 and 3

cc:

Senior Vice President
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Vice President Oversight
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Senior Manager, Nuclear Safety &
Licensing
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Senior Vice President and COO
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Assistant General Counsel
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Manager, Licensing
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway, GSB
P.O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

Mr. Paul D. Tonko
President and CEO
New York State Energy Research and
Development Authority
17 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203-6399

Mr. John P. Spath
New York State Energy, Research and
Development Authority
17 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203-6399

Mr. Paul Eddy
New York State Department
of Public Service
3 Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223-1350

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

Senior Resident Inspector's Office
Indian Point 2
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 59
Buchanan, NY 10511

Senior Resident Inspector's Office
Indian Point 3
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 59
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. Charles Donaldson, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
New York Department of Law
120 Broadway
New York, NY 10271

Mr. Raymond L. Albanese
Four County Coordinator
200 Bradhurst Avenue
Unit 4 Westchester County
Hawthorne, NY 10532

Mayor, Village of Buchanan
236 Tate Avenue
Buchanan, NY 10511

Indian Point Nuclear Generating
Units 2 and 3

- 2 -

cc:

Mr. William DiProffio
PWR SRC Consultant
48 Bear Hill Road
Newton, NH 03858

Mr. Garry Randolph
PWR SRC Consultant
1750 Ben Franklin Drive, 7E
Sarasota, FL 34236

Mr. William T. Russell
PWR SRC Consultant
400 Plantation Lane
Stevensville, MD 21666-3232

Mr. Jim Riccio
Greenpeace
702 H Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001

Mr. Phillip Musegaas
Riverkeeper, Inc.
828 South Broadway
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Mr. Mark Jacobs
IPSEC
46 Highland Drive
Garrison, NY 10524

Mr. R. M. Waters
Technical Specialist Licensing
450 Broadway
P.O. Box 0249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

Mr. Sherwood Martinelli
351 Dyckman
Peekskill, NY 10566

Ms. Susan Shapiro, Esq.
21 Perlman Drive
Spring Valley, NY 10977

John Sipos
Assistant Attorney General
New York State Department of Law
Environmental Protection Bureau
The Capitol
Albany, NY 12224

Robert Snook
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
State of Connecticut
55 Elm Street
P.O. Box 120
Hartford, CT 06141-0120

Ms. Kathryn M. Sutton, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Paul M. Bessette, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Martin J. O'Neill, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

The Honorable Nita Lowey
222 Mamaroneck Avenue, Suite 310
White Plains, NY 10605

Joan Leary Matthews
Senior Counsel for Special Projects
Office of General Counsel
NYS Department of Environmental
Conservation
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-5500

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

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
APRIL 3, 2008**

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATIONS

Kim Green	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
On Yee	NRC
Peter Wen	NRC
Jim Davis	NRC
Bo Pham	NRC
Jim Medhoff	NRC
Mike Stroud	Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy)
Garry Young	Entergy
Alan Cox	Entergy
Ted Ivy	Entergy
Don Fronabarger	Entergy
Charlie Caputo	Entergy
John Curry	Entergy
Nelson Azevedo	Entergy
Charlie Jackson	Entergy

**DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
METAL FATIGUE**

April 3, 2008

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

D-RAI 4.3.1.8-1

License Renewal Application Section 4.3.1 states “Current design basis fatigue evaluations calculate cumulative usage factors (CUFs) for components or sub-components based on design transient cycles.” For CUF values listed in LRA Tables 4.3-13 and 4.3-14, please provide the methodology used with sufficient results of the fatigue analysis such that the staff can make a determination based on the guidance described in Standard Review Plan-License Renewal (SRP-LR) (NUREG-1800). Specifically, please describe the details of how environmentally assisted fatigue (EAF) is factored into the calculation of the CUF using F_{en} values.

Discussion: The applicant was uncertain as to whether the staff was requesting that they provide the evaluations or a description of evaluations. Based on the discussion with the applicant, the staff agreed to revise this question as follows. The revised question will be sent as a formal RAI.

License renewal application (LRA) Section 4.3.1 states “Current design basis fatigue evaluations calculate cumulative usage factors (CUFs) for components or sub-components based on design transient cycles.” For CUF values listed in LRA Tables 4.3-13 and 4.3-14, please describe the details of how various environmental effects are factored into the calculation of the CUF using F_{en} values.

D-RAI 4.3.1.8-2

From the review of EAF analysis of other plants, it was found that the transfer function methodology used in the EAF analysis may not provide valid results, as it is dependent on the inputs. To assist the staff in its review, please provide the EAF analysis for all the NUREG/CR-6260 locations (components) at Indian Point unless it can be demonstrated that the CUF value is within the ASME Code limit of 1.0 by using the original 40-year analysis value adjusted for 60 years and multiplied by F_{en} , which is consistent with SRP-LR and ASME Code. This analysis should be completed by using NRC-approved fatigue software and the ASME Code, Section III, Subsection NB-3200 methodology (which defines the use of six stress components to determine the stress state and thereby calculates the principal stresses and stress intensities). Justify the analysis method, the load (stress) combination, and the results of the ASME Code analysis if 2-D axis-symmetric modeling is used. In addition, the analysis should apply ASME code rules such as elastic-plastic correction factor, K_e , and stress intensities correction factor for modulus of elasticity. This analysis should be performed without the use of the transfer function method.

Discussion: The applicant wanted clarification on the staff's request. The applicant pointed out that the request is a new staff position and that for previous plants, the staff has not requested the analyses to be provided and has accepted a commitment to perform the analyses two years prior to entering the period of extended operation as part of the Fatigue Monitoring Program in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(iii). Subsequent to the telephone conference, the staff determined that no additional information is needed at this time. Therefore, a formal RAI will not be issued at this time.

D-RAI 4.3.1.8-3

SRP-LR Section 4.3.2.1.1.3 provides the basis for the staff acceptance of an aging management program to address environmental fatigue. It states, "[T]he staff has evaluated a program for monitoring and tracking the number of critical thermal and pressure transients for the selected reactor coolant system components. The staff has determined that this program is an acceptable aging management program to address metal fatigue of the reactor coolant system components according to 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(iii)." The staff is unable to determine if the Fatigue Monitoring Program of IP2 and IP3 contain sufficient details to satisfy this criterion, based on the NA items listed in LRA Tables 4.3-13 and 4.3-14. Please provide adequate details of the Fatigue Monitoring Program, specifically the fatigue analysis used in determining the CUF values for the NA locations and how IPEC plans to proceed in monitoring the locations of Tables 4.3-13 and 4.3-14 during the period of extended operation.

Discussion: The applicant wanted clarification on what the staff is requesting. Based on the discussion with the applicant, the staff agreed to revise this question as follows. The revised question will be sent as a formal RAI.

Standard Review Plan for Review of License Renewal Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (SRP-LR) Section 4.3.2.1.1.3 provides the basis for the staff acceptance of an aging management program to address environmental fatigue. It states, "[t]he staff has evaluated a program for monitoring and tracking the number of critical thermal and pressure transients for the selected reactor coolant system components. The staff has determined that this program is an acceptable aging management program to address metal fatigue of the reactor coolant system components according to 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(iii)." The staff is unable to determine if the Fatigue Monitoring Program for Indian Point 2 and Indian Point 3 contains sufficient details to satisfy this criterion. Please provide adequate details of the Fatigue Monitoring Program such that the staff can make a determination based on the criterion set forth in SRP-LR Section 4.3.2.1.1.3. Also, please explain in detail the corrective actions and the frequency that such actions will be taken so that the acceptance criteria will not be exceeded in the period of extended operation. (This RAI will be renumbered as RAI 4.3.1.8-2.)

D-RAI 4.3.1.8-4

Section B.1.12 of the LRA amendment, dated January 22, 2008, states, "If ongoing monitoring indicates the potential for a condition outside that analyzed above, IPEC may perform further reanalysis of the identified configuration using established configuration management processes as described above." Please explain in detail what is meant by the phrase "using established configuration management processes." Also, please explain in detail the corrective actions and the frequency that such actions will be taken so the acceptance criteria will not be exceeded in the period of extended operation.

Discussion: The applicant stated that it was unclear about the staff's request regarding "configuration management processes." In a subsequent call, the applicant explained that the configuration management processes referred to are those governed by its 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B Quality Assurance program, and include design input verification and independent reviews which ensure that valid assumptions, transients, cycles, external loadings, analysis methods, and environmental fatigue life correction factors will be used in the fatigue analyses. Therefore, this portion of question is withdrawn and will not be sent as a formal RAI. The portion of the request that deals with corrective actions will be added to RAI 4.3.1.8-2 (as renumbered).

Non-EQ Bolted Cable Connection AMP

D-RAI 3.0.3.3.6-1

With regard to Indian Point Aging Management Program (AMP) B.1.22, "Non-EQ Bolted Cable Connection Program," the license renewal application states that inspection methods may include thermography, contact resistance testing, or other appropriate methods including visual, based on plant configuration and industry guidance. In Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) AMP XI.E6, the staff recommends thermography, contact resistance testing, or other appropriate methods based on plant configuration and industry guidance for detecting loss of preload or bolt loosening. In the case where visual inspection will be the only method used, provide a technical basis of how this will be sufficient to detect loss of preload or loosening of bolted connections.

Discussion: The applicant stated that this question is similar to an audit question that has been answered and subsequently discussed during two telephone conferences. This issue is being reviewed by the Division of Engineering and, therefore, is withdrawn at this time. However, when the staff has reached a determination, a formal RAI may be issued at such time.

Boraflex AMP

D-RAI 3.0.3.2.3-1

Indian Point 2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, Revision 20, dated 2006, Section 14.2.1 on page 55 of 218, states in part that:

"Northeast Technology Corporation report NET-173-01 and NET-171-02 are based on conservative projections of amount of boraflex absorber panel degradation assumed in each sub-region. These projections are valid through the end of the year 2006."

Please confirm that the Boraflex neutron absorber panels in the Indian Point Unit 2 spent fuel pool have been re-evaluated for service through the end of the current licensing period. Also, please discuss the plans for updating the Boraflex analysis during the period of extended operation.

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