

IPRenewal NPEmails

From: Kimberly Green
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2008 12:23 PM
To: STROUD, MICHAEL D; Tyner, Donna
Cc: IPRenewal NPEmails
Subject: Telecon Summary of September 8, 2008 re Operating Experience and LRA Section 3.5.2.2
Attachments: Telecon Summary 09-08-08 Operating Experience and LRA Section 3.5.2.2.doc

Mike and Donna,

Attached is the draft telecon summary from the call on September 8, 2008 regarding operating experience and LRA Section 3.5.2.2. Please review and let me know if any corrections are needed.

Kimberly Green
Safety PM
(301) 415-1627
kimberly.green@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: IndianPointUnits2and3NonPublic_EX
Email Number: 790

Mail Envelope Properties (83F82891AF9D774FBBB39974B6CB134F757695FB77)

Subject: Telecon Summary of September 8, 2008 re Operating Experience and LRA
Section 3.5.2.2
Sent Date: 10/17/2008 12:22:38 PM
Received Date: 10/17/2008 12:22:40 PM
From: Kimberly Green

Created By: Kimberly.Green@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"IPRenewal NPEmails" <IPRenewal.NPEmails@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"STROUD, MICHAEL D" <MSTROUD@entergy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Tyner, Donna" <dytyner@entergy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time	
MESSAGE	341	10/17/2008 12:22:40 PM	
Telecon Summary 09-08-08 Operating Experience and LRA Section 3.5.2.2.doc			73722

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

LICENSEE: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

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

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2008, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., CONCERNING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION—OPERATING EXPERIENCE AND LRA SECTION 3.5.2.2

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on September 8, 2008, to obtain clarification on additional information submitted by the applicant by letter dated August 14, 2008, and a standard cited in LRA Section 3.5.2.2. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the information submitted by the applicant.

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 on the status 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 SEPTEMBER 8, 2008, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC., CONCERNING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION—OPERATING EXPERIENCE AND LRA SECTION 3.5.2.2

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on September 8, 2008, to obtain clarification on additional information submitted by the applicant by letter dated August 14, 2008, and a standard cited in LRA Section 3.5.2.2. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the information submitted by the applicant.

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 on the status 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

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: G:\ADRO\DLR\RPB2\Indian Point\Safety Review\Telecon Summaries\Telecon Summary 09-08-08 Operating Experience and LRA Section 3.5.2.2.doc

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR	OGC	BC:RPB2:DLR
NAME		KGreen	STurk	RFranovich

DATE	10/ /08	10/ /08	10/ /08	10/ /08
------	---------	---------	---------	---------

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

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

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
SEPTEMBER 8, 2008**

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATIONS

Kim Green	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
George Thomas	NRC
Hans Ashar	NRC
Dan Hoang	NRC
Rich Morante	Brookhaven National Laboratory
Mike Stroud	Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy)
Alan Cox	Entergy
Reza Ahrabli	Entergy
John Skonieczny	Entergy
Rich Drake	Entergy
Charlie Caputo	Entergy
John Curry	Entergy

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION DATED AUGUST 14, 2008
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
OPERATING EXPERIENCE AND LRA SECTION 3.5.2.2**

September 8, 2008

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on September 8, 2008, to obtain clarification on additional information submitted by the applicant by letter dated August 14, 2008, and a standard cited in LRA Section 3.5.2.2.

LRA Section 3.5.2.2

During a telephone call on September 3, 2008, the staff asked the applicant to clarify a citation to American Concrete Institute (ACI)-318 in LRA Section 3.5.2.2. The staff noted that this standard is also referenced in other subsection in LRA Section 3.5. Specifically, LRA Section 3.5.2.2 states, "Water/cement ratios were in accordance with requirements of the version of ACI 318 used in IPEC construction, which allows a ratio of up to 0.576 for concrete with the compressive strength specified for IPEC concrete." The staff questioned whether that the correct ratio value for citation should be 0.465. The applicant stated that it would clarify the value used in the application, and it will provide additional information to substantiate how it meets ACI-318-63.

In addition, in the same section of the LRA, the applicant states, "IPEC concrete also meets requirements of later ACI guide ACI 201.2R-77, Guide to Durable Concrete, since both documents use the same American Society for Testing and Material (ASTM) standards for selection, application and testing of concrete." The staff requested clarification, in that the fact that the two documents use the same ASTM standard does not necessarily mean that the concrete meets a later edition of a standard. The applicant stated that it will clarify the reference to ACI 201.2R-77.

In LRA Section 3.5.2.2.1, the applicant states, "For Unit 2 containment during normal operation, areas are maintained below a bulk average temperature of 130°F. Piping penetrations through the containment cylinder wall associated with pipes carrying hot fluid are cooled using air-to-air heat exchangers and the pipes are insulated to maintain the temperature in the adjoining concrete below 250°F. NUREG-1801 allows for concrete temperatures higher than 200°F for local areas if tests or calculations are provided to evaluate the reduction in strength. Concrete associated with the Unit 2 hot piping penetrations has been evaluated and determined acceptable at temperatures up to 250°F." The staff asked that if the temperatures are greater than 200°F in localized areas, what will be the effects on the properties of concrete during the period of extended operation. The applicant stated that it will look at the calculations and provide a response.

Audit Question 361 Follow-Up

During a telephone conference call on August 27, 2008, the staff inquired about locations of spalling on the containment buildings. The staff also asked about the worst case margins in the concrete and rebar at the degraded areas. During this phone call, the staff inquired about the margin in the calculations performed for the containment buildings. The applicant stated that a

ENCLOSURE 2

calculation was performed in 1999 in preparation for the IWL inspection. The applicant stated that it will review the calculation and provide information to the staff to show that margin exists for the containment.

The staff noted that ACI 349.3R may apply for degradation in reference to the spalled areas, as this standard is referenced in the GALL Report (NUREG-1801). The applicant stated that it will review the standard, and it will provide information regarding the spalled areas by indicating elevation, dimensions and depth.

