

Elizabeth Keighley

From: John Richmond, *RI*
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 12:29 PM
To: David Pelton; Darrell Roberts; Richard Conte; Ronald Bellamy; Mary Baty; Karl Farrar
Cc: Doug Tift; Neil Sheehan; Nancy McNamara; Diane Screnci; Michael Modes; Richard Barkley
Subject: FW: REVISED OC Report 2008-07 (rev-12)

Passing along review comments from [(b)(5)] *EXS*

From: John Richmond
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 12:25 PM
To: Mary Baty
Subject: RE: REVISED OC Report 2008-07 (rev-12)

Good input! No problem making the 2 wording changes.

for the UT next outage, they did say "upper" drywell ... however, that was before water was found in a poly bottle. Don't know what their final condition report will tell them to do. BUT, I'll change it to be Upper Drywell consistent with what they initially said. [thanks for the good catch]

2.0 vs 2.5 inches ... I'll check. I'm pretty sure I read "2 inches" in their Tech Eval. Might be they chose to use a more restrictive limit than the limiting design value.

Thanks

From: Mary Baty
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 12:16 PM
To: John Richmond
Subject: RE: REVISED OC Report 2008-07 (rev-12)

NOT FOR FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE--ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

My comments

In the cover letter, change "in" to "on" after Commission as shown.
The license renewal application had a hearing associated with it and the matter is before the Commission on appeal.

In section 1.1 *consider* adding the following after sentence to the third paragraph: Thus, they are referred to in this Report as "proposed" conditions and commitments.

(b)(5)

NOT FOR FOR PUBLIC DISCLSoure--ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

From: John Richmond

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 11:06 AM

To: David Pelton; Richard Conte; Diane Bearde; Darrell Roberts; Ronald Bellamy; Mary Baty; Karl Farrar; Neil Sheehan; Diane Screnci; Nancy McNamara

Cc: Doug Tift; Michael Modes; Richard Barkley; Lisa Regner; Timothy OHara; Glenn Meyer; Marsha Gamberoni; Joseph Schoppy

Subject: REVISED OC Report 2008-07 (rev-12)

[resent because I forgot to attach Rev-12 Oops!]

REVISED Rev-12 is attached, with R. Conte comments incorporated
I've highlighted the salient changes below [balance of comments didn't affect intent or any sensitive wording]

IF you already reviewed Rev-11, THEN please review these highlighted changes, and RESPOND back to me with any comments.

IF you have not yet reviewed last night's version (Rev-11), THEN please review the attached Rev-12, and RESPOND back to me with any comments.

Thanks for your help in this Time-Sensitive matter.
John R.

COVER LETTER

Dear Mr. Pardee

On December 23, 2008, the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed an inspection at your Oyster Creek Generating Station. The enclosed report documents the inspection results, which were discussed on December 23, 2008, with Mr. T. Rausch, Site Vice President, Mr. M. Gallagher, Vice President License Renewal, and other members of your staff.

First, the inspection examined activities conducted under your current license as they relate to safety and compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations. This portion of the inspection focused on the inservice inspection of the drywell containment. Based on the results of the NRC's inspection, the NRC determined there were no safety significant conditions affecting current operations. The inspectors reviewed selected procedures and records, observed activities, and interviewed personnel.

Second, this inspection was also conducted using the guidance of Inspection Procedure (IP) 71003 "Post-Approval Site Inspection for License Renewal" as a prudent measure to observe Oyster Creek license renewal activities during the last planned refueling outage prior to entering the period of extended operation. The license renewal application had a hearing associated with it and the matter is before the Commission in appeal. Because a renewed license has not been issued, the proposed license conditions and associated regulatory commitments, made as a part of the license renewal application, are not in effect. Accordingly, the enclosed report records the inspector's observations only.

PURPOSE OF INSPECTION

An appeal of a licensing board decision about the Oyster Creek (OC) application for a renewed license is pending before the Commission. The NRC conducted this inspection, in part, using the guidance of Inspection Procedure (IP) 71003 "Post-Approval Site Inspection for License Renewal." This inspection was considered a prudent measure in order to make observations of Oyster Creek license renewal activities during the last refueling outage prior to entering the period of extended operation.

Inspection observations were made of license renewal commitments and license conditions selected from NUREG-1875, "Safety Evaluation Report (SER) Related to the License Renewal of Oyster Creek Generating Station" (ML071290023 & ML071310246). The inspection included observations of a number of license renewal commitments which were enhancements to exiting programs implemented under the current license. Performance of existing programs, absent of any associated license renewal enhancement, was evaluated using current licensing basis (CLB) criteria, based on ASME inservice inspection requirements.

For license renewal activities, within the context of 10 CFR 54, the report only documents the inspector observations, because the proposed license conditions and associated regulatory commitments are not in effect. These conditions and commitments are not in effect because the application for a renewed license remains under Commission review for final decision, and a renewed license has not been approved for Oyster Creek.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-UP

As noted in the detailed observations of Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 below, a number of CLB issues were observed for which Exelon has placed them into their corrective action program. The 10 CFR 50 CLB bases for any potential performance deficiencies was unclear to the inspectors, since the focus of the inspection preparation was on 10 CFR 54 activities and correspondence. The drywell corrosion issue dates back to the late 1980's and early 1990's. Because more information is required in order to determine whether the current issues are acceptable or are CLB performance deficiencies, an Unresolved Item (URI) is being opened for follow-up during the next inspection in this area (March 2009)

From: John Richmond

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 9:37 AM

To: David Pelton; Richard Conte; Diane Bearde; Darrell Roberts; Ronald Bellamy; Mary Baty; Karl Farrar; Neil Sheehan; Diane Screnci; Nancy McNamara

Cc: Doug Tiff; Michael Modes; Richard Barkley; Lisa Regner; Timothy OHara; Glenn Meyer; Marsha Gamberoni

Subject: RE: Resend OC Report 2008-07 (rev-11)

(b)(5)

It's not clear to me whether we'll need another round of review for those changed sections, but that's my recommendation!
I'll send out just the revised portions, for everyone's review, when I get done editing!!!

>>>>>>>>>

(b)(5)

From: David Pelton

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 9:14 AM

To: John Richmond; Richard Conte; Diane Bearde; Darrell Roberts; Ronald Bellamy; Mary Baty; Karl Farrar; Neil Sheehan; Diane Screnci; Nancy McNamara

Cc: Doug Tift; Michael Modes; Richard Barkley; Lisa Regner; Timothy OHara; Glenn Meyer; Marsha Gamberoni

Subject: RE: Resend OC Report 2008-07 (rev-11)

John,

Nice job.

(b)(5)

"Thanks to you and all in Region I for your hard work on this report!"

David Pelton

NRC/NRR/DLR

Chief, Projects Branch I

(301) 415-2307

From: John Richmond

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2009 8:25 PM

To: Richard Conte; Diane Bearde; Darrell Roberts; Ronald Bellamy; David Pelton; Mary Baty; Karl Farrar; Neil Sheehan; Diane Screnci; Nancy McNamara

Cc: Doug Tift; Michael Modes; Richard Barkley; Lisa Regner; Timothy OHara; Glenn Meyer; Marsha Gamberoni

Subject: Resend OC Report 2008-07 (rev-11)

Importance: High

RESENT this e-mail because I was getting Network Error messages the first time!

Time for the final review!

This electronic version (rev-11) will become the "concurrence copy" Friday morning (Jan 16)

Please review and provide comments to directly to me ASAP.

Your help in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Thanks

John R.

From: Doug Tift

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2009 7:01 PM

To: Doug Tift; Richard Conte; John Richmond; Diane Bearde; Darrell Roberts; Michael Modes; Richard Barkley; Ronald Bellamy; David Pelton; Mary Baty; Karl Farrar; Neil Sheehan; Diane Screnci

Subject: Project Plan Update

All,

Attached is the current version of the OC LR inspection report project plan. We are currently on track to issue the report on time, and possibly a little early. The final draft version will be sent out shortly. We are looking to receive comments from OGC and DLR by noon on Friday if possible.

Thanks,

-Doug

Received: from R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov ([148.184.99.7]) by R1MS01.nrc.gov
([148.184.99.10]) with mapi; Fri, 16 Jan 2009 12:29:28 -0500
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
From: John Richmond <John.Richmond@nrc.gov>
To: David Pelton <David.Pelton@nrc.gov>, Darrell Roberts
<Darrell.Roberts@nrc.gov>, Richard Conte <Richard.Conte@nrc.gov>, Ronald
Bellamy <Ronald.Bellamy@nrc.gov>, Mary Baty <Mary.Baty@nrc.gov>, Karl Farrar
<Karl.Farrar@nrc.gov>
CC: Doug Tifft <Doug.Tifft@nrc.gov>, Neil Sheehan <Neil.Sheehan@nrc.gov>,
Nancy McNamara <Nancy.McNamara@nrc.gov>, Diane Screnci
<Diane.Screnci@nrc.gov>, Michael Modes <Michael.Modes@nrc.gov>, Richard
Barkley <Richard.Barkley@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2009 12:29:27 -0500
Subject: FW: REVISED OC Report 2008-07 (rev-12)
Thread-Topic: REVISED OC Report 2008-07 (rev-12)
Thread-Index:
Acl1yye2/6wk3x9dSZ+TUeFJGayzvAAxQFdwADcvo0AAAnmB0AAar6dgAADThIAAA0e
QIAACc7KmAAckpdAAAGlqgA==
Message-ID:
<2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72AA7CBD3FBE@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
Accept-Language: en-US
Content-Language: en-US
X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
<2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72AA7CBD3FBE@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0