



**UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001
September 14, 2009

LICENSEE: FPL Energy Point Beach, LLC

FACILITY: Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE AUGUST 6, 2009, MEETING WITH FPL ENERGY POINT BEACH, LLC, ON THE EXTENDED POWER UPRATE AND ALTERNATE SOURCE TERM AMENDMENTS (TAC NOS. ME0219, ME0220, ME1044, ME1045, ME1083, AND ME1084)

On August 6, 2009, a Category 1 public meeting was held between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and representatives of FPL Energy Point Beach, LLC (the licensee) at NRC Headquarters, Executive Boulevard Building, 6003 Executive Boulevard, Rockville, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the scope of review and the location of information in the licensee's Extended Power Uprate (EPU) submittal for each of the licensing actions into which the EPU has been divided. Also, the relationship between the EPU and the Alternate Source Term (AST) license amendment request (LAR) was discussed. A list of attendees is provided as Enclosure 1.

The licensee's presentation can be found at Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession Nos. ML092190563 and ML092240298.

DISCUSSION

The licensee started off the presentation talking about the AST ventilation system seismic design. The licensee talked about how the staff has issued a number of requests for additional information (RAI) on this topic from multiple branches. As suggested by the staff, the licensee reviewed a previously approved AST safety evaluation (Hatch) and stated that they now understand the staff's concern regarding seismic qualification for credited systems. The licensee stated that in an upcoming RAI response, they will commit to performing a seismic evaluation of the ventilation systems credited in the AST analysis. The staff mentioned that the Electric Power Research Institute paper in the Hatch safety evaluation was not approved for generic use, and that the licensee would have to justify its use for Point Beach.

The licensee then went on to discuss the relationship between the EPU and AST LARs. The licensee stated how the AST LAR was intended to be a stand alone submittal, and that the EPU LAR only references the AST LAR for radiological consequences. The licensee presented different options on review plans for the two LARs which involved pulling out what the licensee views as portions of the EPU LAR, which are not affected by AST. The licensee presented the staff a list of modifications currently in the EPU LAR in which they asked if it would be possible for the staff to review these items in a schedule that would support their spring 2010 outage, even if the review of the rest of the EPU took longer. The staff stated that they would take it into consideration and get back to the licensee. The staff also stated that additional work would be required by the licensee to justify these changes at the current licensed power level, and that the licensee would have to submit this on the docket.

The licensee went over the matrices provided in the handouts, which were intended to assist the staff in locating information for the two licensing actions that were separated out of the EPU by the staff (Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) modification and Reactor Protection System/Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (RPS/ESFAS) setpoint changes). While going over the AFW matrix, the licensee made note that some of the methodology changes needed for the AFW review are also needed for the EPU. The licensee divided the RPS/ESFAS setpoint matrix into three categories. Category A is recalculated setpoints unaffected by the EPU. Category B is recalculated setpoints affected by the EPU. Category C is new setpoints for EPU only. Category A is the setpoints that the staff has planned on reviewing. The licensee asked the staff to consider some of the Category B and Category C setpoints that they felt were conservative changes and could be reviewed regardless of the EPU. The staff said that they would consider this and get back to the licensee. The staff went on to say that much like when asked to review some modifications independent of the EPU, the licensee would need to supplement their application to support this type of review.

The licensee asked the staff for a timeframe for the EPU review and if the 12 to 14 month review schedule from the date of the application was still a goal. The staff replied that it is working towards finishing the review of the AFW and RPS/ESFAS amendments to support the spring 2010 outage, but that to expect the rest of the EPU by spring 2010 is unrealistic. The staff still has concerns with the AST submittal which the EPU is contingent upon. The staff repeated that the specific modifications of the EPU that the licensee would like to have by spring of 2010, would have to be discussed internally.

Members of the public were not in attendance. Public Meeting Feedback forms were not received.

Please direct any inquiries to me at 301-415-2048, or Justin.Poole@nrc.gov.



Justin C. Poole, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosures:
List of Attendees

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

LIST OF ATTENDEES
FOR MEETING WITH POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT
REGARDING ALTERNATE SOURCE TERM AND
EXTENDED POWER UPRATE LICENSE AMENDMENT
FOR UNITS 1 AND 2

Name	Title	Organization
Harv Hanneman BENJAMIN PARKS	PBNP EPU Lic Supr NRC/NRR/DSS/SRXB	Nextera - Point Beach R Systems Engr
Steve Jones	Reactor Systems Eng	NRC/NRR/DSS/SRPB
Eva Brown	Senior Project Manager	NRC/NRR/DORL/LPLI-2
Nageewara Karim	Reactor Systems Engineer	NRC/NRR/SCVB
HAROLD WALKER Summer B Sui	SR REACTOR SYSTEMS ENGINEER Sr Reactor Systems Eng	NRR/DSS/SCVB NRC/DSS/SRXB
Norman Hanley Jason White	Shaw Proj. Manager Physical Scientist	Shaw Group NRR/DRA/AADB
Dylann Duvigneaud	Reactor Engineer	NRR/DRA/AADB
Alcem Boutright	Nuclear Engineer	NRR/DRA/AADB
Andrea Russell	Project Manager	NRR/DRA/AADB
Laura Walker	Westinghouse Project Manager	Westinghouse
Jim Andrachek Allen Howe	(W) Licensing Engr NRC/Dep Dir DORL	(W) NRC
* Gerald Waig	Senior Reactor System Eng	NRR/DIRS/ITSB
Joe Gritter	Division Director	NRR/DORL
Steve Hale	EPU Licensing	NextEra

* Via phone

LIST OF ATTENDEES
FOR MEETING WITH POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT
REGARDING ALTERNATE SOURCE TERM AND
EXTENDED POWER UPRATE LICENSE AMENDMENT
FOR UNITS 1 AND 2

[illegible]

The licensee went over the matrices provided in the handouts, which were intended to assist the staff in locating information for the two licensing actions that were separated out of the EPU by the staff (Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) modification and Reactor Protection System/Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (RPS/ESFAS) setpoint changes). While going over the AFW matrix, the licensee made note that some of the methodology changes needed for the AFW review are also needed for the EPU. The licensee divided the RPS/ESFAS setpoint matrix into three categories. Category A is recalculated setpoints unaffected by the EPU. Category B is recalculated setpoints affected by the EPU. Category C is new setpoints for EPU only. Category A is the setpoints that the staff has planned on reviewing. The licensee asked the staff to consider some of the Category B and Category C setpoints that they felt were conservative changes and could be reviewed regardless of the EPU. The staff said that they would consider this and get back to the licensee. The staff went on to say that much like when asked to review some modifications independent of the EPU, the licensee would need to supplement their application to support this type of review.

The licensee asked the staff for a timeframe for the EPU review and if the 12 to 14 month review schedule from the date of the application was still a goal. The staff replied that it is working towards finishing the review of the AFW and RPS/ESFAS amendments to support the spring 2010 outage, but that to expect the rest of the EPU by spring 2010 is unrealistic. The staff still has concerns with the AST submittal which the EPU is contingent upon. The staff repeated that the specific modifications of the EPU that the licensee would like to have by spring of 2010, would have to be discussed internally.

Members of the public were not in attendance. Public Meeting Feedback forms were not received.

Please direct any inquiries to me at 301-415-2048, or Justin.Poole@nrc.gov.

/RA/

Justin C. Poole, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosures:
List of Attendees

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	SBagley, EDO Region 3	BParks, NRR	CTucci, NRR
LPL3-1 R/F	RidsOgcRp Resource	SJones, NRR	ARussell, NRR
RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCTR Resource	EBrown, NRR	GWaig, NRR	WJessup, NRR
RidsNrrDorLpl3-1 Resource	NKaripineni, NRR	ATsirigotis, NRR	ABoatright, NRR
RidsNrrPMPPointBeach Resource	HWalker, NRR	KManoly, NRR	SMazumdar, NRR
RidsNrrLABTully Resource	SSun, NRR	RTaylor, NRR	MMcConnell, NRR
RidsRgn3MailCenter Resource	DDuvigneaud, NRR	JWhite, NRR	

ADAMS Accession No. PKG ML092370550

Meeting Notice ML091970042

Meeting Summary ML092321184

Handouts ML092190563 and ML092240298

OFFICE	DORL/LPL3-1/PM	DORL/LPL3-1/LA	DORL/LPL3-1/BC
NAME	JPoole	BTully (THarris for)	LJames (TWengert for)
DATE	09/10/09	09/10/09	09/14/09

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY