



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 21, 2010

LICENSEE: Florida Power & Light

FACILITY: Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF JULY 22, 2010, MEETING WITH FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT,  
ON TURKEY POINT'S PROPOSED EXTENDED POWER UPRATE  
APPLICATION (TAC NOS. ME1167 AND ME1168)

On July 22, 2010, a Category 1 public meeting was held between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and representatives of Florida Power & Light (FPL, the licensee) at NRC Headquarters, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed extended power uprate (EPU) application for Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4. A list of attendees is provided as an Enclosure.

The licensee presented information (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML102310411). The licensee presented the schedule of submitting the proposed application and implementation of the EPU. The schedule states the EPU license amendment request would be submitted August 2010. The NRC asked if this schedule is final and the licensee responded by stating that this is more of a proposed schedule and depends on approval of the alternate source term license amendment request that is currently under review.

FPL presented its path forward for addressing the spent fuel pool criticality analysis. The licensee plans on submitting a separate submittal that will address the fuel storage criticality and fuel enrichment. The NRC asked what FPL considered the current licensing basis with the enforcement action taken against the Turkey Point spent fuel pool. The licensee responded by stating the enforcement action taken against the Turkey Point spent fuel pool has been entered into the corrective action program. The licensee continued by stating the new criticality analysis performed replaces the previous licensing basis analysis for spent fuel and new fuel storage. The NRC staff stated, submitting the new criticality analysis separately from the EPU application is acceptable but asked for a proposed submittal date of the criticality analysis. The licensee stated that another meeting can be setup to discuss the specifics of the application and continue the discussion on different options for separating or consolidating the analysis with the EPU application. The NRC cautioned FPL that if the criticality analysis is submitted separately from the EPU application, and the criticality analysis is not approved before the EPU, then the EPU, if approved, would have to be issued with a limited scope.


The licensee also had a presentation on the modifications needed to implement the EPU and the approach for completing the modifications to the plant. The licensee stated that Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.59 will be applied to determine when prior NRC review is required. The licensee continued by stating that most of the modifications do not require prior NRC review for implementation. The NRC provided feedback by stating the 10 CFR 50.59 discussions should include a description of the modification and the EPU affects on the modification. Also, the licensee should include in the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluations if the method and assumptions are the same as described in the final safety analysis report (FSAR) and the specification section in the FSAR that outlines the methodology and assumptions used.

The NRC asked how far ahead the licensee would complete the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluations before implementing the modifications. The licensee responded by stating the evaluations will be completed months in advance.

The licensee concluded the presentation by stating the Turkey Point EPU application will conform to Review Standard (RS) – 001, Extended Power Uprates. The licensee also stated that Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4 were licensed prior to the general design criteria (GDC) and standard review plan but would provide a matrix that shows the correlation between the GDCs and the criteria that Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4 are licensed to.

Members of the public were in attendance. A member of the public provided feedback via email that he was very disappointed in the sound quality. He continued by stating that he heard very little of the meeting and disconnected after 45 minutes. His comments have been forwarded to the NRR Senior Communications Analyst who will forward them to the Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

Please direct any inquiries to me at 301-415-5888, or [Jason.Paige@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Paige@nrc.gov).



Jason C. Paige, Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251

Enclosure:  
List of Attendees

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

LIST OF ATTENDEES

JULY 22, 2010, MEETING WITH FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REGARDING

TURKEY POINT, UNITS 3 AND 4 EXTENDED POWER UPRATE LICENSE AMENDMENT

REQUEST

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

J. H. Raval  
Harold Walker  
Matt Kromer  
Prem Sahay  
Swagata Som  
Aloysius Obodoako  
John Parillo  
Len Ward  
Steve Jones  
Vic Cusumano  
Richard Bulavinetz

Tom Alexion  
Carl Schulten  
Carla Roquecruz  
Bob Wolfgang  
Farideh Saba  
Garry Armstrong  
Eva Brown  
Tony Ulses  
Greg Casto  
Andrew Howe

Florida Power & Light

Carl O'Farrill  
Steve Franzone  
Philip Tiemann  
Liz Abbott

NextERA

Steve Hale

Westinghouse

Mike Watson  
Kris Cummings

Progress Energy

Ken Wilsa

Public

Glenn Adams

Enclosure

The NRC asked how far ahead the licensee would complete the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluations before implementing the modifications. The licensee responded by stating the evaluations will be completed months in advance.

The licensee concluded the presentation by stating the Turkey Point EPU application will conform to Review Standard (RS) – 001, Extended Power Uprates. The licensee also stated that Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4 were licensed prior to the general design criteria (GDC) and standard review plan but would provide a matrix that shows the correlation between the GDCs and the criteria that Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4 are licensed to.

Members of the public were in attendance. A member of the public provided feedback via email that he was very disappointed in the sound quality. He continued by stating that he heard very little of the meeting and disconnected after 45 minutes. His comments have been forwarded to the NRR Senior Communications Analyst who will forward them to the Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

Please direct any inquiries to me at 301-415-5888, or Jason.Paige@nrc.gov.

*/RA/*

Jason C. Paige, Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251

Enclosure:  
List of Attendees

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC	HWalker, NRR	CSchulten, NRR
LPL 2-2 Branch Reading	MKromer, NRR	CRoquecruz, NRR
RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCTR Resource	SJones, NRR	BWolfgang, NRR
RidsNrrDorlLpl2-2 Resource	PSahay, NRR	FSaba, NRR
RidsNrrDssSrx	SSom, NRR	GArmstrong, NRR
RidsNrrPMTurkey Point Resource	AObodoako, NRR	EBrown, NRR
RidsNrrLABClayton Resource	JParillo, NRR	GCasto, NRR
RidsOgcRp Resource	LWard, NRR	AHowe, NRR/DRA
RidsRgn2MailCenter Resource	VCusumano, NRR	NSanfilippo, EDO
CSteger, NRR	RBulavinetz, NRR	
JRaval, NRR	TAlexion, NRR	

ADAMS Accession Nos.: Pkg.: ML102380422      Summary: ML102380239  
Meeting Notice ML101880620      Handouts ML102310411

OFFICE	DORL/LPL2-2/PM	DORL/LPL2-2/LA	DORL/LPL2-2/BC	DORL/LPL2-2/PM
NAME	JPaige	BClayton	DBroaddus	JPaige
DATE	8/27/2010	8/26/2010	9/21/2010	9/21/2010