

PMVogtleCOLPEm Resource

From: Sebrosky, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2010 3:19 PM
To: PMVogtleCOLPEm Resource
Cc: 'Amy Aughtman'; 'Wes Sparkman'; Pieringer, Paul; Minarik, Anthony; McGovern, Denise; Moody, Robert; Joshi, Ravindra; Musico, Bruce
Subject: Reissuance of 9/30/10 phone call summary to correct an error and to provide additional discuss regarding the ACRS action associated with Chapter 18
Attachments: 9-30-10 revised phone call summary.docx

Note: The text of the phone call summary is being revised to correct an error and to provide additional discussion regarding the ACRS action associated with Chapter 18. The changes are shown in redline/strikeout in the attached document

Hearing Identifier: Vogtle_COL_Public
Email Number: 515

Mail Envelope Properties (36CF286628C20846A68047F24632330933FF7BFA78)

Subject: Reissuance of 9/30/10 phone call summary to correct an error and to provide additional discuss regarding the ACRS action associated with Chapter 18
Sent Date: 10/5/2010 3:18:45 PM
Received Date: 10/5/2010 3:18:48 PM
From: Sebrosky, Joseph

Created By: Joseph.Sebrosky@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Amy Aughtman" <agaughtm@southernco.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Wes Sparkman" <wasparkm@southernco.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Pieringer, Paul" <Paul.Pieringer@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Minarik, Anthony" <Anthony.Minarik@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"McGovern, Denise" <Denise.McGovern@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Moody, Robert" <Robert.Moody@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joshi, Ravindra" <Ravindra.Joshi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Musico, Bruce" <Bruce.Musico@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PMVogtleCOLPEm Resource" <PMVogtleCOLPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	250	10/5/2010 3:18:48 PM
9-30-10 revised phone call summary.docx		22258

Options

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

Note: The text of the phone call summary is being revised to correct an error and to provide additional discussion regarding the ACRS action associated with Chapter 18. The changes are shown in redline/strikeout.

MEMORANDUM TO: File (Vogtle Units 3 and 4 (Dockets 52-25 and 52-26))

From: Joseph Sebrosky, Project Manager
AP1000Projects Branch (NWE1)
Division of New reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Subject: Summary of September 30, 2010 Public Phone Call to Discuss Issues Associated with the Vogtle Units 3 and 4 Combined License Application Review

The NRC headquarters attendees were:

Paul Pieringer, Tony Minarik, Bob Moody, Bruce Musico, John Rycyna, Denise McGovern, Pat Moulding (OGC), Rollie Berry, Joe Sebrosky, John Frost, and Judy Johnson

Participants on the call that supported the discussions for Southern were:

Amy Aughtman (SNC), Wes Sparkman (SNC), James Flowers (SNC), Ted Amundson (SNC), Eddie Grant (NuStart), and Neil Haggerty (NuStart)

In addition to the Southern participants several other members of the public attended the call

The agenda for the meeting appears below and the result of the discussion are provided below.

1. ACRS Action item related to Chapter 18

Summary of Discussion: The description of this issue and a high-level summary is attached.

Action: The staff and the applicant indicated that they would both consider whether the use of an EP ITAAC is appropriate (and needed), in order to address the TSC's capability to support multiple units at the same time during an emergency. The staff asked the applicant to propose an appropriate EP ITAAC. The applicant indicated that such an ITAAC ~~could be, may not be~~ associated with ~~an EP drill, the exercise~~.

1- Subsequent to the phone call the staff determined that an exercise may have to be performed in order to fully demonstrate that the TSC is capable of supporting multiple units at the same time during an emergency. Such things as demonstrating that the human factors engineering is adequate so that data from one unit is not confused with data from another unit, and the command and control functions of the TSC are adequately demonstrated with multiple units in an emergency, would appear to only be able to be demonstrated during an exercise involving two or more units.

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

2. License condition for Cyber security program and Physical security program

Summary of Discussion: The staff indicated that the the applicant needs to make changes to FSAR table 13.4-201 to remove reference to a license condition for security program implementation and replace this with a reference to the regulation which provides requirements for when the security programs needs to be in place. The staff stated that it

recognizes that Part 10 of the application is incorrect but no changes to Part 10 are needed because it is not part of the licensing basis.

Action: Southern to revise its application to correct references in FSAR table 13.4-201 regarding security program implementation

3. Target set---TR-94 report—FSAR commitment/license condition.

Summary of Discussion: The staff has reviewed the Westinghouse topical report and determined that no changes are needed to the Vogtle COL application. The staff's basis is that the target sets will have to be identified and the applicant will have to have appropriate training in place in order to fulfill the security requirements in 10 CFR 73. Because 10 CFR 73 provides requirements regarding implementation any issue associated with the target sets will be subject to inspection and enforcement. Therefore, no further action is needed by the applicant.

4. Limits on 30/40 license to capture response VEGP RAI 1.05-1 (i.e., will not exceed Schedule C limits in 10 CFR 30.72, and will not possess uranium hexafluoride in quantities greater than 50 kilograms in a single container or 1000 kilograms total.) (Denise and me)

Summary of Discussion: The applicant's draft response is attached to this summary. The staff indicated that it understood the applicant's technical basis for why portions of the emergency plan did not need to be implemented to support the Part 30 and 40 license request. However the staff noted that the draft response relied on statements that limits in 10 CFR 30 and 40 that require an emergency plan would not be exceeded.

Action: Both the applicant and the staff indicated that they would consider whether the license should include restriction that byproduct material will not exceed Schedule C limits in 10 CFR 30.72, and source material will not allow possession of uranium hexafluoride in quantities greater than 50 kilograms in a single container or 1000 kilograms total. A followup discussion was tentatively scheduled for the 10/4/10 9:00 am public conference call.

5. Manual start of DGs

Summary of Discussion: The staff did have a questions regarding the applicants revised response to a loss of large area fire question regarding manual starting of the diesel generators. Because the response is considered sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information the staff took an action to schedule a separate phone call with the applicant to provide feedback on the revised response.

6. Chapter 15 draft OI response

Summary of Discussion: The staff deferred this discussion to the 9:00 am phone call scheduled for October 5, 2010.