

**From:** Paige, Jason  
**Sent:** Friday, April 01, 2011 10:39 AM  
**To:** Abbatiello, Tom  
**Cc:** Abbott, Liz; Hoffman, Jack; Tiemann, Philip; Hanek, Olga; Tomonto, Bob  
**Subject:** Turkey Point EPU - Quality and Vendor (EQVB) Request for Additional Information - Round 1

Tom,

Below is a request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Turkey Point Extended Power Uprate (EPU) license amendment request. On March 31, 2011, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) held a public meeting to discuss draft RAIs generated from various NRC technical branches while reviewing the October 21, 2010, EPU application. During the meeting, it was concluded that the Quality and Vendor (EQVB-1.1) question was understood by the FPL and can be formally issued by the NRC staff. The below RAI reflects the question discussed during the March 31, 2011, meeting. FPL agreed upon providing its responses within 30 days of the date of this email. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

EQVB-1.1 The licensee stated in the LAR that satisfactory post EPU industry operating experience has been demonstrated at greater than original power levels at two other pressurized-water reactors (PWRs) of similar design to Turkey Point (PTN). Section 2.12.1.2.2, "Background," of Attachment 4 to the LAR states, in part, that "In addition to Beaver Valley, Units 1 and 2, and the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, PTN has benefited from industry operating experience in power uprate implementation from several industry sources, including the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations.

However, in Section 2.12.1.2.6.2, "Justification for Exception to Transient Testing," of Attachment 4, a discussion of such industry operating experience was not provided. Additionally, no discussion of any PTN plant-specific transient operating experience relative to operating events, planned and unplanned reactor trips, and overall plant transient performance was presented. Such information may be considered by the NRC staff, as discussed in Section III.C.2 of NRC Standard Review Plan 14.2.1, to support the basis for the licensee's request not to perform certain initial startup tests as part of the proposed EPU PATP. The licensee's primary basis for not performing certain transient testing as part of the proposed EPU LAR appears to rely solely on an analytical justification using LOFTRAN.

**Jason Paige**, Turkey Point Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Phone: (301) 415-5888