DiabloCanyonNPEm Resource

From: Ferrer, Nathaniel
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 11:05 AM
To: Grebel, Terence
Cc: DiabloCanyonNPEm Resource
Subject: Draft Telecon Summary
Attachments: Telecon Summary 3-17-11.doc

Terry,

Attached is a draft of the Teleconference Summary for February 28 and March 17, 2011. Please review and let me know if there are any corrections/changes needed.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Nathaniel Ferrer
Project Manager
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
(301)415-1045

Hearing Identifier: DiabloCanyon_LicenseRenewal_NonPublic
Email Number: 2771

Mail Envelope Properties (26E42474DB238C408C94990815A02F094C09FA939C)

Subject: Draft Telecon Summary
Sent Date: 4/5/2011 11:05:06 AM
Received Date: 4/5/2011 11:05:06 AM
From: Ferrer, Nathaniel

Created By: Nathaniel.Ferrer@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"DiabloCanyonNPEm Resource" <DiabloCanyonNPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Grebel, Terence" <TLG1@pge.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	412	4/5/2011 11:05:06 AM
Telecon Summary 3-17-11.doc	61946	

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

LICENSEE: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

FACILITY: Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALLS HELD ON FEBRUARY 28 AND MARCH 17, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. ME2896 AND ME2897)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the applicant) held telephone conference calls on February 28 and March 17, 2011, to obtain clarification on the applicant's response to requests for additional information (RAIs) regarding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant license renewal application.

By letters dated January 7 and 12, 2011, PG&E responded to RAIs regarding the Flux Thimble Tube Program and Metal Fatigue. The subjects of these RAIs are open items concerning the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant safety evaluation report. The staff requested a telephone conference call for clarification regarding the applicant's response. Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants. Enclosure 2 provides discussions on the RAIs for which the staff requested clarification. The applicant will submit applicable supplements within 30 days of the issuance of this summary.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Nathaniel B. Ferrer, Project Manager
Projects Branch 2
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

LICENSEE: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

FACILITY: Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALLS HELD ON FEBRUARY 28 AND MARCH 17, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. ME2896 AND ME2897)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the applicant) held telephone conference calls on February 28 and March 17, 2011, to obtain clarification on the applicant's response to requests for additional information (RAIs) regarding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant license renewal application.

By letters dated January 7 and 12, 2011, PG&E responded to RAIs regarding the Flux Thimble Tube Program and Metal Fatigue. The subjects of these RAIs are open items concerning the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant safety evaluation report. The staff requested a telephone conference call for clarification regarding the applicant's response. Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants. Enclosure 2 provides discussions on the RAIs for which the staff requested clarification. The applicant will submit applicable supplements within 30 days of the issuance of this summary.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Nathaniel B. Ferrer, Project Manager
Projects Branch 2
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:
See next page

ADAMS Accession Number:

OFFICE	LA:DLR*	PM: RPB2:DLR	BC:RPB2:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR
NAME				
DATE				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
FEBRUARY 28 AND MARCH 17, 2011

PARTICIPANTS:	**AFFILIATIONS:**
Nate Ferrer	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Allen Hiser	NRC
Jim Medoff	NRC
Yogen Garud	Argonne National Laboratory (contractor)
Terry Grebel	Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)
Mike Wright	PG&E
Kyle Duke	PG&E
Kevin Braico	PG&E
Dan Hardesty	PG&E
Michelle Albright	PG&E
Brett Lynch	PG&E
Brandy Sizemore	PG&E
Dave Kunsemiller	Strategic Teaming And Resource Sharing (STARS)
Chalmer Myer	STARS

ENCLOSURE 1

DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
FLUX THIMBLE TUBE INSPECTION PROGRAM/TIME-LIMITED AGING ANALYSES

RAI 4.1-7

In a response dated January 12, 2011, the applicant submitted the cumulative usage factor calculation for the baffle and former bolts as a time-limited aging analysis (TLAA). The applicant dispositioned the TLAA in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(c)(1)(iii), stating that it would manage fatigue of the components with the Reactor Vessel Internals Aging Management Program.

Discussion:

The response was not clear on how the inspection frequency for the baffle and former bolts would be determined and justified. The applicant agreed to supplement its response to clarify how it would validate the inspection frequency for the components.

RAI 4.3-15

In a response dated January 7, 2011, the applicant committed to performing an evaluation to determine whether the NUREG/CR-6260-based components that have been evaluated for the effects of reactor coolant environment on fatigue usage are the limiting components. The applicant stated that if more limiting components are identified, then an evaluation will be performed in accordance with the Metal Fatigue of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary Program. In its response, the applicant also provided details discussing the assumed dissolved oxygen (DO) content for the derivation of environmentally-assisted fatigue factors. The applicant stated, in part, that for a pressurized-water reactor environment, the DO content is less than 0.05 ppm.

Discussion:

The response was unclear with regard to how nickel-alloy components would be evaluated, if they are determined to be one of the most limiting components. The staff noted that the applicant's Metal Fatigue of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary Program does not address nickel-alloy components. Additionally, the response did not specify whether the DO content at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant is less than 0.05 ppm. The applicant agreed to supplement its response to RAI 4.3-15 to address the staff's concerns.

RAIs B2.1.21-2

In a supplemental response dated January 12, 2011, the applicant submitted justification for why the acceptance criteria for its Flux Thimble Tube Program are adequate. The applicant provided additional details on its operating experience related to flux thimble tubes, and clarified how it accounts for measurement uncertainties. Additionally, the applicant provided justification

for why the program's wear projection methodology was conservative and why the program was adequate. Additionally, during a conference call held on February 4, 2011, the applicant agreed to make flux thimble tube wear data available for the staff to audit.

Discussion:

The staff agreed that acceptance criteria are adequate and that they account for measurement uncertainties. However, the staff could not determine, based on the wear data, whether the program's wear projection was conservative. The applicant agreed to supplement its response to address the staff's concern with respect to program's the wear projection method