



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

October 13, 2011

LICENSEE: NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC
FACILITY: Seabrook Station
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, CONCERNING
CLARIFICATION OF INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE SEABROOK
STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME4028)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (NextEra or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on September 21, 2011, to obtain clarification on information contained in the Seabrook Station license renewal application (LRA). The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the applicant's information in the LRA.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a summary of the issues discussed during the call with the applicant.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Arthur Cunanan *for*

Rick Plasse, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
September 21, 2011**

PARTICIPANTS

Rick Plasse
Roger Kalikian
Ching Ng
Bo Pham
Richard Cliche
Bob McCormack
Ed Carley
Ali Kodal
Henry Mentel
Dennis Bemis
Paul Willoughby

AFFILIATIONS

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
NRC
NRC
NRC
NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC. (NextEra)
NextEra
NextEra
NextEra
NextEra
NextEra
NextEra

ENCLOSURE 1

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
SEABROOK STATION
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

Draft Follow-up RAI

In response to request for additional information (RAI) 3.1.1-60-2, by letter dated February 3, 2011, on page 9 of 92, the applicant stated, "The flux thimble tube no longer provides a function of pressure boundary hence, it has no license renewal function, and it will be removed from scope."

In response to follow-up RAI 3.1.1-60-01/02, by letter dated April 22, 2011, on page 6 of 43, the applicant stated, "When the incore detector assembly is inserted, the thimble housing tube (outer tube) provides the reactor coolant system (RCS) pressure boundary to keep the incore detector assembly internal volume dry." The letter further stated that, "The thimble calibration tube (inner tube), although considered a RCS pressure boundary, is not in contact with reactor coolant."

Following the August 3, 2011, teleconference discussion on the above topic, the staff still seeks clarification as to where exactly the applicant is taking credit for the RCS pressure boundary for the incore detector assemblies in the applicant's license renewal application and how it is dispositioned under 10 CFR 54.

Response:

NextEra provided clarification of the thimble tube design configuration, provided a description of the RCS pressure boundary, and described the associated aging management programs. NextEra agreed to provide this detailed information in a subsequent RAI response.

Follow-up Draft RAI 4.3.1-c

Background:

By letter dated April 22, 2011, the applicant responded to RAI 4.3-1b stating that the pressure boundary portion of the ASME Class 1 valves were designed, analyzed, and qualified for service (including fatigue) in accordance with the rules of American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code Section III Subsection NB-3500. Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Table 5.2-1 identifies the code edition and addenda applicable to the design of the following types of Class 1 valves: pressurizer safety valves, motor-operated valves, manual valves, control valves, and pressurizer spray valves in the reactor coolant systems. UFSAR Table 5.2-10 also identifies the valves that are included in the reactor coolant pressure boundary.

Issue:

The staff noted that, in the 1971 and later editions of the ASME Section III Code, paragraphs NB-3545.3 and NB-3550 required fatigue analyses for valves that have an inlet piping connection larger than 4 inches nominal pipe size unless the exemption requirements of

NB-3222.4(d) are met. The staff also noted that the 1968 Draft ASME Pump and Valve Code Sections 452 and 454 included applicable time-dependent cyclic or fatigue assessment criteria to be performed if the inlet piping connection is larger than 4 inches nominal pipe size. It is not clear to the staff if the fatigue analyses for these Class 1 valves were performed in accordance with the requirements of the applicable ASME codes.

Request:

- Identify all the Class 1 valves that did not have a fatigue analysis performed as part of the design-basis and their associated design code. In addition, justify why a fatigue analysis was not required for these Class 1 valves in accordance with the ASME Section III Code or the ASME Draft Pump and Valve Code, with reference to the applicable sections of the design code.
- If a fatigue analysis was performed as part of the design-basis for Class 1 valves, justify the conclusion that the fatigue analyses for these Class 1 valves do not need to be identified as a time-limited aging analysis in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1).

Response:

Following discussion of the draft RAI, the applicant stated that they understood what was being requested and would be able to respond.

October 13, 2011.

LICENSEE: NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

FACILITY: Seabrook Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, CONCERNING
CLARIFICATION OF INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE SEABROOK
STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME4028)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (NextEra or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on September 21, 2011, to obtain clarification on information contained in the Seabrook Station license renewal application (LRA). The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the applicant's information in the LRA.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a summary of the issues discussed during the call with the applicant.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA Arthur Cunanan for/

Rick Plasse, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:
See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML11284A016

| | | | |
|--------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|
| OFFICE | LA:DLR* | PM:RPB1:DLR | BC:RPB1:DLR |
| NAME | SFigueroa | RPlasse (ACunanan for) | DMorey |
| DATE | 10/11/11 | 10/12/11 | 10/13/11 |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memorandum to NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC from R. Plasse dated October 13, 2011

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, CONCERNING CLARIFICATION OF INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME4028)

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDlr Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRapb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpob Resource

MWentzel

RPlasse

DMorey

DWrona

EMiller

ICouret, OPA

EDacus, OCA

MSpencer, OGC

WRaymond, RI

DTift, RI

NMcNamara, RI

NSheehan, RI

DScrenci, RI

JJohnson, RI

ABurritt, RI