

SeabrookNPEM Resource

From: Plasse, Richard
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 2:56 PM
To: Cliche, Richard
Subject: Revised draft RAIs
Attachments: RAI Set 16.docx

Hearing Identifier: Seabrook_License_Renewal_NonPublic
Email Number: 2327

Mail Envelope Properties (Richard.Plasse@nrc.gov20111006145600)

Subject: Revised draft RAIs
Sent Date: 10/6/2011 2:56:26 PM
Received Date: 10/6/2011 2:56:00 PM
From: Plasse, Richard

Created By: Richard.Plasse@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Cliche, Richard" <Richard.Cliche@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3	10/6/2011 2:56:00 PM
RAI Set 16.docx	37233	

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

Mr. Paul Freeman
Site Vice President
NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE
SEABROOK STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Freeman:

By letter dated May 25, 2010, NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC, submitted an application pursuant to 10 CFR Part 54, to renew the operating license NPF-86 for Seabrook Station, for review by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff). The staff is reviewing the information contained in the license renewal application and has identified, in the enclosure, areas where additional information is needed to complete the review.

These requests for additional information were discussed with Richard Cliche, and a mutually agreeable date for the response is within 30 days from the date of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-2927 or e-mail richard.plasse@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

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

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosure:
Requests for Additional Information

cc w/encl: Listserv

Mr. Paul Freeman
Site Vice President
NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE SEABROOK STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Freeman:

By letter dated May 25, 2010, NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC, submitted an application pursuant to 10 CFR Part 54, to renew the operating license NPF-86 for Seabrook Station, for review by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff). The staff is reviewing the information contained in the license renewal application and has identified, in the enclosure, areas where additional information is needed to complete the review.

These requests for additional information were discussed with Richard Cliche, and a mutually agreeable date for the response is within 30 days from the date of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-2927 or e-mail richard.plasse@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

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

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosure:
Requests for Additional Information

cc w/encl: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:
See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML11278A069

*concurrence via e-mail

OFFICE	LA:DLR*	PM:RPB1:DLR	OGC	BC:RPB1:DLR	PM: RPB1:DLR
NAME	SFigueroa	RPlasse	MSpencer	DMorey	RPlasse
DATE	10/6/2011	10/6/2011	10/ /2011	10/ /2011	10/ /2011

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SEABROOK STATION
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION Set 16

Follow-up RAI 3.1.1.60-02

Background

By letter dated January 5, 2011, the staff issued two requests for additional information (RAIs) to the applicant, RAI 3.1.1-60-01 and RAI 3.1.1-60-02.

In its response dated February 3, 2011, to these RAIs the applicant stated that its design is unique in that the flux thimble tube is a double walled concentric tube design with a capped inner tube and does not provide a pressure boundary function. During its review of the applicant's response, the staff noted that the applicant has the option to place the movable incore detectors back in service and questioned the exclusion of the flux thimble tube as a pressure boundary. A follow-up RAI 3.1.1-60-01/02 was asked on March 30, 2011. In its response dated April 22, 2011, the applicant provided additional bases for not including the flux thimbles as part of its reactor coolant system (RCS) pressure boundary.

Issue

Following its review of the applicant's responses to the RAIs, the staff seeks clarification as to where exactly the RCS pressure boundary is for the applicant's replacement detector assemblies and the original capped detector assemblies.

Request

Verify the RCS pressure boundaries for the replacement and original capped incore detector assemblies. Specifically, identify components that constitute the RCS pressure boundary from the reactor vessel penetration to the seal table and any extensions beyond the seal table. Provide AMR items for the components which are in scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a) and subject to an aging management review and any applicable aging management program(s).

Follow-up RAI 4.3-1c

Background

By letter dated April 22, 2011, the applicant responded to RAI 4.3-1b stating that the pressure boundary portion of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Class 1 valves were designed, analyzed, and qualified for service (including fatigue) in accordance with the rules of 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 5.4-13 also identifies the valves that are included in the reactor coolant pressure boundary.

ENCLOSURE

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. It is not clear to the staff if the fatigue analyses for all Class 1 valves, has been dispositioned as time-limited aging analysis (TLAA) in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1).

Request

- If fatigue analysis were performed for Class 1 valves that have an inlet piping connection larger than 4 inches nominal pipe size as part of the design-basis, amend the license renewal application (LRA) to provide and justify the TLAA disposition for these analyses. Or justify that the fatigue analyses for these Class 1 valves need not to be identified as a TLAA in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1).
- If fatigue analyses were not performed for any Class 1 valves that have an inlet piping connection larger than 4 inches nominal pipe size. Amend the LRA to identify these valves and justify why fatigue analyses were 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.

Letter to P. Freeman from R. Plasse dated October, XX, 2011

SUBJECT: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE
SEABROOK STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDir Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDirRarb Resource

RidsNrrDirRapb Resource

RidsNrrDirRasb Resource

RidsNrrDirRerb Resource

RidsNrrDirRpob Resource

RidsNrrDraApla 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