

IPRenewal NPEmails

From: Daily, John
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 1:40 PM
To: 'RWater1@Entergy.com'
Cc: rwalpol@entergy.com
Subject: Applicant review fo Conference call notes,
Attachments: Draft for IPEC Comment.docx

Roger,
Please review the attached Record of Conversation for the conference call on RAIs 13-15 on Aug. 8, 2012, for any comments or corrections.

Thank you.

John Daily

Senior Project Manager, Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
USNRC

John.Daily@NRC.Gov

(301) 415-3873

Hearing Identifier: IndianPointUnits2and3NonPublic_EX
Email Number: 3670

Mail Envelope Properties (0046140293E11F408991442DB4FE25CA958528C41D)

Subject: Applicant review fo Conference call notes,
Sent Date: 8/13/2012 1:39:51 PM
Received Date: 8/13/2012 1:39:55 PM
From: Daily, John

Created By: John.Daily@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"rwalpol@entergy.com" <rwalpol@entergy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"RWater1@Entergy.com" <RWater1@Entergy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	383	8/13/2012 1:39:55 PM
Draft for IPEC Comment.docx	32395	

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

Draft for IPEC Comment
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
INDIAN POINT ENERGY CENTER
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
August 8, 2012

PARTICIPANTS	AFFILIATIONS
John Daily	Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Jeff Poehler	NRC
Allen Hiser	NRC
On Yee	NRC
Alan Cox	Entergy
Ted Ivy	Entergy
Roger Waters	Entergy
Bob Dolansky	Entergy
Nelson Azevedo	Entergy
Mark Gray	Westinghouse
Cheryl Boggess	Westinghouse
Rick Basel	Westinghouse
Karli Szweda	Westinghouse
Brad Grimmel	Westinghouse

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONFERENCE CALL
INDIAN POINT ENERGY CENTER, UNITS 2 AND 3
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
REACTOR VESSEL INTERNALS PROGRAM AND MRP-227-A
RAI SET 2012-02

August 8, 2012

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on August 8, 2012, to discuss staff aging management questions related to the applicant's Reactor Vessel Internals Aging Management Program, in the Indian Point Energy Center (IPEC), Units 2 and 3, license renewal application (LRA). The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the requests for additional information (RAIs) on the issue.

RAI Set 2012-02
Reactor Vessel Internals Program and MRP-227-A discussion

RAI 13

The applicant stated that there were no questions regarding Request for Additional Information (RAI) 13. RAI 13 will stand as-is.

RAI 14

The applicant stated that for IPEC, Units 2 and 3, the UFSAR treats split pins not as part of the core support structure, rather as part of the reactor vessel internals (RVI) package; therefore the applicant did not perform VT-3 inspections of them under the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code, Section XI, Table IWB-2500-1, Examination Category B-N-3. The applicant also recounted its RAI response to RAI 8.

The staff stated that it understood the applicant's categorization of the split pins and Entergy's current management plans for them. The staff agreed that RAI 14 would be dropped. If the staff, during its review, has other questions regarding the split pins, then it will create a new RAI for those issues.

RAI 15

The staff noted the applicant's response to RAI 12, which states that Entergy will use the Fatigue Monitoring Program to manage aging for RVI components that are associated with a fatigue time-limited aging analysis (TLAA), and that it will review RVI fatigue calculations for the effects of a reactor coolant system water environment on cumulative usage factors (CUFs), especially concerning effects on limiting locations, before the period of extended operation. The staff had questions regarding the following issues, and these were discussed with the applicant:

1. Whether Entergy's review described in the response to RAI 12 will include CUF calculations for the RVI that incorporate environmental factors (F_{en}) and, if CUF calculations are not performed, how the effects of the reactor water environment on the existing CUF analyses for RVI would be evaluated.

2. What action(s) Entergy would take if the consideration of environmental effects results in a CUF exceeding 1.0 for any RVI component (as opposed to just the most limiting one).
3. Whether evaluations being referenced by Entergy's term "ASME Code Class 1 fatigue evaluations for [RVIs]," creates an inconsistency, since ASME Code Class 1 components are those designed to ASME Code Section III, Subsection NB (i.e., reactor coolant pressure boundary components, not reactor vessel internals components).
4. Whether expanding Commitment No. 43 to include existing RVI fatigue calculations is appropriate to address Applicant/Licensee Action Item 8 of the Staff's Safety Evaluation of MRP-227-A; the staff believes that a revision, or a separate commitment and UFSAR supplement to address review of RVIs for environmentally-assisted fatigue, is more appropriate than a simple expansion of the existing commitment.

The applicant agreed that it would take the staff's questions into account as it prepares its responses to RAIs 13 and 15. Both the staff and the applicant agreed that the discussion was useful in clarifying the RAIs.