



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

March 26, 2013

LICENSEE: FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company  
FACILITY: Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station  
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON JANUARY 16, 2013, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on January 16, 2013, to discuss and clarify the staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the Davis-Besse license renewal application.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a summary of the staff discussion with FENOC. A brief description on the status of the items is also included.

FENOC had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Cuadrado de Jesús".

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús, Project Manager  
Projects Branch 1  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. List of Requests for Additional Information

cc w/encls: Listserv

March 26, 2013

LICENSEE: FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

FACILITY: Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON JANUARY 16, 2013, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on January 16, 2013, to discuss and clarify the staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the Davis-Besse license renewal application.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a summary of the staff discussion with FENOC. A brief description on the status of the items is also included.

FENOC had an opportunity to comment on this summary

Sincerely,  
*/RA/*

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús, Project Manager  
Projects Branch 1  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. List of Requests for Additional Information

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.:ML13051A068

OFFICE	LA:DLR/RPB1	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR
NAME	Y Edmonds	SCuadrado de Jesús	DMorey	SCuadrado de Jesús
DATE	02/05 /2013	03/05/2013	03/06/2013	03/26/2013

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
January 16, 2013

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATIONS

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Michael Marshall	NRC
Bryce Lehman	NRC
Abdul Sheikh	NRC
Cliff Custer	FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC)
Steven Dort	FENOC
Jon Hook	FENOC
Thomas Henry	FENOC
Don Kosloff	FENOC

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

January 16, 2013

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on January 16, 2013, to discuss and clarify the following requests for additional information (RAIs) [ADAMS Accession No. ML12355A184] concerning the Davis-Besse license renewal application (LRA).

**RAI B.2.43-2a (issued by letter dated January 4, 2013)**

**Discussion:** This RAI requests information on FENOC's technical basis for the adequacy of the shield building core bore inspection sample size. The staff clarified that the intent of the RAI was to gain additional information about the already completed testing regarding rebar bond strength, and how the test results provide assurance that, even with the laminar cracking, the Shield Building is structurally acceptable. FENOC informed the staff that the sample size was not based on completed testing regarding rebar bond strength. The staff acknowledged that its linkage of the completed testing to the technical basis of the sample size was mistaken. The staff stated that a copy of the test reports is not needed; a summary of the results would be sufficient.

FENOC understood the staff's clarification and stated that its response would address the shield building rebar-concrete bond strength, the assumptions made in the structural operability calculations regarding bond strength, and how the testing performed to date supports those assumptions.

**Action:** As part of its RAI response, FENOC may reference this summary which documents the staff's clarification of the RAI during the telephone conference call.

**RAI B.2.43-3a (issued by letter dated January 4, 2013)**

**Discussion:** This RAI questions why other structures within the scope of license renewal were not included within the scope of the Shield Building AMP and whether structural coatings for the other structures are included in the scope of license renewal.

In response to the staff's question on the consideration of uncoated structures within the scope of the plant-specific shield building AMP, FENOC stated that several other site structures are uncoated or have portions that are uncoated. However, the uncoated Shield Building 'barrel' did not experience initiation of laminar cracking; laminar cracking identified in the 'barrel' of the structure initiated in adjacent shoulders and propagated. FENOC believes this provides a reasonable representation of what would occur in other uncoated structures so there is no need to perform core bores in the other structures. FENOC also stated that the coatings on the other structures are not credited for license renewal aging management. FENOC further stated that the Auxiliary Building and resulting core bore locations were chosen based on similarities of

reinforcing bar density, wall thickness, and a southwest location (the direction from which the blizzard approached in 1978). FENOC stated that these core bores demonstrated cracking did not occur in a building without the flute shoulder configuration and were adequate to justify the scope of the Shield Building AMP. During the call, FENOC indicated that sufficient information was already on the docket concerning the structures that were included in the scope of the shield building AMP.

The staff stated that they would look at the information available on the docket and would reconsider whether this RAI should have been issued. The staff stated they would contact FENOC in the next several days regarding the status of the RAI. There was no further discussion, and the call was concluded.

**Action:** The staff will hold another telephone conference call with the applicant to provide additional clarification on RAI B.2.43-3a and its status. This follow-up call was held on January 23, 2013, and the call is documented in a separate summary (ML13042A042).

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL CONDUCTED ON JANUARY 16, 2013.

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDir Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDirRarb Resource

RidsNrrDirRapb Resource

RidsNrrDirRasb Resource

RidsNrrDirRerb Resource

RidsNrrDirRpob Resource

-----  
SCuadrado

EKeegan

EMiller

MMahoney

DMcIntyre, OPA

TRiley, OCA

BHarris, OGC