



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

May 13, 2015

LICENSEE: DTE Electric Company

FACILITY: Fermi 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 24, 2015, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, SET 30 PERTAINING TO THE FERMI 2 LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. MF4222)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of DTE Electric Company (DTE or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on March 24, 2015, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft request for additional information (DRAI) 4.7.1-1a and the applicant's response to request for additional information (RAI) B.1.22-1 concerning the Fermi 2 license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's DRAI and the applicant's RAI response.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains the DRAI and RAI response discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the item.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA/

Daneira Meléndez-Colón, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. Summary of Telephone Conference Call

cc w/encls: Listserv

May 13, 2015

LICENSEE: DTE Electric Company

FACILITY: Fermi 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 24, 2015, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, SET 30 PERTAINING TO THE FERMI 2 LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. MF4222)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of DTE Electric Company (DTE or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on March 24, 2015, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft request for additional information (DRAI) 4.7.1-1a and the applicant's response to request for additional information (RAI) B.1.22-1 concerning the Fermi 2 license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's DRAI and the applicant's RAI response.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains the DRAI and RAI response discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the item.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA/

Daneira Meléndez-Colón, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. Summary of Telephone Conference Call

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

Accession Number: ML ML15104A504

* Concurred via e-mail

OFFICE	LA:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR
NAME	YEdmonds*	DMeléndez-Colón	JDaily	YDiaz-Sanabria	DMeléndez-Colón
DATE	4/15/15	4/17/15	5/ 4/15	5/13/15	5/13/15

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 24, 2015, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, SET 30 PERTAINING TO THE FERMI 2 LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. MF4222)

DISTRIBUTION:

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDlr Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRsrg Resource

RidsNrrPMFermi2 Resource

D. Melendez-Colon

Y. Diaz-Sanabria

E. Keegan

B. Wittick

B. Harris, OGC

D. Roth, OGC

M. Kunowski, RIII

B. Kemker, RIII

V. Mitlyng, RIII

P. Chandrathil, RIII

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
FERMI 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
MARCH 24, 2015

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATIONS

Daneira Meléndez-Colón

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

Christopher Hovanec

NRC

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús

NRC

Lynne Goodman

DTE Electric Company (DTE)

Kevin Lynn

DTE

Vladimir Tamahkyarov

DTE

Dan Sparks

GE Hitachi (GEH)

Matt Polomik

GEH

Patrick Davis

GEH

Brian Eber

GEH

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
FERMI 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
MARCH 24, 2015

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of DTE Electric Company (DTE or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on March 24, 2015, to discuss and clarify the following draft request for additional information (DRAI) and request for additional information (RAI) response concerning the Fermi 2 license renewal application (LRA).

DRAI 4.7.1-1a

Background:

Request for Additional Information 4.7.1-1, issued by the staff on January 20, 2015, had two primary requests. The two primary requests were:

- a) Quantify the new erosion rate and describe and justify the methodology that was used to calculate it.
- b) Quantify the increase in the choked flow rate that was determined as a result of re-calculating the analysis using the new erosion rate and a time frame of 60 years.

Each of the two primary requests also had additional clarification/supporting requests associated with them.

The response to RAI 4.7.1-1, by letter dated March 5, 2015, partially addressed each of the two requests. The new erosion rate used in the projected 60-year time-limited aging analysis (TLAA) was provided; however, a description and justification of the methodology used to establish the new rate was not. It was also stated that thickness measurements were not taken on the main steam line flow restrictor castings and therefore, not used to determine the new erosion rate. The calculated increase in restrictor area after 60 years of operation was provided; however, the associated increase in choked flow rate was not.

Issue:

The response to RAI 4.7.1-1 only partially addressed the staff's request in RAI 4.7.1-1. The items of the original RAI that have not been addressed include:

- a) The methodology used to determine the new erosion rate has not been described and justified. The basis for not conducting wall thickness measurements has not been provided.

- b) The increase in choked flow rate after 60 years of operation has not been provided. Also, it is unclear to the staff what is meant by the statement “this reduced choked flow has not been credited in meeting the 5% allowance given in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report]” when referring to the choked flow in the response to RAI 4.7.1-1.

Request:

- a) Describe and justify the methodology that was used to calculate the new erosion rate for the flow restrictor castings. Provide justification for why wall thickness measurements of the main steam line flow restrictors were not considered in the determination of the new erosion rate.
- b) Quantify the increase in the choked flow rate that was determined as a result of re-calculating the analysis using the new erosion rate and a time frame of 60 years. Clarify what is meant by the statement “this reduced choked flow has not been credited in meeting the 5% allowance given in the UFSAR” when referring to the choked flow in the response to RAI 4.7.1-1, dated March 5, 2015.

Discussion:

The applicant provided clarification on its response to RAI 4.7.1-1, dated March 5, 2015, (Proprietary).

The staff provided clarification related to its request in draft RAI 4.7.1-1a.

The applicant understands the staff's concerns and will provide a response to the RAI.

The applicant stated that it will consider revising the original response and resubmit for staff review. The staff is waiting on the applicant's decision. Otherwise, this request will be sent as a formal RAI. A mutually agreeable date for the response will be within 30 days from the date of the official letter.

During a subsequent telephone call (March 30, 2015), the applicant stated their intent to revise the original response to RAI 4.7.1-1 and resubmit for staff review. This RAI will not be issued.

RAI B.1.22-1

Background:

By letter dated February 19, 2015, the applicant provided its response to RAI B.1.22-1 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15050A602). The staff requested clarification on the applicant's response.

Discussion:

The staff asked the applicant whether it intends to install high-strength structural bolts with actual measured yield strength of less than 150 ksi during the period of extended operation consistent with Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report Aging Management Program (AMP) XI.S3, "ASME Section XI, Subsection IWF," recommendations. The applicant stated that it intends to install high-strength structural bolts with actual measured yield strength of less than 150 ksi during the period of extended operation with the exception of the bolts currently installed in the reactor pressure vessel skirt to ring girder bolted joint, as described in its response, dated February 19, 2015.

The staff will continue its review of the response based on the clarification provided by the applicant.