



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

August 28, 2015

LICENSEE: Exelon Generation Co., LLC

FACILITY: LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELECON HELD ON JULY 22, 2015, BETWEEN THE NRC AND EXELON GENERATION CO., LLC, CONCERNING REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SET 8 PERTAINING TO THE LASALLE COUNTY STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. MF5347 AND MF5346)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Exelon Generation Co., LLC (Exelon or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on July 22, 2015, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft requests for additional information (DRAIs) provided in Enclosure 2 concerning the LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's DRAIs.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains the DRAIs discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jeffrey S. Mitchell, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374

Enclosures:

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

cc: Listserv

August 28, 2015

LICENSEE: Exelon Generation Co., LLC

FACILITY: LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELECON HELD ON JULY 22, 2015, BETWEEN THE NRC AND EXELON GENERATION CO., LLC, CONCERNING REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SET 8 PERTAINING TO THE LASALLE COUNTY STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. MF5347 AND MF5346)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Exelon Generation Co., LLC (Exelon or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on July 22, 2015, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft requests for additional information (DRAIs) provided in Enclosure 2 concerning the LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's DRAIs.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains the DRAIs discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jeffrey S. Mitchell, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374

Enclosures:

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

cc: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

ADAMS Accession Number: **ML15222A008**

*Concurred via e-mail

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR
NAME	YEdmonds	JMitchell	RPlasse	YDiaz-Sanabria	JMitchell
DATE	8/ 19 /15	8/ 25 /15	8/ 26 /15	8/ 28 /15	8/ 28 /15

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memo to Exelon Generation Co. from J. Mitchell dated August 28, 2015

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELECON HELD ON JULY 22, 2015, BETWEEN THE NRC AND EXELON GENERATION CO., LLC, CONCERNING REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SET 8 PERTAINING TO THE LASALLE COUNTY STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NOS. MF5347 AND MF5346)

DISTRIBUTION:

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDlr Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource
RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRsrg Resource
RidsNrrPMLaSalle Resource

J. Mitchell
R. Plasse
D. Drucker
B. Wittick
J. Wachutka, OGC
D. McIntyre, OPA
M. Kunowski, RIII
V. Mitlyng, RIII
P. Chandrathil, RIII
H. Logaras, RIII
C. Lipa, RIII
S. Sheldon, RIII
R. Ruiz, RIII
J. Robbins, RIII

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
JULY 22, 2015

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATION

Jeff Mitchell	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Jim Medoff	NRC
Chris Hovanec	NRC
Juan Lopez	NRC
John Hufnagel	Exelon Generation Co., LLC (Exelon)
Michael Guthrie	Exelon
Wayne Choromanski	Exelon
Jim Jordan	Exelon
James Annett	Exelon

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
JULY 22, 2015

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Exelon Generation Co., LLC (Exelon or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on July 22, 2015, to discuss and clarify the following draft requests for additional information (DRAIs) concerning the LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2 license renewal application (LRA).

DRAI 4.2.2-1

Background:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) requirements for upper shelf energy (USE) and adjusted reference temperature (ART) of ferritic materials and ferritic welds in the beltline region of the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) are specified in Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 50, Appendix G, "Fracture Toughness Requirements" (10 CFR 50, Appendix G). Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.99, Revision 2, "Radiation Embrittlement of Reactor Vessel Materials," provides staff approved procedures for calculating the effects of neutron radiation embrittlement, specifically USE and ART, at the end of the licensed operating period. The guidance in RG 1.99, Revision 2, is subdivided into Regulatory Positions depending on the availability and use of relevant RPV surveillance data. The NRC's requirements for collecting and reporting material surveillance results are specified in 10 CFR 50, Appendix H, "Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program Requirements."

License Renewal Application (LRA) Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 describe the time limited aging analyses (TLAAs) for projecting the USE and ART values, respectively, to the end of the licensed operating period (54 effective full power years (EFPY)). LRA Table 4.2.2-1 and Table 4.2.2-2 provide the USE values calculated for 54 EFPY for each ferritic RPV plate, weld, and nozzle component evaluated as a beltline component in the USE TLAA. These tables also include the unirradiated upper shelf energy (UUSE) values, percent drop in USE, and associated copper content percentages for these RPV beltline components. LRA Tables 4.2.3-1, 4.2.3-2, 4.2.3-3, and 4.2.3-4 provide the 54 EFPY ART values calculated for these components and the applicable information used to calculate the values. The LRA states that the USE and ART values were calculated using methods consistent with RG 1.99, Revision 2.

Issue:

The applicant's most recent application for an extended power uprate (EPU) (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML100321303), with supporting documentation (ADAMS Accession No. ML100321327), was approved in an NRC safety evaluation dated September 16, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML101830361). However, the staff is unable to verify whether the USE data provided in LRA Tables 4.2.2-1 and 4.2.2-2 and the ART data provided in Tables 4.2.3-2 and 4.2.3-4 for the N6 low pressure core injection (LPCI) nozzle welds are consistent with those approved for the current licensing basis (CLB) (i.e., in the NRC's approval of the EPU).

The guidance in RG 1.99, Revision 2, provides two methods for projecting USE and ART values to the end of the licensed operating period. The LRA states that the USE and ART values were projected to 54 EFPY based on methods consistent with RG 1.99, Revision 2; however, it is unclear to the staff if surveillance data is used in these projections. The staff is unable to determine which Regulatory Position was used to project the values in LRA Tables 4.2.2-1, 4.2.2-2, 4.2.3-1, 4.2.3-2, 4.2.3-3, and 4.2.3-4. Additionally, these tables provide duplicated entries for certain heats of material that reference Boiling Water Reactor Vessel and Internals Project (BWRVIP)-135, Revision 2. These duplicate entries have different material and chemistry values for a given heat of material. The staff is unable to reconcile the difference in time independent values contained in these duplicate entries.

Request:

1. The staff is unable to verify that the values provided in LRA Tables 4.2.2-1, 4.2.2-2, 4.2.3-2, and 4.2.3-4 for the N6 LPCI nozzle welds are consistent with those approved for the CLB. Provide either:
 - a. the references that identify the bases for the UUSE, initial RT_{NDT} , percent copper, and percent nickel values used in the TLAA's for the N6 LPCI nozzles, and whether the values have been approved for use by the NRC, or
 - b. the source and technical substantiation of the values if they have not been approved by the NRC. Justify that these values are acceptable inputs for calculating USE and ART at 54 EFPY.
2. The staff is unable to determine which Regulatory Position was used to project the values in LRA Tables 4.2.2-1, 4.2.2-2, 4.2.3-1, 4.2.3-2, 4.2.3-3, and 4.2.3-4. Identify which of the USE calculations in LRA tables 4.2.2-1 and 4.2.2-2 and which of the ART calculations in LRA tables 4.2.3-1, 4.2.3-2, 4.2.3-3, and 4.2.3-4 were based on the application of relevant RPV surveillance data from the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) BWRVIP integrated surveillance program. Distinguish between values that were calculated using Regulatory Position 1 and Regulatory Position 2 of RG 1.99, Revision 2.
3. The staff is unable to reconcile the difference in time independent values contained in the duplicate entries in LRA Tables 4.2.2-1, 4.2.2-2, 4.2.3-1, 4.2.3-2, 4.2.3-3 and 4.2.3-4. Clarify or reconcile the duplicated entries in these tables.
4. Identify any surveillance data reports associated with capsule withdrawals and test results obtained from the integrated surveillance program that are applicable to either Unit 1 or Unit 2. Confirm that summary technical reports have been submitted in accordance with Section IV, "Report of Test Results," of 10 CFR 50, Appendix H.

Teleconference Summary:

The applicant clarified that the LRA tables referenced in Request number 3 contain values that are specific to LSCS, as well as values from the EPRI BWRVIP integrated surveillance program, and that the entries in question are not duplicates. The staff verified that the entries are not duplicates, and will revise the draft RAI to remove Request number 3 and renumber Request number 4 to be Request number 3.

DRAI 4.6.1-1

Background:

Section 54.21 (a)(3) of 10 CFR requires applicants to demonstrate that the effects of aging will be adequately managed so that intended functions will be maintained consistent with the CLB for each structure and component subject to aging management review. Section 54.2 (c)(1) of 10 CFR requires the evaluation of TLAAAs to demonstrate that: (i) the analyses remain valid for the period of extended operation, (ii) the analyses have been projected to the end of the period of extended operation; or (iii) the effects of aging on the intended function will be adequately managed for the period of extended operation.

Section 4.6.1 of the LRA, "Primary Containment Liner and Penetration Fatigue Analysis," describes the analyses of transients predicted for 40 years for the primary containment liner, Class MC components, and containment penetrations. The applicant identified these fatigue analyses as TLAAAs. LRA Tables 4.3.1-1 and 4.3.1-2 show the results of 60-years transient cycle projections for Unit 1 and Unit 2, respectively. Transient cycle projections for Unit 1 (LRA Table 4.3.1-1) show that startup and shutdown cycles are projected to exceed their design limits in 60 years, and transient cycle projections for Unit 2 (LRA Table 4.3.1-2) show that transient cycle limits will not be exceeded in 60 years. The applicant dispositioned the analyses in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(iii) and stated that "the effects of aging on the intended functions of components analyzed in accordance with ASME Section III, Class 1 requirements will be managed by the Fatigue Monitoring program through the period of extended operation."

Issue:

It is not clear to the staff which transient cycle projections from LRA Tables 4.3.1-1 and 4.3.1-2 are applicable or correspond to each fatigue analysis described in LRA Section 4.6.1 (i.e., primary containment liner plate, containment penetrations, and Class MC components). It is also unclear what the original fatigue design values are for each analysis in LRA Section 4.6.1.

Considering that the TLAA disposition in LRA Section 4.6.1 seems to address components that are in accordance with ASME Section III, Class 1 requirements, it is not clear what the TLAA disposition is for non-Class 1 components or how the transient cycle limits will be maintained below the cumulative usage factor (CUF) design limits for these non-Class 1 components.

Request:

1. Clarify which transient cycle projection(s) from LRA Tables 4.3.1-1 and 4.3.1-2 were considered for each design analysis described in LRA Section 4.6.1 (i.e., primary containment liner plate, containment penetrations, and Class MC components). Also, identify the associated original fatigue design values.
2. Clarify what the TLAA dispositions are for non-Class 1 components and describe how the transient limits will be maintained below the design limits for these components.

Teleconference Summary:

The staff stated that the request to identify the associated original fatigue design values is not required and will delete that sentence from Request number 1.

DRAI 3.5.2.1-1

Background:

LRA Tables 3.5.2-1, 3.5.2-4, 3.5.2-5, 3.5.2-7, 3.5.2-8, 3.5.2-9, and 3.5.2-13 state that various stainless steel components exposed to concrete have no aging effects requiring management (AERM) and no aging management program (AMP). These components include: liners, liner anchors, integral attachments, concrete anchors, electrical and mechanical penetration sleeves and assemblies, downcomers, hatches, and plugs. The aging management review (AMR) line items cite SRP-LR Table 3.3.1, item 3.3.1-120 and generic note C.

An analogous request for additional information (RAI) on the topic of AERMs for steel components exposed to concrete is given in RAI 3.3.2.1.1-11, which was issued to Exelon in a letter dated May 29, 2015 (RAI Set 2, ADAMS Accession No. ML15125A198).

Issue:

1. Several of the AMR line items in LRA Tables 3.5.2-1, 3.5.2-4, 3.5.2-5, 3.5.2-7, 3.5.2-8, 3.5.2-9, and 3.5.2-13 cite "steel" in the component description where the material designation is stainless steel.
2. Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report AMR line item AP-19 states that for stainless steel piping and piping components exposed to concrete there are no AERM and no recommended AMP. Other GALL Report AMR line items state that stainless steel components exposed to concrete or embedded in concrete may be susceptible to loss of material as a result of pitting or crevice corrosion. These AMR line items include: (a) AP-137 and SP-94 for stainless steel piping and piping components exposed to concrete, (b) SP-137 for stainless steel tanks exposed to concrete, and (c) AP-243 and SP-143 for stainless steel bolting exposed to concrete. The staff lacks sufficient information to conclude that the stainless steel structural components exposed to concrete (including potential water seepage entering the concrete) will not be susceptible to loss of material due to pitting or crevice corrosion.

Request:

1. For AMR line items in LRA Tables 3.5.2-1, 3.5.2-4, 3.5.2-5, 3.5.2-7, 3.5.2-8, 3.5.2-9, and 3.5.2-13 that cite "steel" in the component description, where the material designation is stainless steel, state whether the components are constructed from steel or stainless steel materials.
 - a. If the components are constructed from steel, state whether the steel piping and piping components exposed to concrete cited in LRA Tables 3.5.2-1, 3.5.2-4, 3.5.2-5, 3.5.2-7, 3.5.2-8, 3.5.2-9, and 3.5.2-13 are potentially exposed to water (e.g., groundwater). If they are potentially exposed to water, identify all aging effects requiring management and the AMP that will be used

to manage these effects, or justify why there are no aging effects requiring management. Otherwise,

- b. If the components are constructed from stainless steel, provide the basis why loss of material due to pitting and crevice corrosion has not been identified as an AERM for the stainless steel components described above. If loss of material due to pitting and crevice corrosion is an applicable AERM for the exposure of these components to concrete (including potential water seepage into the concrete), identify and justify the aging management program or programs that will be used to manage this aging effect during the period of extended operation.

Teleconference Summary:

The applicant clarified that “steel” is the component description to be consistent with the general description in the GALL Report, but the material is stainless steel for all components in question, as listed in the tables. The staff will revise the draft RAI to no longer include the portions that would pertain to steel components, since the applicant confirmed that the material listed in the LRA is stainless steel.