



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

December 4, 2015

LICENSEE: NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

FACILITY: Seabrook Station, Unit 1

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 23, 2015, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, CONCERNING  
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE  
SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4028)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC held a telephone conference call on November 23, 2015, to discuss and clarify the staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the Seabrook Station license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's RAIs.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the RAIs 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/**

Tam Tran, Project Manager  
Reactor Projects Branch 1  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:

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

cc: Listserv

December 4, 2015

LICENSEE: NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

FACILITY: Seabrook Station, Unit 1

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 23, 2015, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, CONCERNING  
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE  
SEABROOK STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO.  
ME4028)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC held a telephone conference call on November 23, 2015, to discuss and clarify the staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the Seabrook Station, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's RAIs.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the RAIs 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/**

Tam Tran, Project Manager  
Reactor Projects Branch 1  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:

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

cc: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: **ML15328A139**

\*concurred via email

OFFICE	LA:DLR/RPB1*	PM:DLR/RPB1	BC:DLR/RPB1	PM:DLR/RPB1
NAME	IBetts	TTran	YDiaz-Sanabria	TTran
DATE	12/ 3 /15	12/ 3 /15	12/ 4 /15	12/ 4 /15

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
SEABROOK STATION, UNIT 1  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
NOVEMBER 23, 2015

**PARTICIPANTS**

**AFFILIATIONS**

Tam Tran

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

James Medoff

NRC

Mark Yoo

NRC

Edward Carley

NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (NextEra)

Michael Ossing

NextEra

Thomas Malota

NextEra

REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION  
NOVEMBER 23, 2015

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC, held a telephone conference call on November 23, 2015, to discuss and clarify the following requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the license renewal application (LRA).

**Draft RAI 3.0.3.3.5-1a**

Background:

By letter dated August 28, 2015, the staff issued RAI 3.0.3.3.5-1, requesting the applicant to provide the basis for how applicant/licensee action item (A/LAI) 3 of MRP-227-A is addressed such that age-related degradation of the control rod guide tube (CRGT) split pins will be adequately monitored during the period of extended operation. If the applicant was not proposing inspections of the split pins, the applicant was requested to provide additional information on how it will evaluate the operating experience and inspections of the Type 316 stainless steel CRGT split pins at [uncertain] leading indicator plants and how they apply to Seabrook.

By letter dated October 9, 2015, the applicant responded to RAI 3.0.3.3.5-1. The applicant stated that Seabrook complies with the original equipment manufacturer recommendations and MRP-227-A adequacy evaluation requirements for aging management of the split pins. The applicant stated that there are no augmented inspection requirements for the Seabrook split pins and that it will follow appropriate actions as recommended by Westinghouse or as a result of operating experience.

Issue:

- If the CRGT splits pins are defined as ASME Section XI Examination Category B-N-3 removable core support structure components, the applicant will be required to inspect the components in accordance with its ISI program requirements for B-N-3 inspections independent of the position taken in MRP-227-A for replaced split pins made from Type 316 cold-worked stainless steel materials.
- Regarding the need for collecting and assessing CRGT split pin inspection data, the EPRI MRP has not identified in MRP-227-A or in the background reports for MRP-227-A that augmented inspections are part of the programmatic criteria for managing cracking or wear in replaced Westinghouse-design CRGT split pins made from Type 316 cold-worked stainless steel materials or that such data will be collected by the EPRI MRP for distribution to and evaluation by the industry licensees. Thus, some additional information is needed to clarify how the applicant will implement its process for collecting and assessing CRGT split pin inspection data in accordance with the PWR Vessel Internals Program. In RAI 3.0.3.3.5-1, the staff requested that the applicant provides additional information regarding the operating experience associated with aging of the CRGT split pins that it will evaluate. The staff requested the applicant provides information on the inspection techniques and acceptance criteria that the leading

indicator plants use to age manage the Type 316 stainless steel CRGT split pins that Seabrook will apply at its site. However, in its response, the applicant did not provide these details. The applicant stated that it participates in PWR Owners Group (PWROG) activities and follows its recommendations.

Request:

- Clarify whether the replaced CRGT split pins at Seabrook are categorized as ASME Section XI Examination Category B-N-3 components (i.e. ASME removable core support structure components). If the split pins are defined as ASME removable core support structure components, justify why the components would not need to be inspected and managed for aging using either the "Existing Program" criteria in the PWR Vessel Internals Program or the ASME Section XI Inservice Inspection, Subsections IWB, IWC, and IWD Program.
- Provide the following information if operating experience and inspections of CRGT split pins at other [uncertain] Westinghouse-designed facilities will be used as part of the basis for managing potential cracking in the CRGT split pins at Seabrook Station: (a) identify the plants that will be performing inspections of their replaced Type 316 cold-worked CRGT split pins on behalf of Seabrook Station, (b) identify the process or processes that will be used in accordance with the "Administrative Controls" or "Confirmation Process" elements of the PWR Reactor Internals Program to collect and compile the inspection data from these plants, (c) identify the criteria that will be implemented in accordance with the "monitoring and trending" program element of the AMP to assess the data from the other plants, and (d) identify the plant-specific "acceptance criteria" that will be used to assess such data and the "corrective actions" that will be taken if the acceptance criteria are not met.

Discussion:

Based on the discussion with the applicant, the staff indicated that the response to this RAI requires clarification. The applicant clarified that for Seabrook, the split pins are not considered B-N-3 components under the ASME Section XI Program (i.e. **NOT** ASME removable core support structure components). Operating experience that comes in from the PWROG along with vendor recommendations is entered into the corrective action program.

Regarding the need for collecting and assessing CRGT split pin inspection data, the staff explained that it was unclear what was intended regarding collection and assessment of operating experience by other licensees or [uncertain] leading indicator plants. The applicant clarified that no other licensees are performing inspections of their replaced Type 316 pins on behalf of Seabrook. The applicant intends to follow industry program for collecting and assessing operating experience (owner group program) regarding the applicable use of industry operating experience for Seabrook.

The applicant agreed that it will provide these needed clarification for the docket in the form of LRA supplement, for the staff to complete its review. Because the applicant is not relying on [uncertain] leading indicator plants, additional implementation information request for leading indicator plants is not applicable. The supplement is scheduled for December 20, 2015.

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 23, 2015, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, CONCERNING  
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE  
SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4028)

**DISTRIBUTION:**

**HARD COPY:**

DLR RF

**E-MAIL:**

RidsNrrDlr Resource  
RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource  
RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource  
RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource  
RidsNrrDlrRapb Resource  
RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource  
RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource  
RidsNrrDraArcb Resource  
RidsOgcMailCenter Resource  
Rids NrrMailCenter Resource

-----  
[Richard.Plasse@nrc.gov](mailto:Richard.Plasse@nrc.gov)  
[Lois.James@nrc.gov](mailto:Lois.James@nrc.gov)  
[Tam.Tran@nrc.gov](mailto:Tam.Tran@nrc.gov)  
[James.Danna@nrc.gov](mailto:James.Danna@nrc.gov)  
[Brian.Wittick@nrc.gov](mailto:Brian.Wittick@nrc.gov)  
[John.Lamb@nrc.gov](mailto:John.Lamb@nrc.gov)  
[David.McIntyre@nrc.gov](mailto:David.McIntyre@nrc.gov)  
[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)  
[Brian.Harris@nrc.gov](mailto:Brian.Harris@nrc.gov)  
[Jeremy.Watchuka@nrc.gov](mailto:Jeremy.Watchuka@nrc.gov)  
[Fred.Bower@nrc.gov](mailto:Fred.Bower@nrc.gov)  
[Paul.Cataldo@nrc.gov](mailto:Paul.Cataldo@nrc.gov)  
[Rich.Barkley@nrc.gov](mailto:Rich.Barkley@nrc.gov)  
[Chris.Lally@nrc.gov](mailto:Chris.Lally@nrc.gov)  
[Christopher.Newport@nrc.gov](mailto:Christopher.Newport@nrc.gov)  
[Christopher.Highley@nrc.gov](mailto:Christopher.Highley@nrc.gov)  
[Nancy.McNamara@nrc.gov](mailto:Nancy.McNamara@nrc.gov)  
[Doug.Tift@nrc.gov](mailto:Doug.Tift@nrc.gov)  
[Neil.Sheehan@nrc.gov](mailto:Neil.Sheehan@nrc.gov)  
[Diane.Screnci@nrc.gov](mailto:Diane.Screnci@nrc.gov)