

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Habib, Donald
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 12:56 PM
To: PMLevyCOLPEm Resource
Subject: FW: RE: Clarification from Monday Public Teleconference

From: Kitchen, Robert H [mailto:Robert.Kitchen@duke-energy.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 11:22 AM
To: Habib, Donald <Donald.Habib@nrc.gov>
Cc: Wilkins, Tillie <Tillie.Wilkins@duke-energy.com>; Waters, David B <David.Waters2@duke-energy.com>; Haggerty, Neil (X2NHAGGE@SOUTHERNCO.COM) <X2NHAGGE@SOUTHERNCO.COM>
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Clarification from Monday Public Teleconference

Don – I think your summary is good but I am proposing a change to the wording (highlight and red text below). I prepared a summary also and had delayed sending to you to have others check. On the call we discussed specifically our statement in Section 5.0 of our recent Levy COLA change submittal for Flux Doubling that included a request for exemption regarding IEEE 603-1991 compliance (Duke submittal: NPD-NRC-2015-038, Dated September 1, 2015). There were NRC questions since we are required to consider risk in our evaluation and the Staff wanted clarification of what was meant by the statement in Enclosure 1, page 13 of 13 which states, “5.0 Risk Assessment - A risk assessment was determined to be not applicable to address the acceptability of this request.”

Our departure evaluation associated with any change requires response to the following questions that relate to risk:

- Does the proposed departure from Tier 2 result in more than a minimal increase in the frequency of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated in the plant-specific DCD?
- Does the proposed departure from Tier 2 result in more than a minimal increase in the likelihood of occurrence of a malfunction of a structure, system, or component (SSC) important to safety and previously evaluated in the plant-specific DCD?
- Does the proposed departure from Tier 2 result in more than a minimal increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the plant-specific DCD?
- Does the proposed departure from Tier 2 result in more than a minimal increase in the consequences of a malfunction of an SSC important to safety previously evaluated in the plant-specific DCD?
- Does the proposed departure from Tier 2 create a possibility for an accident of a different type than any evaluated previously in the plant-specific DCD?
- Does the proposed departure from Tier 2 create a possibility for a malfunction of an SSC important to safety with a different result than any evaluated previously in the plant-specific DCD?

In addition, our exemption procedure requires that we confirm that the design functions are still met and that the change does not result in a significant reduction in plant safety.

The departures and exemptions that we have implemented in our COLA have been made to improve the AP1000 design and none have impacted the DCD PRA. As a result, our exemption documentation states that, “A risk assessment was determined to be not applicable to address the acceptability of this request.” If a license submittal was requesting a change that required a revision to the PRA or that we determined may significantly (i.e., more than minimally) increase risk or that was a risk-informed submittal as described in RG 1.174, it would result in the identification of a risk assessment in section 5.0 – Risk Assessment of the exemption request.

From: Habib, Donald [mailto:Donald.Habib@nrc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 8:23 AM

To: Kitchen, Robert H

Subject: Clarification from Monday Public Teleconference

*** Exercise caution. This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ***

Bob –

Can you look at the paragraph, below, to go in the public teleconference summary and note any significant inaccuracies or omissions?

Thanks

Don

On January 25, 2016, the NRC staff conducted a public meeting with representatives from DEF and members of the AP1000 design center to discuss issues to support the safety review for the LNP Units 1 and 2 COL application. Specifically, the meeting focused on how DEF addressed the requirements of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Subsection 52.79(d)(1), relating to updating the plant-specific probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) to account for the site-specific design changes and departures included in the LNP Units 1 and 2 COL application. The staff questioned the language in DEF's exemption request submittals, Section 5.0, "A risk assessment was determined to be not applicable to address the acceptability of this request." (e.g., this language appears in the flux doubling logic departure submittal dated September 1, 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15247A153). DEF confirmed that it and Westinghouse had evaluated the design changes and departures for potential inclusion in the site-specific PRA as part of their internal design change identification and evaluation processes. DEF clarified that the language in question was intended to convey the results of their risk screening for 52.79(d)(1) which found that there was no impact on the results of the PRA, ~~and not that no evaluation had been performed.~~ **Duke confirmed that impact to risk was considered in the change evaluation.** The staff and applicant deferred a discussion about the need for additional information to be submitted to document the evaluations in to support the staff's review of the LNP Units 1 and 2 COL application.

Don Habib

Levy COL Review, Lead Project Manager

NRO/DNRL, Licensing Branch 4

301-415-1035

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 1317

Mail Envelope Properties (95b96ae457084a9db934a18a224f10b0)

Subject: FW: RE: Clarification from Monday Public Teleconference
Sent Date: 1/28/2016 12:56:00 PM
Received Date: 1/28/2016 12:56:01 PM
From: Habib, Donald

Created By: Donald.Habib@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"PMLevyCOLPEm Resource" <PMLevyCOLPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS06.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5604	1/28/2016 12:56:01 PM

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