

Possible Topics for the April 17, 2018 Public Meeting with Dominion on its Surry Subsequent License Renewal Application:

1. Identification of those generic vs. site-specific issues outlined in the industry owners groups topical reports (e.g., PWROG-17011-NP, Rev 0, PWROG-17031-NP, Rev 0, and PWROG-17033-NP, Rev 0, etc.)
2. Reactor Vessel Internals, MRP-227A, environmentally assisted fatigue (EAF), and related GAP analysis
3. Concrete degradation
4. Cable & electrical AMPs (e.g., XI.E7 *High-Voltage Insulators*)
5. Scoping and screening
6. Which program(s) to be continued/discontinued from the first license renewal
7. Which program(s) to be initiated for the subsequent license renewal
8. Fatigue calculations – how will these calculations be carried out differently for the SLRA compared to they were performed for the first license renewal
9. Issues encountered from previous acceptance reviews
 - a. Lack of consistency throughout the application (e.g., inconsistencies between Tables 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 in that Table 3.6.2 omits malleable iron and aluminum from the list of high voltage insulators materials, whereas LRA Table 3.6.1 includes malleable iron and aluminum.)
 - b. LRAs do not address staff concerns documented in previous reviews (e.g., missing fire protection components from the fire protection scoping & screening tables.)
 - c. LRAs reference reports and/or methodologies that have not been approved by the NRC (e.g., EPRI Report 1024995 *Environmentally Assisted Fatigue Screening, Process and Technical Basis for Identifying EAF Limiting Locations*” the staff has concerns about the methodology and has not approved this report. Some LRAs reference this report without including the additional information addressing the staff’s concerns.)
 - d. Applicants are advised to ensure the CLB issues have been addressed prior to submittal of the LRA so that the CLB issue resolution does not impact the LRA review schedule (e.g., one applicant calculated neutron fluence values by two different methods: one pre-EPU, and one post-EPU; the pre-EPU method associated with the current CLB had not been approved for use at the plant by the NRC. The applicant subsequently submitted a LAR to appropriately to incorporate a single fluence method to cover the PEO, which impacted the LRA review.)
 - e. Information in the LRA should be sufficient for the staff to reach a regulatory decision. (e.g., the need to demonstrate the high-strength bolts used in the Structure Monitoring & IWF Programs are within the scope of SMP, IWF or both.)