

Davis-BesseNPEm Resource

From: CuadradoDeJesus, Samuel
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2012 8:56 AM
To: dorts@firstenergycorp.com; Davis-BesseHearingFile Resource
Cc: custer@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: FW: 8 2 2011 telephone conference summary for your review
Attachments: 8 2 2011 V2 DB NRC Telecon Summary.docx

Steve,
I'll incorporate FENOC's comments. Thanks.

From: dorts@firstenergycorp.com [<mailto:dorts@firstenergycorp.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2012 7:50 AM
To: CuadradoDeJesus, Samuel
Cc: custer@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Re: 8 2 2011 telephone conference summary for your review

Sam..... FENOC provides the following comments on the attached telecon summary:

Enclosure 1 -- Seung Min is listed twice.
Enclosure 2 -- Page 1, 1st paragraph, 3rd line, "response to" should read "responses to".
Enclosure 2 -- Page 1, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence repeats the words "documented in".
Enclosure 2 -- Page 3, RAI 3.1.2.2-2, 1st paragraph, the RAI number "3.1.2.22" is missing a dash (-), and should read "3.1.2.2-2".
Enclosure 2 -- Page 4, 4th paragraph, last sentence starts with "The atff", but should read "The staff".

Thank you for the opportunity to review the summary.

Steve Dort
DBNPS License Renewal

From: "CuadradoDeJesus, Samuel" <Samuel.CuadradoDeJesus@nrc.gov>
To: "dorts@firstenergycorp.com" <dorts@firstenergycorp.com>
Cc: "custer@firstenergycorp.com" <custer@firstenergycorp.com>, Davis-BesseHearingFile Resource <Davis-BesseHearingFile.Resource@nrc.gov>
Date: 02/01/2012 02:26 PM
Subject: 8 2 2011 telephone conference summary for your review

Steve,

Let me know if you have any comments.

Regards,
Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús
Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Phone: 301-415-2946
Samuel.CuadradoDeJesus@nrc.gov

----- The information contained in this message is intended only for the personal

and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately, and delete the original message.

Hearing Identifier: Davis_BesseLicenseRenewal_Saf_NonPublic
Email Number: 3501

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D08071E249B4)

Subject: FW: 8 2 2011 telephone conference summary for your review
Sent Date: 2/6/2012 8:55:38 AM
Received Date: 2/6/2012 8:55:41 AM
From: CuadradoDeJesus, Samuel

Created By: Samuel.CuadradoDeJesus@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"custer@firstenergycorp.com" <custer@firstenergycorp.com>

Tracking Status: None

"dorts@firstenergycorp.com" <dorts@firstenergycorp.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Davis-BesseHearingFile Resource" <Davis-BesseHearingFile.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2281	2/6/2012 8:55:41 AM
8 2 2011 V2 DB NRC Telecon Summary.docx		32267

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

LICENSEE: FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

FACILITY: Davis-Besse

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON AUGUST 2, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on August 2, 2011, to discuss and clarify the applicant's response to staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) and new draft RAIs concerning the Davis-Besse license renewal application.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a description of the staff concerns discussed with the applicant. A brief description on the status of the items is also included.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Number:50-346

Enclosures:

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

cc w/encls: See next page

LICENSEE: FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

FACILITY: Davis-Besse

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON AUGUST 2, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on August 2, 2011, to discuss and clarify the applicant's response to staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) and new draft RAIs concerning the Davis-Besse license renewal application.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a description of the staff concerns discussed with the applicant. A brief description on the status of the items is also included.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Number: 50-346

Enclosures:

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

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.:

DOCUMENT NAME: Insert document name and full path.

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC:RPB1:DLR
NAME		S Cuadrado de Jesús	D Morey
DATE	/ /	/ /	/ /

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
DAVIS-BESSE
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
AUGUST 2, 2011

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATIONS

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Seung Min	NRC
Robert Sun	NRC
John Klos	NRC
Michelle Kichline	NRC
James Gavula	NRC
Lane Howard	
Roger Kalikian	NRC
Seung Min	NRC
Elizabeth Trillo	Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses
Cliff Custer	FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC)
Steven Dort	FENOC
Larry Hinkle	FENOC
Don Kosloff	FENOC
Kathy Nesser	FENOC
Allen McAllister	FENOC

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
DAVIS-BESSE
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
AUGUST 2, 2011

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on Month Day, 2011, to discuss and clarify the following response to requests for additional information (RAIs) and new draft RAIs concerning the Davis-Besse license renewal application (LRA).

Response RAI 3.3.2.3.14-1

Discussion:

The staff stated that it reviewed the applicant's June 3, 2011, response to RAI 3.3.2.3.14-1. The staff also stated that it disagrees with the applicant's justification, documented in its response, documented in, for not identifying loss of preload for steel bolting exposed to an external environment of raw water. The staff further stated that aging mechanisms do exist and loss of pre-load could occur.

The applicant stated that it will supplement the response to add a row in LRA Table 3.3.2-14 for loss of pre-load. The applicant stated that it will include the supplemental response with the upcoming RAI that is due August 11, 2011. The NRC staff agreed to this action and noted that some additional detail should be provided on how the loss of pre-load will be managed for the subject submerged bolting (e.g., opportunistic inspections or pump performance).

ACTION: The applicant will supplement the response to RAI 3.3.2.3.14-1 to add a row for loss of pre-load in LRA Table 3.3.2-14.

Followup One-Time Inspection Program LRA Amendment

Discussion:

The staff noted that LRA Section B.2.30's amendment dated June 3, 2011 states an enhancement that the "scope" program element is to include visual and volumetric inspections of the stainless steel makeup pump casings for cracking due to cyclic loading but it does not state what type of visual examinations will be used to detect cracking.

The staff also stated that the GALL Report AMP XI.M32, "One-Time Inspection" states in the "detection of aging effects" program element that the program manages cracking due to cyclic loading using enhanced visual (EVT-1 or equivalent), surface, or volumetric examinations. Some types of visual examination may not be sufficient to identify cracking and it is unclear what visual examinations will be performed to meet this need.

The staff requested a discussion, followed by a docketed letter response later, of the type of visual examinations that will be used to identify cracking as part of the One-Time Inspection Program.

The applicant asked for clarification regarding whether the inspection is required to be an enhanced VT-1 visual examination, or could an alternative method such as volumetric examination be performed to identify cracking. The staff stated that there are other options listed in Revision 2 of the GALL Report. The applicant agreed to provide an update to identify the types of examinations that may be performed to identify cracking in components managed by the One-Time Inspection Program.

ACTION: The applicant to provide a docketed response to identify the types of examinations that may be used to identify cracking as part of the One-Time Inspection Program.

Draft follow-up RAI B.2.34-2

Discussion:

Previous to the telephone conference call the staff provided the applicant with draft RAI B.2.34-2 as follows:

Background

In its response to RAI B.2.34-1, the applicant stated that according to the certificate of material test report (CMTR) for the reactor head closure studs, the actual measured yield strength varied from 151 to 159 ksi, and the tensile strength varied from 166 to 171 ksi. The applicant also stated that its reactor head stud material is SA-540, Grade B-23 and that as provided in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.65, "Materials and Inspections for Reactor Vessel Closure Studs," this material when tempered to a maximum tensile strength of 170 ksi, is relatively immune to stress corrosion cracking (SCC). The Reactor Head Closure Studs Program was amended to include an enhancement to preclude the future use of replacement closure stud bolting fabricated from material with actual measured yield strength greater than or equal to 150 ksi, except for use of the existing spare reactor head closure stud bolting.

The "preventive actions" program element of GALL Report AMP XI.M3, "Reactor Head Closure Stud Bolting," references the guidance in RG 1.65 and NUREG-1339, "Resolution of Generic Safety Issue 29: Bolting Degradation or Failure in Nuclear Power Plants." GALL Report AMP XI.M3 states that one of the preventive measures that can reduce the potential for SCC includes using bolting material for closure studs that has an actual measured yield strength less than 150 ksi.

Issue

LRA Section B.2.34 states that the Reactor Head Closure Program is an existing program that with enhancements will be consistent with the 10 elements of an effective aging management program as described in GALL Report AMP XI.M3. All of the applicant's reactor head closure studs were fabricated from material with measured yield strength above 150 ksi and some of the furnished materials have a measured tensile strength above 170 ksi. The staff noted that this is an exception to the "preventive actions" program element of GALL AMP XI.M3.

Request

1) Revise the appropriate sections of the LRA to reflect the use of reactor head closure studs with measured yield strength above 150 ksi as an exception to GALL Report AMP XI.M3.

2) In view of the greater susceptibility to SCC of the studs, justify the adequacy of the Reactor Head Closure Program to manage cracking due to SCC of highstrength bolting material. As part of the justification, describe how the program manages the potential exposure of closure bolting to borated water and other potential contaminants that may initiate SCC of the reactor head closure bolting studs and components.

The applicant stated that it will supplement RAI B.2.34-1 response to address request 1 and 2 above. This would include tables changes associated with taking an exception to the GALL XI.M3 program.

Davis-Besse project manager (PM) Cliff Custer and the staff's PM Sam Cuadrado de Jesus to determine the due date of this supplemental response. The NRC staff agreed to this action.

ACTION: The applicant will supplement RAI B.2.34-1 response to address request 1 and 2 above.

Response to RAI 3.1.2.2-2

Discussion:

After reviewing the applicant response to RAI 3.1.2.22 and previous to the telephone conference call the staff provided the applicant with the following draft follow-up RAI:

Background

In the third request item of RAI 3.1.2.2-2, the staff requested that the applicant describe the functional groups for the following two components that are addressed in LRA Table 3.1.2-2: (1) core support assembly (CSA) vent valve body, and (2) plenum cylinder reinforcing plate. The staff also requested that if existent, the applicant describe their link relationships (such as primary/expansion link) with other components. In addition, the applicant was requested to describe the inspection method, including the inspection frequency, for the components.

In its response dated July 22, 2011, the applicant stated that in MRP-227, the reactor internals were assigned to one of the following four functional groups: Primary, Expansion, Existing Programs, and No Additional Measures components. The applicant also stated that the link relationships are consistent with that provided in Tables 4-1 and 4-4 of MRP-227, Revision 0. The applicant further stated that the inspection frequency and method for the primary and expansion components are provided in Tables 4-1 and 4-4 of MRP-227, Revision 0. In addition, the revised LRA Table 3.1.2-2 in response to RAI 3.1.2.2-2 does not include an AMR item to manage reduction in fracture toughness of the CASS CSA vent valve body and plenum cylinder reinforcing plate.

Issue

The staff noted that MRP-227 Tables 4-1 and 4-4 referenced in the applicant's response do not clearly address information regarding: (1) the functional groups, (2) the link relationships, or (3) the inspection method, including the frequency, specified for the CSA vent valve body and plenum cylinder reinforcing plate. In addition, the revised LRA Table 3.1.2-2 does not address reduction in fracture toughness of these CASS components. The staff also found a need to clarify whether or not the applicant's aging management for these components is based on applicant's plant-specific existing inspections (for example, inspections per ASME Code Section XI requirements or Technical Specifications).

Request

Provide the information regarding: (1) the functional groups, (2) the link relationships (if existent) and (3) the inspection method including the frequency for the CSA vent valve body and plenum cylinder reinforcing plate made of CASS.

As part of the response, clarify whether or not the applicant's aging management for reduction in fracture toughness of these CASS components is based on applicant's plant-specific existing inspections (for example, inspections per ASME Code Section XI requirements or Technical Specifications). In addition, describe the applicant's operating experience in terms of the occurrence of cracking or reduction in fracture toughness of these components.

The staff indicated that the applicant did not clearly address the requested information associated with the CSA vent valve body and plenum cylinder reinforcing plate, item number 3 of RAI 3.1.2.2-2. In response the applicant stated that these components were Category A components and were screened out as not requiring aging management (MRP-227, Revision 0 and MRP-189, Revision 1) and therefore, were not included in the revised LRA Table 3.1.2-2 submitted as part of the response to item number 2 of RAI 3.1.2.2-2. However, the staff stated that it still desires a response to the requested information associated with the CSA vent valve body and plenum cylinder reinforcing plate. The applicant stated that the response to RAI 3.1.2.2-2 (item number 3) will be revised to address the above requested information. The staff and the applicant also agreed to schedule an additional telephone conference call for Thursday, August 4, 2011, to further discuss this topic.

ACTION: The staff and the applicant will held another telephone conference call on August 4, 2011, to further discuss this topic.

SUBJECT: Summary of Telephone Conference Call conducted on August 2, 2011

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC [or NON-PUBLIC, if applicable]

RidsNrrDlr Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource
RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRapb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpob Resource

PCooper
BHarris
SCuadrado
EMiller
MMahoney
ICouret, OPA
TReilly, OCA
BHarris, OGC