

April 24, 2001

LICENSEE: Florida Power and Light Company (FPL)

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MARCH 20, 2001, MEETING WITH FPL TO DISCUSS DRAFT RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAIs) FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 3 AND 4, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

On March 20, 2001, representatives of FPL Company met with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff to discuss and/or provide clarification on FPL draft responses to RAIs made by the staff as part of its review of the application. The draft material discussed was as follows:

- Section 3.3, "Engineered Safety Features," [ML010730305]
- Section 3.4, "Auxiliary Systems," [ML010730306]
- Section 3.6, "Structures and Structural Components," [ML010730355]
- Section 3.7, "Electrical and Instrumentation and Controls," [ML010730296]
- Section 4.4, "Environmental Qualification" [ML010730296]
- Appendix B, Section 3.2.4, "Chemistry Control Program," [ML010800177]
- Appendix B, Section 3.2.6, "Environmental Qualification Program" [ML010730296]

The meeting was useful to clarify whether the draft responses satisfied the intent of staff questions. Based on discussions of the draft RAI responses, the applicant stated that they would consider modifying various draft responses in order to meet the intent of the RAIs. Attached is a list of attendees and documentation of the draft responses that may be revised.

*/RA/*

Stephen S. Koenick, Project Manager  
License Renewal and Standardization Branch  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251

Attachments: As Stated

cc w/attachments: See next page

April 24, 2001

LICENSEE: Florida Power and Light Company (FPL)

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MARCH 20, 2001, MEETING WITH FPL TO DISCUSS DRAFT RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAIs) FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 3 AND 4, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LICENSEE: Florida Power and Light Company (FPL)

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MARCH 20, 2001, MEETING WITH FPL TO DISCUSS DRAFT RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAIs) FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 3 AND 4, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

On March 20, 2001, representatives of FPL Company met with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff to discuss and/or provide clarification on FPL draft responses to RAIs made by the staff as part of its review of the application. The draft material discussed was as follows:

- Section 3.3, "Engineered Safety Features," [ML010730305]
- Section 3.4, "Auxiliary Systems," [ML010730306]
- Section 3.6, "Structures and Structural Components," [ML010730355]
- Section 3.7, "Electrical and Instrumentation and Controls," [ML010730296]
- Section 4.4, "Environmental Qualification" [ML010730296]
- Appendix B, Section 3.2.4, "Chemistry Control Program," [ML010800177]
- Appendix B, Section 3.2.6, "Environmental Qualification Program" [ML010730296]

The meeting was useful to clarify whether the draft responses satisfied the intent of staff questions. Based on discussions of the draft RAI responses, the applicant stated that they would consider modifying various draft responses in order to meet the intent of the RAIs. Attached is a list of attendees and documentation of the draft responses that may be revised.

/RA/

Stephen S. Koenick, Project Manager  
License Renewal and Standardization Branch  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251

Attachments: As Stated

cc w/attachments: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

**ML011150017**

See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\meeting minutes 3\_20\_01.WPD

OFFICE	LA:DRIP	PM:DRIP:RLSB	PM:DRIP:RLSB	C:DRIP:RLSB
NAME	EGHylton	SSKoenick	RAuluck	CIGrimes
DATE	04/17/01	04/23/01	04/24/01	04/24/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION:

**ML011150017**

**HARD COPY**

RLSB RF

E. Hylton

**E-MAIL:**

PUBLIC

J. Johnson

D. Matthews

C. Grimes

B. Zalcman

J. Strosnider

G. Bagchi

K. Manoly

W. Bateman

J. Calvo

J. Shea

G. Holahan

T. Collins

B. Boger

J. Peralta

J. Moore

R. Weisman

M. Mayfield

S. Bahadur

A. Murphy

W. McDowell

S. Droggitis

S. Duraiswamy

RLSB Staff

[liz\\_thompson@fpl.com](mailto:liz_thompson@fpl.com)

[steve\\_hale@fpl.com](mailto:steve_hale@fpl.com)

[cwillbanks@scientechnology.com](mailto:cwillbanks@scientechnology.com)

-----

S. Hom

K. Jabbour

R. Correia

C. Julian (RII)

C. Casto (RII)

L. Wert (RII)

C. Lauron

J. Davis

D. Jeng

A. Pal

D. Nguyen

A. Lee

B.P. Jain

K. Parczewski

J. Ma

E. Andruszkiewicz

J. Medoff

P. Shemanski

NRC PUBLIC MEETING ATTENDANCE LIST  
MEETING WITH FPL TO DISCUSS DRAFT RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION (RAIs) FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 3 AND 4, LICENSE RENEWAL  
APPLICATION  
March 20, 2001

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Stephen Koenick	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLSB
E. A. Thompson	FPL
Stephen T. Hale	FPL
Bruce Beisler	FPL
Charles Willbanks	Scientech
Amar Pal	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB
Duc Nguyen	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB
Paul Schemanski	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB
David Jeng	NRC/NRR/DE/EMEB
Arnold Lee	NRC/NRR/DE/EMEB
Jim Davis	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
Carolyn Lauron	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
Yueh-Li Li	NRC/NRR/DE/EMEB
B.P. Jain	NRC/NRR/DE/EMEB
Jim Medoff	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
Ed Andruszkiewicz	NRC/NRR/DE/EMEB
Kris Parczewski	NRC/NRR/DE/EMCB
J.S. Ma	NRC/NRR/DE/EMEB

Draft Responses that may be modified as a result of the March 20, 2001, meeting

1. Draft RAI responses addressing electrical systems, instrumentation and controls, and environmental qualifications [ADAMS accession # ML010730296].

RAI 4.4.1 - 1: The staff question discussed whether wear cycle aging effect is applicable to various components. In the applicant's draft response, they refer to industry data as a source of information to demonstrate this aging effect is not applicable to various components. The NRC staff stated that the applicant should include vendor information for specific components to clearly demonstrate this aging effect is not applicable.

RAI 4.4.1-2: The staff question asks whether there have been any major plant modifications or events that would have impacted the environmental qualification calculations. During discussion of the applicant's draft response, the staff asked the applicant to elaborate on how operational experience was used in determining the effectiveness of monitoring environmental conditions.

RAI App. B 3.2.6-1: The staff question is related to operating experience and demonstration of the Environmental Qualification Program. The applicant's draft response did not answer the intent of the question. The NRC staff stated that the applicant should revise the draft response in its entirety to adequately address the question.

RAI 3.7.1-1: The staff question relates to the need for an aging management program for electrical cables to manage the aging effects associated with adverse localized environments. The applicant's draft response provided a basis why an aging management program wasn't necessary. Following the discussion, the applicant stated it would consider an aging management program with a limited scope. Furthermore, they were going to provide some vendor data to provide justification why they did not need to have an aging management program to address an adverse localized environment caused by moisture-produced water trees.

2. Draft RAI responses addressing structures and structural components [ADAMS accession #: ML010730355].

RAI 3.6.1.2-1: The staff question relates to attachment welds to the containment shell and the necessary aging management requirements. In the applicant's draft response, they stated that the attachment welds were included in the commodity group of "Liner plant anchorages/attachments exposed surfaces," and that aging effects would be managed, accordingly. The staff stated that the response should be modified to specifically state attachment welds in the table.

RAI 3.6.1.2-3: The staff question relates to the discussion on the steam generator support material (Lubrite) and the need for an aging management program. In the applicant's draft response, they provide the bases for why an aging management program is not needed. The staff stated that the response should be modified to include some vendor specific information to support the applicant's conclusions.

RAI 3.6.1.2-4: The staff question relates to the discussion on ASME Section XI, Subsection IWE and asks for a discussion on plant-specific program contents related to Class CC metallic liners and pressure retention components. In the applicant's draft response, they provide a description of their programs to satisfy Subsection IWE requirements. Through the discussion, the staff asked for clarification of the moisture barrier and the term metal-to-metal interfaces, and a description of the quality of the concrete for management of inaccessible areas.

RAI 3.6.1.5-1: The staff question relates to the discussion of miscellaneous components made of galvanized carbon steel and asks for a discussion of whether the Systems and Structures Monitoring Program should be applicable to these items. In the applicant's draft response, they provide a discussion as to why the program was not necessary to manage aging. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to describe operating history to support the response.

RAI 3.6.1.5-3: The staff question relates to self-loosening of bolted connections due to vibration not being listed as an applicable aging effect. In the applicant's draft response, they provide the bases for why this is not an applicable aging effect. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to provide some clarification on the design specifications.

RAI 3.6.1.5-4: The staff question relates to elastomers within the scope of renewal and associated aging management programs. In the applicant's draft response, they identify the elastomers in scope, the operating experience of seepage, and associated aging management programs. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to provide a bounding discussion of no significant seepage has been experienced at the site.

RAI 3.6.1.5-5: The staff question relates to anchorages/embedments that are located above groundwater that are within the scope of license renewal and whether they are subject to aging effects requiring management. In the applicant's draft response, they provide the bases for why these components are not subject to any aging effects requiring management. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to expand on the process for which boric acid leakage has been observed and addressed through the Boric Acid Wastage Surveillance Program.

RAI 3.6.2.1-2: The staff question relates to whether aging management programs are necessary to manage aging effects related to reinforced concrete components in structures other than containments. In the applicant's draft response, they provide the bases for not needing an aging management program. The bases comprised of operating history and use of the Maintenance Rule inspections to demonstrate no aging effects have been experienced. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to provide the criteria used to make the determination that there were no applicable aging effects that required management.

RAI 3.6.2.3-1: The staff question relates to whether cracking of masonry block walls is adequately managed by the Systems and Structures Monitoring Program. In the applicant's draft response, they provide a discussion of how the Systems and Structures Monitoring Program manages cracking of block walls. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to provide the specific acceptance criteria used related to block walls.

3. Draft RAI responses addressing Auxiliary Systems [ADAMS accession #: ML010730306].

RAI 3.4.15-2: The staff question relates to the need for a selective leaching program related to various materials exposed to treated water. In the applicant's draft response, they provide a discussion of how loss of material due to selective leaching has been identified as an aging effect requiring management. Furthermore, the applicant stated that the Chemistry Control Program would manage this aging effect. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to provide a discussion of operating experience related to selective leaching.

4. Draft RAI responses addressing the Chemistry Control Program [ADAMS accession #: ML010800177].

RAI 3.9.4-2: The staff question relates to how the Chemistry Control Program is related to the emergency diesel fuel oil system. In the applicant's draft response, they provide a discussion of how the Chemistry Control Program managed aging associated with the emergency diesel fuel oil system. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked that the applicant to specify the type of oil including sulfur content as well as providing additional references to applicable standards.

RAI 3.9.4-3: The staff question relates to whether microbiologically influenced corrosion is an aging effect that is adequately managed by the Chemistry Control Program. In the applicant's draft response, they expand on the plant parameters that would be conducive for microbiologically influenced corrosion. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to discuss how they would manage microbiologically influenced corrosion if this aging effect occurred in the plant.

5. Draft RAI responses addressing the Engineered Safety Features [ADAMS Accession #: ML010730305]

RAI 3.3.4-2: The staff question relates to whether cracking of stainless steel and Inconel components in the safety injection system is an applicable aging effect requiring management. In the applicant's draft response, they provide a discussion of how cracking is addressed related to the safety injection system. Through discussion of the response, the staff asked the applicant to provide additional discussion on the operating experience related to cracking as an applicable aging effect requiring management.

Mr. T. F. Plunkett  
Florida Power and Light Company  
cc:  
M. S. Ross, Attorney  
Florida Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Robert J. Hovey, Site Vice President  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
Florida Power and Light Company  
9760 SW. 344th Street  
Florida City, FL 33035

County Manager  
Miami-Dade County  
111 NW 1 Street, 29th Floor  
Miami, Florida 33128

Senior Resident Inspector  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
9762 SW. 344<sup>th</sup> Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

Mr. William A. Passetti, Chief  
Department of Health  
Bureau of Radiation Control  
2020 Capital Circle, SE, Bin #C21  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1741

Mr. Joe Myers, Director  
Division of Emergency Preparedness  
Department of Community Affairs  
2740 Centerview Drive  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

Attorney General  
Department of Legal Affairs  
The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Plant Manager  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
Florida Power and Light Company  
9760 SW. 344th Street  
Florida City, FL 33035

## **TURKEY POINT PLANT**

Mr. Steve Franzone  
Licensing Manager  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
9760 SW. 344th Street  
Florida City, FL 33035

Mr. Don Mothena  
Manager, Nuclear Plant Support Services  
Florida Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. J.A. Stall  
Vice President - Nuclear Engineering  
Florida Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Douglas J. Walter  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
1776 I Street NW, Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Stephen T. Hale  
Turkey Point Nuclear Point  
Florida Power & Light Company  
9760 S.W. 344 Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

Ms. E.A. Thompson  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
Florida Power and Light Company  
9760 SW 344<sup>th</sup> Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

Ms. Joette Lorion  
13015 SW 90 Court  
Miami, Florida 33176

Mr. Mark P. Oncavage  
12200 S.W. 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Miami, Florida 33176-4520

David R. Lewis, Esq.  
Shaw Pittman  
2300 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037





