October 10, 2001

LICENSEE : Duke Energy Corporation

FACILITIES: McGuire, Units 1 and 2, and Catawba, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: TELECOMMUNICATION WITH DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION TO DISCUSS INFORMATION IN THEIR LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION ON SEVERAL WASTE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SYSTEMS

On September 12, 2001, after the NRC staff reviewed information provided in Chapter 2 of the license renewal application, a conference call was conducted between the NRC and Duke Energy Corporation to clarify information presented in the application pertaining to the scoping of structures and components in the Liquid Waste System, Waste Gas System, and Conventional Waste Water Treatment System. Participants in the conference call are provided in Attachment 1.

The questions asked by the NRC staff, as well as the responses provided by the applicant, are as follows:

1. Why are the system functions described in Section 2.3.3.24 for Catawba and McGuire different? Does Catawba's Liquid Waste System also have a reactor coolant leakage detection function?

   The applicant indicated that the system descriptions in Chapter 2 were intended to be general in nature. The Chapter 2 sections were not intended to define the system functions that were within the scope of license renewal. As such, discussions of general system functions do not imply that those functions are within the scope of license renewal; nor do the discussions attempt to define all of the functions that are within the scope of license renewal. The applicant indicated the Catawba Liquid Radwaste system functions that were within the scope of license renewal involved safety-related equipment relied upon to remain functional during and following a design basis event [10 CFR 54.4(a)(1)]; nonsafety-related equipment that is required to maintain its pressure boundary and/or structural integrity during and following a design basis event [10 CFR 54.4(a)(2)]; and equipment required by 10 CFR 50.48, 50.49, and 50.63 to mitigate regulated events involving fire, environmental qualification, and station blackout [10 CFR 54.4(a)(3). The applicant indicated that these in-scope system functions were documented in the technical basis information for their license renewal application, which would be available for review during the NRC's Scoping Methodology Audit.

   The reactor coolant system leakage detection system described in Section 2.3.3.24 for the McGuire Liquid Waste System is not an "in scope" function. The system function is provided at Catawba as well, but the applicant did not include that function in the Catawba system description. The applicant indicated that, in order to understand what is

within the scope of the license renewal rule and subject to an aging management review, one must review the scoping drawings, which specify the structures and components that are within the scope of license renewal as well as their function.

2. Liquid Waste system components such as sump pumps, orifices, separators, strainers, tubing, and a waste drain tank were included in the scope of license renewal for Catawba but not for McGuire. What are the design differences between Catawba and McGuire that would explain these differences in scoping results?

   The applicant stated that a significant amount of Liquid Waste System equipment was credited in the Catawba's design basis for removing discharged fire water system inventory from flooded areas during and following fire water system actuation to prevent safety-related equipment from flood-induced failure. Floor drains are provided in areas protected by fixed water suppression systems. These areas include the residual heat removal and containment spray pump rooms and connecting corridors; auxiliary feedwater pump rooms; component cooling water pump rooms and connecting corridors; control room ventilation equipment rooms; the reactor building annulus; reactor building pipe corridors; and reactor coolant pumps and lower containment filters. The applicant also stated that this Class H piping is high-lighted as within the scope of license renewal in flow diagrams CN-1565-1.0, -1.1, -2.2, -2.4, and CN-2565-2.2. The design basis for McGuire's Liquid Waste System does not include this provision.

   The applicant also specified that the plant-specific nonsafety-related pipe runs at Catawba involve more potential for adverse impact to safety-related equipment (Class F piping). As such, this scoping criterion caused more components to be within the scope of license renewal at Catawba than at McGuire.

3. Is the hydrogen recombiner function for combustible gas control one of the intended safety functions for the Waste Gas (WG) Systems ?

   The applicant indicated that the safety-related hydrogen recombiners are part of the Containment Air Return Exchange and Hydrogen Skimmer (VX) System at Catawba and McGuire and that they can be located on piping and instrumentation drawings associated with the VX systems. The applicant further indicated that the WG hydrogen recombiners are within the scope of license renewal because they provide a pressure boundary function to retain radioactive gases. The applicant indicated that the safety-related hydrogen recombiners in the VX system are within the scope of license renewal but the electrical portions are not subject to an aging management review because they are heaters, which are classified as active components. The electrical components are located in enclosures that are considered component supports. The enclosures are seismically qualified and are included in Table 3.5-3, page 3.5-19, Electrical & Instrument Panels & Enclosures. No aging effects or aging management programs were identified for the VX hydrogen recombiner enclosures.

4. In drawing CN-1567-1.0, the waste gas separator is highlighted to indicate that it is within the scope of license renewal. However, this component is not included in Table 3.3-47. Is this component within the scope of license renewal? And what are the results of Duke's aging management review?

   The applicant indicated that the waste gas separator is within the scope of license renewal and provided the results of the aging management review to the NRC staff for review (see the table presented in Attachment 2).

5. In Section 2.3.3.9, a Conventional Waste Water Treatment System sump pump for the Standby Shutdown Facility (SSF) at McGuire is identified as within the scope of license renewal. Does a similar pump exist at the Catawba station? If so, what are the design differences between these two systems that would cause the SSF sump pump to be in scope at McGuire and not in scope at Catawba?

   The applicant indicated that the SSF sump pump was included in the scope of license renewal at McGuire because credible events involving pipe breaks in other systems could cause flooding in the SSF building. At Catawba, no credible pipe breaks were identified that could cause flooding of the SSF and necessitate the use of the Catawba SSF sump pump to prevent flood-induced failure of equipment required to mitigate the effects of a fire or station blackout event.

The NRC staff is considering the applicant's responses to these questions and is continuing its review of the waste treatment and disposal systems.

A draft of this telecommunication summary was provided to the applicant to allow them the opportunity to comment prior to the summary being issued.

/***RA***/

Rani L. Franovich, Project Manager
License Renewal Project Directorate
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-369, 50-370, 50-413, and 50-414

Attachments: As stated

cc w/attachments: See next page

4. In drawing CN-1567-1.0, the waste gas separator is highlighted to indicate that it is within the scope of license renewal. However, this component is not included in Table 3.3-47. Is this component within the scope of license renewal? And what are the results of Duke's aging management review?

   The applicant indicated that the waste gas separator is within the scope of license renewal and provided the results of the aging management review to the NRC staff for review (see the table presented in Attachment 2).

5. In Section 2.3.3.9, a Conventional Waste Water Treatment System sump pump for the Standby Shutdown Facility (SSF) at McGuire is identified as within the scope of license renewal. Does a similar pump exist at the Catawba station? If so, what are the design differences between these two systems that would cause the SSF sump pump to be in scope at McGuire and not in scope at Catawba?

   The applicant indicated that the SSF sump pump was included in the scope of license renewal at McGuire because credible events involving pipe breaks in other systems could cause flooding in the SSF building. At Catawba, no credible pipe breaks were identified that could cause flooding of the SSF and necessitate the use of the Catawba SSF sump pump to prevent flood-induced failure of equipment required to mitigate the effects of a fire or station blackout event.

The NRC staff is considering the applicant's responses to these questions and is continuing its review of the waste treatment and disposal systems.

A draft of this telecommunication summary was provided to the applicant to allow them the opportunity to comment prior to the summary being issued.

/***RA***/

Rani L. Franovich, Project Manager
License Renewal Project Directorate
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-369, 50-370, 50-413, and 50-414

Attachments: As stated

cc w/attachments: See next page
DISTRIBUTION:
See next page
Document Name: C:\Program Files\Adobe\Acrobat 4.0\PDF Output\Conference Call Summary Sep~.wpd

OFFICE	LA:DRIP	ME:RLSB:DRIP	BC:RLSB:DRIP
NAME	E Hylton	R Franovich	C Grimes
DATE	10/10/01	10/10/01	10/10/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION:
HARD COPY
RLSB RF
E. Hylton

E-MAIL:
PUBLIC
J. Johnson
W. Borchardt
D. Matthews
C. Carpenter
C. Grimes
B. Zalcman
J. Strosnider (RidsNrrDe)
F. Eltawila
G. Bagchi
K. Manoly
W. Bateman
J. Calvo
C. Holden
P. Shemanski
S. Rosenberg
G. Holahan
T. Collins
B. Boger
D. Thatcher
G. Galletti
B. Thomas
J. Moore
R. Weisman
M. Mayfield
A. Murphy
W. McDowell
S. Droggitis
N. Dudley
RLSB Staff

R. Martin
C. Patel
C. Julian (RII)
R. Haag (RII)
A. Fernandez (OGC)
J. Wilson
M. Khanna
R. Elliott
B. Rogers

Mr. Gary Gilbert
Regulatory Compliance Manager
Duke Energy Corporation
4800 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745

Ms. Lisa F. Vaughn
Duke Energy Corporation
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Anne Cottington, Esquire
Winston and Strawn
1400 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

North Carolina Municipal Power
Agency Number 1
1427 Meadowwood Boulevard
P. O. Box 29513
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626

County Manager of York County
York County Courthouse
York, South Carolina 29745

Piedmont Municipal Power Agency
121 Village Drive
Greer, South Carolina 29651

Ms. Karen E. Long
Assistant Attorney General
North Carolina Department of Justice
P. O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Ms. Elaine Wathen, Lead REP Planner
Division of Emergency Management
116 West Jones Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-1335

Mr. Robert L. Gill, Jr.
Duke Energy Corporation
Mail Stop EC-12R
P. O. Box 1006
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Mr. Douglas J. Walters
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

North Carolina Electric Membership
Corporation
P. O. Box 27306
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
4830 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745

Mr. Virgil R. Autry, Director
Dept of Health and Envir Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-1708

Mr. C. Jeffrey Thomas
Manager - Nuclear Regulatory Licensing
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Mr. L. A. Keller
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Saluda River Electric
P. O. Box 929
Laurens, South Carolina 29360

Mr. Peter R. Harden, IV
VP-Customer Relations and Sales
Westinghouse Electric Company
5929 Carnegie Blvd.
Suite 500
Charlotte, North Carolina 28209

Mr. T. Richard Puryear
Owners Group (NCEMC)
Duke Energy Corporation
4800 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745

Mr. Richard M. Fry, Director
North Carolina Dept of Env, Health, and
Natural Resources
3825 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

County Manager of
Mecklenburg County
720 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Michael T. Cash
Regulatory Compliance Manager

Duke Energy Corporation
McGuire Nuclear Site
12700 Hagers Ferry Road
Huntersville, North Carolina 28078

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
12700 Hagers Ferry Road
Huntersville, North Carolina 28078

Dr. John M. Barry
Mecklenburg County
Department of Environmental Protection
700 N. Tryon Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

TELECOMMUNICATION PARTICIPANTS
AUGUST 21, 2001

Staff Participants

Rani Franovich

Chang-Yang Li

Duke Energy Corporation Participants

Bob Gill

Mike Semmler

Attachment 1

Table 3.3-47 Insert for Waste Gas Separators

1	2	3	4	5	6
Component Type	Component Function (Note 1)	Material (Note 2)	Internal Environment / External Environment	Aging Effects	Aging Management Programs and Activities
Waste Gas Separators	PB	SS	Gas / Sheltered	None Identified / None Identified	None Required / None Required
Waste Gas Separators	PB	SS	Treated Water (unmonitored) / Sheltered	Cracking / Loss of Material / None Identified	Waste Gas System Inspection / Waste Gas System Inspection / None Required