October 25, 2005

LICENSEE: Duke Energy Corporation

FACILITY: Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY - MEETING WITH DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION TO DISCUSS REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSES RE: NUCLEAR SERVICE WATER ALLOWED OUTAGE TIME AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION (TAC NOS. MC5117 AND MC5118)

Representatives of Duke Energy Corporation (DEC, the licensee) met with members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff at NRC Headquarters on September 19, 2005, in Rockville, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss DEC's September 13, 2005, Request for Additional Information (RAI) response related to the licensee's request for amendment to allow a one-time outage of 14 days for the Nuclear Service Water System (NSWS) headers for each unit at Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. This was a followup meeting to the one held on January 31, 2005. Attachment 1 provides a list of the attendees. Attachment 2 contains the slides presented by DEC during the meeting. Attachment 3 is a draft set of the NRC staff's followup questions that were discussed during the meeting.

BACKGROUND

By letter dated November 16, 2004 (Agencywide Documents Access Management System (ADAMS Accession No. ML043240367), DEC requested approval of amendments to allow a one time outage of 14 days for the NSWS Headers for each unit at Catawba. The licensee presented its request to the NRC staff during a meeting on January 31, 2005 (ADAMS Accession No. ML050490135). Based on discussions with the NRC staff during this meeting, the licensee submitted its revised amendment request by a letter dated May 3, 2005 (ADAMS Accession No. ML05131199). By letter dated July 6, 2005, DEC revised its request (ADAMS Accession No. ML051920358) to address the discussions with the NRC staff. These discussions concerned the probabilistic risk assessment analysis for the proposed amendment. In this revision, the licensee evaluated the dominant sequences and identified some additional actions that could be taken to reduce the overall plant risk. Additionally, by letter dated September 13, 2005 (ADAMS Accession No. ML052590245), the licensee submitted its response to the NRC staff's RAIs. In order to facilitate the review of the DEC's response, the licensee requested a meeting with the NRC.

SUMMARY OF MEETING

The first part of the meeting pertained to the licensee's presentation of the enclosed handout entitled, "Catawba Nuclear Station Nuclear Service Water System Technical Specification Extension Request." The licensee presented information on the background of the issues related to the NSWS. The licensee made additional presentations in support of its request on NSWS 14-Day Allowed Outage time (AOT) Activities, Risk Mitigation, and Probabilistic Risk Assessment. During this presentation, the NRC staff noted that the licensee plans to start the

proposed NSW system activities for one of the headers in January 2006. Upon completion of the activities related to this header, DEC will switch to two header operations for a couple of days which would be followed by activities related to the other NSWS header. Therefore, Catawba Units 1 and 2 each will be operating with a single train of NSWS for about a month. During this presentation, DEC stated that it is not planning to request any further AOT amendments for the future NSWS modifications. Rather, the licensee plans to request a permanent technical specification amendment so that it could operate each unit at Catawba Nuclear Station with a single NSWS train.

The second part of the meeting pertained to discussions on DEC's September 13, 2005, response to the NRC staff's RAIs. During the meeting, the licensee provided additional details in response to the staff's questions. Also, the NRC staff asked additional questions related to the information that was presented by DEC during the first part of the meeting. The NRC staff specifically asked the licensee to provide justification for its request of an NSWS 14-day AOT extension for each unit, while both units are operating at 100% power. Furthermore, the NRC staff sent its draft followup questions via e-mail to the licensee (Attachment 3).

CONCLUSION

At the conclusion of the meeting, DEC indicated that it would consider the information discussed and would submit supplemental information to further aid the review. DEC also stated that it is seeking approval of its amendment by early November 2005, to facilitate implementation of the NSWS 14-Day AOT activities.

No members of the public attended this meeting. There were no public comments.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Farideh E. Saba, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414

Attachments: 1. Attendance List
2. Meeting presentation materials
3. NRC Staff'S Followup Questions

cc w/atts: See next page

proposed NSW system activities for one of the headers in January 2006. Upon completion of the activities related to this header, DEC will switch to two header operations for a couple of days which would be followed by activities related to the other NSWS header. Therefore, Catawba Units 1 and 2 each will be operating with a single train of NSWS for about a month. During this presentation, DEC stated that it is not planning to request any further AOT amendments for the future NSWS modifications. Rather, the licensee plans to request a permanent technical specification amendment so that it could operate each unit at Catawba Nuclear Station with a single NSWS train.

The second part of the meeting pertained to discussions on DEC's September 13, 2005, response to the NRC staff's RAIs. During the meeting, the licensee provided additional details in response to the staff's questions. Also, the NRC staff asked additional questions related to the information that was presented by DEC during the first part of the meeting. The NRC staff specifically asked the licensee to provide justification for its request of an NSWS 14-day AOT extension for each unit, while both units are operating at 100% power. Furthermore, the NRC staff sent its draft followup questions via e-mail to the licensee (Attachment 3).

CONCLUSION

At the conclusion of the meeting, DEC indicated that it would consider the information discussed and would submit supplemental information to further aid the review. DEC also stated that it is seeking approval of its amendment by early November 2005, to facilitate implementation of the NSWS 14-Day AOT activities.

No members of the public attended this meeting. There were no public comments.

Sincerely,

/RA/
Farideh E. Saba, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414

Attachments: 1. Attendance List
2. Meeting presentation materials
3. NRC Staff's Followup Questions

cc w/atts: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

Package No.: ML052910390 Meeting Notice: ML052450341
Meeting Summary: ML052910376 Meeting Handout (Encl 2): ML052920066 NRC-001

OFFICE	PDII-1/PM	PDII-1/PM	PDII-1/LA	PDII-1/SC
NAME	FSaba	SPeters	*Rsola for* CHawes	EMarinos
DATE	10/24/05	10/24/05	10/24/05	10/25/05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUBJECT: SUMMARY - MEETING WITH DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION TO DISCUSS REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSES RE: NUCLEAR SERVICE WATER ALLOWED OUTAGE TIME AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION (TAC NOS. MC5117 AND MC5118)

Dated: October 25, 2005

DISTRIBUTION:
PUBLIC
PDII-1 R/F
RidsNrrPMSPeters (Hard Copy)
RidsOgcRp
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter
RidsNrrDlpm (TMarsh/CHaney)
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii (EHackett)
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii1 (EMarinos)
RidsNrrLACHawes (Hard Copy)
FSaba
RJasinski
PHearn
JTatum
APal
SJones
AHowe
SLaur

ATTENDEES LIST

September 19, 2005

MEETING WITH DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Sean Peters	NRC/NRR/DLPM
Farideh Saba	NRC/NRR/DLPM
Lee Keller	Duke Energy Corporation
Paul Farish	Duke Energy Corporation
Randall Hart	Duke Energy Corporation
Bill Peista	Duke Energy Corporation
Terry Edwards	Duke Energy Corporation
Duncan Brewer	Duke Energy Corporation
George Hamrick	Duke Energy Corporation
Dayna Herick	Duke Energy Corporation
James Tatum	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPLB
Amar Pal	NRC/NRR/DE/EEIB
Steve Jones	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Anderw Howe	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Steven Laur	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Peter Hearn	NRC/NRR/DIPM/IROB

NRC STAFF'S DRAFT FOLLOWUP QUESTIONS
(e-mailed to DEC dated September 22, 2005)

PRA Questions:

Please clarify two of the September 13, 2005 RAI responses (5 and 1b) for risk as follows:

1. PSB-5 (Referenced in response to RAB-10)

The committed compensatory measure of monitoring weather conditions during the outage implies a potential for recovery which does not exist. Please identify that once the NSW header outage commences, restoration of the header to a functional status cannot be made within sufficient time to provide any meaningful mitigation capability.

2. RAB-1b

The scope and development of the fire PRA scenarios are not clear, and Duke identified in the September 19, 2005, public meeting that its fire PRA modeling is not as rigorous and complete as a full fire PRA. Please provide a basis for why fire risk is not significant during the NSW header outage, when the plant essentially relies upon one train of equipment, and a single fire which can then fail the remaining train could become risk significant.

Plant Systems Questions:

1. (a) It is the NRC staff's current impression that more "one-time" TS changes may be needed to support the planned NSW work at Catawba, but in the September 19, 2005, public meeting it appeared that the next step for Duke is to apply for a permanent TS change for managing header outages and that additional one-time changes may not be needed. If this is the case and the docket is not clear on this point, please provide additional clarification about the future plans for the NSW system at Catawba.

(b) The licensee needs to provide a compelling argument that supports the request to perform the planned maintenance with both units operating, and to fully justify why it would not be more appropriate to coordinate the planned maintenance with the next one or two refueling outages. In its September 13, 2005 submittal, Duke provided some discussion about economic considerations and efficiencies of doing the work in a back-to-back fashion, but their argument should include safety as the primary consideration. For example, if there should be a grid disturbance (LOOP) and both units should trip during this refurbishment evolution, would the plant risk be substantially greater than if only one unit is operating and the other one is in a refueling outage? What about the case where the fuel has been off-loaded to the spent fuel pool for the shutdown unit in preparation for performing the required NSWS refurbishment? What about performing the complete refurbishment (both headers) during the next refueling outage rather than spreading it over the next two refueling outages? Please consider all of the options and propose the best course of action considering first the safety implications, and second other factors such as economic, scheduling, etc.

2. Relating to your plans to use the CCW pumps from the inoperable train for providing CCW flow in the event that power is lost for the operable CCW pumps. Please evaluate the hydraulic characteristics of the CCW system when cross-connected in that fashion and confirm that there would be sufficient NPSH for the CCW pumps and that the system would be capable of functioning in that manner.

Electrical Questions:

1) Does the transmission system operator (TSO) perform real-time contingency analysis to determine grid conditions that would make the offsite system inoperable in the event of various contingencies? What actions will be taken if the offsite system becomes inoperable during the 14 day AOT?

2) Discuss how the grid stability will be maintained during the 14 day AOT.

3) Does your TSO notify the plant operators when degraded grid conditions could occur and what action will be taken if degraded grid conditions occur?

cc:

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

Ms. Lisa F. Vaughn
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
P. O. Box 1006
Mail Code = EC07H
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

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

NCEM REP Program Manager
4713 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4713

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

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

Mr. Henry Porter, Assistant Director
Division of Waste Management
Bureau of Land and Waste Management
Dept. of Health and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-1708

Mr. R.L. Gill, Jr., Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Issues
and Industry Affairs
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
Mail Stop EC05P
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

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

Mr. Peter R. Harden, IV, Vice President
Customer Relations and Sales
Westinghouse Electric Company
6000 Fairview Road
12th Floor
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210

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

cc:

Division of Radiation Protection
NC Dept. of Environment, Health,
and Natural Resources
3825 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Mr. Henry Barron
Group Vice President, Nuclear Generation
and Chief Nuclear Officer
P.O. Box 1006-EC07H
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

Diane Curran
Harmon, Curran, Spielbergy &
Eisenberg, LLP
1726 M Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036