

Inspector and Tech Reviewer Areas to focus on:

1. Cover letter messages and request
2. Executive Summary (ES) for appropriateness and need
3. Length of Open URI section 4OA5.2
4. Summary of POD assumptions issues from TIA in ES and 4OA5
5. What to address in plans is only in cover letter (management integration of inspector observations to TIA)
6. No immediate safety concerns in ES only.
7. List of ACRONYMS and Reference list ???????

Sugg'd edits:
Remove - Yellow
Insert - Green

SC

Mr. Paul Freeman
Site Vice President, North Region
Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant
NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC
c/o Mr. Michael O'Keefe
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: SEABROOK STATION - NRC INSPECTION REPORT 05000443/2011010

Dear Mr. Freeman:

On January 20, 2012, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed an inspection at Seabrook Station. The enclosed inspection report documents the inspection results, which were discussed on January 20 with you and other members of your staff.

The inspection examined activities conducted under your license as they relate to safety and compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations, and with the conditions of your license. The inspectors reviewed selected procedures and records, observed activities, and interviewed personnel. The focus of this inspection was activities surrounding your development actions related to the Alkali-Silica Reaction (ASR) problem occurring in safety related structures, and other structures of regulatory importance (covered by the maintenance rule). In particular, we reviewed your Prompt Operability Determinations for certain structures based on best available information. At the beginning of the inspection report period, we noted some areas that still needed to be addressed based on available information, and that NextEra had satisfactorily addressed them with revisions to the documents.

On January 20, 2011 a final exit meeting was conducted and lead by Mr. Richard J. Conte, Chief Engineering Branch No. 1 of my staff. During the meeting, my staff summarized the change in status of the new findings and our plans to issue a Task Interface Agreement between Region I and the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation simultaneously with this report. The TIA was placed in the public document room (ADAMS Accession No. MLXXXXXXX). The purpose of the Task Interface Agreement was for the NRR staff to identify the review criteria in evaluating the operability determination for the "B" Electrical Tunnel affected by ASR (part of the Control Building) in assistance to to assist the Region I staff by addressing questions we had on the matter.

Also on January 20, we focused on and summarized observations on your plans with respect to the unwritten assumptions in your operability determinations. The NRC staff noted that these

F/9

determinations listed no assumptions in the applicable sections of the documents, and that the design basis code ACI 318-1971 was based on empirical data for determining certain parameters that were a part of the design bases. Also, Poisson's ratio on concrete cores were not being tested determined or evaluated, and this ratio was used as a design basis in the UFSAR. The assumption of this empirical data was that the relationships were for ASR free concrete. Specific areas for which your plans do not address unwritten assumptions being made in the prompt operability determinations were list in section 4OA5.2

In consultation with our technical reviewers in headquarters and to address the current shortcomings on unwritten assumptions for your operability determinations, we have determine d that your plans do not sufficiently provide information related to: 1) condition assessment (extent and characterization); 2) cause or causes of the ASR as it impacts current degradation and operability; 3) estimate of ASR affected area expansion to date and current propagation expansion rate; 4) interim structural assessment as it impacts current operability vs. longer term structural assessment and longer term monitoring to ensure operability in the near future vs. longer term of the duration of the license (1-2 years vs. longer); and, 5) short term mitigation or needed remedial actions. This is in distinction to your overall comprehensive plan for the problem.

Accordingly, we request that you provide us your plans to address the above issues within 30 days of the date of this inspection report. We have noted that, from the exit meeting of January 20 you have agreed to this request and to review the report in 15 days and let us know of your plans to honor our request or identify the need for a management meeting. We further request that, should a management meeting be needed on these issues, it should be conducted within 30 days of the date of this report and a final response time will be negotiated at the management meeting. If your root cause evaluation scheduled for Feb. 2012 and the associate corrective action plan for this significant condition adverse to quality addresses the above, please use them to respond to our request.

Also, the report documents two NRC-identified findings of very low significance (Green) that were determined to involve a violation of NRC requirements. Because of the very low safety significance, and because they are entered into your corrective action program, the NRC is treating these findings as Non-cited Violations, consistent with Section 2.3.2 of the NRC Enforcement Policy. If you contest any non-cited violations in this report, you should provide a response within 30 days of the date of this inspection report, with the basis for your denial, to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN.: Document Control Desk, Washington, DC 20555-0001; with copies to the Regional Administrator, Region I; the Director, Office of Enforcement, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; and the NRC Resident Inspector at Seabrook Station. In addition, if you disagree with the cross-cutting aspect assigned to any finding in this report, you should provide a response within 30 days of the date of this inspection report, with the basis for your disagreement, to the Regional Administrator, Region I, and the NRC Resident Inspector at Seabrook.

EX-15

P. Freeman

2

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter, its enclosure, and your response (if any), will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of the NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Sincerely,

Christopher G. Miller, Director
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No.: 50-443
License No.: NPF-86

Enclosure:
Inspection Report No. 05000443/201110
w/Attachment: Supplemental Information

cc w/encl: Distribution via ListServ