



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 28, 2018

Mr. William F. Maguire  
Site Vice President  
River Bend Station, Unit 1  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
5485 U.S. Highway 61 N  
St. Francisville, LA 70775

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON  
MARCH 6, 2018, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION AND ENTERGY REGARDING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE RIVER BEND STATION, UNIT 1  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION REVIEW (CAC NO. MF9757)

Dear Mr. Maguire:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Entergy Operations, Inc. (the applicant) held a public telephone conference call on March 6, 2018, to discuss and clarify the applicant's response to the staff's requests for additional information, RAIs B.1.4-1 and B.1.4-2 contained in RAI Set 5, (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML18025B750). The telephone conference call was held at the request of NRC to clarify the applicant's response to the staff's RAIs.

Enclosure 1 includes a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 provides a summary of the key points discussed in the conference call. The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary to ensure accuracy.

If you have any questions, please contact me by telephone at 301-415-4084 or via e-mail at [Emmanuel.Sayoc@nrc.gov](mailto:Emmanuel.Sayoc@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

/RA/

Emmanuel Sayoc, Project Manager  
License Renewal Project Branch  
Division of Materials and License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-458

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. Summary of the Telephone Call

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON  
MARCH 6, 2018, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION AND ENTERGY REGARDING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE RIVER BEND STATION, UNIT 1  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION REVIEW (CAC NO. MF9757)

**DISTRIBUTION:**

E-MAIL:

RidsNrrDmlr Resource  
RidsNrrDmlrMrpb Resource  
RidsNrrDmlrMenb Resource  
RidsNrrDmlrMphb Resource  
RidsNrrDmlrMccb Resource  
RidsNrrDmlrMvib Resource  
RidsNrrPMRiverBend Resource  
[RidsRgn4MailCenter@nrc.gov](mailto:RidsRgn4MailCenter@nrc.gov)

-----  
ESayoc  
AWong  
BAllik  
WGardner  
EOesterle  
SBloom  
DAlley  
SRuffin  
BWittick  
TMartinezNavedo  
SBailey  
LRegner  
TSherwin, OGC  
DMcIntyre, OPA  
SBurnell, OPA  
AMoreno, OCA  
JSowa, RIV  
BParks, RIV  
GPick, RIV  
JKozal, RIV  
CYoung, RIV  
GWerner, RIV  
VDricks, RIV  
[tbrous1@entergy.com](mailto:tbrous1@entergy.com)  
[DLach@entergy.com](mailto:DLach@entergy.com)  
[TSCHENK@entergy.com](mailto:TSCHENK@entergy.com)  
[alacey@entergy.com](mailto:alacey@entergy.com)

**ADAMS Accession No. ML18078A755**

OFFICE	PM:MRPB:DMLR	LA:MRPB:DMLR	BC:MRPB:DMLR	PM:MRPB:DMLR
NAME	ESayoc	YEdmonds	EOesterle	ESayoc
DATE	03/27/2018	03/22/2018	03/28/2018	03/28/2018

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE MARCH 6, 2018  
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL

PARTICIPANTS

AFFILIATIONS

Eric Oesterle	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Brian Allik	NRC
William Gardner	NRC
Emmanuel Sayoc	NRC
Albert Wong	NRC
Alan Cox	Entergy Nuclear Operations Inc. (Entergy)
Dave Lach	Entergy
Alyson Coates	Entergy
Mark Spinelli	Entergy
Steve McKissack	Entergy
Jim Morgan	Entergy
Randy Gauthreaux	Entergy
Mike Cooper	Entergy
Reggie Jackson	Entergy
Mark Sandusky	Entergy
Lisa Borel	Entergy
Ted Ivy	Entergy
Scott Kauffman	Exelon
Brian Messett	Florida Power and Light
Rick Orthen	Florida Power and Light
Mark Moenssens	Westinghouse
Matthew Golliet	Westinghouse

## SUMMARY OF THE TELEPHONE CALL

### **BACKGROUND**

During the public telephone conference call the following items were discussed.

GALL Report (NUREG-1801 Rev. 2) Aging Management Program (AMP) XI.M41, "Buried and Underground Piping and Tanks," as modified by LR-ISG-2015-01, "Changes to Buried and Underground Piping and Tank Recommendations," Table XI.M41-2, "Inspection of Buried and Underground Piping and Tanks," recommends that when conducting inspections for Preventive Action Category E (i.e., three inspections or five percent of the piping length per 10-year interval), it is permissible that cathodic protection does not meet performance goals; however, the conditions necessary to meet Preventive Action Category E are: coatings have been provided, backfill meets the recommendations in the "preventive actions" program element, plant-specific operating experience meets expectations, and soil sampling demonstrates that the soil is not corrosive.

The applicant's response to RAI B.1.4-1, dated January 24, 2018, states that Preventive Action Category F will be used in determining the number of inspections for portions of the in-scope buried steel piping where the cathodic protection system is not meeting performance goals (i.e., operational time period, effectiveness) unless the soil is demonstrated to be non-corrosive.

It was unclear to the staff how demonstration of soil non-corrosiveness constitutes the only condition necessary when transitioning from Preventive Action Category F to E. GALL Report AMP XI.M41, as modified by LR-ISG-2015-01, Table XI.M41-2 states that the four conditions to consider when transitioning from Preventive Action Category F to E are soil corrosivity, coatings, backfill and plant-specific operating experience.

In addition, in the applicant's response to RAI B.1.4-2, dated January 24, 2018, LRA Sections A.1.4 and B.1.4 state that the criterion for determining piping inspection locations will include in-scope piping protected by cathodic protection located in areas exceeding the limiting critical potential of -1200 mV in more than one survey.

It was unclear to the staff why exceeding the limiting critical potential in a single survey would not be considered when determining piping inspection location (e.g., instances where a single survey shows that the limiting critical potential has been exceeded by hundreds of millivolts).

During the public telephone conference call the applicant agreed to supplement its original response with additional information to explain its rationale on conditions to consider when transitioning from Preventive Action Category F to E and how exceeding the limiting critical potential would be considered when determining piping inspection location.

### **Response Date**

Entergy stated that they understand the concern and will be able to provide additional justification. Entergy staff agreed to supplement their RAI response and provide it no later than 30 days from the date of the public telephone conference call.