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

February 1, 2012

LICENSEE: FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

FACILITY: Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON JUNE 28, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on June 28, 2011, to discuss and clarify the applicant's responses to the staff's requests for additional information concerning the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station license renewal application.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a description of the staff concerns discussed with the applicant. A brief description on the status of the items is also included.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
JUNE 28, 2011

PARTICIPANTS	AFFILIATIONS
Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Bryce Lehman	NRC
Abdul Sheikh	NRC
Cliff Custer	FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC)
Steve Dort	FENOC
Kathy Nesser	FENOC
Jon Hook	FENOC
Dick Bair	FENOC
Tim Ridlon	FENOC
Don Kosloff	FENOC
Jake Hofelich	FENOC
David Chew	FENOC

ENCLOSURE 1

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

JUNE 28, 2011

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on June 28, 2011, to discuss and clarify the following responses to requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station license renewal application (LRA).

Response to RAI B.2.22-1

Discussion:

The staff requested the applicant to provide the basis for selecting only three locations for nondestructive testing (NDT) for such a large area. The staff finds that one-time NDT before the period of extended operation (PEO) will not be sufficient to establish a trend before the PEO. The applicant did not provide details on what and how it will inspect the annulus area. The staff stated that specific details are needed.

The applicant responded by stating that the basis for the three locations is that those are the areas of known leakage. The applicant stated that is not aware of leakage elsewhere. As far as trending, the applicant is confirming the analysis for the Cycle 13 Refueling Outage (RFO) Report rather than establishing a trend.

The staff stated that a follow-up RAI will be sent to the applicant to clarify the information provided. The staff also stated that the applicant needs to provide a basis for examining only three areas, describe the location of the exams (i.e., below current grout elevation, at grout surface, and above grout surface) and provide the basis for a one–time examination (i.e., this exam will verify the conclusions of the 13 RFO study.)

Action: The staff will issue a follow-up RAI.

Response to RAI B.2.22-2

Discussion:

The staff stated that the applicant needs to identify firm plans. The staff finds that just stating that it plans to access the inside surface of containment is not acceptable.

The staff requested additional information regarding the examination of the bottom head of the containment vessel. This activity will require removal of concrete in containment to gain access to the inside surface of the containment vessel to inspect for potential boric acid degradation. The applicant stated that there are several potential access locations; however a specific location and schedule has not been developed.

The staff stated that a follow-up RAI will be sent to the applicant so that a more specific schedule with details may be submitted by the applicant.

Action: The staff will issue a follow-up RAI.

Response to RAI B.2.22-3

Discussion:

The staff asked the applicant to explain how and when coating is inspected.

The applicant stated that a containment coating inspection is performed using its Coating Condition Assessment Program and is conducted every refueling outage.

The staff stated that there are no open questions for this RAI.

Response to RAI B.2.22-4

Discussion:

The staff stated that the response is not consistent with GALL recommendations. GALL Report, Program XI.S1 states: "Stainless steel penetration sleeves, dissimilar metal welds, bellows, and steel components that are subject to cyclic loading but have no current licensing basis fatigue analysis are monitored for cracking." However, the staff noted that the LRA states that the program is consistent with the GALL Report. RAI B.2.22-4 addresses an issue concerning the GALL Report, Revision 2, requirements for inspection of containment vessel penetrations for potential cracks in welds or the evaluation of the penetrations in a fatigue analysis.

The applicant stated that a completed plan is not currently available.

The staff stated that a follow-up RAI will be issued and the applicant is to provide details on whether inspection (potentially a sampling program) or analysis of the penetrations will be performed to satisfy this requirement.

Action: The staff will issue a follow-up RAI.

Response to RAI B.2.39-1

Discussion:

The staff stated that it needs more information on the core bore results and how the applicant concluded there is no concern with the structural integrity. The staff noted that the applicant should be prepared to discuss the report referenced in the RAI response. The staff also stated that it needs more details in the commitment (Commitment No. 33), specifically what will be done if the applicant cannot stop the leakage or the leakage begins again at a later date (e.g. core bores, more frequent inspections, etc.).

The applicant stated that the 2003 core drills were based on nondestructive examination results. The conclusion was that the leak did not adversely affect the structural integrity of the concrete inside containment. The primary concern was the refueling canal wall in the east/west tunnel area. The results were minor corrosion with a minimal effect on the concrete. The applicant also stated that a contractor conducted a pulse velocity test on the concrete samples and that there were also other exams of the concrete to determine what effect the leakage had.

The staff stated that, during the audit, it saw extensive corrosion, indicating the leakage has continued since 2003. The applicant explained that there is surface rust in the area but rust stains are not from the rebar inside. The staff stated that more information is needed as to why the 2003 report is still applicable today. The staff will issue a follow-up RAI and ask the applicant to include details on the location and number of core drills, types of testing to be performed, actions to stop leakage, plans for addressing continued leakage or renewed leakage. The staff will also request the applicant's plans for addressing commodities in the containment east/west tunnel (conduit, pipe supports, etc.) affected by the refueling canal leakage.

Action: The staff will issue a follow-up RAI.

Response to RAI B.2.39-2

Discussion:

The staff noted that to address its concerns the applicant should provide a two-part solution: (1) concrete bores to verify past leakage did not degrade walls and (2) future actions to ensure leakage does not occur again. The staff noted that the applicant addressed part 1; however, it did not adequately address part 2. The staff stated that the applicant should commit to take actions to ensure the leak-chase system remains operable during the PEO (e.g. boroscopic inspections at a technically justifiable interval).

In response to part 2 of the question, the applicant stated that a preventative maintenance task was created to clean leak chase components on a three-year basis. Previously, there had been about 10 years between cleanings. The applicant stated that a 3-year program will be in place. The channel leakage will continue to be monitored monthly and trended. If necessary, a condition report will be generated and an investigation will be conducted. The staff stated that a follow-up RAI will be sent and requested that the applicant consider a commitment for its future actions.

Action: The staff will issue a follow-up RAI.

Other

Discussion:

The staff stated brief questions on AMRs 3.5.2.3.12-1 and 3.5.2.3.12-2 but was unsure if the applicant was prepared to discuss these issues. The staff stated that follow-up RAIs may be issued on the following items concerning opportunistic periodic inspections.

- AMR 3.5.2.3.12-1 concerns the emergency diesel generator fuel oil tank hold down components and how the applicant response discusses undisturbed natural soil.
- AMR 3.5.2.3.12-2 concerns galvanized steel corrugated piping buried adjacent to the Intake Structure.

Lastly, the staff stated that it had a question related to Appendix J RAI B.2.1.5.1-1 and the qualifications of personnel. The staff stated that the applicant references its own procedures and that these procedures are not docketed. The staff noted that the applicant will need to confirm its standards.

An RAI (later determined to be B.2.1-2) has been sent to the applicant addressing this Appendix J issue.

There was no further discussion, and the call was concluded.

LICENSEE: FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

FACILITY: Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON JUNE 28, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on June 28, 2011, to discuss and clarify the applicant's responses to the staff's requests for additional information concerning the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station license renewal application.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a description of the staff concerns discussed with the applicant. A brief description on the status of the items is also included.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA/
Samuel Cuadrado de Jesús
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML12018a022

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC:RPB1:DLR
NAME	YEdmonds	SCuadrado de Jesús	D Morey
DATE	01/26/12	01/ 27 /12	02/ 01 /12

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memorandum to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company from S. CuadradoDeJesus dated February 1, 2012

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON JUNE 28, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND FIRSTENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC. NO. ME4640)

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:
PUBLIC [or NON-PUBLIC, if applicable]
RidsNrrDlr Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource
RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRapb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource
RidsNrrDlrRpob Resource

PCooper
BHarris
SCuadrado
EMiller
MMahoney
ICouret, OPA
TReilly, OCA
BHarris, OGC