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CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: This meeting will now come to order. This is a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Plant License Renewal Subcommittee. I am Otto Maynard, Chairman for this subcommittee meeting. ACRS members in attendance are Graham Wallis, William Schack, Mario Bonaca, Jack Sieber, Said Abdel-Khalik and Sam Armijo. Our ACRS consultant, John Barton is also present. Cayetano Santos with the ACRS staff, is a designated official for this meeting.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the license renewal application for the Oyster Creek Generating Station, the Associated Draft Safety Evaluation Report and other related documents. The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts and formulate proposed positions and actions as appropriate for deliberation by the full committee. The rules for participation in today's meeting were announced in the Federal Register on October 2nd, 2006. ACRS meetings are conducted in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. They are normally open to the public and provide opportunities for oral or written statements from...
members of the public to be considered as part of the Committee's information gathering process. I would like to emphasize that these comments should be limited to issues associated with the Oyster Creek Generating Station License Renewal Application.

We will hear presentations from representatives of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, the Region 1 office, and the Amergen Energy Company. We have also received requests for time to make oral statements at today's meeting. Mr. Paul Gunter of the Nuclear Information Resource Service and Mr. Richard Webster of the Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic will make their statements following the formal presentation by the Applicant and staff.

If anyone else in the audience would like to make a statement, please notify Mr. Cayetano Santos during the break and we will try to accommodate your request during the public comment portion of the agenda. We have received one written comment from a member of the public regarding today's meeting. This comment was provided by e-mail from Mr. Bill Hering, dated October 3rd, 2006. Copies have been distributed to the subcommittee. A transcript of the meeting is being kept and will be made available as stated in the
Federal Register notice. Therefore, we request that participants in this meeting use the microphones located throughout the meeting room when addressing the subcommittee.

Participants should first identify themselves and speak with sufficient clarity and volume so that they can be readily heard. Due to the number of people, we do have an overflow room next door. The audience can see the slides in that room. So if seating is not available in here, next door there should be some seating. Also due to a large number of people, I request to turn your cell phones off or at least put them on vibrate or your pagers on vibrate to minimize disturbance in the meeting.

I will now proceed with the meeting, and I call upon Ms. Louise Lund of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation to begin.

MS. LUND: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Louise Lund. I'm the Branch Chief of License Renewal Branch A in the Division of License Renewal. Beside me is also Frank Gillespie, our Director for the Division of License Renewal. The staff has conducted a very detailed and thorough review of the Oyster Creek Generating Station License Renewal Application which was submitted in July of
2005. Mr. Donnie Ashley, here to my right, is the
Project Manager for this review. He will lead the
staff's presentation this afternoon on the Draft
Safety Evaluation Report. In addition, we have Mr.
Michael Modes, who is our team leader for the Region
1 inspections that were conducted at Oyster Creek.

We also have several members of the NRR
technical staff here in the audience to provide
additional information and answer your questions. As
a result of the review, five open items were
identified which will be discussed in the
presentation. This also resulted -- our review
resulted in the issuance of 108 formal requests for
additional information. I know the ACRS has been
interested in the number of questions that have come
out in the reviews in the past. We believe part of
that reduction is as a result of the generic aging
lessons learned report. This application was
submitted using the draft GALL report that was issued
back in January 2005. However, it was reconciled with
a September 2005 version of the GALL report.

The GALL has certainly helped with the
review by providing a roadmap. The staff at Oyster
Creek provided excellent support for onsite audits and
inspections that were conducted and also the
headquarters review through the conference calls and numerous meetings that we've had. And would you like to make some opening remarks?

MR. GILLESPIE: Only what we tried to do and you're going to see when Donnie comes on is we're going to try to conserve the Committee's time so that we can kind of focus on questions and answers. We do have a large number of slides but we're going to try to go through them on the staff presentation very quickly and not duplicate what you're going to hear from the licensee. So we'll make some adjustments because we know, at least in this case there's a number of technical issues. This is the one plant that's the first one to have us focus on this containment shell question which is also a topic of litigation.

So you'll also find the staff being very careful and trying to be careful of their words at his point relative to saying anything too definitive about specific findings because this is not the final SE. This is the SE with open items. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Mike Gallagher from Exelon.

MR. GALLAGHER: Okay, good afternoon. My name is Mike Gallagher and I am the Vice President of License Renewal Projects for Amergen and Exelon. For
worst areas above it.

MEMBER WALLACE: That doesn't say very much.

MR. TAMBURNO: So it was no better.

MEMBER WALLACE: It was no better, right?

MR. GALLAGHER: Yeah, so it was the same. But there you would expect it to be similar because the sand, the wet sand -- there was sand throughout so the sand was contacting that. What we're saying is below that interface, it would be less -- the corrosion should be less significant because of the concrete that's embedded in it.

MEMBER ARMijo: And that's a debate, right? That's an ongoing debate.

MR. GALLAGHER: Well, we think we're consistent with the guidance that's in the GALL and --

MEMBER WALLACE: You replaced the seal, did you?

MR. GALLAGHER: We put that seal in.

MEMBER WALLACE: You put it in afterwards.

MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, this is the corrective action.

MEMBER WALLACE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: I'd like to move on with the presentation.
MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, sir.

MEMBER SIEBER: I'd like to ask, beyond, in our package the last slide you have is Slide 28. You're referring to backup slides which should be made part of the record. So -- okay.

MR. GALLAGHER: Yeah, any slide we show, we'll put in.

MEMBER SIEBER: Okay, we'll I'd like to have copies of this.

CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Yeah, I want to remind everybody, we still have the staff's presentation after this and we also have public comment time. I want to make sure we get a chance to get through this and we'll see where we need to come back to.

MEMBER WALLACE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'm responsible for this. I want to really know what's going on though, I'm afraid, so I have to ask these questions, because the presentation doesn't tell me unless I ask them, but I'll try to be brief.

MR. GALLAGHER: Okay, so leaving the embed, the drywell shell in the sandbed region was then coated. The coating that was applied was application of a three-coat epoxy coating system consisting of one coat of primer and two coats of epoxy coating. Each coat was visually examined and
dry film thickness measurements were taken to assure
the proper coating thickness was achieved. The
coating is a two-part 100 percent solid epoxy coating
which is less susceptible to the degradation and moist
environments. The coating was tested to qualify for
emersion surface coating applications such as tank
linings. The surrounding environment has stable
temperature conditions resulting in lower thermal
stresses being applied to the coating and therefore,
provides close to an ideal service environment which
will result if a very long service life.

MR. BARTON: Do you have any idea how long
that coating would be good for, the epoxy coating?

MR. GALLAGHER: We can have Ahmed answer
that question.

MR. OUAOU: There were some estimates done
by our engineering and it varied from 10 years to 20
years. Recently we spent a lot of time talking to the
vendor about the qualification of the coating and the
feedback we're getting is that there is no guarantee
for that coating, whether it is 20 years, 15 years,
whatever. However, you can rely on your inspections
to give you an indication whether you're approaching
the end life of the coating. So the rigor inspection
is the gauge as to when we think that coating is to
get replaced or repaired.

MR. BARTON: And the inspections are how frequent, every 10 years?

MR. OUAOU: The inspection, we inspect every fueling outage. We look at it basically every refueling outage.

MR. OUAOU: Every other refueling outage.

MR. GALLAGHER: Our current program, and I'll go into this, our current program which we do -- there's 10 bays. We do two of the 10 bays every other refueling outage and going forward, we're going to insure we do 100 percent of the bays every 10 years.

MEMBER SIEBER: And what's your cycle length, two years?

MR. GALLAGHER: Two-year refueling.

MEMBER ARMIJO: So it's every four years you inspect two out of 10 bays?

MR. GALLAGHER: That's the current program. Going forward, it will be a minimum of three every other outage to insure that we cover the you know, 10 bays.

CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Do you have a criteria that when you find degradation that you expand or you increase your frequency or expand the number you look at?
MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, Ahmed?

MR. OUAOU: Yes, in the future, we'll be performing the ASME IBE inspections for the coating. Which requires that if you perform an automatic inspection, you look at the coating and you find defects, you have to assess the other areas that you looked at if you're doing a sampling. So if we do find degradations, we would look at other areas in accordance with our corrective action process.

CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: And you have a criteria as to what constitutes degradation?

MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, in the inspection program.

MR. OUAOU: This is Ahmed. We do have criteria. We're using the criteria right out of the WE that's looking for blistering and flaking and cracking, et cetera, degradation of the coating.

MEMBER WALLACE: This slide would benefit from numbers. If the first bullet said .74 and the second bullet said .69 or something, it would help.

MEMBER SIEBER: Yeah, it sure would.

MEMBER WALLACE: Can you tell us what those numbers are, what the shell thickness needs to be and what it is? Are you going to tell us the numbers?