

October 17, 2005

Mr. David A. Christian
Senior Vice President
and Chief Nuclear Officer
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, REGARDING MILLSTONE
POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3, STEAM GENERATOR PLUGGING REPORT
(TAC NO. MC6714)

Dear Mr. Christian:

By letters dated May 3, 2004, and April 7, 2005, respectively, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. submitted the 15-day steam generator (SG) plugging report in accordance with Technical Specification (TS) Sections 4.4.5.5.a and 6.9.2, and the 12-month SG tube inspection report in accordance with TS Sections 4.4.5.5.b and 6.9.2. In order to complete its review of the reports, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff requires responses to the attached questions. These questions were forwarded electronically to Mr. Paul Willoughby of your staff on September 20, 2005. Please provide your responses within 60 days of the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

/RA/

George F. Wunder, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

Mr. David A. Christian
Senior Vice President
and Chief Nuclear Officer
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, REGARDING MILLSTONE
POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3, LEAD TEST ASSEMBLY EXTENDED BURNUP
(TAC NO. MC6714)

Dear Mr. Christian:

By letters dated May 3, 2004, and April 7, 2005, respectively, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. submitted the 15-day steam generator (SG) plugging report in accordance with Technical Specification (TS) Sections 4.4.5.5.a and 6.9.2, and the 12-month SG tube inspection report in accordance with TS Sections 4.4.5.5.b and 6.9.2. In order to complete its review of the reports, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff requires responses to the attached questions. These questions were forwarded electronically to Mr. Paul Willoughby of your staff on September 20, 2005. Please provide your responses within 60 days of the date of this letter.

Sincerely,
/RA/

George F. Wunder, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	CRaynor	PKrohn, RGN-I	DLPM DPR
PDI-2 Reading	LLund	OGC	
DRoberts	GWunder	ACRS	

ACCESSION NUMBER: ML052640170

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	PDI-2/LA	PDI-2/SC
NAME	GWunder	CRaynor	DRoberts
DATE	10/17/05	10/14/05	10/17/05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3

cc:

Lillilan M. Cuoco, Esquire
Senior Counsel
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Edward L. Wilds, Jr., Ph.D.
Director, Division of Radiation
Department of Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

First Selectmen
Town of Waterford
15 Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. P. J. Parulis
Manager - Nuclear Oversight
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. W. R. Matthews
Senior Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. John Markowicz
Co-Chair
Nuclear Energy Advisory Council
9 Susan Terrace
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. Evan W. Woollacott
Co-Chair
Nuclear Energy Advisory Council
128 Terry's Plain Road
Simsbury, CT 06070

Senior Resident Inspector
Millstone Power Station
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 513
Niantic, CT 06357

Mr. G. D. Hicks
Director - Nuclear Station Safety
and Licensing
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Ms. Nancy Burton
147 Cross Highway
Redding Ridge, CT 00870

Mr. William D. Meinert
Nuclear Engineer
Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale
Electric Company
Moody Street
P.O. Box 426
Ludlow, MA 01056

Mr. J. Alan Price
Site Vice President
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. Chris Funderburk
Director, Nuclear Licensing and
Operations Support
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

Mr. David W. Dodson
Licensing Supervisor
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3

cc:

Mr. S. E. Scace
Assistant to the Site Vice President
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. M. J. Wilson
Manager - Nuclear Training
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. A. J. Jordan, Jr.
Director - Nuclear Engineering
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. S. P. Sarver
Director - Nuclear Station Operations
and Maintenance
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

REVIEW OF STEAM GENERATOR INSPECTION REPORTS

DOCKET NO. 50-423

By letters dated May 3, 2004, and April 7, 2005, respectively, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. submitted the 15-day steam generator (SG) plugging report in accordance with Technical Specification (TS) Sections 4.4.5.5.a and 6.9.2, and the 12-month SG tube inspection report in accordance with TS Sections 4.4.5.5.b and 6.9.2. In order to complete its review of the reports, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff requires responses to the following questions.

1. On Page 3 of the letter dated April 7, 2005 (12-month report), it is stated that possible loose part signals were identified for two tubes in SG B. No associated tube degradation was reported. Were these loose parts removed from SG B? If not, what hindered the removal of these parts? Discuss any other loose parts that may have been left in service. In addition, provide the results of any evaluations performed to ensure the loose parts left in service will not result in a loss of tube integrity for the period between inspections.
2. Page 3 of the 12-month report stated that manufacturing burnish marks (MBM) were reported for SG B (9) and SG D (6). The MBMs were determined not to be service-induced for both SGs. Discuss whether the MBMs were traceable to the baseline inspection to support that they were not service-induced, and if their signals had undergone any changes.
3. Due to dents and dings being areas of increased stress, discuss the scope and results of any dent and ding examinations performed during the 9th refueling outage. If no inspections were performed, provide the basis for not performing such inspections.
4. On Page 4 of the 12-month report, it is reported that two single volumetric indications (SVI) are due to hand-hole installation during SG fabrication. Discuss which tubes (e.g., Row 27, Column 39) are related to the installed hand-holes, and if the SVIs were traceable to the baseline inspection. In addition, discuss whether the SVI signals had undergone any changes.
5. It was stated on Page 5 of the 12-month report that an SVI in Tube Row 1, Column 1 (R1C1) appeared to be a manufacturing defect similar to tubes plugged prior to startup. Discuss whether previous rotating pancake coil (RPC) exams of Tube R1C1 have been performed. In addition, discuss any changes the SVI may have undergone from any previous exams.
6. Page 5 of the 12-month report indicates that five tubes with SVI and/or PLP signals were plugged due to the area not being accessible for visual inspection. Were the five tubes stabilized in case there was a loose part present?

7. Discuss whether a visual inspection was performed on Tube R5C1 which contained a SVI with no associated loose part signal (from eddy current). In addition, provide the results of the inspection, if a visual inspection was performed.
8. Regarding the staff's review summary of the 8th refueling outage dated April 25, 2004, discuss any other restricted or ovalized tubes that may have been identified (even though not plugged) during this outage.
9. Table 1 of the annual report indicates that RPC was performed for 50% of Row 1 and Row 2 U-bends. Please provide the basis for not expanding the scope of the U-bend inspection given that an indication was found in Row 1.
10. On Page 4 of the 12-month report, it was indicated that four tubes with indications attributed to Freespan indications, possibly MBMs which could not be confirmed by historical bobbin data were left in service. Please describe these indications in greater detail. If they are not traceable to previous inspections, why were they not considered degraded and plugged?