

August 16, 2007

Mr. Richard M. Rosenblum
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

SUBJECT: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 -
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSED
AMENDMENT ON STEAM GENERATOR TUBE SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM,
TUBE REPAIR (TAC NOS. MD2584 AND MD2585)

Dear Mr. Rosenblum:

By letter dated July 14, 2006 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML061990071), as supplemented by later dated June 28, 2007, Southern California Edison submitted an application to change the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3, technical specifications (TS) related to steam generator tube integrity TS. The proposed amendment incorporates a description of the parent tube inspection limitation adjacent to the nickel-band portion of the lower sleeve joint and provides the bases for the structural and leakage integrity of the joint being ensured with the existing inspection of the parent tube adjacent to the nickel-band region.

After reviewing your request, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that additional information is needed to complete the review. We discussed the enclosed request for additional information (RAI) with your staff by telephone and they agreed to provide a response to the RAI by the third week of September 2007.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1480.

Sincerely,

/RA/

N. Kalyanam, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch IV
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

August 16, 2007

Mr. Richard M. Rosenblum
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

SUBJECT: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 -
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSED
AMENDMENT ON STEAM GENERATOR TUBE SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM,
TUBE REPAIR (TAC NOS. MD2584 AND MD2585)

Dear Mr. Rosenblum:

By letter dated July 14, 2006 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML061990071), as supplemented by later dated June 28, 2007, Southern California Edison submitted an application to change the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3, technical specifications (TS) related to steam generator tube integrity TS. The proposed amendment incorporates a description of the parent tube inspection limitation adjacent to the nickel-band portion of the lower sleeve joint and provides the bases for the structural and leakage integrity of the joint being ensured with the existing inspection of the parent tube adjacent to the nickel-band region.

After reviewing your request, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that additional information is needed to complete the review. We discussed the enclosed request for additional information (RAI) with your staff by telephone and they agreed to provide a response to the RAI by the third week of September 2007.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1480.

Sincerely,

/RA/

N. Kalyanam, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch IV
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

LPLIV r/f

RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter

RidsNrrDciCsgb

RidsNrrDorl (CHaney/JLubinski)

RidsNrrDorlDpr

RidsNrrDorlLpl4 (THiltz)

RidsNrrLAJBurkhardt

RidsNrrPMNKKalyanam

RidsOgcrp

RidsRgn4MailCenter (TPruett)

K. Karwoski, DCI/CSGB

ADAMS Accession No.: ML072220365

*No major change from Staff provided RAI

OFFICE	NRR/LPL4/PM	NRR/LPL4/LA	NRR/DCI/CSGB*	NRR/LPL4/BC
NAME	NKalyanam	JBurkhardt	AHiser	THiltz
DATE	8/14/07	8/14/07	7/30/07	8/16/07

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
Units 2 and 3

cc:

Mr. Raymond W. Waldo, Vice President,
Nuclear Generation
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

Mr. Douglas K. Porter, Esquire
Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

Dr. David Spath, Chief
Division of Drinking Water and
Environmental Management
California Dept. of Health Services
850 Marina Parkway, Bldg P, 2nd Floor
Richmond, CA 94804

Chairman, Board of Supervisors
County of San Diego
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335
San Diego, CA 92101

Mark L. Parsons
Deputy City Attorney
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522

Mr. Gary L. Nolff
Assistant Director - Resources
City of Riverside
3900 Main Street, 4th Floor
Riverside, CA 92522

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Arlington, TX 76011-8064

Mr. Michael J. DeMarco
San Diego Gas & Electric Company
8315 Century Park Ct. CP21G
San Diego, CA 92123-1548

Director, Radiologic Health Branch
State Department of Health Services
P.O. Box 997414, MS 7610
Sacramento, CA 95899-7414

Resident Inspector
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 4329
San Clemente, CA 92674

Mayor
City of San Clemente
100 Avenida Presidio
San Clemente, CA 92672

Mr. James T. Reilly
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

Mr. James D. Boyd, Commissioner
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street (MS 31)
Sacramento, CA 95814

Brian Katz
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

Mr. Steve Hsu
Department of Health Services
Radiologic Health Branch
MS 7610, P.O. Box 997414
Sacramento, CA 95899-7414

Mr. A. Edward Scherer
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

May 2007

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI)
REGARDING SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3
STEAM GENERATOR TUBE SURVEILLANCE
TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION AMENDMENT
DOCKET NOS. 50-361 AND 50-362

The following questions are a continuation to those in our previous RAI letter dated May 17, 2007:

21. In your June 28, 2007, letter, you indicated (in your response to question 20), that the text in your July 14, 2006, letter (Enclosure 5) was discussing the leakage from two different sources: the tube-to-tubesheet joint and the tube-to-sleeve joint. Please clarify whether this is correct. If so, how was the leakage from the tube-to-sleeve joint distinguished from the leakage from the tube-to-tubesheet joint and which results in Table 6-1 apply to the tube-to-sleeve joint? In addition, please clarify the following:
 - a. The text on page 6-1 of your July 14, 2006, letter (Enclosure 5) indicates that samples 1, 2, 6, and 8 and all 7/8-inch samples essentially did not leak during room temperature testing. Assuming that leakage of 2.7×10^{-6} gallons per minute (gpm) is considered negligible (per your June 28, 2007, letter), please clarify whether sample 5 leaked under room temperature conditions.
 - b. You indicated that the leak rate from the room temperature specimens is bounded by 2.72×10^{-6} gpm. In this case, please clarify the leak rate for specimen 4 (3/4-inch tubing), which is reported in Table 6-1 as having leaked at 5.44×10^{-5} gpm.
22. In your June 28, 2007, letter, you indicated (in your response to question 1), that additional testing was judged not to be necessary to establish the integrity of the sleeve joint over the limited operating period until steam generator replacement. As a result, it appears (to the staff) that you may not have performed certain tests and analyses (e.g., load cycling tests) since the sleeves were not expected to be in service for an extended period of time. Given that it appears that you are relying, in part, on the sleeves not being installed for the licensed operating time of the facility, discuss your plans to place a limitation in your technical specifications that all sleeves will be removed from service by a specific date (e.g., December 2009 for Unit 2 and December 2010 for Unit 3) or after a specific period of time (i.e., all tubes with sleeves shall be plugged after the sleeve has been in service for "x" years). The specific date or time period should be chosen consistent with the results of your assessment. The staff recognizes that no sleeves are currently installed in Unit 3. Alternatively, provide the appropriate test results and analyses (i.e., those tests and analyses performed during initial licensing of the sleeves and affected by a shorter rolled joint) that support continued operation of the sleeves, with a shorter rolled joint length, for the licensed operating time of the facility.