

From: Kalyanam, Kaly
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2011 3:06 PM
To: STEELMAN, WILLIAM J
Cc: Lent, Susan; Burkhardt, Janet
Subject: Acceptance Review Result for Request for Alternative, W3-CISI-002

Susan,

When you get a chance, could you please include this email in ADAMS?

Thanks

Kaly

The SUNSI information as follows:

Subject: Request for Alternative to ASME IWE-5221 Regarding Post Repair Testing of Waterford 3's Steel Containment Vessel Opening – W3-CISI-002

Plant: Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3

Docket No.: 50/382

Subject: TAC Nos.: ME6795

SUNSI Review Done: Yes. Publicly Available, Normal Release, Non-sensitive,

From: N. Kalyanam

To: W. Steelman

Subject: Acceptance Review Result for Relief Request W3-CISI-002

Mr. Steelman:

By letter dated July 27, 2011, Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy) submitted "Request for Alternative to ASME IWE-5221 Regarding Post Repair Testing of Waterford 3's Steel Containment Vessel Opening," for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3).

Entergy will be replacing the Waterford 3 steam generators (SGs) during the 18th refueling outage which will commence in the fall of 2012. The removal of a welded construction hatch in the SCV will be required for providing access for the original and replacement SGs in and out of containment. Entergy would be required to perform a containment integrated leak rate test (ILRT) in accordance with IWE-5221, "Leakage Test," of ASME Section XI and 10CFR50, Appendix J prior to reentry into Mode 4.

However, the performance of a localized leakage test provides a more appropriate leak test than an ILRT for the limited repair area. Therefore, Entergy is requesting relief from the ASME Section XI, IWE-5221 requirements to perform a localized pressure test for the associated repair of the Waterford 3 SCV.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the NRC staff's acceptance review of this Request for Alternative. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed Request for Alternative. If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

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

N. Kalyanam
Project Manager
ANO-1 and 2 & Waterford 3
DORL/NRR/NRC
Email: kaly.kalyanam@nrc.gov