

From: Guzman, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 7:37 AM
To: 'Wanda D Craft (Generation - 6)'
Subject: RE: NRC letter of May 29, 2015 MPS2 - Reactor Vessel Internals Aging Management Program and Inspection Plan for License Renewal Commitment No. 13 (Tac. No. MF3402)

Wanda,

I have discussed these apparent inconsistencies and/or errors with the technical staff. We agree that the items identified below are indeed editorial errors in the safety assessment; however, they do not affect the staff's assessment determination or change the stated safety conclusions. Please consider this e-mail as documented acknowledgement from the NRR technical staff of these identified errors in the May 29, 2015, subject safety assessment.

Thanks,
Rich

Rich Guzman
Sr. Project Manager
NRR/DORL
US NRC
301-415-1030

From: Wanda D Craft (Generation - 6) [<mailto:wanda.d.craft@dom.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2015 5:02 PM
To: Guzman, Richard
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC letter of May 29, 2015 MPS2 - Reactor Vessel Internals Aging Management Program and Inspection Plan for License Renewal Commitment No. 13 (Tac. No. MF3402)

Rich,
In review of the subject letter, a few differences were noted between the DNC submittal and the NRC safety assessment letter. The differences are described in the table below:

Safety Assessment	Comment	Suggested resolution
Page 2, para 3, last sentence	Reference is made to "modification/rework package (MRP)-227-A." The phrase "modification/rework package" is not the meaning of "MRP". The correct meaning of the acronym is "Materials Reliability Program".	Delete "modification/rework package" since the meaning of MRP is already explained prior to this occurrence.
Page 19, "Staff Evaluation", first para, 3 rd sentence	Sentence states "The licensee's maximum allowable gap corresponds to a linear growth of 4 percent or a volumetric swelling amount of 12 percent." DNC did not provide these values in its submittals and the analysis described by DNC was not predicated on specific values of void swelling.	
Page 22, last para	The staff summarizes the DNC submittal for the core support plate flow holes as being "(less than 2-inch	Correct to "less than 2 ¼ inch"

	except for one 3-inch flow hole per quadrant)". The "2-inch" value is not correct. Page 6 of the DNC submittal dated July 27, 2014 stated that the flow holes are "less than 2 ¼ inch."	
--	---	--

If you have any questions, please let me know. Thanks.

Wanda D. Craft
Nuclear Licensing and Operations Support
Dominion Resources Services, Inc
(804) 273-4687
tie-line 730-4687

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message contains information which may be legally confidential and or privileged and does not in any case represent a firm ENERGY COMMODITY bid or offer relating thereto which binds the sender without an additional express written confirmation to that effect. The information is intended solely for the individual or entity named above and access by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please reply immediately to the sender that you have received the message in error, and delete it. Thank you.