

NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

From: Miller, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 10:49 AM
To: 'lawrence.rudy@duke-energy.com'
Subject: FW: Draft RAI for MUR Flex Hose RR
Attachments: MF6452 Draft RAI.docx

Larry,

The NRC staff's draft RAI for the subject relief request is attached to this e-mail. The draft RAI is not an official NRC staff request and is being provided to you to facilitate a subsequent conference call to determine: 1) If the questions clearly convey the NRC staff information needs; 2) Whether the regulatory basis for the questions is understood; 3) Whether the information is already available in existing, docketed, correspondence; and 4) To determine an appropriate response time-frame. After you've had a chance to review the draft information request, please contact me to schedule the conference call.

Ed Miller
(301) 415-2481

Hearing Identifier: NRR_PMDA
Email Number: 2256

Mail Envelope Properties (abb100a4f5324663a0c11babb4d4b18f)

Subject: FW: Draft RAI for MUR Flex Hose RR
Sent Date: 7/29/2015 10:48:56 AM
Received Date: 7/29/2015 10:48:00 AM
From: Miller, Ed

Created By: Ed.Miller@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"lawrence.rudy@duke-energy.com" <lawrence.rudy@duke-energy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS03.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	660	7/29/2015 10:48:00 AM
MF6452 Draft RAI.docx	24942	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION UNIT 2
SPRING 2015 STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INSPECTIONS
TAC NO. MF6452
DOCKET No. 50-414

By letter dated July 6, 2015 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML15190A109) Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (the licensee), submitted information summarizing the results of the spring 2015 steam generator (SG) tube inspections at Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2. These inspections were performed during refueling outage 20 (RFO 20). In order to complete its review, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff requests the following additional information:

1. The report indicated that the scope of inspections included a "50% DNT sample (tubes not examined in 2EOC19)." Please clarify the voltage thresholds at which these dents were inspected (e.g., 50 percent of dents greater than 2 volts).
2. The report indicated that the tube at row 29, column 75 was plugged for a presumed crack-like indication at the tube support plate. Did the indication initiate from the inner or outer diameter of the tube? Please clarify whether or not the relevant tube (row 29, column 75) is a 2-sigma tube. If this was not a 2-sigma tube, was there any denting associated with the indications? If so, what was the magnitude of the dent?

ENCLOSURE