

From: [Vu, Phong T](#)
To: [Robertson, Jeffrey N](#); [Sreenivas, V](#)
Cc: [Murphy, George M](#); [Hentz, Lee A](#)
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: RE: McGuire Unit No. 2: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW- Relief Request Alternative Testing approval for Two PORV Block Valves (CAC Nos. MF8416)
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 5:00:59 PM
Attachments: [RR MC-SRV-NC-01 Additional Info.docx](#)

Dr. V,

Attached is our response to the two questions. Please let me know if you need anything else.
Thanks.

PT

From: Robertson, Jeffrey N
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 1:58 PM
To: Sreenivas, V
Cc: Murphy, George M; Vu, Phong T; Hentz, Lee A
Subject: RE: RE: McGuire Unit No. 2: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW- Relief Request Alternative Testing approval for Two PORV Block Valves (CAC Nos. MF8416)

Dr. V,

PT Vu and Lee Hentz are working on the response now.

Jeff Robertson
MNS Regulatory Affairs Manager
980-875-4499 (w)
704-562-7267 (c)

From: Sreenivas, V [<mailto:V.Sreenivas@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 1:32 PM
To: Robertson, Jeffrey N
Cc: Murphy, George M; Hentz, Lee A
Subject: RE: RE: McGuire Unit No. 2: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW- Relief Request Alternative Testing approval for Two PORV Block Valves (CAC Nos. MF8416)

Jeff, I am working on the SE, when you get chance pl give me call to for me to capture outcome of your call on last Thursday. Thank you, -V

From: Sreenivas, V
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 12:42 PM
To: 'Robertson, Jeffrey N' <Jeffrey.Robertson@duke-energy.com>

Cc: Murphy, George M <George.Murphy2@duke-energy.com>; Hentz, Lee A <Lee.Hentz@duke-energy.com>

Subject: RE: RE: McGuire Unit No. 2: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW- Relief Request Alternative Testing approval for Two PORV Block Valves (CAC Nos. MF8416)

I forwarded this to Mike Markley, BC. He will lead this call. I am in training between 1 to 3:15.

From: Robertson, Jeffrey N [<mailto:Jeffrey.Robertson@duke-energy.com>]

Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 12:30 PM

To: Sreenivas, V <V.Sreenivas@nrc.gov>

Cc: Murphy, George M <George.Murphy2@duke-energy.com>; Hentz, Lee A <Lee.Hentz@duke-energy.com>

Subject: [External_Sender] RE: McGuire Unit No. 2: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW- Relief Request Alternative Testing approval for Two PORV Block Valves (CAC Nos. MF8416)

Dr. V,

We've set up a phone call to answer the following NRC questions at 3 PM:

1. Does the Surveillance Test Frequency Program allow the test frequency to be extended beyond 2X the existing frequency.
2. The Relief Request indicates we will test the valve at cold shutdown. Is the cold shutdown test adequate to test the valve function at the applicable TS modes.
3. Do we intend to repair the valve packing if we have a forced shutdown.
4. How is maintenance rule impacted by the change in surveillance frequency.

Please call request NRC participants to call into:

704-382-8080 or 866-385-2663 with PIN 277871

Thanks

Jeff Robertson

MNS Regulatory Affairs Manager

980-875-4499 (w)

704-562-7267 (c)

From: Sreenivas, V [<mailto:V.Sreenivas@nrc.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 10:21 AM

To: Capps, Steven D

Cc: Robertson, Jeffrey N; Richards, Brian H; Vu, Phong T; Murphy, George M; Miller, Ed; Farnan, Michael

Subject: McGuire Unit No. 2: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW- Relief Request Alternative Testing approval for Two PORV Block Valves (CAC Nos. MF8416)

***** Exercise caution. This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. *****

By letter dated September 29, 2016, Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession Nos. ML16274A066, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy), the licensee, submitted alternative request to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The licensee requested an alternative test plan for two PORV Block Valves in lieu of certain inservice testing (IST) requirements of the 2004 Edition through 2006 Addenda of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) *Code for Operation and Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants* (OM Code) for the IST program at McGuire Nuclear Station (MNS) Unit 2 during the fourth 10-year IST program interval. Specifically, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50, section 50.55a(z)(2), the licensee requested to use proposed alternatives since complying with the current ASME OM Code requirements would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety. The purpose of this e-mail is to provide the results of the NRC staff's acceptance review of this relief request. 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.

The NRC staff has reviewed the submittal and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed request in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff's ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. If additional information is needed, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

V. Sreenivas, Ph.D., CPM.,
Project Manager
NRR/DORL/LPL2-1
301-415-2597
