

August 30, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Jack N. Donohew, Senior Project Manager, Section 2  
Project Directorate IV /RA/  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON LICENSEE'S LICENSE  
AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR OPERATION WITH ONE RPV HEAD  
CLOSURE BOLT NOT FULLY TENSIONED FOR WOLF CREEK  
(TAC NO. MA9990)

On August 10, 2001, the licensee sent an e-mail to the staff providing draft responses to a request for additional information (RAI) dated June 14, 2001 (ML011630386 and ML012080016 for the RAI e-mail). The draft responses were for a conference call between the staff and licensee on the licensee's application dated September 15, 2000 (WO 00-0036).

The draft responses were forwarded to the State of Kansas by e-mail dated August 10, 2001 (Attachment 1). The State had previously talked to the staff about its interest in the proposed amendment and requested that it wanted to participate in any conference call or meeting between the staff and the licensee on the application. Providing the State a copy of the draft responses helped the State to be able to participate in a conference call or meeting. A meeting could not be set up in August 2001 where all the individuals representing the staff and the licensee could attend (See ML012080016). Therefore, it was decided to conduct a conference call instead after the responses were received, and the call was set up for Thursday, August 16, 2001. This was approximately one week after receipt of the draft responses. The intent was to expedite the staff's review of the application and the licensee would submit the responses by letter after the call, with any additional information needed to clarify or expand on the responses. The draft responses from the licensee are in ADAMS ML012290223.

Attachment 2 is the State's comments on the licensee's response to the staff's June 14 RAI. The State stated that its initial concerns with the licensee's amendment request had been satisfied. The State decided not to participate in the conference call on August 16, 2001. Only the responses submitted by the licensee in its letter will be used by the staff in its evaluation of the licensee's requested amendment.

Docket No. 50-482

Attachments: 1. First E-mail dated August 10, 2001  
2. Second E-mail dated August 10, 2001

August 30, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Jack N. Donohew, Senior Project Manager, Section 2  
Project Directorate IV /RA/  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON LICENSEE'S LICENSE  
AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR OPERATION WITH ONE RPV HEAD  
CLOSURE BOLT NOT FULLY TENSIONED FOR WOLF CREEK  
(TAC NO. MA9990)

On August 10, 2001, the licensee sent an e-mail to the staff providing draft responses to a request for additional information (RAI) dated June 14, 2001 (ML011630386 and ML012080016 for the RAI e-mail). The draft responses were for a conference call between the staff and licensee on the licensee's application dated September 15, 2000 (WO 00-0036).

The draft responses were forwarded to the State of Kansas by e-mail dated August 10, 2001 (Attachment 1). The State had previously talked to the staff about its interest in the proposed amendment and requested that it wanted to participate in any conference call or meeting between the staff and the licensee on the application. Providing the State a copy of the draft responses helped the State to be able to participate in a conference call or meeting. A meeting could not be set up in August 2001 where all the individuals representing the staff and the licensee could attend (See ML012080016). Therefore, it was decided to conduct a conference call instead after the responses were received, and the call was set up for Thursday, August 16, 2001. This was approximately one week after receipt of the draft responses. The intent was to expedite the staff's review of the application and the licensee would submit the responses by letter after the call, with any additional information needed to clarify or expand on the responses. The draft responses from the licensee are in ADAMS ML012290223.

Attachment 2 is the State's comments on the licensee's response to the staff's June 14 RAI. The State stated that its initial concerns with the licensee's amendment request had been satisfied. The State decided not to participate in the conference call on August 16, 2001. Only the responses submitted by the licensee in its letter will be used by the staff in its evaluation of the licensee's requested amendment.

Docket No. 50-482

- Attachments: 1. First E-mail dated August 10, 2001  
2. Second E-mail dated August 10, 2001

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC RidsNrrPMJDonohew RidsNrrLAEPeyton  
PDIV-2 R/F

**Adams Accession No: ML012360222** NRR-106

OFFICE	PDIV-2/PM	PDIV-2/LA	PDIV-2/SC
NAME	JDonohew:am	EPeyton	SDembek
DATE	8/28/2001	8/28/2001	8/30/2001

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

FIRST E-MAIL DATED AUGUST 10, 2001

**From:** Jack Donohew  
**To:** Ron Fraass  
**Date:** 8/10/01 12:39PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Draft Response to Request for Additional Information on the LAR  
Regarding Reactor Pressure Vessel Head Closure Bolts

Attached is the email from Wolf Creek Nuclear operating Corporation with its draft response to the staff's RAI for the head closure bolt license amendment request. The schedule is to have the telephone conference call at 9:30 CDT on Thursday, August 16th, next week. <JND>

[The attachment referred to above is in ADAMS ML011XXXXX.]

SECOND E-MAIL DATED AUGUST 10, 2001

**From:** <RFraass@kdhe.state.ks.us>  
**To:** "Jack Donohew" <JND@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 8/10/01 1:35PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: Draft Response to Request for Additional Information on the LARRegarding Reactor Pressure Vessel Head Closure Bolts

Jack,

I read the draft reply.

If I focus on the answer to question 2, it appears that 52 of 54 studs are adequate to meet the ASME code. Although it would have been good to see a finite element study on 52 rather than just 53 studs, that probably is not necessary. The discussion of a lack of mechanisms to degrade the studs during operation also supports their request.

Question 11 focused on commitments by Wolf Creek concerning operations with one stud non-tensioned. Current management apparently believes it would not be appropriate to continue operations beyond one fuel cycle with a non-tensioned stud. However; a simple commitment to that concept would ensure that future management, perhaps under stress of deregulation, would continue to have that philosophy.

Based upon the comments from Wolf Creek, and if NRC agrees with their request, my initial concerns about the amendment are satisfied. I appreciate your work on this.

Ron

Ronald Fraass  
Supervisor, Environmental Radiation and Emergency Preparedness  
Radiation Control Program  
Kansas Department of Health and Environment  
Forbes Field, Bldg 283  
Topeka, KS 66620-0001  
(785) 296-1569  
FAX 296-0984  
rfraass@kdhe.state.ks.us  
rfraass@aol.com