

**From:** "Robert L Gill Jr" <rlgill@duke-energy.com>  
**To:** "Rani Franovich" <RLF2@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 11/6/02 12:46PM  
**Subject:** Re: Response to open item 3.0.3.10.2-1

Rani,

Volumetric examinations will be performed on the locations within the scope of the RI-ISI program. The following statements are from the staff's SER dated June 12, 2002 that has been incorporated into the license renewal record by being referred to in our letter dated 10/28/2002:

(from page 2 of the SER) "The RI-ISI program maintains the fundamental requirements of the Code, such as examination technique, frequency, and acceptance criteria. However, the RI-ISI program is intended to reduce the number of required examination locations significantly while maintaining an acceptable level of quality and safety."

For confirmation of the above, the LR reviewers might consider discussing this with S.Dinsmore and P. Patnaik, the Principal Staff Contributors to the MNS RI-ISI SER. I believe that all of the required material information is already on the docket.

Bob

"Rani Franovich"  
<RLF2@nrc.gov> To: <rlgill@duke-energy.com>  
cc: "Barry Elliot" <BJE@nrc.gov>, "James Medoff"  
11/06/2002 10:39 <JXM@nrc.gov>, "Stephanie Coffin" <SMC1@nrc.gov>, "Samson  
AM Lee" <SSL1@nrc.gov>  
Subject: Re: Response to open item 3.0.3.10.2-1

Bob,

Does Duke plan to use volumetric examination of the sample of small-bore pipe welds? Or some other examination technique? Unfortunately, the October 28 letter is vague on this rather significant distinction....

Thanks,  
Rani

>>> "Robert L Gill Jr" <rlgill@duke-energy.com> 11/06/02 06:59AM >>>

Dear Rani,

Please re-review the relevant correspondence. In its original submittal dated June 26, 2001, Duke provided TWO relief requests. One to use risk-informed ISI, the other concerning relief from volumetric examination of socket welds.

In the staff letter dated June 12, 2002, look at the subject line: "Request to use risk-informed inservice inspection program". Look at the first paragraph in this letter. The staff states: The results of the

review indicate that your proposed RI-ISI program is an acceptable alternative to the requirements..." The staff approved the first relief request.

The second paragraph goes on to say "In addition..." The staff also approved the second relief request as noted in your note below.

As noted above, two relief requests were originally submitted by McGuire and both have been approved by the staff in its June 12, 2002 letter. Further confirmation of this may be obtained from the McGuire Part 50 PM - Bob Martin.

By the way, we are discussing with CNS plant management the need to revise its commitment concerning RI-ISI for license renewal. Will get back on that later.

Bob

"Rani Franovich"

<RLF2@nrc.gov> To:  
<rlgill@duke-energy.com>  
cc: "Barry Elliot"  
<BJE@nrc.gov>, "James Medoff"  
11/05/2002 02:57 <JXM@nrc.gov>, "Stephanie  
Coffin" <SMC1@nrc.gov>, "Samson  
PM Lee" <SSL1@nrc.gov>

Subject: Response to open

item 3.0.3.10.2-1

Hi Bob,

The following message came to me this afternoon from Jim Medoff. It pertains to the open item on small-bore piping examination.

"As we discussed earlier, the relief request approval referenced in our SE dated June 12, 2002, seems to only deal with approval of risk-informed visual inspections of Class 1 and 2 small bore socket welds and does not appear to address the issue of performing volumetric examinations of small bore Class 1 piping joined by full penetration butt welds. If this is the case, we need commitments for the applicant to submit risk-informed ISI programs for both the McGuire and Catawba stations in approval of risk-informed volumetric examination programs for small bore Class 1 piping joined by full penetration butt welds. These requests will need to be submitted pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i)."

Please advise us as to what Duke proposes to do to resolve this issue. We can discuss if you have any questions.

Thanks,  
Rani