

March 28, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Victor Nerses, Sr. Project Manager, Section 2     /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3, FACSIMILE  
TRANSMISSION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
(RAI) TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL  
(TAC NOS. MB6943)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on March 28, 2003, to Mr. Ravi Joshi, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (licensee). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by NRR and to support a conference call with the licensee to discuss the RAI. The RAI was related to the licensee's submittal dated November 26, 2002, concerning the Second Ten Year Interval Section XI Repair and Replacement Program. Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-423

Attachment: Draft RAI

March 28, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Victor Nerses, Sr. Project Manager, Section 2 /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3, FACSIMILE  
TRANSMISSION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
(RAI) TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL  
(TAC NOS. MB6943)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on March 28, 2003, to Mr. Ravi Joshi, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (licensee). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by NRR and to support a conference call with the licensee to discuss the RAI. The RAI was related to the licensee's submittal dated November 26, 2002, concerning the Second Ten Year Interval Section XI Repair and Replacement Program. Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-423

Attachment: Draft RAI

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC

J. Clifford

V. Nerses

E. Reichelt

PDI-2 Reading

Accession Number: ML030910249

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	EMCB/SC
NAME	VNerses	TCHAN
DATE	3/28/03	3/28/03

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

# DRAFT

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
MATERIALS AND CHEMICAL ENGINEERING BRANCH  
SECOND TEN YEAR INTERVAL SECTION XI REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT PROGRAM  
(TAC NO. MB6943)  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-65  
DOMINION NUCLEAR CONNECTICUT, INC  
MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3  
DOCKET NO. 50-423

1. Were the welding procedures and welding procedure qualifications reviewed and approved by the licensee? If so, what edition of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code did the procedures meet?
2. Were the non-destructive evaluation (NDE) reports reviewed by the licensee? If so, were the tests performed sensitive enough to identify discontinuities that may have been detrimental to the integrity of the welds? What were the results of all the inspections? You say the procedures either met or were reconciled to meet the ASME 1992 Edition of Section III, however, there is no statement identifying that the inspection results were acceptable.
3. Were the radiographs results and technique sheets reviewed by the licensee? Were the tests sensitive enough to identify discontinuities that may have been detrimental to the integrity of the welds?
4. Were all base material and filler material certifications reviewed and found to meet the requirements of the ASME Code? If so, who reviewed the certifications and what edition of the Code did the material meet?
5. Were production weld records provided and were they reviewed against the parameters of the production weld procedure used? Were the records reviewed by the licensee? Was the production weld performed by qualified welders?
6. The licensee identifies that no nonconformance reports were issued. However, several welds were repaired during fabrication. Please indicate if these repairs were considered minor, or major repairs and what sort of inspection method identified the need to have the repair performed. Was there grinding performed and if so, were the indications dimensionally inspected? Where is the in-process inspection and discrepancy documented?
7. What kind of Authorized Nuclear Inspector (ANI) involvement was provided? Did he witness welding, inspection, subassembly? Did the ANI approve the Code Data Report?
8. Was the pressure testing performed to Code Case N-416-1?
9. Please provide a breakdown of which joints on the "A" train and the "D" train required weld repair.
10. Did the licensee audit the vendor's facility and work?