

November 12, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief  
Project Directorate II-2  
Division of Licensing Project Management

FROM: A. Louise Lund, Chief */RA/*  
Steam Generator Integrity & Chemical Engineering Section  
Materials and Chemical Engineering Branch  
Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING  
THE MILLSTONE UNIT 3 STEAM GENERATOR TUBE  
INSPECTION SUMMARY REPORTS FOR THEIR FALL 2002  
OUTAGE (TAC NO.: MC0631)

By letters dated October 7, 2002 (ML022910045) and August 25, 2003 (ML032471591), Dominion Nuclear Connecticut Inc., the licensee, submitted the steam generator tube plugging and inspection summary reports for the Millstone Power Station Unit 3 for their Fall 2002 outage in accordance with the plant's Technical Specifications. The NRC staff participated in a conference call on September 18 and 20, 2002 (ML023110528), with Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc, representatives regarding the ongoing steam generator tube inspection activities at Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3.

The staff has reviewed the information the licensee provided and determined that additional information is required in order to complete the evaluation. The additional information being requested is attached. Please forward the attached request for additional information to the licensee.

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: Yamir Díaz EMCB/DE  
301-415-2228

B/q

November 12, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief  
Project Directorate II-2  
Division of Licensing Project Management

FROM: A. Louise Lund, Chief **/RA**  
Steam Generator Integrity & Chemical Engineering Section  
Materials and Chemical Engineering Branch  
Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING  
THE MILLSTONE UNIT 3 STEAM GENERATOR TUBE  
INSPECTION SUMMARY REPORTS FOR THEIR FALL 2002  
OUTAGE (TAC NO.: MC0631)

By letters dated October 7, 2002 (ML022910045) and August 25, 2003 (ML032471591), Dominion Nuclear Connecticut Inc., the licensee, submitted the steam generator tube plugging and inspection summary reports for the Millstone Power Station Unit 3 for their Fall 2002 outage in accordance with the plant's Technical Specifications. The NRC staff participated in a conference call on September 18 and 20, 2002 (ML023110528), with Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc, representatives regarding the ongoing steam generator tube inspection activities at Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3.

The staff has reviewed the information the licensee provided and determined that additional information is required in order to complete the evaluation. The additional information being requested is attached. Please forward the attached request for additional information to the licensee.

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: Yamir Díaz EMCB/DE  
301-415-2228

DISTRIBUTION:

EMCB RF LLund YDíaz MMurphy VNerses

G:\EMCB\Díaz,Yamir\Millstone ISI Review\Millstone 3 RAI.wpd

OFFICE	EMCB:DE	E	EMCB:DE	
NAME	YDíaz	LLund		
DATE	11/12/03	11/12/03		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR  
DOMINION NUCLEAR CONNECTICUT INC  
MILLSTONE UNIT 3 STEAM GENERATOR  
TUBE INSPECTION REPORT FOR THEIR 2002 OUTAGE  
DOCKET NO. 50-423

1. On page two of your inservice inspection report you indicated that the rotating pancake coil (RPC) examinations in Steam Generator (SG) A resulted in 43 volumetric indications. 28 of these indications were determined to be manufacturing burnish marks (MBM) and the remaining 15 were considered to be MBM or loose part wear that could not be confirmed with bobbin coil. The last 15 indications were reported as single volumetric indications (SVI) and documented in Attachment 4 of your report. There seems to be a difference between the number of SVIs listed in Attachment 4 and the number of SVIs discussed in the report. A similar situation occurs for the number of SVIs in SG C. Please clarify the differences.

2. On page four of your inservice inspection report you indicated that one tube in the C SG was identified with an obstruction. Please describe the nature of the obstruction. Include in your response a discussion of whether the obstruction was service induced and the extent and location of the obstruction (e.g., what was the largest size probe to be passed through the tube during this outage and previous outages).

3. On page four of your report you indicate that a SVI was identified and in contact with a non-retrievable loose part. Please discuss the nature of this part and discuss the results of evaluations performed to ensure the part would not damage other adjacent tubes. In addition, please discuss what other loose parts have been left in the SGs and the results of any evaluations performed to ensure these parts would not result in a loss of tube integrity for the period of time between inspections.

ATTACHMENT