

David H. Jones
Vice President
Engineering

**Southern Nuclear
Operating Company, Inc.**
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Birmingham, Alabama 35242

Tel 205.992.5984
Fax 205.992.0341



February 7, 2008

Docket No.: 50-348

NL-08-0146

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555-0001

**Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant – Unit 1
Inservice Inspection Summary Report
Response to Request for Additional Information**

Ladies and Gentlemen:

By letter NL-06-1766, dated August 17, 2006 Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) submitted the Unit 1 Inservice Inspection Summary Report which included the inspection results required by Technical Specification 5.6.10.

Subsequently, on December 20, 2007 the NRC staff issued a Request for Additional Information (RAI) regarding the 2006 Steam Generator Inspections. Enclosed is SNC's response to the NRC RAIs.

If you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D.H. Jones", is written over a circular stamp or seal.

D. H. Jones
Vice President - Engineering

DHJ/JLS/phr

Enclosure: Response to Request for Additional Information

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

NL-08-0146

Page 2

cc: Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Mr. J. T. Gasser, Executive Vice President
Mr. J. R. Johnson, Vice President – Plant Farley
Mr. D. H. Jones, Vice President – Engineering
RType: CFA04.054; LC# 14719

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mr. V. M. McCree, Acting Regional Administrator
Ms. K. R. Cotton, NRR Project Manager – Farley
Mr. E. L. Crowe, Senior Resident Inspector – Farley

**Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant – Unit 1
Inservice Inspection Summary Report
Response to Request for Additional Information**

Enclosure

Response to Request for Additional Information

**Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant – Unit 1
Inservice Inspection Summary Report
Response to Request for Additional Information**

Enclosure

Response to Request for Additional Information

NRC Request 1

Please clarify the statement in the report that no indications of wear were observed. Does this include wear caused by loose parts?

SNC Response to Request 1

No wear indications were observed from loose parts or antivibration bars (AVBs).

NRC Request 2

Please describe the secondary side inspections performed.

SNC Response to Request 2

- Sludge lancing in all three steam generators (SGs)
- Foreign Object Search and Retrieval (Bundle Annulus and Tube lane) in all three SGs
- Shell Wrapper and Annulus visual inspections in all three SGs
- Upper bundle In-Bundle inspections to inspect support plate ligaments and for blockage of the quatrefoil-shaped holes in the tube support plates (SG A)
- Visual inspection, through the upper handhole of 7th tube support plate, of support plate ligaments and for blockage of the quatrefoil-shaped holes in the tube support plate (SG A)
- 100% top of tubesheet In-Bundle visual inspection in all three SGs
- Wrapper Drop inspection in all three SGs

NRC Request 3

Were any Potential Loose Parts (PLPs) identified during the eddy current testing?

SNC Response to Request 3

No PLPs were identified with eddy current testing during 1R20. Eddy current testing was also performed for loose parts identified during secondary side inspections.

Enclosure

Response to Request for Additional Information

NRC Request 4

Were any of the loose parts identified in the U1R18, U1R19 or U1R20 inspections, left in the steam generator during the subsequent operating cycle? If so, please discuss the following regarding those loose parts:

- Indications of tube damage associated with the loose parts.
- The source or nature of the loose parts, if known.
- How will tube integrity be maintained with the loose parts left in service?

SNC Response to Request 4

Requested Item:

Were any of the loose parts identified in the U1R18, U1R19 or U1R20 inspections, left in the steam generator during the subsequent operating cycle?

Response:

Yes. An attempt was made to retrieve all loose parts. Those parts not removed (left remaining in the SGs) were very small or locked in the hard sludge.

Requested Item:

If so, please discuss the following regarding those loose parts:

- Indications of tube damage associated with the loose parts.

Response:

No wear (tube damage) indications were observed either with eddy current testing or by visual inspection.

Requested Item:

If so, please discuss the following regarding those loose parts:

- The source or nature of the loose parts, if known.

Response:

Machining remnants and spiral wound gaskets were the major contributors.

Requested Item:

If so, please discuss the following regarding those loose parts:

- How will tube integrity be maintained with the loose parts left in service?

Response:

An attempt was made to retrieve all loose parts. Those parts not removed (left remaining in the SGs) were very small or locked in the hard sludge. An engineering evaluation was

Enclosure

Response to Request for Additional Information

performed on all loose parts left in the SGs. The engineering evaluation concluded that there would be no adverse affect to the steam generators during the next cycle.

During 1R21, a 100% top of tubesheet visual inspection was performed for loose parts. No wear indications were observed.

NRC Request 5

Please clarify the bullet stating “Plus point of dents/dings \geq 2 volts.” Did this include all dents and dings with greater than or equal to 2 volts or was it a sampling inspection?

SNC Response to Request 5

All dents and dings 2.00 volts and greater as measured by the bobbin coil, from the current inspection and/or previous inspections (base line & first ISI), were rotating pancake coil (RPC) inspected with the plus point probe.