



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 22, 2008

Mr. Rick A. Muench
President and Chief Executive Officer
Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation
Post Office Box 411
Burlington, KS 66839

SUBJECT: WOLF CREEK GENERATING STATION – REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION RE: REVIEW OF RESULTS OF THE 16TH STEAM
GENERATOR TUBE INSPECTION (TAC NO. ME0124)

Dear Mr. Muench:

By letter dated October 27, 2008 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML083090879), Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC, the licensee) submitted the results of the 2008 steam generator (SG) tube inspection performed at Wolf Creek Generating Station during the 16th refueling outage.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has determined that the following additional information is required for staff to complete its review:

1. Please provide a high-level summary of the results of the scale profiling analysis.
2. In the submittal, there is discussion of the results of the J-tube secondary inspections (presumably from SG B). Please describe the results of the other secondary side inspections (e.g., upper bundle in-bundle in SG C, and upper steam drum in SG B).
3. In the submittal on page 6 of 7, it is stated, "One new indication was identified in SG B at the top of the tubesheet on the cold leg side." It is not clear from the remaining discussion in that paragraph whether this indication was attributed to a "transient" foreign object and whether it was present in previous inspection data. Please clarify.
4. Please discuss the results of your inspections of the plugs. For example, were all the plugs confirmed to be present?
5. In the submittal, it was indicated that there were no new indications of wear at the flow distribution baffle. These indicators had been attributed to pressure pulse cleaning. Please confirm that these indications have not changed in size (other than would be attributed to normal variability in sizing techniques).
6. In your submittal, there is a paragraph that indicates that no operational leakage was observed during Cycle 16 and that no other potential sources of accident-induced leakage were identified above the tubesheet during refueling outage 16. The remaining part of the paragraph appears to relate to a limit that

would be imposed on the amount of operational leakage (as determined from your accident-induced leakage limit). In other words, it appears to the staff that the first part of the paragraph is focused on condition monitoring and the second part of the paragraph is focused on the operational assessment. Please clarify the purpose of the second part of the paragraph. For example, is the purpose of the second part of the paragraph to simply indicate that no administrative limit is needed on the amount of operational leakage for the next operating cycle (i.e., Cycle 17)? If so, please confirm that your analysis of your refueling outage 16 inspection results indicates that there are no other potential sources of accident-induced leakage from above the tubesheet for Cycle 17.

This request for additional information (RAI) was sent to Ms. Diane Hooper of WCNOG via e-mail on December 15, 2008. Based on discussions with Ms. Hooper, on December 22, 2008, it was agreed that WCNOG will provide its RAI response by January 30, 2009.

The NRC staff considers that timely responses to RAIs help ensure sufficient time is available for the NRC staff to complete its review and contribute toward the NRC's goal of efficient and effective use of staff resources.

Sincerely,



Balwant K. Singal, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch IV
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-482

cc: Distribution via Listserv

December 22, 2008

R. Muench

- 2 -

would be imposed on the amount of operational leakage (as determined from your accident-induced leakage limit). In other words, it appears to the staff that the first part of the paragraph is focused on condition monitoring and the second part of the paragraph is focused on the operational assessment. Please clarify the purpose of the second part of the paragraph. For example, is the purpose of the second part of the paragraph to simply indicate that no administrative limit is needed on the amount of operational leakage for the next operating cycle (i.e., Cycle 17)? If so, please confirm that your analysis of your refueling outage 16 inspection results indicates that there are no other potential sources of accident-induced leakage from above the tubesheet for Cycle 17.

This request for additional information (RAI) was sent to Ms. Diane Hooper of WCNOG via e-mail on December 15, 2008. Based on discussions with Ms. Hooper, on December 22, 2008, it was agreed that WCNOG will provide its RAI response by January 30, 2009.

The NRC staff considers that timely responses to RAIs help ensure sufficient time is available for the NRC staff to complete its review and contribute toward the NRC's goal of efficient and effective use of staff resources.

Sincerely,
/RA/

Balwant K. Singal, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch IV
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-482

cc: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
LPLIV r/f

RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCTR Resource
RidsNrrDciCsgb Resource

RidsNrrDorLpl4 Resource
RidsNrrPMWolfCreek Resource
RidsNrrLAJBurkhardt Resource
RidsOgcRp Resource

RidsRgn4MailCenter Resource
EWong, NRR/DCI

ADAMS Accession No.: ML083510127

*Memo dated 12/9/08

OFFICE	NRR/LPL4/PM	NRR/LPL4/LA	NRR/CSGB	NRR/LPL4/BC	NRR/LPL4/PM
NAME	BSingal <i>BS</i>	JBurkhardt <i>JB</i>	AHiser*	MMarkley <i>MM</i>	BSingal <i>BS</i>
DATE	12-22-08	12/17/08	12/9/08	12/22/08	12-22-08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY