



DAVE BAXTER
Vice President
Oconee Nuclear Station

Duke Energy
ON01VP / 7800 Rochester Highway
Seneca, SC 29672

864-873-4460
864-873-4208 fax
dabaxter@dukeenergy.com

May 13, 2010

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3
Docket No: 50-287
Fourth Ten Year Inservice Inspection Interval
Request for Relief No. 08-ON-002
Request for Resumption of Review

By letter dated December 29, 2008 (ML090050027), Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) submitted Request for Relief No. 08-ON-002 seeking relief, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(5)(iii), from the requirement to examine 100% of the volume specified by the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, 1998 Edition with 2000 Addenda (as modified by Code Case N-460). Duke received two requests for additional information (RAI) and replied to each (August 7, 2009 ML092250467 and December 2, 2009 ML093410636).

Subsequently, the NRC Project Manager was informed by a telephone call on November 18, 2009 of errors in Relief Request No. 09-MN-006 from Duke Energy's McGuire Nuclear Station. As a result of discovery of that error, Duke Energy requested that the NRC place several Duke Energy relief submittals currently under review on hold pending an additional accuracy review by Duke Energy. One of the affected submittals was 08-ON-002.

Duke Energy has completed the additional re-review of our Relief Request 08-ON-002 submittals for accuracy. The review included the original Relief Request dated December 29, 2008 (ML090050027), the first RAI response dated August 7, 2009 (ML092250467), and the second RAI response dated December 2, 2009 (ML093410636).

The only error found was a minor typographical error in the second RAI response, in the last sentence of the response to question 2 for the weld 3HP-365-9C. The sentence currently reads (emphasis added):

"Therefore the 100% coverage obtained in the 10.1" of weld length results in a total coverage of 71.6% coverage ($10.1"/14.1" \times 100 = \underline{76.1\%}$) from the tee side."

The value "76.1" is the error, and should be "71.6" as indicated earlier in the sentence.

A047
LRR

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
May 13, 2010
Page 2

We do not consider this minor typographical error to be of any significance with respect to the NRC review and approval of the request. Since review of this relief request was placed on hold at the request of Duke Energy, we now request that review be resumed and completed.

If there are any questions or further information is needed you may contact Randy Todd at (864) 873-3418.

Sincerely,



Dave Baxter,
Site Vice President

xc: Luis Reyes
 Region II Administrator
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Atlanta Federal Center
 61 Forsyth St., SWW, Suite 23T85
 Atlanta, GA 30303

 John Stang
 Project Manager
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
 Washington, D.C. 20555

 Andrew Sabisch
 Senior NRC Resident Inspector
 Oconee Nuclear Station

 Susan Jenkins, Section Manager
 Division of Waste Management
 Bureau of Land and Waste Management
 SC Dept. of Health & Environmental Control
 2600 Bull St.
 Columbia, SC 29201