Duke Energy®

REGIS T. REPKO
Vice President
McGuire Nuclear Station

Duke Energy
MG01VP / 12700 Hagers Ferry Rd.
Huntersville, NC 28078

980-875-4111
980-875-4809 fax
regis.repko@duke-energy.com

August 16, 2010

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

Subject: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy)
McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2
Docket No. 50-370
Relief Request Serial #09-MN-001
Response to Request for Additional Information

On March 23, 2009, Duke Energy submitted Relief Request 09-MN-001 pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(5)(iii), requesting relief from in-service examination requirements for a Unit 2 reciprocating charging pump to flange weld.

On February 26, 2010, Duke Energy submitted a response to the NRC's request for additional information regarding this relief request.

On July 15, 2010, the NRC Staff electronically requested additional clarification regarding this relief request. This additional information request, along with the Duke Energy response, is attached.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact M. K. Leisure at (980) 875-5171.

Sincerely,

for

Regis T. Repko

Attachment

A047
NRR

xc:

L. A. Reyes, Region II Administrator
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Marquis One Tower
245 Peachtree Center Ave., NE Suite 1200
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257

J. H. Thompson, Project Manager
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11555 Rockville Pike
Mail Stop O-8G9A
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

J. B. Brady
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
McGuire Nuclear Station

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
August 16, 2010
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Relief Request 09-MN-001

Response to NRC Request for Additional Information

Response to NRC Request for Additional Information (Relief Request #09-MN-001)

1. Clarify whether the fabrication flaws were completely removed, before the weld was repaired.

   Yes, the fabrication flaws were completely removed before the weld was repaired.

2. Clarify whether any NDE other than RT was used to ensure that the fabrication flaws were not extended into the pipe housing weld or the base materials.

   A dye penetrant (PT) examination of the excavated areas was used prior to welding to ensure the fabrication flaws did not extend into the base materials of the pump housing or flange.

3. Did the licensee perform surface examination on the portion that could not be examined volumetrically with RT or UT? If not, provide reasons.

   No, a surface examination was not performed on the limited portion of the area that could not be volumetrically examined. The RI-ISI program did not require this weld to have surface examination.