



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

October 5, 2010

Mr. Mark J. Ajluni
Manager, Nuclear Licensing
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.
40 Inverness Center Parkway
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201


SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION (RAI), FOURTH 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION
PROGRAM (TAC NOS. ME4218, ME4219)

Dear Mr. Ajluni:

By letter dated July 8, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), Accession Number ML101890572), Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC), submitted relief requests for the Fourth 10-Year Interval Inservice Inspection Program. Responses to the enclosed RAI are needed for us to continue our review. These RAIs result from a review of relief requests ISI-RR-02, ISI-RR-06 and ISI-RR-07. Further RAIs may result from a review of the remaining relief requests.

Please provide a response within sixty (60) calendar days of the date of this letter. Please contact me at (301) 415-1493, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,


Robert E. Martin, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch II-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure:
RAI

cc w/ encl: Distribution via Listserv

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

RELIEF REQUESTS ISI-RR-06 FOR EDWIN I. HATCH, UNIT 2

AND ISI-RR-07 FOR EDWIN I. HATCH, UNIT 1

DOCKET NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

TAC NOS. ME4218 AND ME4219

1. It was stated in ISI-RR-06 (Hatch, Unit 2), "Pressure Retaining Welds in Pump Casings," that this is the first relief request regarding the surface examination of Weld 2E11-2RHR-PMI-A and Weld 2E21-2CS-PMI-A (American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code, Section XI, Class 2, Category C-G, Item C6.10).

How did you achieve the ASME Code-required coverage for the surface examination of these welds in prior inspection intervals? What type of surface examination techniques did you use in this interval when compared to those used in prior intervals? Why can't you achieve the same coverage that you had accomplished previously?

2. It was stated in ISI-RR-06 that supplemental visual examination was performed to increase the amount of coverage to greater than 90 percent. Please confirm that this supplemental visual examination is the VT-2 examination that you mentioned later under Section 6, "Proposed Alternative and Basis for Use," which is associated with the leakage test.

If the supplemental visual examination that your are referring to is not the VT-2 examination associated with the leakage test, provide additional information regarding how the supplemental visual examination was performed, what standards were used to determine the effectiveness of the examination, how the inspectors were qualified to perform the examination, etc.

3. ISI-RR-06 did not discuss previous surface examination results for Weld 2E11-2RHR-PMI-A and Weld 2E21-2CS-PMI-A. Provide this information, including the degree of coverage obtained, whether any relevant indications were identified, and how those indications, if any, were dispositioned. Further, discuss any industry examination results or operating experience regarding degradation found in similar pressure retaining welds in pump casings. The staff will use this information to assess the likelihood of having flaws in the uninspected region of these two welds.
4. ISI-RR-07 (Hatch, Unit 1), "Welded Attachments for Piping," did not discuss previous surface examination results for the subject piping welded attachments under ASME Code, Section XI, Table IWB-2500-1, "Examination Categories," Category B-K, Item

Enclosure

B10.20. Provide this information, including the degree of coverage obtained, whether any relevant indications were identified, and how those indications, if any, were dispositioned. Further, discuss any industry examination results or operating experience regarding degradation found in similar piping welded attachments. The staff will use this information to assess the likelihood of having flaws in the uninspected region of these welds.

October 5, 2010

Mr. Mark J. Ajluni
Manager, Nuclear Licensing
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.
40 Inverness Center Parkway
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION (RAI), FOURTH 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION
PROGRAM (TAC NOS. ME4218, ME4219)

Dear Mr. Ajluni:

By letter dated July 8, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), Accession Number ML101890572), Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC), submitted relief requests for the Fourth 10-Year Interval Inservice Inspection Program. Responses to the enclosed RAI are needed for us to continue our review. These RAIs result from a review of relief requests ISI-RR-02, ISI-RR-06 and ISI-RR-07. Further RAIs may result from a review of the remaining relief requests.

Please provide a response within sixty (60) calendar days of the date of this letter. Please contact me at (301) 415-1493, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Robert E. Martin, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch II-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure:
RAI

cc w/ encl: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

Public	RidsOgcRp Resource	RidsRgn2MailCenter Resource
LPL2-1 R/F	RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCTR	RidsNrrPMVogle Resource
RidsNrrDorlLpl2-1 Resource	RidsNrrLASRohrer Resource	SSheng, NRR
RidsNrrDciCvib Resource	CNove, NRR	

ADAMS Accession No.: ML102570081

*RAI transmitted by memo dated

OFFICE	NRR/LPL2-1/PM	NRR/LPL2-1/LA	NRR/LPL2-1/BC	NRR/LPL2-1/PM
NAME	RMartin	SRohrer	GKulesa	RMartin
DATE	09/27/10	09/14/10	10/04/10	10/05/10

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY