

From: Kalyanam, Kaly
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 3:46 PM
To: STEELMAN, WILLIAM J
Cc: Lent, Susan; Burkhardt, Janet
Subject: Acceptance Review Result for Requests for Alternative W3-ISI-019 (ME5701)

Susan,

When you get a chance, could you please include this email in ADAMS?

Thanks

Kaly

The SUNSI information as follows:

Plant: Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3
Docket No.: 50/382
Subject: Result of the Acceptance Review of Waterford 3 Request for Alternative W3-1SI-019, Inspection of Reactor Vessel Head In-Core Instrument Nozzles during the Third Ten-Year Inservice Inspection Interval
TAC Nos.: ME5701
SUNSI Review Done: Yes. Publicly Available, Normal Release, Non-sensitive,
From: N. Kalyanam
To: W. Steelman

Mr. Steelman:

By letter dated February 16, 2011, Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy) submitted a Request for Alternative, W3-ISI-019 for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3).

Entergy was scheduled to replace the original steam generators and RPV head during the spring 2011 refueling outage (RF17). However, due to a discovered manufacturing condition, the replacement steam generators will not be available for installation during RF17. Replacement of the RPV head must utilize a construction opening in containment which will necessitate its replacement to be concurrent with the replacement steam generators now scheduled for the fall of 2012 (RF18). As a result of this deferral, the installed Waterford 3 RPV head will require continued examination in accordance with Code Case N-729-1 as conditioned by 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(ii)(D) during the upcoming spring 2011 refueling outage. Therefore, Entergy requested the same ASME Code alternative to these examination requirements as was performed in RF16 under W3-1SI-01 5.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the NRC staff's acceptance review of this Request for Alternative. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed Request for Alternative. If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1480.

N. Kalyanam
Project Manager
ANO-1and 2 & Waterford 3
DORL/NRR/NRC
Email: kaly.kalyanam@nrc.gov