

## NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

---

**From:** DiPasquale, Sam J. [Sam.DiPasquale@xenuclear.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2011 5:32 PM  
**To:** Wengert, Thomas  
**Cc:** Ricker, Jeffrey; Vincent, Dale M.  
**Subject:** RE: Prairie Island NGP Unit 2 - Request for Clarification of 180-Day SG Tube Inspection Report (TAC No. ME5085)  
**Attachments:** PINGP response to NRC SG report questions.pdf

Tom,

Per your request, I have attached PINGP's response to your questions below.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Regards,

Sam

**Sam J. DiPasquale, P.E.**

**Xcel Energy | Responsible By Nature**

Senior Licensing Engineer

1717 Wakonade Drive East, Welch, MN 55089

P: 651.388.1121x7350 F: 612.330.6247

E: [sam.dipasquale@xcelenergy.com](mailto:sam.dipasquale@xcelenergy.com)

---

**From:** Wengert, Thomas [<mailto:Thomas.Wengert@nrc.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2011 10:12 AM  
**To:** Vincent, Dale M.  
**Subject:** Prairie Island NGP Unit 2 - Request for Clarification of 180-Day SG Tube Inspection Report (TAC No. ME5085)

Dale,

The NRC staff is reviewing the Prairie Island NGP 2010 Unit 2 180-Day Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report, submitted by letter dated November 12, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML103190514), and request the following clarifications in order to complete the review:

1. Please confirm that Tables 3 through 20 list all of the indications detected during the 2010 outage (e.g., there were no indications sized with a rotating probe that were left in service).
2. Please confirm that no degradation was observed during the secondary side inspections and the plug inspections.
3. Please discuss the nature of the single axial indication in the tube in row 1, column 8 in steam generator 21. Has cracking in the row 1 and 2 u-bend regions been observed since the in-situ stress relieving of this region?

4. For the tube that was in-situ pressure tested, please discuss whether any leakage was observed and whether there was any change in the eddy current signal (other than that attributed to test repeatability) as a result of the in-situ pressure test (if a post in-situ pressure test inspection was performed).

Please provide an email response to the above questions, or alternately I can arrange a teleconference with the technical staff to discuss.

Tom Wengert  
Project Manager – Prairie Island  
NRR/DORL/LPLIII-1  
(301) 415-4037

**Hearing Identifier:** NRR\_PMDA  
**Email Number:** 73

**Mail Envelope Properties** (71AC1869DEB82E47AAC75C450F60546A0DC137E28E)

**Subject:** RE: Prairie Island NGP Unit 2 - Request for Clarification of 180-Day SG Tube Inspection Report (TAC No. ME5085)  
**Sent Date:** 4/20/2011 5:32:14 PM  
**Received Date:** 4/20/2011 5:32:23 PM  
**From:** DiPasquale, Sam J.

**Created By:** Sam.DiPasquale@xenuclear.com

**Recipients:**

"Ricker, Jeffrey" <Jeffrey.Ricker@xenuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Vincent, Dale M." <Dale.Vincent@xenuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Wengert, Thomas" <Thomas.Wengert@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** enex04

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2116	4/20/2011 5:32:23 PM
PINGP response to NRC SG report questions.pdf		738918

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

## NRC Question Response Form

Request Number:

Status:

Requested By (Inspector name): Tom Wengert    Date Requested: March 28, 2011  
Question / Document Request:  Q  D (circle one)    System: SG  
Detailed Question or Request:

The NRC staff is reviewing the Prairie Island NGP 2010 Unit 2 180-Day Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report, submitted by letter dated November 12, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML103190514), and request the following clarifications in order to complete the review:

1. Please confirm that Tables 3 through 20 list all of the indications detected during the 2010 outage (e.g., there were no indications sized with a rotating probe that were left in service).
2. Please confirm that no degradation was observed during the secondary side inspections and the plug inspections.
3. Please discuss the nature of the single axial indication in the tube in row 1, column 8 in steam generator 21. Has cracking in the row 1 and 2 u-bend regions been observed since the in-situ stress relieving of this region?
4. For the tube that was in-situ pressure tested, please discuss whether any leakage was observed and whether there was any change in the eddy current signal (other than that attributed to test repeatability) as a result of the in-situ pressure test (if a post in-situ pressure test inspection was performed).

Please provide an email response to the above questions, or alternately I can arrange a teleconference with the technical staff to discuss.

Initiated By (individual taking the request): Vincent/DiPasquale

Assigned To (Person responding to request): Redner/Den Herder    Date Assigned: March 30, 2011

**CAP / Work Order Issued? Yes**  **No** (circle one) Number:           N/A          

Response (include a list of documents provided):

1. *Tables 3 through 20 list all the service induced indications detected (or known to exist from previous inspections) during the current inspection. There were no indications sized (reported with a numerical estimated percent through wall depth) with the rotating coil and subsequently left in service.*
2. *Inspection of the 22 SG upper internals included the Swirl Vane Moisture Separators, Feed Ring Hangers, Holes, and Plugs, Upper Transition Girth Weld, Thermal Sleeve, Magnetic Particle Examine of the Feedwater Nozzle, Ultrasonic inspections of Feed Ring Tee, and Feedwater to Reducer Welds Downcomer, and other upper bundle components per NRC Generic Letter 97-06. The 22 SG tube lane and periphery of the tube bundle was inspected using a Camera Transporter System. A visual inspection of all the installed tube plugs and a*

Use of this form as a procedural aid does not require retention as a quality record.



- Is the information provided correct? Was the preparer of the response a subject matter expert?
- Information Requests:
  - Does the response answer the question being asked? Is the response on topic and clear?
  - Are inputs and assumptions appropriately validated?
  - If there is an embedded calculation, is the math correct?
  - Is the response well formulated? Was enough work put into the response?
  - Does the response reflect a differing professional opinion between the preparer and the inspector? Is the response professional in tone? Is the response argumentative?
  - Is there a condition adverse to quality? Has a CAP been initiated?