From: Lamb, John
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2012 1:27 PM
To: 'OKeefe, Michael'; 'Willoughby, Paul'
Cc: Khanna, Meena; Johnson, Andrew
Subject: For Your Review - SEABROOK STATION – Draft RAI Regarding 2011 SG Tube Inspections (TAC No. ME7207)

Mike & Paul,

Below, for your review, are draft RAIs for the Seabrook 2011 SG Tube Inspections. Please review to ensure that the questions are understandable, the regulatory basis is clear, there is no proprietary information contained in the RAI, and to determine if the information was previously docketed. Please also let me know how much time TVA needs to respond to the RAI.

Thanks.
John

DRAFT RAI QUESTIONS

By letter dated September 19, 2011, (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession Number ML11266A008), NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (the licensee) submitted information summarizing the results of the 2011 steam generator (SG) tube inspections at Seabrook Station. These inspections were performed during the fourteenth refueling outage. In order to complete its review of the document listed above, the NRC staff requests the following additional information:

1. Page 1, Section 1 – Please clarify whether the indication of axial outside diameter stress corrosion cracking detected in 2009 was both in and below the expansion transition region, or just below the expansion transition region.
2. Page 1, Section 2 – Please clarify whether the 100 percent inspection of previously reported wear indications included all wear indications (and these were examined from 3-inches above the wear scar to 3-inches below the wear scar) or whether it just included previously reported wear indications located from 3-inches above the top of the tubesheet to 3-inches below the top of the tubesheet.
3. Page 4 – Please clarify the difference between the codes NR and INR referenced in Table 2, which presumably stand for “not reportable” and “indication not reportable,” respectively.
4. Page 4, Table 2 – Please discuss whether all locations where potential loose part signals were detected were inspected visually to confirm the presence of a loose part. Please clarify when the NDD [no detectable degradation] and INR [indication not reportable] codes are used for dispositioning a location where a previous PLP [possible loose part] call was made (steam generator B, row 3, column 104 and steam generator C, row 40, column 92).
5. Page 5, Section 7 – Please clarify what is meant by the statement that outside diameter and primary water stress corrosion cracking are not of concern for operation until OR15.
6. Page 6 – Please confirm that the foreign object referenced in the last sentence is the same metal nail that is referenced on page 3. If it is not, please clarify the history of the foreign object on page 6.