

From: [Benney, Brian](#)
To: ["Wideman Steve G"](#)
Cc: [Burkhardt, Janet](#); [Chen, Qiao-Lynn](#); [Rankin, Jennivine](#)
Subject: ME8676 RAIs
Date: Thursday, September 06, 2012 9:04:20 AM

Dear Mr. Wideman:

By letter dated May 2, 2012, (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML12132A050), the Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation submitted a license amendment request for the Wolf Creek Generating Station. The proposed amendment would replace the current ten-year surveillance frequency for testing the containment spray nozzles as specified in Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 3.6.6.8, with an event-based frequency.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information provided by the licensee and determined that the additional information identified in the attachment is needed in order for the NRC staff to complete its review. The staff is requesting a written response to the RAIs no later than October 15, 2012.

Please contact me if you would like to have a clarifying conference call.

Thank you,
Brian Benney

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST
TO REVISE CONTAINMENT SPRAY AND COOLING SYSTEMS
TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENT
WOLF CREEK NUCLEAR OPERATING CORPORATION
WOLF CREEK GENERATING STATION
DOCKET NUMBER 50-482

By letter dated May 2, 2012, (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML12132A050), the Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation submitted a license amendment request for the Wolf Creek Generating Station. The proposed amendment would replace the current ten-year surveillance frequency for testing the containment spray nozzles as specified in Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 3.6.6.8, with an event-based frequency.

The NRC staff has reviewed the submitted information and determined that the information below is needed for the staff to complete its evaluation.

1. In Section 3.0 "Technical Evaluation," the third paragraph under the heading "Foreign Material Exclusion" states, "Due to their locations in the containment, introduction of foreign material into the spray headers is highly unlikely."

Please explain why it is unlikely that the location of the containment spray header would not cause introduction of foreign material into the spray system.

2. Please describe the training and/or pre-job briefs received by personnel in order to be qualified to work on open systems, structures, and components such as the containment spray system.

3. Please confirm that the FME procedure requires an inspection to be performed when closing a system, structure, or component in order to ensure that all foreign material is removed.