Duke Energy®

T. PRESTON GILLESPIE, JR.
Vice President
Oconee Nuclear Station

Duke Energy
ON01VP / 7800 Rochester Hwy.
Seneca, SC 29672

864-873-4478
864-873-4208 fax
T.Gillespie@duke-energy.com

October 25, 2012

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy)
Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2
Docket Numbers 50-270
2011 Unit 2 End of Cycle (EOC) 25 Request for Additional Information (RAI) Response

On February 29, 2012, Duke Energy submitted information summarizing the results of the 2011 Steam Generator (SG) Tube Inservice Inspections performed during the Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS) Unit 2 EOC-25 Refueling Outage (ADAMS Accession No. ML12066A243).

On September 11, 2012, the NRC Staff electronically requested additional information regarding this SG report. The enclosure provided in this submittal contains Duke Energy's response to the RAI.

This submittal document contains no regulatory commitments.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Corey Gray at (864) 873-6325.

Sincerely,

TPGillespie

T. Preston Gillespie Jr.,
Site Vice President

Enclosure

A047
NRR

xc (w/enclosure):

Victor McCree
Region II Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Marquis One Tower
245 Peachtree Center Ave., NE, Suite 1200
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257

John Boska
Project Manager
(by electronic mail only)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North, M/S O-8G9A
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2746

cc: (w/o enclosure)

NRC Senior Resident Inspector
Oconee Nuclear Station

Susan Jenkins
Section Manager
Division of Waste Management
Bureau of Land and Waste Management
SC Dept. of Health & Environmental Control
2600 Bull St.
Columbia, SC 29201

Duke Energy Response to Request for Additional Information on Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report, ME8435

1. Please clarify the results of your steam generator tube plug inspections.

Duke Response
All plugs were visually inspected and no abnormal conditions were detected

2. Please clarify which tubes were plugged.

Duke response
The table below contains the tubes that were repaired

Steam Generator	Row	Tube
A	75	1
A	78	1
A	79	1
A	73	2
A	75	3
A	98	125
A	75	131
A	76	131
A	77	131
A	77	132
B	64	5
B	93	6
B	99	6
B	68	10
B	72	10
B	123	97

3. Please provide the effective full power years that the steam generators have operated for the last several outages

Duke Response
Below is listed the EFPY for each refueling outage since replacement

EOC	Date	EFPY
EOC 20	March 2004	Replacement
EOC 21	October 2005	1.31
EOC 22	April 2007	1.37
EOC 23	October 2008	1.38
EOC 24	April 2010	1.36
EOC 25	October 2011	1.37

4. In your condition monitoring assessment, you assess structural integrity against a limit associated with burst at three times the normal operating differential pressure. Please confirm that this limit is more limiting than the limit associated with a large break loss of coolant accident for both single and multiple sided wear indications.

Duke response

Yes, the limit associated with burst at three times the normal operating differential pressure is more limiting than the limit associated with a large break loss of coolant accident for both single and multiple sided wear indications.