

Lent, Susan

From: Kalyanam, Kaly
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 9:33 AM
To: CLARK, ROBERT W
Cc: Lent, Susan; Burkhardt, Janet
Subject: Request for Additional Information - Relief Request ANO1-ISI-021 (TAC No. ME9147)

Susan,

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

Thanks

Kaly

The SUNSI information as follows:

Plant: Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1

Docket No.: 50/313

Subject: RAI on Request for Relief No. ANO1-ISI-021

TAC NO. ME9147

SUNSI Review Done: Yes. Not Publicly Available, Normal Release, Non-sensitive,

From: N. Kalyanam

To: Robert Clark

R. Clark:

By letter dated June 6, 2012, Entergy Operations, Inc., submitted proposed alternative ANO1-ISI-021 requesting for Relief from American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Section XI Volumetric Examination Requirements, Fourth 10-Year Interval, First Period.

The NRC has reviewed the information submitted by the licensee and determined the following additional information is required to complete the evaluation. Entergy is requested to provide the response to this request within 45 days of the receipt of this e-mail.

Thanks

Kaly

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 1

ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC

RELIEF REQUEST NO. ANO1-ISI-021

DOCKET NUMBER 50-313

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information provided by Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy, the licensee) for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1, and Relief Request No. ANO1-ISI-021 in its letter dated July 25, 2012 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML12207A594), and has determined that additional information is necessary to complete the review of Relief Request No. ANO1-ISI-021.

Based on the staff's review of Relief Request ANO1-ISI-021, please provide a response which addresses the following requests:

1. Identify the ASME material designation for each part of the welds. If a material is clad with Stainless Steel or other metal, identify that material.
2. Provide details of the basis that 100% Ultrasonic testing cannot be accomplished, such as, the specific design and the conditions that prevent the welds from being 100% examined by the Ultrasonic testing technique.
3. Have there been any indications detected on the pressurize nozzle-to-vessel welds that were evaluated to be either relevant or non-relevant indications? If any indications were detected, discuss the disposition of these indications.
4. Has a visual examination been performed on these welds?
5. Provide the dimensions for all of materials shown in Figures 1 and 2 in the relief request, specifically, provide the diameter and thicknesses for each of the welds.
6. There appears to be a discrepancy between the stated coverage percentages and the "uninspected area" shown in the figures. How was coverage calculated? Please provide a coverage map showing the areas that were missed.
7. Does the inspection procedure require one inspection angle or all three inspection angles for the area to be considered inspected?

Reviewer: Edward Andruszkiewicz