

## NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

---

**From:** Mozafari, Brenda  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2014 4:03 PM  
**To:** Nicely, Ken M.:(GenCo-Nuc) (ken.nicely@exeloncorp.com)  
**Cc:** Purnell, Blake  
**Subject:** Draft RAI from TAC NOS.: MF2489 AND MF2490 review on NEUTRON ABSORBING INSERTS

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Due By:** Friday, March 07, 2014 6:00 PM  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

<b>Tracking:</b>	<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Read</b>
	Nicely, Ken M.:(GenCo-Nuc) (ken.nicely@exeloncorp.com)	
	Purnell, Blake	Read: 2/24/2014 4:36 PM

Ken,

In case I did not send the draft RAI previously:

By letter dated July 16, 2013, (Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems Accession Number [ADAMS] ML13199A037), Exelon Generation Company, LLC. (the licensee), submitted a license amendment request to revise the Quad Cities Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications to support use of neutron absorbing inserts in spent fuel pool.

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS, UNITS 1 AND 2  
REGARDING USE OF NEUTRON ABSORBING INSERTS  
IN SPENT FUEL STORAGE RACKS  
DOCKET NOS.: 50-254 AND 50-265  
TAC NOS.: MF2489 AND MF2490

1. On page 23 of the July 16, 2013 submittal, it states "The surveillance "trees" were placed within one of the QCNPS SFPs..." Since SFP conditions in each Unit could be different, identify in which Unit's SFP are the "trees" placed and whether the placement is considered bounding for both pools. Discuss why placement of coupons in one pool will ensure adequate material surveillance representing all panels.
2. On page 26 of the July 16, 2013 submittal, it states "Two rack inserts from the Unit 1 SFP will be visually inspected." Discuss and justify whether inserts from Unit 2 will be visually inspected. If the inserts in Unit 1 are the only ones to be visually inspected, please discuss why a Unit 2 inspection is not necessary.
3. In NET-300054-01 Rev 0, the visual inspection of the coupons revealed some rust colored pitting.
  - a. For coupons F15 and F16, discuss the cause of this pitting. Include whether the pitting is indicative of what the SFP inserts may be experiencing.
  - b. For coupon F11, discuss whether the carbon steel tool chain was the cause of the large pit. If not, discuss the cause of the large pit.

If you require a call for clarification, let me know as soon as possible. Otherwise I will discuss a final response by March 24, 2014.

## Thanks

Brenda L. Mozafari  
Senior Project Manager, NRR/DORL  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Dresden 2/3 and QuadCities 1/2  
301-415-2020  
email: [brenda.mozafari@nrc.gov](mailto:brenda.mozafari@nrc.gov)

**Hearing Identifier:** NRR\_PMDA  
**Email Number:** 1150

**Mail Envelope Properties** (Brenda.Mozafari@nrc.gov20140224160200)

**Subject:** Draft RAI from TAC NOS.: MF2489 AND MF2490 review on NEUTRON  
ABSORBING INSERTS  
**Sent Date:** 2/24/2014 4:02:48 PM  
**Received Date:** 2/24/2014 4:02:00 PM  
**From:** Mozafari, Brenda

**Created By:** Brenda.Mozafari@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Purnell, Blake" <Blake.Purnell@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status:: Response: Read : 2/24/2014 4:36:00 PM

"Nicely, Ken M.:(GenCo-Nuc) (ken.nicely@exeloncorp.com)" <ken.nicely@exeloncorp.com>

Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:**

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2252	2/24/2014 4:02:00 PM

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** Yes

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:** Follow up By 3/7/2014 6:00:00 PM