



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

April 26, 2017

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael T. Markley, Chief  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: James R. Hall, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James R. Hall".

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH, UNITS 1 AND 2 – REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION, FOURTH 10-YEAR ISI INTERVAL RELIEF  
REQUESTS (CAC NOS. MF9027, MF9030, MF9031, MF9034,  
MF9035, and MF9036)

The attached draft request for additional information (RAI) was transmitted on April 14, 2017, to Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC, the licensee). This information was transmitted in order to clarify the licensee's specified relief requests, submitted by SNC on December 27, 2016 (Agencywide Documents Access Management System Accession No. ML16362A273), for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1, and 2 (HNP). The relief requests are associated with the fourth 10-year Inservice Inspection Interval at HNP, which ended on December 31, 2015.

The draft RAI was sent to the licensee to ensure that the questions are understandable, the regulatory basis for the questions is clear, and to determine if the information was previously docketed. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request. On April 19, 2017, the licensee confirmed that they understood the questions and there was no need for a clarification call with NRC. Therefore, this memorandum serves to document the attached RAI as an Official Agency Record.

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Attachment:  
Request for Additional Information

cc w/attachment: Distribution via Listserv

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
FOURTH 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM  
REQUEST FOR RELIEF NOS. RR-16, RR-17, RR-21, AND RR-22  
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, INC.  
DOCKET NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

By letter dated December 27, 2016 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML16362A273), the Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC, the licensee) submitted 11 Requests for Relief associated with the fourth 10-year Interval Inservice Inspection (ISI) Program for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information provided by the licensee regarding relief requests RR-16, RR-17, RR-21, and RR-22, and determined that the additional information requested below is needed to complete its evaluation.

RR-16

1. Please provide any plant-specific and industry-wide operating experience of detected flaws in the nozzle-to-vessel welds subject to relief request RR-16, since some of the welds had limited coverage (e.g., approximately 32% coverage was obtained for weld number 1B11\1N4C). Were any flaws or degradation identified in past examinations of the welds subject to relief request RR-16, and if so, how were the flaws dispositioned?

RR-17

2. Were any flaws or degradation identified in the past examination of the welds subject to relief request RR-17, and if so, how were the flaws dispositioned?
3. It is not clear how the three thermocouple pads are positioned around the shell circumference and obstructing the examinations. Please provide a diagram that illustrates the position and size of the thermocouple pads on the shell side of the weld around the circumference.

RR-21

4. Were any flaws or degradation identified in the past examination of the welds subject to relief request RR-21, and if so, how were the flaws dispositioned?
5. The staff reviewed the October 17, 1995 submittal identified under Section 8 (Precedents) of RR-21. In this submittal (which corresponds to a similar relief request for the third interval for weld 2E11-2HX-A-1), it is stated that 72% of the required volume was inspected. Please discuss the rationale and basis for the decrease in coverage to 40% during the fourth interval from 72% during the third interval.

RR-22

6. Were any flaws or degradation identified in the past examination of the welds subject to relief request RR-22, and if so, how were the flaws dispositioned?
  
7. It is stated that "two UT indications were recorded on weld 1E11-2HX-A-I" and a fracture mechanics and fatigue crack growth evaluation was performed. It is then stated that "the flaw is acceptable" based on the evaluation. Please confirm that the indications were first evaluated to the requirements of ASME Section XI, IWB-3500 and that the analyses performed by Structural Integrity Associates were evaluated to the requirements of IWB-3600. Please also confirm that the flaw size assumed in the flaw evaluation bounds the size of the two UT indications.

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH, UNITS 1 AND 2 – REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, FOURTH 10-YEAR ISI INTERVAL RELIEF REQUESTS (CAC NOS. MF9027, MF9030, MF9031, MF9034, MF9035, and MF9036) DATED APRIL 26, 2017

**DISTRIBUTION**

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDorlDpr Resource

RidsNrrDorlLpl2-1 Resource

LPL2-1 R/F

RidsNrrPMHatch Resource

RidsNrrDeEvib Resource

**ADAMS Accession No. ML17111A579**

OFFICE	DORL/LPL2-1/PM	DORL/LPL2-1/LA	DORL/LPL2-1/BC	DORL/LPL2-1/PM
NAME	JHall	KGGoldstein	MMarkley	JHall
DATE	04/25/2017	04/24/2017	04/26/2017	04/26/2017

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**