

**From:** [Shawn Williams](#)  
**To:** [Treadway, Ryan I](#)  
**Cc:** [Vaughan, Jordan L](#)  
**Subject:** Acceptance of Requested Licensing Action RE: Duke Fleet Proposed Alternative for Pressurizer Welds in Accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(z)(1) (EPID L-2023-LLR-0020)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 4, 2023 10:02:52 AM

---

Mr. Treadway,

By letter dated February 17, 2023 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML23048A148), Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, (the licensee, Duke Energy) submitted a proposed alternative to certain requirements of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code, Section XI for Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 (CNS), McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 (MNS), Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2, and 3 (ONS), Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP), and H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2 (RNP). Specifically, Duke Energy is requesting an alternative to the requirements of Article IWB-2500(a), Table IWB-2500-1, examination category B-B and B-D for Pressurizer Pressure-Retaining Welds and Full-Penetration Welded Nozzles.

The purpose of this e-mail is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this proposed alternative request. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to begin its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the request has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(z)(1) and 50.55a(z)(2) of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of Section 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to begin its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed request in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff's ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified in despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. If additional information is needed, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

Based on the information provided in your submittal, the NRC staff has estimated that this alternative request will take approximately 210 hours to complete. The NRC staff expects to complete this review by November 13, 2023. If there are emergent complexities or challenges in our review that would cause changes to the initial forecasted completion date or significant changes in the forecasted hours, the reasons for the changes along with the new estimates, will be communicated during the routine interactions with the assigned project manager. These estimates are based on the NRC staff's initial review of the application and they could change, due to several factors including requests for additional

information, unanticipated addition of scope to the review, and review by NRC advisory committees or hearing-related activities.

If you have any questions, please contact Shawn Williams at (301) 415-1009 or [Shawn.Williams@nrc.gov](mailto:Shawn.Williams@nrc.gov).

Shawn Williams, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch II-1  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.

50-413, 50-414

50-369, 50-370

50-269, 50-270, 50-287

50-261, 50-400

cc: Listserv