June 7, 2000

Mr. Michael B. Sellman
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING APPLICATION OF LEAK-BEFORE-BREAK METHODOLOGY IN DESIGN-BASIS ANALYSIS OF PIPING SYSTEM (TAC NOS. MA7805, MA7806, MA7834, MA7835, MA7836, AND MA7837)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated December 2, 1999, Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) submitted, for staff's review and approval, an application of leak-before-break methodology in a design-basis analysis to exclude dynamic effects associated with the postulated rupture of certain piping systems, including portions of residual heat removal system piping, surge line piping, and accumulator injection line piping. The enclosed request for additional information has been prepared to clarify issues raised by the staff based on its review of the licensee's December 2, 1999, submittal.

The enclosed request was discussed with Mr. Tom Malanowski and other members of your staff during a conference call on April 28, 2000. A mutually agreeable target date of 30 days from the date of this letter for your response was established. If circumstances result in the need to revise the target date, please contact me at (301) 415-1355 at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Beth A. Wetzel, Senior Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

June 7, 2000

Mr. Michael B. Sellman
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING APPLICATION OF LEAK-BEFORE-BREAK METHODOLOGY IN DESIGN-BASIS ANALYSIS OF PIPING SYSTEM (TAC NOS. MA7805, MA7806, MA7834, MA7835, MA7836, AND MA7837)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated December 2, 1999, Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) submitted, for staff's review and approval, an application of leak-before-break methodology in a design-basis analysis to exclude dynamic effects associated with the postulated rupture of certain piping systems, including portions of residual heat removal system piping, surge line piping, and accumulator injection line piping. The enclosed request for additional information has been prepared to clarify issues raised by the staff based on its review of the licensee's December 2, 1999, submittal.

The enclosed request was discussed with Mr. Tom Malanowski and other members of your staff during a conference call on April 28, 2000. A mutually agreeable target date of 30 days from the date of this letter for your response was established. If circumstances result in the need to revise the target date, please contact me at (301) 415-1355 at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,
/RA/
Beth A. Wetzel, Senior Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC	MMitchell
PDIII-1 Reading	OGC
SBlack	ACRS
CCraig	LBerry
RBouling	RLanksbury, RIII
BWetzel	

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	PDIII-1/LA	PDIII-1/SC
NAME	TJKim for BWetzel	RBouling	AMendiola for SCraig
DATE	6/6/00	6/6/00	6/7/00

ACCESSION NO. ML003722850

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

cc:

Mr. John H. O'Neill, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128

Mr. Richard R. Grigg
President and Chief Operating Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Mr. Mark E. Reddemann
Site Vice President
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Ken Duveneck
Town Chairman
Town of Two Creeks
13017 State Highway 42
Mishicot, WI 54228

Chairman
Public Service Commission
of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, IL 60532-4351

Resident Inspector's Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6612 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Ms. Sarah Jenkins
Electric Division
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
LEAK-BEFORE-BREAK SUBMITTAL
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

The staff has completed an initial review of the information provided in Wisconsin Electric Power Company's December 2, 1999, submittal requesting approval of leak-before-break (LBB) status for sections of the Point Beach, Units 1 and 2, residual heat removal (RHR) system piping, surge line piping, and accumulator injection line piping. The following questions are based on the reports from Westinghouse Energy Systems (WCAP-15105, WCAP-15065, and WCAP-15107) enclosures to the December 2, 1999, submittal letter.

Section I: Regarding WCAP-15107 on Accumulator Injection Line Piping LBB

(1) Clarify the information in Table 3-5. It appears that there are two entries for Type 316 stainless steel @ 600 °F. What does each entry signify?

(2) Confirm that the analyses in WCAP-15107 bound all of the nodal locations identified in Figures 3-1 thru 3-4.

(3) In Section 4.1, equation 4-2, the torsional loads (M_x) have been left out of the moment summation. The LBB procedural guidance in NUREG-1061, Volume 3 (see Section 5.4), requires that these loads be conservatively included in the moment summation. It may be that these loads are insignificant in comparison to the other loads on this piping. If so, note that this is the case and provide some bounding value for M_x that would adequately cover all of the nodal locations in this piping system.

Section II: Regarding WCAP-15105 on RHR System Piping LBB

(1) In Section 4.1, equation 4-2, the torsional loads (M_x) have been left out of the moment summation. The LBB procedural guidance in NUREG-1061, Volume 3 (see Section 5.4) requires that these loads be conservatively included in the moment summation. It may be that these loads are insignificant in comparison to the other loads on this piping. If so, note that this is the case and give some bounding value for M_x that would adequately cover all of the nodal locations in this piping system.

(2) Confirm that the analyses in the WCAP bound all of the nodal locations identified in Figures 3-1 and 3-2 and that the LBB approval is intended to apply to all of the depicted piping.

(3) For Tables 4-1 and 4-2, provide the normal (used to determine the leakage flaw size) and faulted (used to determine the critical flaw size) loading conditions (with and without the inclusion of the thermal stratification stresses) for each nodal location in Figures 4-1 and 4-2. It is understood that for some nodal locations, thermal stratification stresses may

ENCLOSURE

not apply. Therefore, only having a Table 4-1 entry for those locations would be sufficient. If it is not practical to include the loads for every nodal location, provide the appropriate loads for the 10 highest stressed locations. Confirm that the information for the node with the highest ratio of:

> (the loads determining the critical flaw size)-to-(the loads determining the leakage flaw size)

is included in the 10 highest stressed locations.

Section III: Regarding WCAP-15065 on Surge Line Piping LBB

(1) In Section 4.1, equation 4-2, the torsional loads (M_x) have been left out of the moment summation. The LBB procedural guidance in NUREG-1061, Volume 3 (see Section 5.4) requires that these loads be conservatively included in the moment summation. It may be that these loads are insignificant in comparison to the other loads on this piping. If so, note that is the case and give some bounding value for M_x that would adequately cover all of the nodal locations in this piping system.

(2) For Table 4-4, provide the case A through G loading conditions for each nodal location in Figure 4-1. It is understood that for some nodal locations, not all of the loading cases may apply. If it is not practical to include the loads for every nodal location, provide the appropriate loads for the three highest stressed locations. Confirm that the information for the node with the highest ratio of:

> (the loads determined for Case F)-to-(the loads determined for Case B)

is included in the three highest stressed locations.