

July 13, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Victor Nerses, Senior Project Manager, Section 2 */RAI/*
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE, UNIT NO. 3, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION, RELIEF FROM ASME CODE-TEMPORARY
NON-CODE REPAIR (TAC NO. MA9140)

The enclosed draft request for additional information (RAI) was transmitted by facsimile on July 13, 2000, to M. D. Dodson of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (licensee). Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the enclosure do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket No. 50-423

Enclosure: Relief request for through-wall pinhole leak on Service Water System

July 13, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Victor Nerses, Senior Project Manager, Section 2 */RAI/*
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE, UNIT NO. 3, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION, RELIEF FROM ASME CODE-TEMPORARY
NON-CODE REPAIR (TAC NO. MA9140)

The enclosed draft request for additional information (RAI) was transmitted by facsimile on July 13, 2000, to M. D. Dodson of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (licensee). Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the enclosure do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket No. 50-423

Enclosure: Relief request for through-wall pinhole leak on Service Water System

DISTRIBUTION

PDI-2 R/F

PUBLIC

Project Manager

K. Wichman, EMCB

OFFICE	PDI, S2/PM	EMCB/SC
NAME	VNerses	KWichman
DATE	7/13/00	7/13/00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDI-2\MILLSTONE3\MA9140RAI.WPD

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 3
RELIEF REQUEST FOR THROUGH-WALL PINHOLE LEAK ON SERVICE WATER SYSTEM
NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY
DOCKET NO. 50-423

1. The flaw evaluation was based on GL-90-05/Code Case N-513/Code Case N-597. Explain why the evaluation cannot be done within the context of GL-90-05 and why you need both Code Case N-513 and Code Case N-597. The staff would like to point out that by using part of methodologies from different Code Cases, you are actually proposing a unique plant-specific methodology.
2. On page 1 of M3-EV-00-0019, you indicated that the measured minimum wall thickness is 0.088 inch. What is the basis for that when you have a through-wall hole of zero thickness and a degraded area surrounding the hole with wall thicknesses varying from 0.054 inch to 0.090 inch? Also, your wear rate of 0.0088 inch/year should be revised accordingly.
3. On page 2 of M3-EV-00-0019, you stated two criteria: (a) t_{adj} must be greater than $2t_m$, and (b) the postulated circular diameter, d , shall not exceed the pipe nominal outside diameter. Provide the source of these criteria. Further, what is your basis for setting the predicted total flaw circular length (1.75 inch) to be one half the maximum allowable flaw length (3.5 inch)? Was the maximum allowable flaw length determined by the outside diameter of the pipe?
4. On page 2 and 3 of M3-EV-00-0019, you stated "OK" several times on the right hand side of some Tables. Provide the source of the associated criterion for each place where "OK" appears. Evidently, you are proposing something which does not exist in GL-90-05, Code Case N-513, and Code Case N-597. Detailed explanation should be given in addition to the summary type information on pages 2 and 3 of M3-EV-00-0019.
5. Provide a sketch showing the contour for thickness 0.088 inch and the hole size for the branch connection in your branch reinforcement evaluation.

Notes:

The “through-wall flaw” approach of GL-90-05 cannot be applied because the flaw size is larger than 15% of the pipe circumference.