

From: Lawrence Burkhart
To: Brian Sepelak
Date: 5/24/01 10:07AM
Subject: RAI - RELIEF REQUEST

Brian,

Attached is a revision to the previous RAI. 2 new questions have been added. Please let me know if/when you would like to discuss.

Mail Envelope Properties (3B0D15AD.537 : 6 : 21370)

Subject: RAI - RELIEF REQUEST
Creation Date: 5/24/01 10:07AM
From: Lawrence Burkhart

Created By: LJB@nrc.gov

Recipients

firstenergycorp.com
sepelakb (Brian Sepelak)

Post Office	Route
firstenergycorp.com	internet

Files	Size	Date & Time
RAI to licensee 052401.relief request.wpd	35327	05/24/01 10:06AM
MESSAGE	674	05/24/01 10:07AM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
THIRD 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION
REQUESTS FOR RELIEF
FOR
BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT 1
DOCKET NUMBER: 50-334

1. SCOPE

By letter dated February 6, 2001, the First Energy Nuclear Operating Company, the licensee, submitted a revision to a previously approved relief request (1-TYP-3-B5.70, Revision 0). The relief requests further relief from the examination coverage requirements of Section XI of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) for the third 10-year inservice inspection (ISI) interval at Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 1. Based on the review of the relief request the following additional information is requested to complete the evaluation.

2. INFORMATION REQUIRED

2.1 List the obtained coverage for each specific weld and any significant indications. For welds not examined for the third interval yet, submit relief after the examinations have been performed.

2.2 What is the reason for the examination coverage change? Provide the reasoning and documentation for the current credited examination coverage being lower than previous examinations. The submittal stated that the limitations are documented in the most recent examination reports. Provide the documentation on the limitations and explain the current methods used to calculate coverage. Discuss and compare the changes in limitations and coverage calculations from previous intervals.

2.3 What assurance is provided that a significant flaw would be detected with the limited UT coverage?

2.4 What is the weld configuration (include base materials and weld in the diagrams)?

2.5 What prevents examining these welds from the ID?