

October 11, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: Stuart A. Richards, Director  
Project Directorate IV  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Michael L. Scott, Project Manager, Section 2  
Project Directorate IV /RA/  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2001, MEETING WITH  
WESTINGHOUSE OWNERS GROUP ON WCAP-15604, "LIMITED  
SCOPE HIGH BURNUP LEAD TEST ASSEMBLIES"

On September 26, 2001, the NRC staff met with representatives of the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) at the WOG's request. Representatives of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) and fuel vendors also attended. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the WOG response to the NRC staff's request for additional information (RAI) on WCAP-15604, "Limited Scope High Burnup Lead Test Assemblies." The attachment contains a list of meeting attendees. No slides or other materials were handed out at the meeting, with the exception of the WOG's response to the RAI, which is available under ADAMS accession number ML011980215.

In opening remarks, the WOG stated that they wished to emphasize that this was an industry report, not just a Westinghouse report. The NRC staff agreed and stated that it was being reviewed on an industry basis as requested by NEI.

The NRC staff stated that the RAI responses were generally adequate but that a few details needed additional discussion. The staff stated that they would prefer that the WOG submit a revised topical report (TR) incorporating the RAI responses for the staff's final review.

The staff also stated that precharacterization for BWRs should include channel bow, or an explanation should be provided of why it is not necessary. The WOG asked whether, in view of very little oxidation having been noted at Limerick, channel bow precharacterization could be substituted for oxidation. The staff replied that this could be considered. The WOG asked whether a standard set of precharacterization data can be eliminated if there is sufficient data to support that. The staff replied that the challenge is what constitutes enough data. The WOG indicated they would discuss with General Electric (GE) adding channel bow as a precharacterization parameter if channels would exceed their burnup limits.

The staff stated that reporting was the only other issue. The staff stated that they would expect notification prior to each lead test assembly irradiation and a formal report after irradiation. Because the staff does not regulate vendors, these reports would need to be provided by licensees. This would allow the staff to see trends and understand how the irradiation is going.

The staff asked for clarification of the following item in the response to RAI No. 4: "What planned post-irradiation examinations (PIEs) are anticipated which would specify the purpose of the Limited Scope High Burnup Lead Test Assemblies." The WOG replied that it could be for the specific purpose of looking at certain fuel types.

The WOG agreed to provide the staff a revision to the TR, one version showing changes and the other version "clean."

The staff stated that predicted vs. measured performance should be part of the final report. An industry participant expressed concern that this would amount to submitting a TR after each campaign. The staff replied that the report could be limited to measured vs. maximum predicted. The WOG replied that this would not be too difficult to provide. The staff noted that they were not looking for a full engineering assessment; those assessments could be provided during NRC/vendor meetings or in TRs to justify using fuel at higher burnups.

The WOG asked whether five years later, if data shows no problem with oxidation, a specific submittal could be developed to eliminate data collection for that parameter. The staff answered affirmatively.

The WOG then summarized action items from the meeting. They were:

- The WOG will review the channel bow issue with GE and get back to the NRC.
- The WOG will clarify reporting requirements to require that utilities notify the staff by letter of plans to irradiate and will provide a follow-up report comparing measured data and predictions. They will also clarify that engineering assessments will occur in vendor meetings or TRs.
- The WOG will provide Revision 1 to the TR with updated information. They will attempt to submit the revised document by the end of the year, and maybe as soon as the end of November.

The WOG asked whether after the safety evaluation (SE) is issued, other vendors would need to make separate submittals. The staff replied that the intention is to write the SE such that it applies to the entire industry. The next NRC step might be to get it endorsed as a Regulatory Guide. This would provide the document additional visibility, which is worth doing. The WOG asked what the NRC target date for the SE would be. The staff replied that a reasonable date would be the end of February or earlier, provided the revised report is submitted by the third week in November.

Project No. 694

Attachment: Meeting Attendees

cc w/attachment: See next page

The staff asked for clarification of the following item in the response to RAI No. 4: "What planned post-irradiation examinations (PIEs) are anticipated which would specify the purpose of the Limited Scope High Burnup Lead Test Assemblies." The WOG replied that it could be for the specific purpose of looking at certain fuel types.

The WOG agreed to provide the staff a revision to the TR, one version showing changes and the other version "clean."

The staff stated that predicted vs. measured performance should be part of the final report. An industry participant expressed concern that this would amount to submitting a TR after each campaign. The staff replied that the report could be limited to measured vs. maximum predicted. The WOG replied that this would not be too difficult to provide. The staff noted that they were not looking for a full engineering assessment; those assessments could be provided during NRC/vendor meetings or in TRs to justify using fuel at higher burnups.

The WOG asked whether five years later, if data shows no problem with oxidation, a specific submittal could be developed to eliminate data collection for that parameter. The staff answered affirmatively.

The WOG then summarized action items from the meeting. They were:

- The WOG will review the channel bow issue with GE and get back to the NRC.
- The WOG will clarify reporting requirements to require that utilities notify the staff by letter of plans to irradiate and will provide a follow-up report comparing measured data and predictions. They will also clarify that engineering assessments will occur in vendor meetings or TRs.
- The WOG will provide Revision 1 to the TR with updated information. They will attempt to submit the revised document by the end of the year, and maybe as soon as the end of November.

The WOG asked whether after the safety evaluation (SE) is issued, other vendors would need to make separate submittals. The staff replied that the intention is to write the SE such that it applies to the entire industry. The next NRC step might be to get it endorsed as a Regulatory Guide. This would provide the document additional visibility, which is worth doing. The WOG asked what the NRC target date for the SE would be. The staff replied that a reasonable date would be the end of February or earlier, provided the revised report is submitted by the third week in November.

Project No. 694

Attachment: Meeting Attendees

cc w/attachment: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See attached list

**MEETING NOTICE: ML012560303**

**ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML012820240**

**PACKAGE: ML012820244**

|        |            |            |            |
|--------|------------|------------|------------|
| OFFICE | PDIV-2/PM  | PDIV-2/LA  | PDIV-2/SC  |
| NAME   | MScott:as  | EPeyton    | SDembek    |
| DATE   | 10/11/2001 | 10/10/2001 | 10/11/2001 |

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

Westinghouse Owners Group

Project No. 694

cc:

Mr. H. A. Sepp, Manager  
Regulatory and Licensing Engineering  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0355

Mr. Andrew Drake, Project Manager  
Westinghouse Owners Group  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
Mail Stop ECE 5-16  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0355

**MEETING WITH WESTINGHOUSE OWNERS GROUP**

**WCAP-15604, "LIMITED SCOPE HIGH BURNUP LEAD TEST ASSEMBLIES"**

**SEPTEMBER 26, 2001**

**ATTENDANCE LIST**

**WESTINGHOUSE OWNERS GROUP**

T. Rieck (Excelon)  
K. Vavrek (Westinghouse)  
S. Ferguson (WOG/Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Company)  
W. Slagle (Westinghouse)  
D. Mitchell (Westinghouse)

**Nuclear Energy Institute**

J. Butler

**Framatome ANP**

J. Holm

**NRC**

M. Chatterton  
S. Dembek  
H. Scott  
S. Basu  
M. Scott

DISTRIBUTION FOR MEETING SUMMARY WITH WESTINGHOUSE OWNERS GROUP ON  
SEPTEMBER 26, 2001

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Hard Copy:  
PUBLIC  
PDIV-2 R/F

E-Mail:  
RidsNrrDlpm (JZwolinski/TMarsh)  
WBateman  
RBarrett  
RCaruso  
MChatteron  
SDembek  
DMcCain  
HScott  
SBasu  
RidsOgcMailCenter  
RidsAcrcAcnwMailCenter  
RidsNrrPMMScott  
RidsNrrLAEPeyton