

May 25, 2004

Mr. J. A. Stall  
Senior Vice President, Nuclear and  
Chief Nuclear Officer  
Florida Power and Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420

SUBJECT: TURKEY POINT UNIT 3 - RELAXATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF  
ORDER (EA-03-009) REGARDING REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL HEAD  
INSPECTIONS (TAC NO. MC1740)

Dear Mr. Stall:

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has approved your request for relaxation of the requirements of "Order Modifying Licensees (Effective Immediately)," EA-03-009 (Order), Paragraph C.(1)(b)(i) requiring specific inspections of the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) head and associated penetration nozzles at pressurized water reactors, for Turkey Point, Unit 3 (TP3). By letters dated December 19, 2003 and March 24, 2004, Florida Power and Light requested relaxation for TP3, of the requirements to perform the prescribed ultrasonic testing (UT) inside the tube from 2 inches above the J-groove weld to the bottom of the penetration for one RPV head penetration. Specifically, you requested a reduction of the examination coverage area for 65 nozzles. This relaxation request was submitted after discussions between you and the NRC staff revealed that the previously submitted relaxation request for Unit 3 did not address all conditions wherein UT blade probe design prevented full examination to the bottom of the nozzle.

The NRC staff has completed its review and concludes that you have demonstrated that compliance with the Order for the RPV nozzles specified would have resulted in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety. Therefore, pursuant to Section IV, paragraph F of the Order, the NRC staff finds there is good cause shown to relax the Order and authorizes the proposed relaxation and alternative inspection for the identified RPV head penetration nozzles at TP3 for the March 2003 examination of the 65 nozzles, subject to the following condition:

If the NRC staff finds that the crack-growth formula in industry report MRP-55 is unacceptable, the licensee shall revise its analysis that justifies relaxation of the Order within 30 days after the NRC informs the licensee of an NRC-approved crack growth formula. If the licensee's revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are exceeded prior to the end of the current operating cycle, this relaxation is rescinded and the licensee shall, within 72 hours, submit to the NRC written justification for continued operation. If the revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are exceeded during the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit the revised analysis for NRC review. If the revised analysis shows that the crack

growth acceptance criteria are not exceeded during either the current operating cycle or the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit a letter to the NRC confirming that its analysis has been revised. Any future crack-growth analyses performed for this and future cycles for RPV head penetrations must be based on an acceptable crack growth rate formula.

Be aware that when vessel head inspections are performed using American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) requirements, acceptance criteria, or qualified personnel, those activities and all related activities fall within the jurisdiction of the ASME Code. Therefore, Order-related inspection activities may be subject to third party review, including those by the Authorized Nuclear Inservice Inspector.

If there are any questions concerning this approval, please feel free to contact Ms. Eva Brown at (301) 415-2315.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Edwin M. Hackett, Director  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-250

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl: See next page

growth acceptance criteria are not exceeded during either the current operating cycle or the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit a letter to the NRC confirming that its analysis has been revised. Any future crack-growth analyses performed for this and future cycles for RPV head penetrations must be based on an acceptable crack growth rate formula.

Be aware that when vessel head inspections are performed using American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) requirements, acceptance criteria, or qualified personnel, those activities and all related activities fall within the jurisdiction of the ASME Code. Therefore, Order-related inspection activities may be subject to third party review, including those by the Authorized Nuclear Inservice Inspector.

If there are any questions concerning this approval, please feel free to contact Ms. Eva Brown at (301) 415-2315.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Edwin M. Hackett, Director  
 Project Directorate II  
 Division of Licensing Project Management  
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-250

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution:

PUBLIC	RidsNrrDe (RBarrett)
Dlpm/Lpdii-2 R/F	RidsNrrDeEmcb (WBateman/TChan)
RidsNrrOd (JDyer/RBorchardt)	RidsRgn2MailCenter (VMcCree/SVias/JMunday)
RidsNrrAdpt (BSheron)	RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter
RidsNrrDlpm (LMarsh/ELeeds)	RidsOgcRp
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii (EHackett)	EReichelt
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii-2 (WBurton)	WKoo
RidsNrrPMEBrown	GHill (2)
RidsNrrLABClayton	TKim, EDO
RidsNrrDlpmDpr	RidsSecyMailCenter
SBurnell	

ADAMS Accession No. ML040580462

NRR-028

OFFICE	PDII-2/PM	PDII-2/LA	EMCB/SC	PDII-2/SC	OGC	PDII/D
NAME	EBrown	BClayton	TChan	WBurton (A)	GLongo	EHackett
DATE	5/21/04	5/18/04	4/15/04	5/24/04	4/23/04	5/25/04

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

ORDER (EA-03-009) RELAXATION REQUEST

REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL HEAD INSPECTIONS

FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT

TURKEY POINT NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 3

DOCKET NO. 50-250

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letters to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) dated December 19, 2003, and March 24, 2004, Florida Power and Light (the licensee), submitted a request for relaxation, in accordance with Section IV, paragraph F(2) of "Order Modifying Licenses (Effective Immediately)," EA-03-009 (Order) for Turkey Point, Unit 3 (TP3), of the requirements contained in Section IV, paragraph C.(1)(b)(i) of Order EA-03-009 issued by the NRC staff on February 11, 2003. Relaxation was requested for the March 2003 Unit 3 Refueling Outage. This relaxation request was submitted after discussions between you and the NRC staff revealed that the previously submitted relaxation request for Unit 3 did not address all conditions wherein ultrasonic testing (UT) blade probe design prevented full examination to the bottom of the nozzle.

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

The NRC issued the Order on February 11, 2003, as amended on March 14, 2003, which requires specific examinations of the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) head and vessel head penetration (VHP) nozzles of all pressurized water reactor plants. Section IV, paragraph F, of the Order states that requests for relaxation of the Order associated with specific penetration nozzles will be evaluated by the NRC staff using the procedure for evaluating proposed alternatives to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Code in accordance with Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 50.55a(a)(3). Section IV, paragraph F, of the Order states that a request for relaxation regarding inspection of specific nozzles shall address the following criteria: (1) the proposed alternative(s) for inspection of specific nozzles will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or (2) compliance with this Order for specific nozzles would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety.

For TP3 and similar plants determined to have a high susceptibility to primary water stress-corrosion cracking in accordance with Section IV, paragraphs A and B, of the Order, the

Enclosure

following inspections were required to be performed every refueling outage in accordance with Section IV.C.(1)(b) of the Order:

Either:

- (i) Ultrasonic testing of each RPV head penetration nozzle (i.e., nozzle base material) from two (2) inches above the J-groove weld to the bottom of the nozzle and an assessment to determine if leakage has occurred into the interference fit zone, OR
- (ii) Eddy current testing or dye penetrant testing of the wetted surface of each J-groove weld and RPV head penetration nozzle base material to at least two (2) inches above the J-groove weld.

### 3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

#### 3.1 Components for Which Relaxation is Requested

The licensee has requested relaxation from Section IV, paragraph C.(1)(b)(i) of the Order for 65 RPV head penetration nozzles which had incomplete UT.

#### 3.2 Order Requirements for Which Relaxation is Requested

Section IV.C.(1)(b) of Order EA-03-009 requires, in part, that the following inspections be performed every refueling outage for high susceptibility plants similar to TP3:

Either:

- (i) Ultrasonic testing of each RPV head penetration nozzle (i.e., nozzle base material) from two (2) inches above the J-groove weld to the bottom of the nozzle and an assessment to determine if leakage has occurred into the interference fit zone, OR
- (ii) Eddy current testing or dye penetrant testing of the wetted surface of each J-groove weld and RPV head penetration nozzle base material to at least two (2) inches above the J-groove weld.

#### 3.3 Licensee's Proposed Alternative

The proposed alternative is to perform a UT examination to include 2 inches above the weld to the lowest elevation possible or greater than 1 inch below the weld, whichever is greater.

#### 3.4 Licensee's Basis for Relaxation

The licensee stated that additional efforts to achieve the Order-required examination area (below the weld) would result in a hardship due to unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety. The licensee stated that the 65 RPV head penetration nozzles at TP3 are used for a variety of functions and present a variety of

examination conditions. In particular, the 45 RPV head penetration nozzles that are attached to active control rod drive mechanisms (CRDMs) have funnel-ended guide sleeves permanently attached inside the nozzles, which leave only a narrow annulus available for inspection. There are six RPV head penetration nozzles attached to part-length CRDMs that have threaded drive rods permanently retracted and pinned inside the RPV head penetration nozzles that hang down below the nozzle end and create an obstruction. There are two RPV head penetration nozzles, modified for the reactor vessel level measurement system, that have a guide sleeve installed and a welded end plate (that required removal for inspection). The licensee stated that the UT technology currently available for the TP3 RPV penetration nozzle inspections has led to some areas of missed inspection coverage greater than or equal to 1 inch below the weld.

The licensee stated that performing penetrant testing in accordance with Section IV, paragraph C.(1)(b)(ii) of the Order of the missed outside diameter (OD) areas of the penetration base material would be time and dose intensive without a compensating increase in safety. As described in the attachment to the licensee's submittal dated December 19, 2003, the effect of not performing the inspection for which relaxation is requested is negligible on the level of quality and safety. The licensee indicated that there are no concerns with the structural integrity of the VHP nozzles from the unexamined portions of the nozzles addressed in their relaxation request, due to the low stresses in these portions of the nozzles and the consequently low crack-growth rates.

### 3.5 Evaluation

The NRC staff's review of this request was based on criterion (2) of paragraph F of Section IV of the Order, which states:

Compliance with this Order for specific nozzles would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety.

The licensee has demonstrated that hardship or unusual difficulty would have resulted from implementing examinations to the bottom end of the identified RPV head nozzles. The hardship is due to nozzle configuration and probe limitations, as well as hardware modifications needed, and associated doses to reach inaccessible areas as stated by the licensee as follows:

- The available circumferential UT blade probe inspection technique is not capable of interrogating the bottom triangular segment of the nozzle. This probe design was selected based on its ability to detect and size axial, off-axis, and circumferential flaws. It was also selected for its robustness and ability to obtain more consistent surface contact. The deployment of the axial UT blade probes in addition to the currently deployed circumferential blade probe does not significantly increase coverage. The axial probe also has limitations, due to element size, that prohibit interrogation to the bottom of the nozzle. Deployment of both probes provides little additional information and no commensurate increase in safety.

- To employ a rotating UT probe, capable of interrogating all the material to the bottom of the nozzles in penetrations that were not open (thermal guide sleeves, part length drive rods or other permanently installed equipment) would require hardware changes to cut, remove, and replace interfering equipment in the RPV head penetrations. The modifications required would be time and dose intensive.
- Manual PTs [dye penetrant tests] of the missed OD areas of the penetration base material would be time and dose intensive without a compensating increase in safety. Access to the OD of the nozzles is limited by a "forest" of 45 thermal sleeves and 6 permanently installed part length CRDM drive rods that extend well below the nozzle ends. The dose estimate to perform manual PT surface examination of the 65 RPV head nozzle ends examined by blade probe UT would be approximately 17.7 man Rem. This estimate is based on the dose rates of the TP3 head compared to dose rates and actual surface examinations of the vent line at Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 and portions of 9 RPV head nozzle ends at St. Lucie Unit 2. The PT examination of the remaining 65 penetration base material OD would result in excessive dose without a resultant commensurate increase in safety.

The licensee's request to limit the examination of the nozzle base material inner surface to greater than 1 inch below the weld is supported by the licensee's analysis which demonstrated that no flaw below that portion of the nozzle would propagate to a level adjacent to the J-groove weld within an 18-month operating period. The licensee's flaw evaluation was performed postulating an axial flaw in the area of missed coverage below the weld using the method described in Westinghouse WCAP-16027-P, "Structural Integrity Evaluation of Reactor Vessel Upper Head Penetrations to Support Continued Operation: Turkey Point Units 3 & 4," Revision (Rev.) 0. In the licensee's flaw evaluation, a through-wall flaw is postulated in the nozzle material from the bottom of the penetration to 1 inch from the bottom of the weld. The licensee stated that this is a conservative assumption since the inspected region extends 0.39 inches farther below the weld on the inner diameter (ID) surface of the nozzle. The licensee stated that the flaw evaluation in WCAP-16027-P, Rev. 0, is based on Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4, specific stresses in the nozzle penetrations. Since the stresses in the region greater than 1 inch below the weld are too low to propagate an axial flaw, the WCAP-16027-P, Rev. 0, flaw evaluations started at one-half of an inch below the weld, and evaluated the time to propagate the flaw in the nozzle to the bottom of the weld (start of the pressure boundary portion of the nozzle material or toe of the J-groove weld). The licensee concluded that assuming a through-wall flaw below the weld, with the flaw end located at one-half of an inch below the weld (which is in the area of complete UT coverage), an axial flaw would take greater than 5 years of operation in any nozzle location to grow to the point of contact with the weld. This time period is greater than the current inspection frequency of every refueling cycle (18 months for TP3) identified in Order EA-03-009.

The licensee's analysis in WCAP-16027-P, Rev. 0, used the crack growth formula in Electric Power Research Institute Report Material Reliability Program (MRP) report MRP-55, "Material Reliability Program (MRP) Crack Growth Rates for Evaluating Primary Water Stress Corrosion Cracking (PWSCC) of Thick Wall Alloy 600 Material (MRP-55), Revision 1." The NRC staff has

completed a preliminary review of the crack growth formula, but has not yet made a final determination on the acceptability of the subject industry report. Therefore, should the crack growth formula used by the licensee be found to be unacceptable, the licensee would need to revise its analysis to incorporate an acceptable crack growth formula as described below:

If the NRC staff finds that the crack-growth formula in industry report MRP-55 is unacceptable, the licensee shall revise its analysis that justifies relaxation of the Order within 30 days after the NRC informs the licensee of an NRC-approved crack growth formula. If the licensee's revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are exceeded prior to the end of the current operating cycle, this relaxation is rescinded and the licensee shall, within 72 hours, submit to the NRC written justification for continued operation. If the revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are exceeded during the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit the revised analysis for NRC review. If the revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are not exceeded during either the current operating cycle or the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit a letter to the NRC confirming that its analysis has been revised. Any future crack-growth analyses performed for this and future cycles for RPV head penetrations must be based on an acceptable crack growth rate formula.

The licensee indicated compliance with these conditions in a letter dated February 24, 2004.

The licensee also provided the TP3 specific hoop stresses identified in WCAP-16027-P, Rev. 0, for the individual nozzle angles. These figures were previously submitted and approved in a safety evaluation supporting an Order relaxation for TP3, dated March 20, 2003 [ADAMS Accession No. ML030790501]. The figures show that the stress rapidly decreases as the distance from the weld toe increases.

The licensee stated that there are no concerns with the structural integrity of the TP3 RPV penetration nozzles that could be caused by axial cracking in the missed coverage areas in the nonpressure boundary portion of the nozzle material greater than 1 inch below the weld for a period of greater than 5 years of operation. The licensee's statement is based on the following considerations:

- UT inspection results show no indications in the nozzle areas examined from a minimum of 1 inch below the weld to 2 inches above the weld (100 percent coverage obtained in this region);
- Acceptable assessment of no "leak path" present into interference-fit zone (100 percent coverage obtained as indicated in Table 1);
- Acceptable bare metal visual (BMV) examination results of no leakage since the last refueling outage bare metal RPV head inspection and;
- Circumferential cracks in this portion of the penetration are of no safety significance and would be identified by the full UT ID inspection before a loose part could develop.

The NRC staff finds that the licensee's bases listed above, concerning the absence of axial cracking in the missed coverage areas in the nonpressure boundary portion of the nozzle, are acceptable.

The safety issues that are addressed by the inspections mandated by Order EA-03-009 are degradation (corrosion) of the low-alloy steel RPV head and ejection of the VHP nozzles due to circumferential cracking of the nozzle above the J-groove weld. The following items provide reasonable assurance that these safety issues are addressed:

- The BMV examination performed by the licensee demonstrated the integrity of the RPV head and the absence of ongoing degradation of the head.
- The UT examination of the RPV head penetration nozzles from 2 inches above the J-groove weld to a minimum of 1 inch below the weld showed no indications. The licensee performed an acceptable assessment of no "leak path" present into the interference fit zone. This examination provides reasonable assurance that no circumferential cracking of the nozzle above the J-groove weld is present and no through-wall leakage and degradation of the RPV head should occur.
- The licensee's analysis, showed that any flaw located within the unexamined portion of the nozzles (greater than 1 inch below the J-groove weld) would not propagate to a level adjacent to the weld within an 18-month operating period. This analysis provides reasonable assurance that there is a very low likelihood for a flaw in the unexamined area to grow through-wall and cause leakage and degrade the low-alloy steel RPV head prior to the next inspection.

Based upon (1) the uninspected areas being in a lower stress area, (2) verification of the integrity of the RPV head and the absence of ongoing degradation as a result of the BMV inspections, (3) successful "leak path" results providing assurance of no circumferential cracking or through-wall leakage, and (4) the crack growth results indicating a very low likelihood for a flaw in the unexamined area to grow through-wall and cause leakage and degrade the low-alloy steel RPV head prior to the next inspection, the proposed alternative, as conditioned, provides reasonable assurance of the structural integrity of the RPV head. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the Order for the 65 nozzles would have resulted in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety for the March 2003 outage.

#### 4.0 CONCLUSION

The NRC staff concludes that examination of the 65 RPV head penetration nozzles in accordance with Section IV, paragraph C.(1)(b), of the Order would result in hardship without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety. Further, the NRC staff concludes that the licensee's proposed alternative examination of the 53 RPV head penetration nozzles from 2 inches above the J-groove weld to a level at least 1 inch below the J-groove weld provides reasonable assurance of the structural integrity of the RPV head, VHP nozzles and welds. Therefore, pursuant to Section IV, paragraph F of the Order the NRC staff finds that there is good cause shown to relax the Order and authorizes the proposed relaxation and alternative

inspection for the identified RPV head penetration nozzles at TP3, for the previous March 2003 refueling outage and current operating cycle subject to the following conditions:

- If the NRC staff finds that the crack-growth formula in industry report MRP-55 is unacceptable, the licensee shall revise its analysis that justifies relaxation of the Order within 30 days after the NRC informs the licensee of an NRC-approved crack growth formula.
- If the licensee's revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are exceeded prior to the end of the current operating cycle, this relaxation is rescinded and the licensee shall, within 72 hours, submit to the NRC written justification for continued operation.
- If the revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are exceeded during the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit the revised analysis for NRC review.
- If the revised analysis shows that the crack growth acceptance criteria are not exceeded during either the current operating cycle or the subsequent operating cycle, the licensee shall, within 30 days, submit a letter to the NRC confirming that its analysis has been revised. Any future crack-growth analyses performed for this and future cycles for RPV head penetrations must be based on an acceptable crack growth rate formula.

Principal Contributor: Eva Brown

Date: May 25, 2004

Mr. J. A. Stall  
Florida Power and Light Company

cc:

M. S. Ross, Managing Attorney  
Florida Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420

Marjan Mashhadi, Senior Attorney  
Florida Power & Light Company  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Suite 220  
Washington, DC 20004

T. O. Jones, Site Vice President  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
Florida Power and Light Company  
9760 SW. 344th Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

County Manager  
Miami-Dade County  
111 NW 1 Street, 29th Floor  
Miami, Florida 33128

Senior Resident Inspector  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
9762 SW. 344<sup>th</sup> Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

Mr. William A. Passetti, Chief  
Department of Health  
Bureau of Radiation Control  
2020 Capital Circle, SE, Bin #C21  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1741

Mr. Craig Fugate, Director  
Division of Emergency Preparedness  
Department of Community Affairs  
2740 Centerview Drive  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

## **TURKEY POINT PLANT**

Attorney General  
Department of Legal Affairs  
The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Michael O. Pearce  
Plant General Manager  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
Florida Power and Light Company  
9760 SW. 344th Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

Walter Parker  
Licensing Manager  
Turkey Point Nuclear Plant  
9760 SW 344th Street  
Florida City, Florida 33035

David Moore, Vice President  
Nuclear Operations Support  
Florida Power and Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420

Mr. Rajiv S. Kundalkar  
Vice President - Nuclear Engineering  
Florida Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420