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1. Introduction

- Utilities interested in applying WOLs preemptively if some assurance received that current inspection and LBB requirements will remain valid
- Preemptively WOLs justify:
  - ASME Code Inspection Intervals
  - Inspection coverage consistent with current WOL requirements
  - Support LBB
- Topical Report
  - Technical Report by Structural Integrity Associates, Inc. for MRP/EPRI
  - Provide a technical basis for PWOL as an effective long term mitigation of PWSCC
  - Provide information to aid the NRC in establishing suitable inspection and LBB requirements for uncracked and PWOL mitigated dissimilar metal welds susceptible to PWSCC

2. Technical Report Objectives

- Provide information to establish design basis for pre-emptive WOLs on PWSCC susceptible butt welds in PWRs that permanently retains ASME Code margins:
  - Mitigates against future cracking/crack growth by producing favorable residual stress reversal
  - Provides additional margin against leakage and pipe rupture by structural reinforcement with a PWSCC resistant material
  - Pre-emptive WOLs are additional reinforcement of piping
    - not a repair but analyzed as such
    - no defects in Piping
- Provide information to establish inspection requirements:
  - Change inspection coverage based on additional reinforcement (WOL material plus a percentage of the original pipe wall per Code Case N-504-2)
  - Provide technical basis to maintain current Section XI Inspection Interval (ten years)
- Provide information to maintain Leak Before Break status of the mitigated welds
- Obtain NRC approval of Topical Report in time-frame consistent with Spring 2006 Implementation schedule
3. Weld Overlay Design Requirements

- Weld Overlay Structural Sizing
- Residual Stress Improvement
- Inspectability Considerations
- Fatigue Considerations
- Leak Before Break

WOL Design Requirements: Structural Sizing

- Two types of design basis flaws assumed for PWOLs:
  - 100% thru original nozzle wall and 360° around circumference (full structural overlay)
  - 75% thru original nozzle wall and 360° around circumference (reduced thickness overlay)
  Thus, both are structural overlays, in addition to providing residual stress benefits
- WOL must satisfy ASME XI margins (IWB-3640) in presence of above flaw assumptions
- Minimum WOL length is $1.5\sqrt{\text{Rt}}$ plus length of susceptible material on OD of original DMW
- WOL thickness & length must also be checked against residual stress & inspectability criteria
**Full Structural Overlay Concept**

(per CC N-504-2)

- Weld Overlay Thickness, \( t_{w\text{cl}} \)
- Original Wall, \( t_w \)
- Postulated 360° circumferential flaw
  Depth equals original wall thickness.

---

**Reduced Thickness Overlay Concept**

- Weld Overlay Thickness, \( t_{w\text{cl}} \)
- Original Wall, \( t_w \)
- Postulated 360° circumferential flaw
  Depth equals 0.75 of original wall thickness.
WOL Design Requirements:
Residual Stress Improvement

- Weld overlay improves residual stress condition
  - Initial unfavorable residual stress state assumed to exist due to original weld ID repair during plant construction
  - Nozzle-specific analyses performed to demonstrate that PWOL reverses residual stress field producing compressive residual stresses (both axial and hoop) in original pipe wall
  - Prior experimental work has verified residual stress analysis techniques (EPRI Reports NP-7103-D and NP-7085-D)
- Current MRP project underway to confirm residual stress improvement (and inspectability) on typical PWR nozzle geometry

Residual Stress Model:
Pressurizer Spray Nozzle

![Residual Stress Model Diagram]
WOL Design Requirements:
Inspectability Considerations

- WOL length and other design details often need to be modified to accommodate inspection requirements
  - WOL plus outer 25% or 50% of original nozzle thickness, encompassing PWSCC material + ½" on either side of weld
  - Inspectability of adjacent welds also needs to be considered

WOL Design Requirements:
Fatigue Considerations

- Fatigue Crack Growth
  - Assume initial flaw that could be missed by pre-WOL inspection (10% thru wall)
  - Apply residual stresses plus all design basis loading conditions, including flow stratification concerns where applicable (e.g., NRC Bulletin 88-01 for surge nozzles)
  - Demonstrate that flaw doesn't grow to design basis flaw for PWOL in remaining design life (plus license renewal period where applicable)
  - For geometries that are uninspectable pre-WOL, start with flaw depth = post-WOL inspection depth.

- Fatigue Usage
  - Demonstrate acceptable fatigue usage for overlay geometry in accordance with ASME Section III requirements
WOL Design Requirements:
Leak Before Break

- Guidelines for LBB Evaluation provided in NUREG-1061, Vol. 3 and Draft SRP 3.6.3
- Design basis loads considered:
  - Normal (pressure + deadweight + thermal) used to determine leakage from a crack no larger than 1/2 critical flaw size
  - Normal + SSE used to determine critical flaw size (or other)
  - Alternately, leakage flaw size may be determined using factor of 1.4 on loads
- Leakage rate determined from thru-wall crack with required margin to critical flaw size (factor of 2 on flaw size or 1.4 on load)
- To qualify for consideration, there must be no potential for degradation by erosion, erosion/corrosion, erosion/cavitation, water hammer, thermal fatigue, or other mechanisms that could lead to cracking
- Factor of 10 required between predicted leakage rate and detection capability of plant leakage detection systems (previously ~1 GPM, but improving with current technology)

4. Verification of Weld Overlay Effectiveness

- Prior Experimental Programs (in support of BWR WOLs)
  - 28-Inch Notched Pipe Test [Ref. 1]
  - EPRI/GE Degraded Pipe Program [Ref. 2]
  - EPRI Weld Overlay Large Diameter Pipe Test Program [Ref. 1]
  - Battelle/NRC Degraded Pipe Tests [Ref. 3]
- Current EPRI-MRP Program
- Field Experience [Refs. 4, 5]
WOL Verification References


28-Inch Notched Pipe Test
28-Inch Notched Pipe Test

28-Inch Notched Pipe Test

a) Notch Tested Before Weld Overlay

b) Notch Tested After Weld Overlay

No MC12 Cracking
Current EPRI/MRP PWOL Demonstration Program

- Task Descriptions - Development And Testing Of Preemptive Weld Overlay Mitigation Techniques For PWSCC
  - Finite Element Analysis
    - Perform weld overlay sizing calculations plus finite element analyses (FEA) in accordance with the mockup design specification to optimize/guide experimental results
    - Provide a PWOL design drawing for mockup based on the analyses
    - Results from the FEA of the mockup will be compared with those from a prior FEA of a generic surge nozzle
  - Mockup Fabrication
    - Welding Services, Inc. (WSI) contracted through SI, with the support of SI and input from EPRI, will fabricate the mockup and weld overlay
    - Preliminary mockup drawing is seen in the following figure
Current EPRI/MRP PWOL Demonstration Program (Con't)

- Application of PWOL
  * Provide the design drawing and FEA results to EPRI to assist in application of the PWOL and to compare with the diametrical displacement measurements to be taken by EPRI at 4 azimuths, with spacing at approximately \( \frac{1}{4} \)-inch from the edge of the overlay and at two additional locations

- Residual Stress Measurements and Metallography
  * XRD residual stress analysis and strain gage testing, to provide measurements to compare with the FEA results
  * Metallography of mockup sections

- Inspection
  * Examine mockup using an inspection protocol that satisfies the requirements of the Performance Demonstration Initiative (PDI)
  * Inspection procedures, personnel and equipment (including instrumentation and ultrasonic probes) used to conduct these inspections will satisfy the requirements of the PDI
Current EPRI/MRP PWOL Demonstration Program (Con’t)

- Reporting and Documentation
  - final report on demonstration program will include:
    - details of the mockup fabrication, FEA, PWOL, and surface conditioning
    - results from XRD stress measurements, metallography, hardness profile, and corrosion testing.

- Topical Report
  - EPRI/MRP topical report will be prepared documenting overall PWOL technical basis
  - will include residual stress, fatigue, LBB and other work that SI has performed at its own expense
  - Will also summarize the experimental and analytical work performed under the demonstration program

Weld Overlay Field Experience

- Used extensively in BWRs
  - Code Case N-504-2
  - Code Case N-638 (ambient temperature temperbead)
  - NUREG-0313
  - EPRI Reports (NP-7103-D and NP-7085-D)
  - Vermont Yankee Core Spray Nozzle to Safe-End Repair
    - In Service ~20 years
    - Multiple UT Inspection results demonstrated no flaw growth
  - Repairs Greater than 100 square inches approved by NRC

- Initial PWR butt weld WOL applied in Dec. 2003 (TMI surge line to hot leg nozzle)
  - Repair over 100 square inches
  - Approved by NRC
**BWRVIP-75 Review of BWR WOL Experience**

- Weld overlays applied to BWR SS and DM welds since 1981
- Initially considered temporary repair
- Total applied: more than 800
- BWRVIP-75 survey of overlays still in service (Issued 1999):
  - 262 in service, in 33 responding plants
  - More applied since that survey

**BWR Weld Overlay Inspection Requirements**

- GL 88-01/NUREG-0313 Rev. 2 Category E:
  - 100% every two refueling cycles
- BWRVIP-75 Category E:
  - Normal water chemistry: 25%/10 years
  - Hydrogen water chemistry: 10%/10 years
- Weld overlays now considered permanent repair
Experience with Weld Overlays for Dissimilar Metal Welds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Calvert Cliffs</td>
<td>RCL drains (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Hope Creek</td>
<td>Recirc. Inlet Nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2004</td>
<td>Susquehanna Unit 1</td>
<td>Recirc. inlet nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2003</td>
<td>TMI Unit 1</td>
<td>Surge line nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td>Core spray nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>Peach Bottom Units 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Core spray nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>Oyster Creek</td>
<td>Recirc. outlet nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Duane Arnold</td>
<td>Recirc. inlet nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1999</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Feedwater nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1998</td>
<td>Nine Mile Point Unit 2</td>
<td>Feedwater nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1996</td>
<td>Brunswick Units 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Feedwater nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1996</td>
<td>Hatch Unit 1</td>
<td>Recirc. inlet nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1991</td>
<td>River Bend</td>
<td>Feedwater nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1986</td>
<td>Vermont Yankee</td>
<td>Core spray nozzle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Metallurgical and Welding Considerations

- Metallurgical Considerations on Service Performance
  - Micro-Structure/Cooling Rate
  - Tempering
  - Hydrogen Cracking
- Welding Considerations
  - ASME Code Cases
    - N-XXX - Dissimilar Weld Overlays
      - CR Content of First layer
    - N-638-3 - Ambient Temp. Temer Bead Welding
      - 100 square inch imitation
Metallurgical and Welding Considerations
(Con't)

- Metallurgical Considerations on Service Performance
  - Micro-Structure/Cooling Rate
    - High Cooling Rate for Weld from Water or Large Heat Sink from Nozzle
    - Heat Affected Zone (HAZ) Fully Martensitic
  - Tempering
    - Second and Third Weld Layers Temper HAZ
    - Final Structure of HAZ – Tempered Martensite
    - Base Materials with lower fracture toughness most improved
  - Hydrogen Cracking
    - Auto GTAW Process
    - Bare Filler Wire/Dry Shielding Gas
    - High Permeability Ferritic Base Materials
    - 48 Hour Hold Time Prior to NDE

---

Metallurgical and Welding Considerations
(Con’t)

Pre-PWOL Axial Stress Contour, 70 F
Metallurgical and Welding Considerations (Con't)

* Welding Considerations
  - ASME Code Cases
    - N-XXX - "Alternative Rules for Repair of Class 1, 2, and 3 Dissimilar Metal Welds by Weld Overlay"
      - ASME White Paper-CR Content of First Layer
      - At WG Welding & SG RR&A Next Section XI Meeting
      - Design and Inspection Consistent with N-504 and Non-Mandatory Appendix
    - N-638-3 -Ambient Temp. Temper Bead Welding
      - ASME White Paper-100 square inch imitation
        - Analyses and Experimental Work Show Residual Stresses for Repairs to 500 Square Inches Equivalent or better than Cavity and Overlay Repairs 100 Square Inches or Less
        - All Repairs meet ASME Section III or Construction Code and Owner's Requirements
        - Service History for Repairs (Dissimilar Weld Overlays, Cavity and Weld Pads) made with Ambient Temperature Temper Bead Welding has been Excellent
        - Many of the Repairs are Greater than 100 Square Inches and have been approved by the NRC
  - New Alloy 52 MS Filler Wire has been Shown to have Much Improved Weldability

Post PWOL Axial Stress Contour, 650 F
6. PWOL Inspection Requirements

- Inspection requirements for structural weld overlays defined in Code Case N-504-2
  - Initial Inspection – WOL material for welding defects + outer 25% of original weld (±0.25")
  - Subsequent ISIs – WOL directly over original weld (±0.25") + outer 25% of original weld (±0.25")
- Proposed Inspection requirements for reduced thickness PWOLs
  - Initial Inspection – WOL material for welding defects + outer 50% of original weld (±0.25")
  - Subsequent ISIs – WOL directly over original weld (±0.25") + outer 50% of original weld (±0.25")
- Easier exam than inspection of entire original bi-metallic weld
- PDI Qualification Process available
- Favorable residual stresses plus structural reinforcement justify ASME Section XI ISI intervals (10 years)

7. Example Analyses and Results

- Example Nozzles
  - pressurizer upper head spray nozzle (OD=6", t=0.875")
  - pressurizer lower head surge nozzle (OD=15", t=1.28")
  - a typical main RCS hot leg nozzle (OD=33", t=2.33")

- Analyses Performed
  - WOL Sizing and Residual Stress (all nozzles)
  - Fatigue Crack Growth (surge nozzle)
  - Leak Before Break (surge and hot leg nozzles)
**PWOL Examples:**

**Structural Sizing Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nozzle</th>
<th>WOL Thickness (in.)</th>
<th>Minimum Length (in.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Thickness</td>
<td>Full Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurizer Spray</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurizer Surge</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS Hot Leg</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residual Stress Model:**

**Pressurizer Spray Nozzle**

![Residual Stress Model](image)
Residual Stress Results:
Pressurizer Spray Nozzle

Residual Stress Model:
Pressurizer Surge Nozzle
Residual Stress Model:
RCS Hot Leg Nozzle

Residual Stress Results:
RCS Hot Leg Nozzle
Final PWOL Designs
(Reflecting Resid. Stress & Inspectability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nozzle</th>
<th>WOL Thickness (in.)</th>
<th>WOL Length (in.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressurizer Spray</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurizer Surge</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS Hot Leg</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WOL Thickness Minimum Nozzle Length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nozzle</th>
<th>WOL Thickness (in.)</th>
<th>Minimum Length (in.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressurizer Spray</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurizer Surge</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS Hot Leg</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example Fatigue Evaluation: Surge Nozzle

- Plant transients defined for 500 HU/CD Transients, including:
  - Pressure stresses
  - Dead weight stresses
  - Residual stresses (from prior analyses)
  - Bending stresses due to thermal stratification (from NRC Bulletin 88-11 evaluation)
  - Surge line thermal expansion stresses (scaled proportionally to surge line mean temperature)
  - Hot leg thermal anchor movement stresses (scaled proportionally to the hot leg temperature)

- Initial Flaw Assumptions
  - Circ crack; 10% through wall, 10 to 1 aspect ratio
  - Axial crack: 10% through-wall; 2 to 1 aspect ratio (length limited by adjacent LAS and SS)
Surge Line Fatigue Crack Growth
Analysis Results

Results of LBB Evaluation
of Surge Nozzle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Crack Morphology</th>
<th>Critical Flaw Size, Inches</th>
<th>Leakage Flaw Size, Inches</th>
<th>Leakage Rate, GPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/o Overlay SCC</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Overlay Fatigue</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>94.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Overlay Fatigue</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Overlay SCC</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of LBB Evaluation of Hot Leg Nozzle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Crack Morphology</th>
<th>Critical Flaw Size, Inches</th>
<th>Leakage Flaw Size, Inches</th>
<th>Leakage Rate, GPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/o Overlay</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Overlay</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>76.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Overlay</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ Overlay</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Conclusions

- Significant technical bases and field experience exist in support of WOLs as a long term repair of SCC susceptible welds
- Technical bases and field experience equally applicable to WOLs applied preemptively to uncracked welds (PWOLs)
- When used preemptively on welds that are inspected and found clean, PWOLs justify:
  - ASME Code Inspection Intervals
  - Reduced inspection coverage
  - Preservation of LBB
- Several utilities interested in applying if some assurance received that current inspection and LBB requirements will remain valid
9. Schedule

- Design basis established and sample analyses completed
- Additional mockup/experimental program underway
- Topical Report submittal July 1, 2005
  - Technical report on new mockup program by Sept. 2005
- SER desired to support Fall 2005 outage schedule

10. NRC Fees for Review

- Request is made to 10CFR170.11(a)(1)(iii) which states: As a means of exchanging information between industry organizations and the NRC for the specific purpose of supporting the NRC's generic regulatory improvements or efforts
- Technical report when approved by the NRC could be used to establish a generic position for inspection credit for the use of a Preventive Weld Overlay for mitigating PWSCC and for establishing that the criteria for mitigating the active degradation mechanism of PWSCC for LBB are satisfied
- Fee exemption applies since the document would aid NRC in establishing generic guidance as a part of a NUREG or Regulatory Guide. Similar type to example in 10CFR170.11(a)(1)(iii)(B). NRC has established generic positions for addressing acceptable ways to mitigate cracking caused by Inter-Granular Stress Corrosion Cracking in BWRs in NUREG-313, Rev. 1.