# ENCLOSURE 3

 $\cdot$   $-$ 

Analytical Evaluation of Steam Generator B Upper Shell to Transition Cone Weld Indications

27 pages follow



# **CALCULATION** File No.: PBCH-14Q-303<br>PACKAGE Project No.: PBCH-14Q

 $\sigma_{\rm{max}}$  and  $\sigma_{\rm{max}}$ 

Project No.: PBCH-14Q



## 1 INTRODUCTION

The 2005 inservice inspection of steam generator A at Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 1 identified several indications in the transition cone to upper shell weld region of the steam generator. The indications were assessed per the flaw proximity rules of ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Section XI, IWA-3300 [1]. Following assessment of flaw proximity, indication dimensions were compared to the flaw acceptance standards of Section XI, IWC-3510 [1] by the plant [4]. One indication did not meet the flaw acceptance standards of Section XI, IWC-3510 <sup>[1]</sup>. It is therefore necessary to conduct a flaw evaluation per Section XI, IWB-3600 (since IWC-3600 is in preparation) for this flaw. This calculation evaluates the flaw per the guidelines of Section XI, IWB-3610, which include acceptance criteria based on linear elastic fracture mechanics and consideration of potential flaw growth. This calculation does not apply to other flaws which may be identified, without further evaluation. Conservative assumptions have been used in this evaluation to demonstrate flaw acceptability per IWB-3610. This calculation has been design reviewed in accordance with the requirements of the Structural Integrity Associates Quality Assurance Program.

# **2** TECHNICAL **APPROACH**

Fracture mechanics methods consistent with the requirements of ASME Section XI have been applied in this flaw evaluation. The acceptance criterion is that the applied stress intensity factor due to the observed flaw, with consideration of flaw growth over the remaining life of the plant, remains below the material toughness, including applicable margins from Section XI. The flaw acceptance criteria, based on applied stress intensity factor, was determined based on Paragraph IWB-3612 of ASME Section XI [1]. The material toughness for the carbon/low alloy steel steam generator shell material at operating temperature is taken to be 200 ksi- $\sqrt{in}$ ch, consistent with Figure A-4200-1 from ASME Section XI Appendix A for K<sub>Ic</sub>. A safety factor of  $\sqrt{10}$  is applied, as required by IWB-3610. This gives an allowable stress intensity factor of  $200/\sqrt{10} = 63.25$  ksi- $\sqrt{inch}$ .

The fracture mechanics analysis was performed for the unacceptable flaw.

# **3 FLAW CHARACTERIZATION**

A total of 24 flaw indications were observed. These flaws were compared to the flaw proximity rules of IWA-3300. Table 1 (which is based on data in [4]) lists all 24 flaw dimensions and their locations, and summarizes the results of the proximity rule assessment. None of the 24 indications had to be combined by the proximity rules. Plant personnel assessed all flaws to the IWC-3510 acceptance standards, and determined that only one flaw (number 19 in Table 1) required further evaluation. This flaw has length  $= 1.75$  inch, and depth  $= 0.22$  inch. It is located 1.03 inches below the outside surface.

The observed unacceptable flaw is entirely subsurface and not exposed to any fluid chemistry.



# 4 DESIGN INPUTS

The as-measured wall thickness is 3.68 inches in the transition cone region (from plant UT reports [4]).

The transition cone material is SA-533 Grade A, Class 2 [6] with specified yield stress = 70 ksi. The Upper Shell material has a yield stress of less than 50 ksi.

From [5], the combined membrane, bending and secondary stress  $(P_L+P_B+Q)$  at the affected weld location is 64.7 ksi.

Welding residual stresses at the flaw location are negligible since the vessel is a thick walled shell that has been stress relieved. Residual stresses are steady state secondary stresses.

## 5 ASSUMPTIONS

- 1. To be conservative, the limiting stress value reported in Section 4.0 is used, and treated as an applied membrane stress. This is conservative because membrane stresses are more severe than bending stresses at equal magnitude.
- 2. The service life is assumed to be 60 years.
- 3. The material toughness  $K_{1c}$  is taken as 200 ksi-  $\sqrt{inch}$ , from Section XI Appendix A [1].

# 6 CALCULATIONS

## **6.1** Fracture mechanics evaluation

Linear elastic fracture mechanics and fatigue flaw growth evaluations of the flaw were performed. The flaw was modeled as a subsurface semi-elliptical flaw in an infinite plate subjected to membrane and bending stress as illustrated in Figure 1. This is a common fracture mechanics model applied to subsurface flaws in thick shells. Figure 1 refers to the 1986 Edition of ASME Section XI. This is the Edition to which the SI fracture mechanics program pc-CRACK [3] was developed. However, the flaw definition in that figure remains the same in subsequent Editions of the Code, including the committed Edition and Addenda for Point Beach [1]. For this subsurface flaw model, the flaw depth is defined as 2a. Therefore, the flaw depth, a, is half of the measured flaw depth as reported in the UT reports.

For the indication the flaw parameters were calculated as follows:





The applied stress intensity factors for the indication above were calculated using pc-CRACK, [3]. The aspect ratio of 0.1 was used in the evaluation for the indication (limit of the model). The applied stress intensity factor  $K_{\text{applied}}$  at the limiting location on the flaw face was compared to an allowable value of  $K_{Ic}/\sqrt{10}$ , where  $K_{Ic}$  is the material toughness (assumed to be 200 ksi- $\sqrt{10}$  for the steam generator shell material at the service temperatures, from Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A-4200-1), and the factor of  $\sqrt{10}$  represents the factor of safety that is imposed by ASME Section XI, IWB-3610 for Normal and Upset conditions. The allowable K is therefore  $63.25$  ksi- $\sqrt{in}$ . As long as the applied stress intensity factor remains below the allowable value for the flaw size, the flaw remains acceptable by Section XI criteria. pc-CRACK output for the fracture mechanics analysis is contained in Appendix A.

# 6.2 End of Life Fatigue Flaw Growth Calculation

Since the indication is subsurface and therefore not wetted, the end of life flaw size due to fatigue growth was calculated using the fatigue growth curves for carbon and low alloy ferritic steels exposed to air environments, Figure A-4300-1 of Appendix A of Section XI [1]. The flaw was conservatively assumed to experience cyclic stresses corresponding to a stress range from 0 to 64.7 ksi [5]. This is conservative because the latter value corresponds to the sum of the highest reported membrane plus bending plus secondary  $(P_L+P_B+Q)$  stress..

Fatigue growth results are contained in Appendix B.

# 7 RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

The fracture mechanics analysis shows that flaw 19 is acceptable per the criteria of ASME Section XI, IWB-3612. The calculated maximum stress intensity factor for the observed flaw is 40 ksi- $\sqrt{\text{inch}}$ , as compared to the allowable value of 63.25 ksi- $\sqrt{inch}$ , which includes required safety margins ( $\sqrt{10}$ ) as noted in Section 2 of this calculation.

The fatigue growth calculation demonstrates that over more than 4800 cycles from 0 to 64.7 ksi, the resulting flaw growth of the flaw remains below the allowable flaw size. Most transients experienced by the component are much less severe than this transient, and would lead to negligible growth. Therefore, growth of the flaw to an unacceptable size over the remaining life of the plant is not predicted.

The flaw analyzed in this calculation is more severe than are any of the flaws in this weld that were accepted under the Acceptance Standards of IWC-3510. Therefore, although fracture mechanics evaluation of such acceptable flaws is not required, the fracture mechanics analysis in this calculation could conservatively be applied to such flaws, if necessary.



**Structural Integrity File No.: PBCH-14Q-303** Revision: 1 *Associates, Inc.* Page 4

# **8 DEGRADATION MECHANISMS**

The observed flaws are subsurface flaws that are remote from any surface (either the wetted inside surface or the air outside surface). Such a flaw is therefore not a result of chemistry-driven mechanisms such as stress corrosion cracking or corrosion. These factors lead to the conclusion that the observed flaws are in fact artifacts of original fabrication, and not due to an active degradation mechanism. The evaluation of the hypothetical flaw growth by a fatigue mechanism is therefore conservative.

# 9 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the results of the evaluation presented in this calculation package, the indications found during the inservice inspection of the steam generator A transition cone weld are acceptable and meet the requirement of ASME Code, Section XI, IWB-3610 [1].

The total of all indication areas is about 5.06 in<sup>2</sup>. The area of the steam generator weld is about 1928 in<sup>2</sup>. assuming a circumference of 524 inches [4], and a wall thickness of 3.68 inches. The transverse area reduction is less than 0.26% of the original area. This area reduction will have no significant affect on the hoop stress in the weld. Thus, the steam generator stress analysis based on ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Section III is not affected. Therefore, the requirement of IWB-3610 (d) (2) is satisfied.

# 10 REFERENCES

- 1. ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, 1998 Edition with Addenda through 2000.
- 2. Steam Generator Design Summary, E-mail from Brian Kemp (NMC) to Hal Gustin (SI), dated 10/19/05 SI File: PBCH-14Q-220
- 3. pc-CRACK for Windows, Version 3.1-98348, Structural Integrity Associates, 1998.
- 4. Point Beach Ultrasonic Examination Reports, SI File: PBCH-14Q-222
- *5.* E-mail from Brian Kemp (NMC) to Hal Gustin (SI) dated 10/22/05, supplemented by e-mail from Brian Kemp (NMC) to Hal Gustin (SI) dated 11/10/05. SI File: PBCH-14Q-220
- 6. Telecon, Russell Turner **(NMC)** to Hal Gustin (SI) 10/25/05 SI File: PBCH-14Q-220





## **Explanation of Terms Utilized for the Resolution of Indications**

 $X =$  Distance from the vessel outside surface to the upper tip of the flaw

Sheet No. 175-0004 Page & of &

S = Distance from the vessel inside surface to the lower tip of the flaw

Thru-wall  $(2a \text{ or } a) =$  Flaw depth size

Length (I) = Flaw length

Thickness =

#### 3.68 inches

Lmax = Flaw circumferential location measured in inches clockwise from Vessel Zero.

 $Y = (St)(aA) = S/a$ . If  $Y \le 0.40$ , the flaw is classified as surface. If  $Y > 1.0$ , then  $Y = 1$ .



Note: Indications 20 & 21 are the same detection indication recorded from two directions.

Resolution Performed By:

**Resolution Reviewed By:** 

<u>Coll Joseph 2605</u>

26-Oct-2005 14:13:13

**WELD NUMBER: SG-A-4** 

# **APPENDIX A**

# pc-CRACK OUTPUT FILES: ALLOWABLE FLAW DETERMINATION



File No.: PBCH-14Q-303

tm<br>pc-CRACK pc-CRACK for Windows version 3 .1-98348 (c) copyright '84 - '98 structural Integrity Associates, Inc. 3315 Almaden Expressway, Suite 24 San Jose, CA 95118-1557 voice: 408-978-8200 Fax: 408-978-8964 E-mail: pccrack@structint.com

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

Date: Thu Oct 27 13:49:16 2005 Input Data and Results File: 303SSF.LFM

Title: PBCH-14Q: Steam Generator A Flaw Evaluation

Load cases:



-<sub>--</sub>----Through Wall Stresses for Load Cases With Stress Coeff----*--*wall case<br>Depth PL+PB+Q PL+PB+Q



Crack Model: Elliptical subsurface cracked Plate under Membrane & Bending stresses

Page 1

Reference: ASME Boiler and Pressure vessel code, section XI, '86 Ed. WARNING: The stress i ntensity factor (K) is the maxi mum of <sup>K</sup>at point 1 and K at point 2 as identi fi ed in Section XI.

Crack Parameters: wall thickness: 3.6800 Max. crack depth: 0. 4000 crack aspect ratio: 0.1000 Eccentricity ratio: 0.3800 Material yield strength: 70.0000<br>Co = Sigma(membrane) + Sigma(bending)<br>C1 = -2\*Sigma(bending)/thickness -------------- ------Stress Intensity Factor--*----------------*-



Material fracture toughness: Material ID: SG Plate Depth K1C

 $\overline{a}$ 

0.0000 63.2500

 $\sim$ 

 $\alpha$  and  $\alpha$  are  $\alpha$ 



Load combination for cri tical crack size:

 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 





 $\sim$ 

 $\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllll} \multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{1}}}&\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{1}}}&\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{2}}}&\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{3}}} &\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{4}}}&\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{5}}} &\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{6}}} &\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{6}}} &\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{6}}} &\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{7}}} &\multicolumn{2}{c}{\textbf{\emph{$ 

 $\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots$ 

# Critical crack size = 0.2716

 $\cdots$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{c}}$  .

End of PC-C RACK Output

 $\sim$ 

# APPENDIX B

# pc-CRACK **OUTPUT** FILE: FATIGUE CRACK GROWTH



### 303FCG2

tm

pc-CRACK for Windows version 3 .1-98348 (C) copyright '84 - '98 Structural Integrity Associates, Inc. 3315 Almaden Expressway, Suite 24 San lose, CA 95118-1557 voice: 408 -978-8200 Fax: 408-978-8964 E-mail: pccrack@structint.com

#### Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

Date: Thu Oct 27 13:51:18 2005 Input Data and Results File: 303FCG2.LFM

Title: PBCH-14Q: steam Generator A Flaw Evaluation

Load cases:



------Through Wall Stresses for Load Cases With Stress Coeff------wall Case<br>Depth PL+PB+Q PL+PB+Q



crack Model: Elliptical subsurface cracked Plate under Membrane & Bending Stresses

Page 1

Reference: ASME Boiler and Pressure vessel code, section XI, '86 Ed. WARNING: The stress i ntensity factor (K) is the maxi mum of K at point 1 and K at point 2 as identified in Section XI.

crack Parameters: Wall thickness: 3.6800<br>Max. crack depth: 0.4000 Max. crack depth: 0.4000 crack aspect ratio: 0.1000 Eccentricity ratio: 0.3800 Material yield strength: 70.0000 Co = sigma(membrane) + sigma(bending)  $C1 = -2 *$ Sigma(bending)/thickness -------------- ------Stress Intensity Factor------------------- -- crack Case PL+PB+Q 10.6409 15.0576 18.4528 21.3202 23.8511 26.1433 28.2549 30.2239 32.0765 33.8319 35.5045 37.1054 38.6437 40.1264 41.5596 42.9482 44.2965 45.6079 46.8856 48.1323 49.3503 50.5417 51.7084 52.8519 53.9738 55.0754 56.1579

57.2223 58.2697 59.3009 60.3169 61.3183 62.3058 63. 2802 64.2898 65.3371 66.3756 67.4057 68.4277 69.4422 70.4493 71.4495 72.4431 73.4302 74.4114 75.3866 76.3563 77.3207 78.2799 79.2342

0.0080 0.0160 0.0240 0.0320 0.0400 0.0480 0.05 60 0.0640 0.0720 0.0800 0.0880 0.0960 0.1040 0.1120 0.1200 0.1280 0.1360 0.1440 0.1520 0.1600 0.1680 0.1760 0.1840 0.1920 0.2000 0.2080 0.2160 0.2240 0.2320 0.2400 0.2480 0.25 60 0.2640 0.2720 0.2800 0.2880 0.2960 0.3040 0.3120 0.3200 0.3280 0.3360 0.3440 0.35 20 0.3600 0.3680 0.3760 0.3840 0.3920 0.4000

303FCG2

crack Growth Laws:

Law ID: SG subsurface<br>Model: ASME Section )

 $da/dN = C * S * dK \land 3.07$ 

where

ASME Section XI - ferritic steel in air environment



I



 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

End of pc-CRACK Output

 $\cdot$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

Page 4



Hal L. Gustin

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kemp, Brian [Brian.Kemp@nmcco.com] Saturday, October 22, 2005 11:08 AM Kemp, Brian; Hal L. Gustin Additional PBNP Design Input

Hal,

The following information should be used as a design input for the UlR29 SG structural evaluation that SIA is performing.

This information is an exerpt from the Westinghouse Report titled "PBNP Power Uprate Project

NSSS Engineering Report Volume 1."

The PBNP Unit 1 Steam Generators (Westinghouse Model 44F) calculated stress for normal and abnormal conditions (PL+PB+Q) in the flaw region (upper shell to upper head weld) is 64.7 ksi.

Brian Kemp

Page 1 of 1

## Hal **L.** Gustin



Hal,

As described in my email to you (dated October 22, 2005), the calculated stress for normal and abnormal conditions ( $P_L+P_B+Q$ ) that should be used in the SIA analysis for the PBNP-1 SG flaw region (upper shell to upper head weld) is 64.7 ksi. This value was selected because it represented the highest stress values in the Model 44F SG transition cone region and is clearly referenced in the text of

the Westinghouse SG Analysis . This is a conservative value that is appropriate to use for the SIA analysis of upper shell to transition cone weld.

Additionally, the file that I forwarded to you October 19, 2005 titled "design parameters.doc" has a \*.pdf to \*.doc conversion error in it's note 1. The correct note should read "Parameters reflect Model A47 replacement steam generators but also bound operation with Model 44F in Unit 1." The note is corrected and the revised file is attached to this email.

Please call with questions.

Brian Kemp

**[1]**

"PBNP Power Uprate Project NSSS Engineering Report Volume 1."

Brian Kemp NMC Fleet Lead - Materials 715-426-6960 (office) 612-202-9286 (cell)

 $\mathbf{u}$ 

"PBNP Power Uprate Project NSSS Engineering Report Volume 1."

## Hal L. Gustin



Kemp, Brian [Brian.Kemp@nmcco.com]<br>Wednesday, October 19, 2005 9:30 AM Hal L. Gustin PBNP design input

Attachments: design paramters.doc; load cycles.doc; Pzr Fatigue Usage.doc; SG Design Information.doc; Transition Cone Region Figure.doc; Transition Cone Region Figure -Thicknesses.doc











design load cycles.doc (68 Pzr Fatigue SG Design Transition Cone Transition Cone aramters.doc (70 KE KB) Usage.doc (43 KB) iformation.doc (37 . Region Figure.... Region Figure ... Usage.doc (43 KB) iformation.doc (37 . Region Figure.... Region Figure ...  $Hal,$ 

The attached information should be used as design inputs for the U1R29 SG & PZR structural evaluations that SIA is performing.

This information is non-proprietary exerpts from the Westinghouse Report titled "PBNP Power Uprate Project

NSSS Engineering Report Volume 1."

Please call with questions.

Brian Kemp



 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

**Transition Cone Region** 



 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 



## PBNP Power Uprate Project (Bounding 10.5% Core Power Uprate)<br>Design Benematan(<sup>1,2)</sup> Head for Surtange Components <sup>8</sup>, Accident An  $\mathbb{R}^{(1,2)}$  Used for Systems

Notes:

- 1. Parameters reflect Model A47 replacement steam generators but also bound operation with Model 44F in Unit 1
- 2. Systems and components analyses have been performed using the parameters identified in Table 1-1.
- 3. Steam pressure/temperature must be greater than 745.7 psia/510.0°F due to the steam generator design pressure differential requirements.
- 4. Steam pressure at the outlet of the steam generator nozzle.
	- 5. A maximum moisture carry over of 0.10% was assumed; however, this value cannot be warranted at this high power level and low steam pressure. The maximum moisture carry over for the Model 44F steam generators is 0.25% and the maximum steam flow associated with this value is  $7.40 \times 10^6$  lb/hr.

#### **Structural**

The critical steam generator components that were evaluated for structural adequacy are:

- Primary side: Primary chamber, tubesheet, primary nozzles, primary manway, divider plate, and tube-to-tubesheet weld. The primary side of the replacement steam generators was evaluated as a whole through a review of the uprating transients that affect the primary side of the steam generator, i.e., RCS transients.
- Secondary side: Upper shell, transition cone, lower shell, junction of tubesheet and stub barrel, main and auxiliary feedwater and spray nozzles, secondary manway opening and bolts, inspection ports, and minor shell taps.

These components were evaluated for the effects of the uprate on the steady-state and transient conditions for the normal and upset loads in the design specifications, References 1 (Model 44F) and Reference 2 (Model A47). The test, emergency, and faulted loading conditions are unaffected by the uprate. The structural acceptance criteria for both steam generator models are given in the 1965 Edition through Summer 1966 Addenda of the ASME B&PV, Section III, Reference 3. Details of the actual acceptance criteria employed in the structural evaluation of both the 44F and A47 are given in Section 4 of Volume 1 of Reference 4.

#### **Secondary Shell - Model 44F**

Summary stress results for the secondary shell transition cone are given in Table 7-44 of Reference 5 for current power rating. These results, shown in Table 5.6-9, remain bounding for the uprated conditions since a reduction in secondary pressure will reduce the stresses in the shell. Citical sections in the transition cone region are depicted in Figure 5.6-3. The results in Table 5.6-9 show that all stress limits are satisfied. For fatigue, Section BB, shown in Figure *5.6-1,* is the overall governing location for the secondary shell and has been considered above in the evaluation for the channel head, the tubesheet and the tubesheet to shell junctions. The structural evaluation of the relocated PBNP Unit **1** level taps in the secondary shell is discussed below.

#### **Upper Shell Remnant - Model 44F**

The upper shell (along with its manway) and the steam outlet nozzle are remnant components from the original 44 Series steam generator. The remnant components were evaluated for continued use in Model 44F replacement steam generators in Section 7.20 of Reference 5. Figure 5.6-5 shows the locations in the upper shell remnant evaluated in Reference 5. Section DD in Figure 5.6-5 refers to the manway pad. The feedwater nozzle is evaluated above as a separate item. As discussed previously, the power uprate results in reduced secondary (steam) pressures and temperatures. Therefore, the specified loads, considered in Reference 5, bound the structural evaluation. The calculated fatigue usage factor for 40 years is less than 1.0 at the limiting location, Section BB in Figure 5.6-5. Since the maximum usage in the remnant based on 40 years is very low, extension to 60 years and ASME Code compliance within the usage limit of one are obvious.





**Transition Cone Region - Model 44F**