

PR 50
(75FR24323)

July 19, 2010 (10:30am)

Rulemaking Comments

From: David.Anthony@exeloncorp.com
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2010 10:39 PM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Comments on proposed changes to 10 CFR 50.55a, paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(2)(xi)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

10

Dear Sir or Madam,

This letter provides comments to the subject proposed rulemaking.

I have interpreted the proposed rule, issued in draft form on May 4th, 2010, paragraph (b)(2) incorporates by reference the 2005 Addenda through the 2008 Addenda of Section XI of the ASME B&PV Code, with conditions, into 10CFR50.55a. Furthermore paragraph (b)(2)(xi) to state that licensees using up to the 2006 Addenda of Section XI, shall use the 2001 Edition of Appendix VIII, and that licensees using the 2007 Edition or 2008 Addenda of Section XI shall use the edition or addenda of Appendix VIII that corresponds with the Code year of Section XI that they are using. If these interpretations are incorrect, then I would request clarifying information be added to the proposed rulemaking.

Comments on proposed changes to 10 CFR 50.55a, paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(2)(xi)

Comment No. 1 – Allowing multiple incompatible versions of Section XI, Appendix VIII to be used by licensees will create a hardship on the industry for consistent implementation of an Appendix VIII qualification program.

The proposed revision to paragraph (b)(2) incorporates by reference the 2005 Addenda through 2008 Addenda of Section XI of the ASME B&PV Code, with conditions, into 10 CFR 50.55a. When combined with the revision to paragraph (b)(2)(xi), the resulting changes create a regulation which potentially will have various licensees invoking distinctly different versions of Appendix VIII. Licensees using anything up to the 2006 Addenda of Section XI would have to implement the 2001 Edition, while licensees updating to the 2007 Edition, or the 2008 Addenda of Section XI would have to implement the version of Appendix VIII corresponding to the Code year to which they were updating. Historically, 10 CFR 50.55a has mandated a particular edition or addenda of Appendix VIII to be used by licensees, which has greatly simplified industry efforts at maintaining a qualification program that complies with the code. The proposed new rule contains no such requirement.

The 2001 Edition of Appendix VIII is inconsistent, in certain respects, with the 2007 Edition and the 2008 Addenda. The titles and corresponding scopes of Supplements 5 and 7 have changed significantly, between the 2001 and 2007 Code years. This creates difficulty with maintaining one qualification program or one set of inspection procedures that encompasses all these code years. While the revisions that these supplements have undergone have no technical impact, invoking them will require that the qualified procedures and the PDI qualification records be modified in order to accommodate the newer versions. These types of programmatic changes require significant time and resources.

For the reasons stated above, allowing incompatible versions of Section XI, Appendix VIII to be used by licensees places an undue administrative burden on the industry and its Appendix

VIII implementation program, without providing any improvement in safety. I believe this will create difficulty and confusion in trying to determine what rules are to be met, and the potential for mistakes will be increased.

Suggested Modification – See below

Comment No. 2 – If the 2008 Addenda of Section XI, Appendix VIII is the preferred singular version to be mandated, the industry will need time to update programs and procedures to accommodate this change:

Since the industry is currently working to the 2001 Edition of Appendix VIII, there would be no issues with 10 CFR 50.55a continuing to require licensees to use this version. However, I recognize that much work has transpired within the Section XI NDE Code committees, between 2001 and 2008, to update Appendix VIII to eliminate the need for the additional provisions within 10CFR50.55a. While I am not opposed to the 2008 Addenda of Appendix VIII being the mandated version for implementation, I am aware that there would be a significant amount of effort involved for the PDI Program and the industry to revise programs and procedures to comply with the 2008 Addenda. Therefore, I request that the date for mandatory implementation of the 2008 version of Appendix VIII be delayed for a minimum of 18 months, after the publishing of the final rule, in order to allow time to make all the necessary program and procedure revisions and to communicate these changes to the industry.

Suggested Modification for Comment 1 and 2: This revision of 10CFR50.55a mandates the use of the 2007 Edition with the 2008 Addenda of Appendix VIII, (regardless of the edition and addenda of Section XI being used by the licensee), with an industry-wide implementation date of December 1, 2012.

As such, paragraph (b)(2)(xi) might be changed to, “*Appendix VIII specimen set and qualification requirements prior to September 1, 2012. Licensees using Appendix VIII in the 1995 Edition through 2001 Edition of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code may elect to comply with all of the provisions in paragraphs (b)(2)(xi)(A) through (b)(2)(xi)(M) of this section, except for those in (b)(2)(xi)(F) of this section, which may be used at the licensees option. Licensees using editions and addenda after the 2001 Edition shall use the 2001 Edition of Appendix VIII, and may elect to comply with all of the provisions in paragraphs (b)(2)(xi)(A) through (b)(2)(xi)(M) of this section, except for those in (b)(2)(xi)(F) of this section, which may be used at the licensees option.*”

An additional paragraph should also be added that states, “The Supplements to Appendix VIII of Section XI, Division 1, 2007 Edition with the 2008 Addenda of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code must be implemented by December 1, 2012.”

Comment on proposed changes to 10 CFR 50.55a, paragraph (b)(2)(xi)(A)(2)

Comment No. 3 – The provision in paragraph (b)(2)(xi)(A)(2) contains a requirement for qualification of dissimilar metal welds from the austenitic side of the weld. This requirement is not always possible to meet. The provision needs to be revised to accommodate certain exceptions.

The 3rd sentence of paragraph (b)(2)(xi)(A)(2) currently states, “Dissimilar metal weld qualifications must be demonstrated from the austenitic side of the weld and may be used to

perform examinations from either side of the weld." The proposed rule reflects that this paragraph has not been changed.

Industry surveys have revealed that there are dissimilar metal weld configurations where a ferritic component has been attached to another ferritic component using an inconel weld (no austenitic base material involved). An example of this configuration is the Core Spray/Feedwater safe end-to-pipe welds of many Boiling Water Reactor plants. Additionally, there are cases where only the ferritic side of a dissimilar metal welded component is accessible for scanning, due to component geometry. This is common in Babcock and Wilcox and Combustion Engineering designed Pressure Water Reactors, which have ferritic steel main loop piping. Often, there is either insufficient room on the austenitic safe end side of these welds to perform an examination or the safe end material itself is cast stainless steel, prohibiting a meaningful examination to be performed from that side.

Suggested Modification for Comment 3: Replace the 3rd sentence in paragraph (b)(2)(xi)(A)(2) with the following two sentences: "Dissimilar metal weld qualifications must be demonstrated from the austenitic side of the weld, where practical, and may be used to perform examinations from either side of the weld. For dissimilar metal weld configurations that do not contain an austenitic base material, or for which the geometric or metallurgical conditions of the component preclude sufficient scan coverage to be obtained from the austenitic side of the weld, the qualification may be performed from the ferritic side of the weld only."

Should you have any questions pertaining to these comments, please contact me by phone at 630-200-1128 or by email at david.anthony@exeloncorp.com.

Sincerely,

David L. Anthony

***** This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain Exelon Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Exelon Corporation family of Companies. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this e-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout. Thank You. *****

Received: from mail1.nrc.gov (148.184.176.41) by TWMS01.nrc.gov
(148.184.200.145) with Microsoft SMTP Server id 8.1.393.1; Sun, 18 Jul 2010
22:38:35 -0400

X-Ironport-ID: mail1

X-SBRS: 5.3

X-MID: 18476040

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result:

Al8CAGhXQ0zGHe4FmWdsb2JhbAA2gQyePwEBAQEBCAsKBxEivg8CgnWCLgSEAIcL

X-IronPort-AV: E=Sophos;i="4.55,224,1278302400";

d="scan'208,217";a="18476040"

Received: from mailwest.ceco.com (HELO ceco.com) ([198.29.238.5]) by
mail1.nrc.gov with ESMTP; 18 Jul 2010 22:38:34 -0400

Received: from ([10.121.132.83]) by cclxsecure01.ceco.com with ESMTP id
1xh9wh1.91930453; Sun, 18 Jul 2010 21:38:31 -0500

Received: from CCCMSCON01.energy.power.corp ([130.197.106.20]) by
CCCMSWSMTP01.energy.power.corp with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.4675); Sun,
18 Jul 2010 21:38:30 -0500

Received: from cccmsxch13.energy.power.corp ([130.197.160.41]) by
CCCMSCON01.energy.power.corp with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.4675); Sun, 18
Jul 2010 21:38:31 -0500

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.5

Content-Class: urn:content-classes:message

MIME-Version: 1.0

Subject: Comments on proposed changes to 10 CFR 50.55a, paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(2)(xi)

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 2010 21:38:30 -0500

Message-ID:

<AF3E12BA76CF0640B481623B636CE6F778F059@cccmsxch13.energy.power.corp>

X-MS-Has-Attach:

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

Thread-Topic: Comments on proposed changes to 10 CFR 50.55a, paragraphs (b)(2) and
(b)(2)(xi)

Thread-Index: Acsm63ISQTpUQ7b+RCeWChCJ8cJNmng==

From: <David.Anthony@exeloncorp.com>

To: <Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov>

Return-Path: David.Anthony@exeloncorp.com

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 19 Jul 2010 02:38:31.0010 (UTC) FILETIME=[79A33420:01CB26EB]

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01CB26EB.7937965D"