Attachment 2

"The Evaluation of Indications in Peach Bottom Unit 2 Vessel Closure Head For Continued Operation," Report Number GE-NE-0000-0007-9747, September 2002

 $\bar{\gamma}$

GE Nuclear Energy

ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY GE Nuclear Energy 175 Curtner Avenue, San Jose, CA 95125 *GE-NE-0000-0007-9747 Rev. 1 DRF #0000-0007-9747 Class H September 2002*

THE EVALUATION OF INDICATIONS IN PEACH BOTTOM UNIT 2 VESSEL CLOSURE HEAD FOR CONTINUED OPERATION

September 2002

Prepared for

Exelon Corp. Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2

I

 \sim

THE EVALUATION OF INDICATIONS IN PEACH BOTTOM UNIT 2 VESSEL CLOSURE HEAD FOR **CONTINUED OPERATION**

September 2002

lenjsnjith Prepared by: S. Kleinsmith, Engineer

Structural Mechanics & Materials Hommel for H. Mehta

Verified by: Wallet

H.S. Mehta, Engineering Fellow Structural Mechanics & Materials

くん Approved by:

 \mathbf{i}

R.M. Horn, Manager Structural Mechanics & Materials

Matthew O'Conner

DISCLAIMER OF RESPONSIBILITY Important Notice Regarding the Contents of this Report Please Read Carefully

The only undertakings of the General Electric Company (GE) respecting information in this document are contained in the contract between Exelon Corporation and GE, Purchase Order 01026357 Revision 5, effective 8/28/02, as amended to the date of transmittal of this document, and nothing contained in this document shall be construed as changing the contract. The use of this information by anyone other than Exelon Corporation, or for any purpose other than that for which it is furnished by GE, is not authorized; and with respect to any unauthorized use, GE makes no representation or warranty, express or implied, and assumes no liability as to the completeness, accuracy, or usefulness of the information contained in this document, or that its use may not infringe privately owned rights.

Copyright, General Electric Company, 2002.

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

Table of Contents

Subject

 \sim

 $\bar{\bar{z}}$

 \sim

 \hat{J}

Page No.

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ $\sim 10^{11}$ km $^{-1}$

 \sim

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The reactor pressure vessel closure head at Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2 (PBAPS-2) was ultrasonically examined during refueling outage fourteen (2R-14). Each of the six meridional welds was examined. Several indications were noted at these welds. Other than the CH-MB weld, the detected indications at the other meridional welds were acceptable as-is by the acceptance standards IWB-3510 of ASME Section XI (1989 Edition without Addenda). At the CH-MB weld numerous recordable indications were noted out of which eighteen (18) indications/flaws displayed tip signals and possessed a through-wall dimension. Sixteen (16) of these flaws did not meet the acceptance standards. The Section XI Code allows for the acceptance of such flaws for continued service if they meet the requirements of Paragraph IWB-3600, Analytical Evaluation of Flaws. The analysis involves the use of fracture mechanics procedures in accordance with Appendix A of Section XI. The objective of this report is to document the results of such evaluation.

The use of surface proximity rules of Section XI indicated that all sixteen (16) indications need to be characterized as surface flaws for the purposes of fracture mechanics evaluation. Two conditions were deternined to be governing: bolt-up and system pressure test. The bounding membrane and bending stress values for the fracture mechanics evaluation for the two conditions were obtained through a review of previous stress analyses of the closure heads. The bolt-up temperature was assumed as $70^{\circ}F$ [1-1] & 1-2] at a pressure of 0 psi and the pressure test temperature was assumed as 169° F [1-1] with a pressure of 1050 psi [1-1]. The stress intensity factors for the characterized surface flaws were calculated for various flaw depth (a) to flaw length *(1)* ratios (or, aspect ratios). It was determined that the pressure-test condition was governing. The limiting flaw was found to be acceptable per ASME Section XI Code even after accounting for projected crack growth for the life of the plant including license renewal (60 total years).

Based on this evaluation it is concluded that all of the indications found in PBAPS-2 vessel closure head during Refueling Outage (2R-14) are acceptable by the flaw acceptance criteria of the ASME Section XI Code.

1.1. *REFERENCE*

- [1-1] Exelon Nuclear, Peach Bottom Unit 2, Surveillance Test Specification ST-O-080- 680-2, Rev. 6: Reactor Pressure Vessel (Class **1)** Hydrostatic Pressure Test.
- [1-2] PECO Energy Company, Peach Bottom Unit 2, Surveillance Test Specification ST-O-080-500-2, Rev. 7: Recording and Monitoring Reactor Vessel Temperature and Pressure.

2. **INTRODUCTION AND** REPORT **OUTLINE**

The reactor pressure vessel closure head at Peach Bottom, Unit 2 (PBAPS-2) was ultrasonically examined during the 2R14 refueling outage. Figure 2-1 shows the geometry of the vessel head. The inside radius of the head is 125.69 inches and the minimum specified thickness is 4.00 inches [2-11. However, the measured thickness reported during the UT examination is 4.25 inches, the value used in the evaluations conducted for this report [2-2]. The inside surface of the closure head is unclad. Meridional welds were examined. Several flaws were noted in the meridional weld CH-MB. All of the flaws are not ID connected (i.e. sub surface) as confirmed by surface examination conducted at the ID surface. However, portions of the flaws are less than 0.4d from the ID surface, thus they were classified as surface flaws for fracture mechanics analysis. The observed flaws were first characterized and compared with the acceptance standards provided in Table IWB-3500-1 of Section XI, ASME Code [2-3]. Some of the flaws did not meet the acceptance standards. Section XI, subparagraph IWB-3132.4 allows for the acceptance of such flaws for continued service if they meet the requirements of Paragraph IWB-3600, Analytical Evaluation of Flaws. The analysis involves the use of fracture mechanics procedures in accordance with Appendix A of Reference 2-3. The objective of this report is to document the results of such evaluation.

Section 3 of this report summarizes UT inspection results and describes the flaw geometries considered in the evaluation. The results of the fracture mechanics evaluation are presented in Section 4. A comparison with the allowable flaw values is presented. Finally, summary and conclusions are presented in Section 5.

2.1. REFERENCE

- [2-1] Babcock & Wilcox CO. Pressure Boundary Drawing, "Closure Head Assembly" for Peach Bottom Unit 2, Drawing # 129392 E R7, GE VPF# 1896-67-8.
- [2-2] GE Nuclear Energy, Peach Bottom Unit $2 2R14$ UT Examination Report # 008900 for Weld ID - CH-MB Meridional Weld $@$ 60 Degrees. September 27, 2002.
- [2-3] ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, Rules for In-Service Inspection of Nuclear Power Plant Components, ASME, 1989 Edition without Addenda.

Figure 2-1 PBAPS 2 Vessel Closure Head Geometry

 \sim

3. UT INSPECTION RESULTS & FLAW GEOMETRY FOR **EVALUATION**

This section discusses the UT results and the flaw geometries considered in the subsequent fracture mechanics evaluation. Appendix B shows the evaluation sheets for the limiting/bounding case flaws that were found to exceed acceptance standards and required fracture mechanics evaluation. A brief discussion on the origin of the indications is also provided.

3.1. UT INSPECTION RESULTS

Automated 0°L, 2.25 MHz, 45°S, 1.0 MHz, 60°L, 2.0 MHz, 70°L, 2.0 MHz scans were performed on the closure head meridional weld CH-MB. The scans and calibrations were performed in accordance with procedure GE-UT-704 Version 4 DRR# P3-001, that is qualified to the Performance Demolition Initiative (PDI). All of the detected flaws were sub-surface but in close proximity to the surface, thus they were classified as surface flaws for the analysis [Appendix A & B].

There were sixty-five **(65)** recordable indications detected in the CH-MB weld. Eighteen (18) indications displayed tip signals and possessed a through wall dimension. Forty-seven (47) indications without through wall dimension have been evaluated as being acceptable to the requirements of Table IWB-3510-1 [2-3]. Of the eighteen (18) remaining separate flaws, two (2) of the recorded flaws have been evaluated as being acceptable to the requirements of Table IWB-3510-1 [2-3]. Sixteen (16) of flaws have been evaluated as being rejectable to the requirements of Table IWB-3510-1. These Sixteen (16) flaws are characterized in Table 3-2. The GERIS 2000 Indication Data Sheets for each indication can be found in the Appendix A. The GERIS 2000 Indication Evaluation Data Sheets for each flaw can be found in the Appendix B.

Figures 3-1-1 thru 3-1-3 shows the approximate locations of the indications relative to the CH-MB weld centerline.

3.2. FLAW GEOMETRIES CONSIDERED IN EVALUATION

Table 3-2 shows the criteria used to determine if the indications that are to be evaluated need to be characterized as surface or sub-surface type flaws for the purpose of fracture mechanics analysis. The guidance for this characterization is provided in Article IWA-3000 [2-3]. Figure 3-2 shows the parameters used for surface proximity evaluation. It is seen in Table 3-2 that all of the indications are to be characterized as surface. In view of the varying aspect ratio (a/l) , the stress intensity factors in the next section were calculated for different *a/l* values: 0.0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, .0.4, and 0.5.

3.3. FABRICATION REVIEW

All the indications in question are sub surface, in close proximity to the surface and are not service induced, but were considered as surface flaws for the fracture mechanics evaluation. A fabrication review (Reference 3-1) concluded the following:

- The flaws detected during 2R14 have existed since the closure head was fabricated.
- * These flaws do not indicate "abnormal degradation of the pressure boundary" as defined by the USNRC.
- * These flaws should be considered newly discovered flaws, rather than newly developed flaws.

Indications at vessel welds of the type seen in the Peach Bottom Unit 2 top head welds are not uncommon and have been found in other reactor pressure vessel welds in other plants. In most cases, the new finding is attributed to the ability of current UT techniques to detect flaws that would have been undetectable using inspection techniques available during the time of fabrication of the Peach Bottom vessel. Thus, as long as the required fracture margins are demonstrated, the indications are judged to be benign and have no impact on structural integrity.

3.4. REFERENCES

[3-1] Miller, W.F., "Investigation into the Origin of Ultrasonic Indications in RPV Closure Head Welds for the Peach Bottom 2R14 Outage," GE Report No. GENE-955-004-0902 Rev. 1, September 2002.

Table 3-1 Listing of Ultrasonic Indications in RPV Closure Head Weld CH-MB at Peach Bottom Unit 2

CH-MB

Note: Values reported are taken directly from Appendix A & B.

 \sim

 \mathcal{L}

Table **3-2** Characterization of Flaws

* Flaw characterized as surface flaw if S < 0.4a.

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

 \sim \sim

 ~ 10

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

Figure 3-1-1 Plot displaying Approx. Location of Indications with No Throughwall Dimension

Figure 3-1-2 Plot displaying Approx. Location of Acceptable Indications with Throughwall Dimension

Figure 3-1-3 Plot displaying Approx. Location of Unacceptable UT Indications with Throughwall Dimension

 \bar{z}

Figure 3-2 Parameters for Surface Proximity Evaluation

4. FRACTURE **MECHANICS EVALUATION**

The fracture mechanics evaluation was conducted for several surface flaw shape geometries using the procedures outlined in Appendix A of Section XI [4-1]. Two conditions were found to be limiting for the determination of allowable flaw sizes: (1) bolt-up, and (2) system pressure test.

4.1. ASSUMPTIONS

The following values were used for the pressure and temperature conditions during the bolt-up and system pressure test conditions. These values remain unchanged for power uprate conditions, but can change when new PT curves are licensed.

- The bolt-up temperature is 70°F [4-2 & 4-3].
- The pressure test pressure and temperature are 1050 psi and 169°F [4-4].
- The limiting RT_{NDT} value for the closure head side plate (torus) region is 10°F. [4-3]

The number of bolt-up, pressure test and start up-shut down events assumed in the fatigue crack growth calculation was based on [Reference 4-5], and is discussed in Subsection 4.4.

4.2. APPLIED AND WELD RESIDUAL STRESSES

The applied stresses in the vessel closure head to flange region are primarily from the following sources: bolt preload, internal pressure and weld residual stress. The internal pressure is zero during the bolt-up. Since all of the flaws are in the meridional direction welds, the circumferential or hoop stress is of interest for the purpose of this evaluation. Due to the complex geometry of the flange region, only a detailed finite element analysis of PBAPS Unit 2 closure head geometry can provide a complete picture of the stress distribution due to bolt-up and internal pressure. Since such an analysis was unavailable, the results from finite element analyses conducted for other BWR vessels of similar size on file with GENE were reviewed to conservatively determine a set of membrane and bending stresses. The determination took into account the differences in the R/t ratios between the available finite element model geometry and the PBAPS, Unit 2 closure head geometry.

During bolt-up large hoop bending stresses are introduced in the head near the flange junction but they attenuate rapidly as one moves away from the flange meridionally. These bending stresses are compressive at the ID surface near the flange junction. The hoop membrane stress is tensile but attenuates less rapidly. The longest flaw extends 3.75 inches in the meridional direction beginning approximately 41 inches above the top surface of the flange. Therefore, the hoop membrane and bending stress distributions corresponding to the meridional length of this indication were reviewed to determine the following conservative values for hoop membrane and bending stresses:

$$
\sigma_{\rm m} = 14.0 \text{ ksi}
$$

$$
\sigma_{\rm b} = -8.0 \text{ ksi}
$$

During the pressure test, the internal pressure stresses are superimposed over those induced by the bolt-up condition. Since some of the discontinuity related internal pressure stresses cancel those due to bolt-up, the overall stress level is lower than the simple addition of the bolt-up and the nominal pressure stresses in the vessel head. The same approach as that used for bolt-up case was also used to determine the following set of conservative membrane and bending stress values for the pressure test case:

$$
\sigma_m = 25.0 \text{ ksi}
$$

$$
\sigma_b = 0 \text{ ksi}
$$

It should be noted that the nominal value of hoop or meridional stress from an internal pressure of 1050 psi is **15.5** ksi. Thus, the difference between this value and the 25.0 ksi reported above represents the discontinuity effects from bolt-up and pressurization.

After the torus section plates are welded together, residual stresses remain due to thermal expansion and contraction. The post-weld heat treatment effectively reduces these residual stresses. A bending stress of 8.0 ksi was assumed in this analysis to model the remaining residual stresses. This bending stress closely approximates the measured cosine stress distribution for welds with PWHT reported in [Reference 4-6]. The 8 ksi magnitude was added algebraically to the calculated bending stresses due to bolt-up and pressure. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 graphically show the stress distributions used for the boltup and pressure test cases, respectively.

4.3. K CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Since all of the analyzed indications have been characterized as surface flaws (Table 3-2), the stress intensity factor (K) calculation procedures specified for surface flaws in Appendix A of Section XI [4-1] were used. Table 4-1 shows the calculated values of K as a function of 'a' values for the pressure test cases for an assumed aspect ratio of 0.0. Similar calculations were also conducted for aspect ratios of 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4 and **0.5.**

4.4. FATIGUE CRACK GROWTH

Since all the flaws are characterized as surface flaws, they are assumed as being exposed to the reactor water environment. Thus, the crack growth analysis was performed using the Section XI fatigue crack growth rates for water environment.

The current analyzed reactor pressure vessel cycles for the 40-year design life are listed in [Reference 4-5]. Only the bolt-up (66), hydrostatic test (130) and heatupcooldown (161) events are significant from the perspective of fatigue crack growth in the vessel closure head. The stress range for the heatup-cooldown cycle is bounded by that for the pressure test, and therefore, the cycles for the two events were lumped together for the fatigue crack growth calculation purposes. The number of cycles for these events were increased by **50%** to account for operation during the license renewal period. Thus, the number of events assumed for the bolt-up were 66xl.5 or 100. The number of events assumed for the pressure test were $\{(130+161)x1.5\}$ or \sim 440. This approach is conservative since it does not take any credit for the number of cycles already used so far. The highest. applied K values listed in Tables 4-2 and 4-3 were used for the fatigue crack growth calculations. The predicted crack growth was calculated as 56.2 micro inches per cycle. Which results in a crack growth of 0.025" for 440 cycles.

4.5. ALLOWABLE K VALUES

The first step in the allowable flaw calculation is to determine the K_{Ia} value at the temperature appropriate for the operating condition being analyzed. The 1989 version of Section XI [4-1] does not provide an explicit mathematical equation for the calculation of K_{Ia} at a given temperature and RT_{NDT} . However, Reference 4-7 gives the following equation that was used to calculate the K_{1a} curve given in Figure A-4200-1[4-1]:

 $K_{1a} = 26.78 + 1.233 * Exp (0.0145 * (T - RT_{NDT} + 160))$

where, T and RT_{NDT} are in ${}^{\circ}F$ and K_{Ia} is in ksivin.

Paragraph IWB-3613 of Section XI [4-1] also indicates that for flange region a safety factor of $\sqrt{2}$ can be used for bolt-up condition. Thus, a safety factor of $\sqrt{2}$ was used for the bolt-up condition to obtain K_{Ia} allowable. For the pressure test condition, a safety factor of $\sqrt{10}$ was used as specified in IWB-3613[4-1]. The following summarizes the numerical values:

 \sim

 \sim

Bolt-up

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

Pressure test

4.6. DISPOSITION OF INDICATIONS

Tables 4-2 and 4-3 show comparisons of the K values for the limiting flaw being evaluated and the allowable values for bolt-up and pressure test conditions, respectively. It is seen that the calculated K values for all of the indications are less than the allowable values.

The calculated primary stresses after subtracting the area lost to indications, satisfied the primary stress limits specified in the original Code of construction for the reactor vessel. \mathcal{L}

Based on the preceding, it is concluded that the subject flaws are acceptable for continued operation in as-is condition.

4.7. REFERENCES

- [4-1] ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, Rules for In-Service Inspection of Nuclear Power Plant Components, ASME, 1989 Edition without Addenda.
- [4-2] PECO Energy Company, Peach Bottom Unit 2, Surveillance Test Specification ST-O-080-500-2, Rev. 7: Recording and Monitoring Reactor Vessel Temperature and Pressure.
- [4-3] L. Tilly, "Pressure-Temperature Curves for Exelon Peach Bottom Unit 2" GE Nuclear Energy, San Jose, CA, GE-NE-B13-02118-00-01 Rev. 0, September 2002.
- [4-4] Exelon Nuclear, Peach Bottom Unit 2, Surveillance Test Specification ST-O-080- 680-2, Rev. 6: Reactor Pressure Vessel (Class 1) Hydrostatic Pressure Test.
- [4-5] PECO Energy Company, Peach Bottom Unit 2, Surveillance Test Specification ST-O-080-940-2, Rev. 6: Reactor Pressure Vessel Transients Cycles Record.
- [4-6] D.A. Ferrill, et al, "Measurement of Residual Stresses in Heavy Weldment," Welding Journal Research Supplement, Vol 45, Nov. 1966.
- [4-7] EPRI Report No. NP-719-SR, "Flaw Evaluation Procedures: ASME Section XI," August 1978.

 \sim

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \mathcal{A}^{\pm}

Table 4-1 Calculated K values for Pressure test Cases

Calculation of Stress Intensities (ksi-sqrt[in])

Table 4-2 Comparison of Calculated and Allowable K values for bolt-up

 \sim $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

Table 4-3 Comparison of Calculated and Allowable K values for pressure tests

Weld ID:	CH-MB							
IND#:	$A (initial) =$	16		(in)	$t =$		4.25	(in)
	$l =$	3.75 .	(in)		$\sigma_{YS} =$	45.0	(ksi)	
	$\sigma_{m} =$	25.0	(ksi)		$\sigma_{\rm b} =$	8.0	(ksi)	
	$TEMP =$ $a/l =$	169 0.067	$(^{\circ}F)$		$A_P =$	1050	(psi)	
	Applied $K =$ Applied $K =$ Allowable $K =$		33.2	$(ksi \, \forall in)$	Assumes no crack growth			
			34.8	(ksi \sqrt{in})		Includes an increase of 5% to account for fatigue crack growth		
			48.3	$(ksi \, \forall in)$				

Figure 4-1 Through-Wall Stress Distribution Assumed for Bolt-up Condition

PRESSURE TEST **LEAD** CENDITIEN

Figure 4-2 Through-Wail Stress Distribution Assumed for Pressure Test Condition

5. SUMMARY **AND CONCLUSIONS**

The reactor pressure vessel closure head at Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2 (PBAPS-2) was ultrasonically examined during refueling outage fourteen (2R-14). Each of the six meridional welds was examined. Several indications were noted at these welds. Other than the CH-MB weld, the detected indications at the other meridional welds were acceptable as-is by the acceptance standards IWB-3510 of ASME Section **XI** (1989 Edition without Addenda). At the CH-MB weld numerous recordable indications were noted out of which eighteen (18) indications/flaws displayed tip signals and possessed a through-wall dimension. Sixteen (16) of these flaws did not meet the acceptance standards. The Section XI Code allows for the acceptance of such flaws for continued service if they meet the requirements of Paragraph IWB-3600, Analytical Evaluation of Flaws. The analysis involves the use of fracture mechanics procedures in accordance with Appendix A of Section XI. The objective of this report is to document the results of such evaluation.

The use of surface proximity rules of Section XI indicated that all sixteen (16) indications need to be characterized as surface flaws for the purposes of fracture mechanics evaluation. Two conditions were determined to be governing: bolt-up and system pressure test. The bounding membrane and bending stress values for the fracture mechanics evaluation for the two conditions were obtained through a review of previous stress analyses of the closure heads. The bolt-up temperature was assumed as 70'F at a pressure of 0 psi and the pressure test temperature was assumed as 169°F with a pressure of 1050 psi. The stress intensity factors for the characterized surface flaws were calculated for various flaw depth (a) to flaw length *(1)* ratios (or, aspect ratios). It was determined that the pressure-test condition was governing. The limiting flaw was found to be acceptable per ASME Section XI Code even after accounting for projected crack growth for the life of the plant including license renewal (60 total years).

Based on this evaluation it is concluded that all of the indications found in PBAPS-2 vessel closure head during Refueling Outage (2R-14) are acceptable by the flaw acceptance criteria of the ASME Section XI Code.

 \bar{z}

APPENDIX A

 \mathcal{L}

 \bar{z}

 \sim

 \cdot

 \bar{z}

GERIS 2000 Indication Data Sheets

Rev 1 September 2002 (Includes 2 Appended Pages September 27, 2002)

 \sim

 \sim

 \sim \sim

PEACH BOTTOM R \sim PAGE <u>1.0F 87</u> μ , μ and

 \mathbf{r}

P82-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xls

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\ddot{}$ \sim \sim

 $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\bar{\beta}$

 \sim

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{r}}$

أماله أأمنت بالأ

 \sim

P82-CH.MB-Data 2R14.xis

 $\overline{2}$

 $\pmb{\mathbb{N}}$

المستحب وزار

 \sim

 \bar{z} المسترا

 $\bar{\alpha}$

 $\overline{}$ $\bar{\beta}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\bar{\tau}$. $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ \sim ang
Waliomatan

J, \bar{z} $\ddot{}$ J. $\bar{\bar{z}}$

 λ

 \sim

 \sim

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 \bar{z}

PB2-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xls

بالسر

 \bar{z}

 \mathcal{L}

 \bar{u}

 \sim

 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ \mathcal{L}

 $\gamma=1$ \sim \sim

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ $\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}$.

> $\sim 10^{-11}$ $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}$

 $\hat{\cdot}$

 \sim , \sim

 \mathcal{A}^{max}

SERVICE SERVED ON A SALE AND SALE AND PRESENT AND PROPERTY

PB2-CH-MB-Oata 2R14.xis

 \sim \sim

 \sim

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\sim 10^7$

÷.

PB2-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xls

p.9

 \sim \sim

 ~ 10

 \sim

سيساء س

- -

PB2,-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xI3

 \sim

ng P

 $\sqrt{2}$, \sim

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 \bar{z}

 β $\mathcal{F}^{\text{c}}_{\text{c}}$ and $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ $\hat{r} = \hat{r} \hat{r}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\sim 10^5$ $\langle \hat{r} | \hat{r} \rangle$. $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{$ $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n$ $\sim 10^{-1}$

 \sim

 \bar{a}

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\sim 10^7$

PB2-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xts

 \overline{a}

GERIS 2000 Indication 86 **GE Nuclear Energy Data Sheet** Project : Peach Bottom 2 - 2R14 Exam Data Sheet : mbr.2 Weld ID: CH-MB Patch ID: mbr.2 Channel: 2 Angle: 45 Direction: 270 **Search Unit** \mathbf{Y} ThruWall Length S **Comments** $\ln d$ # Amp. \boldsymbol{x} 11.11 N/A 0.50 0.00 125.96 11.36 37 **15%** 11.61 18.36 $45%$ 0.19 0.75 0.00 38 127.96 18.61 19.11 21.86 127.46 $31%$ 22.11 0.16 0.40 0.00 39 22.26 25.36 0.00 0.50 25.61 N/A 40 31% 125.71 25.86 31.61 **N/A** $1,50$ 0.00 $\overline{41}$ 31% 126.21 32.61 33.11 34.61 1.75 0.00 0.19 29% 125.96 35.11 42 36.36 39.11 0.00 **N/A** 0.25 43 20% 127.21 39.11 $\gamma_{\rm A} \approx 10$ 39.36 Comments: Reviewed By: Mark Trol Analyst: 0 Date: $2/2/02$ Date: 92502 Level: $\underline{\mathbf{11}}$ Level: $\overline{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{U}}$

PB2-CH-MR-Data 2R14.xls

 $p.12$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

 \mathcal{A} $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\tau}$

 $\bar{\alpha}$

 $\bar{\beta}$

 ϵ , we have

 \mathcal{H}

 \sim

شراءة

 \equiv

 \leftarrow

-- -

PB2-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xls

 \sim \sim

 \sim

 $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\mathrm{max}}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 \sim

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$

PB2-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xis

. . . .

 \rightarrow

 \sim

لمسادر

 \sim \sim

. —

 \sim

 $\ddot{}$

PB2-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xls

والأستاذ والمحامر $\frac{1}{2}$, \mathcal{L}^2 in

PEACH BOTTOM
2 R CH
PAGE 40 OF 84

p.3

 $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\Delta \sim 1$

 ~ 10

 \pm

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\bar{\psi}$ \sim \mathcal{L}^{\pm}

 $\lambda_{\rm{max}}$ \sim \sim \sim

 \mathcal{L}

 $\varphi_{\rm{max}}$

 ~ 10

_ ______

__ _

 \sim

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and

 ~ 100

MB-CH-MB-Data 2R14.xts

q

APPENDIX B

GERIS 2000 Indication Evaluation Data Sheets

Rev 1 September 2002 (Includes 2 New Pages September 27, 2002)

examps4 v.7 7&55

EXAMOSA V.7 7500

en Baie

100om v.7 7W= *-* .~~a *4-l*

EXAM-0.54 V.7 7/500

. 10.N

1ZA.OS- 7ý

 $\bar{\gamma}$

 \sim \overline{a} \mathcal{L}

 \bar{z}

 \sim $\varphi(\lambda)$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

Exam 054 v 7 7/500

 \bar{A}

l,

fiE.c. **V.,** ?,,S mdkcMk• 4.1M

EXAM OS 4 V,7 7/5/00 **indication 34 as a contract of the contr**

 $\overline{}$ and $\overline{}$

 $\overline{}$ \sim

 $\bar{\bar{z}}$

 $\Delta \phi = 0.01$

l,

IAM.OM7 7 M.

.
Indextion 38 via

example 1.7 7500 *Example* 1.7 MW *Democration of the contract of the con*

 ϵ

 $\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{d\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1$

 \bar{z}

EflAMO4•,lV,) *7tS*

Industion 42 city

EXAM-034V.7 7/SQD

LUM-03.Y.7 **'ý**

indentius 50 xts

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

U-61. .. ' -

-…

 \sim

Indication Shaft

 \sim $-$

 $-$

EXAM-054 V 7 7/5/00

 $\sim 10^{-11}$

 $\sim 10^{-10}$

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ \sim 0.00 μ .

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

EXA06 7.7 74 Z :- (L.4

1000000

 $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$

ينسوا

EXAMPS (V.7 7/5/08

Indication 81.zls

 \bar{z}

 ~ 1000 km s $^{-1}$

UAM-fl4 14=