

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 3, 1998

Mr. Harold W. Keiser Chief Nuclear Officer & President-Nuclear Business Unit Public Service Electric & Gas Company P. O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: GENERIC LETTER 97-01, "DEGRADATION OF CRDM/CEDM NOZZLE AND OTHER VESSEL CLOSURE HEAD PENETRATIONS" RESPONSES FOR SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M98591 AND M98592)

Dear Mr. Keiser:

10004

980903

On April 1, 1997, the NRC staff issued Generic Letter (GL) 97-01, "Degradation of CRDM/CEDM Nozzle and Other Vessel Closure Head Penetrations," to the industry requesting in part that addressees provide a description of their plans to inspect the vessel head penetration nozzles (VHPs) at their respective pressurized water reactor (PWR) designed plants. With respect to the issuance of the GL, the staff required the addressees to submit an initial response within 30 days of issuance informing the staff of the intent to comply with requested information and a follow-up response within 120 days of issuance containing the technical details to the staff's information requests. In the discussion section of the GL, the staff stated that "individual licensees may wish to determine their inspection activities based on an integrated industry inspection program. ...," and indicated that it did not object to individual PWR licensees basing their inspection activities on an integrated industry inspection activities on the staff.

As a result, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) determined that it was appropriate for its members to develop a cooperative integrated inspection program in response to GL 97-01. The WOG program is documented in two Topical Reports issued by the Westinghouse Electric Corporation (WEC), WCAP-14901, Revision 0, "Background and Methodology for Evaluation of Reactor Vessel Closure Head Penetration Integrity for the Westinghouse Owners Group," and WCAP-14902, Revision 0, "Background Material for Response to NRC Generic Letter 97-01: Reactor Vessel Closure Head Penetration Integrity for the Westinghouse Owners Group."

The WOG submitted the integrated programs described in WCAP-14901 and WCAP-14902 to the staff on July 25, 1997.

The staff has determined by letters dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, that you were a member of the WOG and a participant in the WOG-integrated program that was developed to address the staff's requests in GL 97-01. In your April 29, and July 30, 1997, letters, you also indicated that the information in WEC Topical Report WCAP-14901 is applicable with respect to the assessment of VHP nozzles at the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2.

98-180

FILE CENTER COPY

Mr. H. Keiser

The staff has reviewed your responses to GL 97-01, dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, and requires further information to complete its review of your responses as they relate to the WOG's integrated program for assessing VHP nozzles at WOG member plants, and to the contents of Topical Report No. WCAP-14901. The enclosure to this letter forwards the staff's inquiries in the form of a request for additional information (RAI).

We request that the additional information be provided within 90 days of receipt of this letter. The 90-day response timeframe was discussed with Mr. Phil Duca of your staff on September 1, 1998. Mr. Duca indicated that additional time may be required for a response depending on input that may be required from the WOG. It should be noted that similar staff requests have been issued to other WOG member utilities. As was the staff's position before, we encourage you to address these inquiries in integrated fashion with the WOG and the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI); however, we also request that you identify any deviations from the WOG's integrated program that may be specific to your facilities. If circumstances result in the need to revise your response date, or if you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1457.

Sincerely,

original signed by R.Ennis for

Patrick D. Milano, Senior Project Manager Project Directorate I-2 Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION w/encl:

Docket File PUBLIC PDI-2 Read	JZwolins RCapra ling ESullivar	ki PMilano TClark n OGC	ACRS JHarold	
OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	PDI-3/LA	PDI-2/D	
NAME	PMilano:mw P32	TLClarkJLU	RCapra Roc	
DATE	913198	913198	9/3/98	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY DOCUMENT NAME: SAM98591.RAI Mr. H. Keiser

The staff has reviewed your responses to GL 97-01, dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, and requires further information to complete its review of your responses as they relate to the WOG's integrated program for assessing VHP nozzles at WOG member plants, and to the contents of Topical Report No. WCAP-14901. The enclosure to this letter forwards the staff's inquiries in the form of a request for additional information (RAI).

We request that the additional information be provided within 90 days of receipt of this letter. The 90-day response timeframe was discussed with Mr. Phil Duca of your staff on September 1, 1998. Mr. Duca indicated that additional time may be required for a response depending on input that may be required from the WOG. It should be noted that similar staff requests have been issued to other WOG member utilities. As was the staff's position before, we encourage you to address these inquiries in integrated fashion with the WOG and the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI); however, we also request that you identify any deviations from the WOG's integrated program that may be specific to your facilities. If circumstances result in the need to revise your response date, or if you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1457.

Sincerely,

original signed by R.Ennis for

Patrick D. Milano, Senior Project Manager Project Directorate I-2 Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION w/encl:

Docket File PUBLIC PDI-2 Reac	JZwolins RCapra ling ESullivar	ki PMilano TClark n OGC	ACRS JHarold	
OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	PDI-3/LA	PDI-2/D	
NAME	PMilano:mw PBE	TLClark	RCapra RoC	
DATE	913198	9-13-198	9 / 3 /98	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY DOCUMENT NAME: SAM98591.RAI Mr. H. Keiser

The staff has reviewed your responses to GL 97-01, dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, and requires further information to complete its review of your responses as they relate to the WOG's integrated program for assessing VHP nozzles at WOG member plants, and to the contents of Topical Report No. WCAP-14901. The enclosure to this letter forwards the staff's inquiries in the form of a request for additional information (RAI).

We request that the additional information be provided within 90 days of receipt of this letter. The 90-day response timeframe was discussed with Mr. Phil Duca of your staff on September 1, 1998. Mr. Duca indicated that additional time may be required for a response depending on input that may be required from the WOG. It should be noted that similar staff requests have been issued to other WOG member utilities. As was the staff's position before, we encourage you to address these inquiries in integrated fashion with the WOG and the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI); however, we also request that you identify any deviations from the WOG's integrated program that may be specific to your facilities. If circumstances result in the need to revise your response date, or if you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1457.

Sincerely,

Patrick D. Milano, Senior Project Manager Project Directorate I-2 Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

Mr. Harold W. Keiser Public Service Electric & Gas Company

CC:

Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire Nuclear Business Unit - N21 P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

General Manager - Salem Operations Salem Nuclear Generating Station P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Louis Storz Sr. Vice President - Nuclear Operations Nuclear Department P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Senior Resident Inspector Salem Nuclear Generating Station U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Drawer 0509 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Dr. Jill Lipoti, Asst. Director Radiation Protection Programs NJ Department of Environmental Protection and Energy CN 415 Trenton, NJ 08625-0415

Maryland Office of People's Counsel 6 St. Paul Street, 21st Floor Suite 2102 Baltimore, MD 21202

Ms. R. A. Kankus Joint Owner Affairs PECO Energy Company 965 Chesterbrook Blvd., 63C-5 Wayne, PA 19087

Mr. Elbert Simpson Senior Vice President-Nuclear Engineering Nuclear Department P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2

Richard Hartung Electric Service Evaluation Board of Regulatory Commissioners 2 Gateway Center, Tenth Floor Newark, NJ 07102

٠.

Regional Administrator, Region I U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 475 Allendale Road King of Prussia, PA 19406

Lower Alloways Creek Township c/o Mary O. Henderson, Clerk Municipal Building, P.O. Box 157 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Manager-Licensing and Regulation Nuclear Busienss Unit - N21 P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. David Wersan Assistant Consumer Advocate Office of Consumer Advocate 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120

Manager - Joint Generation Atlantic Energy 6801 Black Horse Pike Egg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234-4130

Carl D. Schaefer External Operations - Nuclear Delmarva Power & Light Company P.O. Box 231 Wilmington, DE 19899

Public Service Commission of Maryland Engineering Division Chief Engineer 6 St. Paul Centre Baltimore, MD 21202-6806 Request for Additional Information Regarding Utilities Participating in the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) Response to Generic Letter (GL) 97-01 "Background and Methodology for Evaluation of Reactor Vessel Closure Head Penetration Integrity for the Westinghouse Owners Group" Topical Report No. WCAP-14901, Revision 0

Applicability of Topical Report No. WCAP-14901, Revision 0, to the Plant-specific Responses to GL 97-01 for Participating Member Utilities and Plants in the WOG

I. Relationship and Applicability of WCAP-14901, Revision 0, to GL 97-01 and the WOG

On April 1, 1997, the staff issued Generic Letter (GL) 97-01, "Degradation of CRDM/CEDM Nozzle and Other Vessel Closure Head Penetrations," to the industry requesting in part that addressees provide a description of the plans to inspect the vessel head penetration nozzles (VHPs) at their respective pressurized water reactor (PWR) designed plants. With respect to the issuance of the GL, the staff required the addressees to submit an initial response within 30 days of issuance informing the staff of the intent to comply with requested information and a follow-up response within 120 days of issuance containing the technical details to the staff's information requests. In the discussion section of the GL, the staff stated that "individual licensees may wish to determine their inspection activities based on an integrated industry inspection program. . .," and indicated that it did not object to individual PWR licensees basing their inspection activities on an integrated industry inspection activities.

As a result, the WOG determined that it was appropriate for its members to develop a cooperative integrated inspection program in response to GL 97-01. The WOG program is documented in two Topical Reports issued by the Westinghouse Electric Corporation (WEC), WCAP-14901, Revision 0, "Background and Methodology for Evaluation of Reactor Vessel Closure Head Penetration Integrity for the Westinghouse Owners Group," and WCAP-14902, Revision 0, "Background Material for Response to NRC Generic Letter 97-01: Reactor Vessel Closure Head Penetration Integrity for the Westinghouse Owners Group," and WCAP-14902, Revision 0, "Background Material for Response to NRC Generic Letter 97-01: Reactor Vessel Closure Head Penetration Integrity for the Westinghouse Owners Group."

The technical content provided in WCAP-14901, Revision 0, is basically the same as that provided in WCAP-14902. The difference with regard to the reports is that WOG member plants subscribing to the content of WCAP-14901 have opted to rank the susceptibility of their vessel head penetrations according to a probabilistic Weibull analysis method that was developed by WEC. In contrast, the WOG member plants subscribing to the content of WCAP-14902, Revision 0, have opted to rank the vessel head penetrations for their facilities according to a probabilistic methodology that was developed by another vendor of choice. The staff has determined by letters dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, that you were a member of the WOG and a participant in the WOG integrated program that was developed to address the staff's requests in GL 97-01. In your April 29, and July 30, 1997, letters you also indicated that the information in WEC Topical Report WCAP-14901 is applicable with respect to the assessment of VHP nozzles at the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2.

Enclosure

The staff has reviewed your responses to GL 97-01, dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, and requires further information to complete its review of your responses as they relate to the WOG's integrated program for assessing VHP nozzles at WOG member plants, and to the contents of Topical Report No. WCAP-14901. The staff requests the following information with respect to the content of your responses to GL 97-01, dated April 29, and July 30, 1997, and to the content of WCAP-14901 as it relates to these responses:

- 1. In WCAP-14901 WEC did not provide any conclusions as to what the probabilistic failure model would lead the WOG to conclude with respect to the assessment of PWSCC in WEC-designed vessel head penetrations. With respect to the probabilistic susceptibility model (e.g., probabilistic failure model) provided in WCAP-14901:
 - Provide the susceptibility rankings compiled for the WOG member plants for which WCAP-14901 is applicable. In regard to other WOG member plants to which WCAP-14901 is applicable, include the basis for establishing the ranking of your plant relative to the others.
 - b. Describe how the probabilistic failure model in WCAP-14901 for assessing postulated flaws in vessel head penetration nozzles was bench-marked, and provided a list and discussion of the standards the model was bench-marked against.
 - c. Provide additional information regarding how the probabilistic failure models in WCAP-14901 will be refined to allow the input of plant-specific inspection data into the model's analysis methodology.
 - d. Describe how the variability in product forms, material specifications, and heat treatments used to fabricate each CRDM penetration nozzle at the WOG member utilities are addressed in the probabilistic crack initiation and growth models described or referenced in Topical Report No. WCAP-14901.
- 2. Table 1-2 in WCAP-14901 provides a summary of the key tasks in WEC's vessel head penetration nozzle assessment program. The table indicates that the Tasks for (1) Evaluation of PWSCC Mitigation Methods, (2) Crack Growth Data and Testing, and (3) Crack Initiation Characterization Studies have not been completed and are still in progress. In light of the fact that the probabilistic susceptibility models appear to be dependent in part on PWSCC crack initiation and growth estimates, provide your best estimate when these tasks will be completed by WEC, and describe how these activities relate to and will be used to update the probabilistic susceptibility assessment of VHP nozzles at your plants.
- 3. In the NEI letters of January 29, 1998 (Ref. 1), and April 1, 1998 (Ref. 2), NEI indicated that inspection plans have been developed for the VHP nozzles at the Farley Unit 2 plant in the year 2002, and the Diablo Canyon Unit 2 plant in the year 2001, respectively. The staff has noted that although you have endorsed the probabilistic susceptibility model described in WCAP-14901, Revision 0, other WOG member licensees have endorsed a probabilistic susceptibility model developed by an alternate vendor of choice. The WOG's proposal to inspect the VHP nozzles at the Farley Unit 2 plants

appears to be based on a composite assessment of the VHP nozzles at all WOG member plants. Verify that such a composite ranking assessment has been applied to the evaluation of VHP nozzles at your plants. If composite rankings of the VHP nozzles at WOG member plants have been obtained from the composite results of the two models, justify why application of the probabilistic susceptibility model described in WCAP-14901, Revision 0, would yield the same comparable relative rankings of the VHP nozzles for your plants as would application of the alternate probabilistic susceptibility model used by the WOG member plants not subscribing to WCAP-14901, Revision 0. Comment on the susceptibility rankings of the VHP nozzles at your plants relative to the susceptibility rankings of the VHP nozzles at the Farley Unit 2 and Diablo Canyon Unit 2 plants.

REFERENCES

- 1. January 19, 1998 Letter from David J. Modeen, Director of Engineering, Nuclear Generation Division, Nuclear Energy Institute, to Mr. G.C. Lainas, Acting Director, Division of Engineering, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Untitled).
- April 1, 1995 Letter from David J. Modeen, Director of Engineering, Nuclear Generation Division, Nuclear Energy Institute, to Mr. G.C. Lainas, Acting Director, Division of Engineering, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "SUBJECT: Generic Letter 97-01, 'Degradation of Control Rod Drive Mechanism Nozzle and Other Vessel Head Penetrations.' "