



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 63 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-24
AND AMENDMENT NO. 68 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-27
WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301

Introduction

By letter dated April 26, 1976, the NRC outlined to Wisconsin Electric Power Company (licensee) the requirements of the newly enacted rule governing inservice inspection of safety class components, 10 CFR 50.55a. That letter also requested that the licensee update its Technical Specifications to conform to the new rule and, as allowed by the new rule, request relief and provide justification for those requirements, if any, felt to be impractical to perform for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. The licensee responded with Technical Specification (TS) change requests by letters dated February 17, 1977 (Unit 1), December 8, 1977 (Units 1 and 2) and November 27, 1978 (Unit 2).

Proposed TS 15.4.2.B for the Point Beach Nuclear Plants Units 1 and 2 states that inservice examination of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by the 10 CFR 50.55a(g) except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission. Certain requirements of later editions and addenda of Section XI are impractical to perform on older plants because of the plants' design, component geometry, and materials of construction. Thus, 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i) authorizes the Commission to grant relief from those requirements upon making the necessary findings.

By letters dated May 20, 1977, October 6, 1977, February 6, 1979, February 26, 1979, December 14, 1979, October 6, 1981 and April 14, 1982, Wisconsin Electric Power Company submitted its inservice inspection program, revisions, or additional information related to requests for relief from certain Code requirements determined to be impractical to perform on the Point Beach facilities during the inspection interval. The inservice inspection programs are based on the requirements of the 1974 Edition through Summer 1975 Addenda of Section XI.

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By _____

8210040425 820831
PDR ADDCK 05000266
PDR
P

Evaluation

Requests for relief from the requirements of Section XI which have been determined to be impractical to perform have been reviewed by the staff's contractor, Science Applications, Inc. The contractor's evaluations of the licensee's requests for relief and his recommendations are presented in the Technical Evaluation Report (TER) attached (Attachment 1). The staff has reviewed the TER and agrees with the evaluations and recommendations. A summary of the determinations made by the staff is presented in the following table:

Table 1 Class 1 Components

IWB-2600 item no.	IWB-2500 exam. cat.	System or component	Area to be examined	Required method	Licensee proposed alterna- tive exam.	Relief request status
B1.4 (Applies to Unit 1 only)	B-D	Reactor vessel nozzles (6)	Nozzle-to- vessel welds and inside radiused sections	Volumetric at frequency below: 1st period - 2 welds 2nd period - 1 or 2 welds 3rd period - remaining welds	Volumetric - all nozzles once every 10 years when core barrel is removed	Granted
B1.6 (Applies to Unit 1 only)	B-F	Safety Injection nozzle- to-safe end	Weld	Volumetric & surface at frequency in IWB-2411	Volumetric only once every 10 years when core barrel is removed	Granted
B1.12 (Units 1 & 2)	B-H	Reactor vessel	Integrally- welded supports	Volumetric at frequency below: 1st period- 25% 2nd period - 25% 3rd period - remainder	Volumetric- 100% of weld when core barrel is removed during interval	Granted

Table 1 (Continued)

IWB-2600 item no.	IWB-2500 exam. cat.	System or component	Area to be examined	Required method	Licensee proposed alterna- tive exam.	Relief request status
B1.14 (Applies to Unit 1 only)	B-I-1	Reactor vessel	Cladding patches	Visual at frequency below: 1st period - 25% 2nd period - 25% 3rd period - remainder	Visual - 100% when core barrel is removed	Update to 1977 edition through Summer 1978 addenda; relief not necessary
B3.7 (Units 1 & 2)	B-H	Regenera- tive heat exchanger	Integrally - welded sup- ports	Volumetric (10% of weld)	Visual	Granted
B5.4 (Units 1 & 2)	B-K-1	Reactor coolant pumps	Integrally - welded supports	Volumetric	Visual	Granted
B5.6 (Units 1 & 2)	B-L-1	Reactor coolant pumps	Pump casing welds	Volumetric	Examine Weld To 1977 §78 Section XI Code	Granted

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that granting relief from specific ASME Section XI Code requirements does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that this is an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the granting of this relief.

Conclusion

The NRC staff has reviewed portions of the February 17, 1977 and November 27, 1978 TS change requests and after making modifications to the wording as discussed with the licensee's staff, has found them acceptable. These proposed TS relating to inservice inspection of safety class components, as modified, conform to the language recommended by the NRC staff's April 26, 1976 letter and are, therefore, acceptable.

Based on the review summarized, the staff concludes that relief granted from the examination requirements and alternate methods imposed through this document give reasonable assurance of the piping, component pressure boundary, and support structural integrity, that granting relief where the Code requirements are impractical is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property, or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest considering the burden that could result if they were imposed on the facility.

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: August 31, 1982

Principal Contributors:

T. Colburn
G. Johnson