Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

February 14, 1994

LICENSEE: Wisconsin Electric Power Company

FACILITY: Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: REACTOR VESSEL HEAD PENETRATION INSPECTION

On November 3, 1993, the staff met with representatives of the licensee at One White Flint North, Rockville, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the upcoming inspection of the control rod drive vessel head penetrations at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. Enclosure 1 lists the meeting participants.

Following introductions and a brief summary of the purpose of the meeting, the licensee staff and their consultants presented details of their plans for the upcoming inspections (Enclosure 2 provides copies of the meeting handouts). Issues discussed included schedule, inspection scope, techniques to be employed, evaluation methods and criteria, and repair methodology.

A key issue identified during the presentation was the dispositioning of circumferential flaws. The licensee stated that NRC and WEPCo must agree on the acceptance criteria for these flaws (to leave in place as found, or to repair by an approved method) before the inspections begin. The staff stated that current analysis techniques and completed inspections at other plants indicate that there should not be any circumferential flaws, implying that if these flaws were found then the analysis could be deficient for not identifying them. The licensee then clarified that the analysis techniques can indeed be used for prediction of circumferential cracking, though this requires viewing the data from above the penetration. The licensee also stated that any circumferential cracks identified during the inspection could have been there since original construction, and not a result of operations. At the end of this part of the discussions, the staff agreed that the NRC position would be formalized before the inspections began.

A five day window in the upcoming Unit 1 refueling outage has been identified for the inspections. The inspections will encompass all 49 penetrations if time allows. If there are schedule problems, the licensee may alter the inspection scope and/or sequence.

> ORIGINAL SIGNED BY Allen G. Hansen, Project Manager Project Directorate III-3 Division of Reactor Projects III/IV/V

170045 Enclosures:

As stated

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY FILENAME: G:\PTBEACH\CRDCRACK.MTS

cc: See next page

| OFFICE | LA: PDJ IJ-3 | PM: PDIII-3 | D:PDIII-3 |
|--------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| NAME | MRUSEBROOK | AHansen | JHannon In |
| DATE | 2/14/94 | 2-11/194 | 2/1494 |

7402180257 740214 PDR ADOCK 05000266 PDR NRC FILE CENTER COPY

DISTRIBUTION: Docket File NRC & Local PDRs PDIII-3 Reading File SVarga, Acting ADP JRoe JZwolinksi JHannon MRushbrook AHansen RHermann JHannon LBanic JDavis WKoo JStrosnider OGC EJordan ACRS (10) WDean 17 G 21 EGreenman

Mr. Robert E. Link Wisconsin Electric Power Company Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2

:00

Mr. Robert E. Link, Vice President Nuclear Power Department Wisconsin Electric Power Company 231 West Michigan Street, Room P379 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Ernest L. Blake, Jr. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20037

Mr. Gregory J. Maxfield, Manager Point Beach Nuclear Plant Wisconsin Electric Power Company 6610 Nuclear Road Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Town Chairman Town of Two Creeks Route 3 Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Chairman Public Service Commission of Wisconsin Hills Farms State Office Building Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Regional Administrator, Region III U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 801 Warrenville Road Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351

Resident Inspector's Office U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 6612 Nuclear Road Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

| NAME | AFFILIATION | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Robert Hermann | USNRC/NRR/DE | | | |
| John Hannon | USNRC/NRR/DRPW | | | |
| Lee Banic | USNRC/NRR/DE | | | |
| Jim Davis | USNRC/NRR/DE | | | |
| William Koo | USNRC/NRR/DE | | | |
| Jack Strosnider | USNRC/NRR/DE | | | |
| Allen Hansen | USNRC/NRR/DE | | | |
| Steve Hunt | Dominion Engineering | | | |
| Dick Cyburon | ABB - Combustion Engineering | | | |
| Kevin Fleming | BWNT | | | |
| Melvin Arey | Duke Power | | | |
| David Whitaker | Duke Power | | | |
| John Galembush | Westinghouse | | | |
| Rick Rishel | Westinghouse | | | |
| David Howell | Westinghouse | | | |
| Warren Bamford | Westinghouse | | | |
| Dave Boyle | Westinghouse | | | |
| Steve Brewer | American Electric Power | | | |
| Jim Benes | American Electric Power | | | |
| Dom Bemis | Consumers Power | | | |
| Sid Burns | W(SI) ² | | | |
| E. Kietzman | EPRI NDE Center | | | |
| Frank Ammirato | EPRI NDE Center | | | |
| Morris Schreim | NUMARC | | | |
| Tom Spry | Commonwealth Edison | | | |
| Tom Malanowski | Wisconsin Electric | | | |
| Greg Maxfield | Wisconsin Electric | | | |
| Roger Newton | Wisconsin Electric | | | |
| Craig Prothero | Wisconsin Electric | | | |

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER CO.

POINT BEACH MEETING

WITH NRC

REACTOR VESSEL HEAD PENETRATION INSPECTION

January 31, 1994

NRC MEETING AGENDA

- Introduction Roget Newton
- 2) WE Schedule Caug Prothero
 - a) Preparation
 - b) EPRI Mock-up Qualification
 - c) Outage
- 3) Scope of WE Inspection strang Prothero.
- 4) Techniques to be Employed Dave Howell
 - a) Detection
 - b) Sizing

5) Evaluation of Indications Warren Bamford

- a) Crack growth rate methodology
- b) Acceptance Criteria
 - (1) Axial Flaws
 - (2) Circumferential Flaws
- 6) Repair Methodology Dave Howell
- ") Questions Closing Roger Newton

SCHEDULE

| 7 | A | 1000 | *** | - | 2.6 | makes 1 | en. | 10.00 | m | in. | - |
|----|----|------|-----|-----|-----|---------|-----|-------|---|-----|---|
| LN | DU | D | Ľ | ĸ | Y | E. | ħ. | 1 | 0 | R | Ŧ |
| | | - | - | * * | | (Barris | | * | | * * | |

Support WOG Activities Support AHAC Activities

Ongoing

Ongoing

INSPECTION PREPARATION SCHEDULE

| Decision to plan for inspection | 03/03/93 |
|--|----------|
| Specification complete | 03/24/93 |
| Performed visual inspection of head penetrations from underneath | 04/18/93 |
| Performed scoping of job in containment | 05/05/93 |
| Received bids | 05/21/93 |
| Evaluated bids | 09/02/93 |
| Contract awarded | 09/10/93 |
| EPRI Mockup demonstration | 02/09/94 |
| Mockup of inspection end effectors with R-0 manipulator | 02/14/94 |
| Mockup of repair tooling end effectors with R-0 manipulator | 02/21/94 |
| Perform plant specific engineering analysis for flaw evaluation | 03/10/94 |
| Design head stand modification | 03/15/94 |
| Design head shield ring alteration | 03/15/94 |
| Design temporary lead shielding | 03/15/94 |
| | |

OUTAGE SCHEDULE

| Modify shield ring | 04/03/94 |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Inspection equipment to arrive onsite | 04/03/94 |
| Install RV head stand modification | 04/04/94 |
| Install temporary lead shielding | 04/05/94 |
| Stage inspection equipment | 04/08/94 |
| Set RV head | 04/09/94 |
| Start head penetration inspection | 04/10/94 |
| Complete head penetration inspection | 04/15/94 |
| Replace RV head | 04/17/94 |
| | |

WE INSPECTION SCOPE

INSPECTION SEQUENCE LOGIC

- Start with outer row penetrations that do not have thermal sleeves and work towards the ID on non-sleeved penetrations (12 total).
- 2) Upon completion of non-sleeved penetrations, proceed with inspection of the sleeved penetrations starting with the outer most penetrations and working in (33 total).
- 3) Upon completion of unsleeved penetrations proceed with inspection of the penetrations with part-length control rods (4 total).

Inspection sequence will be very flexible. If problems are encountered on any particular penetration(s) then sequence may be altered to allow continued production.

If, for any reason, a 100% inspection cannot be conducted (e.g. equipment breakdown, access problems, critical path impact, etc.) then the particular situation will be assessed and a decision will be made on the course of action to be taken. Based on the inspection data to date, if the outer two rows (11 penetrations) are inspected, in accordance with the Westinghouse Owners Group Inspection Guidelines, and no flaws are identified, probabilistic analysis shows that there is a 94% confidence factor that no defects will exist.

INSPECTION VOLUME

See Figure 1

PLAN

The objective of the CRDM inspection effort at PBNP is to conduct ECT of all 49 penetrations. The current outage schedule and estimated inspection rate allow for a 100% inspection.

Inspection Volume



INSPECTION TECHNIQUES

- REMOTE DELIVERY TOOL WITH R 0 Z CAPABILITY.
- REMOTE END EFFECTOR/PROBE CHANGEOUT.
- PERFORM EDDY CURRENT SCAN ON ALL PENETRATIONS TO IDENTIFY DEFECTS.
- ANY PENETRATIONS WITH AN INDICATION WILL BE EVALUATED WITH T.O.F. U.T.
- SEPARATE SABRE PROBE FOR PENETRATIONS WITH THERMAL SLEEVES (EC & UT).
- ROTATING PROBE FOR NONSLEEVED (EC/UT) LOCATIONS.
- NO REMOVAL OF THERMAL SLEEVE WILL BE REQUIRED.

EDDY CURRENT CAPABILITIES

(Based on Westinghouse Qualification Results)

• PANCAKE COIL/ROTATING PROBE

| MINIMUM DETECTABLE DEFECT | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| LENGTH | 1.5MM |
| DEPTH | . 5MM |
| PRECISION FOR LOCATION OF | |
| ONE INDICATION | <u>+</u> 5MM |
| SEPARATION EFFECT BETWEEN | |
| TWO INDICATIONS | 5MM |
| PRECISION OF THE INDICATION | |
| LENGTH | ± 1MM |
| SCANNING FOR 1ST ANALYSIS | 2• / |
| | TRANSITION |
| SCANNING FOR 2ND ANALYSIS | 1* / |
| | TRANSITION |

WEST NOHOUSE PROPERETARY DUASE

REACTOR VESSEL ALLOY 600

WESTINGHOUSE INSPECTION SUPPORT

R.V. HEAD INSPECTION STRATEGY

TESTING RESULTS



U.T. SIZING CAPABILITIES (Based on Testing Performed in France)

WELD PROFILE T.O.F. PROBES IN P/E MODE.

- DEFECT SIZING UTILIZING TIME OF FLIGHT TECHNIQUE.
 - MULTIPLE SPACING BETWEEN PROBES TO ASSURE FULL COVERAGE OF WALL THICKNESS.
- ACCURATELY SIZE DEFECTS GREATER THAN 2-3MM DEEP.
- ACCURACY ± .5MM ON DEPTH AND ± 2MM ON LENCTH.
- ABILITY TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN 16MM THROUGH WALL DEFECT AND A 15MM PARTIAL DEPTH DEFECT.
- SEPARATION BETWEEN DEFECTS = 8MM 10MM.

-

1

WESTINGHOUSE / AEA O'DONNELL REACTOR VESSEL ALLOY 600 PENETRATION INSPECTION

TIME-OF-FLIGHT DIFFRACTION



"TIME-OF-FLIGHT" ULTRASOUND PATHS

TESTING PROGRAMS/FIELD EXPERIENCE

- ALL EQUIPMENT TESTED AND QUALIFIED BY WESTINGHOUSE PRIOR TO FIELD USE.
- E.C. SYSTEM HAS BEEN SUCCESSFULLY UTILIZED ON THE FOLLOWING PLANTS:
 - DOEL 1 (BELGIUM) 49 PENETRATIONS
 ANGRA (BRAZIL) 40 PENETRATIONS
- U.T. SYSTEM HAS BEEN SUCCESSFULLY USED AT CATTENOM IN FRANCE - 2 PENETRATIONS.

EPRI PERFORMANCE DEMONSTRATION

- FULL PERFORMANCE DEMONSTRATION CONDUCTED BY EPRI IS SCHEDULED FOR WEEK OF 2/7/94.
- BOTH E.C. AND U.T. TECHNIQUES WILL BE VERIFIED ON EPRI MOCKUP.
- PROCEDURES WILL BE REVIEWED BY WESTINGHOUSE, EPRI AND PT. BEACH.

EVALUATIONS OF INDICATIONS

- Industry Acceptance Criteria will be used
 - Axial Flaws
 - Circumferential Flaws
- Point Beach specific evaluations are underway to determine the predicted growth for a range of indications.
- These evaluations will be complete before the inspection begins.

FLAW CHARACTERIZATION

- FLAWS DETECTED MUST BE CHARACTERIZED BY LENGTH AND PREFERABLY DEPTH
- 2. IF ONLY FLAW LENGTH IS CHARACTERIZED, ASSUME $A = 0.5 \times LENGTH$
- 3. FLAWS SHALL BE CONSIDERED SINGLE FLAWS PROVIDED THE SEPARATION DISTANCE BETWEEN FLAWS IS EQUAL TO OR LESS THAN THE DIMENSION S, WHERE S IS DETERMINED AS SHOWN IN SECTION XI,
- 4. FLAW LOCATION RELATIVE TO BOTH THE TOP AND BOTTOM OF THE PARTIAL PENETRATION ATTACHMENT WELD TO THE VESSEL HEAD SHALL BE DETERMINED. (SEE FIGURE 1)
- 5. FLAW PROJECTIONS SHOULD BE MADE IN BOTH THE AXIAL AND CIRCUMFERENTIAL DIRECTIONS IF THE FLAW IS ORIENTED AT AN ANGLE.





FLAW PROXIMITY RULES FROM SECTION XI (FIGURE IWA 3400-1)

FLAW ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

1. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DEPTH AT OR ABOVE WELD IS A/T = 0.75 for both axial and circumferential FLAWS, where A = FLAW DEPTH AND T = PENETRATION THICKNESS. THIS DEPTH IS A_F AS DEFINED IN IWB 3600.

2. AXIAL FLAWS FOUND BELOW THE WELD ARE ACCEPTABLE REGARDLESS OF DEPTH, PROVIDED THEIR UPPER END DOES NOT REACH THE BOTTOM OF THE WELD DURING THE PERIOD OF SERVICE UNTIL THE NEXT INSPECTION. AXIAL FLAWS ABOVE THE BOTTOM OF THE WELD ARE SUBJECT TO ITEM 1.

3. CIRCUMFERENTIAL FLAWS FOUND BELOW THE WELD ARE ACCEPTABLE REGARDLESS OF DEPTH, PROVIDED THE LENGTH IS LESS THAN 75% OF THE CIRCUMFERENCE. 4. AXIAL FLAWS EXTENDING THROUGH AND/OR ABOVE THE WELD REGION ARE NOT LIMITED IN LENGTH BUT DEPTH IS LIMITED BY ITEM 1.

5. CIRCUMFERENTIAL FLAWS AT AND ABOVE THE WELD ARE LIMITED TO A MEASURED LENGTH OF 50 PERCENT OF THE CIRCUMFERENCE AND THE DEPTH IS LIMITED BY ITEM 1.

6. FLAWS WHICH EXCEED THESE CRITERIA MUST BE REPAIRED, UNLESS ANALYTICALLY JUSTIFIED FOR FURTHER SERVICE WITHOUT REPAIR. THIS ANALYSIS SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE REGULATORY AUTHORITY HAVING JURISDICTION AT THE PLANT SITE. Table 1: Summary of R.V. Head Penetration Acceptance Criteria

| LOCATION | A | KIAL | CIRC | | | |
|-------------------|-------|----------|-------|----------|--|--|
| | a, | l | a, | l | | |
| BELOW WELD | t | no limit | t | .75 circ | | |
| AT AND ABOVE WELD | 0.75t | no limit | 0.75t | .50 circ | | |

a, = FLAW DEPTH AS DEFINED IN IWB 3600

= FLAW LENGTH

R

t

= WALL THICKNESS

REMEDIAL REPAIRS

- EXCAVATION AVAILABLE FOR PT. BEACH
- O WINDOW THRU SLEEVE
 - * 1" (25MM) WIDE X 7" (178MM) LONG
 - * STRUCTURALLY AND FUNCTIONALLY ACCEPTABLE.
 - O ACCEPTABLE STRESSES IN SLEEVE
 - o GUIDANCE FUNCTION OF SLEEVE/FUNNEL REMAINS
 - o ACCEPTABLE THERMAL EFFECTS ON CRDM
- o REMOVAL OF LOCAL INDICATIONS EDM EXCAJATION
- 360" SKIM CUT BY ROTATION OF SLEEVE
- o ANALYSIS PERFORMED TO JUSTIFY:
 - * LOCAL EXCAVATION = 5/8" WIDE X 1/4" DEEP 4 TO 1
 TAPER
 - * SKIM CUT = 3/16" REDUCTION IN WALL THICKNESS
- EXCAVATION WITH WELD REPAIR AVAILABLE FOR PT. BEACH
 LOCAL REMOVAL OF INDICATIONS
 - O WELD REPAIR
- ALL WORK WILL BE PERFORMED INCOMPLIANCE TO ASME CODES
- NO REMOVAL OF THE THERMAL SLEEVE WILL BE REQUIRED