U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission A 2 tn: Document Control Desk Washington, D.C. 20555

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Subject: } & \text { Byron Station Units } 1 \text { and } 2 \\
& \text { Response to NRC Bulletin } 88-08 \mathrm{~s} \\
& 88-08 \text { : Supplement } 182 \\
& \text { Docket Nos. } 50-454 / 455
\end{aligned}
$$

Dear Sir:

The above referenced bulletin and supplements requested that licensees review the reactor coolant system (RCS) to identify any connected, unisolable piping that could be subjected to temperature distributions which would result in unacceptable thermal stresses and (2) take action, where such piping is identified, to ensure that the piping will not be subjected to unacceptable thermal stresses.

Commonwealth Edison has completed its review pursuant to the request outlined in Bulletin $88-08$ and its supplements for Byron Station Units 182. Additionally Edison has discussed with the staff the methodologies used by Westinghouse Electric Corporation to support Byron Station's proposed response. These discussions were held per teleconferences September 2 and 9 , 1988.

Fer the staff's request Commons lIth Edison is submitting Byron Station's proposed response to Bulletin 88-08 along with the Westinghouse Electric Corporation engineering evaluation used to prepare this response. This information is attached in enclosures $1 \leqslant 2$.

To the best of Ny knowledge and belief, the statements csacained above are true and correct. In some respect these statements are not based on my personal knowledge, but obtained information furnished by other Commonwealth Edison employees. contractor employees, and consultants. Such information has been reviewed in accordance with company practice, and I believe it to be reliable.

Please address any questions that you or your staff may have concerninc this response to this office.

Respectfully,
Wayne 6 Mong Mongan
Nuclear Licensing Administrator

Attachments:
cc: A.B. Davis
Resident Inspector/Byron
rf
5140 F


Byron Station Response To NRC Bulletin 88-08: "Thermal Stresses in Piping Connected to Reactor Coolant Systen"

## IBRC Requested Action 11

Review systems connected to the RCS to determine whether unisolable sections of piping connected to the RCS can be subjectee to stresses from temperature strntification or temperature oscillations that could be induced by leaking valves and that were not evaluated in the design analysis of the piping. For those addressees who determine that there are no unisolable sections of piping that can be subjected to such stresses, no additional actions are requested except for the report required below.

## Byron Station's Response

A review of Byron piping systems connected to the RCS was conducted by Westinghouse to determine whether unisolable sections of connected piping could be subjected to stresses from temperature stratification or oscillations induced by lealing valves. Susceptible sections of piping we.e identified in the single Aux liary Spray line and the four Charging Pump to Cold ieg Injection line, of each Byron Unit. Temperature oscillations may be induced in these lines by leakage of the isolation valves located between the RCS and the charging system.

NRC Requested Action $\$ 2$
For any unisolable sections of piping connected to the RCS that may have been subjected to excessive thermal stresses, examine nondestructively the welds, heat-affected zones and high stress locations, including geometric discontinuities, in that piping to provide assurance that there are no existing flaws.

## Byron Station's Response

Current nondestructive examination technology does not permit reliable volumetric (radiographic/ultrasonic) examination of small diameter (less than 4 -inch) stainless steel piping with high contact radiation readings. Therefore, the 1.5 -inch diameter Charging Pump to Cold Leg Injection lines cannot be nondestructively examined at Byron Station. However, reasonable assurance can be provided that the thermal stress phenomenon potentially caused by the leakage of the Charging Pump to Cold Leg Iajection Isolation Valves ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{~S} 18801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ ) has not occurred at Byron Station. Performance of "Reactor Coolant System Isolation Valve Leakage Surveillance Procedure" (1/2 BVS 4.6.2,2-1) determines back leakage from the Reactor Coolant System through the Charging/Safety Injection Check Valves (1/25I8815, $1 / 2$ SI8900A, B, C, D) to a test tap 10 ated between $1 / 2 \mathrm{~S} 18815$ and $1 / 2 \mathrm{SI} 8801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ valves. By virtue of the test tap's location, the detection of forward leakage from the Charging Pump through the $1 / 2$ SI8801A, $B$ isolation valves is an unintended result of $1 / 2$ RVS $4,6,2,2-1$ performance. Procedures $1 / 2$ BVS $4,6,2,2-1$ are routinely fformed as follows for the $1 / 2 \$ 18815$ check vulves :
a) At least once per 18 monchs;
b) Prior to entering Mode 2 (Startup) whenever the plant has been in Cold Shutdown for 72 hours or more and if leakage testing has not been performed in the previous 9 months;
c) Prior to returning valves $1 / 2 \mathrm{SI} 8815$ to service following maintenance, repair or replacement work on the valves ;
d) Within 24 hours following $1 / 2$ S18815 valve actuation due to automatic or normal action or flow through the valve.

Data from past performances of $1 / 2$ BVS $4.6,2.2-1$ were reviewed and indicate zero leakage in eleven performances and one instance in which leak rate was recorded as 0.000317 gallons per minute (negligible and well within the acceptance criteria of 1.0 gpm$)$. Since all twelve leak tests of the $1 / 2518815$ valves conducted from January 1985 to Apris 1988 indicate that zero or negligible leakage existed, $1 / 2518801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ valves have not leaked; therefore, the Charging Pump to Cold Leg Injection lines have not been subjected to excessive thermal stresses.

Regarding the Auxiliary Spray line, Westinghouse recommended inspections of a 2-inch sockolet weld at the RCS piping connection and a portion of the $6-i n c h$ main spray piping. Due to nondestructive examination technique limitations, the 2 -inch sockolet weld cannot be volumetrically examined, however, it will receive a surface examination and the susceptible portion of the 6 -inch main spray line will be volumetrically examined prior to the end of the Unit 1 second refueling outage (scheduled to begin September 2 , 1988). The necessity to nondestructively examine the Unit 2 main spray line and 2 -inch sockolet weld will be determined by a pending stress analysis of the pipe. In the event that nondectructive examinations of the Unit 2 main spray 1 ine and 2 -inch sockolet weld are requiraci, the examinations will te completed prior to the ond of the Unit 2 first refueling outage (scheduled to begin January 1989).

## NRC Requested Action 13:

Plan and implement a program to provide continuing assurance that unisolable sections of all piping connected to the RCS will not be subjected to combined cyclic and static thermal and other stresses that could cause fatigue failure during the remaining life of the unit. This assurance may be provided by (1) redesigning and modifying these sections of piping to withstand combined stresses caused by various loads including temporal and spatial distributions of temperature resulting from leakage across valve seats, (2) instrumenting this piping to detect adverse temperature distributions and establishing appropriate limits on temperature distributions, or (3) providing means for ensuring that presture upstream from block valves which might leak is monitored and does not excerd RCS pressure.

## Byron Station Response:

In order to assure that the four Charging Pump to Culd Leg Injection 1:nes on ach Byron Unit will not be subjected to cyclic thermal stresses that could cause fatique failure during the remaining lives of Byron Units 1 and 2 , surveillance procedures will be deveioped or revised as neressary to require pe.iodic tests specifically for leakage past thi $1 / 2 \mathrm{~S} 18801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ isolation valves. If the $1 / 2818801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ valves leak, the leakage will be discovered d. ring the conduct of the surveillance, and action wuild ensue to determine the leakage source and correct the cause. Leak testing for the $1 / 2 \mathrm{Si} 8801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ valves will be routinely performed as fol.ows:
a) At least once per 18 months;
b) Prior to entering Mode 2 whencver the plant has been in Cold Shutdown for 72 hours or more and if leakage testing has not been performed in the previous 9 months;
c) Prior to returning valves $1 / 2 \mathrm{Si8801A}, \mathrm{~B}$ to service following maintenance, repair or replacement work on the valve;
d) Within 24 hours following $1 / 2 S 18801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ valve actuation due to automatic or manual action or flow through the valve.

The periodic performance of the leak test minimizes the potential for long term thermal cycling of the four unisolable Charging Pump to Cold Leg injection lines by detecting and resolving isolation valve leakage. The $1 / 2518801 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ leak test procedures will be approved for use prior to the end of the Unit 1 second refueling outage (scheduled to begin September 2, 1988).

In order to assure that the single Auxiliary Spray line on Byron Unit 1 will not be subjected to cyclic thermal stresses that could cause fatigue failure, appropriate sections of the piping will be instrumented with external temperature monitoring devices. The outputs of these devices will be evaluated to determine if leakage past the single isolation valve from the charging system is occurring. The temperature monitoring devices will be installed on Unit 1 prior to the end of the second refueling outage (scheduled to begin September 2, 1988). If a pending stress analysis of the line concludes that the Auxiliary Spray line is not susceptible to fatigue failure, then the temperature monitoring devices may be removed. The necessity to instrument the Unit 2 Auxiliary Spray line will be determined by a pending stress analysis of the pipe. In the event that temperature monitoring of Unit 2 is required, the instrumentation will be installed prior to the end of the Unit 2 first refueling outage (scheduled to begin January 1989).

All Class 1 piping receives a VT-2 Visual Leak Test before and after refueling outages in accordance with the ASME Code. The examinations are intended to detect leakage from Class 1 piping. The Auxiliary Spray and Charging Pump to Cold Leg Injection lines are examined as part of the test, and any leakage due to thermal stress induced pipe cracking would be noted and resolved, Additionally, the high stress welds identifled in these iines are routinely dye penetrant inspected as part of the ASME Inservice inspection Program.

## ATTACHMENT 2

Westinghouse Electric Corporation<br>Engineering Evaluation for<br>Commonwealth Edison<br>Byron and Braidwood Nuclear Stations<br>To Address NRC Bulletin 88-08

Mr. D. Elias, Engineering Superintendent
Byron and Braidwood Stations
Commonwealth Edison Company
P. 0. Box 767

Chicago, IL 60690

CAE-88-308
CCE-88-427
FSSE/SS-CAE-5530
S.0. CAE-280

Augus: 15, 1988

> Commonwealth Edison Company Byron and Braidwood Nuclear Stations Revised Information Regarding Potential for Iemperature Oscillations in the Reactor Coolant Piping

Dear Mr, Elias:
The reference letter CAE-88-301 provided Westinghouse's initial irput to Commonweal th Edison to address NRC Bulletin 88-08. This letter supersedes CAE-88-301 and provides more information about the screening criteria used to select potential locations of cyclic fatigue. The potential locations are listed on the attached table.

In the table, only those lines connected to reactor coolant system where temperature induced cyclic fatigue could occur, are included for both units ! and 2 of Byron and Braidwood Stations. The screening criteria for determining these lines are as follows:

- Adequate driving force must be available. Only lines connecting the charging pumps to the RCS are potential candidates for continuous or cyclic leakage.
- Only lines with single, normally-closed isolation valves are included.
- 10CFR50.55a defines the reactor coolant pressure boundary as extending out to the second isolation boundary. Conservatively this would extend the piping line segments reportable under NRCB 88-08 Action 1 back to the second isolation valve; however, the location of the highest fatigue is the part of the system interconnecting piping between the last check valve and the reactor coolant main loop. The affected table contains only the portion of the piping between the last check valve and the main coolant loop.
- Piping peak-to-peak temperature cycles of $50^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ were observed in the region of the cracked pipe at the J. M. Farley plant with the overall top-to-bottom stratification temperature being about $250^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. Westinghouse's recommendation to Portland Gas and Electric was that fatigue could occur at cycles as 10 w as $20^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. All temperatures refer to piping outer diameter measurements.
- Piping layouts have been reviewed to locate cold traps. When piping runs vertically downward from heat sources (e.g., reactor coolant pipes or regenerative heat exchanger outlet piping), the water (and piping) at the bottom of the cold trap is cooler than the water and piping at the heat sources. This leads to the potential for temperature oscillations.

The charging lines and auxiliary spray line are potentially subject to temperature-iduced cyclic fatigue due to the piping layouts that have cold traps. Warm water ( $470^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) from the regenerative heat exchanger can propagate to the cold trapped piping where it will be further cooled. Further propagations of the now-cooled leakage to the pressurizer spray or cold leg(s) ( $530^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ or $556^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, respectively) can cause cold-to-hot temperature cycles.

One of the charging isolation valves (CV8146 or CV8147) is closed at all times. This reduces the number of design transients that affect the charging nozzle because the operating duty is shared by each charging nozzle. At any given time, the charging line with the closed isolation valve could potentially have cycifc leakage and piping temperature oscillations. Valves CV8383A and 8 are spring loaded check valves with a cracking pressure of 200 psid intended to be thermal expansion relief valves for the regenerative heat exchanger tube side piping. The high cracking pressure prevents these valves from opening during normal operation, and the flow paths through valves CV8383A and B will not eliminate the potential for cyclic fatigue.

The charging/SI branch line potential leakage will be at the temperature of the charging puinp discharge. Leakage could cause cold-to-hot temperature cycles to occur in the branch line piping adjacent to the reactor coolant cold legs.

The attached tables also define whether the potential leakage source temperature applies to normal plant operation or whether it is a transient condition. If it is a transient condition, a duration for the transient was defined. This information is provided to assist in the evaluation of the severity of any thermal stresses or to make the judgment that short-tarm transients will not cause high cyclic fatigue.

A separate document will be provided that documents the components and locations for non-destructive examination.

```
Mr. D. Elias
If we can be of any additional assistance, please call me.
Yours very truly,
S a Fujatas for
H. f. Walls, Manager
Commonwealth Edison Projects
U.S. Nuclear Projects

\section*{Attachment}
cc: C. A. Moerke
R. A. Gesior
R. Pleniewicz
R. E. Querio
\(P\). The \(4 \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{H}\)
R. W. Buchholz, W
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Line Number Subject to Temperature & Normally Closed Isolation Valves & Leakage Source Temperature & Notes \\
\hline Stratification & & \begin{tabular}{l}
(a) normal operation \\
(b) design basis \\
(c) design transient
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{RC37A3} & CV8146 & \(470{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) & 1 \\
\hline & & \(400^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (b) & 1 \\
\hline & & \(375^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (c) & 2 \\
\hline & & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{c})\) & 3 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{RC28A3} & CV8147 & \(470{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) & 1 \\
\hline & & \(400^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (b) & 1 \\
\hline & & \(375{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{c})\) & 2 \\
\hline & & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (c) & 3 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{RC3C4A1-1/2} & SI8801A or B & \(100-130^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) & 1 \\
\hline & (valves in parallel) & \(60^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (b) & 1 \\
\hline & & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{c})\) & 2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{RC30AB1-1/2} & \$18801A or B & \(100-130^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) & 1 \\
\hline & (valves in parallel) & \(60^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{b})\) & 1 \\
\hline & & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{c})\) & 2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{RC30AC1-1/2} & \$18801A or B & \(100-130^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) & 1 \\
\hline & (valves are in & \(60^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (b) & 1 \\
\hline & parallel) & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{c})\) & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Line Number Subject to Temperature & Normally Closed Isolation Valves & Leakage Source Temperature \\
\hline Stratification & & \begin{tabular}{l}
(a) normal operation \\
(b) design basis \\
(c) design transient
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{RC30AD1-1/2} & SI8801A or B & \(100 \cdot 130^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) \\
\hline & (values are in & \(60^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (b) \\
\hline & parallel) & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{c})\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{RY18A2} & CV8145 & \(470^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{a})\) \\
\hline & & \(400^{\circ} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{b})\) \\
\hline & & \(375{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (c) \\
\hline & & \(35^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\) (c) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes
1) Potentially, leakage source would occur continuously.
2) Leakage source temperature would occur very infrequently--likely less than one hour per year per reactor.
3) Leakage source temperature based on low pressurizer level signal without coincident safety injection or on phase A containment isolation without coincident safety injection. These scenarios are unlikely to continue for more than 0.5 hours per year (for one instance per reactor) until either operator intervention/rectification occurs or else the scenario degrades to a safety injection which isolates normal charging.```

