

March 19, 1998

Mr. Roger A. Newton, Chairman
Regulatory Response Group
Westinghouse Owners Group
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RELATED TO THE
PART-LENGTH CONTROL ROD DRIVE MECHANISM (CRDM) HOUSING ISSUE

Dear Mr. Newton:

By letter dated March 6, 1998, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) provided information regarding the assessment of the part-length CRDM housing issue and the WOG's planned activities to resolve the potential generic concerns. The staff has reviewed the information and has determined that it needs additional information in order to complete its review. The staff's questions are enclosed.

To ensure timely resolution of the short-term Regulatory Response Group issues, the staff requests a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues and Environmental
Projects Branch
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 694

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See attached page

DOCUMENT NAME: RRGRAI.WPD

OFFICE	PGEB	(A)SC:PGEB	(A)BC:PGEB	(A)BC:EMCB
NAME	CCraig:sw	MMalloy	TEssig <i>ME</i>	TSullivan <i>ES</i>
DATE	3/17/98	3/18/98	3/18/98	3/19/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9803250002 980319
PDR TOPRP EMVWEST
C PDR

1/1
DF03
98-61

PROJ. 694

DISTRIBUTION: Ltr. to R. Newton fm C. Craig dated March 19, 1998

✓ Central Files

Project File

PUBLIC

PGEB r/f

JRoe/DMatthews

GLainas/JStrosnider

RWessman

TSullivan

RHermann

KWichman

GHornseth

RBenedict

MChatterton

SLong

RLi

CCarpenter

BWetzel

TEssig

MMalloy

CCraig

DHood



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 19, 1998

Mr. Roger A. Newton, Chairman
Regulatory Response Group
Westinghouse Owners Group
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RELATED TO THE
PART-LENGTH CONTROL ROD DRIVE MECHANISM (CRDM) HOUSING ISSUE

Dear Mr. Newton:

By letter dated March 6, 1998, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) provided information regarding the assessment of the part-length CRDM housing issue and the WOG's planned activities to resolve the potential generic concerns. The staff has reviewed the information and has determined that it needs additional information in order to complete its review. The staff's questions are enclosed.

To ensure timely resolution of the short-term Regulatory Response Group issues, the staff requests a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Claudia M. Craig".

Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues and Environmental
Projects Branch
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 694

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

QUESTIONS

1. In the March 6, 1998, WOG letter, the RRG suggested WOG members "Perform additional records search to better identify applicability and obtain other data to confirm the absence of any cracking" as an option that might be incorporated in a member's plan to address this issue. In the meeting scheduled for March 23, 1998, the following has been included as an agenda item to develop details of a potential integrated plan: "Perform additional records search to identify details regarding welds, materials and CRDM design changes." The staff understands how the second item could be useful in identifying information that demonstrates the uniqueness of the Prairie Island crack. However, it is not clear what information supports this option as part of an individual member's plan based on the information currently available. Please clarify how this option would be beneficial on a plant-specific basis.
2. The RRG recommendations do not appear definitive regarding the need for either inspection or preemptive repair to alleviate the concern regarding a degraded component being in service. While the staff agrees that inspection results from other plants have not, to date, identified similar degradation and are considered encouraging with regard to addressing the issue in the longer term, in our view, sufficient information has not been presented to obviate the need for inspection or preemptive repair at each plant in the long term. Please provide your response.
3. Are there any design or construction differences (aside from filler metal) between those welds buttered with Alloy 82 rather than 309 stainless steel (SS)? Were the construction sequences and the non-destructive examination (NDE) methods (welding, machining, NDE and PWHT) used for the Alloy 82 welded assemblies different from the 309 buttered assemblies? What were the welding process and pre and post weld heat treatment requirements?
4. Are dissimilar metal welds on part length motor housings manufactured by Royal Industries using Alloy 82 instead of 309 SS considered an alternative design?
5. In the response to Question 2(b)(3) (Attachment 1 to the WOG letter dated March 6, 1998), the WOG stated that the effects of jet thrust force from the postulated failure of a part length CRDM housing are bounded by previously analyzed postulated jets from full length CRDM housing. It is not clear what type or size of breaks (i.e., longitudinal breaks vs. circumferential breaks) were assumed in those previous studies. In addition, the WOG's response stated that the previous analysis of jet thrust forces assumed a jet expansion of 10°. However, in the WOG/NRC meeting of February 27, 1998, Westinghouse stated that the jet from a postulated full circumferential break would be directed upward and not directly impinge on adjacent full length housings. It is not clear what jet expansion model was assumed for the circumferential break jet evaluation discussed in the WOG/NRC meeting. Please describe the jet thrust force evaluations performed, including the previously postulated full length CRDM housing failure studies. The description should include the type and the size of the breaks postulated, the jet expansion model assumed, the potential targets identified, and a discussion to show how the jet impingement load evaluation previously performed for the full length CRDM housing would envelop the worst potential jet loads from the current postulated failure of a part length CRDM housing.

Enclosure

ADDITIONAL COMMENT

The staff notes the probabilistic analysis described in response to NRC Question 3 (Attachment 1 to the WOG letter dated March 6, 1998) uses a value of 0.1 for the presence of a flaw in other WOG plants. This value was obtained as a per-weld probability. Based on the cited data alone, the probability for another plant with 8 of the subject welds would be 0.57 and the probability for a plant with 16 welds would be 0.81. The staff believes the ongoing inspections are important to provide more data and confidence in the RRG conclusion that the subject weld defect is an isolated incidence resulting from weld fabrication.

Enclosure

cc:

Mr. Andrew P. Drake, Project Manager
Westinghouse Owners Group
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mail Stop ECE 5-6
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-0355

Mr. Louis F. Liberatori, Jr., Chairman
Westinghouse Owners Group
Consolidated Edison Co. of NY, Inc.
Indian Point, Unit 2
Broadway and Beakley Avenue
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. Henry A. Sepp, Manager
Regulatory and Licensing Engineering
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mail Stop ECE 4-07A
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-0355

March 19, 1998

Mr. Roger A. Newton, Chairman
Regulatory Response Group
Westinghouse Owners Group
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RELATED TO THE
PART-LENGTH CONTROL ROD DRIVE MECHANISM (CRDM) HOUSING ISSUE

Dear Mr. Newton:

By letter dated March 6, 1998, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) provided information regarding the assessment of the part-length CRDM housing issue and the WOG's planned activities to resolve the potential generic concerns. The staff has reviewed the information and has determined that it needs additional information in order to complete its review. The staff's questions are enclosed.

To ensure timely resolution of the short-term Regulatory Response Group issues, the staff requests a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues and Environmental
Projects Branch
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 694

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See attached page

DOCUMENT NAME: RRGRAI.WPD

OFFICE	PGEB	(A)SC:PGEB	(A)BC:PGEB	(A)BC:EMCB
NAME	CCraig:sw	MMalloy	TEssig <i>ME</i>	TSullivan <i>ES</i>
DATE	3/17/98	3/18/98	3/18/98	3/19/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION: Ltr. to R. Newton fm C. Craig dated March 19, 1998

Central Files

✓ Project File

PUBLIC

PGEB r/f

JRoe/DMatthews

GLainas/JStrosnider

RWessman

TSullivan

RHermann

KWichman

GHornseth

RBenedict

MChatterton

SLong

RLi

CCarpenter

BWetzel

TEssig

MMalloy

CCraig

DHood



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 19, 1998

Mr. Roger A. Newton, Chairman
Regulatory Response Group
Westinghouse Owners Group
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RELATED TO THE
PART-LENGTH CONTROL ROD DRIVE MECHANISM (CRDM) HOUSING ISSUE

Dear Mr. Newton:

By letter dated March 6, 1998, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) provided information regarding the assessment of the part-length CRDM housing issue and the WOG's planned activities to resolve the potential generic concerns. The staff has reviewed the information and has determined that it needs additional information in order to complete its review. The staff's questions are enclosed.

To ensure timely resolution of the short-term Regulatory Response Group issues, the staff requests a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Claudia M. Craig".

Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues and Environmental
Projects Branch
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 694

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

QUESTIONS

1. In the March 6, 1998, WOG letter, the RRG suggested WOG members "Perform additional records search to better identify applicability and obtain other data to confirm the absence of any cracking" as an option that might be incorporated in a member's plan to address this issue. In the meeting scheduled for March 23, 1998, the following has been included as an agenda item to develop details of a potential integrated plan: "Perform additional records search to identify details regarding welds, materials and CRDM design changes." The staff understands how the second item could be useful in identifying information that demonstrates the uniqueness of the Prairie Island crack. However, it is not clear what information supports this option as part of an individual member's plan based on the information currently available. Please clarify how this option would be beneficial on a plant-specific basis.
2. The RRG recommendations do not appear definitive regarding the need for either inspection or preemptive repair to alleviate the concern regarding a degraded component being in service. While the staff agrees that inspection results from other plants have not, to date, identified similar degradation and are considered encouraging with regard to addressing the issue in the longer term, in our view, sufficient information has not been presented to obviate the need for inspection or preemptive repair at each plant in the long term. Please provide your response.
3. Are there any design or construction differences (aside from filler metal) between those welds buttered with Alloy 82 rather than 309 stainless steel (SS)? Were the construction sequences and the non-destructive examination (NDE) methods (welding, machining, NDE and PWHT) used for the Alloy 82 welded assemblies different from the 309 buttered assemblies? What were the welding process and pre and post weld heat treatment requirements?
4. Are dissimilar metal welds on part length motor housings manufactured by Royal Industries using Alloy 82 instead of 309 SS considered an alternative design?
5. In the response to Question 2(b)(3) (Attachment 1 to the WOG letter dated March 6, 1998), the WOG stated that the effects of jet thrust force from the postulated failure of a part length CRDM housing are bounded by previously analyzed postulated jets from full length CRDM housing. It is not clear what type or size of breaks (i.e., longitudinal breaks vs. circumferential breaks) were assumed in those previous studies. In addition, the WOG's response stated that the previous analysis of jet thrust forces assumed a jet expansion of 10°. However, in the WOG/NRC meeting of February 27, 1998, Westinghouse stated that the jet from a postulated full circumferential break would be directed upward and not directly impinge on adjacent full length housings. It is not clear what jet expansion model was assumed for the circumferential break jet evaluation discussed in the WOG/NRC meeting. Please describe the jet thrust force evaluations performed, including the previously postulated full length CRDM housing failure studies. The description should include the type and the size of the breaks postulated, the jet expansion model assumed, the potential targets identified, and a discussion to show how the jet impingement load evaluation previously performed for the full length CRDM housing would envelop the worst potential jet loads from the current postulated failure of a part length CRDM housing.

Enclosure

ADDITIONAL COMMENT

The staff notes the probabilistic analysis described in response to NRC Question 3 (Attachment 1 to the WOG letter dated March 6, 1998) uses a value of 0.1 for the presence of a flaw in other WOG plants. This value was obtained as a per-weld probability. Based on the cited data alone, the probability for another plant with 8 of the subject welds would be 0.57 and the probability for a plant with 16 welds would be 0.81. The staff believes the ongoing inspections are important to provide more data and confidence in the RRG conclusion that the subject weld defect is an isolated incidence resulting from weld fabrication.

Enclosure

cc:

Mr. Andrew P. Drake, Project Manager
Westinghouse Owners Group
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mail Stop ECE 5-6
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-0355

Mr. Louis F. Liberatori, Jr., Chairman
Westinghouse Owners Group
Consolidated Edison Co. of NY, Inc.
Indian Point, Unit 2
Broadway and Bleakley Avenue
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. Henry A. Sepp, Manager
Regulatory and Licensing Engineering
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mail Stop ECE 4-07A
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-0355

March 19, 1998

Mr. Roger A. Newton, Chairman
Regulatory Response Group
Westinghouse Owners Group
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RELATED TO THE
PART-LENGTH CONTROL ROD DRIVE MECHANISM (CRDM) HOUSING ISSUE

Dear Mr. Newton:

By letter dated March 6, 1998, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) provided information regarding the assessment of the part-length CRDM housing issue and the WOG's planned activities to resolve the potential generic concerns. The staff has reviewed the information and has determined that it needs additional information in order to complete its review. The staff's questions are enclosed.

To ensure timely resolution of the short-term Regulatory Response Group issues, the staff requests a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues and Environmental
Projects Branch
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 694

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION. See attached page

DOCUMENT NAME: RRGRAI.WPD

OFFICE	PGEB	(A)SC:PGEB	(A)BC:PGEB	(A)BC:EMCB
NAME	CCraig-sw	MMalloy	TEssig <i>ME</i>	TSullivan <i>ES</i>
DATE	3/17/98	3/18/98	3/18/98	3/19/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION: Ltr. to R. Newton fm C. Craig dated March 19, 1998

Central Files

Project File

✓ **PUBLIC**

PGEB r/f

JRoe/DMatthews

GLainas/JStrosnider

RWessman

TSullivan

RHermann

KWichman

GHornseth

RBenedict

MChatterton

SLong

RLi

CCarpenter

BWetzel

TEssig

MMalloy

CCraig

DHood



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 19, 1998

Mr. Roger A. Newton, Chairman
Regulatory Response Group
Westinghouse Owners Group
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) RELATED TO THE
PART-LENGTH CONTROL ROD DRIVE MECHANISM (CRDM) HOUSING ISSUE

Dear Mr. Newton:

By letter dated March 6, 1998, the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) provided information regarding the assessment of the part-length CRDM housing issue and the WOG's planned activities to resolve the potential generic concerns. The staff has reviewed the information and has determined that it needs additional information in order to complete its review. The staff's questions are enclosed.

To ensure timely resolution of the short-term Regulatory Response Group issues, the staff requests a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Claudia M. Craig".

Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues and Environmental
Projects Branch
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 694

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

QUESTIONS

1. In the March 6, 1998, WOG letter, the RRG suggested WOG members "Perform additional records search to better identify applicability and obtain other data to confirm the absence of any cracking" as an option that might be incorporated in a member's plan to address this issue. In the meeting scheduled for March 23, 1998, the following has been included as an agenda item to develop details of a potential integrated plan: "Perform additional records search to identify details regarding welds, materials and CRDM design changes." The staff understands how the second item could be useful in identifying information that demonstrates the uniqueness of the Prairie Island crack. However, it is not clear what information supports this option as part of an individual member's plan based on the information currently available. Please clarify how this option would be beneficial on a plant-specific basis.
2. The RRG recommendations do not appear definitive regarding the need for either inspection or preemptive repair to alleviate the concern regarding a degraded component being in service. While the staff agrees that inspection results from other plants have not, to date, identified similar degradation and are considered encouraging with regard to addressing the issue in the longer term, in our view, sufficient information has not been presented to obviate the need for inspection or preemptive repair at each plant in the long term. Please provide your response.
3. Are there any design or construction differences (aside from filler metal) between those welds buttered with Alloy 82 rather than 309 stainless steel (SS)? Were the construction sequences and the non-destructive examination (NDE) methods (welding, machining, NDE and PWHT) used for the Alloy 82 welded assemblies different from the 309 buttered assemblies? What were the welding process and pre and post weld heat treatment requirements?
4. Are dissimilar metal welds on part length motor housings manufactured by Royal Industries using Alloy 82 instead of 309 SS considered an alternative design?
5. In the response to Question 2(b)(3) (Attachment 1 to the WOG letter dated March 6, 1998), the WOG stated that the effects of jet thrust force from the postulated failure of a part length CRDM housing are bounded by previously analyzed postulated jets from full length CRDM housing. It is not clear what type or size of breaks (i.e., longitudinal breaks vs. circumferential breaks) were assumed in those previous studies. In addition, the WOG's response stated that the previous analysis of jet thrust forces assumed a jet expansion of 10°. However, in the WOG/NRC meeting of February 27, 1998, Westinghouse stated that the jet from a postulated full circumferential break would be directed upward and not directly impinge on adjacent full length housings. It is not clear what jet expansion model was assumed for the circumferential break jet evaluation discussed in the WOG/NRC meeting. Please describe the jet thrust force evaluations performed, including the previously postulated full length CRDM housing failure studies. The description should include the type and the size of the breaks postulated, the jet expansion model assumed, the potential targets identified, and a discussion to show how the jet impingement load evaluation previously performed for the full length CRDM housing would envelop the worst potential jet loads from the current postulated failure of a part length CRDM housing.

Enclosure

ADDITIONAL COMMENT

The staff notes the probabilistic analysis described in response to NRC Question 3 (Attachment 1 to the WOG letter dated March 6, 1998) uses a value of 0.1 for the presence of a flaw in other WOG plants. This value was obtained as a per-weld probability. Based on the cited data alone, the probability for another plant with 8 of the subject welds would be 0.57 and the probability for a plant with 16 welds would be 0.81. The staff believes the ongoing inspections are important to provide more data and confidence in the RRG conclusion that the subject weld defect is an isolated incidence resulting from weld fabrication.

Enclosure

cc:

Mr. Andrew P. Drake, Project Manager
Westinghouse Owners Group
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mail Stop ECE 5-6
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-0355

Mr. Louis F. Liberatori, Jr., Chairman
Westinghouse Owners Group
Consolidated Edison Co. of NY, Inc.
Indian Point, Unit 2
Broadway and Bleakley Avenue
Buchanan, NY 10511

Mr. Henry A. Sepp, Manager
Regulatory and Licensing Engineering
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mail Stop ECE 4-07A
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230-0355