



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

November 12, 1999

Mr. R. P. Necci - Vice President
Nuclear Oversight and Regulatory Affairs
c/o Mr. David A. Smith
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P. O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385-0128

SUBJECT: GENERIC LETTER 97-01, "DEGRADATION OF CRDM/CEDM NOZZLE AND OTHER VESSEL CLOSURE HEAD PENETRATIONS" REVIEW OF THE RESPONSES FOR MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

Dear Mr. Necci:

Enclosed is the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's assessment of your letters dated April 28 and July 28, 1997, that provided your 30-day and 120-day responses to Generic Letter (GL) 97-01, "Degradation of CRDM/CEDM Nozzle and Other Vessel Closure Head Penetrations," and your letter of December 21, 1998, that provided your response to the staff's request for additional information (RAI) dated August 27, 1998, relative to the issuance of the GL. Your responses provided your proposed program and efforts to address the potential for primary water stress corrosion cracking (PWSCC) to occur in the control rod drive mechanism (CRDM) nozzles at the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 (MP3).

On April 1, 1997, the staff issued GL 97-01, requesting that addressees provide a description of the plans to inspect the vessel head penetrations (VHPs) at their respective pressurized water reactor (PWR) designed plants. In the discussion section of the GL, the staff indicated that it did not object to individual PWR licensees basing their inspection activities on an integrated, industry-wide inspection program.

The Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG), in coordination with the efforts of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) and the other PWR Owners Groups (the Babcock and Wilcox Owners Group (B&WOG) and Combustion Engineering Owners Group (CEOG)), determined that it was appropriate for its members to develop a cooperative integrated inspection program in response to GL 97-01. Therefore, on July 25, 1997, the WOG submitted two Topical Reports, WCAP-14901, Revision 0, and WCAP-14902, Revision 0, on behalf of the member utilities in the WOG. In these reports, the WOG provided descriptions of the two models, the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)/Dominion Engineering CIRSE Model (crack initiation and growth susceptibility model) and the Westinghouse Model, that were used to rank the VHPs at the participating plants in the owners group. In your 30- and 120-day responses, you indicated that you were a participant in the WOG's integrated program for evaluating the potential for PWSCC to occur in the VHPs of Westinghouse designed PWRs, and that you were endorsing the probabilistic susceptibility model in WCAP-14901, Revision 0, as being applicable to the assessment of VHPs at MP3.

0500423 P

DF01

The staff performed a review of your responses dated April 28 and July 28, 1997, and the applicable WCAP for your facility and determined that additional information was needed for completion of the review. Therefore, on August 27, 1998, the staff issued an RAI requesting: (1) a description of the probabilistic susceptibility ranking for a plant's VHPs to undergo PWSCC relative to the rankings for the rest of the industry; (2) a description of how the respective susceptibility models were benchmarked; (3) a description of how the variability in the product forms, material specifications, and heat treatments used to fabricate a plant's VHPs were addressed in the susceptibility models; and (4) a description of how the models would be refined in the future to include plant-specific inspection results. As was the case for the earlier responses to the GL, the staff encouraged a coordinated, generic response to the requests in the RAI.

On December 11, 1998, NEI submitted a generic, integrated response to the RAIs on GL 97-01 on behalf of the PWR industry and the utility members in the owners groups. In the generic submittal, NEI informed the staff that it had normalized the susceptibility rankings for PWRs. The generic response to the RAIs also provided sufficient information to answer the information requests in the RAIs, and emphasized that the integrated program is an ongoing program that will be implemented in conjunction with EPRI, the PWR Owners Groups, the participating utilities, and the Material Reliability Projects' Subcommittee on Alloy 600. By letter dated March 21, 1999, the staff informed NEI that the integrated program was an acceptable approach for addressing the potential for PWSCC to occur in the VHPs of PWR-designed nuclear plants, and that licensees responding to the GL could refer to the integrated program as a basis for assessing the postulated occurrence of PWSCC in PWR-design VHPs.

To date, all utilities have implemented VT-2 type visual examinations of their VHPs in compliance with the ASME requirements specified in Table IWB-2500 for Category B-P components. Most utilities, if not all, have also performed visual examinations as part of plant-specific boric acid wastage surveillance programs. In addition, the following plants have completed voluntary, comprehensive augmented volumetric inspections (eddy current examinations or ultrasonic testing examinations) of their CRDM nozzles:

- 1994 - Point Beach Unit 1 (Westinghouse design)
- 1994 - Oconee Unit 2 (B&W design)
- 1994 - D.C. Cook Unit 2 (Westinghouse design)
- 1996 - North Anna Unit 1 (Westinghouse design)
- 1998 - Millstone Unit 2 (CE design)
- 1999 - Ginna (Westinghouse design)

In addition, the following plants have completed voluntary, limited augmented volumetric inspections of their VHPs as well:

- 1995 - Palisades - eight instrument nozzles (CE design)
- 1996 - Oconee Unit 2 - reinspection of two CRDM nozzles (B&W design)
- 1997 - Calvert Cliffs Unit 2 - vessel head vent pipe (CE design)

The majority of these plants have been ranked as having the more susceptible VHPs in the industry. Of these inspections, only the inspection at D.C. Cook Unit 2 has resulted in the identification of any domestic PWSCC type flaw indications. The current program includes

additional commitments to perform further volumetric inspections of the CRDM nozzles at Oconee Unit 2 (a reinspection of 2-12 nozzles in 1999), Crystal River 3 (in 2001, a B&W design), Diablo Canyon Unit 2 (in 1999, a Westinghouse design), Farley Unit 2 (in 2001, a Westinghouse design), and San Onofre Unit 3 (in 2002-2008, a CE design). These plants are currently ranked in either the high or moderate susceptibility categories.

On December 21, 1998, you provided your response to the staff's RAI of August 27, 1998. In your letter of December 21, 1998, you endorsed the NEI submittal of December 11, 1998, and indicated that you were a participant in the NEI/WOG integrated program. Since the additional voluntary volumetric inspections performed to date have confirmed that PWSCC is not an immediate safety concern with respect to the structural integrity of VHPs in domestic PWRs, and since we have approved the integrated program for implementation, we conclude that the integrated program provides an acceptable basis for evaluating your VHPs. You may refer to the integrated program when submitting VHP-related licensing action submittals for the remainder of the current 40-year licensing period. However, if you are considering applying for license renewal of your facilities, your application will need to address the following items: (1) an assessment of the susceptibility of your VHPs to develop PWSCC during the extended license terms for the facilities; (2) a confirmation that the VHPs at your facilities are included under the scope of your boric acid corrosion inspection program, and (3) a summary of the results of any inspections that have been completed on your VHPs prior to the license renewal application, as appropriate.

This completes the staff's efforts relative to your responses to GL 97-01. Thank you for your consideration and efforts in addressing this issue.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 John A. Nakoski, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
 Project Directorate I
 Division of Licensing Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

cc: See next page

Distribution

File Center	PUBLIC	EAdensam (EGA1)	JClifford	JNakoski	DLew, RI
PDI-2 Rdg File	OGC	JHarold, Lead PM	JLinville, RI	TClark	ACRS

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDI-2\Millstone3\M98576close.wpd

To Receive a Copy of this Document, Indicate in the Box: "C" = Copy Without Enclosures "E" = Copy with Enclosures "N" = No Copy

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	PDI-2/LA	ε	LPM	PDI-2/SC
NAME	JNakoski <i>[Signature]</i>	TClark <i>[Signature]</i>		Closeout Input Dated	JClifford <i>[Signature]</i>
DATE	11/5/99	11/5/99		10/13/99	11/12/99

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

additional commitments to perform further volumetric inspections of the CRDM nozzles at Oconee Unit 2 (a reinspection of 2-12 nozzles in 1999), Crystal River 3 (in 2001, a B&W design), Diablo Canyon Unit 2 (in 1999, a Westinghouse design), Farley Unit 2 (in 2001, a Westinghouse design), and San Onofre Unit 3 (in 2002-2008, a CE design). These plants are currently ranked in either the high or moderate susceptibility categories.

On December 21, 1998, you provided your response to the staff's RAI of August 27, 1998. In your letter of December 21, 1998, you endorsed the NEI submittal of December 11, 1998, and indicated that you were a participant in the NEI/WOG integrated program. Since the additional voluntary volumetric inspections performed to date have confirmed that PWSCC is not an immediate safety concern with respect to the structural integrity of VHPs in domestic PWRs, and since we have approved the integrated program for implementation, we conclude that the integrated program provides an acceptable basis for evaluating your VHPs. You may refer to the integrated program when submitting VHP-related licensing action submittals for the remainder of the current 40-year licensing period. However, if you are considering applying for license renewal of your facilities, your application will need to address the following items: (1) an assessment of the susceptibility of your VHPs to develop PWSCC during the extended license terms for the facilities; (2) a confirmation that the VHPs at your facilities are included under the scope of your boric acid corrosion inspection program, and (3) a summary of the results of any inspections that have been completed on your VHPs prior to the license renewal application, as appropriate.

This completes the staff's efforts relative to your responses to GL 97-01. Thank you for your consideration and efforts in addressing this issue.

Sincerely,



John A. Nakoski, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

cc: See next page

Millstone Nuclear Power Station
Unit 3

cc:

Ms. L. M. Cuoco
Senior Nuclear Counsel
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P. O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

Edward L. Wilds, Jr., Ph.D.
Director, Division of Radiation
Department of Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

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

First Selectmen
Town of Waterford
15 Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. M. H. Brothers
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. M. R. Scully, Executive Director
Connecticut Municipal Electric
Energy Cooperative
30 Stott Avenue
Norwich, CT 06360

Mr. J. T. Carlin
Vice President - Human Services
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P. O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. F. C. Rothen
Vice President - Nuclear Operations
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P. O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Ernest C. Hadley, Esquire
1040 B Main Street
P.O. Box 549
West Wareham, MA 02576

Mr. James S. Robinson, Manager
Nuclear Investments and Administration
New England Power Company
25 Research Drive
Westborough, MA 01582

Ms. Deborah Katz, President
Citizens Awareness Network
P.O. Box 83
Shelburne Falls, MA 03170

Mr. Allan Johanson, Assistant Director
Office of Policy and Management
Policy Development & Planning Division
450 Capitol Avenue - MS# 52ERN
P. O. Box 341441
Hartford, CT 06134-1441

Ms. Terry Concannon
Co-Chair
Nuclear Energy Advisory Council
415 Buckboard Lane
Marlboro, CT 06447

Millstone Nuclear Power Station
Unit 3

cc:

Mr. Evan W. Woollacott
Co-Chair
Nuclear Energy Advisory Council
128 Terry's Plain Road
Simsbury, CT 06070

Mr. John W. Beck, President
Little Harbor Consultants, Inc.
Millstone - ITPOP Project Office
P.O. Box 0630
Niantic, CT 06357-0630

Mr. L. J. Olivier
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer - Millstone
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. C. J. Schwarz
Station Director
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Senior Resident Inspector
Millstone Nuclear Power Station
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 513
Niantic, CT 06357

Nicholas J. Scobbo, Jr., Esquire
Ferriter, Scobbo, Caruso, & Rodophele, P.C.
75 State Street, 7th Floor
Boston, MA 02108-1807

Mr. G. D. Hicks
Director - Nuclear Training Services
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Citizens Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Ms. Geri Winslow
P. O. Box 199
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. William D. Meinert
Nuclear Engineer
Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale
Electric Company
P.O. Box 426
Ludlow, MA 01056

Mr. B. D. Kenyon
President and Chief Executive Officer-
NNECO
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. D. B. Amerine
Vice President - Engineering Services
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P. O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. D. A. Smith
Manager - Regulatory Affairs
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P. O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Ms. Nancy Burton
147 Cross Highway
Redding Ridge, CT 00870