

November 16, 2000

Mr. Mike Reandeau
Director - Licensing
Clinton Power Station
P.O. Box 678
Mail Code #V920
Clinton, IL 61727

SUBJECT: CLINTON POWER STATION - CORRECTION TO SAFETY EVALUATION OF
RELIEF REQUESTS FOR CONTAINMENT INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS
AND VISUAL EXAMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BOLTED CONNECTIONS
(TAC NO. MA9117)

Dear Mr. Reandeau:

By letter dated May 25, 2000, as supplemented on September 21, 2000, you submitted relief requests (RRs) from the containment inspection requirements and visual examination requirements for bolted connections for the Clinton Power Station (CPS). The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff approved the relief requests by letter dated November 3, 2000.

There was an error in the safety evaluation approving the relief requests. The error was "VT-3" listed on line 6 of section 2.11.7 on page 21 of the safety evaluation. The safety evaluation should have stated "VT-1". Enclosed is a corrected page.

We apologize for any inconvenience that may have resulted from this error.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jon B. Hopkins, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-461

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

November 16, 2000

Mr. Mike Reandeau
Director - Licensing
Clinton Power Station
P.O. Box 678
Mail Code #V920
Clinton, IL 61727

SUBJECT: CLINTON POWER STATION - CORRECTION TO SAFETY EVALUATION OF
RELIEF REQUESTS FOR CONTAINMENT INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS
AND VISUAL EXAMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BOLTED CONNECTIONS
(TAC NO. MA9117)

Dear Mr. Reandeau:

By letter dated May 25, 2000, as supplemented on September 21, 2000, you submitted relief requests (RRs) from the containment inspection requirements and visual examination requirements for bolted connections for the Clinton Power Station (CPS). The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff approved the relief requests by letter dated November 3, 2000.

There was an error in the safety evaluation approving the relief requests. The error was "VT-3" listed on line 6 of section 2.11.7 on page 21 of the safety evaluation. The safety evaluation should have stated "VT-1". Enclosed is a corrected page.

We apologize for any inconvenience that may have resulted from this error.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jon B. Hopkins, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-461

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	PD3-2 r/f	DTerao
OGC	ACRS	ESullivan
GHill(2)	GGrant, RIII	TBergman

ACCESSION NO.: ML003769531

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PM:PD3-2	E	LA:PD3-2	E	SC:PD3-2	
NAME	J Hopkins		T Harris		A Mendiola	
DATE	11/15/00		11/15/00		11/16/00	

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

Mike Reandeau

Clinton Power Station, Unit 1
AmerGen Energy Company, LLC

cc:

Michael Coyle
Vice President
Clinton Power Station
P.O. Box 678
Clinton, IL 61727

Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
Office of Nuclear Facility Safety
ATTN: Mr. Frank Nizidlek
1035 Outer Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62704

Patrick Walsh
Manager Nuclear Station
Engineering Department
Clinton Power Station
P.O. Box 678
Clinton, IL 61727

Kevin P. Gallen
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1800 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
RR#3, Box 229 A
Clinton, IL 61727

R. T. Hill
Licensing Services Manager
General Electric Company
175 Curtner Avenue, M/C 481
San Jose, CA 95125

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

Chairman of DeWitt County
c/o County Clerk's Office
DeWitt County Courthouse
Clinton, IL 61727

J. W. Blattner
Project Manager
Sargent & Lundy Engineers
55 East Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60603

inspect bolting in all systems is excessively restrictive and would result in a hardship without a compensating level of quality and safety. The alternative proposed will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety.

2.11.6 Alternative Examinations:

As an alternative to IWA-5250(a)(2), CPS will perform the following actions when leakage is identified at bolted connections:

1. The leakage shall be stopped in accordance with approved maintenance procedures, or;
2. If the leakage is not stopped, the joint shall be evaluated for joint integrity. This evaluation shall consider the following criteria:
 - o Number and condition of bolting
 - o Bolting and component material
 - o Leakage location and system function
 - o Corrosiveness of process fluid
 - o Radiological conditions
 - o Previous bolting inspection results
 - o Visual evidence of corrosion at the assembled connection
 - o Leakage monitoring

If any of the above parameters indicates a need for further evaluation, the bolt closest to the source of leakage shall be removed and receive a VT-1 Examination and evaluated in accordance with IWA-3100. If the bolt has evidence of degradation, all remaining bolting shall be inspected or replaced.

2.11.7 Staff Evaluation of 1202:

In accordance with the 1989 Edition of the ASME Code, Section XI, when leakage occurs at bolted connections, all bolting is required to be removed for VT-3 visual examination. In lieu of the Code-required removal of bolting to perform a VT-3 visual examination, the licensee has proposed to perform an evaluation of the bolted connection to determine the susceptibility of the bolting to corrosion and the potential for failure. If the initial evaluation indicates the need for a more in-depth evaluation, the bolt closest to the source of leakage will be removed, VT-1 examined, and evaluated in accordance with IWA-3100. This alternative allows the licensee to utilize a systematic approach and sound engineering judgment, provided that, as a minimum, all of the eight evaluation factors listed in the licensee's proposed alternative are considered. As a result, the licensee's alternative to the Code-required removal of bolting at a joint when leakage occurs will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, since the integrity of the joint will be maintained.

The staff concludes that the licensee's proposed alternative is authorized pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i) for CPS for the second ten-year inservice inspection interval.

Enclosure