

May 3, 2001

Mr. Oliver D. Kingsley, President  
Exelon Nuclear  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
200 Exelon Way, KSA 3-E  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

SUBJECT: ALTERNATIVES TO ASME SECTION XI INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM  
RELATED TO LENGTH SIZING QUALIFICATION CRITERION FOR LIMERICK  
GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. MB0910 AND MB0911)

Dear Mr. Kingsley:

By letter dated December 21, 2000, PECO Energy Company (PECO), the previous licensee, submitted proposed Alternative VIII-1, Depth Sizing Criteria, and proposed Alternative VIII-2, Annual Training, for the Inservice Inspection (ISI) Program at the Limerick Generating Station (LGS), Units 1 and 2. This submittal was supplemented by letter dated February 20, 2001, from Exelon Generation Company, LLC (EGC), the current licensee, revising the proposed Alternative VIII-1, Depth Sizing Criteria. By Alternative VIII-1, the licensee proposed to use a length sizing qualification criterion of 0.75-inch root mean square (RMS) in lieu of the criterion contained in Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(b), of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code). Also by proposed Alternative VIII-1, the licensee proposed to use the depth sizing requirement of 0.15-inch RMS consistent with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 50.55a(b)(2)(xv)(C)(1) in lieu of the requirements contained in Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(c), of the ASME Code. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the alternative proposed in Alternative VIII-1. Alternative VIII-2, Annual Training, was previously approved by letter dated March 28, 2001.

PECO was succeeded by EGC as the licensed operator of LGS on January 12, 2001. By letter dated January 30, 2001, EGC requested that the NRC staff continue to process and disposition licensing actions previously docketed and requested by PECO.

The alternative proposed for Subparagraph 3.2(b) of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, is no longer needed. On March 26, 2001, the NRC published in the *Federal Register* (66 FR 16390) a rule change to 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(xv)(C)(1), which deals with flaw detection criteria. The rule change corrected an earlier administrative error in the regulation, and the alternative you sought is no longer required. The matter was discussed with Mr. T. Loomis of your licensing staff.

Based on the information provided, the NRC staff concludes that the alternative proposed by Alternative VIII-1 to Subparagraph 3.2(c) of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), the NRC staff authorizes the ISI Program alternatives proposed in

O. Kingsley

-2-

Alternative VIII-1 for Subparagraph 3.2(c) for the second ISI 10-year interval at LGS. The NRC staff's safety evaluation is enclosed.

If you have any questions, please contact your Project Manager, Christopher Gratton, at 301-415-1055.

Sincerely,

***/RA/***

James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl: See next page

O. Kingsley

-2-

May 3, 2001

If you have any questions, please contact your Project Manager, Christopher Gratton, at 301-415-1055.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

MO'Brien	PUBLIC	Belliot
CGratton	ACRS	PDI-2 r/f
OGC	BPlatchek, RGN-I	GHill (4)
EAdensam (EGA1)	JClifford	JShea

ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML011230015

\*=See Previous Concurrence

OFFICE	PM/PD1-2	LA/PD1-2	SC/EMCB	OGC	SC/PD1-2
NAME	CGratton	MO'Brien	JDavis*	RHoeffling	JClifford
DATE	4/3/01	4/3/01	4/10/01	4/27/01	5/2/01

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 & 2

cc:

Mr. Edward Cullen  
Vice President & General Counsel  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
300 Exelon Way  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Manager-Limerick Licensing  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
Nuclear Group Headquarters  
Correspondence Control  
P.O. Box 160  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. William Levis, Vice President  
Limerick Generating Station  
P.O. Box 2300  
Sanatoga, PA 19464

Plant Manager  
Limerick Generating Station  
P.O. Box 2300  
Sanatoga, PA 19464

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

Senior Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Limerick Generating Station  
P.O. Box 596  
Pottstown, PA 19464

Chairman  
Board of Supervisors  
of Limerick Township  
646 West Ridge Pike  
Linfield, PA 19468

Chief-Division of Nuclear Safety  
PA Dept. of Environmental Resources  
P.O. Box 8469  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8469

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

Dr. Judith Johnsrud  
National Energy Committee  
Sierra Club  
433 Orlando Avenue  
State College, PA 16803

Mr. Jeffrey A. Benjamin  
Licensing - Vice President  
Exelon Corporation  
1400 Opus Place, Suite 900  
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Mr. James A. Hutton  
Director-Licensing  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
Nuclear Group Headquarters  
Correspondence Control  
P. O. Box 160  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Correspondence Control Desk  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
200 Exelon Way, KSA 1-N-1  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. John Skolds  
Chief Operating Officer  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
1400 Opus Place, Suite 900  
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Mr. William Bohlke  
Senior Vice President, Nuclear Services  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
1400 Opus Place, Suite 900  
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 & 2

cc:

Mr. John Cotton  
Senior Vice President, Operations Support  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
1400 Opus Place, Suite 900  
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Mr. Joseph Hagan  
Senior Vice President  
Mid-Atlantic Regional Operating Group  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
200 Exelon Way, KSA 3-N  
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. R. Braun  
Plant Manager  
Limerick Generating Station  
P.O. Box 2300  
Sanatoga, PA 19464

Mr. K. Gallogly  
Regulatory Assurance Manager  
Limerick Generating Station  
P.O. Box 2300  
Sanatoga, PA 19464

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SECOND 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM PLAN

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE VIII-1

EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC

LIMERICK GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-352 AND 50-353

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The inservice inspection of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 components is to be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Code and applicable editions and addenda as required by Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i). Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3), alternatives to the requirements of paragraph (g) may be used, when authorized by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), if the licensee demonstrates that: (i) the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or (ii) compliance with the specified requirements would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality and safety.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4), ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components (including supports) shall meet the requirements, except the design and access provisions and the preservice examination requirements, set forth in the ASME Code, Section XI, "Rules for Inservice Inspection of Nuclear Power Plant Components," to the extent practical within the limitations of design, geometry, and materials of construction of the components. The regulations require that inservice examination of components and system pressure tests conducted during the first 10-year interval and subsequent intervals comply with the requirements in the latest edition and addenda of Section XI of the ASME Code incorporated by reference in 10 CFR 50.55a(b) on the date 12 months prior to the start of the 120-month interval, subject to the limitations and modifications listed therein. The inservice inspection (ISI) Code of record for Limerick Generating Station (LGS), Units 1 and 2, for the second 10-year interval is the 1989 Edition of the ASME Code. The components (including supports) may meet the requirements set forth in subsequent editions and addenda of the ASME Code incorporated by reference in 10 CFR 50.55a(b) subject to the limitations and modifications listed therein and subject to Commission approval.

The NRC staff has reviewed the information submitted by PECO Energy Company, the previous licensee, in a letter dated December 21, 2000, with a supplement dated February 20, 2001, submitted by Exelon Generation Company, LLC, the current licensee, requesting relief from certain ASME Code-required ultrasonic testing (UT) criteria. The licensee's proposed alternative to the ASME Code requirements is contained in proposed Alternative VIII-1 for the second 10-year ISI interval at LGS.

ENCLOSURE

## 2.0 ALTERNATIVE VIII-1, UT LENGTH SIZING TOLERANCE FOR REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL PERFORMANCE DEMONSTRATIONS

### 2.1 ASME Code Requirements for which Relief is Requested

The licensee requested relief from Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, Subparagraphs 3.2(b) and 3.2(c), to Section XI of the ASME Code, 1995 Edition with 1996 Addenda.

### 2.2 Licensee's Proposed Alternative to ASME Code

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), the licensee proposed using a length sizing qualification criterion of 0.75-inch root mean square (RMS) in lieu of Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(b). The licensee also proposed to use the RMS value of 0.15-inch RMS specified in 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(xv)(C)(1) which modifies the depth sizing criterion of Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(a), in lieu of Subparagraph 3.2(c).

### 2.3 Evaluation

The alternative proposed for Subparagraph 3.2(b) of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, is no longer needed. On March 26, 2001, the NRC published in the *Federal Register* (66 FR 16390) a rule change to 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(xv)(C)(1), which deals with flaw detection criteria. The rule change corrected an earlier administrative error in the regulation, and the alternative sought is no longer required.

Section 50.55a(g)(6)(ii)(C) imposes implementation of Appendix VIII to the 1995 Edition with 1996 Addenda of Section XI of the Code. The imposed implementation schedule for Supplement 4 to Appendix VIII was November 22, 2000. Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(c), requires that the UT performance demonstration results be plotted on a two-dimensional plot with the measured depth plotted along the ordinate axis and the true depth plotted along the abscissa axis. For qualification, the plot must satisfy the following statistical parameters: (1) slope of the linear regression line is not less than 0.7; (2) the mean deviation of flaw depth is less than 0.25 inches; and (3) correlation coefficient is not less than 0.70.

As an alternative, the licensee proposed eliminating the use of Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(c), which imposes three statistical parameters for depth sizing. The first parameter, 3.2(c)(1), pertains to the slope of a linear regression line. The linear regression line is the difference between actual versus true value plotted along a through-wall thickness. For Supplement 4 performance demonstrations, a linear regression line of the data is not applicable because the performance demonstrations are performed on test specimens with flaws located in the inner 15-percent through-wall. The differences between actual versus true value produce a tight grouping of results which resemble a shotgun pattern. The slope of a regression line from such data is extremely sensitive to small variations, thus, making the parameter of Subparagraph 3.2(c)(1) a poor and inappropriate acceptance criterion. The second parameter, 3.2(c)(2), pertains to the mean deviation of flaw depth. The value used in the ASME Code is too lax with respect to evaluating flaw depths within the inner 15 percent of wall thickness. Therefore, the licensee proposed to use the more appropriate criterion of 0.15-inch RMS of 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(xv)(C)(1), which modifies Subparagraph 3.2(a), as the acceptance criterion. The third parameter, 3.2(c)(3), pertains to a correlation coefficient. The value of the

correlation coefficient in Subparagraph 3.2(c)(3) is inappropriate for this application since it is based on the linear regression from Subparagraph 3.2(c)(1).

In 1991 the U.S. nuclear utilities created the Performance Demonstration Initiative project (PDI) at the Electric Power Research Institute's (EPRI's) Nondestructive Examination (NDE) Center in Charlotte, North Carolina, to implement performance demonstration requirements contained in Appendix VIII of Section XI of the ASME Code. The EPRI NDE center provides technical support and administration for this project on behalf of the utilities. To this end, PDI has developed a performance demonstration program for qualifying UT equipment, procedures, and personnel.

PDI was aware of the inappropriateness of Subparagraph 3.2(c) early in the development of their program. They brought the issue before the appropriate ASME committee which formalized eliminating the use of Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(c) in ASME Code Case N-622. NRC staff representatives participated in the discussions and consensus process of the code case. Based on the above, the NRC staff has determined that the use of the Subparagraph 3.2(c) requirements in this context is inappropriate and that the proposed alternative to use the RMS value of 10 CFR 50.55a(b)(2)(xv)(C)(1), which modifies the criterion of Appendix VIII, Supplement 4, Subparagraph 3.2(a), in lieu of Subparagraph 3.2(c) will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the NRC staff has concluded that the alternative proposed in Alternative VIII-1 for the second 10-year interval will provide an acceptable level of quality and safety. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), the NRC staff authorizes the proposed alternative for the second 10-year interval.

Principal Contributor: J. Boska

Date: May 3, 2001