

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 PEACH
BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. MB0901
AND MB0902)

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 Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3. 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 alternatives proposed in Alternative VIII-1. Alternative VIII-2, Annual Training, was previously approved by letter dated March 27, 2001.

PECO was succeeded by EGC as the licensed operator of PBAPS 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 alternative proposed in Alternative VIII-1 for Subparagraph 3.2(c) for the third ISI 10-year interval at PBAPS. The NRC staff's safety evaluation is enclosed.

O. Kingsley

-2-

If you have any questions, please contact your Project Manager, John P. Boska, at 301-415-2901.

Sincerely,

/RA/

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

Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278

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, John P. Boska, at 301-415-2901.

Sincerely,

/RA/

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

Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278

Enclosure: Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

MO'Brien	PUBLIC	Belliot
JBoska	ACRS	PDI-2 Reading
OGC	BPlatchek, RGN-I	GHill (4)
EAdensam (EGA1)	JClifford	JShea

ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML011230065

OFFICE	PM/PD1-2	LA/PD1-2	SC/EMCB	OGC	SC/PD1-2
NAME	JBoska	MO'Brien	JDavis	RHoeffling	JClifford
DATE	4/3/01	4/23/01	4/10/01	4/27/01	5/2/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station,
Units 2 and 3

cc:

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

Mr. J. Doering
Site Vice President
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
1848 Lay Road
Delta, PA 17314

Mr. G. Johnston
Plant Manager
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
1848 Lay Road
Delta, PA 17314

Mr. A. Winter
Regulatory Assurance Manager
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
1848 Lay Road
Delta, PA 17314

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
P.O. Box 399
Delta, PA 17314

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

Mr. Roland Fletcher
Department of Environment
Radiological Health Program
2400 Broening Highway
Baltimore, MD 21224

A. F. Kirby, III
External Operations - Nuclear
Delmarva Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 231
Wilmington, DE 19899

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

Board of Supervisors
Peach Bottom Township
R. D. #1
Delta, PA 17314

Public Service Commission of Maryland
Engineering Division
Chief Engineer
6 St. Paul Center
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Mr. Richard McLean
Power Plant and Environmental
Review Division
Department of Natural Resources
B-3, Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

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

Manager-Financial Control & Co-Owner
Affairs
Public Service Electric and Gas Company
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038-0236

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

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

Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station,
Units 2 and 3

cc:

Mr. James A. Hutton
Director - Licensing
Mid-Atlantic Regional Operating Group
Exelon Generation Company, LLC
200 Exelon Way, KSA 3-E
Kennett Square, PA 19348

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. 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

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

THIRD 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM PLAN

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE VIII-1

EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3

DOCKET NOS. 50-277 AND 50-278

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 Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3, for the third 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 third 10-year ISI interval at PBAPS.

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 third 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 third 10-year interval.

Principal Contributor: J. Boska

Date: May 3, 2001