Wisconsin Electric POWER COMPANY
231 W. MICHIGAN, P.O. BOX 2046, MILWAUKEE, WI 53201

December 14, 1979

POOR ORIGINAL

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. A. Schwencer, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch 1

Gentlemen:

DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM

On May 20, 1977, we submitted a proposed inservice inspection and testing program for Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 1 in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a. On February 26, 1979, we submitted a similar program for Unit 2. Following review of the programs by the Commission Staff, a letter dated October 4, 1979, forwarded a request for additional information on the Unit 2 program which referenced the Unit 1 program and our answers to previous requests for information.

As directed, we are enclosing three signed originals and forty copies of the responses to your requests for additional information.

Should you have additional questions concerning the information, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

C. W. Fay, Director
Nuclear Power Department

Enclosures

1635 341

P 7912210 143

DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
RESPONSE TO NRC REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
INSERVICE INSPECTION AND TESTING PROGRAM

A. CLASS 1

*1. Several categories were omitted. Please include these categories in the submittal or explain and justify their absence from it.

B1.1 B-2	B2.5 B-G-1	B3.4 B-G-1	
B1.2 B-B	B2.6 B-G-1	B3.5 B-G-1	
B1.4 B-D	B2.7 B-G-1	B3.6 B-G-1	
B1.6 B-F			
B1.14 B-I-1	B4.1 B-F	B6.1 B-G-1	B6.5 B-K-2
B1.15 B-N-1	B4.2 B-G-1	B6.2 B-G-1	B6.6 B-M-1
B1.16 B-N-2	B4.3 B-G-1	B6.3 B-G-1	
B1.18 B-0	B4.4 B-G-1	B6.4 B-K-1	

*Questions previously asked for Unit 1. (Indicate if previous responses apply to Unit 2.)

RESPONSE:

The responses previously submitted for Unit 1 are also applicable to Unit 2.

2. B3.7 B-H, regenerative heat exchanger support tack weld; please provide drawings and more detail concerning accessibility for ultrasonic examination in requesting relief from volumetric examination.

RESPONSE:

Please refer to Sentry Drawing No. A04195 attached. The weld is shown in View A. Because it is a discontinuous tack weld, it is not amenable to UT techniques.

3. B4.8 B-J, socket welds larger than one inch; why has volumetric inspection been specified when only surface inspection is required:

RESPONSE:

This was a typographical error in the Unit 2 test plan. The requirement was correctly listed as PT in the Unit 1 test plan. Please change UT to PT for Item B4.8 B-J in the Unit 2 test plan.

4. B5.4 B-K-1, B5.6 B-L-1, reactor coolant pump support and casing welds; is a surface examination, in addition to visual, practical to use in lieu of volumetric?

RESPONSE:

A dye penetrant examination of one of the supports on a reactor coolant pump was tried; however, the surface roughness of the casting prevented a meaningful exam. It was concluded that surface examination was not practical.

B. CLASS 2

*1. Please include or justify absence of all examinations identified by Table IWC-2600 and IWC-2520.

*Questions previously asked for Unit 1. (Indicate if previous responses apply to Unit 2.)

RESPONSE:

The responses previously submitted for Unit 1 are also applicable to Unit 2.

C. CLASS 3

1. Please include or justify absence of all examinations required by Subsection IWD.

RESPONSE:

The examinations required by Subsection IWD are shown on page 2.17 of the test plans. 100 percent of the Class 3 safety related components will be visually inspected during this inspection period either during normal operation or during system pressure tests. 33-1/3 percent of the Class 3 safety related components will be subjected to system pressure tests.

D. APPARENT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROGRAMS FOR UNIT 1 AND UNIT 2

Reactor Vessel

1. Unit 2 program requires 33-1/3% of flange-to-shell weld be examined during third period. Unit 1 completed this exam during second period.

1635 343

RESPONSE:

The reactor vessel flange to shell weld in Unit 2 was 100 percent inspected during the first period using manual UT techniques and 100 percent inspected during the second period using mechanized UT techniques. The inspection interval requirements are complete. Please delete this exam from the Unit 2 test plan for the third period.

2. Unit 1: S.I. safe end nozzles are not accessible from outside. (Welds were UT'd from inside.) Unit 2: does not mention the component or exam at all.

RESPONSE:

The safety injection nozzle safe end welds on the reactor vessel are inaccessible from the outside on both Unit 1 and Unit 2. Therefore, relief from the Code requirement to perform a surface examination (PT) on these welds is requested for both units. The safe end welds on Unit 2 were 100 percent volumetrically examined using mechanized UT during the second period. The inspection interval requirements are complete.

Pressurizer

1. Unit 1: no mention of safe end examination of the safety valve nozzle. Requires UT exam of manway bolting. (WE letter of October 6, 1977 states that there is no bolting greater than 2" in diameter.) Unit 2: no mention of UT exam. Requires visual inspection of bolting. Requires UT exam of safety valve nozzle safe end welds.

RESPONSE:

In both Unit 1 and Unit 2, two of the five pressurizer nozzle to safe end welds will be UT examined during the third period. In both Unit 1 and Unit 2, the pressurizer manway bolting will be 100 percent VT examined during the third period. The bolting is the same in both units and is less than two inches diameter; therefore, UT is not required by the Code.

1635 344

2. Unit 1: completed visual exam requirements by end of second period.
   Unit 2: requires exam of cladding during third period.

RESPONSE:

There is one manway in the pressurizer; therefore, only one cladding patch need be examined during each inspection interval per the Code. In both Unit 1 and Unit 2, two patches were examined during the first period and one patch examined during the second period. Therefore, the inspection interval requirements have been completed for both units. Please delete this item from the Unit 2 test plan.

Steam Generators

Unit 1: requires UT examination of this weld.
Unit 2: no mention of tube-sheet-to-primary-head weld.

RESPONSE:

The inspection interval requirements for UT examination of the steam generator tubesheet to primary head weld have been completed for both Unit 1 and Unit 2. In Unit 1, steam generator A was examined during the first period and steam generator B was examined during the second period. In Unit 2, steam generator B was examined during the first period and steam generator A was examined during the second period. Please delete this item from the Unit 1 test plan.

Piping

Unit 1: completed the required UT exam for piping branch connections during second period
Unit 2: requires this exam in third period.

RESPONSE:

The required UT examination for piping branch connections larger than six inches was completed during the second period for Unit 1. In Unit 2, the examination had not been performed by the end of the second period; therefore, it was included in the inspection plan for the third period.

1635 345

Reactor Coolant Pumps

Unit 1: UT exam of ligaments
Unit 2: visual exam (Code requires UT).

RESPONSE:

Inspection of the reactor coolant pump ligaments is specified by Item No. B5.3, Category B-G-1 of the Code, which requires VT, not UT, examination. The UT requirement in the Unit 1 test plan was a typographical error and it is correctly stated as VT in the Unit 2 test plan. Please change UT to VT in the Unit 1 test plan for this item.

Your letter of May 17, 1979, states your desire to have identical technical specifications and periodic testing requirements for both units. It appears from the above that the programs for both units are not identical in all respects. To assist us in expediting and coordinating the review for both units, we request that all differences between programs (both ISI and IST) be identified. Alternatively, you may wish to amend your programs in areas where differences now exist in order to eliminate (or minimize) these differences.

RESPONSE:

The Technical Specifications requested for Unit 1 and Unit 2 are identical. The periodic testing programs for both units are identical. The inservice inspection programs for the two units for the third period are nearly identical with only minor differences between programs. There are some minor differences in the number of welds in some categories as shown in the remarks section of the test plans. A branch connection weld larger than six inches will be examined in Unit 2, whereas this examination has been completed in Unit 1. Apparent differences between plans have been resolved in this letter concerning both test plans and previous letters concerning the Unit 1 test plan.

DOCUMENT/ PAGE PULLED

ANO. 7912210143

NO. OF PAGES 1

REASON:

☐ PAGE ILLEGIBLE:

☐ HARD COPY FILED AT: (PDR) CF

OTHER _____

☐ BETTER COPY REQUESTED ON ____/____/____

☒ PAGE TOO LARGE TO FILM:

☐ HARD COPY FILED AT: PDR CF

OTHER _____

☒ FILMED ON APERTURE CARD NO. 7912210143