

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : E. G. Case, Assistant Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

FROM : L. Kornblith, Jr., Assistant Director
for Reactors
Division of Compliance *L. Kornblith, Jr.*

SUBJECT: CONNECTICUT YANKEE ATOMIC POWER CO., DOCKET NO. 50-213
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT CO., DOCKET NO. 50-219
NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CO., DOCKET NO. 50-220
CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER CO., DOCKET NO. 50-245
CONSOLIDATED EDISON CO., DOCKET NO. 50-247

DATE: February 28, 1966

The attached report by our inspector of a visit to Combustion Engineering in Chattanooga, Tennessee, on February 2-4, 1966, is forwarded for information. The principal purposes of the visit were to review the record file on the Connecticut Yankee reactor pressure vessel and to determine the status of the pressure vessels for the other four subject facilities.

Based on the information obtained during this visit, we have comments on two areas which we feel are significant. The first concerns the adequacy of ASME Code radiography sensitivity requirements. As indicated in the report, through the use of a linear accelerator having higher resolution than the betatron used initially, CE detected additional flaws in the nozzle welds of the ConnYankee vessel. It was stated that both machines met minimum Code sensitivity requirements, yet the betatron radiographs overlooked more than half the flaws ultimately detected. As you are aware, we are in the process of obtaining the services of a pressure vessel consultant. One of the first assignments which we have in mind for the consultant is to evaluate the adequacy of the radiography procedures being used in pressure vessel fabrication.

The second area of comment has to do with the matter of records. In his observation of the records required by the Code, our inspector has been unable to identify any information recorded regarding the number, location, size or nature of specific flaw areas. The only requirement of the Code is a certification that flaws have been repaired and, in the case of weld radiographs, only the final radiographs showing compliance with the Code are required. We also note that the Code requires retention of these records for a period of only five years. While we have concluded that adequate repairs of flaws are made, it would seem to be beneficial to know the location of suspected weak points in connection with later in-place inspection of vessels if such methods are

(continued)

8111030658 660228
PDR ADOCK 05000213 247
G PDR



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

developed. We suggest that consideration be given to requiring an applicant for an operating license to submit a descriptive report of vessel fabrication history including the flaws detected and repaired.

With respect to the welding flux problem that developed with the Niagara Mohawk and Jersey Central vessels, we conclude that all parties responded in a responsible manner. This was evidenced by G-E's expenditure of additional funds for further testing and major reworking of the faulty areas by CE which resulted in substantial delays and rescheduling. CE also stated that further efforts were being made to ascertain the quality of incoming vendor products.

Attachment:

CO Rpts No. 213/66-2, 219/66-1, 220/66-2,
247/66-1, 245/66-1 by G. W. Reinmuth
dtd 2/14/66

Distribution:

L. Kornblith, Jr., CO:HQ (5)

R. G. Page, SLR (5)

R. S. Boyd, DRL

CO:HQ File (5)

J. P. O'Reilly, CO:I

M. L. Ernst, CO:II

H. D. Thornburg, CO:III

J. W. Flora, CO:IV

R. H. Engelken, CO:V