50-237
-249
-245
-219
-220

March 11, 1969

Roger S. Boyd, Assistant Director for Reactor Projects, DRL

DESIGN PROVISIONS FOR PIPE WHIP PROTECTION

We have been reviewing the design provisions incorporated into the containment for protection against the effects of pipe whipping as part of our review of the Dresden 2/3 and Millstone Point facilities. This matter was discussed at various meetings with the applicants. We have also forwarded appropriate questions and, in the case of Dresden 2/3, answers have been received.

As a result of our review, we have learned that, as in the case of Oyster Creek and Nine Mile Point, full protection against the effects of pipe whipping has not been provided for all pipes; i.e., steam and feedwater lines. General Electric has only been concerned with the recirculation pipes. It considers the failure of main steam lines and/or the feedwater lines to be incredible for this concern. I further understand as a result of talking with General Electric that it does not intend to provide any form of protection to these lines because of physical limitations in the drywell.

We looked at this matter during our review of the Oyster Creek and Nine Mile Point facilities and realized that complete protection against pipe whipping was not considered as a design basis for these plants. Further backfitting for this type of protection could not be considered on a reasonable and practical requirement. We did, however, arrive at a conclusion that pipe whip would not destroy ECCS operation.

We were led to believe that starting with the Dresden 2 plant, such design provisions would be provided. This belief was derived in part on the basis of the concern over failure in the steam lines near the isolation valves and because of the design basis requirement to protect against the effects of any pipe rupture. We now find out that this has not been the case. I am not really sure how many other plants are going to be affected by this action.

We talked to Commonwealth Edison and Millstone and indicated that this lack of action on this matter has created a concern and we are not sure of the outcome with regard to action or resolution. I also talked with John Barnard on Monday, March 10, 1969, regarding General Electric's response to our concern and generally reviewed our feelings as discussed above.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

I call the matter to your attention because of its impact on present licensing action and for consideration with regard to future action on construction permit reviews.

We intend to pursue the matter further and will advise you of the outcome. This matter is of great significance to safety.

Original signed by
Robert L. Tedesco

Robert L. Tedesco, Chief
Reactor Project Branch 2
Division of Reactor Licensing

cc: F. Schroeder
S. Levine
R. DeYoung
Branch Chiefs, RP/RT
B. Grimes
C. J. DeBevec
H. R. Denton

Distribution:
Docket File
DRL Reading
RPB-2 Reading

OFFICE ▶	DRL:RP					
SURNAME ▶	RLTedesco/dj					
DATE ▶	3/11/69					