



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

June 7, 1979

NRC PDR

Docket No. 50-336

Mr. W. G. Counsil, Vice President
Nuclear Engineering & Operations
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P. O. Box 270
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Dear Mr. Counsil:

In the process of reviewing your proposed Inservice Inspection Program for the Millstone Unit No. 2, we find that additional information as detailed in the enclosure is needed to complete our review. The page references in the enclosure correspond to your January 25, 1979 submittal.

In order to complete our review in a timely manner, please provide the additional information by at least July 2, 1979.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

487 001

③
7007190789.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company

cc:
William H. Cuddy, Esquire
Day, Berry & Howard
Counselors at Law
One Constitution Plaza
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Waterford Public Library
Rope Ferry Road, Route 156
Waterford, Connecticut 06385

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
ATTN: Superintendent
Millstone Plant
Post Office Box 128
Waterford, Connecticut 06385

Northeast Utilities Service Company
ATTN: Mr. James R. Himmelwright
Nuclear Engineering and Operations
P. O. Box 270
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Natural Resources Defense Council
917 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Mr. John T. Shedlosky
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region I
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

457 002

Millstone Unit 2
Inservice Inspection Program
Request For Additional Information

PAGE I-2

1. Use of Appendix III of Section XI, 1974 edition through winter 1975 is acceptable, however, the recording of indications should be as follows:

Record all indications which produce a response of 50% or greater of primary reference level.

Evaluate all indications producing a response of 100% or greater of primary reference level.

2. Use of technical specifications for examination of hydraulic snubbers is acceptable if technical specification procedures meet or exceed code requirements. Please provide documentation that shows the extent of technical specification examination requirements.

PAGE I-3

Class 1 Components

1. Can nozzle to vessel welds N-2, N-4 and N-6 be examined using surface methods?

PAGE I-10

1. Concerning your request for relief from examination of vessel cladding, will examination of the closure head welds also provide meaningful information about the condition of the cladding?
2. In Note 10, you state that safety injection valve bonnet bolting has spherical ends, thus precluding volumetric examination. Since the probable point of crack initiation and growth is the thread root area, has an ultrasonic examination technique utilizing response from thread roots been considered? If this alternate volumetric examination is not possible, is a surface examination of these bolts possible?

Class 2 Components

1. Examination of hydraulic snubbers to requirements of technical specifications is acceptable only if technical specifications meet or exceed code requirements. Please compare and state the differences.
2. Note 2, Page II-6, states that volumetric examination of the shutdown heat exchangers is precluded due to weld design. Please provide details of the nozzle-to-vessel welds that explain why no volumetric examination can be done.