THE BABCOCK & WILCOX COMPANY
POWER GENERATION GROUP

| | |
|---|---|
| To: Distribution | 8 July 18-20, 1979 |
| From: J. T. Willse, Licensing (2208) JTW | |
| Cust. Toledo | File No. or Ref: T4.2.3 |
| Subj. Loss of Pressurizer Level Indication | Date March 9, 1979 |

This letter to cover one enclosure and one subject only.

CRESWELL JAN 8, 1979

Distribution:

R. L. Reed
R. C. Luken
J. T. Janis
G. T. Fairburn
C. D. Russell
J. H. Taylor
E. R. Kane
R. W. Winks
L. R. Cartin
E. A. Womack
D. Mars
J. O. Howard
J. D. Agar
F. R. Faist

A meeting to discuss the loss of pressurizer level indication at DB-1 was convened February 14, 1979 at the B&W offices in Lynchburg. Those in attendance were:

| | |
|---|---|
| J. E. Kohler | NRC Region III |
| J. E. Foster | NRC Region III |
| D. Anderson | NRC/OIE/LCVIP |
| Sushil Jain | Toledo Edison |
| J. F. Hilbish | Metropolitan Edison |
| R. A. Dietrich | SMUD |
| M. D. White | Arkansas |
| J. T. Enos | Arkansas |
| E. R. Kane | B&W |
| R. C. Luken | " |
| S. H. Klein | " |
| F. R. Faist | " |
| B. M. Dunn | " |
| L. R. Cartin | " |
| R. W. Winks | " |
| J. T. Willse | " |



This meeting was requested by the Region III inspectors. The purpose of this meeting was thought to be to discuss the loss of pressurizer level indication on all B&W plants. The utilities were present to discuss incidences where loss of level indication occurred at their plants.

Mr. Foster of the NRC opened the meeting by stating that the purpose of this meeting was to investigate an allegation by an NRC inspector that B&W had not responded in a timely manner to resolve the loss of pressurizer level indication concern at DB-1. He apologized to the utilities for his method of requesting information from them; not realizing that the utilities would feel compelled to send

representatives to this meeting. Mr. Foster next asked the utilities to respond to the questions he had submitted (letter attached). The questions were:

(1) What previous experience of loss of pressurizer level have occurred?
(2) The facility where the event(s) were experienced.
(3) The dates of occurrence.
(4) Whether the NRC was informed of the event.
(5) What evaluation of the event was performed?

Duke Power and Florida Power did not send a representative to the meeting because they have not experienced a loss of pressurizer level indication.

Mr. Hilbish stated that TMI #1 had not experienced any loss of pressurizer level indication. TMI #2 had two such events (4/23/78 & 11/7/78) both of which were reported to the NRC in LER's. Both of these events were thoroughly evaluated.

Mr. Enos stated that ANO-1 had experienced 2 transients during which pressurizer level indication had been lost. Neither event had been officially reported to the NRC although their inspectors were aware of both events. Both events were evaluated by B&W and the ANO safety committee. As a result of those evaluations ANO believes that loss of pressurizer level indication is only as operational inconvenience and that RC pressurizer is sufficient to determine if the pressurizer has gone "dry".

Mr. Dieterich acknowledged that SMUD has had approximately 38 trips during which loss of level indication occurred on 5 to 10 of those transients. These events were not officially reported to the NRC although their inspectors were aware of the loss of pressurizer level indication. SMUD also had experienced two rapid cooldown transients during which pressurizer level indication was lost, these transients were evaluated and reported to the NRC.

Mr. Jain described the one transient where loss of level indication had occurred at Toledo. This transient was evaluated and reported to the NRC in an LER. He further described the discussions that had occurred between Toledo, the NRC, and B&W. The remainder of the morning was spent discussing the consequences of loss of level indication, the differences between DB-1 and the other B&W plants, and the dual level set point for the steam generator at Toledo.

Mr. Foster closed the morning meeting by thanking the utilities for their cooperation. He stated that as far as he was concerned loss of pressurizer level indication was merely an operational inconvenience and that the loss of pressurizer level was not a safety concern. He was recommending that this issue be closed. He agreed to send copies of his report to all utilities in attendance.

Messrs. Foster and Kohler spent most of the afternoon reviewing the Toledo correspondence file pertaining to the overcooling transient. As a result of this review and the morning discussions Messrs. Foster and Kohler were convinced that B&W had responded in a manner consistent with the magnitude of the problem.

Mr. Foster summarized the days meeting by stating that he believed B&W had been exonerated of the charge that they had not responded in a timely manner, that the loss of pressurizer level indication was only an operational inconvenience, and that the loss of pressurizer level was not a safety concern. The only item that remained open was a review of the DB-1 operating instructions to insure that Toledo was operating the plant in the manner prescribed by B&W.

Copies of Arkansas, SMUD and Met. Ed. written responses to the NRC questions are attached.

JTW/fw
Attachment