

January 19, 1979

THREE MILE ISLAND COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM NUMBER: _____

DATE: 8/22/79

MEMORANDUM FOR: M. C. Moseley, Director, Division of Reactor Operations Inspection, IE

H. D. Thornburg, Director, Division of Reactor Construction Inspection, IE

FROM: James G. Keppler, Director, RIII

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION FOR NOTIFICATION OF LICENSING BOARDS AND REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (AITS F30468H2)

The enclosed inspector memorandum dated January 8, 1979, with enclosures, identifies several potential problems which are being or will be pursued at Davis-Besse 1 which appear to be generic to B&W plants. In addition to the items identified in the memorandum, an issue (described in enclosed Action Item AITS F30385H2) concerning GDC 17 which was recently resolved at Davis-Besse 1 could possibly be common to other plants under review by NRC (e.g., Davis-Besse 2 and 3). The GDC 17 item and some of the other items may only be generic to B&W plants having Bechtel as the architect-engineer. We are aware that some of the items have been previously identified and dispositioned at other plants.

In accordance with the inspector's recommendation, RIII supervision has reviewed the materiality and relevancy of these matters to all pending cases before Boards involving B&W as the NSSS supplier. Based on information we have on those cases (Davis-Besse 2 and 3, Midland 1 and 2, Greene County, Three Mile Island 2), guidance given in MC 1500, and a liberal interpretation of the MC 1500 words "...any new information that could reasonably be regarded as putting a new or different light upon an issue before the Board or as raising a new issue", RIII believes NRC policy dictates that the information be forwarded to all sitting Boards for cases involving B&W as the NSSS supplier. To our knowledge, none of the information relates to specific issues under consideration in the pending hearings. RIII does not know the significance of the information as it may affect current staff positions.

8001200003

Noralius Roy Keppler
1/13/79 1/13/79 1/13/79

RIII

Straefer	Knop	Tambling	Vandel	Jones	Hayes
1/18/79	1/13/79	1/13/79	1/13/79	1/18/79	1/13/79

POOR ORIGINAL

Although ERG believes that NRC policy as described in MC 1530 dictates the transmittal of this information to sitting Boards, ERG questions the appropriateness of doing so. It would seem that a more effective and less premature way of handling this information would be for NRC to review and disposition the information during the development of the SR and SR Supplement relating to OL issuance for the affected plants. In the case of Three Mile Island 2 and other operating plants where the SR and SR Supplement have already been issued, the information could be evaluated for application to those plants as an NRC generic review task.

For your information, listed below is the status of reviews at Davis-Besse 1 of the items in the inspector memorandum:

- Item 1 - During a recent inspection the licensee was requested to provide information to reconcile the apparent inconsistency between the PSAR statement on fuel assembly not holddown force and the administrative requirement to place restrictions on starting the fourth reactor cooling pump. This information will be available February 1979.
- Item 2 - We plan to continue following the licensee's efforts to determine the magnitude of the power oscillations. To date the maximum oscillations have been approximately 1.5% and do not appear to present a safety problem.
- Item 3 - The pressurizer level question is presently the subject of communications between NRC and the licensee. We have not addressed the possibility that Flood and makeup instrumentation do not meet CDC 17.
- Item 4 - To our knowledge, this problem has not developed at DB 1. We plan to inspect this item in February 1979.
- Item 5 - In response to an item of noncompliance, the licensee is developing criteria for detector substitution when the reactor is operated with incore strings out of service.
- Item 6 - To our knowledge, this problem has not developed at DB 1. We plan to inspect this item in February 1979.

ERG will use the results of any technical reviews conducted which relate to items in the inspector memorandum to disposition the items as they relate to Davis-Besse 1. By copy of this letter, the Assistant Directors for Technical Programs and Field Coordination are requested to provide ERG with answers to the following questions:

POOR ORIGINAL

January 19, 1979

Assistant Director for Technical Programs

1. Has NRE generically determined that the B&W core lift problem is not an unreviewed safety question?
2. Has NRE generically determined that the B&W power oscillation problem is not an unreviewed safety question?
3. Does the failure of Tcold and makeup instrumentation to follow the transient constitute a GDC LB problem?

Assistant Director for Field Coordination

1. Is there a need to develop standard B&W technical specifications for continued plant operations with failed incore detector strings?
2. Is there a need to develop standard B&W technical specifications for restrictions on starting a fourth reactor coolant pump below certain temperatures?

For your convenience, the items in the inspector memorandum have been retyped on separate pages. If you need additional information please contact J. S. Craswell (387-9311) or J. F. Straeter (387-9213) of my staff.

James G. Kappler
Director

Enclosures:

1. Memorandum from J. S. Craswell
to J. F. Straeter, dtd, 1/8/79
2. Retyped excerpts (6) from the
1/3/79 memorandum
3. Memorandum from J. F. Straeter
to E. W. Woodruff, dtd, 6/9/78

cc: w/enclosures

E. L. Jordan, IE
S. E. Bryan, IE
J. S. Craswell, RIII

POOR ORIGINAL



UNITED STATES
 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
 REGION III
 719 ROOSEVELT ROAD
 GLEN OAK, ILLINOIS 60137

January 3, 1979

7120160

Docket No. SC-300/501
 SC-119/110

MEMORANDUM FOR: J. F. Swastar, Chief, Nuclear Support Section 1
 FROM: J. S. Graywell, Reactor Inspector
 SUBJECT: CONVERTING NEW INFORMATION TO LICENSING BOARDS -
 DAVIS-BESSE CURBS 1 & 2 AND KILLARNEY CURBS 1 & 2

During the course of my inspections at Davis-Besse, certain issues have come to my attention which I am submitting for consideration for forwarding to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board which has jurisdiction over the aforementioned facilities. This submission is made pursuant to Regulatory Procedure 15024 (November 16, 1978), step 3 and information supplied to me per step 1. The issues for consideration are:

1. During a recent inspection at Davis-Besse Unit 1 information has been obtained which indicates that at certain conditions of reactor coolant viscosity (as a function of temperature) core lifting may occur. The licensee informed the inspector that this issue involved other DAB facilities. The Davis-Besse TRS notes in section 4.0.2.7:

The hydraulic forces on the fuel assembly receiving the most flow is shown as a function of system flow in Figure 4-19. Additional forces acting on the fuel assembly are the assembly weight and a hold down spring force, which reaction is a net downward force at all times during normal reactor operation.

The licensee states that there is a 300% margin for the seating of the four main reactor pumps. However, no Technical Specification requires that the pump be seated at or above this critical core. A concern regarding this matter would be if assemblies moved upward into a position such that control rod movement would be hindered.

2. Inspection Report SC-300/78-06, paragraph 4, reported reactantivity - power oscillations in the Davis-Besse core. These oscillations have also occurred at Conner and are attributed to water generator level oscillations. TRS report DW-10017 notes in 4.0.1:

790420027

POOR ORIGINAL

January 8, 1979

The OTSC laboratory model test results indicated that periodic oscillations in steam pressure, steam flow, and steam generator primary outlet temperatures could occur under certain conditions.

It was shown that the oscillations were of the type associated with the relationships between feedwater heating chamber pressure drop and tube nest pressure drop, which are eliminated or reduced to levels of no consequence (no feedback to reactor system) by adjustment of the tube nest inlet resistance. As a result of the tests, an adjustable orifice has been installed in the downcomer section of the steam generators to provide for adjustment of the tube nest inlet resistance and to provide the means for elimination of oscillations if they should develop during the operating lifetime of the generators. The initial orifice setting is chosen conservatively to minimize the need for further adjustment during the starting test program.

It also note that the effect on the incore detector system for monitoring core parameters during the oscillations is not clear.

1. Inspection and Information Report SO-146/78-08 documented that pressurizer level had gone offscale for approximately five minutes during the November 28, 1977 loss of offsite power event. There are some indications that other B&W plants may have problems maintaining pressurizer level indications during transients. In addition, under certain conditions such as loss of feedwater at 100% power with the reactor coolant pumps running the pressurizer may void completely. A special analysis has been performed concerning this event. This analysis is attached as Enclosure 1. Because of pressurizer level maintenance problems the siting of the pressurizer may require further review.


Also noted during the event was the fact that void went offscale (less than 5200%). In addition, it was noted that the makeup flow monitoring is limited to less than 160 gpm and that makeup flow may be substantially greater than this value. This information should be examined in light of the requirements of GDC 13.

4. A memo from B&W regarding control rod drive system trip breaker maintenance is attached as Enclosure 2. This memo should be evaluated in terms of shutdown margin maintenance and ATRC considerations particularly in light of large positive moderator coefficients allowable with B&W facilities.

POOR ORIGINAL

January 8, 1979

5. Inspection and Information Report 10-146/78-17, paragraph 6 refers to inspection findings regarding the capability of the in-core detector system to determine voids under thermal conditions. The reactor can be operated per the Technical Specifications with the center in-core wiring out of service. If the peak power location is in the center of the core (this has been the case at Davis-Besse), factors are not applied to conservatively monitor values such as β_Q and β_{clim} .
6. Enclosure 3 describes an event that occurred at a BWR facility which resulted in a severe thermal transient and extreme difficulty in controlling the plant. The aforementioned facilities should be reviewed in light of this information for possible safety implications.



J. S. Craswell
Reactor Inspector

Enclosures: As stated

cc w/o enclosures:

- G. Fiorilli
- R. C. Koop
- T. M. Tombling

POOR ORIGINAL

POOR ORIGINAL