

NOV 24 1971

50-269

Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

DUKE POWER COMPANY OCONEE NUCLEAR REACTOR CONTAINMENT TEST REPORT

The Duke Power Company's Oconee Unit One report, Structural Integrity
Test Report of the Reactor Containment Building, October 29, 1971,
has been reviewed and evaluated by the Structural Engineering Branch.
The evaluation is enclosed.

Original Signed By
E. G. Case

Edson G. Case, Director
Division of Reactor Standards

Enclosure:
Evaluation Report

cc w/encl:
S. Hanauer, DR
R. Boyd, DRL
R. DeYoung, DRL
D. Skovholt, DRL
R. Maccary, DRS
A. Schwencer, DRL
A. Dromerick, DRS
F. Schauer, DRS

Distribution
Suppl. Doc. No. 50-269 ←
DR RF
DRS RF
SEB RF
bcc: E. G. Case

OFFICE ▶	DRS:SEB <i>FS</i>	DRS:SEB <i>QAD</i>	DRS:A/D <i>RJM</i>	DRS:DIR <i>EW</i>	Memo
SURNAME ▶	Schauer:ewe	Dromerick	Maccary	Case	
DATE ▶	11-22-71	11-22-71	11-22-71	11-24-71	

EVALUATION REPORT

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION ACCEPTANCE TESTING

REFERENCE

Duke Power Company, "Structural Integrity Test Report of the Reactor Containment Building," October 29, 1971.

DISCUSSION

The above cited report described the general dimensions of the Oconee Unit One containment; the strain, deformation, and load measuring devices installed for the test; the test procedures and pressure cycle; and summarized the results obtained from the test. The results obtained were (1) compared with analytical predictions, and (2) those obtained in testing the Turkey Point and Point Beach containments. The results displayed showed the containment performance essentially as predicted. Its performance was also similar to those of the two previously tested containments. Items that were notable by their absence from the report, however, were (1) the gaging experience with embedded gaging and (2) the state of surface cracking of the dome. In view of previous experience, these items should have been addressed in rather detailed terms.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The report should be expanded to include a discussion of the performance of embedded gaging and a description of the surface condition of the dome. Assuming favorable resolution of these two items, the summary and conclusions presented in section two of the report are considered valid.