

ACTION

A Schwencer
Suspense

JAN 31 1975

Note to: V. A. Moore

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM FOR CE 16 X 16 AND B&W
17 X 17 ASSEMBLIES

With regard to Vic Stello's January 22 and 24, 1975 memos to Dick DeYoung, apparently it is TR's desire to impose a special fuel surveillance program on the first plants using 16 x 16 and 17 x 17 arrays. While I agree it makes good sense to conduct such a program, the write up attached to Stello's memo needs considerable work before it clearly describes an acceptable fuel surveillance program. As presently written, it is much too broad to be meaningful or enforceable. For example, it simply requires "visual inspection of all peripheral rods" in the first core. It does not say what this visual inspection consists of, what the criteria is for acceptance or rejection. There is no criteria which say a follow-on effort will be required if unacceptable fuel performance could be expected "from any condition observed". It does not define what these conditions might be nor the qualifications of the persons making the observations. Further, the procedure as written would permit the program to be completed with no dimensional measurements being made. It is hard to understand how relatively small but significant dimensional changes could be detected by remote viewing through a TV system or boroscope alone. As a further concern, the write up simply says that the conclusions of the inspection are to be provided to the staff prior to return to power. It is not clear whether the intent here is for the staff to formally review and approve these conclusions prior to return to power or just receive them without evaluation. In another sense, it is not clear if the conclusions are negative why the staff needs to have them prior to returning to power. Further on, it says the supplemental program will be conducted in addition to "that which may be performed at other reactors"; the meaning of this is not clear. I presume this means identical supplemental programs are being planned at several reactors in about the same time frame. I do not recommend issuance of a letter to any utility until the document is clarified and needs for this program are better established. We note also that Combustion Engineering does not agree with the staff's intention in this regard as indicated in the CE letter dated April 5, 1972 to V. Stello.

I recommend that a meeting be arranged with the appropriate Reactor Safety people and Projects.

A. Schwencer

A. Schwencer, Chief
Light Water Reactors Branch 2-3
Division of Reactor Licensing

Attachments and ccs: See next page

Note to: V. A. Moore

Attachments:

- (1) Memo to RCDeYoung dtd. 1/22/75
from V. Stello
- (2) Memo to RCDeYoung dtd. 1/24/75
from V. Stello

ccs: RCDeYoung
LWR TCs
KKniel
SMacKay
*DDavis
*CStahle

*Rec'd copy of enclosures