Docket No. 50-219

Mr. John J. Barton, Director Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station P. O. Box 388 Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Dear Mr. Barton:

Distribution:
Docket File
NRC & Local PDRs
PD 1-4 Plant
SVarga
EGGreenman
SNorris
ADromerick
OGC

EJordan

BDLiaw

CWHeh?

ACRS (10)

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON DYSTER CREEK DRYWELL STRESS AND STABILITY ANALYSIS (TAC NO. 79166)

The staff has reviewed the GE reports Index No. 9-1 and 9-2, "An ASME Section VII Evaluation of the Oyster Creek Drywell Stress and Stability Analysis" and our comments and request for additional information are contained in the enclosure.

We request that the information be provided within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me.

The requirements of this letter affect fewer than 10 respondents and therefore, are not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under P.L. 97-511.

Sincerely.

151

Alexander W. Dromerick, Senior Project Manager Project Directorate 1-4 Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure: See next page

9102180072 910214 PDR ADDCK 05000219 PDR

NAME :SNOTTS :AGFORMETICK: Cn :JFStolz :

DATE :2/14/91 :2/4/91 :2/4/91 :2/14/91

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY POCLUMENT Name: TAC NO. 79166

Mr. J. J. Barton Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station

Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station

cc:

Ernest L. Blake, Jr. Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge 2300 N Street, NW Washington, 7.C. 20037

I. H. Jolles, Executive Vice President GPU Service Corporation 100 Interpace Parkway Parsipanny, New Jersey 07054

Regional Administrator, Region I U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 475 Allendale Road King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

BWR Licensing Manager GPU Nuclear Corporation 1 Upper Pond Road Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Mayor Lacey Township 818 West Lacey Road Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Licensing Manager
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Mail Stop: Site Emergency Bldg.
P. O. Box 388
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Resident Inspector c/o U.S. NRC Post Office Box 445 Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Kent Tosch, Chief New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Nuclear Engineering CN 415 Trenton, New Jersey 08625

## PART I - Stress Analysis

1. Page 2-3, first paragraph

Reference is made to Table 2-1 which shows the 95 percent confidence thickness values in the locally corroded areas of the drywell. The basis and method of calculating these projected thicknesses should be explained. Furthermore, the anticipated date for reaching these projected thicknesses should be specified.

2. Page 2-5, first paragraph

The last sentence states that "given a design which satisfies the general code intent, as the Oyster Creek drywell does as originally constructed, it is not a violation of Subsection NE requirements for the membrane stress to be between 1.05 and 1.15 cover significant distances." Further justification for the licensee's position should be provided. Under what conditions would this become a code violation? In other words, at what point does the "local" region become a "general membrane" region? Has the opinion of the Code Committee been solicited regarding this matter? If reference is to be made to Code Case N=480, the specific portions of the Code Case as it applies to the Oyster Creek drywell situation should be fully explained.

3. Page 5-2, Section 5.4

This section states that "the membrane stresses for the degraded thickness condition were obtained by scaling upwards the calculated stresses for the nominal thickness case (Table 5-2) by the thickness ratio." It should also be explained how the primary membrane plus bending stresses shown in Table 5-3 were obtained. It appears that the combined stress was scaled upwards linearly by the thickness ratio. However, the bending portion of the stress should be scaled by the square of the thickness ratio. Also, the effect of stress concentrations due to the change of thickness should be addressed.

4. Appendix A, page 21, second paragraph

The last sentence states that "impact testing would not be required by the present code rules unless the LST (lowest metal service temperature) were less than "0"F, and the Oyster

Creek drywell material would not require impact testing."
Earlier in this section it is stated that an LST of 30'F was
used for the Oyster Creek design basis. Is the LST for the
drywell monitored by any plant operating procedures or the
Technical Specifications? Have studies and plant operating
history demonstrated that the drywell shall temperature is not
expected to be lower than 30'F for all loading conditions?

5. Appendix F, page 1, first paragraph

What is the basis for performing the sand sensitivity study with a nominal sand stiffness of 366 psi/inch and a sand stiffness of 80 percent of the nominal value? Were studies and/or tests performed to support these assumptions? Otherwise, the sensitivity study should be conducted further with lower stiffness values. The licenses's letter of Dacember 5, 1990 indicates that structural calculations assuming the sand removed would be completed by December 31, 1990. The results of these studies should be provided to demonstrate the sensitivity of the stresses to the assumed sand stiffness.

## PART 2 - Stability Analysis

6. Page 2-3, Section 2.3

This section states that the method described in Reference 2-5 was used to quantify the effect that the orthogonal tensils stress has on reducing the effect of imperfections on the buckling strength. The sensitivity of the results should be studied by using other methods which also address this effect.

7. Page 2-4, Section 2.4

This section states that Reference 2-6 was used to calculate the plasticity reduction factor for the meridional direction elastic buckling stress. Since this approach apparently has not been incorporated into Code Case N-284, the sensitivity of the results should be studied by using other methods which address this effect.

8. Page 3-3, second paragraph

For the stability analysis the stiffness for the sandbed was assumed to be 366 psi/inch and no sensitivity studies are reported. As described in Question 5, the results of the stability analysis with the sand removed should be provided.

9. Page 3-6, Section 3.5.3

The first sentence states that "the 2 psi external pressure load for the refueling case is applied to the external faces of all of the dryvell and vent shell elements." Unless it can be demonstrated that this pressure actually is present at all times during normal operation and refueling, the effect on the buckling analysis results of assuming no external pressure for these two load cases should be reported. Furthermore, is it possible to have an external pressure greater than 2 psi on the drywell shell? If so, an enveloping pressure case should be considered in the analysis.

## PART 3 - General

- 10. Justification for the use of ASME Section III, Subsection NE has been provided to evaluate the Oyter Creek Steel drywell, taking into consideration DESIGN, material's, fabrication inspection and testing with exception of the comments indicated above, the justification appears to be reasonable. Since the present-day quality assurance and quality control requirements for the design and construction of nuclear power were in the formative stage at the time when the Oyster Creek Plant was designed and constructed, indicate what quality assurance and quality control programs were implemented for the Oyster Creek drywell. Indicate if documentation of the programs is available.
- 11. In GPU's presentation to the staff in September, 1990, it was indicated that GPU would have an on-line thickness measurement capability in the critical areas of thickness measurement. GPU has a current commitment to make UT measurements at outages of opportunity. State clearly what online thickness measurement program GPU will have during the fuel cycle starting in early 1991.