UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERIC.	A

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMINGION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In	the	The t	ter	of		
Phi	lado	lot	nia	Elec	tric	Company
(Li	meri	ck	Gen	erat	ing	Station
1	mits	1	ami	21		

Dockets Nos. 353 and 35007 26 A10:23

.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKETED

REBUTTAL TO" APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS AS TO WHICH THE DOCKELING & SERVICE GENUINE ISSUE TO BE HEARD AS TO CONTENTION 1-62 dated Oct 12,1983."

1. Pressurized thermal shock is a condition that results from the introduction of cold water into or onto or proximate to . a hot pressure vessel while pressure is or becomes high. (Intervenor's Statement at A.4)

*Please note that the numbering system proposed and used in the Applicant's Statement of Material Facts is used in this Intervenor's Rebuttal.

Intervenor differs with Applicant in this 1st fact, andarea of disagreement is underlined. Justification for disagreement and Intervenor's position can be found in referenced (Intervenor's Statement at A.4). Similar convention will be carried throughout this Rebuttal to show areas of disagreement. 2. Thermal Stresses are produced in the vessel walls when cold water is introduced into, on or proximate to the vessel (Id.)

3. Stresses are produced when vessel is subjected to high pressure. (Id.) #3 is accepted by intervenor as it stands.

- 4. No comment.
- 5. No comment.
- 6. No comment.
- 7. No comment.

8. High reactor vessel pressure , during <u>or after</u> cold water injection , <u>can</u> occur in a BWR. (See Statementof intervenor at A.5.1.)

9. It has not been adequately demonstrated that significant neutron embrittlement does not occur in a EWR. (Intervenor's Statement at A.4 and A.5(2)). 10. Has not been adequately demonstrated that the decrease in vessel material toughness as a result of irradiation is substantially less in a EWR than that

in a TWR. (Intervenor's Statement at A.11 and A.13.)

11. No comment. 12. No comment. 13. The neutron fluence at the vessel wall in a BWR should be very low compared with a FWR due to the presence of a large water filled annulus... A Comment: Intervenor disagrees with this #13 .(Intervenor's Statement at A.5.2.) 14. Intervenor disagrees in totowith this #14 for the reasons stated in Intervenor's Statement at A.5. 15.No comment. 16. No comment 17. Required weld test samples were performed ... Intervenor must disagree with this #17 because it is a conclusory statement that another Contention on QA/QC in this proceeding will be without merit. Until and unless Mr Romano's Contention on QA/QC is dismissed without merit, #17 is conclusory and without basis. 18. Same comment as 17. 19. Same comment as 17. 20. No comment. 21. Same comment as 17. 22. No comment. 23. Same comment as 17. 24. Same comment as 17. 25. Same comment as 17. 26. Same comment as 17. 27. Same comment as 17. 28. Same comment as 17. 29. This is a promise not a statement of material fact. 30.No comment. 31 No comment. 32. This "material fact" is rife with assumptions, "well above those expected"; undefined nuances, "conservative calculational techniques"; and allusions to data that is not on the record, "verified by operational experience." 33. No comment. 34. No comment. 35.No comment. 36. This "material fact " hangs upon data that is not in the record, "field measurements; and nuances that intervenor has not had access to even the definition of words, "conservatively overpredict." 37. This "material fact" is only true for the calculation of average values and is not exact or reliable for point data. 38. No comment. 39. No comment.

13.

40. No comment

41. No comment.

42. No comment.

43.A maximum fluence reported by the Applicant in this "Material Fact" is really a calculational average that does not take into account anomalies. (See Intervenor Statement at A.5.(2))

44. This "material fact" hangs or a framework of assumption , calculations, and complete ignoring of the possibility f PTS in a BWR.

45.No comment.

46. Fame comment as 44.

47. Same comment as 44. Also this "material fact"appears conclusory without factual basis on the record.

49. This "material fact" is really a prediction and is the crux of the Contention. 49. No comment.

50. "Fracture Mechanics evaluation" has several drawbacks. This should not be depended upon unless and until defended upon the record. (SeeIntervenor Statement at A.12.)

51. Aside from the concerns stated in the answer to "material fact" 50, above, the term "available materials" is not defined herein. I may not really understand what the Applicant is trying to say here ,but if actual data is not obtained from materials actually used in the reactor(archival is sometimes the word used), this material fact is without basis.

52. This is conclusory, and merely describes the results of an analysis that has not passed any scrutily and is not on any ASLB record.

53. This is merely a statement of an assumption. It is not a "material fact." 54. Same comments as 43,50, and 51.

55. No comment.

56 thru 60. No comment.

61. This is really a promise and not a statement of material fact.

Respectfully submitted.

city, 15 24.17 1, lagan

Marvin I. Lewis, R.P.E. 6504 Bradford Terrace Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19149 (215) CU 9 5964 (215) 725 7325 (Answerphone.)

14.