

General Offices . Selden Street, Berlin, Connecticut

P.O. BOX 270 HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06141-0270 (203) 666-6911

June 18, 1984

Docket No. 50-423 B11232

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Mr. B. J. Youngblood, Chief Licensing Branch No. 1 Division of Licensing U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Reference:

- (1) B. J. Youngblood letter to W. G. Counsil, Draft SER, dated December 20, 1983.
- (2) B. J. Youngblood letter to W. G. Counsil, Request for Additional Information, dated January 16, 1984.
- (3) W. G. Counsil letter to B. J. Youngblood, Response to DSER Open Item 250.10.

Gentlemen:

Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 Response to Materials Engineering Branch Open Items

Attached is the response of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) to the Materials Engineering Branch, Inservice Inspection Section, request for additional information concerning the recording and investigating crack indications (MTEB 250.10). We expect the response will resolve the Staff's concerns regarding this issue.

If there are any questions, please contact our licensing representative.

Very truly yours,

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY Et. Al.

BY NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, Their Agent

W. G. Counsil

Senior Vice President

200/

STATE OF CONNECTICUT)
) ss. Berlin
COUNTY OF HARTFORD)

Then personally appeared before me W. G. Counsil, who being duly sworn, did state that he is Senior Vice President of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, an Applicant herein, that he is authorized to execute and file the foregoing information in the name and on behalf of the Applicants herein and that the statements contained in said information are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

My Commission Expires March 31, 1988

a'anico

Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3
Open Item
Materials Engineering Branch
Inservice Inspection Section

MTEB 250.10 Recording and Investigating Crack Indications (Draft SER Section 6.6)

250.10 Your response to Question 250.4 states that only indications 50 percent of DAC or greater will be recorded and investigated. This is not acceptable because a direct correlation does not always exist between the amplitude of ultrasonic response and the size of actual flaws.

Our position is when using either Article 5 of Section V or Appendix III of Section XI for examination of either ferritic or austenitic piping welds, the following should be incorporated:

- Any crack-like indication, regardless of ultrasonic amplitude, discovered during examination of piping welds or adjacent base metal materials should be recorded and investigated by a Level II or Level III examiner to the extent necessary to determine the shape, identity, and location of the reflector.
- 2. The Owner should evaluate and take corrective action for the disposition of any indication investigated and found to be other than geometrical or metallurgical in nature.

Response:

NUSCO will revise their ultrasonic procedures for examining ferritic and austenitic pipe welds, per our recent discussion, to incorporate the following paragraph:

"Any indication of a suspected flaw, regardless of amplitude, discovered during examination of piping welds or adjacent base material shall be recorded."