

JUN 5 1968

Roger S. Boyd, AD/RF, DRL
(THRU) R. L. Tedesco, Chief, RPB-2, DRL*

V. Stello, RPB-2
Division of Reactor Licensing /s/

REVIEW OF OYSTER CREEK TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS -- DOCKET NO. 50-219

A meeting was held on May 28, 1968 to discuss the proposed Oyster Creek Technical Specifications. A list of attendees is attached.

Three other versions of the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications have been reviewed. During previous meetings, representatives of the General Electric Company have responded to most of the technical questions. Representatives of Jersey Central would respond to a question directed at them but in general, did not actively engage in the technical discussions. The meeting on May 28, 1968 followed essentially the same pattern. I find it difficult, based on the response at meetings (to discuss the Technical Specifications as well as other technical meetings) to assess how well Jersey Central knows "their" plant.*

The major portion of the May 28 meeting was devoted to discussions of the core thermal hydraulic safety limit. The data proposed to specify the safety limit are not adequate to determine whether or not the safety limit was violated during all anticipated transients. It is also not clear that the methods used to record certain process parameters are adequate to measure relatively fast transient conditions. Of particular concern is the method used to record the neutron flux and how the neutron flux will be related to the thermal power to the water. GE admitted that rather elaborate calculations would be necessary to determine whether or not a transient (that was not previously analyzed) resulted in conditions for which the core thermal and hydraulic design safety limit was exceeded. GE also admitted that these calculations would have to be performed by GE and it was not planned to provide Jersey Central with this capability. GE stated that it is trying to develop a suitable set of curves to avoid such calculations; but it was not clear how useful it would be. GE will provide us with the results of the study in the near future. GE also agreed to provide a list of the type of recorders used for the parameters related to the safety limits. A discussion of the accuracy and behavior of the recorders during transients will be included. Certain inconsistencies between the parameters used for the safety limit and safety system settings were noted.

OFFICE	See note at end of this memo.								
SURNAME	9509220304 950824								
DATE	PDR FOIA DEKOK95-258 PDR								

9509220304

Handwritten initials/signature: A/SO

The following items were noted as missing from the proposed Technical Specifications:

- a. Preoperational and periodic testing program for the secondary containment building (agreed upon at a previous meeting).
- b. Protection afforded by the systems in the event of a refueling accident. (We will need requirements on system operability, valve closure times, etc.)
- c. Statement that would require plant shutdown whenever the canal water level exceeds an agreed upon value. In addition, clarification of actions required during tornado or hurricane forecast (warning); e.g., stop refueling will be necessary.
- d. Pressure differential signals for monitoring the structural status of the core spray pipe within the pressure vessel should be included in the Technical Specifications.
- e. A specification for the environmental monitoring program and reporting requirements for same is required.
- f. Flow biased neutron flux scram should be included in the Technical Specifications.

NOTE:

As you know, we have been involved in a very lengthy and difficult review procedure on this project. We admit that progress has been made but only because of an intensive effort on the part of DRL personnel and especially that of Mr. V. Stallo. As we near the completion of the POL review stage, I feel compelled to inform you that we are not satisfied with the role of the "real" applicant in this matter. Jersey Central personnel have not demonstrated their technical understanding of the plant. We made every effort to engage them in discussions on the plant design and especially on the technical specifications. Little success has been realized. I do not see how we can issue a POL unless the applicant becomes more involved. I propose that we restrict attendance at future meetings to Jersey Central

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

principally and let them respond on the technical specification matters. I believe this is a necessary course of action. I also believe that enough protection under the guise of a "contract" between GE and J.C. has been afforded. After all, we do hope (someday) to issue a POL to the applicant (J.C.) and deem it technically qualified to operate the Oyster Creek No. 1 facility.

Original signed by
Robert L. Tedesco

R. L. Tedesco

Attachment:
List of Attendees

Distribution:
Suppl. ←
DRL Reading
RPB-2 Reading
Orig: VStello/RLTedesco

OFFICE ▶	DRL:RP <i>V Stello</i>	DRL:RP <i>R</i>				
SURNAME ▶	VStello/dj	RLTedesco				
DATE ▶	6/3/68	6/5/68				

ATTENDEES FOR MAY 28, 1968 MEETING WITH JERSEY CENTRAL

AEC

M. M. Mann, REG
V. Stello, DEL
R. Schemel, DEL
R. L. Ferguson, DRS
R. T. Carlson, CO
S. D. MacKay, DEL

Jersey Central

G. H. Ritter
T. J. McCluskey
I. R. Finfrock, Jr.

General Electric

W. L. Stiede
R. V. Poe
J. B. Graham

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						