



UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

October 30, 1968

Roger S. Boyd, Assistant Director
for Reactor Projects, DRL
THRU: Robert L. Tedesco, Chief, RPB-2, DRL

B

OYSTER-CREEK REACTOR VESSEL - DOCKET NO. 50-219

A meeting was held on October 24, 1968, to discuss the inspection program for the Oyster Creek reactor vessel. Representatives from Jersey Central, General Electric, MPR Associates and DRL were in attendance. A list of attendees is attached.

Discussion

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the post-hydro reactor vessel inspection program covering the following items:

- (1) To what extent have the various reactor vessel components in which defects have been found been examined following the hydrostatic test? Why is it enough?
- (2) Has sufficient testing been performed to establish adequate bases for subsequent in-service inspection?

GE summarized the extent of the post-hydro inspection program. Dye penetrant tests of 79 stub tubes (including shop and field welds) and ultrasonic testing of 8 field welds were performed. The I.D. and O.D. of the inlet and outlet nozzles of one recirculation loop and the O.D. surface of a core spray nozzle were also examined using the dye penetrant technique. GE's original intent was to inspect 32 stub tubes and the above safe ends using only the dye penetrant technique. It argued that this amount of inspection could be supported technically; however, the additional tests were performed because they "heard" we had a concern in this regard. Mr. Price stated that we would not be able to establish the acceptability of the extent of testing until after we complete our review which will include the ACRS.

GE made a presentation comparing the requirements set forth by the N45 Code Committee with the in-service inspection program proposed for Oyster Creek Unit No. 1. In most cases, GE stated that it was not possible to comply with the code because the component to be inspected was not accessible. But limitations on accessibility were not clearly identified. For example, it would appear that some form of visual inspection could be implemented even though the various other techniques such as: radiographic, ultrasonic and dye penetrant examinations could not be performed. Other reasons were mentioned such as: high radiation levels, technology not sufficiently developed,

A/37

October 30, 1968

insulation not designed to be removed, and the proposed inspection was not required for safety. Again, the foregoing reasons were not presented in sufficient detail to allow for an independent evaluation. It was agreed that these matters would be discussed further at a future meeting.

The applicant confirmed his position that it would continue to operate the plant even though the shroud support flange was known to have failed. The applicant does not plan a surveillance program to assess the integrity of the flange.

Several advanced copies of Amendment No. 43, which contains supplemental information on the reactor vessel repair program were made available for our review. The applicant stated that this amendment would be filed on October 25, 1968.

At the conclusion of the meeting we outlined the schedule we intended to follow to complete our review. We informed the applicant that we expected to complete our review of the facility in time for the December 1968 ACRS meeting. It was noted that the Technical Specifications appeared to represent the "critical path" of our review process. However, the applicant did not commit a date on which the Technical Specifications would be submitted. Several problem areas considered outstanding were also discussed with the applicant.

Several other topics discussed at the meeting are outlined below:

- (1) GE is evaluating the effectiveness of using a shear wave ultrasonic technique to detect flaws in the control rod drive housing. A decision has not been made as to whether this method will be used for the Oyster Creek housings.
- (2) A statement on reactivity anomalies will be included in the Technical Specifications.
- (3) One of the amendments, yet to be filed, will include design changes on the reactor building closed cooling water and normal service water systems. That is these systems will be redesignated as Class II systems (they were originally designated as Class I systems).
- (4) The water used for the hydrostatic test of the reactor pressure vessel was found to contain about 30 ppm of chlorides. The source of the chlorides has not been identified.

Roger S. Boyd

- 3 -

October 30, 1968

- (5) GE indicated that the repair was performed according to the requirements set forth in Section III of the ASME Pressure Vessel Code except for the requirements with regard to inspection after the field hydrostatic test. They do not intend to follow the requirements of Code III with regard to the latter.

V Stello

V. Stello
Reactor Project Branch 2
Division of Reactor Licensing

Attachment:
List of Attendees

Distribution
Suppl. ✓
DRL Reading
RPB-2 Reading
P. A. Morris
F. Schroeder
S. Levine
Branch Chiefs, RP
V. Stello
M. Wetterhahn
L. Porse
J. G. Keppler
W. J. Collins
G. W. Reinmuth
L. Kornblith

ATTENDEES

OCTOBER 24, 1968

AEC - DR

H. L. Price
R. L. Doan

AEC - DRL

P. A. Morris
F. Schroeder
R. Boyd
V. Stello
L. Porse
M. Wetterhahn

AEC - CO

J. G. Keppler
W. J. Collins
G. W. Reinmuth
L. Kornblith

Shaw & Pittman

G. Chernoff

GPU

L. H. Roddis, Jr.

GE

S. Naymark
R. Holt
G. Lees
J. B. Graham
A. M. Hubbard
S. W. Tagart
J. Barnard

ACRS Staff

M. C. Gaske

Jersey Central
Power & Light Co.

I. R. Finfrock
G. H. Ritter
D. R. Rees

MPR Associates

I. H. Mandil
Wm. R. Schmidt