

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

RPRT 68-2

Memorandum

TO : N. C. Moseley, Senior Reactor Inspector DATE: MAY 9 1968
Region I, Division of Compliance

FROM : R. T. Carlson, Reactor Inspector *R.T. Carlson*
Region I, Division of Compliance

SUBJECT: JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
CO REPORT NO 219/68-2

Attached is the report covering inspection activities from February 5, 1968 through March 28, 1968. Visits by Messrs. Reinmuth, Kornblith (in the company of Reinmuth), Nolan, and Collins (in the company of myself) are included. Pertinent observations by Messrs. Nolan and Collins were transmitted to me verbally and were incorporated as is appropriate. Mr. Reinmuth's observations were incorporated by reference.

The principal issues highlighted in the report and the current status of these issues are as follows:

1. Reactor Pressure Vessel Problems -

Well along with programmed repairs, schedule for total project and the CO inspection program are dependent upon any future position statement by AEC regarding adequacy of basic design of stub tubes.

2. Quality Assurance

Phone communications with Mr. Strand subsequent to my last visit, March 18-19, indicate that contrary to the signals received earlier and to what is reflected in the report, GE may indeed be making a significant effort to satisfy our stated need for additional assurance. This appears to be taking the form of a records inventory and review for all systems to confirm the existence and adequacy, results-wise, of documentation reflecting satisfactory completion of all related specifications and code requirements. It should be noted that this is an in-house effort, by GE, as opposed to the third party approach suggested by CO. In light of the above, suggest we hold on scheduling another meeting with JC-GE management on this subject pending a more detailed review of the specifics of this new development by me during my next visit to the site.



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

8502070488 840524
PDR FOIA
BELL84-318 PDR

Memorandum

W. H. Hildner
Carlson
W. H. Hildner

TO : R. C. DeYoung, Chief
Containment & Component Technology Branch, DRL

DATE: May 29, 1968

FROM : L. Forse
Containment & Component Technology Branch, DRL

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK PRESSURE VESSEL REPAIR, DOCKET NO. 50-219

DRL:G.C.T.B.:LP RT-771

Telephone calls were made to P. Patriarca and E. Miller, ORNL, on May 28, 1968 to enlist their opinions on the advisability of releasing Jersey Central to proceed with the repair of the two stub tubes presently held untouched for potential tests of unnamed nature. Both consultants were informed about the tests presently underway on two stub tubes in the center bottom of the vessel for which the following information is available:

- (a) 1 tube has been clad similar to repair procedure used for all stub tubes.
- (b) 1 tube has been clad and a "field weld" made to a piece of a CRD tube.
- (c) 1 1/2 inch of the top of these stub tubes have been cut off for testing.
- (d) Side bend tests, chemistry on clad material, macro-etch on clad of base metal, and long term corrosion tests are planned. (At this time it is not clear whether the corrosion tests will be stress-corrosion tests or other).
- (e) No tests are planned by GE on the two tubes presently held intact.
- (f) Work could possibly proceed for 20 days on other stub tubes before it would be necessary to start on the two remaining tubes, and it would be possible to delay work on these tubes if it was deemed necessary to perform additional testing before proceeding with the repair work.
- (g) The two "held" tubes are uphill and there is no extra length available for "free sampling"; boat samples must be taken and the voids refilled by welding.

Based on the above and the Jersey Central reports the following opinions were given:

P. Patriarca

Mr. Patriarca believes that there is no reason to hold the tubes until



results are available from tests of the two bottom tube cutoff's for the following reasons:

- (a) There is little likelihood of finding a new subject or item to test for, and should such an item become evident it would probably not be tested on these two tubes.
- (b) If the outcome of the tests is unfavorable, then all the presently repaired stub tubes would have to be replaced anyhow.

E. Miller

Mr. Miller believes that there is no real advantage in saving the two "hold tubes" until results are available from the tests on the two bottom tubes. The following reasons and concerns were expressed:

- (a) His chief concern is the general removal of all cracks prior to repair. This refers to all the stub tubes and no additional tests can really establish that confidence.
- (b) A micro-probe test across a crack is needed. However, the test may not be easy because the "gunk" may be removed in preparing the sample. The sample would not have to be taken of the two tubes with a "hold".
- (c) Does not know of any tests not already done that would justify additional tests on the "hold" tubes.
- (d) Stress-corrosion tests would be desirable on the bottom test material.
- (e) You are satisfying yourself that what they have done will prevent stress corrosion cracking.
- (f) He is concerned about the fatigue tests mentioned in the reports. Fatigue tests should be made on a clad section with material at temperature so the effect of material relaxation can be factored into the results. A test of this nature cannot be greatly accelerated and in his opinion a 40 year life could not be compressed into less than 4 years.

cc: J. P. O'Reilly, CO
G. W. Reinmuth, CO
R. L. Tedesco, DRL
V. Stello, DRL