

SECRET NO. 30-219  
For Div of Compliance

# Jersey Central Power & Light Company

MADISON AVENUE AT PUNCH BOWL ROAD • MORRISTOWN, N. J. 07960 • 539-6111

April 9, 1968

Mr. Harold L. Price  
Director of Regulation  
United States Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Mr. Price:

In Dr. Morris' letter of March 22 and in subsequent discussions, you and members of your staff have expressed concern over the continuation of the Oyster Creek pressure vessel repair program pending your further review of the information on the program filed with AEC on March 25.

As you know, the General Electric Company has begun and is currently carrying out the first phase of the program consisting of the inspection, preparation and overlay of the exterior surface of the vessel stub tubes, using a 308L stainless steel weld cladding and remaking of the field welds.

You and your staff have recently advised us, however, that our March 25 report does not contain sufficient information to permit you to complete your evaluation of the vessel repair program and that further data and safety analysis will be required. Much of the additional information requested consists of documentation of matters with which your staff is already familiar through numerous informal meetings and discussions. We will respond with supplemental data at the earliest possible date. We are prepared also to make available at any time and at your convenience experts from General Electric and our own consultants to discuss with your staff any aspect of the repair program. Meanwhile, however, the question is not whether sufficient data has been supplied to enable AEC to complete its safety evaluation but whether there is any justification for our bringing to a halt the repair work now in progress.

Before undertaking the present repair work, we, our consultants and the General Electric Company considered whether the work could possibly prevent the undertaking of any alternative repair program which might later be required. We also considered whether this work would be



19 APR 12 4-12-68  
ORR 4-12-68  
JN 4-12-68  
JN 4-12-68  
JN 4-18-68  
Cand. for...

8304070620 690106  
PDR ADOCK 05000219  
A PDR

COPY SENT REGION +

8 1195

April 9, 1968

inconsistent with further investigation into the cause of the stub tube cracking, taking into account the two stub tubes which are being held in reserve and on which no repair work has been done. We have concluded that this would not be the case. Nothing in our numerous discussions with your staff has suggested a different conclusion.

We can, therefore, think of no justification for discontinuing the present stub tube overlay and field weld work. If, as we believe, we are on the right track, we will save critical weeks in the completion and startup of the Oyster Creek plant. At worst, even if the AEC were ultimately to decide that the Oyster Creek vessel repair program was unsatisfactory, we might find that we and General Electric have expended money and effort to no purpose. We cannot conceive that this expenditure, minute in relation to the cost of the total project, could in any way influence or prejudice AEC's decision on the adequacy of the pressure vessel repair program or on our pending license application.

Because of our conviction that the stub tube repair program presently undertaken is in the right direction, because proceeding with the program would not prevent any alternative solution which might later be required, and because of the importance of completing the Oyster Creek plant at the earliest possible date, we request that no formal action be taken regarding the work in progress without first affording us an appointment to discuss the matter with members of the Commission.

Very truly yours,



Geo. H. Ritter  
Vice President

GHR:ep