

Indian Point 2 (IP2) Steam Generator (SG) Tube Failure  
Lessons-Learned Task Group  
(TAC No. MA9163)

Task Group Notes - Discussion with Bob Weisman on 7/17/00

Attendees: Rick Ennis, Jack Goldberg

Background

Bob was the OGC reviewer for the amendment approving the IP2 one-time extension of the SG inspection interval (IP2 Amendment No. 201, dated 6/9/99, TAC No. MA4526).

Focus of Discussion

The focus of this discussion was to look at OGC considerations in reviewing license amendments and if there are any specific lessons-learned related to the OGC review of IP2 Amendment No. 201.

Results

- 1) The Con Ed amendment request includes a page signed by a Con Ed Vice-President. This page also includes a notarized signature with the statement "Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1998." Some licensees' applications include a statement that says something such as "to the best of my knowledge all information provided is true and correct." Does the Con Ed amendment request meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.30(b) with respect to requirements for oath or affirmation?

The Con Ed amendment request with the notarized signature is sufficient to meet the oath or affirmation requirements. This notarized signature and the associated statement basically attests to the fact that the notary knows or has verified the identity of the person signing the application. Regardless of the oath or affirmation requirements, the licensee is required to provide information that is complete and accurate in all material respects in accordance with 10 CFR 50.9. In addition, the licensee shall not deliberately submit information that they know to be incomplete or inaccurate in some material respect in accordance with 10 CFR 50.5.

J/108

2) What criteria does OGC use to review a license amendment?

OGC typically assigns a lawyer to review an amendment based on the applicable Standard Review Plan (SRP) section (i.e., specific lawyers usually review specific technical areas). However, the information in the SRP is not used for the OGC review. The same review is done regardless if there is an applicable SRP section or not (there was no applicable SRP section for the review associated with IP2 Amendment No. 201). The OGC review normally includes the following steps:

- a) Verify the proper NRC staff signature authority for the letter transmitting the amendment and the amendment itself;
- b) Review the initial Federal Register notice to ensure that licensee supplements to the original application don't affect the scope of the initial no significant hazards review;
- c) Review the amendment package for completeness;
- d) Review the Safety Evaluation (SE) for factual accuracy;
- e) Review the SE to ensure accuracy of citations to references, (Technical Specification sections, regulations, etc.);
- f) Ensure that environmental considerations are properly addressed in the SE; and
- g) Review the SE to ensure that the staff has articulated a basis for its conclusions.

3) What is the NRC staff responsibility for addressing all information that forms the basis for the licensee's conclusions in a licensee's incoming license change request (e.g., if some of incoming information is incomplete or incorrect)?

There is no regulatory requirement for the staff to address all information that forms the basis for the licensee's conclusions in a licensee's incoming license change request. The staff may form the basis for granting the amendment based on any (or none) of the licensee's information. If the staff discovers that any of the incoming information is incomplete or incorrect, it would be a good idea to address this in the SE (even if this information was not relied on in the SE). The SE must be specific as to what information was relied on to form the basis for the staff's conclusions.

4) Are there any specific lessons-learned related to the OGC review of IP2 Amendment No. 201?

Bob thought the SE was well done and he couldn't think of any specific lessons-learned from this review.