



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

February 28, 2000

1  
2  
3  
4

MEMORANDUM TO: Ashok Thadani, Director  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: *for* Samuel J. Collins, Director *Roy P Zimmerman*  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEWS OF MAY 26, 1999, SAFETY  
EVALUATION REGARDING STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INSPECTION  
INTERVAL AND FEBRUARY 13, 1995, SAFETY EVALUATION  
REGARDING F\* REPAIR CRITERIA FOR INDIAN POINT STATION  
UNIT 2

In follow up to discussions with your staff on February 18, 2000, concerning the recent steam generator tube failure event at Indian Point Station Unit 2 (IP-2), this memorandum documents the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation's request that the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) perform an independent review of the attached safety evaluation (SE) regarding the steam generator (SG) tube inspection interval for this Unit. In addition, this memorandum requests that RES perform an independent review of the attached safety evaluation allowing the F\* repair criteria to be used at IP-2.

As you are aware, IP-2 shut down February 15, 2000, because of a sudden increase in primary to secondary leakage in SG 24. In 1999 the staff approved a license request to extend the SG tube inspection interval beyond the 24 calendar months required by the plant technical specifications. In particular, by letter dated December 7, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated May 12, 1999, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (the licensee), proposed to amend the technical specifications for the Indian Point Station Unit 2. These letters are also attached. This was to allow a one-time extension of the SG inspection interval and remove the requirement of receiving NRC concurrence on the licensee's proposed SG examination program. By letter dated June 9, 1999, the staff issued the requested amendment and forwarded the SE of the licensee's proposed amendment request to the licensee (TAC No. MA4526).

In addition, by letter dated March 13, 1995, the staff issued an amendment allowing the repair of SG tubes via the implementation of an F\* criteria, and forwarded the related February 13, 1995, SE (TAC No. M89373). The SE is attached. The F\* criteria allowed tubes that are degraded in a location not affecting structural integrity of the tube to remain in service as an alternative to removal from service through the use of tube plugs. The amendment was issued in response to an application from the licensee transmitted by letter dated April 13, 1994, and supplemented by letters dated December 20, 1994, January 12, 1995, and January 31, 1995.

CONTACT: L. Lund, EMCB/DE  
415-2786

ITEM #

*17* *15* *M/10*

*ML00367563*

⑦

Ashok Thadani

- 2 -

We request that you perform an independent review of that part of the SE regarding the extension of the inspection interval, transmitted to the licensee on June 9, 1999. A written response is requested by March 8, 2000.

We also request that you perform an independent review of the SE regarding the implementation of the F\* repair criteria, transmitted to the licensee on March 13, 1995. A written response is also requested by March 8, 2000.

The purpose of these independent reviews is to determine if the staff's conclusions are technically sound and that the data presented by the licensee provided reasonable assurance that the delayed inspection and the use of the F\* repair criteria would not result in an appreciably increased probability of tube failure prior to the next scheduled inspection. Your support for this quick response is greatly appreciated.

Docket No.: 50-247

Attachments: As stated

Ashok Thadani

- 2 -

We request that you perform an independent review of that part of the SE regarding the extension of the inspection interval, transmitted to the licensee on June 9, 1999. A written response is requested by March 3, 2000.

We also request that you perform an independent review of the SE regarding the implementation of the F\* repair criteria, transmitted to the licensee on March 13, 1995. A written response is also requested by March 3, 2000.

The purpose of these independent reviews is to determine if the staff's conclusions are technically sound and that the data presented by the licensee provided reasonable assurance that the delayed inspection and the use of the F\* repair criteria would not result in an appreciably increased probability of tube failure prior to the next scheduled inspection. Your support for this quick response is greatly appreciated.

Docket No.: 50-247

Attachments: As stated

Distribution:  
EMCB RF  
File Center

~~ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED~~

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\LUND\RES-IP2NEED.WPD \*PREVIOUSLY CONCURRED  
INDICATE IN BOX: "C"=COPY W/O ATTACHMENT/ENCLOSURE, "E"=COPY W/ATT/ENCL, "N"=NO COPY

OFFICE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	DD:DE
NAME	LLund*	EJSullivan*	WHBateman*	RHWessman*
DATE	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00
OFFICE	D:DE	AD:ADPT	DD:NRR <i>RPZ</i>	D:NRR <i>RPZ</i>
NAME	JRStrosnider*	BWSheron*	RPZimmerman	SJCollins
DATE	2/ 22 /00	2/ 24 /00	2/ 27 /00	2/ 27 /00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Ashok Thadani

- 2 -

We request that you perform an independent review of that part of the SE regarding the extension of the inspection interval, transmitted to the licensee on June 9, 1999. A written response is requested by March 8, 2000.

We also request that you perform an independent review of the SE regarding the implementation of the F\* repair criteria, transmitted to the licensee on March 13, 1995. A written response is also requested by March 8, 2000.

The purpose of these independent reviews is to determine if the staff's conclusions are technically sound and that the data presented by the licensee provided reasonable assurance that the delayed inspection and the use of the F\* repair criteria would not result in an appreciably increased probability of tube failure prior to the next scheduled inspection. Your support for this quick response is greatly appreciated.

Docket No.: 50-247

Attachments: As stated

Distribution:  
EMCB RF  
File Center

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\LUND\RES-IP2NEED.WPD \*PREVIOUSLY CONCURRED  
INDICATE IN BOX: "C"=COPY W/O ATTACHMENT/ENCLOSURE, "E"=COPY W/ATT/ENCL, "N"=NO COPY

OFFICE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	DD:DE
NAME	LLund*	EJSullivan*	WHBateman*	RHWessman*
DATE	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00	2 / 22 /00	2 / 22 /00
OFFICE	D:DE	AD:ADPT	DD:NRR	D:NRR
NAME	JRStrosnider*	BWSheron*	RPZimmerman	SJCollins
DATE	2 / 22 /00	2/ 24 /00	2 / 28 /00	2/ 28 /00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Ashok Thadani

- 2 -

We request that you perform an independent review of that part of the safety evaluation regarding the extension of the inspection interval, transmitted to the licensee on June 9, 1999. A written response is requested by March 3, 2000.

We also request that you perform an independent review of the safety evaluation regarding the implementation of the F\* repair criteria, transmitted to the licensee on March 13, 1995. A written response is also requested by March 3, 2000.

The purpose of these independent reviews is to determine if the staff's conclusions are technically sound and that the data presented by the licensee provided reasonable assurance that the delayed inspection and the use of the F\* repair criteria would not result in an appreciably increased probability of tube failure prior to the next scheduled inspection. Your support for this quick response is greatly appreciated.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: L. Lund, EMCB/DE  
415-2786

Distribution: EMCB RF      File Center

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\Lund\RES-IP2NEED.wpd \*PREVIOUSLY CONCURRED

INDICATE IN BOX: "C"-COPY W/O ATTACHMENT/ENCLOSURE, "E"-COPY W/ATT/ENCL, "N"-NO COPY

OFFICE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	DD:DE
NAME	LLund*	EJSullivan*	WHBateman*	RHWessman*
DATE	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00
OFFICE	D:DE	AD:ADFT	DD:NRR	D:NRR
NAME	JRStrosnider*	BWSheron	RPZimmerman	SJCollins
DATE	2/ 22 /00	2/24/00	/ /00	/ /00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

#1  
2/23

#2  
2/24

MEMORANDUM TO: Ashok Thadani, Director  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Samuel J. Collins, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MAY 26, 1999 SAFETY  
EVALUATION REGARDING STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INSPECTION  
INTERVAL FOR INDIAN POINT STATION UNIT TWO

Based on discussions with your staff on February 18, 2000, concerning the recent steam generator tube failure event at Indian Point Station Unit 2 (IP-2), the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation requests that the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research perform an independent review of the attached safety evaluation regarding the steam generator (SG) tube inspection interval for this Unit.

As you are aware, IP-2 shut down February 15, 2000, because of a sudden increase in primary to secondary leakage in steam generator 24. In 1999 the staff approved a license request to extend the SG tube inspection interval beyond the 24 calendar months required by the plant TS. In particular, by letter dated December 7, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated May 12, 1999, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (the licensee), proposed to amend the technical specifications for the Indian Point Station Unit 2. These letters are also attached. This was to allow a one-time extension of the steam generator inspection interval and remove the requirement of receiving NRC concurrence on the licensee's proposed SG examination program. By letter dated June 9, 1999, the Commission issued the requested amendment and forwarded the related safety evaluation of the licensee's proposed amendment request to the licensee (TAC No. MA4526).

We request that you perform an independent review of that part of the safety evaluation regarding the extension of the inspection interval. The purpose of this independent review is to determine if you, given the same information, would have come to the same conclusion as NRR. A written response is requested by February 25, 2000. Your support for this quick response is greatly appreciated.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: L. Lund, EMCB/DE  
415-2786

Distribution: EMCB RF File Center

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\Lund\RES-IP2NEED.wpd

INDICATE IN BOX: "C"=COPY W/O ATTACHMENT/ENCLOSURE, "E"=COPY W/ATT/ENCL, "N"=NO COPY

OFFICE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	DD:DE
NAME	LLund*	EJSullivan*	WHBateman*	RHWessman
DATE	2/ 22 /00	2/ 22 /00	2 / 22 /00	2/ 22 /00
OFFICE	D:DE	AD:ADPT	DD:NRR	D:NRR
NAME	JRStrosnider	BWSheron	RPZimmerman	SJCollins
DATE	2/ 22 /00	/ /00	/ /00	/ /00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MEMORANDUM TO: Ashok Thadani, Director  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Samuel J. Collins, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MAY 26, 2000 SAFETY  
EVALUATION REGARDING STEAM GENERATOR TUBE INSPECTION  
INTERVAL FOR INDIAN POINT STATION UNIT TWO

Based on discussions with your staff on February 18, 2000, concerning a possible tube rupture event at Indian Point Station Unit 2 (IP-2), the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation requests that the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research perform an independent review of the attached safety evaluation regarding the steam generator (SG) tube inspection interval for this Unit.

As you are aware, IP-2 shut down February 15, 2000 because of a sudden increase in primary to secondary leakage in steam generator 24. A review of the technical specifications (TS) indicates that the staff approved a license request to extend the SG tube inspection interval beyond the 24 calendar months required by the plant TS. In particular, by letter dated December 7, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated May 12, 1999, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (the licensee), proposed to amend the technical specifications for the Indian Point Station Unit 2. These letters are also attached. This was to allow a one-time extension of the steam generator inspection interval and remove the requirement of receiving NRC concurrence on the licensee's proposed SG examination program. By letter dated June 9, 1999, the Commission issued the requested amendment and forwarded the related safety evaluation of the licensee's proposed amendment request to the licensee (TAC No. MA4526).

We request that you perform an independent review of that part of the safety evaluation regarding the extension of the inspection interval. The purpose of this independent review is to determine if you, given the same information, would have come to the same conclusion as NRR, i.e., you would have issued a safety evaluation granting the licensee's request. A written response is requested by February 25, 2000. Your support for this quick response is greatly appreciated.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: L. Lund, EMCB/DE  
415-2786

Distribution: EMCB RF File Center

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\Lund\RES-IP2NEED.wpd

INDICATE IN BOX: "C"=COPY W/O ATTACHMENT/ENCLOSURE, "E"=COPY W/ATT/ENCL, "N"=NO COPY

OFFICE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	EMCB:DE	DD:DE
NAME	LLund	EJSullivan	WHBatem	RHWessman
DATE	2/22/00	2/22/00	2/22/00	1/00
OFFICE	D:DE	AD:ADPT	DD:NRR	D:NRR
NAME	JRStrosnider	BWSheron	RPZimmerman	SJCollins
DATE	1/00	1/00	1/00	1/00

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY