

CORR: 01-0057

CORR: 01-0057

COMMISSION CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence Response Sheet

Date: *April 5, 2001*

To: *Chairman Meserve —*
Commissioner Dicus
Commissioner Diaz
Commissioner McGaffigan
Commissioner Merrifield

Approved by dated
John J. Meserve
April 13, 2001

From: *Annette Vietti-Cook, Secretary*

Subject: *Letter to James Riccio, Public Citizen's Critical Mass*
Energy & Environmental Program, concerns Indian Point 2
and NRC's conclusions in an inspection report pertaining
to the Reactor Protection System

ACTION: *Please comment/concur and respond to the Office of the*
Secretary by:

Time: *3:30 p.m.*

Day: *Friday*

Date: *April 13, 2001*

Comment:

Contact: *Patrick Milano, EDO/NRR*
415-1457

Entered in STARS Tracking System ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

W/106



CHAIRMAN

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

Mr. James Riccio
Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy
& Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue SE
Washington, D.C. 20003

Dear Mr. Riccio:

I am responding to your letter of March 5, 2001 in which you requested that I meet with you and Mr. David Lochbaum regarding the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2 (IP2). I met with you on March 7, 2001, and hope you found this meeting beneficial. Your letter, also raised concerns about conclusions in a recent U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection report pertaining to the Reactor Protection System (RPS), among other issues. In your letter, you state you have information that contradicts these conclusions and you question why the inspector's review of RPS issues was limited to a few Consolidated Edison (Con Edison) condition reports. Finally, you questioned the adequacy of Con Edison's 1997 response to NRC's 10 CFR 50.54(f) letter regarding design basis documentation.

The inspection report to which you referred is a report documenting numerous reviews by NRC resident inspectors and regional specialists between November 19 and December 30, 2000. As this inspection report and a separate letter issued before plant restart indicate, our staff inspected many activities and issues in this period. In addition to performing baseline inspections, we examined activities associated with the modification, testing, and restoration of plant systems after the steam generator replacement. We undertook a variety of special

inspection initiatives to assess the readiness of plant systems and equipment. We devoted a³ significant ^{resources} ~~effort~~ ^{ing} to assess the issues which emerged during these reviews and plant restoration activities, ^{including those associated with} ~~Numerous issues arose with respect to~~ the plant design control process and vendor interface affecting such functions as residual heat removal system flow, containment pressure control, diesel generator starting sequence, and battery capacity.

~~As with all of these issues and consistent with our process,~~ ^{reported} our review of problems ^{with} ~~reported on the RPS~~ ^{was consistent with our inspection process,} involved the sampling of issues or conditions which, in the judgment of inspectors, potentially affected the ability of equipment to perform ^{its} intended safety functions. NRC has unfettered access to plant activities, reports and records. During the period before plant restart, in the normal screening of condition reports generated by Con Edison's corrective action process, our resident inspectors became aware of wiring and drawing discrepancies in the RPS. The resident inspectors ^{and regional specialists} selected for examination condition reports on cable separation problems which potentially affected system operability. ~~The resident inspectors~~ obtained help from a specialist in the region. We believe our inspection and assessment of these issues provided reasonable assurance that the discrepancies reported were not of a nature that would prevent this system from performing its intended safety function. We believe, contrary to your statements regarding "lack of a questioning attitude" by NRC staff, that our inspectors were appropriately thorough.

Our inspections and review of RPS issues continued past restart and the end of the inspection period covered in the January 30, 2001, inspection report. We are still inspecting RPS issues, examining, among other things, information contained in other condition reports, ^{some of which you described in your meeting with me.} While we continue to identify issues

similar to those previously raised, we have found none that would render the system ~~inoperable~~. ^{incapable of performing its intended}
 Confidence ^{in the ability} ~~about operability~~ of the RPS is enhanced by the frequent testing conducted by Con Edison ^{to perform these functions} ~~following~~ ^{per pursuant to} detailed requirements in the technical specifications. ^{observed on a sampling basis by NRC inspectors} If at any time Con Edison

or the NRC were to determine there was a significant problem associated with the RPS, Con Edison would be required to take action in accordance with the condition of ^{its} ~~their~~ license, up to and including plant shutdown for problems affecting operability. ~~Results of inspections conducted from the beginning of the year are being documented in inspection reports.~~

For the past several years, raised concerns with Con Edison

The NRC has ~~been concerned~~ about the general area of design control and engineering support at the IP2 plant, of which the RPS issues are a subset, ~~for the past several years.~~

The NRC considered design control and engineering support issues
 Along with other performance issues, ~~it was a consideration~~ in designating IP2 as an "agency

focus" facility warranting heightened oversight in May 2000. ~~As described most recently by the~~ ^{meeting associated with}

~~NRC~~ ^{at} the March 2, 2001, public exit ~~for~~ ^{the} 95003 supplemental inspection, we have

continued to identify weaknesses in this area. As we ^{indicated} ~~said~~ at ~~the~~ exit meeting, we expect Con Edison to reassess ^{its} ~~their~~ improvement efforts related to design control and inform us of ^{planned} ~~changes~~

~~they plan to make~~ to address identified issues. This area will be a topic of discussion at a public meeting with the NRC staff following Con Edison's receipt of the 95003 inspection report.

We have taken numerous steps to keep the public accurately informed of our inspections, assessments, and findings at the IP2 plant. As you know, we instituted a special website and have held numerous public meetings over the past year. We believe, ~~in all of this,~~ that our communications on IP2 matters have been extensive and accurate.

Your letter also expressed concern that the RPS ^{issues} ~~problems~~ call into question the adequacy of Con Edison's response to our letter requesting, under 10 CFR 50.54(f), information on design basis documentation. In a December 4, 2000, ~~Retition~~ ^{Petition} that you, among others, submitted under 10 CFR 2.206, you raised similar concerns. We are reviewing your ~~Retition~~ ^{Petition} and expect to respond in detail to this item of your ~~Petition~~ ^{Petition} by July 2001.

I understand that you have informed the NRC's Office of the Inspector General and Congressional oversight committees of your concerns. ~~Therefore,~~ ^{As a result,} a copy of this response, along with your March 5, 2001, letter, will be forwarded to these parties. If you have any further questions please contact me.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Meserve