



OFFICE OF THE  
COMMISSIONER

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

SECRETARY COPY 7

March 14, 1979

50-334  
333  
280  
281  
389

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman Hendrie  
Commissioner Gilinsky  
Commissioner Kennedy  
Commissioner Bradford

FROM: John Ahearne J A

SUBJECT: SHUTDOWN OF NUCLEAR PLANTS

I continue to believe the action we have just taken to be prudent. However, I believe we should now prepare to be ready to address what further action should be taken once the Stone and Webster calculations are completed. According to Harold Denton, the schedule for Stone and Webster to have completed their calculations is the following:

- Beaver Valley - completed.
- Fitzpatrick - March 27
- Maine Yankee - April 2
- Surry - April 10

In order to be ready I believe we should ask OPE to prepare the following paper:

1. What will be the impact on each region of this shutdown? The analysis should estimate the length of time the plants will be shut down to make the fix, if we require the plants be brought back to the original specification; the cost of doing that, both to repair and to purchase replacement power; the impact upon reserve margins in each region; and the increased use of oil. To the extent possible, this impact estimate should include from where the oil would come. In order to prepare this section, OPE should work with NRR and the Economic Regulatory Administration of DOE.

B-6

2. What degree of relaxation from our standards might be allowable, based upon either on NRR's best judgment or previous compromises? This should be by particular plant, based upon the likelihood of earthquakes in the region, and should also include an assessment of conservatism embodied in the new code being used by Stone and Webster (which apparently does not incorporate the time history but merely takes peak values of all shocks).
3. Based upon the Stone and Webster calculations and the answer to No. 2, can modifications be done over an extended period of time, rather than all at once? For example, would it be reasonable to do most during routine maintenance or reloads and for some of the more immediately required, is it possible to do them during non-peak times? For example, over weekends?
4. Given the current regulations and Stone and Webster calculations, what legal flexibility does the Commission have to allow either continued operation or operation during peak periods (for example, can we require the plant to shut down during the Spring and the Fall but remain running during the summer and winter)? In developing this section, OPE should work with OGC and OELD.
5. In light of the answers to questions 4, what amount of flexibility can be used by the Commission in balancing in the public interest increased demand on oil and increased costs of power versus requirements for the Commission to assure public health and safety?

I believe this paper should be ready by April 15, so that the Commission can adequately address what are the next steps to be taken after Stone and Webster completes its calculations and NRR has seen the results. I would not be surprised if our order is challenged, for example, by ERA. I believe our actions to date are appropriate, but also believe we should take the above steps in order carry out our responsibilities.

cc: OGC  
OPE  
OCA  
OPA  
EDO

*Seq ✓*