

James S. Baumstark
Vice President
Nuclear Engineering

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
Indian Point 2 Station
Broadway & Bleakley Avenue
Buchanan, New York 10511

Internet: baumstarkj@coned.com
Telephone: (914) 734-5354
Cellular: (914) 391-9005
Pager: (917) 457-9698
Fax: (914) 734-5718

June 15, 2000

Re: Indian Point Unit No. 2
Docket No. 50-247

Document Control Desk
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Station P1-137
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject : Response to Request for Additional Information – Proposed Steam
Generator Tube Examination Program (TAC No. MA8219)

References: 1) NRC Letter to Con Edison dated March 14, 2000
2) NRC Letter to Con Edison dated March 24, 2000

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54(f), this letter provides the responses of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Con Edison) to Questions 2 and 4 identified in Reference 1, and Questions 8 and 15 identified in Reference 2 regarding the RFO 14 steam generator tube examination program.

No new regulatory commitments are being made by Con Edison in this correspondence.

Should you or your staff have any concerns regarding this matter, please contact Mr. John McCann, Manager, Nuclear Safety & Licensing.

Sincerely,



Attachment

A001

C Mr. Hubert J. Miller
Regional Administrator-Region I
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. Patrick D. Milano, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Regulatory Projects I/II
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop 14B-2
Washington, DC 20555

Senior Resident Inspector
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
PO Box 38
Buchanan, NY 10511

Attachment

Response to RAI Questions Regarding Proposed Steam Generator
Tube Examination Program

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
Indian Point Unit No. 2
Docket No. 50-247
June 2000

NRC RAI Letter dated March 14, 2000

Question 2

Provide a description and the basis for your root cause analysis, the bases for all assumptions, and the results.

Reply

The root cause evaluation for the steam generator tube rupture event of February 15, 2000 was submitted to the NRC via Con Edison letter dated April 14, 2000. Based upon initial review, the NRC staff requested additional root cause information in their letter to Con Edison dated April 28, 2000. Con Edison's response to these items is being provided in separate correspondence specifically addressing each item in the April 28, 2000 letter.

Question 4

Provide a summary of the results of the condition monitoring performed for the period of operation from the 1997 inspections through February 15, 2000. Provide a summary of the results of an operational assessment for the proposed period of operation until your next planned inspections. Include in these assessments an explanation of your methodology, uncertainties, growth rates, and the bases for any assumptions, as appropriate.

Reply

The Indian Point 2 Cycle 14 Condition Monitoring assessment and the Cycle 15 Operational Assessment reports were submitted to the NRC via Con Edison letter dated June 2, 2000. Detailed explanations of the analysis methodology, uncertainties, growth rates, and the bases for any assumptions were provided in those reports.

NRC RAI Letter dated March 24, 2000

Question 8

Provide a description of the operational assessment demonstrating that adequate structural and leakage integrity will be maintained until the next scheduled inspection for each degradation mechanism. This description should include a discussion of the input parameters (including flaw growth rates and flaw size measurement errors) and predictive structural and leakage models used in the assessment. Methods for accounting for flaws not detected during the inspection, or initiating after the inspection, should be discussed.

Reply

The Indian Point 2 Cycle 14 Condition Monitoring assessment and the Cycle 15 Operational Assessment reports were submitted to the NRC via Con Edison letter dated June 2, 2000. Detailed explanations of input parameters, predictive structural and leakage models used in the assessment, as well as the methods of accounting for flaws not detected during the inspection, were provided in those reports.

Question 15

Provide the results of the condition monitoring assessment for each defect mechanism, including the results of the in-situ pressure tests.

Reply

The Indian Point 2 Cycle 14 Condition Monitoring assessment and the Cycle 15 Operational Assessment reports were submitted to the NRC via Con Edison letter dated June 2, 2000. Detailed explanations of the condition monitoring for each defect mechanism, including the results of the in-situ pressure tests were provided in those reports.