

**Special Inspection Plan
Indian Point 2**

NRC Inspection 50-247/2000-010

I. Inspection Objectives

- A. Determine whether the licensee's 1997 SG inspection performance was adequate with respect to identifying the flaw in steam generator 24, tube R2C5, given the identification of a PWSCC indication in tube C2R67, and the susceptibility of the steam generator to degradation mechanisms?

Assess the adequacy of the licensee's assessment of steam generator degradation mechanisms in 1997, and the effectiveness of the licensee's identification, corrective action and root cause evaluation of these degradation mechanisms, including the impact on the ability to detect flaws.

- B. Independently verify selected information, which was provided by Con Edison, in support of the NRR's safety evaluation of the operational readiness of the Indian Point steam generators for operation during the next cycle in 2000.

II. Inspection Scope

- A. Assess the licensee's effectiveness in identifying, assessing and compensating for conditions impeding the effectiveness of steam generator eddy current inspections in 1997. It is important here to recognize state-of-the-art eddy current techniques available in 1997. This should include:

1. Where anomalous or questionable data were encountered in testing, were adequate steps taken to further investigate/interrogate/evaluate/disposition the data? -- Especially where conditions contributing to increased susceptibility to tube integrity problems existed and additional data (e.g., data recorded at different frequencies) were readily available. [This is not intended to be a question of individual analyst performance.]

2. Were the licensee's response and corrective actions appropriate to an identified PWSCC flaw in the freespan area in SG 24, tube R2C67, in 1997? In particular, did the licensee use this information to re-assess the adequacy of the inspection technique and data analysis.

3. Were the licensee's response and corrective actions appropriate to identified copper-magnetite deposits and sludge pile interference with the inspection technique and data analysis?

4. Was the licensee's response appropriate to poor signal to noise conditions, probe skipping, bad data and analysts missed calls.

ITEM #

36

ALB