

Indian Point 2 (IP2) Steam Generator (SG) Tube Failure
Lessons-Learned Task Group
(TAC No. MA9163)

Task Group Notes - Discussion with Jeff Harold on 6/29/00

Task Group Attendees: Rick Ennis, Maitri Banerjee

Background

Jeff was the PM in DLPM for IP2 at the time of the event.

Focus of Discussion

The focus of this discussion was to look at the overall observations and lessons-learned related to the IP2 event.

Results

Jeff had the following observations:

- 1) The inspection interval extension amendment (Amendment No. 201) was no different from a licensing perspective than other (i.e., non-SG) inspection interval amendments.
- 2) Jeff doesn't see any problems with the current process for license amendment reviews as presently described in Office Letter 803. There are no process changes that would have had any bearing on this event.
- 3) Jeff doesn't think there would have been any benefit to Regional involvement in the Amendment No. 201 review.
- 4) He doesn't think any technical specification (TS) improvements are needed with respect to SG inspection. The better approach is to have the requirements outside the TSS with the requirements based on the latest industry guidelines.
- 5) Jeff thinks that Con Ed was committed to the previous revision of NEI 96-07 at the time of the event. He believes this commitment was based on a letter from NEI, not Con Ed. A possible suggestion is to have specific letters from utilities since it's not clear if a letter from NEI is enforceable as a licensee commitment.
- 6) Con Edison is not pro-active in general.
- 7) Con Edison is exploring the possible sale of IP2. This could impact what corrective actions they will take since they may be reluctant to make certain capital expenditures.
- 8) Duke is preparing the modification for the SG replacement.
- 9) EMCB doesn't have enough technical expertise (i.e., number of people) in the SG area.

J/10

- 10) The decision to put IP2 related documents on the web-site was due in part to complaints from the public on the difficulty using ADAMS. It was also thought this would limit the number of individual requests for copies of documentation. This way of responding to the public took (and is still taking) considerable resources. Putting this amount of resources on the public confidence pillar is taking resources away from the safety pillar.