

Meserve

CORR: 01-0036

CORR: 01-0036

COMMISSION CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence Response Sheet

Date: *March 2, 2001*

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

Approved on Letter
[Signature]
3/6/01

From: *Annette Vietti-Cook, Secretary*

Subject: *Letter to Congresswoman Sue Kelly concerns issues raised by an individual at Consolidated Edison's Indian Point 2 Nuclear Power Station*

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

Time: *C.O.B.*
Day: *Monday*
Date: *March 12, 2001*

Comment:

Contact: *Peter Eselgroth, EDO/RI*
610/337-5234

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

W/95



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Sue W. Kelly
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman Kelly:

I am responding to your letter ^{of} ~~dated~~ February 7, 2001, regarding ~~issues~~ ^{concerns} raised by ~~an~~ ^{a consultant} ~~individual~~ ^{to} ~~at~~ ^(ConEd) the Consolidated Edison's Indian Point 2 nuclear power station. In particular, you requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) investigate ~~issues raised by a~~ ^{his concerns} ~~Consolidated Edison consultant~~ regarding the plant's reactor protection system.

~~To date,~~ the NRC staff has reviewed the documentation of reactor protection system discrepancies identified by this consultant and have also interviewed the individual. These ~~se~~ discrepancies consist principally of differences between the installed reactor protection system and drawings describing that system. Our preliminary conclusion is that these discrepancies do not affect the ability of the reactor protection system to perform its intended safety function. NRC review and inspection continue, ^{and we} ~~Region~~ will forward to your office the inspection report which documents our review, when issued.

I would like to point out that the kind of discrepancies ^{identified by ConEd} ~~this consultant noted~~ are examples of plant configuration control weaknesses that have been ^{found} ~~identified~~ in a number of NRC inspections and Consolidated Edison assessments. NRC has emphasized the need for Consolidated Edison to continue performance improvement efforts in this area through letters

The Honorable Sue W. Kelly

2

such as the December 22, 2000, report of plant restart inspection activities that we previously provided to you.

We will continue our strong regulatory posture at Indian Point 2. As you know, we are ^{recently} ~~are~~ completing ^{ed} a significant supplemental team inspection at the facility, ~~we have scheduled~~ ^{and conducted} a public exit meeting on March 2 in the Cortlandt Town Hall ~~to~~ ^{at} present the results of this team inspection, ~~and will issue~~ ^{which you attended,} a final report by early April 2001. ~~at which we~~ ^{we plan to issue} _{inspection}

~~Thank you for informing me of your concern.~~ If you have any further questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Meserve