

POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

10 COLUMBUS CIRCLE NEW YORK, N. Y. 10019

(212) 397-6200

TRUSTEES

JOHN S. DYSON
CHAIRMAN

GEORGE L. INGALLS
VICE CHAIRMAN

RICHARD M. FLYNN

ROBERT I. MILLONZI

FREDERICK R. CLARK



August 4, 1980
IPN-80-74

GEORGE T. BERRY
PRESIDENT & CHIEF
OPERATING OFFICER

JOHN W. BOSTON
EXECUTIVE VICE
PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR
OF POWER OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. SCHMIEDER
EXECUTIVE VICE
PRESIDENT & CHIEF
ENGINEER

LEROY W. SINCLAIR
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
& CHIEF FINANCIAL
OFFICER

THOMAS R. FREY
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
& GENERAL COUNSEL

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 1
Division of Operating Reactors

Subject: Indian Point 3 Plant
Docket No. 50-286
Schedule for Completion of ATWS Modification

1980 AUG 7 AM 11 01
RECEIVED DISTRIBUTION
SERVICES UNIT
US NRC
REGISTRATION SERVICES
BRANCH

Dear Sir:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to your June 30, 1980 letter to Mr. George T. Berry regarding the ATWS implementation schedule that the Authority submitted in response to Item C.4 of Appendix A of the Confirmatory Order dated February 11, 1980. In your June 30, 1980 letter you have stated that the schedule for Indian Point 3 should be reevaluated because of the risk you believe the Indian Point Plants represent, relative to other plants. We believe this perception to be unfounded and contrary to the best available analyses of risk to date for the Indian Point Plants. We request clarification from you on the matter of Indian Point risk, inasmuch as you are evidently of the view that risk should affect our timetable for compliance.

In a May 23, 1980 letter from William J. Cahill (Con Edison) and Paul J. Early (Authority) to Harold R. Denton, we submitted a Westinghouse/Offshore Power Systems Report (35A96, May 1980) entitled "An Evaluation of the Residual Risk from the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plants". The principal conclusion of this report is that the level of risk associated with the Indian Point Plants is significantly less than the level of risk which has found implicit acceptance in prior NRC licensing actions; that is, the level of risk reported in WASH-1400 for a typical PWR located at an average or "composite" site. This is to be expected because of the special design features installed at the Indian Point Plants as a result of the original licensing review of these plants.

A029
3
1/0

8008080 272


P

After receiving your June 30, 1980 letter, the Authority has nevertheless reviewed in detail the schedule for installation of AMSAC for Indian Point 3 with a view towards improving the scheduled date of fall 1982. The conclusion arrived at from this reanalysis does not result in an improvement of this schedule due to the need to complete engineering in a timely fashion and the long lead time associated with procuring the necessary materials.

Based on the foregoing, and until you can more fully clarify your position, the Authority considers that installation of AMSAC during the cycle 4/5 refueling outage (approximately late 1982) is reasonable.

Should you or your staff have any questions, please contact us.

Very truly yours,


J. R. Bayne
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Generation

cc: Mr. T. Rebelowski
Resident Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 38
Buchanan, New York 10511

Mr. R. Remshaw
Consolidated Edison
4 Irving Place
New York, New York 10003