

7/10/73

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
)
Consolidated Edison Company)
of New York, Inc.)
)
(Indian Point Station, Unit 2))

Docket No. 50-247

APPLICANT'S SPECIAL PRESENTATION
ON QUALITY ASSURANCE MATTERS

1. The evidence demonstrates that the Applicant has considered quality assurance of paramount importance for the design, construction and operation of Indian Point 2.^{1/} The quality assurance program and organization for Indian Point 1 has been expanded to provide for the administrative and technological needs of Indian Point 2. The safe operation of Indian Point 1 for more than eight years proves the effectiveness of this quality assurance program.^{2/}

2. The Staff and the Applicant have introduced evidence which demonstrates that a comprehensive quality assurance

^{1/} Testimony of John J. Grob, Jr., pp. 1-2 (follows Tr. 382);
Testimony of John T. Stieffel, p. 2 (follows Tr. 382).

^{2/} Applicant's Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in the Form of a Proposed Initial Decision with Respect to Motion for 50 Percent Testing License, Part I, Jan. 28, 1972 ("Applicant's Proposed Findings"), Finding No. 12 and references cited therein.

program, including design, procurement, fabrication, installation and construction, has been carried out at Indian Point 2 in order to verify that the facility has been constructed in compliance with applicable requirements.^{3/} In response to specific radiological matters the Staff and the Applicant have shown that an adequate quality assurance program has been designed and implemented for Indian Point 2.^{4/}

3/

Testimony of Alex C. Husband, pp. 1-2 (follows Tr. 382); Testimony of John J. Grob, pp. 1-5 (follows Tr. 382); Testimony of John T. Stieffel, pp. 2, 5-13 (follows Tr. 382); Safety Evaluation by the Division of Reactor Licensing, Nov. 16, 1970 ("SSE"), pp. 64-67, 79-80 (follows Tr. 405); Supplement No. 1 to AEC Regulatory Staff Safety Evaluation, Nov. 20, 1970 ("SSE, Supp. 1") (follows Tr. 405); Final Facility Description and Safety Analysis Report ("FSAR"), FSAR Section 4.1.2, 4.3.1, 4.5.1, 5.1.1.1, 5.1.2.6, 6.2.1, 6.2.5, 6.3.1, 6.3.5, 6.4.1, 6.4.5, 6.5.5, 12.1 through 12.5, Table 4.5-1 and 4.5-2, App. B, Questions 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.2.1, 4.5, 4.5.4, 4.11, 12.2, 12.3, 12.3.1 through 12.3.5, 12.4.

4/

E.g., Reactor Vessel Integrity: Tr. 2032-2059, 3934-99, 7431-37; Additional Testimony of Applicant Concerning Reactor Vessel Integrity, Sept. 17, 1971 (follows Tr. 1935). PAB Fire Restoration: Tr. 3811-33, 4174-4211, 4482-4518, 4844-50; Restoration Plan for Primary Auxiliary Building and Equipment, Dec. 6, 1971 (follows Tr. 4169); Applicant's Proposed Findings of Fact, Finding No. 22. Valve Wall Thickness Verification: Tr. 10061-076, 10156-322, 10569-606, 10611-686, 10981-994. Allegations Concerning Primary System Supports: Tr. 4794-4830, 4834-36, 4932-45, 4954-55, 4988-90, 5060-5114, 5119-68, 5188-5284, 5300-06, 5316-5417, 5509-76, 5578-5633, 5639-5658; Summary Investigation into Allegations of Safety, Prepared by Directorate of Regulatory Operations Region I, U.S. Atomic

3. Applicant's quality assurance program further provides for a thorough, systematic, controlled, testing program prior to full power operation to confirm, among other things, that the equipment and systems at Indian Point 2 are capable of performing their intended functions.^{5/}

4. Applicant's quality assurance procedures will continue throughout plant operation. The technical specifications for Indian Point 2 set forth not only the particular operating parameters but also specific monitoring and testing procedures for the safe operation of the plant.^{6/} In addition,

4/

Cont. Energy Commission, May 8, 1972 (follows Tr. 5112); Applicant's Testimony Concerning Allegations of H. K. Brill, Pennsylvania Engineering Corporation (Pecor Division), May 17, 1972 (follows Tr. 5098); Evaluation of Modifications to Steam Generator Support Shoes and Reactor Vessel Support Ring at Indian Point Generating Station, Unit No. 2, May 4, 1972 (follows Tr. 5317).

5/

Testimony of Alex C. Husband, pp. 3-4 (follows Tr. 382); Testimony of John T. Stieffel, pp. 12-13 (follows Tr. 382); Summary of Application, pp. 68-79; Applicant's Proposed Finding No. 10 and references cited therein.

6/

Summary of Application, Applicant's Exh. No. 1C (introduced into evidence Tr. 377), pp. 57-59 and references contained therein; SSE, p. 70 (follows Tr. 405).

extensive review, audit, surveillance and recording procedures assure that each aspect of Indian Point 2 operations will be conducted in accordance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.^{7/}

5. The evidence in this proceeding on the quality assurance program for Indian Point 2 contributes to the reasonable assurance that Indian Point 2 will be operated without endangering the health and safety of the public and in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE
1821 Jefferson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Attorneys for Consolidated Edison
Company of New York, Inc.

By Edward L. Cohen
Edward L. Cohen

Dated: July 10, 1973

^{7/} SSE, pp. 64-67, (follows Tr. 405); FSAR, Sections 12.3 through 12.5, Questions 12.2 through 12.4; Summary of Application, pp. 8-10, 39-42, 57-59, 62-64; Technical Specifications, Sections 4 and 6.