

Docket

JUN 19 1972

Docket No. 50-286 1 ✓

Consolidated Edison Company  
of New York, Inc.  
ATTN: Mr. William J. Cahill, Jr.  
Vice President  
4 Irving Place  
New York, New York 10003

Gentlemen:

In recent communications with personnel in your organization, including a June 1 meeting in our Bethesda offices, we informed you of our decision to delay the review of the Indian Point Unit No. 3 (IP-3) application for an operating license by four months. The following summarizes the basis for this decision.

The safety analysis and application for an operating license for IP-3 were submitted to the AEC on December 4, 1970. Normally, our operating license review schedules are established such that ACRS consideration precedes fuel loading by 6-9 months. To establish a feasible review schedule we sought a realistic estimate for fuel loading. We were assured that the plant would be ready to load fuel in late 1972. We questioned this estimate as being overly optimistic, but your representatives insisted that it was realistic. The present estimate for fuel loading is late 1973.

In our initial meeting with you on February 4, 1971, we expressed our concern about initiating a license review prematurely. Our main concern, as discussed with you at that time, was that based on our experience we had found it to be extremely inefficient to initiate our review long before the plant is to be completed. First, the applicant is often unable to provide final design details and construction-related information needed for our evaluation. Secondly, there is no real urgency on the applicants' part to respond promptly to our requests for additional information since the plant is so far from completion. If these factors were experienced in the IP-3 review, we advised you that we would in effect be misusing a senior project leader at a time when the industry was complaining about delays in the licensing process. We

*RW*

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

8111110097 720619  
PDR ADOCK 05000286  
A PDR

were assured by you and your prime contractor (Westinghouse) that this would not be the case in this instance. With this assurance, we initiated a review that would have resulted in an ACRS meeting in March 1972 based primarily on your timely response to requests for additional information proposed to be sent to you in July and November 1971. These requests were actually sent to you on August 13 and November 10, 1971. To date, we have responses to approximately 20% of the August 13, 1971 requests and none from the November 1971 list. Without becoming embroiled in the causes or reasons for the delays, in our opinion one fact is clear, the luxury of an excess of time before fuel loading has contributed to the listlessness of IP-3 personnel in responding to our inquiries.

Our present review schedule was discussed with your representatives on June 1, 1972. It is based on receipt of responses to all outstanding requests for additional information by August 1, 1972; one more set of requests to be issued to you in November 1972; receipt of your responses to these by January 1973; and consideration of your application by the ACRS in May 1973. If the dates for your responses cannot be met, or the responses are incomplete, inadequate, or otherwise unacceptable, it is quite likely that the schedule for completing the review will have to be extended, or possibly a complete reassignment and rescheduling of the project will need to be made.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please contact me.

Sincerely,

A. Giambusso, Deputy Director  
for Reactor Projects  
Directorate of Licensing

cc: LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae  
Arvin E. Upton, Esq.  
1821 Jefferson Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Distribution:  
Docket File (50-286)  
RP Reading  
PWR-1 File  
R. C. DeYoung  
C. Hale  
PWR Branch Chiefs  
R. W. Klecker

bcc: L. Manning Muntzing  
J. F. O'Leary  
W. McDonald

OFFICE ▶	L:PWR-1	L:PWR-1	L:AD/PWR's	L:DDIR:RP		
SURNAME ▶	CHale:eg	DVassallo	RCDYoung	AGiambusso		
DATE ▶	6/16/72	6/16/72	6/16/72	6/ /72		