

JUN 28 1972

50-286

Richard C. DeYoung, Assistant Director for Pressurized Water Reactors, L
MEETING WITH CONSOLIDATED EDISON ON INDIAN POINT, UNIT 3 REVIEW SCHEDULE

At the request of Consolidated Edison, a meeting was held on
Thursday, June 1, 1972 in Bethesda, to discuss the review schedule for
Indian Point Unit 3. Summary of the meeting and list of attendees are
enclosed.

Original signed by
J. A. Murphy

for

Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief
Pressurized Water Reactors
Branch No. 1
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:

- 1. Summary of Meeting
June 1, 1972
- 2. Attendance List

Distribution:

Docket (50-286) ✓

RP R/F

PWR-1 R/F

PWR-1 File

R. S. Boyd

R. C. DeYoung

D. Skovholt

D. Knuth

R. Maccary

R. Tedesco

H. Denton

PWR Branch Chiefs

R. W. Klecker

M. Rosen

RO (3)

C. Hale

N. Brown (2)

G. W. Knighton

D. Vassallo

811190981 720628
ADDCK 05000286

OFFICE ▶

PWR-1

SURNAME ▶

CJHale:cls

DATE ▶

6/27/72

Memo

ENCLOSURE 2

ATTENDANCE LIST - MEETING OF JUNE 1, 1972

CON ED

Robert H. Koppe
Morton S. Silberstein
George T. Cowherd, Jr.

LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE

Arvin E. Upton

EP

G. W. Knighton

LICENSING

R. C. DeYoung
D. B. Vassallo

ENCLOSURE 1

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT 3
DOCKET NO. 50-286

At the request of Consolidated Edison, a meeting was held on June 1, 1972 to discuss the review schedule for Indian Point Unit 3.

Mr. DeYoung briefed the applicant on the development and uses of the Regulatory Review Schedule program (blue book). He explained that the review schedule for an OL application is based on a realistic estimate of the fuel loading date. He further explained that we use the fuel loading date estimates made by the Directorate of Regulatory Operations, rather than that supplied by the applicant. Mr. DeYoung also explained that we would not consider issuing a license any earlier than 6 to 9 months prior to the estimated fuel loading date.

We stated that the review schedule for Indian Point Unit 3, as shown in the Progress Summary Report dated May 19, 1972, is consistent with the above cited considerations. We explained that this schedule has Management approval. The applicant stated that the 6 months from issuance of the staff Safety Evaluation to the projected fuel loading date is not sufficient time for completion of the anticipated contested public hearing. The applicant claimed that on the basis of its experience with the protracted length of the Indian Point Unit 2 public hearing, the review schedule should be changed to make allowances for an extended hearing.

We reminded the applicant that its performance in expediting the safety review was very poor. For example, the applicant has responded to less than 20% of our requests for additional information dated August 13 and November 10, 1971. The applicant also informed us that the response to the remaining questions will not be submitted until the end of July 1972 which is two months later than we had expected. We, therefore, informed the applicant that this may delay the review schedule.

George Knighton of Environmental Projects discussed the status of the environmental review. He stated that the applicant was informed by letter that its environmental report was inadequate and required submittal of additional information. Therefore, until the Environmental Report is updated, the environmental review has been placed in the "Hold" category.