



UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

February 24, 1971

R. C. DeYoung, Assistant Director for Pressurized Water Reactors, DRL
THRU: D. R. Muller, Chief, PWR Projects Branch #1, DRL

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

A meeting was held with Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., and its principal contractors, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, and United Engineers and Constructors, to discuss their projected construction schedule in context with our proposed review schedule. We also indicated to the applicant areas in which the FSAR is deficient in information, initial staff concerns which are potential problem areas, and items of a generic nature which may require considerable effort to resolve. The following is a summary of the more salient points of the meeting. An attendance list is attached.

1. INDIAN POINT 3 CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

There does not appear to be general agreement as to the proposed date for fuel loading or the present status of construction. In a recent telephone conversation with Con Ed, the projected date for fuel loading was stated to be September 1973. In a subsequent telephone conversation between D. Muller (DRL) and L. Trosten (LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae) legal counsel for the applicant, this date was stated to be June 1973. However, during this initial meeting, the applicant stated that the date is to be December 1972; but Westinghouse contended that fuel loading would be in September 1972 with full power commercial operation planned for April 1973. Prior to this meeting Con Ed stated by telephone that the plant was approximately 20% constructed; whereas, Westinghouse stated construction was 50% complete.

We questioned the applicant as to the reason for submittal of the application which potentially is far in advance of the proposed fuel loading date. It is our concern that the design of the plant may not be sufficiently finalized to warrant a review at this time. The applicant stated that the design of the plant is at the stage where only minor changes would be expected to be made and that 85% of the hardware for the plant has been delivered to the site.

Mr. DeYoung cited several disadvantages of initiating our review at this time if fuel loading is not anticipated until September 1973. Among these is the fact that the site of Unit 3 is nearly identical to that for Unit 2, and Unit 3 is very similar to Unit 2 which has recently been reviewed by the ACRS. Thus we would expect the review for Unit 3 to require somewhat

811200090 710224
ADOCK 05000286

Memo

less than the usual review time. This would result in a considerable length of time during which the plant would be licensed for operation but waiting for construction to be completed. The applicant stated that in view of recent history, it is not unreasonable to anticipate a public hearing for Unit 3. In this event, the intervening time period might well be used for completion of the plant while the hearing is in progress. Mr. DeYoung advised the applicant that we would consider the plant for immediate review unless they are notified otherwise in the near future.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

At the present time, Con Ed is evaluating the agency comments on the Indian Point 2 environmental report, and plans to incorporate these comments into the Indian Point 3 report which will be submitted to the AEC in March.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE

We briefly discussed with the applicant the QA site-receiving procedures WEDCO is employing for equipment as it arrives on site. It was stated that no equipment vital to plant safety is released for installation unless a quality control release has been executed and signed. This applies to all vendors of vital plant equipment including Westinghouse.

4. REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL INCIDENT

We asked the applicant to discuss the incident which involved a lowering of the reactor pressure vessel at an "accelerated rate" with resultant damage to the pressure vessel shipping cradle and to the steel plates from which the vessel was raised. The applicant stated that three consultants from the ORNL Heavy Steel Section group have been engaged to determine the nature of the impact loads experienced by the vessel, and the resultant effects. Combustion Engineering is also planning to perform stress analyses of the impact areas and will propose other tests and inspection procedures of the vessel in concert with Westinghouse and the ORNL consultants. We asked the applicant that we be kept informed of the results of the investigations.

5. ELECTRICAL DESIGN

The applicant expressed an interest in meeting with D. Sullivan, (DRS) later this month to discuss several problems it is having in the design of the electrical systems for the plant, in particular, the design of sequence switching for the emergency diesel generator system. A tentative date of February 25, was set for this meeting.

6. ACCIDENT DOSES

The applicant requested a numerical value for the dose we would accept for the refueling accident. We advised them that since the probability of a fuel handling accident is higher than the probability of the DBA, the resultant doses should be considerably lower than Part 100 limits. Therefore doses on the order of Part 20 values should be used when reasonably attainable with appropriate engineering design. The applicant stated that in order to design a system with as many variables as the refueling building air cleanup system, it is necessary to have a value of the limiting dose. We could not provide any further guidance.

The applicant also stated that at the present time their calculations indicate that the LOCA doses exceed Part 100 values because of changes in our current calculational methods. They stated that more credit is needed for iodine removal by charcoal filters inside containment than was given in the Unit 2 evaluation. We will determine what credit can be given for these filters and relay this information to them as soon as possible.

7. REVIEW TOPICS

We informed the applicant of several areas where our review will be concentrated. We requested the applicant to review certain items in the near future, since these items may require substantial effort to resolve. A formal request for this information will be transmitted to them in the near future. The following information will be requested:

- (a). Provide a statistical analysis of turbine missiles occurring at design and overspeed conditions, and the probability of such missiles disabling those systems whose failure could lead to a potentially hazardous condition to the offsite population (e.g., Service Water System, main steam and feedwater systems, cable penetration area, and fuel pool).

- (b) Provide a summary description of the tornado protection (including missiles) afforded those systems and structures whose failures would be potentially hazardous to the general public. (e.g., Service Water System, main steam and feedwater systems, cable penetration area, and fuel pool).
- (c) Provide the analyses and results relative to common failure modes which could negate scram action and review the potential for and consequences of anticipated transients without scram.
- (d) Provide a description of the fuel handling building ventilation system, which includes provisions to control building leakage and for charcoal filtration.
- (e) Describe the QA and preoperational testing "field-run" ECCS piping and justify the necessity of this type installation.

The following items were identified as areas where additional information and further discussion would be required as our review progresses.

- (a) Processing steam generator blowdown.
- (b) Permanent incore instrumentation.
- (c) Design provisions for pipe whip.
- (d) Pressure vessel cavity design.
- (e) Effect of Class II and Class III failures on Class I (seismic) systems and structures.
- (f) Unit 3 operating staff.
- (g) RHR hot leg isolation valve.
- (h) Accumulator motor-operated valves.

R. S. Lee

R. S. Lee, Reactor Engineer
PWR Projects Branch #1
Division of Reactor Licensing

R. C. DeYoung

- 5 -

ATTENDANCE LIST

CON ED

J. Grob, Jr.
R. Koppe
R. Remshaw
J. Prestele
A. Flynn

W-PWR

A. Hauge
R. Wiesemann
T. Puryear

AEC/DRL

R. DeYoung
D. Muller
R. Lee
C. Hale
A. Kenneke

LLL&M

L. Trosten

UE&C

D. Rhoads

Distribution:

Docket File

DRL Reading

PWR-1 Reading

P. A. Morris

F. Schroeder

T. R. Wilson

R. C. DeYoung

R. S. Boyd

D. Skovholt

E. G. Case, DRS

R. R. Maccary

Compliance (4)

Branch Chiefs, DRL/DRS

N. M. Brown

R. W. Klecker