

JAN 2 1974

Docket No. 50-286

R. C. DeYoung, Assistant Director for Light Water Reactors Group 1, L

INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 3; COMMENTS ON TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS;
DOCKET NO. 50-286

Plant Name: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 3
Docket Number: 50-286
Licensing Stage: Operating License
Responsible Branch and Project Manager: LWR-1-1, H. Specter
Requested Completion Date: December 21, 1973
Technical Review Branch Involved: Electrical, Instrumentation and
Control Systems Branch
Applicant's Response Date Necessary for Completion of Next Action
Planned on Project: NA
Description of Response: Comments on Technical Specifications
Review Status: Review of Technical Specifications is Completed

The LRS, Electrical, Instrumentation and Control Systems Branch has reviewed the proposed Indian Point Unit 3 Technical Specifications as amended through and including FSAR Supplement 24 dated November, 1973. Comments on the proposed technical specifications and recommendations for resolution of identified deficiencies are enclosed.

We consider that the transmittal of the enclosed comments and recommendations completes the EI&CS Branch review of the Indian Point Unit 3 technical specifications.

Victor Stello, Jr., Assistant Director
for Reactor Safety
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc: See next page

8111240021 740102
ADOCK 05000286

OFFICE ▶									
SURNAME ▶									
DATE ▶									

Handwritten signature

R. C. DeYoung

-2-

JAN 2 1974

cc w/o encl:
W. McDonald. L:OPS

cc w/encl:
S. Hansauer, DRTA
J. Hendrie, L:TR
A. Giambusso, L:RP
S. Varga, L:RP
D. Vassallo, L:LWR 1-1
H. Specter, L:LWR 1-1
T. Ippolito, L:EI&CS
F. Rosa, L:EI&CS
R. Pollard, L:EI&CS

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File
L Rdg
EI&CS Rdg
V. Stello
E. Leins

OFFICE ▶	L:EI&CS	L:EI&CS	L:EI&CS	L:RS		
SURNAME ▶	RDPollard:dh	FRosa	TAIppolito	VStello		
DATE ▶	12-27-73	12-27-73	12-27-73	12-27-73		

Comments on Indian Point Unit 3 Technical Specifications

Prepared by R. D. Pollard, L:EI&CS

1. Specification 1.14 (Page 1-6)

The maximum interval between surveillance performed during each refueling outage is specified to be 20 months. We conclude that the applicant has provided no justification based on the past performance of similar instrumentation for this 20 months. We recommend that the calibration of instruments be performed at least every 15 months (annually +25%) unless it can be demonstrated that a less conservative test frequency is adequate.

2. Specification 3.3.A.1.d

The subject of level and pressure instruments for the accumulators was discussed in the ACRS letter for IP-3. In the absence of any basis from the applicant for the proposed specification, we recommend the following:

Change 3.3.A.1.d to: "Two pressure and two level transmitters shall be operable per accumulator."

Add 3.3.A.2.h: "One level and one level transmitter per accumulator may be out of service for 7 days."

3. Specifications 3.3.E.1.b and 3.3.E.2.b (Page 3.3-10)

These two specifications are inconsistent and therefore could have ambiguous interpretations.

There are four auxiliary component cooling pumps, two per recirculation pump. Specification E.1.b requires that only two be operable, one per recirculation pump. In contrast, E.2.b could be interpreted to require that the plant be shut down, if after seven days, all four auxiliary component cooling pumps are not operable.

Either E.1.b should be revised to require all four pumps to be operable or E.2.b should be deleted.

4. Specification 4.6.B.4

The load test conducted at each refueling outage should be performed on "each" battery rather than "the" battery.

DEC 6 1973

Docket Nos. 50-448, 449
50-3, 247, 284

Roger S. Boyd, Assistant to the Deputy Director of Reactor Projects, L
THRU: Daniel R. Muller, Assistant Director for Environmental Projects, L

INTERVENOR ATTENDANCE IN STAFF/APPLICANT MEETINGS

Your note of November 21, 1973, requested corrections of the status of the cases listed in the enclosure. The following updates are provided:

1. Douglas Point 1 and 2 - The State of Maryland has also requested permission for three individuals from the Power Plant Siting Program to attend the site visit with the applicant as observers. In addition, the Department of Interior has also requested that three of their biologists attend the site visit as observers. Both requests have been granted.

At the first meeting, the State of Maryland attended as observers and they did not participate in any other way.

2. Indian Point 1, 2, and 3 - In this highly controversial case, there have been a number of meetings, starting in November 1971, where both the applicant, Con Ed, and the intervenor have been present, either as a participant or an observer. The meetings have been held at Headquarters, ORNL, and Indian Point and have resulted in a fair exchange of ideas and information among the parties. In 1973, the intervenors were present on July 20, during the meeting to discuss the applicant's comments on the Environmental Technical Specifications for Indian Point Units Nos. 1 and 2. A. Macbeth, Attorney for Hudson River Fisherman's Association and Natural Resources Defense Council, only offered relatively minor remarks since he has made it abundantly clear in the hearing that the ecological studies sponsored by the applicant are no substitute for the alternative closed cycle cooling system.

On July 25 - 26, and November 7 -8, 1973, meetings on various aspects of ecological information presented in the Texas Instruments Annual Report (April 1973) and the 1973 Cornwall ichthyoplankton survey, sponsored by the applicant,

Environ

were held at ORNL and at Indian Point, respectively. John Clark of HRFA participated in the November 7 -8 meeting by presenting his interpretation of the TI data. New York State was represented by individuals from both the Atomic Energy Council under Governor Rockefeller and from the Attorney General's Office at these meetings. There did not appear to be any restriction of expression of ideas on the subject material nor any obstruction of conducting the meetings. In all meetings, the attorneys of each party have been present.

Original signed by
R. S. Cleveland

for
George W. Knighton, Chief
Environmental Projects Branch No. 1
Directorate of Licensing

Distribution:
Docket File(Environ)(5)
EP-1 Reading
RP Reading
AGiambusso, L:DD
DRMuller, L:EP
GWKnighton, L:EP-1
HThompson, L:EP-1
MJOestmann, L:EP-1

For concurrence see previous yellow: *ZSC for*

OFFICE →			<i>for</i> G. W. Knighton		
SURNAME →			12/5/73		
DATE →			EP-1,L		

Roger S. Boyd

0-03 .01 12/06/73

were held at ORNL and at Indian Point, respectively. John Clark of HRFA participated in the November 7 - 8 meeting by presenting his interpretation of the TI data. The New York State which is represented by the Atomic Energy Council under Governor Rockefeller and the Attorney General's Office had representatives at these meetings. There did not appear to be any restriction of expression of ideas on the subject material nor any obstruction of conducting the meetings. In all meetings, the attorneys of each party have been present.

George W. Knighton, Chief
 Environmental Projects Branch No. 1
 Directorate of Licensing

Distribution:
 Docket File (Environ)
 Ep-1 Reading
 RP Rading
 AGiambusso, L:DD
 DRMuller, L:EP
 GWKnighton, L:EP-1
 HThompson, L:EP-1
 MJOestmann, L:EP-1

OFFICE	EP-1:L	EP-1:L	EP-1:L		
SURNAME	HLThompson:mh	MJOestmann	GWKnighton		
DATE	12/16/73	12/16/73	12/ /73		