

POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
INDIAN POINT NO. 3 NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

P. O. BOX 215 BUCHANAN, N. Y. 10511

TELEPHONE: 914-739-8200



January 23, 1981
IP-DQ-11676

Boyce H. Grier, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19405

Dear Mr. Grier:

We were informed by Mr. Todd Jackson of Region I that our response to Item E of Inspection 50-286/80-11 was not sufficient. Item E pertained to Power Authority approval of temporary changes to non-radiological environmental monitoring procedures. This letter provides the details of the steps being taken to prevent a recurrence of this item.

In our letter to Region I dated December 19, 1980, the mechanism for Plant Operating Review Committee (PORC) review of non-radiological environmental monitoring procedures was described. Since, under this system, the procedures receive approval by Con Edison prior to implementation, it was felt that these procedure changes were permanent, not temporary. As such, these permanent changes need PORC review under Section 5.3.2.e of the Environmental Technical Specification Requirements (ETSR), but not under any regulatory time constraints. Based on subsequent conversations between my staff and Region I inspectors (Mr. Todd Jackson and Dr. Robert Borres) it has been made clear that the NRC position is that these procedure changes are considered temporary.

Effective February 2, 1981, the Power Authority will review any non-radiological environmental monitoring procedure changes before they are approved by Con Edison. The mechanism for this is that the Con Edison Manager of Indian Point Biological Studies will forward all proposed procedure changes to the Power Authority's Aquatic Biologist who will forward these procedures to the PORC for approval. The PORC approved proposed procedure will then be sent to Con Edison for further approvals and implementation. We are confident that the actions taken are sufficient to prevent a recurrence of this item of non-compliance.

8103110 528

In our response to item B in Inspection 50-286/80-11, the sample location "New York City Aqueduct" was given as Station No. 56. In fact, Station No. 56 should be Verplanck TLD, and Station No. 26 should be New York City Aqueduct. Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this response.

Very truly yours,



S.S. Zulla
Resident Manager

DQ/pw

cc: Director of Nuclear Regulation (2 copies)
Office of Management Information and Program Control
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

T. Rebelowski, Resident Inspector