

Indian Point 3  
Nuclear Power Plant  
P.O. Box 215  
Buchanan, New York 10511  
914 739.8200



William A. Josiger  
Resident Manager

January 12, 1986  
IP-JAS-003B  
IP-WAJ-008Z

Docket No. 50-286  
License No. DPR-64

Mr. Samuel J. Collins, Chief  
Projects Branch No. 2  
Division of Project and Resident Programs  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region I  
631 Park Avenue  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

SUBJECT: INSPECTION NO. 50-286/85-24

Dear Mr. Collins:

This letter provides the Authority's response to your Inspection Report No. 50-286/85-24 dated December 13, 1985 and received at this office December 19, 1985.

Attachment I to this letter addresses the concerns cited in Appendix A, Notice of Violation, of the Inspection Report.

Should you or your staff have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Mr. W. D. Hamlin of my staff.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'W. A. Josiger', written over a horizontal line.

W. A. Josiger  
Resident Manager  
Indian Point Unit 3  
Nuclear Power Plant

WAJ:jmd

Attachment

cc: IP3 Resident Inspector's Office

8601240022 860112  
PDR ADOCK 05000286  
Q PDR

1E 01

## ATTACHMENT I

### VIOLATION

10 CFR 50.59(b) requires the licensee to maintain records of changes in the facility as described in the safety analysis report and that these records shall include a written safety evaluation which provides the bases for the determination that the change does not involve an unreviewed safety question.

Contrary to the above, as indicated in the following examples, two movable hoists were erected, and a seismic support was removed in seismic category structures in the vicinity of safety-related equipment required to be operable. These actions constitute changes to the structure as described in the safety analysis report without the benefit of written safety evaluations.

- a) On November 6, a movable hoist on wheels was located over the No. 32 containment spray pump, exposing the pump and its associated equipment.
- b) On November 6, a movable hoist on wheels was located near component cooling water system valves 759C and 759D.
- c) On November 14, a seismic support for the cable tunnel fire protection water line, located adjacent to safety-related cable trays was removed.

### RESPONSE

The contributing factor to all three was the failure to adhere to and follow existing plant procedures. AP-22, Conduct of Maintenance, outlines the responsibility of maintenance personnel and the maintenance supervisors before, during, and after the completion of work; including the following of approved work procedures (example c) and the return of all tools (example a and b) at the completion of work.

The details of these incidents have been reviewed with the Maintenance Department via a department memorandum from the Maintenance Superintendent. The responsibilities and requirements of all maintenance personnel were stressed in this memorandum.