

John D. O'Toole  
Vice President

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place, New York, NY 10003  
Telephone (212) 460-2533

November 18, 1983

Re: Indian Point Unit No. 2  
Docket No. 50-247

Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
Division of Licensing  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Eisenhut:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of a delay we have encountered in implementing the Safety Assessment System/Safety Parameter Display System (SAS/SPDS) at Indian Point Unit No. 2 (IP-2). Our implementation plan is presented in our response to Supplement 1 to NUREG-0737 submitted on April 15, 1983. In the plan as submitted, we committed to provide an operable SPDS with operators trained by June, 1986. This schedule was based on contractor's promised delivery of hardware and software, the amount of work involved, the availability of management and engineering resources and a reasonable integration of all of the Supplement 1 initiatives.

We have been informed by our contractor that there will be a minimum 6 month schedule delay for delivery of the system software package and certain hardware. Our contractor attributed the major causes of their delay to be (a) software development, (b) manpower shortage and (c) hardware/software merge constraints. We understand that several other licensees who also selected this contractor are experiencing similar delays. This delay now places SAS/SPDS delivery outside of the 1984 refueling outage window. We had planned to perform any work requiring the Unit to be in a shutdown condition during the 1984 outage; the remaining SAS/SPDS installation work was to proceed after the outage. Thus, this delay results in a substantial impact on our implementation plan as described in our April 15, 1983 submittal and could translate into a program completion delay of one year or more.

As a result of this contractor's indicated delay in delivery, we have undertaken many actions in order to re-assess our program for implementing SAS/SPDS. These include (a) establishing an audit team consisting of in-house personnel and a project management consulting company specializing in computers, (b) independently confirming the schedule delay and reasons, (c) establishing with our contractor meaningful detailed milestones and closely monitoring their future performance and progress based on these milestones, (d) reviewing program sequencing and management to minimize delays including delivery of hardware, which requires an outage to install, in time for the 1984 outage, and (e) re-evaluating the ability of our contractor to complete the SAS/SPDS. We expect these actions to be completed by December 31,

8311230078 831118  
PDR ADCK 05000247  
F PDR

A003  
10

1983 at which time the project team will make their report to management. At present we expect to develop a course of action from among the options available to us during January, 1984. We will then be in a position to establish a new firm schedule, now envisioned by the end of February, 1984. At that time we will submit a revised plan and schedule to implement the SAS/SPDS at IP-2. We regret that conditions beyond our control have delayed this program, but assure you that all reasonable alternatives will be examined to minimize the adverse impact on the overall program.

If you or your staff have any questions on this matter, please do not hesitate to call us.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John D. O'Toole", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John D. O'Toole  
Vice President

cc: Mr. T. Foley, Senior Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 38  
Buchanan, New York 10511