UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
2100 RENAISSANCE BOULEVARD, SUITE 100
KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-2713

July 19, 2018

Mr. Gary Shaw
9 Van Cortlandt Place
Croton on Hudson, NY 10520

Dear Mr. Shaw:

I am writing in response to your letter regarding our June 21, 2018, Annual Assessment meeting for the Indian Point nuclear power plant. As Branch Chief, I am responsible for the day to day regulatory oversight of the Indian Point facility and the three NRC resident inspectors who work at the station full-time.

Regarding your questions about decommissioning and the public's involvement in that process, the NRC maintains regulatory authority and oversight of the licensee (currently, Entergy) both during operation and throughout decommissioning. Should Entergy pursue transferring the license to another company to perform decommissioning, that transfer would require NRC review and approval. Any new licensee, if approved, would be subject to the same NRC requirements and regulations as Entergy has been. Within 2 years after submitting the certification of permanent closure, the licensee must submit a post-shutdown decommissioning activities report (PSDAR) to the NRC. This report provides a description of the planned decommissioning activities, a schedule for accomplishing them, and an estimate of the expected costs. After receiving the report, the NRC will publish a notice of receipt in the Federal Register, make the report available for public review and comment, and hold a public meeting in the vicinity of the plant to discuss the licensee's intentions. As with all our processes, the NRC encourages the public to attend these meetings and provide input and insights into the process. The regulations regarding the PSDAR are found under Part 50.82 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*.

Regarding your question about spent fuel cooling, the spent fuel cooling system is a closed cooling system that transfers the heat generated by the spent fuel to a heat exchanger that is ultimately cooled by water from the Hudson River. This water is taken from the Hudson River and after it removes the heat it is returned directly to the Hudson River. The water drawn from and returned to the river will be much less when the operating units are shut down because the circulating water pumps that cool the main condenser during plant operation are no longer required.

Regarding your question about reactor pressure vessel O-rings and the boric acid leak found at Unit 2 this year, these two issues are separate events. While both components reside on the reactor pressure vessel, the causes of the leakage and the configuration of the components are not related.

Finally, regarding your question about the AIM pipeline near Indian Point, the NRC has performed an independent confirmatory analysis of a postulated pipeline rupture and concluded that it would not adversely impact the safe operations at Indian Point. Some analyses that the NRC bases its evaluation on are of a sensitive nature due to security concerns, and cannot be

released at this time. We recognize that your views on the adequacy of previous analyses and evaluations may differ from the views of the NRC; however, no new information has been provided to the NRC that would change our overall assessment of safety at Indian Point, nor require implementation of other NRC processes beyond those already convened.

Thank you for your questions regarding Indian Point. I hope this response addresses your concerns.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Daniel L. Schroeder, Chief
Projects Branch 2
Division of Reactor Projects

SUBJECT: Response Letter to Gary Shaw dated July 19, 2018

DISTRIBUTION: (via email)
DSchroeder, DRP
TSetzer, DRP
MHenrion, DRP

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DRP\BRANCH2\COMMUNICATIONS\2018\GARY SHAW AAM LETTER\SHAW RESPONSE LETTER 2018 AAMFINAL.DOCX
ADAMS Accession No. **ML18200A281**

☑ SUNSI Review		☑ Non-Sensitive ☐ Sensitive		☑ Publicly Available ☐ Non-Publicly Available	
OFFICE	RI/DRP	RI/DRP			
NAME	TSetzer	DSchroeder			
DATE	7/12/18	7/19/18			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY