General Offices . Selden Street, Berlin, Connecticut

(203) 666-6911

P.O. BOX 270 HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06101



June 26, 1981

Docket Nos. 50-213 50-245 50-336 A01758



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

- References: (1) D. M. Crutchfield letter to W. G. Counsil, dated May 29, 1981. (Docket No. 50-213)
  - (2) D. M. Crutchfield letter to W. G. Counsil, dated June 10, 1981. (Docket No. 50-245)
  - (3) R. A. Clark letter to W. G. Counsil, dated May 27, 1981. (Docket No. 50-33b)
  - (4) D. G. Eisenhut letter to All Applicants for Operating Licenses and Construction Permits, Power Reactor Licensees, Architects/Engineers and Reactor Vendors, dated June 3, 1981.
  - (5) W. G. Counsil letter to Dr. J. Hendrie, dated June 4, 1981.

Gentlemen:

Haddam Neck Plant Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 Environmental Qualification

By References (1), (2), and (3), the Safety Evaluation Reports (SERs), in conjunction with the Technical Evaluation Reports (TERs) on Environmental Qualification vere issued to Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO) and Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) for the Haddam Neck Plant, Millstone Unit No. 1, and Millstone Unit No. 2 respectively By Reference (4), the Staff advised that an industry-wide meeting regarding Environmental Qualification will be held from the period of July 7 through July 10, 1981 in Bethesda, Maryland. Reference (4) states that the NRC Staff will discuss the content of SERs and that the primary purpose of the meeting is to further the licensees understanding of NRC requirements. It is also indicated that the meeting will serve as a mechanism to address industry concerns and questions on the subject.

Please be advised that CYAPCO and NNECO will be represented at this meeting, and are currently in the midst of reviewing References (1) through (3) and preparing questions for the Staff in the interest of optimizing the results of this meeting. However, based upon our experience on this issue to date and a preliminary review of References (1) through (3), it is our current perception that the subject meeting will not eliminate the need for docket-specific meetings to explain the information reported in the SERs and TERs. While certain issues, such as those enumerated in Reference (5), are of common concern, there exist numerous, plant-specific issues which will require a dialogue with the Staff and or its consultants to resolve in a timely fashion. While we are hopeful that certain issues will be resolved as a result of this meeting, we are taking this opportunity to docket our position that the subject meeting cannot serve as a substitute for plant-specific meetings.

CYAPCO and NNECO intend to propose dates for licensee-specific meetings with the Staff subsequent to the industry-wide meeting and following additional reliew of the content of References (1) through (3).

Very truly yours,

CONNECTICUT YANKEE ATOMIC POWER COMPANY NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

W. G. Counsil

Senior Vice President