

MORRIS K. UDALL, ARIZONA, CHAIRMAN

GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
 PHILIP R. SHARP, INDIANA
 EDWARD J. MARKEY, MASSACHUSETTS
 AUSTIN J. MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA
 NICK JOE RAHALL, WEST VIRGINIA
 BRUCE F. VENTO, MINNESOTA
 PAT WILLIAMS, MONTANA
 BEVERLY S. BYRNE, MARYLAND
 RON W. LUGG, VIRGIN ISLANDS
 SAM GLIDENSON, CONNECTICUT
 PETER H. KOSTMAYER, PENNSYLVANIA
 RICHARD H. LEHMAN, CALIFORNIA
 BILL FRIEDLANDER, NEW MEXICO
 GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN, GEORGIA
 PETER J. VISCLOSKEY, INDIANA
 JAIME S. RUISTER, PUERTO RICO
 MEL LEVINE, CALIFORNIA
 JAMES MCCLURE CLARKE, NORTH CAROLINA
 WAYNE OWENS, UTAH
 JOHN LEWIS, GEORGIA
 BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, COLORADO
 PETER A. DIAZIO, OREGON
 ENI F. K. FALEOMAVAEGA, AMERICAN SAMOA
 JAMES A. BUDENBOTT, WASHINGTON
 TIM JOHNSON, SOUTH DAKOTA

DON YOUNG, ALASKA
 ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, CALIFORNIA
 RON MARLENE, MONTANA
 LARRY CRAIG, IDAHO
 DENNY SMITH, OREGON
 JAMES V. HANSEN, UTAH
 BARBARA F. YUDANOVICH, NEVADA
 BEN BLAZ, GUAM
 JOHN J. RHODES II, ARIZONA
 ELTON GALLEGLY, CALIFORNIA
 STAN PARRIS, VIRGINIA
 ROBERT F. SMITH, OREGON
 JIM LIGHTFOOT, IOWA
 CRAIG THOMAS, WYOMING
 JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., TENNESSEE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

STANLEY SCOVILLE
STAFF DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL

ROY JONES
ASSOCIATE STAFF DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL

LEE MCELVAIN
GENERAL COUNSEL

RICHARD AGNEW
CHIEF MINORITY COUNSEL

April 2, 1990

The Honorable Kenneth M. Carr, Chairman
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Chairman:

While I appreciate your prompt attention to my original information requests, I find it necessary to write again seeking details about the NRC's handling of reports prepared by the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) regarding the Seabrook plant.

Your March 30, 1990 letter, written in response to my letters of March 13 and March 16, does not include several pieces of information which I think are critical to the investigation being conducted by the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations.

First, your letter states that NRC staff reviewed INPO documents discussed at the March 14 hearing prior to issuance of the Seabrook full power Operating License on March 15. Your letter indicates that, in less than a day, the NRC was able to review all the relevant INPO documents and conclude that they contained no information that would affect the issuance of the OL. Given the complicated nature of the analysis in the INPO reports, I have no choice but to question the thoroughness of your review. Moreover, your letter contains no information regarding the details of the analysis completed by your staff which might put my mind at ease regarding this matter.

Second, your March 30 letter indicates that NRC staff had reviewed INPO reports based on evaluations conducted in 1983 and 1984. This was a critical time in the Seabrook history and I believe it important that we know the specifics of these evaluations. Unfortunately, your letter did not include a detailed summary of the NRC staff reviews of these earlier INPO documents.

Third, your March 30 letter indicates that as part of the total inspection effort at Seabrook, "the senior resident inspector reviewed some, but not all, of the INPO evaluation reports." The enclosure to your March 30 letter indicates that prior to our March 14 hearing, NRC staff had reviewed only two INPO reports, one in

900525072 LA

1983 and one "Before 1985." It was, it appears, review of these two INPO reports that led NRC staff to conclude that there was reasonable assurance that more recent INPO findings "did not reveal unreported violations of NRC requirements." However, you failed to include in your letter any detail of the NRC's assessment of the 1983 and 1984 INPO evaluations.

Please provide the following:

- I. An enumeration of total staff-hours expended on March 15, 1990 upon the review of INPO reports.
- II. A listing of NRC inspection findings which correlate with the INPO findings contained in the reports reviewed on March 15.
- III. Documents describing the nature and conclusions of the NRC staff review of Items A-1 through A-6 of the enclosure to your March 30 letter.
- IV. The INPO Evaluation of Construction and Design Controls, 11/17-28/83 and the INPO Evaluation of Construction, Design Controls, & Testing, 12/3-14/84, Items A-1 and A-2, respectively in the enclosure to your March 30 letter.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Peter Kostmayer

Peter Kostmayer