

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED
USNRC

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

'83 MAR 18 A10:30

Before Administrative Judges:
Helen F. Hoyt, Chairman
Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke
Dr. Jerry Harbour

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

SERVED MAR 18 1983

In the Matter of
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.
(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2)

}
Docket Nos. 50-443-0L
50-444-0L
(ASLBP No. 82-471-02-0L)
}
March 17, 1983

ORDER

(Addressing NECNP Motion To Compel Answers By Applicants
To NECNP Third Set of Interrogatories on
Contentions I.A.2., I.B.1., I.B.2. and I.C.)

By NECNP Motion To Compel Answers By Applicants To NECNP Third Set of Interrogatories on Contentions I.A.2., I.B.1., I.B.2., and I.C.,^{*} dated February 16, 1983, this intervenor seeks amended answers or answers to three interrogatories.

Interrogatory No. 7, which intervenor found non-responsive, asked the following:

What is the basis for classification of equipment as "safety related?"

a) Describe in detail the process by which Applicants determine whether a particular piece of equipment or system at the

* By letter dated March 4, 1983, NRC Staff confirmed to Counsel for NECNP that NECNP had agreed to withdraw seven of its admitted contentions. One of these contentions was I.C. (Environmental Qualification Emergency Feedwater Pump House HVAC). Copies of the letter were served on the Board and parties to this proceeding.

Seabrook plant is safety related.

b) Have Applicants employed any probabilistic risk assessments or other studies at Seabrook to determine what equipment or systems should be considered safety related? If so, please identify and describe them.

NECNP's Motion To Compel Answer To Interrogatory No. 7 is denied.

Applicant responded to question as asked. If Movant wished a more specific response, then a more specific question needed to be framed pointing Applicant toward those named categories of equipment or systems that Applicant had determined by a particular process to be safety related. After a threshold identification of the subject, then the process by which it had been determined to be safety related could be described.

Interrogatory No. 17. Intervenor seeks a yes or no answer to the following interrogatory:

In answer to Interrogatory 6 of NECNP Second Set of Interrogatories on Contentions I.A.2., I.B.1., I.B.2., and I.C., Applicants state that safety systems are qualified to a duration of one year. Do Applicants' surveillance and maintenance programs provide for yearly inspection and replacement of equipment?


a) If not, please identify the components for which a longer inspection interval is provided, and state the interval.

b) Identify all safety/Class 1E components for which no surveillance is provided after the first year of operation.

Applicant has indicated in its response of February 28, 1983 that it will respond to Interrogatory 17(a), the only part of the interrogatory to which a response is called for, "...as quickly as possible." Therefore, the Board will defer ruling on the motion as it pertains to this interrogatory.

Interrogatory No. 21 pertained to Contention I.C. - Emergency Feedwater Pumphouse, a Contention now withdrawn by NECNP.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND
AND LICENSING BOARD



Helen F. Hoyt, Chairman
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland
this 17th day of March, 1983.