

Distribution:
 Stello
 Denton
 DeYoung
 GCunningham
~~LUnderwood~~
 EDO 12947
 SECY-83-1618
 WJDircks
 JAllan
 RStarostecki
 PDR
 LPDR
 Dkt. No. 52-93
 Central File

Central file

APR 11 1983

50-293

The Honorable Peter Forman
 Massachusetts House of Representatives
 55 Warren Avenue
 Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360

Dear Mr. Forman:

Thank you for your letter of March 23, 1983 addressed to Chairman Palladino. I am pleased to respond to your request for additional information regarding safety concerns at the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station expressed by local residents. Apparently these questions resulted from the public meeting held by the local Board of Selectmen on November 16, 1982.

At the request of the Board of Selectmen of Plymouth, the NRC Region I Administrator, Ronald C. Haynes, and members of his staff participated in a public meeting held on November 16, 1982, and presented an update of NRC inspection activities at the Pilgrim Station. After a presentation by the NRC and Boston Edison Company, the Selectmen asked questions of both. The floor was then opened to questions from the general public. Due to time constraints imposed by the Selectmen, several questions were left unanswered; therefore, the Region I staff agreed to answer in writing any questions pertaining to NRC activities if the public would submit them to the Selectmen. The Selectmen agreed in turn to forward the NRC responses to their appropriate constituents.

On November 22, 1982, the Selectmen forwarded a list of questions to NRC Region I which the public considered unanswered. Included among those questions were those from the Pilgrim Alliance to which you have requested a response. On January 10, 1983, a letter was sent to the Selectmen from NRC Region I which addressed those issues. Those answers pertinent to the Pilgrim Alliance's concerns were sent to the Alliance by the Selectmen on February 2, 1983. Excerpts from the January 10 NRC Region I letter to the Plymouth Selectmen specifically addressing those questions you forwarded to Chairman Palladino are enclosed for your use. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

(Signed) William J. Dircks

William J. Dircks
 Executive Director
 for Operations

8304200127 830411
 PDR ADOCK 05000293
 U PDR

Enclosure:
 NRC Response to Pilgrim
 Alliance Questions

OFFICE	RI	RI	RI	<i>WJD</i> EDO			
SURNAME	Elsasser	Starostecki	JAllan	WJDircks			
DATE	4/6/83	4/6/83	4/6/83	4/8/83			

Distribution:
 Stello
 Denton
 DeYoung
 GCunningham
 LUnderwood
 EDO 12947
 SECY-83-1618
 WJDircks
 JAllen
 RStarostecki
 PDR
 LPDR
 Docket No. 52-93

The Honorable Peter Forman
 Massachusetts House of Representatives
 55 Warren Avenue
 Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360

Dear Mr. Forman:

Thank you for your letter of March 23, 1983 addressed to Chairman Palladino. I am pleased to respond to your request for additional information regarding safety concerns at the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station expressed by local residents. Apparently these questions resulted from the public meeting held by the local Board of Selectmen on November 16, 1982.

At the request of the Board of Selectmen of Plymouth, the NRC Region I Administrator, Ronald C. Haynes, and members of his staff participated in a public meeting held on November 16, 1982, and presented an update of NRC inspection activities at the Pilgrim Station. After a presentation by the NRC and Boston Edison Company, the Selectmen asked questions of both. The floor was then opened to questions from the general public. Due to time constraints imposed by the Selectmen, several questions were left unanswered; therefore, the Region I staff agreed to answer in writing any questions pertaining to NRC activities if the public would submit them to the Selectmen. The Selectmen agreed in turn to forward the NRC responses to their appropriate constituents.

On November 22, 1982, the Selectmen forwarded a list of questions to NRC Region I which the public considered unanswered. Included among those questions were those from the Pilgrim Alliance to which you have requested a response. On January 10, 1983, a letter was sent to the Selectmen from NRC Region I which addressed those issues. Those answers pertinent to the Pilgrim Alliance's concerns were sent to the Alliance by the Selectmen on February 2, 1983. Excerpts from the January 10 NRC Region I letter to the Plymouth Selectmen specifically addressing those questions you forwarded to Chairman Palladino are enclosed for your use. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

William J. Dircks
 Executive Director
 for Operations

Enclosure:
 NRC Response to Pilgrim
 Alliance Questions

OFFICE	RI	RI	RI	EDO	QCA		
SURNAME	Elsasser	Starostecki	JAllen	WJDircks			
DATE	4/6/83	4/6/83	4/6/83	4/ /83	4/ /83		

Enclosure

NRC Response to Pilgrim Alliance Questions

The below questions were forwarded to NRC Chairman Palladino by Massachusetts Representative Peter Foreman on March 23, 1983, for resolution. The NRC responses are excerpted from a January 10, 1983, NRC Region I letter to the Plymouth Selectmen dealing with essentially identical questions.

Question:

Boston Edison has been cited by NRC for failing to adequately notify the NRC of certain problems and incidences. What assurances are there that more reliable notification practices will be exercised in the future?

Response:

As discussed at the November 16 meeting, the NRC has numerous reporting requirements which it imposes on licensees which range from telephone calls of an immediate nature to written reports. In addition, the Pilgrim Site Emergency Plan specifies situations which require notification of State and Local governments. With regard to proper notification of State and Local agencies, we have found BECo to be responsive in meeting reporting requirements. When a site alert was declared on June 3, 1982 due to a stuck transversing-in-core probe which caused a localized high radiation area near the probe inside the reactor building, reports made to State and local agencies were prompt and sufficiently detailed to properly keep appropriate officials informed. In regard to written reports, these generally relate to operational problems which are not an immediate hazard to public health and safety but which do require evaluation and corrective action. Improvements in reporting involve timeliness as well as thoroughness of technical evaluation. We do not believe that BECo has a serious deficiency which warrants these practices to be termed as unreliable.

Question:

In 1981, ten masonry walls were found to be structurally unsound. Have all these walls been modified to insure structural stability? If not, when will this be done and what assurances will there be that the stability has been obtained? What action will be taken to prevent a recurrence?

Response:

Boston Edison reported to the NRC in a Licensee Event Report (LER) those walls identified as unstable and which required modification. These walls were all modified prior to plant startup following the winter 1981-82 refueling outage.

The entire block wall issue came to light as a result of problems identified at the Trojan Nuclear Power plant in early 1980 concerning the structural integrity of concrete masonry walls with safety related piping attached to them. As a result of this issue the NRC issued a bulletin in May 1980 (80-11) requiring all licensees to conduct certain reviews and analysis to determine if similar problems which were found at Trojan existed at other plants. It was during the performance of these reviews, required by the NRC, that BECo identified stability problems with certain of Pilgrim's block walls. Subsequent engineering analyses and modifications were conducted to resolve the issue at Pilgrim.

In order to prevent recurrence, in July of 1981 the NRC licensing staff revised its review process to include criteria for safety related masonry wall evaluation. These criteria have been used in NRC's review of new plant applications as well as in existing plants, including Pilgrim.

Question:

There have been reports of mussel buildup in the cooling system pipes at Pilgrim I. What is the significance of this and how can it be controlled?

Response:

Mussel growth in sea water heat exchangers can degrade the heat removal capability of the salt service water system. In this case, the residual heat removal system could be affected because the salt service water system is used to cool that system. Since these systems are required to remove reactor decay heat following certain accident sequences, potential degradation of the heat removal capability is of concern. Numerous methods are used to control mussel growth in heat exchangers. These include: chlorination, backwash with warm water, and cleaning seawater intakes periodically of small mussels. As discussed at the November 16 meeting, the use of chlorination by BECo is under the purview of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Limits on chlorination are established so that marine life in intake or discharge canals will essentially be unaffected. The licensee, as well as all other plants in the country including San Onofre, use a combination of these methods to control mussel growth. Pilgrim also conducts periodic testing to measure degradation in heat exchanger performance. The combination of these preventative measures have been effective in controlling mussel growth in Pilgrim's heat exchangers.

Question:

There have been reports of defective cooling system pumps manufactured by the Hayward Tyler Company. Does Pilgrim I use Hayward Pumps? If so have they been tested for defects?

Response:

There are no Hayward Tyler pumps installed at Pilgrim in any system essential to safety.

Question:

In June 1982, spent resin was found on the roofs of several Pilgrim I buildings. Boston Edison claims the resin was released in September, 1981. Why did it take ten months to discover the resin and when were NRC and Plymouth officials notified? What steps are being taken to monitor the plant more closely for spent resin?

Response:

The resin beads, which are used to deionize the plant feedwater, were discharged out of a piping system vent onto the turbine building roof. The total amount of resin released onto the roof was small, dispersed and difficult to see. A series of rainstorms prior to June 11 caused the resin beads to collect in small piles near roof drains where they were then noticed by a plant employee.

Extensive radiation surveys of the ground areas near the plant buildings and off-site areas were performed. These surveys did not identify resins in any additional areas and did not indicate that there was an offsite release. Also, routine environmental air samples collected during the June 1-15 time frame found nothing unusual.

The NRC resident inspector was notified on the afternoon of June 11 of the discovery within an hour after it occurred.

The town of Plymouth was notified of the resin release by the NRC in a phone call to the Selectmen on June 11, 1982 at approximately 6:00 p.m. Since there were no indications of an offsite release, prompt notification as required by more serious events was not required. If a substantial unplanned offsite release had occurred, the emergency plan would have been implemented and the town of Plymouth promptly notified.

The licensee's program does periodically check onsite areas for sources of radioactive contamination. Past NRC inspections in the Health Physics and radiation control area have indicated that the licensee's program in this regard is acceptable.

FROM Peter Forman Massachusetts State Representative		ACTION CONTROL COMPL DEADLINE 4/8/83	DATES 4/8/83	CONTROL NO 12947
TO: Chairman Palladino		INTERIM REPLY	FINAL REPLY <i>14 Dirick</i>	DATE OF DOCUMENT 3/23/83
DESCRIPTION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LETTER <input type="checkbox"/> MEMO <input type="checkbox"/> REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER		SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS <i>12947</i>		
Q's fm Pilgrm Alliance concerning Pilgrm I		ASSIGNED TO Haynes, Reg. I		
		DATE 3/28/83		
		INFORMATION ROUTING Stelle Denton DeYoung Gunningham Lunderwood		
		SECY-83-1618		

NRC FORM 232
(6-80)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR OPERATIONS
PRINCIPAL CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL

No. SECY-83-1618 Logging Date 3/25/83

NRC SECRETARIAT

TO: Commissioner _____ Date _____
 Exec. Dir./Oper. _____
 Cong. Liaison _____
 Public Affairs _____

 Gen. Counsel _____
 Solicitor _____
 Secretary _____
 Inspector & Auditor _____
 Policy Evaluation _____

Incoming: Peter Forman
From: State House, Boston

To: Palladino Date 3/23/83

Subject: ques concerning problems and incidences at the Boston Edison Pilgrm I facility

Prepare reply for signature of:

- Chairman
- Commissioner
- EDO, GC, CL, SOL, PA, SECY, IA, PE
- Signature block omitted
- _____
- Return original of incoming with response

For direct reply* Suspende: April 5

- For appropriate action
- For information

Remarks: _____

RF, docket, 01

REC'D OF: EDO
Date: 3-28-83
Time: 8:15 A

For the Commission: _____ bac

* Send three (3) copies of reply to Secy Correspondence and Records Branch

NRC FORM 62A
(3-82)

ACTION SLIP