

Docket File



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

AUG 5 1987

50-313

The Honorable John Paul Hammerschmidt  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Hammerschmidt:

You recently brought to our attention the concerns of your constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Smith, regarding Babcock and Wilcox (B&W)-designed nuclear power plants in general and Arkansas Nuclear One (ANO) in particular. In their letter to you dated July 11, 1987, the Smiths questioned the safety of these plants and suggested that the NRC investigate safety questions that have been raised. We are pleased to have this opportunity to provide you with the most current available information regarding the B&W-designed plants.

After the Three Mile Island, Unit 2 accident in 1979, utilities made a substantial number of improvements at the B&W-designed plants, many of which were required by the NRC staff report, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," NUREG-0737, issued by letter dated October 31, 1979. However, the number and complexity of transients from normal operating conditions at the B&W-designed plants still concerned the NRC. In response to transients at two B&W-designed plants--at the Davis-Besse plant in June 1985 and at the Rancho Seco plant in December 1985--I directed that the long-term safety of nuclear reactors designed by B&W be reassessed.

The Babcock and Wilcox Owners Group (BWOG), made up of representatives from each utility that operates B&W-designed plants, is taking an active role in the reassessment. However, the NRC staff also has a major role in the effort. The BWOG Safety and Performance Improvement Program has been modified at the request of the staff, and the NRC is closely reviewing and monitoring its implementation. The NRC staff has met with the Owners Group many times to ensure that NRC concerns are met. In addition to providing input to the BWOG reassessment, the staff is also performing limited, independent evaluations of the B&W plant design. This includes review of operating experience, input from the NRC regional inspection staff, and limited risk and thermal hydraulic analyses. The staff expects to complete its B&W review by October 31, 1987, and the results will be documented in a safety evaluation report.

Since the B&W plant reassessment began, more than 170 recommendations have been referred to the B&W plant owners, who have implemented, or are implementing, many of these recommendations. These changes have already improved plant safety by improving the integrated control system and the performance of the main feedwater system to reduce the number of challenges to safety systems due to feedwater transients.

The Honorable John Paul Hammerschmidt -2-

Because of these changes, the staff concludes that the plants are safer now than they were a year ago. The NRC found no undue risk in the utilities' interim operation a year ago, and, after taking into consideration the utilities' safety improvements, we still find no undue risk in allowing the utilities to continue to operate the plants.

On February 10, 1987, the Union of Concerned Scientists submitted a petition to the NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206. The petition requested the Commission to (1) require all utilities operating or building nuclear power reactors designed by B&W to modify their nuclear generating facilities to correct alleged safety deficiencies; (2) hold public hearings on the sufficiency of these modifications to correct the alleged deficiencies; and (3) revoke the operating license or construction permit of any utility that does not meet the proposed requirements that emerge from (1) and (2) above.

By letter dated March 13, 1987, the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, informed the Union of Concerned Scientists that the concerns expressed in the petition did not warrant immediate suspension of the operating licenses and construction permits in question, but that the staff would continue to review the petition and issue a formal decision.

The NRC staff is continuing to review the petition of the Union of Concerned Scientists, and a formal decision on the requests as stated in the petition will be issued in the reasonably near future.

I trust that this information will assist you in responding to your constituents.

Sincerely,

(Signed) T. A. Rehm

for Victor Stello, Jr.  
Executive Director  
for Operations

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File  
NRC PDR (w/cy of incoming)  
Local PDR (w/cy of incoming)  
EDO No. 003050  
EDO Reading  
T. Murley/J. Snizek

F. Schroeder/J. Collins	V. Stello
OGC-Bethesda	F. Miraglia
GPA/CA (3)	D. Crutchfield
SECY (3) CRC-87-0880	P. Shea
D. Mossburg, PMAS	G. Dick
PD #4 Green Ticket File	P. Noonan
	RMartin, RIV

\*See previous concurrence

\*PD4/PH  
WDick  
07/28/87

PD4/D  
JCalvo  
07/29/87

\*Tch. Ed.  
AThomas  
07/29/87

OGC  
SSohinki  
07/30/87

DR4A  
FSchroeder  
7/30/87

DRSP/D  
DCrutchfield  
7/30/87

ADP/AD  
FMiraglia  
7/30/87

DOAN/DO  
JSnizek  
7/31/87

DANRA  
TMurley  
7/31/87

EDO  
VStello  
8/13/87

Because of these changes, the staff concludes that the plants are safer now than they were a year ago. The NRC found no undue risk in the utilities' interim operation a year ago, and, after taking into consideration the utilities' safety improvements, we still find no undue risk in allowing the utilities to continue to operate the plants.

On February 10, 1987, the Union of Concerned Scientists submitted a petition to the NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206. The petition requested the Commission to (1) require all utilities operating or building nuclear power reactors designed by B&W to modify their nuclear generating facilities to correct alleged safety deficiencies; (2) hold public hearings on the sufficiency of these modifications to correct the alleged deficiencies; and (3) revoke the operating license or construction permit of any utility that does not meet the proposed requirements that emerge from (1) and (2) above.

By letter dated March 13, 1987, the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, informed the Union of Concerned Scientists that the concerns expressed in the petition did not warrant immediate suspension of the operating licenses and construction permits in question, but that the staff would continue to review the petition and issue a formal decision.

The NRC staff is continuing to review the petition of the Union of Concerned Scientists, and a formal decision on the requests as stated in the petition will be issued in the reasonably near future.

I trust that this information will assist you in responding to your constituents.

Sincerely,

Victor Stello, Jr.  
Executive Director  
for Operations

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File  
NRC PDR (w/cy of incoming)  
Local PDR (w/cy of incoming)  
EDO No.\* 003050  
EDO Reading  
T. Murley/J. Snizek

F. Schroeder/J. Collins  
OGC-Bethesda  
GPA/CA (3)  
SECY (3) CRC-87-0880  
D. Mossburg, PMAS  
PD #4 Green Ticket File  
V. Stello  
F. Miraglia  
D. Crutchfield  
P. Shea  
G. Dick  
P. Noonan

\*See previous concurrence  
NRC 7/30/87

\*PD4/PM PD4/D JIC  
WDick JCalvo  
07/28/87 7/29/87

\*Tech. Ed.  
AThomas  
07/29/87

OGC SWS  
SSCHINKI  
7/30/87  
DR4A  
FSchroeder  
/ /87

DRSP:D  
DCrutchfield  
/ /87

ADP:AD DD/NRR  
FMiraglia JSnizek  
/ /87 / /87

D/NRR  
TMurley  
/ /87

EDO  
VStello  
/ /87



On February 10, 1987, the Union of Concerned Scientists submitted a petition to the NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206. The petition requested the Commission to (1) require all utilities operating or building nuclear power reactors designed by B&W to modify their nuclear generating facilities to correct alleged safety deficiencies; (2) hold public hearings on the sufficiency of these modifications to correct the alleged deficiencies; and (3) revoke the operating license or construction permit of any utility that does not meet the proposed requirements that emerge from (1) and (2) above.

By letter dated March 13, 1987, the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, informed the Union of Concerned Scientists that the concerns expressed in the petition did not warrant immediate suspension of the operating licenses and construction permits in question, but that the staff would continue to review the petition and issue a formal decision.

The NRC staff is continuing to review the petition of the Union of Concerned Scientists, and a formal decision on the requests as stated in the petition will be issued in the reasonably near future.

I trust that this information will assist you in responding to your constituents.

Sincerely,

Victor Stello, Jr.  
Executive Director  
for Operations

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File  
NRC PDR (w/cy of incoming)  
Local PDR (w/cy of incoming)  
EDO No.\*  
EDO Reading  
T. Murley/J. Sniezek  
V. Stello  
F. Miraglia  
D. Crutchfield

F. Schroeder  
OGC-Bethesda  
GPA/CA (3)  
SECY (3)  
D. Mossburg, PMAS  
P. Shea  
Project Manager  
P. Noonan  
PD #4 Green Ticket File

PD4/XPM  
WStello  
7/28/87

PD4/D  
JCalvo  
/ /87

Tech. Ed.  
arh  
7/29/87

OGC  
/ /87

DR4A  
FSchroeder  
/ /87

DRSP:D  
DCrutchfield  
/ /87

ADP:AD  
FMiraglia  
/ /87

DD/NRR  
JSniezek  
/ /87

D/NRR  
TMurley  
/ /87

EDO  
VStello  
/ /87



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

**ACTION**

EDO PRINCIPAL CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL  
-----

FROM: REP. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT  
TO: MR. & MRS. MARVIN SMITH, JR.  
(cc: OCA)  
FOR SIGNATURE OF: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
DUE: 08/07/87  
EDO CONTROL: 003050  
DOC DT: 07/14/87  
FINAL REPLY: 50-313  
\*\* GREEN \*\*  
SECY NO: 87-0880

DESC: LETTER FROM MARVIN & JO SMITH CONCERNING SAFETY  
OF B&W REACTORS, SPECIFICALLY ARKANSAS NUCLEAR  
ONE  
ROUTING: RMARTIN, RIV  
MURRAY, OGC/B

DATE: 07/23/87  
ASSIGNED TO: NRR CONTACT: MURLEY

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

NRR RECEIVED: JULY 24, 1987  
ACTION: DRSP:CRUTCHFIELD

NRR ROUTING: MURLEY/SNIEZEK  
MIRAGLIA  
STAROSTECKI  
BLAHA  
FUNCHES  
Mossburg

*Calvo/sig Dick  
nrc  
7/27/87*

*Calvo/sig Dick*

*- Check with OCA to see what  
kind of response they expect  
(none was actually requested)  
- perhaps just a general discussion  
of what is being done would be  
appropriate  
Jose C. 7/27  
Guth 7/24*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

LOGGING DATE: Jul 22 87



JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT

THIRD DISTRICT, ARKANSAS

HOME ADDRESS:

HARRISON, ARKANSAS

WASHINGTON ADDRESS:

2207 RAYBURN BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515

PHONE: 225-4301

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

July 14, 1987

COMMITTEES:

PUBLIC WORKS AND  
TRANSPORTATION

SUBCOMMITTEES:

AVIATION—RANKING MEMBER  
WATER RESOURCES  
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

VETERANS' AFFAIRS—  
RANKING MEMBER

SUBCOMMITTEES:

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE—  
RANKING MEMBER  
COMPENSATION, PENSION AND  
INSURANCE  
HOUSING AND MEMORIAL AFFAIRS  
SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

SUBCOMMITTEE:

HOUSING AND CONSUMER  
INTERESTS—RANKING MEMBER

Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Smith, Jr.  
HC 79, Box 206  
Marshall, Arkansas 72650

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Smith:

Thank you for your recent letter which expressed your concern about Arkansas Nuclear One.

Let me assure you that I understand your feelings, and share your concern that nuclear reactors be properly regulated. In an effort to provide information about the issues you have raised, I am in touch with officials of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Again, thanks for being in touch. Just as soon as there is anything to report, I shall be back to you.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

(Signed) John Paul Hammerschmidt

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT  
Member of Congress

JPH:sw

bcc: Congressional Liaison Officer, NRC ✓  
Enclosure

Monday, July 7, 1987

JUL 11 1987

The Honorable John Paul Hammerschmidt  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Sir:

Arkansas Nuclear One is not safe. Like all Babcock & Wilcox reactors, it suffers from inherent design defects.

Supposedly, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission exists to protect citizens from nuclear hazards. However, in the case of ANO and the other B&W reactors, the NRC chose to allow reactor owners to "regulate" themselves. It is impossible for the B&W Owners Group to adequately address public safety questions. The B&W owners primary motivation is protecting company profits.

Therefore:

- 1.) ANO and the other B&W reactors should be immediately shut down. They should not be allowed to operate until all safety questions are fully satisfied.
- 2.) The NRC must be compelled to responsibly discharge its regulatory function. The NRC should conduct its own thorough study and investigation of the safety charges brought against B&W reactors.

Why must we wait until a serious "accident" occurs? Why must Arkansans remain at risk just to protect a private company's profits?

Sincerely,

*Marvin Smith Jr. Jo Smith*

Marvin Smith Jr.  
HC 79 Box 206  
Marshall, AR 72650

Jo Smith --