BOSTON EDISON COMPANY
800 BOYLSTON STREET
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02199

WILLIAM D. HARRINGTON
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR

November 26, 1985
BECo 85-213

Dr. N. J. Palladino, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

License DPR-35
Docket 50-293

Subject: Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Unit #1
Environmental Qualification Extension Request

References: 1) BECo Letter 85-170 dated September 23, 1985,
W. D. Harrington to N. J. Palladino

2) BECo Letter 85-196 dated October 30, 1985,
W. D. Harrington to N. J. Palladino

3) BECo Letter 85-207 dated November 15, 1985,
W. D. Harrington to D. B. Vassallo

Dear Chairman Palladino:

This letter will provide an update on the status of testing of those items covered by Boston Edison's environmental qualification extension request dated September 23, 1985 (Reference 1). Based upon the information presented below and in previous testing updates (References 2 and 3) and given the immediacy of the November 30, 1985 deadline, Boston Edison requests prompt Commission action granting its extension request.

As presented in our initial extension request (Reference 1), there were five items of equipment (consisting of 15 individual components) for which an extension was requested. All of the items were expected to be qualified by testing which was scheduled before November 30, 1985. Assuming all testing was successful, all would require at least a short extension for completion of documentation of successful test results. Contingency plans and alternative extension dates were identified in the event testing proved unsuccessful.

As of this date, it appears that four of the five items (Items 1, 2, 4 and 5) have been successfully tested and the only remaining concern is completion of documentation files for which an extension of February 8, 1986 is requested. Information reflecting the dates of those tests and the requested extension dates is contained in Attachment 1.

As discussed in Reference 3, the final item, the General Electric and Electroswitch Control Switches, was tested successfully in the closed contact configuration but was not tested in the open contact configuration due to test

I/154

11/26...To EDO for Appropriate Action..Cpys to: RF
Cmrs, SECY...85-1016

8904270162 890419
PDR FOIA
JOHNSON88-158 PDR

lab error. The test lab rescheduled the test for the open contact configuration for November 22, 1985; however, on that date the superheated steam test chamber experienced a failure and is currently awaiting repair. The best information currently available is that the superheated steam test chamber will not be repaired until the week of December 9, 1985 after which time the proper test can be conducted. Based upon the test of the switches in the closed contact mode as well as other tests of similar equipment, there is a high degree of confidence the test will prove successful. Boston Edison continues to analyze contingency of an unsuccessful test result, which could involve replacing the control switches with qualified replacements.

In order to meet the immediate deadline and to resolve what appears the most probable outcome of the scheduled re-test, Boston Edison would request that the same February 8, 1986 extension for completion of qualification be granted for the control switches as for the other items. Such extension would be based upon an initial period until approximately December 20, 1985 for completion of testing in the open contact mode followed by the remaining period for completion of documentation. Boston Edison would agree to keep the Staff closely informed of the schedule for testing and the results of testing, as well as any contingency plan should that be required.

In conclusion, Boston Edison requests an extension until February 8, 1986 for each of the five items identified in its initial extension request (Reference 1). In each case the extension is necessitated by the late receipt of testing results and the need to complete documentation. In the case of one item, the control switches, the need for the extension is compounded by a need for a scheduled extension to perform final testing which was delayed by a test lab error and the recent failure of the superheated test chamber, all of which were completely unforeseen and beyond Boston Edison's reasonable control. In short, we believe the criteria for granting of an extension as set forth in Generic Letter 85-15 have been met, and we request the Commission's prompt favorable consideration.

Should the Commission or the Staff have any questions regarding this extension request as modified, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

W. D. Harrington

cc: Commissioner J. K. Asselstine
Commissioner F. M. Bernthal
Commissioner T. M. Roberts
Commissioner L. W. Zech
Mr. W. J. Dircks
Mr. H. R. Denton
Dr. T. E. Murley
Mr. H. L. Thompson
Mr. D. B. Vassallo

ATTACHMENT I

Status of Equipment Covered by Extension Request

Item No. From Original Extension Request)	Description	Test Date	Status	Extension Requested	Reason
1	Yarway Level Ind. Switches	11/25/85	Successful	February 8, 1986	Documentation
2	Fenwal Temperature Switches	10/22/85	Successful	February 8, 1986	Documentation
3	Control Switches a) Closed Contact	11/9/85	Successful	February 8, 1986	Documentation
	b) Open Contact	12/20/85	Pending	If Successful - February 8, 1986 If Unsuccessful - Being Evaluated	Documentation
4	SI Cables	11/23/85 - 11/26/85	Successful	February 8, 1986	Documentation
5	SIS Cables	10/26/85	Successful	February 8, 1986	Documentation

OK With John
11/26/86

Docket No. 50-293
(10 CFR 2.206)

The Honorable William B. Golden
Massachusetts State Senate
Boston, MA 02133

Dear Mr. Golden:

This is in further response to your Petition of July 15, 1986 requesting that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission order the Boston Edison Company to show cause why the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station should not remain closed or have its operating license suspended by NRC until the licensee demonstrates that the issues raised by you have been resolved. Your Petition is based on allegations of: (1) numerous deficiencies in licensee management, (2) inadequacy of the existing radiological emergency response plan, and (3) inherent deficiencies in the facility's containment structure. You also request that we require the licensee to submit a feasibility study on all possible structural modifications prior to NRC approval of specific modification proposals.

Pilgrim is presently in a shutdown status and we have been informed by the licensee that it will not be ready to commence start-up until April 1987. Start-up will not be permitted until the NRC determines that there is reasonable assurance that the public health and safety will be protected. That determination will involve consideration of the licensee's readiness to operate the facility including licensee management, emergency planning and containment issues related to those outlined in your petition.

We believe that it would be more meaningful to formally respond to your Petition after the licensee has had an opportunity to address issues outlined in your petition and the NRC has had an opportunity to review the licensee's actions.

Concerning your request that NRC schedule a comprehensive public hearing to address the issues raised in the Petition, we would be happy to meet with you and other petitioners to discuss these matters as well as the overall status of NRC's regulatory activities at Pilgrim. Our Philadelphia Regional Office will contact you to further discuss this matter and to arrange for an appropriate time and setting.

Sincerely,

when the licensee has completed those actions necessary for restart of the plant.

James M. Taylor, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement

Region I comments concur in by T. Murley

I/156

8608200426 PDR 3PSS
dated 8/12/86
Fiche: 37598-28-32

2 of 2 for fax

DRAFT

August 28, 1987

Dear Congressman Studds:

As you may recall, the NRC wrote to you on May 21, 1987 regarding the emergency response plan for the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station and the Show Cause Petition submitted by Massachusetts State Senator William B. Golden, and others, on July 15, 1986. In that letter we agreed to provide you the results of the FEMA review and a copy of the NRC response to the Petition.

FEMA completed its review of the overall state of emergency preparedness at Pilgrim and provided NRC a copy of its report on August 6, 1987 (Enclosure 1). The results of that review are summarized, as follows:

> Based on their self-initiated review, FEMA identified six issues regarding offsite emergency planning and has concluded that Massachusetts offsite emergency planning and preparedness are inadequate to protect the public health and safety in the event of an accident at Pilgrim. The six issues identified by FEMA involve the evacuation of schools, a reception center for evacuees, the beach, special needs and transportation dependent populations, and the overall lack of general progress in emergency planning. In its report, FEMA presents an evaluation of each of the issues including the necessary actions required to correct the identified issues. FEMA also evaluated each of the emergency preparedness issues identified in Senator Golden's Petition and found that the Petitioners' contentions could not be sustained.

On August 21, 1987, Dr. Murley signed an Interim Director's Decision in response to the July 15, 1986 Petition regarding Pilgrim filed by Massachusetts State Senator William B. Golden and others (Enclosure 2). The Petitioners requested a show cause Order for Pilgrim shutdown due to: (1) numerous deficiencies in the licensee's management, (2) inadequacies in the existing radiological emergency response plan, and (3) inherent deficiencies in the facility's containment structure. The Director's Decision provided the following conclusions:

> 1. The NRC has required, and will continue to require, that the Pilgrim facility remain shut down until the management and emergency preparedness issues are dealt with to the satisfaction of the NRC.
>
> 2. A decision cannot be made at this time regarding the management issues. (This portion of the Petition will be addressed in a subsequent response.)
>
> 3. Based on the FEMA evaluation of the emergency preparedness issues raised by the Petitioners, the Petitioners' request for action on this issue is denied. However, in view of FEMA's interim finding that Massachusetts offsite radiological emergency planning and preparedness are inadequate to protect the public health and safety, the Commission will consider, among other issues, corrective actions regarding emergency planning issues identified by FEMA before permitting the restart of the Pilgrim Plant.

I/157

4. The information identified by the Petition does not warrant the initiation of the requested proceedings in regard to the containment issues, and the Petitioners' request is denied.

As stated above, the management issues will require a subsequent response to the Petitioners. We will provide you a copy of that response when it is issued.

Sincerely,

Enclosures:
As stated

Document Name:
CONGRESSMAN STUDDS

Requestor's ID:
MARLEY

Author's Name:
RWessman 8/28/87

Document Comments:
DRAFT

Transmitted 8/28/87 (RM)

NRC OCA LEASOP

NRC DCLA MARLEY - 0049 Distr of Doc.

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

Draft
To EDO 12/24/87

The Honorable Michael S. Dukakis
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Boston, Massachusetts 02133

Dear Governor Dukakis:

I am pleased to respond to your letter of December 17, 1987, in which you forwarded the recent report of Secretary Barry concerning the status of emergency preparedness at the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. You expressed concern regarding a number of emergency preparedness and plant-related issues at Pilgrim that remain to be resolved, and requested a clarification of the specific steps the NRC will take to ensure that the concerns identified in the 1986 and 1987 reports by Secretary Barry will be satisfactorily addressed before restart. You also restated the position of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that an adjudicatory hearing be held before any decision is reached on the plant's future.

The inadequacies in emergency planning and preparedness at Pilgrim have been well documented by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in its self-initiated review. That review was based on information provided by Commonwealth and local officials, members of the public, and other sources, including the 1986 Barry report. With the assistance of the licensee, the Commonwealth, the local governments within the emergency planning zone (EPZ), and the two emergency reception center communities are in the process of implementing numerous improvements in their emergency response programs. These improvements include the revision of the local emergency plans, revision of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency Area II plan as well as the Commonwealth's State-wide plan, the development of revised procedures, the development and implementation of training programs for offsite officials and emergency personnel, and the upgrading of Emergency Operation Centers in each of the towns within the EPZ and reception center communities. The NRC is closely monitoring the licensee's restart program, including the licensee's efforts to assist offsite authorities in improving their emergency response programs. We believe extensive progress has been made to date, but we recognize that additional effort will be required before all corrective actions are completed.

In letters to Congressman Gerry E. Studds dated November 20 and November 24, 1987, I indicated some of the steps the NRC has taken and plans to take before considering restart. The NRC staff has held several meetings with Commonwealth and local officials regarding the Pilgrim situation. Future efforts will include a public meeting in the Plymouth area to receive public comments on the Boston Edison restart plan, a second public meeting in the Plymouth area to provide feedback to the public on the disposition of comments and concerns raised in the first meeting, and a public meeting between the NRC senior staff and State Senator William Golden and the other petitioners who submitted the July 1986 10 CFR 2.206 Petition. In addition, Senator Edward M. Kennedy has scheduled a hearing before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee at

I/158

which the NRC will provide testimony on the NRC consideration of a Pilgrim restart request. Other meetings and forums open to the public will be held as circumstances warrant during the course of our review of the licensee's readiness to restart Pilgrim. As I have previously indicated, I believe this series of meetings will be more meaningful than a formal evidentiary hearing in informing the public and Commonwealth and local officials of the NRC's decisions.

I assure you that the NRC will not permit the restart of the Pilgrim plant until all the issues raised during the facility's prolonged shutdown are ~~resolved~~ addressed to our satisfaction.

Sincerely,

Lando W. Zech, Jr.

Enclosures:
1. Ltr. fm L. W. Zech to G. E. Studds dtd. 11/20/87
2. Ltr. fm L. W. Zech to G. E. Studds dtd. 11/24/87

which the NRC will provide testimony on the NRC consideration of a Pilgrim restart request. Other meetings and forums open to the public will be held as circumstances warrant during the course of our review of the licensee's readiness to restart Pilgrim. As I have previously indicated, I believe this series of meetings will be more meaningful than a formal evidentiary hearing in informing the public and Commonwealth and local officials of the NRC's decisions.

I assure you that the NRC will not permit the restart of the Pilgrim plant until all the issues raised during the facility's prolonged shutdown are resolved to our satisfaction.

Sincerely,

Lando W. Zech, Jr.

Enclosures:
1. Ltr. fm L. W. Zech to G. E. Studds dtd. 11/20/87
2. Ltr. fm L. W. Zech to G. E. Studds dtd. 11/24/87

DISTRIBUTION:

VStello, EDO	COThomas, NRR
JMTaylor, EDO	JLBlaha, NRR
TRehm, EDO	FJCongel, NRR
JPMurray, OGC	DBMatthews, NRR
WTRussell, RI	RJBarrett, NRR
TEMurley, NRR	LJCunningham, NRR
JHSniezek, NRR	CRVan Niel, NRR
ADT/P-415	FKantor, NRR
FJMiraglia, NRR	DFMossburg, NRR - EDO 3372
FGillespie, NRR	MCBridgers, EDO-3372
SECY NO: 1410	MECoons, NRR 87-112 (EDO 3372)
RHWessman, NRR	PDR
RRBellamy, RI	PEPB R/F
ARBlough, RI	Central Files
RTHogan, NRR	

EDO	OCM
VStello	LWZech
12/ /87	12/ /87

PEPB/NRR	TECH ED	C/PEPB/NRR	PDI-3/NRR	D/DREP/NRR	A/ADT	D/NRR
FKantor:sc	AThomas	DBMatthews	RHWessman	FJCongel	JHSniezek	TEMurley
12/ /87	12/23/87	12/ /87	by telecon 12/23/87	12/ /87	12/ /87	12/ /87

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

To EDO 1/16--

The Honorable John Kerry
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Kerry:

I am responding to your October 23, 1987 letter, in which you urged the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to convene a formal and comprehensive hearing on the restart of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. The Commission is fully aware of public concern regarding restart of the Pilgrim facility and has gone to unusual lengths to assure broad public participation in the restart decision.

The NRC staff, State and local officials in Massachusetts have engaged in a continuing dialogue on the Pilgrim situation. This dialogue has included at least three public meetings with the Plymouth Board of Selectmen, as well as meetings with the Plymouth Chamber of Commerce, the Duxbury Board of Selectmen, the Massachusetts Joint Committee on Energy, the Massachusetts Legislative Committee on the Investigation and Study of the Pilgrim Station, the Town of Plymouth Advisory Committee on Nuclear Matters, and others. Most recently, the NRC staff participated in a public forum on the Pilgrim situation at the Duxbury High School on October 29, 1987. This meeting was sponsored by the Duxbury Board of Selectmen.

Representatives from some of these groups also have participated in NRC Region I management meetings dealing with the Pilgrim facility, including the Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) meeting held on May 7, 1987. On October 8, 1987, the NRC met with representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in our Region I office. This meeting, which was open for public observation, was held to discuss agenda items proposed by the Commonwealth, including emergency preparedness issues, the status of various NRC technical reviews, and inspection activities expected in the next few months.

As the NRC proceeds with deliberations regarding restart of the Pilgrim reactor, additional public meetings will be held in lieu of the evidentiary hearing you have requested. These meetings will be formal, transcribed sessions where the public's testimony will be heard by NRC management. The following meetings are planned:

I/159

1. A public meeting will be held in the Plymouth area to receive public comments on the Boston Edison Restart Plan. The Restart Plan was recently received by the staff and a meeting will be scheduled after the NRC has placed it in local public libraries for public review. NRC staff will also accept written testimony from those unable to attend the meeting. NRC will consider these comments, as appropriate, for enhancing NRC review and inspection activities.

2. A second public meeting will be held in the Plymouth area to discuss the disposition of comments and concerns raised during the first meeting.

3. Before an NRC position on restart of the plant is developed in final form, a public meeting will be held between NRC senior staff and State Senator William Golden and the other petitioners who submitted the July 1986 10 CFR 2.206 Petition. This meeting will address NRC's actions regarding the Pilgrim plant and answer questions of the petitioners.

Other public meetings, including those with Boston Edison, will be held as circumstances warrant. These meetings will be announced pursuant to NRC staff policy on open meetings (43 FR 28058). After the staff completes its reviews and before the NRC allows Pilgrim to restart, the Commission will hold a public meeting to be briefed by the staff on the readiness of Pilgrim to resume operations.

The Commission believes it has demonstrated its commitment to comprehensive public participation in the Pilgrim restart decision. Moreover, it is our view that when the series of planned public meetings is completed, we will have heard and considered the views of more concerned citizens than would have been likely in a formal hearing.

Sincerely,

Lando W. Zech, Jr.

OFC	DRPR:PDI-3	DRPR:PDIA	TECH ED	DRPR:DIR	ADPR	NRR:DIR	OGC-BETH
NAME	RHWessman:lm	BABoger	A. Thomas	SAVarga	FJMiraglia	TEMurley	L. Chandler
DATE	11/13/87	11/ /87	11/11/87	11/ /87	11/ /87	11/ /87	11/13/87

OFC	REGION I	EDO	GPA/CA				
NAME	R. Blough	VStello					
DATE	11/13/87	11/ /87	11/ /87				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket File (50-293)
NRC PDR w/cy of incoming
Local PDR w/cy of incoming
EDO#003277
EDO Reading
T. Murley/J. Sniezek
FMiraglia
PDI-3 r/f w/cy of incoming
SAVarga (2)
OGC-BETH
GPA/CA
SECY 1270
VStello
DMossburg, PMAS (EDO#003277) w/cy of incoming
MRushbrook
RHWessman w/cy of incoming
PDI-3 Green Ticket File
RStarostecki
CThomas
JBlaha
JTaylor
TRehm
JMurry
WRussell
RBlough, RI
LChandler, OGC
WPaton, OGC

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket File (50-293)
NRC & Local PDRs (w/incoming)
EDO #003523
EDO Reading
TMurley/JSniezek
FMiraglia
PDI-3 Reading (w/incoming)
SAVarga (2)
BABoger
OGC
GPA/CA
SECY
VStello
DMossburg, PMAS (EDO-003523) (w/incoming)
DMcDonald (w/incoming)
MRushbrook
RHWessman
PStohr
JTaylor
TRehm
WCParler
JMurray
WTRussell
JWiggins
FGillespie
ADT

The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am responding to your February 17, 1988 letter, in which you again urged the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to convene a formal and comprehensive hearing on the restart of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. You also raised five recommendations regarding Pilgrim for the Commission's consideration.

In regard to hearings, on November 20, 1987 the Commission responded to you and Congressman Studds regarding formal hearings on Pilgrim. We have carefully reviewed the approach we are following in our consideration of a restart decision on Pilgrim. We believe we are giving close attention to the public health and safety matters involving this facility and providing abundant opportunity for public participation in our regulatory process. In regard to the five recommendations you raised, our comments on them are provided in the enclosure to this letter.

As I wrote you in November, the Commission is very much aware of public concern regarding restart of the Pilgrim facility and has gone to unusual lengths to ensure that there is extensive public participation in the restart decision. A number of public meetings have been held in the vicinity of the Pilgrim facility. These have involved the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and local officials, as well as members of the public. The most recent meeting, which was coordinated with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and allowed participation by many interested members of the public, was held in Plymouth on February 18, 1988 to receive public comments on the Pilgrim Restart Plan. Meetings of this nature allow even broader public participation than the formal evidentiary hearing you requested.

The Commission remains committed to comprehensive public participation in the Pilgrim restart decision. We believe the activities described above, in our recent correspondence, and in the enclosure address the concerns you raised.

I/160

As noted in the enclosure, we would be pleased to have you appear before the Commission to present your views regarding Pilgrim.

Sincerely,

Lando W. Zech, Jr.

Enclosure:
Responses to Recommendations

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1. Until we receive satisfactory answers to the question whether there is a link between cancer and nuclear power, the Pilgrim plant should not be permitted to restart.

Response 1. The NRC staff has reviewed the epidemiological study entitled, "Health Surveillance of the Plymouth Area," which was performed by the Massachusetts Department of Health and referenced in the enclosure to your letter. The study reports detecting an increased incidence of leukemia cases in five towns in the vicinity of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant. Because many factors other than the Pilgrim plant could cause this increase, the authors of the study state that the cause of the increased incidence has not been determined. The staff agrees with the authors' statement.

The effects of radiation on living systems have been studied for decades by individual scientists as well as by select committees that have been formed to objectively and independently assess the risks from radiation. These studies were considered in the development of the public health and safety limits that apply to the Pilgrim plant, as well as to other nuclear power plants. Some of these studies have found a statistically significant increase in certain types of cancers for doses and dose rates higher than those encountered in the vicinity of nuclear power plants. The studies have not detected a statistically significant increase in cancer for doses and dose rates in the vicinity of nuclear power plants. However, as a prudent measure, the NRC staff assumes that there is a linear relation between cancer and low doses of radiation. NRC limits are selected so that the statistical probability of risk is extremely low.

Thus, the staff has found that on the basis of the substantial data available in the area of health effects from exposure to radiation, it is not appropriate to delay restarting the Pilgrim plant pending completion of further study to determine if there is a link between certain types of cancer and commercial nuclear power generation.

Recommendation 2. Until there is an evacuation plan which is approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and is acceptable to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the plant should not be permitted to restart.

Response 2. The NRC will not permit the Pilgrim facility to resume operation until corrective actions satisfactory to NRC have been taken to address the emergency planning deficiencies identified by FEMA. The NRC will give special attention to the corrective actions involving the emergency plans for schools and day care centers, as well as for special needs and transport-dependent populations in the plume exposure pathway emergency planning zone. Before allowing Pilgrim to restart, the NRC will require some demonstration that critical aspects of the emergency plan can be adequately implemented.

Under the NRC's regulatory framework, whether an outstanding emergency planning deficiency delays restart will depend on the gravity of the deficiency, the nature of any compensatory actions, and progress toward correction of the deficiency. Thus, it may be that restart can be authorized with some emergency planning issues not fully resolved. For Pilgrim, the restart decision will be made by the Commissioners.

Recommendation 3. Members of the Commission should make an on-site visit to the Pilgrim plant to assess for themselves the merits of the serious health and safety problems which have been raised.

Response 3. The Commissioners have been personally and directly involved in the consideration of the Pilgrim issues. Three of the Commissioners and I have made visits to Pilgrim during 1987. I expect that we will make additional visits there in 1988.

Recommendation 4. Prior to any consideration of whether the Pilgrim plant should be permitted to restart, Commission members should convene a public meeting to receive first-hand testimony from State and local officials and experts from the Plymouth area.

Response 4. As I described to you in my letter of November 20, 1987, the NRC is holding several meetings in the Plymouth area regarding Pilgrim. These meetings are open to the public and are structured to allow the broadest possible public participation. The first of these meetings was held on February 18, 1988 and provided an opportunity for State and local officials, as well as members of the public, to provide their views to the staff. The Commonwealth was consulted and agreed to the scheduling and purpose of these meetings but did not participate, although approximately 50 members of the public provided comments regarding the Pilgrim Restart Plan and other matters of individual concern. We intend to conduct followup public meetings in the Plymouth area to discuss the disposition of comments and concerns raised during the February 18, 1988 meeting.

The Commission is continuing to involve Commonwealth and local officials, and leaders of local citizens groups, in public meetings regarding Pilgrim. Most recently, on February 9, 1988, a senior member of the NRC staff met with the Massachusetts Assistant Secretary of Public Safety, State Senator William Golden, and others to discuss the Commission's approach towards the restart readiness assessment of Pilgrim. An additional meeting with Senator Golden and others who submitted a July 1986 10 CFR 2.206 Petition is planned.

Other public meetings will be held as circumstances warrant. These will include meetings in which the Pilgrim licensee, the Boston Edison Company, will participate.

The Commission will also hold a public meeting in Washington, D.C., to be briefed by the staff on the readiness of Pilgrim to resume operations. The staff will provide a full accounting of its recommendations and supporting bases in relation to the restart of the Pilgrim station during this meeting.

In Summary, the staff has and is continuing to afford the opportunity for the level of public participation suggested in your comment.

Recommendation 5. Finally, I request that in my capacity as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with experience concerning, and responsibility for, the health and safety issues involved, I be given the opportunity to appear before the Commission to present information on this issue, prior to any Commission deliberation on the question whether the Pilgrim plant should be permitted to restart.

Response 5. The Commission would be pleased to have the Senator appear before the Commission to present his views regarding Pilgrim. Our staff will be in contact with your staff regarding schedule arrangements.

Cordell Reed
late Aug. - IDCOR
Sept 2nd wk - mtg w/NRC

MK I Containment

Howard - IDCOR principle contributors to [illegible] ATWS events. Benefit is venting thru torus, revise EOPs, Bernero's 5 areas being reviewed by IDCOR + BWROG for mtg in Sept w/NRC. PRA prelim of Pilgrim being reviewed by PECo.

PECo considering hydrogen control, containment venting and spray. (will ~~[illegible]~~ connect fire pump into spray)

MR Backlog - Ken Roberts

Major Outage Activities
normal refueling planning
continue
App R except critical tie-ins after core unloading about Nov.
will have detailed sched by 8/31

~~Cliff Anderson Reg I wants to hold up GL-83-28 "4.5.1 for Pilgrim. don't shut down that way"~~ QA insp.

8/5 Chung confirmed ~~typed copy~~ SE is OK as is.

I/161

7/30/86 mtg at K of P

Oxsen - will connect fire pump into venting and improve ~~venting~~ containment spray. (Vermont Yankee) will complete App. R + refueling about - feb.

Murley - emergency planning brochures - Oxsen said it was distributed to all residences on P.O. computer printout. checking further. Will advertise next mailing.

pl. status - 2 RHR pumps disassembled no defects identified but will send out wear rings for examination. D bearing exhibited wear.

LLRT Type B 80 done of 100, no failure
C 101 done 123, 10 did not meet criteria - being analyzed

60 valves + replaced in last outage
method of draining lines before testing is being examined.

Ken Roberts says LLRT will be completed but wants to postpone integrated test (he told me LTP update to be ready 8/31) will do LLRT again before startup

7/30/86 mtg at K of P

Oxsen - will connect fire pump into venting and improve ~~[illegible]~~ containment spray. (Vermont Yankee) will complete App. R + refueling about - feb.

Murley - emergency planning brochures. - Oxsen said it was distributed to all residences on P.O. computer printout. checking further. Will advertise next mailing.

pl. status - 2 RHR pumps disassembled no defects identified but will send out wear rings for examination. D bearing exhibited wear.

armature

LLRT Type B 80 done of 100, no failure
C 101 done 123, 10 did not meet criteria - being analyzed

60 valves + replaced in last outage
method of draining lines before testing is being examined.

Ken Roberts says LLRT will be completed but wants to postpone integrated test
(he told me LTP update to be ready 8/31)
will do LLRT again before startup

Date

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

7/7 Berger to call Leggett to tell him that NRR has time constraints (on T.S. changes for example) as well as the inspection and reporting periods described by RI at the 6/24 meeting

— See Note book – Wiggins Comment on special NRR hold points to show that you know

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
Have to operate the plant.	Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

☆ GPO : 1982 O - 381-529 (223)

I/I-162

140 Dick - please update and return to me COB 11/27 Ben Davis p43

RESTART STATUS
11/23/87

PLANT	SHUTDOWN	LICENSEE ACTION PLAN	RESTART ASSESSMENT REPORT	COMMISSION BRIEFING	RESTART DECISION
PILGRIM	04/12/86	10/26/87C	01/29/88E	02/12/88E	02/26/88E

COMMENTS: RCS HYDRO IS EXPECTED IN LATE NOVEMBER AND ILRT IS EXPECTED IN EARLY DECEMBER. BECO IS STILL FORECASTING COMPLETION OF MOST OUTAGE ACTIVITIES BY DECEMBER. LOSS OF OFFSITE POWER EVENT (11/12/87) AND STOP WORK ACTION (11/09/87) MAY DELAY COMPLETION OF ONSITE ACTIVITIES.

INITIAL REVIEW OF BECO RESTART PLAN IS IN PROGRESS AND IS EXPECTED TO TAKE UNTIL MID-DECEMBER. INTEGRATED TEAM ASSESSMENT OF UTILITY READINESS IS PLANNED FOR EARLY JANUARY 1988.

RESOLUTION OF OFFSITE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS ISSUES EXPECTED TO BE A MAJOR ISSUE. COMPLETION OF IMPROVED LOCAL PLANS IS NOT EXPECTED BEFORE 12/31/87. SUBMITTAL DATE OF COMMONWEALTH EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PLANS TO FEMA IS UNKNOWN. BECO HAS REQUESTED AN EXEMPTION FROM THE BIENNIAL EP EXERCISE (REQUIRED BY 12/31/87) UNTIL EARLY 1988.

Cor - please update src
return to me on case EA 88-25.

Eest Dow. file
10 CFR 50.72
No changes

RESTART STATUS
3/21/88

PLANT	SHUTDOWN	LICENSEE ACTION PLAN	NRR SER	COMMISSION BRIEFING ING	RESTART DECISION
PILGRIM	04/12/86	10/26/87C	7/22/88*	08/01/88E*	08/15/88E*

COMMENTS: RCS HYDRO WAS COMPLETED DECEMBER 10, 1987 AND THE ILRT WAS COMPLETED ON DECEMBER 24, 1987. BECO IS FORECASTING COMPLETION OF REFUELING OUTAGE NO. 7 ACTIVITIES BY THE END OF MARCH 1988.

INITIAL REVIEW OF BECO RESTART PLAN IS IN PROGRESS AND IS EXPECTED TO TAKE UNTIL END OF MARCH 1988. LOCAL MEETINGS TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENTS ON RESTART PLAN WERE HELD ON THE AFTERNOON AND EVENING OF FEBRUARY 18, 1988. FUTURE PUBLIC MEETING WILL BE HELD TO GIVE FEEDBACK TO PUBLIC ON HOW WE HANDLED COMMENTS ON RESTART PLAN. THE ONSITE REVIEW OF THE PROCEDURE GENERATION PACKAGE (PGP), EMERGENCY OPERATING PROCEDURES (EOPs) AND OPERATOR TRAINING IN THE USE OF THE EOPs WAS CONDUCTED DURING THE WEEK OF 3/14/88.

BECO MET WITH THE NRC IN REGION I ON FEBRUARY 24, 1988 TO DISCUSS THEIR SELF-ASSESSMENT OF RESTART READINESS, OVERALL PLANT STATUS AND SCHEDULE FOR REQUESTING OUR INTEGRATED TEAM ASSESSMENT. COMPLETION OF BECO's SELF-ASSESSMENT, WHICH IS CURRENTLY SCHEDULED TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY, IS A PREREQUISITE TO THE NRC ASSESSMENT.

THE PILGRIM RESTART ASSESSMENT PANEL DEVELOPED A ..OJECT SCHEDULE FOR RESTART. THE SCHEDULE IS TENTATIVE AND IS BASED ON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES BY BOTH THE LICENSEE AND STAFF. THE LICENSEE IS AWARE OF THE SCHEDULE AND GENERALLY AGREES, BUT WOULD LIKE TO SHORTEN THE TOTAL TIME. THE STAFF INDICATED IT WOULD SUPPORT AN EFFORT TO IMPROVE THE SCHEDULE AS LONG AS ALL THE KEY ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS ARE MET.

THE LICENSEE HAS IMPLEMENTED SEVERAL ORGANIZATIONAL AND MANAGEMENT CHANGES. MANY OF WHICH BECAME EFFECTIVE ON FEBRUARY 1, 1988. WE HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS, AND AN AMENDMENT WILL BE REQUESTED SOON. THE REALIGNMENT WILL INCREASE LINE FUNCTIONS REPORTING TO SENIOR VP NUCLEAR AND MODIFY THE STATION ORGANIZATION.

RESOLUTION OF OFFSITE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS EP ISSUES IS EXPECTED TO BE A MAJOR CONCERN. COMPLETION OF IMPROVED LOCAL PLANS IS NOT EXPECTED BEFORE 3/31/88. SUBMITTAL DATE OF COMMONWEALTH EMERGENCY PRE.'REDNESS PLANS TO FEMA IS CURRENTLY UNKNOWN. BECO REQUESTED AN EXEMPTION FROM THE BIENNIAL EP EXERCISE (REQUIRED BY 12/31/87) AND STAFF GRANTED EXEMPTION DECEMBER 9, 1987. THIS EXEMPTION COULD BE AFFECTED BY FURTHER RESTART DELAYS.