

Congress of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20515

February 6, 1991

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We are again writing to seek information concerning the quality of welds at the Seabrook station. The Commission's repeated failures to address the central issues of the Congressional investigation necessitate this request.

Please provide the following:

- A. The specific procedure(s), if any, that governed the Yankee Atomic Electric Company's (YAEC's) purported 100% review of radiograph packages, prior to April 1984.
- B. The Commission's position as to whether the procedure(s) referred to in Item A above complied with the requirement of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V.
- C. The Commission's position with regard to whether the Seabrook licensee, in the conduct of the purported 100% review of radiographs, complied with the record keeping requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criteria XVI and XVII.
- D. The Commission's position as to whether the Seabrook licensee, with regard to the purported 100% review of radiographs, complied with the audit requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criteria XVIII.
- E. The Commission's explanation, in light of the contention that the purported 100% review was conducted throughout the duration of pipe welding activities, of why approximately 95% of welds reviewed by the NRC in its NUREG-1425 inspection showed YAEC approvals after Wampler arrived at the site.
- F. A Commission statement providing the following information:
 1. The date when the NRC Region I staff first became aware of the purported 100% radiograph review by YAEC.
 2. An explanation of any delay in the NRC becoming

aware of the purported 100% review and its role in assuring weld quality at Seabrook.

- 3. The date of the first NRC inspection and/or SALP report which described the role of the purported 100% review in assuring weld quality.
- 4. An explanation of the delay in the licensee's awareness of a large backlog of radiographs that had not been transmitted from the welding contractor to the licensee and how this lack of knowledge can be explained in light of the NRC's repeated claims that the licensee maintained a 100% review of all radiographs beginning with the initiation of the pipe welding program.

G. The Commission's explanation of why the NRC staff, in the conduct of the inspection leading to NUREG-1425 failed to obtain information specified in Items 4e, 4f, and 4g of the PLAN FOR TEAM INSPECTION AT SEABROOK, reproduced in NUREG-1425, Appendix 2.


The NRC staff's initial decision to cease providing Seabrook weld documents that had to be obtained from the licensee causes us considerable concern. The decision to cease cooperation with certain of our documents requests was apparently made without consulting the Commission. It was made without a notification by the Commission of the members who, on April 2, 1990, requested that "you instruct the NRC staff to cooperate in this endeavor so that it is not necessary for us to become directly involved in requests for documents."

We again wish to emphasize that we require such documents in order to fulfill our oversight responsibilities and we expect continued cooperation from the Commission and its staff in obtaining all necessary materials.

Please provide the information requested herein prior to February 22, 1991.


Sincerely,


Peter H. Kostmayer


Edward M. Kennedy


Edward J. Markey


Nicholas Mavroules


John F. Kerry