

February 2, 2001

Mr. Steve J. Redeker, Manager  
Plant Closure & Decommissioning  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
14440 Twin Cities Road  
Herald, CA 95638-9799

SUBJECT: RANCHO SECO NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, PROPOSED LICENSE  
AMENDMENT NO. 194 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC  
NO. MB0592)

Dear Mr. Redeker:

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) submitted Proposed License Amendment No. 194 for the Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on October 23, 2000. NRC staff are currently reviewing your proposed amendment and have determined that additional information is required to complete this review. As discussed with your staff by telephone on December 5, 2000, NRC has prepared a Request for Additional Information (RAI) which is enclosed with this letter. Please assure that your response to this RAI is performed under Oath or Affirmation.

Should you have any questions on this matter, please contact me at 301-415-1169.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Paul W. Harris, Project Manager  
Decommissioning Section  
Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-312

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

February 2, 2001

Mr. Steve J. Redeker, Manager  
Plant Closure & Decommissioning  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
14440 Twin Cities Road  
Herald, CA 95638-9799

SUBJECT: RANCHO SECO NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, PROPOSED LICENSE  
AMENDMENT NO. 194 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC  
NO. MB0592)

Dear Mr. Redeker:

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) submitted Proposed License Amendment No. 194 for the Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on October 23, 2000. NRC staff are currently reviewing your proposed amendment and have determined that additional information is required to complete this review. As discussed with your staff by telephone on December 5, 2000, NRC has prepared a Request for Additional Information (RAI) which is enclosed with this letter. Please assure that your response to this RAI is performed under Oath or Affirmation.

Should you have any questions on this matter, please contact me at 301-415-1169.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Paul W. Harris, Project Manager  
Decommissioning Section  
Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-312

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsAcrcsAcnwMailCenter
PDIV-3 r/f	RidsRgn4MailCenter
RidsNrrDlpm(SBlack)	RidsNrrDlpmLpdiv3(MMasnik)
LBerry	RidsNrrPMPHarris
RidsOgcRp	RidsNrrLACJamerson

**ACCESSION NO. ML010040532**

NRR-088

OFFICE	PDIV-D/PM	PDIV-D/LA	PDIV-D/SC
NAME	PHarris:jc	MMcAllister for CJamerson	DWheeler for MMasnik
DATE	01/03/01	12/20/00	02/01/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station

cc:

Mr. Richard Ferreira  
Assistant General Manager - Energy  
Supply & Chief Engineer  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
P.O. Box 15830 - Mail Stop 41  
Sacramento, CA 95852-1830

Thomas A. Baxter, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. Jerry Delezanski  
Quality & Compliance  
Superintendent  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
Rancho Seco Nuclear Station  
14440 Twin Cities Road  
Herald, CA 95638-9799

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400  
Arlington, TX 76011-8064

Sacramento County  
Board of Supervisors  
700 H Street, Suite 2450  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ms. Dana Appling, General Counsel  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
P. O. Box 15830  
Sacramento, CA 95852-1830

Mr. Steve Hsu  
Radiologic Health Branch  
State Department of Health Services  
P. O. Box 942732  
Sacramento, CA 94327-7320

Mr. Ed Bailey, Radiation Program Director  
Radiologic Health Branch  
State Department of Health Services  
P. O. Box 942732 (MS 178)  
Sacramento, CA 94327-7320

Mr. Robert A. Laurie, Commissioner  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street (MS 31)  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Cindy Buchanan, Site Document  
Control Supervisor  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station  
14440 Twin Cities Road  
Herald, CA 95638-9799

RANCHO SECO PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 194

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 1.a Rancho Seco proposes to delete the description for SITE BOUNDARY in PDTS (Permanently Defueled Technical Specifications) D1.5 (definitions), however, you propose to maintain the title "SITE BOUNDARY" in the PDTS Index, page DI-1. The staff notes that this proposed change may be confusing. Consider whether replacing the D1.5 title, "SITE BOUNDARY," page DI-1, with the word "Deleted," clarifies the proposed change.
- 1.b Rancho Seco proposes to delete the description for SITE BOUNDARY in PDTS D1.5 (definitions), however, you propose to maintain the title "SITE BOUNDARY" in PDTS D1.5, page D1-2. The staff notes that this proposed change may be confusing. Consider whether replacing the D1.5 title, "SITE BOUNDARY," with the word "Deleted," to correspond to item 1.a above.
- 2.a Rancho Seco proposes to delete the description for UNRESTRICTED AREA in PDTS D1.13 (definitions), however, you propose to maintain the title "UNRESTRICTED AREA," in the PDTS Index, page DI-1. The staff notes that this proposed change may be confusing. Consider whether a complete deletion of Index item PDTS D1.13 (with a change bar placed in the margin) clarifies the proposed change.
- 2.b. Rancho Seco proposes to delete the description for UNRESTRICTED AREA in PDTS D1.13 (definitions), however, you propose to maintain PDTS D1.13 and the title "UNRESTRICTED AREA" on page D1-3. The staff notes that this proposed change may be confusing. Consider whether a complete deletion of D1.13 on page D1.13 (with a change bar placed in the margin) clarifies your proposed change.
3. The error bar specifying a proposed change to D5.2 SPENT FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES on page D5-1 appears to be on the wrong line. Resubmit the affected page correcting the location of the error bar. The staff notes that Attachment 3 to your proposed license amendment should be an exact representation of what would be incorporated into your PDTs if the proposed amendment was approved.
4. The dot leaders on your submitted Index pages of your proposed amendment are not equivalent to that in your currently approved PDTS. Justify the proposed changes in the dot leaders on your submitted Index pages (e.g., the dot leader changes are administrative in nature etc.). The staff notes that Attachment 3 to your proposed license amendment should be an exact representation of what would be incorporated into your PDTs if the proposed amendment was approved.
5. Provide a short description stating whether or not your proposed change would (1) foreclose release of the site for possible unrestricted use, (2) result in significant environmental impacts not previously reviewed, or (3) result in there no longer being reasonable assurance that adequate funds will be available for decommissioning.

6. In Section D6.8.3a.(8) of the PDTS, the phrase “from the site” was deleted, however, this proposed change was not justified. Justify this proposed change or resubmit a corrected PDTS page and state that the phrase was deleted in error.
7. Your proposed amendment states that definitions and figures proposed for deletion from the PDTS are “equivalent” and in some cases “identical” to figures and definitions contained in other licensee controlled documents referenced in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR). However, there are differences between the figures and definitions proposed for deletion from the PDTS and the “equivalent” or “identical” figures and definitions referenced in the SAR (e.g., the figures in Attachments 5 and 6 of the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual have less information than PDTS Figures D5.1-2 and D5.1-3 proposed for deletion). Justify any and all informational differences between the PDTS figures and definitions proposed for deletion and the figures and definitions already contained in documents that you propose to justify the PDTS deletion on. The staff notes that there is a distinct difference between “removing information from the PDTS because it is equivalently contained in other licensee-controlled documents” and “deleting information from the PDTS.”