

October 23, 2002

NOTE TO: Docket File

FROM: Thomas J. Kenyon, Project Manager 
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: CLARIFICATION TO OMAHA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT'S (OPPD's)
RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI)
REGARDING SEVERE ACCIDENT MITIGATION ALTERNATIVES (SAMA) FOR
THE FORT CALHOUN STATION UNIT 1 LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

During telecons on October 21, 2002, the staff requested clarification to OPPD's September 18, 2002 response to RAIs regarding SAMAs for the Fort Calhoun Station Unit 1 license renewal application. Subsequently, OPPD provided the attached e-mail from Thomas Matthew, OPPD, to Thomas Kenyon, NRC, dated October 23, 2002, to provide written clarification of this matter.

Docket No. 50-285

Attachment: As stated

From: "MATTHEWS, THOMAS C" <tcmatthews2@oppd.com>
To: "Kenyon, Tom" <TJK2@nrc.gov>
Date: 10/23/02 11:32AM
Subject: Responses to SAMA RAI additional questions

Tom-

Here are the SAMA RAI additional questions and the OPPD responses as discussed in telephone calls on 10/21/02.

Question

In your response to RAI 1a, OPPD states

"In all, there were a total of 89 specific review comments. Seven of these

review comments/observations were felt to be significant. These items were

identified for expedited resolution and were included in the plant's PRA

configuration control program."

Were these inclusions reflected in the Revision 3 PRA model used in the SAMA evaluation? If not, please discuss the impact of these 7 significant items on the SAMA assessments, in particular whether any of the SAMAs studied would now be cost beneficial or whether new SAMA candidates would come into the picture.

Response

The initial SAMA assessment considered the 7 items, and it was concluded that resolution of the items would have no impact upon the SAMA assessments. Two of the items were already resolved in the Rev. 3 PRA model, which was used in the initial SAMA evaluation. Four other items identified the need for either a minor model change or increased documentation, and were dispositioned in the initial evaluation as not being significant. The final item was associated with the selection of the human factors modeling. Since FCS uses standard SAIC human factors methodology, the review comment was judged to be not significant to SAMA

assessment.

Question

In your response to 1d you stated that of the 520 plant damage states (PDSs) defined in the model, 12 dominant PDSs were identified as having individual contributions of greater than 1% and in total contribute slightly more than 50% of the CDF. Please confirm that all PDSs (rather than just these 12) were used in the Level 2 and 3 analyses for purposes of determining the 50-mile population dose.

Response

The impact of all possible PDSs was considered in the 50-mile population dose calculation. This can be seen in Table 5.2-4 of Appendix 5, by noting that the release class frequencies which were used in the dose assessments also sum up to the core damage frequency. Thus, all relevant PDSs were accounted for.

Thomas C. Matthews

Supervisor - Nuclear Licensing

Nuclear Projects Division

Fort Calhoun Station

Omaha Public Power District

Voice: 402.533.6938

Fax: 402.533.7291

CC: "HACKEROTT, HAROLD A" <hhackerott@oppd.com>, "FLUEHR III, JOHN J" <jfluehr@oppd.com>, "VAN SANT, BERNARD J" <bvensant@oppd.com>