March 1, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Darrell J. Roberts, Acting Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Lee A. Licata, Project Manager, Section 2 ***/RA/***
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SEABROOK STATION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NO. MC1097)

The attached draft request for information (RAI) was transmitted on March 1, 2004, to Mr. Michael O'Keefe of FPL Energy, LLC(the licensee). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by NRR and to support a conference call with the licensee to discuss the RAI.

This RAI is related to the licensee's amendment request for Seabrook Station (Seabrook) dated October 6, 2003 The proposed amendment would revise Seabrook's Technical Specifications for full implementation of an alternate source term.

Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-443

Attachment: Draft RAI

March 1, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Darrell J. Roberts, Acting Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Lee A. Licata, Project Manager, Section 2 ***/RA/***
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SEABROOK STATION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NO. MC1097)

The attached draft request for information (RAI) was transmitted on March 1, 2004, to Mr. Michael O'Keefe of FPL Energy, LLC(the licensee). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by NRR and to support a conference call with the licensee to discuss the RAI.

This RAI is related to the licensee's amendment request for Seabrook Station (Seabrook) dated October 6, 2003 The proposed amendment would revise Seabrook's Technical Specifications for full implementation of an alternate source term.

Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-443

Attachment: Draft RAI

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC	DRoberts	LBrown	RDenning
PDI-2 Reading	LLicata	VNerses	

ACCESSION NO.: ML040611043

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	PD1-2/PM	SPSB-C/SC
NAME	LLicata	VNerses	RDenning (Concurrence received via email
DATE	03/01/2004	03/01/04	1 March 2004

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

RELATED TO ALTERNATE SOURCE TERM AMENDMENT REQUEST

SEABROOK STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-443

By letter dated October 6, 2003, FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (Seabrook or the licensee) submitted an amendment request for Seabrook. The proposed amendment would revise Seabrook's Technical Specifications for full implementation of an alternate source term (AST).

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information the licensee provided that supports the proposed amendment and requests the following additional information to clarify the submittal:

1. Provide the 1998 through 2002 hourly meteorological data used in the ARCON96 calculations and joint wind speed, wind direction and atmospheric stability distributions (jfd) used in the PAVAN calculations. If these data have already been provided on the docket, please cite an appropriate reference. Please specify if the jfd data are formatted as discussed on page 14 of Enclosure 2 to NYN-03061 (Enclosure 2) provided by letter dated October 6, 2003 or if they are the reformatted data input to the PAVAN calculations.

2. Page 15 of Enclosure 2 states that the exit velocity from the MSSVs is greater than the 95 percentile wind speed for the first 2½ hours of the events during which a release is postulated to occur. What are the estimated exit velocities, flow rates, and pressures as a function of time for the MSSVs and ARVs during this interval? What is the basis for the estimates? The 95 percentile wind speeds are estimated to be 16.72 and 16.81 miles per hour. How were these values estimated?

3 With regard to the ARCON96 relative concentration (X/Q) estimates provided in Table 1.8.1-2 of Enclosure 2, were all of the calculations based upon the same assumptions, other than 1) the differences noted in Table 1.8.1-1, 2) reduction by a factor of two when either the east or west intake was the postulated receptor location, or 3) when the diesel building intakes were the assumed receptors and the X/Q value is a weighted average of the two intakes? In the third case, are the input values given in Table 1.8.1-1 for the more limiting intake and inputs for the less limiting intake not provided? Are the inflow rates assumed to be equal? Were any releases assumed to be diffuse or to have a vent flow? If so, what were the inputs? Are values provided in Table 1.8.1-2 applicable to loss of offsite power and single failure scenarios?

ATTACHMENT