

June 14, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Scott P. Wall, 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 June 10, 2004, to Mr. Michael O'Keefe of FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPLES or 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. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-443

Attachment: RAI

June 14, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Scott P. Wall, 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 June 10, 2004, to Mr. Michael O'Keefe of FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPLES or 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. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-443

Attachment: RAI

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC PDI-2 Reading JClifford SWall

ACCESSION NO.: ML041660406

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM
NAME	SWall
DATE	6/10/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
RELATED TO ALTERNATE SOURCE TERM AMENDMENT REQUEST

SEABROOK STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-443

TAC NO. MC1097

By letter dated October 6, 2003, FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPLES 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. The questions are specifically associated with the licensee's May 24, 2004, supplement.

- 1a. In response to March 23, 2004 RAI No. 3, FPLES identified control room intake radiation monitor dose rates. However, the radiation level table does not provide a value for a fuel handling accident or a liquid waste system failure. The NRC staff requests the projected monitor readings for these events.
- 1b. The whole body dose rate reading at the monitor location for the MSLB is 1.27 mrem/hr. This value is very close to 1 mrem/hr value which corresponds to the 2 x background monitor setpoint. If the whole body dose rate for the actual event was to be, for example, 0.95 mrem/hr, would the 30-day dose to the control room operator be less than 5 rem TEDE assuming no monitor alarm? Since FPLES assumes that isolation would occur within 30 seconds, the NRC staff notes that the internal exposure to inhaled iodine would be expected to increase faster than the external exposure if isolation does not occur.
2. The response to RAI No. 6i did not address the intent of the NRC staff's question. The NRC staff was not questioning what was designated as the source and receptor for the two sets of X/Q values. The staff's primary focus is in the last sub question: "What impact does this windspeed have on the time to reach 0.25 inch water gage (WG)?" Specifically, can the containment enclosure be drawn down to 0.25" WG within 4.5 minutes even in high wind conditions as assumed in the analyses?