

January 31, 2005

Mr. Thomas J. Palmisano  
Site Vice President  
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant  
Nuclear Management Company, LLC  
2807 West County Road 75  
Monticello, MN 55362-9637

SUBJECT: MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT - SECOND REQUEST FOR  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS  
CHANGE REQUEST TO APPLY ALTERNATIVE SOURCE TERM (AST)  
METHODOLOGY TO RE-EVALUATE THE FUEL-HANDLING ACCIDENT  
(TAC NO. MC3299)

Dear Mr. Palmisano:

The Nuclear Management Company's, LLC's, letter of April 29, 2004, as supplemented November 23, 2004, submitted a license amendment request for selective-scope application of AST methodology for re-evaluation of the fuel-handling accident at the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff is reviewing your request and finds that additional information is needed as shown in the enclosed request for additional information (RAI).

I discussed the enclosed RAI with Mr. Richard Loeffler of your organization on January 24, 2005, and he agreed to respond within 30 days of receipt of the RAI. Please contact me at (301) 415-1423 if you have questions.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

L. Mark Padovan, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate III  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-263

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

January 31, 2005

Mr. Thomas J. Palmisano  
Site Vice President  
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant  
Nuclear Management Company, LLC  
2807 West County Road 75  
Monticello, MN 55362-9637

SUBJECT: MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT - SECOND REQUEST FOR  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS  
CHANGE REQUEST TO APPLY ALTERNATIVE SOURCE TERM (AST)  
METHODOLOGY TO RE-EVALUATE THE FUEL-HANDLING ACCIDENT  
(TAC NO. MC3299)

Dear Mr. Palmisano:

The Nuclear Management Company's, LLC's, letter of April 29, 2004, as supplemented November 23, 2004, submitted a license amendment request for selective-scope application of AST methodology for re-evaluation of the fuel-handling accident at the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff is reviewing your request and finds that additional information is needed as shown in the enclosed request for additional information (RAI).

I discussed the enclosed RAI with Mr. Richard Loeffler of your organization on January 24, 2005, and he agreed to respond within 30 days of receipt of the RAI. Please contact me at (301) 415-1423 if you have questions.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

L. Mark Padovan, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate III  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-263

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC	RidsOgcMail	EForrest
PDIII-1 Reading	RidsAcrcAcnwMailCenter	JHayes
RidsNrrDlpmLpdiii1 (MKotzalas)	BBurgess	LBrown
RidsNrrPMMPadovan	RidsNrrLATHarris	DLPM DPR

E:\Filenet\ML050140063.wpd

**ADAMS Accession No.: ML050140063**

NRR-088

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	PDIII-1/LA	PDIII-1/(A)SC
NAME	MPadovan:mp	DClarke for THarris	MKotzalas
DATE	01/24/05	01/24/05	01/31/05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (MNGP)**  
**Fuel Handling Alternative Source Term (AST) Submittal**  
**Second Request for Additional Information**  
**Docket No. 50-263**

Meteorological Measurements and Data

1. Were comparisons made between the 1998 through 2002 hourly wind speed data in the ARCON96 format and the joint wind speed, wind direction and atmospheric stability (jfd) data used in the PAVAN calculations? U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff estimate a slightly higher occurrence of calm winds when generating a jfd from the hourly data in comparison to the frequency in the jfds used in the PAVAN calculations. Further, the incidence of calms reported for 1980 in MNGP's Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (USAR) also appears to be higher than in the jfds used in the PAVAN calculations. Provide further detail of the comparisons made between the 1980 jfd wind speed and direction frequency data and the 1998 through 2002 jfds to support the statement on page 3 of calculation number 2004-01852 (CA-04-036) which asserts that "the new data are generally consistent with the USAR historical data."
2. Did the MNGP onsite meteorological measurement program meet the recommendations of Regulatory Guide 1.23, "Onsite Meteorological Programs," from 1998 through 2002?

Onsite X/Qs

3. With regard to the April 29, 2004, letter on selective scope application of the AST, page 23 of Enclosure 1 states that the reactor vent "was determined to be the limiting and representative release point for the AST FHA [fuel-handling accident]." Staff notes that reference CA-04-037 which describes how estimates were made includes results from a number of calculations, some with higher atmospheric dispersion factors ( $\chi/Q$  values) than that for the postulated release from the reactor vent to the control room. Please confirm that the only two relevant release/receptor pairs for the FHA are from the off-gas stack and the reactor building vent to the control room. Does this assessment include consideration of factors such as single-failure, loss of offsite power, open penetrations (e.g., personnel or equipment hatches), or possible intake to the technical support center?
4. In the elevated release calculation, it appears that the effective stack height was input as the distance between the top of the stack and ground level rather than the distance between the top of the stack and the control room air intake. If this is the case, is the  $\chi/Q$  value for the release from the plant vent still limiting?

Offsite X/Qs

5. What is the basis for use of wind measurements from the 43-meter level in the calculation of ground level  $\chi/Q$  values from the plant vent to the exclusion area boundary and low population zone rather than measurements taken at the 10-meter level? Are the  $\chi/Q$  values calculated using the 43-meter data more limiting than those using the 10-meter wind measurements?

ENCLOSURE

Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant

cc:

Jonathan Rogoff, Esquire  
Vice President, Counsel & Secretary  
Nuclear Management Company, LLC  
700 First Street  
Hudson, WI 54016

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Resident Inspector's Office  
2807 W. County Road 75  
Monticello, MN 55362

Manager, Regulatory Affairs  
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant  
Nuclear Management Company, LLC  
2807 West County Road 75  
Monticello, MN 55362-9637

Robert Nelson, President  
Minnesota Environmental Control  
Citizens Association (MECCA)  
1051 South McKnight Road  
St. Paul, MN 55119

Commissioner  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
520 Lafayette Road  
St. Paul, MN 55155-4194

Regional Administrator, Region III  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
801 Warrenville Road  
Lisle, IL 60532-4351

Commissioner  
Minnesota Department of Health  
717 Delaware Street, S. E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55440

Douglas M. Gruber, Auditor/Treasurer  
Wright County Government Center  
10 NW Second Street  
Buffalo, MN 55313

Commissioner  
Minnesota Department of Commerce  
85 7th Place East, Suite 500  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Manager - Environmental Protection Division  
Minnesota Attorney General's Office  
445 Minnesota St., Suite 900  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2127

John Paul Cowan  
Executive Vice President & Chief Nuclear  
Officer  
Nuclear Management Company, LLC  
700 First Street  
Hudson, WI 54016

Nuclear Asset Manager  
Xcel Energy, Inc.  
414 Nicollet Mall, R.S. 8  
Minneapolis, MN 55401