

February 24, 2005

Mr. Cornelius J. Gannon, Vice President
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, NC 28461-0429

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) REGARDING SEVERE
ACCIDENT MITIGATION ALTERNATIVES FOR THE BRUNSWICK STEAM
ELECTRIC PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. MC4641 AND MC4642)

Dear Mr. Gannon:

The staff has reviewed the analyses of severe accident mitigation alternatives submitted by Carolina Power & Light Company in support of its application for license renewal for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, and has identified areas where additional information is needed to complete its review. Enclosed are the staff's requests for additional information.

We request that you provide your responses to these RAIs within 60 days of the date of this letter, in order to support the license renewal review schedule. If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-415-1590 or via email at RLE@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-324 and 50-325

Enclosures: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

February 24, 2005

Mr. Cornelius J. Gannon, Vice President
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, NC 28461-0429

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) REGARDING SEVERE
ACCIDENT MITIGATION ALTERNATIVES FOR THE BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC
PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. MC4641 AND MC4642)

Dear Mr. Gannon:

The staff has reviewed the analyses of severe accident mitigation alternatives submitted by Carolina Power & Light Company in support of its application for license renewal for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, and has identified areas where additional information is needed to complete its review. Enclosed are the staff's requests for additional information.

We request that you provide your responses to these RAIs within 60 days of the date of this letter, in order to support the license renewal review schedule. If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-415-1590 or via email at RLE@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-324 and 50-325
Enclosures: As stated
cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

D. Matthews/F. Gillespie P.T. Kuo R. Emch A. Kugler E. DiPaolo, SRI
S. Hernandez S. Mitra B. Mozafari M. Lemoncelli
J. Austin, RI RLEP R/F M. Parkhurst (PNNL) P. Frederickson, RIII
C. Guerrero

Adams Accession No.: **ML050550262**

Document name: E:\Filenet\ML050550262.wpd

OFFICE	RLEP:LA	RLEP:GE	RLEP:PM	RLEP:PM	PD:RLEP
NAME	MJenkins	SHernandez	REmch	AKugler (JC for)	PTKuo (SSL for)
DATE	2/ 16 /05	2/ 23 /05	2/ 23 /05	2/ 24 /05	2/ 24 /05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**Request for Additional Information Regarding the Analysis of
Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMAs) for the
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2**

1. The SAMA analysis is based on the most recent version of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP) Probabilistic Safety Assessment (PSA), i.e., the MOR03 model. Please provide the following information regarding this PSA model:
 - a. The Unit 2 PSA is used to quantify the risk for both Units 1 and 2. Characterize the major differences in the results from the Unit 1 and Unit 2 PSAs, and any plant design or operational differences that may impact the SAMA analysis.
 - b. Provide the CDF contribution due to station blackout events and ATWS events.
 - c. Describe the evolution of the current Level 2 PSA relative to that described in the BSEP Individual Plant Examination (IPE). Include an explanation of the Level 2 metrics (last column) presented in the table in Section F.2.1 of the Environmental Report (ER).
 - d. Provide a discussion of the Level 2 PSA models or assumptions that lead to the following results indicated in Table F-4 of the ER:
 - i. the approximate 50 percent split of ATWS Class IV sequences between high/early and moderate early release categories,
 - ii. the majority of Class IIIA sequences being assigned to the low/early release category, and
 - iii. the relatively large fraction of Classes IA, IB and IIC and the relatively small fraction of Class ID sequences being assigned to the intact containment release class.
 - e. Briefly describe the approach used to determine the source terms for each release category. Clarify whether new MAAP analyses were performed as part of the development of the current model and how the MAAP cases were selected to represent each release category (i.e., based on the frequency-dominant sequence in each category or on a conservative, bounding sequence). Clarify how the MAAP calculations used to determine the source terms relate to the MAAP calculations that were used to support the improved success criteria (as mentioned in Section F.2.3 of the ER).
 - f. Provide a breakdown of the annual population dose risk (person-rem/year) by containment release mode.
 - g. Section F.2 of the ER indicates that a major upgrade and replacement of the IPE models was undertaken during 1998-2001 and that subsequent updates were made in 2001, 2002 and 2003. Provide a discussion, similar to that in Section F.2.1.1, of the major changes made in the 1998 and subsequent updates, and the resulting CDF and LERF for each update. Note that the internal events CDF cited in the August 9, 2001 extended power uprate (EPU) submittal was 2.55×10^{-5} per year. Include an explanation of why the CDF value of 5.49×10^{-5} per year based on MOR98R1 (as reported in Section F.2.1 of the ER) was not used.

- b. Briefly describe how the information in Table A-1 of the Addendum to Appendix F of the ER was used in the identification of SAMAs.
 - c. In Table F-15 of the ER, Phase I SAMA 38 is said to address the same issues as Phase I SAMA 27. However, SAMA 27 is indicated as "Not Used." Provide an evaluation for Phase I SAMA 38 (at 3 percent and 7 percent), including implementation costs.
5. Provide the following with regard to the Phase II cost-benefit evaluations:
- a. Detailed descriptions of the PSA assumptions/modifications made to estimate the risk reduction are provided for each SAMA in Section F.6 of the ER. In order to accurately reflect the assumptions in the Summary table that is typically included in the staff's evaluation (see the summary table in prior EIS supplements for examples), provide a concise high-level statement for each SAMA that captures the assumed impact of the SAMA, e.g., eliminate all ISLOCA events; reduce RHR pump failure by a factor of two.
 - b. In Table F-16, the implementation cost for Phase II SAMA 1 is stated to be for a single unit site. However, the benefit estimate is based on the risk reduction achieved at both units. Even if only one portable DC generator is provided there may be some added cost for implementing the SAMA for both units. Provide an explanation.
 - c. The discussion of Phase II SAMA 13 indicates that this SAMA would not be beneficial for the loss of control rod drive (CRD) initiator but that there would be some benefit for other loss of makeup sequences. The benefit analysis indicates a 6.4 percent reduction in CDF and a 9.3 percent reduction in person-rem doses (dose risk). These reductions appear higher than expected considering that no CRD failures appear in the importance list of Table F-13. Please explain.
 - d. Phase II SAMA 18 is modeled by setting the loss of 4 kV bus initiators to zero and is stated to reduce the CDF by 3.1 percent. Figure F-2 of the ER indicates that the total CDF due to loss of AC "E"-bus (emergency bus) is 5.7 percent. Explain the difference. Also, discuss if eliminating the failure of an "E"-bus during other initiating events also makes a contribution to the estimated benefit for this SAMA.
 - e. The cost of implementing Phase II SAMA 31 is given as \$250,000. This seems high for changes that appear to be limited to improved training and communications equipment. Provide a further explanation for this cost.
 - f. The description of the estimated benefit of Phase II SAMA 32 in Section F.6.21 of the ER indicates that only improvements in the North Central and North West areas elevation 20' of the reactor building were considered. Table F-16 indicates that the cost of implementation for this SAMA is based on work in additional fire areas (including the South area, the control room cabinets, and the Switchgear Rooms). Please reconcile these apparent inconsistencies and justify the cost estimate.
 - g. Information in Sections F.6.11.1 and F.6.28 of the ER indicate that Phase II SAMA 16 is not cost-beneficial. However, the entry in Table F-16 for this SAMA states that the cost of implementation is less than the averted cost-risk (\$135,817), and that this SAMA has been retained for further evaluation. Clarify this apparent discrepancy.

- Provide alternate ventilation for various rooms, e.g., using portable equipment or blocking open doors for RHR pump room, HPCS pump room, RCIC pump room (Nine Mile Point, Unit 2, SAMA 23),
- Enhance procedures to provide more specific guidance for loss of service water events (Nine Mile Point, Unit 2, SAMA 213),
- Reduce unit cooler contribution to emergency diesel generator unavailability through increased testing frequency or redundant cooling (Nine Mile Point, Unit 2, SAMA 221), and
- Enhance procedures to provide more specific guidance for loss of instrument air events (Nine Mile Point, Unit 2, SAMA 222).

Mr. Steven R. Carr
Associate General Counsel - Legal
Department
Progress Energy Service Company, LLC
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. David R. Sandifer, Chairperson
Brunswick County Board of Commissioners
Post Office Box 249
Bolivia, North Carolina 28422

Resident Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
8470 River Road
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. John H. O'Neill, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128

Ms. Beverly Hall, Section Chief
Radiation Protection Section,
Division of Natural Resources
N.C. Department of Environment
and Natural Resources
3825 Barrett Dr.
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Mr. David H. Hinds
Plant General Manager
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Public Service Commission
State of South Carolina
Post Office Drawer 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Ms. Margaret A. Force
Assistant Attorney General
State of North Carolina
Post Office Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Robert P. Gruber
Executive Director
Public Staff - NCUC
4326 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4326

Mr. T. P. Cleary
Director - Site Operations
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Mr. Norman R. Holden, Mayor
City of Southport
201 East Moore Street
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. Warren Lee
Emergency Management Director
New Hanover County Department of
Emergency Management
Post Office Box 1525
Wilmington, North Carolina 28402-1525

Mr. Chris L. Burton, Manager
Performance Evaluation and
Regulatory Affairs PEB 7
Progress Energy
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. Edward T. O'Neill
Manager - Support Services
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. Allen K. Brittain
Superintendent, Security
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
P.O. Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Mr. Michael Heath
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
P.O. Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Talmage B. Clements
Manager - License Renewal
Progress Energy
P. O. Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Fred Emerson
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Ms. Ilene Brown
NCUW
William Randall Library
601 S. College Rd.
Wilmington, NC 28403-5616

Cynthia Tart
3404 E. Yacht Dr
Oak Island, NC 28468

May Moore - Commissioner
Brunswick County
P.O. Box 249
Bolivia, NC 28422

Hilary Snow
The State Port Pilot
114 E. Moore
Southport 28461

Ken Raber
North Carolina Eastern Municipal
Power Agency
P.O. Box 29513
Raleigh, NC 27626

Vicki Soltis
5134 Minnesota Dr.
Southport, NC 28461

Pat Woods
3700 Players Club Drive
Southport, NC 28461

Joe Woods
3700 Players Club Drive
Southport, NC 28461

Rob Gandy, City Manager
City of Southport
201 E Moore Street
Southport, NC 28461

Jerry Thrift, Vice President
Brunswick Community College
P.O. Box 30
Supply, NC 28462-0030

J. Steven Johnson, Director
Brunswick County Economic Development
Commission
Post Office Box 158
25 Courthouse Drive NE
Bolivia, NC 28422

Mr. J. Leslie Bell, AICP, Director
Brunswick County Planning Department
P.O. Box 249
Bolivia, NC 28422