November 22, 2006

Mr. Gene F. St. Pierre, Site Vice President
c/o James M. Peschel
Seabrook Station
FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC
PO Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES (TAC NO. MD2791)

Dear Mr. St. Pierre:

By letter dated August 7, 2006, FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC submitted license amendment request (LAR) 06-03. The LAR requested to revise various sections of the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 Technical Specifications (TSs). This letter relates specifically to the changes proposed for TS 3.3.9, "Remote Shutdown System," and TS 3.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink."

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has been reviewing the submittal and has determined that additional information is needed to complete its review. These questions were discussed with Mr. Michael O'Keefe of your staff on October 12, 2006.

In order to complete our review of LAR 06-03 in a timely manner, a response to this request for additional information is required to be provided within 45 days. If you cannot respond within 45 days, please inform us in writing why you cannot response and provide an alternate response date. This alternate response date must be no later than 60 days from the date of this letter.

Please note that if you do not respond to this letter within 45 days or provide an acceptable alternate date in writing, we may reject your application for amendment under the provisions of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.108. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (301) 415-2481.

Sincerely,

/RA Richard Ennis for/

G. Edward Miller, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

November 22, 2006

Mr. Gene F. St. Pierre, Site Vice President
c/o James M. Peschel
Seabrook Station
FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC
PO Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES (TAC NO. MD2791)

Dear Mr. St. Pierre:

By letter dated August 7, 2006, FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC submitted license amendment request (LAR) 06-03. The LAR requested to revise various sections of the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 Technical Specifications (TSs). This letter relates specifically to the changes proposed for TS 3.3.9, "Remote Shutdown System," and TS 3.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink."

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has been reviewing the submittal and has determined that additional information is needed to complete its review. These questions were discussed with Mr. Michael O'Keefe of your staff on October 12, 2006.

In order to complete our review of LAR 06-03 in a timely manner, a response to this request for additional information is required to be provided within 45 days. If you cannot respond within 45 days, please inform us in writing why you cannot response and provide an alternate response date. This alternate response date must be no later than 60 days from the date of this letter.

Please note that if you do not respond to this letter within 45 days or provide an acceptable alternate date in writing, we may reject your application for amendment under the provisions of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.108. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (301) 415-2481.

Sincerely,
/RA Richard Ennis for/
G. Edward Miller, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsNrrDorlLpl1-2	RidsNrrPMGMiller	RidsOgcMailCenter
LPL1-2 R/F	RidsNrrLACRaynor	RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	JTatum
RidsNrrDssSbpb			

ADAMS Accession Number: **ML063050698**

OFFICE	LPL1-2/PM	LPL1-2/LA	DSS/SBPB/BC	LPL1-2/BC
NAME	GEMiller	CRaynor	JSegala	Hchernoff (REnnis for)
DATE	11/14/2006	11/14/2006	11/01/06	11/22/2006

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1

cc:

Mr. J. A. Stall
Senior Vice President, Nuclear and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Peter Brann
Assistant Attorney General
State House, Station #6
Augusta, ME 04333

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Seabrook Nuclear Power Station
P.O. Box 1149
Seabrook, NH 03874

Town of Exeter
10 Front Street
Exeter, NH 03823

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Office of the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place, 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02108

Board of Selectmen
Town of Amesbury
Town Hall
Amesbury, MA 01913

Mr. Robert Poole
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Region I
J.W. McCormack P.O. &
Courthouse Building, Room 401
Boston, MA 02109

Mr. Tom Crimmins
Polestar Applied Technology
One First Street, Suite 4
Los Altos, CA 94019

Ms. Cristine McComb, Director
ATTN: John Giarrusso
Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency
400 Worcester Road
Framingham, MA 01702-5399

Ms. Kelly Ayotte, Attorney General
Mr. Orvil Fitch, Deputy Attorney General
33 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301

Mr. Christopher M. Pope, Director
Homeland Security & Emergency Mgmt.
New Hampshire Department of Safety
Bureau of Emergency Management
33 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301

Mr. M. S. Ross, Managing Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Rajiv S. Kundalkar
Vice President - Nuclear Engineering
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

James M. Peschel
Regulatory Programs Manager
FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC
PO Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

Ms. Marjan Mashhadi
Senior Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Suite 220
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Mark E. Warner
Vice President, Nuclear Operations Support
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES

FPL ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC

SEABROOK STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-443

By letter dated August 7, 2006, FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPLE) submitted license amendment request (LAR) 06-03. The LAR requested to revise various sections of the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 (Seabrook) Technical Specifications (TSs). This letter relates specifically to the changes proposed for TS 3.3.9, "Remote Shutdown System," and TS 3.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink." The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has been reviewing the submittal and has determined that the following additional information is needed to complete its review with respect to the aforementioned TS sections:

1. TS Table 3.3-9 lists components requiring operable remote safe shutdown controls. The table currently includes the turbine driven emergency feedwater (TDEFW) pump steam supply valves MS-V-127 and MS-V-128. These valves were also relied upon for addressing Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR 50), Appendix A, General Design Criteria (GDC) 57. FPLE stated that a design change was implemented in 1991 to replace the pneumatic actuators on these valves with gear operated manual actuators. The design change also upgraded the downstream branch header remote/manual isolation valves MS-V-393 and MS-V-394 for use as the containment isolation valves.

   a. Among other things, GDC 57 states that the containment isolation valve be located as close to the containment as practical, and valves MS-V-393 and MS-V-394 are located downstream of valves MS-V-127 and MS-V-128. Please elaborate on the 1991 plant design changes that were made and justify how they continue to address this particular provision of GDC 57.

   b. Explain what impact the 1991 plant design change has on the capability to mitigate a high energy line break of the TDEFW pump steam supply line, taking into consideration single active failure considerations.

2. Seabrook TS 3.7.4 specifies the actions that are required for an inoperable service water system/ultimate heat sink. Action e. requires the portable tower makeup pump system to be restored to its required condition within 72 hours if the system is not stored in its operational readiness state. Action e. also contains a requirement to notify the NRC within one hour in accordance with 10 CFR 50.72 if the portable tower makeup pump system is not restored to its design operational readiness state within 72 hours. The LAR proposes to eliminate the 1 hour reporting requirement because the condition does not meet the immediate reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72; and the LAR also proposes a requirement to implement actions, within the next 96 hours, that ensure

an adequate supply of makeup water for the service water cooling tower for a minimum of 30 days.

TS 3.7.4 for Seabrook differs from the Standard Technical Specification (STS) in that it allows continued plant operation when the UHS is inoperable due to insufficient water inventory; whereas the STS requires that the plant enter a shutdown action requirement. Because the cooling tower basin for Seabrook is not large enough to store 30 days worth of cooling water, the NRC staff allowed the makeup capability of a portable cooling tower makeup pump system to be credited. However, means other than the portable cooling tower makeup pump system for ensuring the required 30 day cooling water inventory for Seabrook have not been approved by the NRC. Therefore, if the portable cooling tower makeup pump system should become inoperable for more than the allowed outage time, prompt NRC notification and oversight would be necessary to assure that: (a) the situation is being adequately resolved, and (b) alternate means that are credited in the interim for ensuring cooling tower makeup capability are acceptable to the NRC staff.

Although the current 1-hour reporting requirements specified by 10 CFR 50.72 may no longer be applicable to the condition referred to in TS 3.7.4, the considerations discussed above continue to be valid. Therefore, to justify that the proposed changes are still considered to be appropriate, please address the considerations referred to above.