

January 16, 2008

MEMORANDUM TO: Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Senior Project Manager */ra/*
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION AND SALEM NUCLEAR
GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2, DRAFT REQUEST
FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NOS. MD5716, MD5717,
AND MD5718)

The attached draft request for information (RAI) was transmitted on January 16, 2008, to Mr. Jeff Keenan of PSEG Nuclear LLC (the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate an upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's request dated June 1, 2007, as supplemented on August 29, 2007, for proposed changes to the emergency plan for Hope Creek Generating Station and Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The proposed changes would extend the time goal for key emergency response organization personnel to respond and activate emergency response facilities in the event of an emergency.

This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket Nos. 50-354, 50-272 and 50-311

Attachment: Draft RAI

January 16, 2008

MEMORANDUM TO: Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Senior Project Manager */ra/*
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION AND SALEM NUCLEAR
GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2, DRAFT REQUEST
FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NOS. MD5716, MD5717,
AND MD5718)

The attached draft request for information (RAI) was transmitted on January 16, 2008, to Mr. Jeff Keenan of PSEG Nuclear LLC (the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate an upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's request dated June 1, 2007, as supplemented on August 29, 2007, for proposed changes to the emergency plan for Hope Creek Generating Station and Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The proposed changes would extend the time goal for key emergency response organization personnel to respond and activate emergency response facilities in the event of an emergency.

This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket Nos. 50-354, 50-272 and 50-311

Attachment: Draft RAI

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC RidsNrrDorLp1-2 KWilliams, NSIR
PDI-2 Reading RidsNrrPMREnnis
RidsNrrDorIDpr MNorris, NSIR

ACCESSION NO.: ML080160176

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM
NAME	REnnis
DATE	1/16/08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
REGARDING PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EMERGENCY PLAN
FOR
HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION
AND SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-354, 50-272 AND 50-311

By letter dated June 1, 2007, as supplemented on August 29, 2007, PSEG Nuclear LLC (PSEG or the licensee) submitted proposed changes to the emergency plan for Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek) and Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (Salem). The proposed changes would extend the time goal for key emergency response organization (ERO) personnel to respond and activate emergency response facilities in the event of an emergency.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information the licensee provided that supports the proposed changes and would like to discuss the following issues to clarify the submittals.

1. Explain what role/function the committed on-shift staff positions would have for normal operations, ERO/emergency planning, and/or fire brigade. Please supply this information in a structured (e.g., tabular) format and include any collateral duties.
2. Control Room Communicator
 - a) What procedural guidance directs the notification activities of the two assigned communicators? Provide a copy of the procedures.
 - b) Note 8 on Figure 3-1 in Attachment 4 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, states: "EO assigned to the OSC cannot concurrently be assigned as control room communicator." Are the two control room communicators included as part of the nuclear equipment operators "on-shift" compliment?
3. Explanation #6 on page 26 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, states, in part: "There would be no difference between self-monitor qualified personnel in an emergency and Rad Worker trained personnel based upon current radiation protection program."
 - a) Provide the procedural guidance that supports that statement.
 - b) What is the level of training for each of those qualifications?
 - c) What types of radiation protection specific functions are these two qualifications procedurally allowed to perform?

4. Explanation #3 on page 25 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, states, in part: "Took credit for the Shift Maintenance Supervisor who is a member of the OSC." How does the Shift Maintenance Supervisor, whose duties are discussed as "OSC command and control" on page 16 of Attachment 2, perform the functions of a mechanical maintenance person for repair and corrective actions?
5. Explanation #4 on page 25 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, states, in part: "Added the unaffected stations on-shift Electrical and Controls Technicians as additional resources to replace the maintenance supervisor (C4) in the 1986 E-plan revision. The unaffected stations Electrical and Controls Technicians can provide limited support to the affected stations technicians as some tasks have station specific qualification requirements."
 - a) With respect to "limited support," how limited is the support and how does that affect the ability of the on-shift ERO to respond to an event?
 - b) How are they qualified to replace the maintenance supervisor position?
6. Page 14 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, has a table of on-shift ERO positions.
 - a) Under the Operations Support Center - Hope Creek, the nuclear equipment operator has a "+" after the "2." What does this indicate?
 - b) Under the Operations Support Center - Salem, it indicates 4 Nuclear Equipment Operators and a Radwaste Operator. Explanation #3 on page 25 of Attachment 2 states "At Salem, this position is filled by any NEO while at Hope Creek, a separate RW Operator is an on-shift position." Does the table on page 14 accurately describe the number of Operators on shift? If so, is the explanation accurate?
7. Note 1 on Page 12 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, states: "Fire Department personnel also perform some maintenance activities on a routine basis. The on-shift availability and capabilities of the Onsite Fire Department increases the availability of operations and maintenance personnel to perform their expected OSC duties."
 - a) What are the qualifications of the Fire Department personnel with respect to performing emergency response maintenance activities?
 - b) Describe the maintenance activities that are performed on a routine basis.
8. Pages 16-17 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007, provide the justification for the OSC and states in part: "An OSC Coordinator and RP Supervisor are duty responders and the proposed change would result in a delay of this augmented support to the OSC. A review of their functions indicates that the on-shift OSC staff can continue to perform those functions until the duty responders arrive without significant impact on the OSC." The facility list of personnel on page 16 does not indicate any RP

personnel on it. Who performs any procedurally required functions of the RP Supervisor prior to additional staff augmentation (e.g., radiological briefings, etc)?

9. Are the chemistry technicians at both stations trained to perform any radiation protection specific functions such as radiation exposure surveys or air sampling (radioactive or industrial) since they are addressed as an available resource in Explanation #2 on page 25 of Attachment 2 to the submittal dated June 1, 2007?
10. What primary or collateral duties do the chemistry technicians have that could provide competing priorities during an event?
11. What primary or collateral duties do the radiation protection technicians have that could provide competing priorities during an event?
12. Are the unaffected station's chemistry and radiation protection technicians qualified to perform all emergency response functions at the affected station?
13. How are the terms "on-shift and initial augment," "short-term augment" and "long-term augment" defined relative to the PSEG Emergency Plan? Explain how they relate to the proposed Table 3-2 and time goals associated with staffing and augmentation.
14. Are there any procedural actions performed at the unaffected station for different emergency classes that could affect the availability of personnel to respond to the affected station? If so, how are these actions compensated for?