



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 22, 2010

Mr. Ross T. Ridenoure
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Southern California Edison Company
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, CA 92674-0128

SUBJECT: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3 -
CHANGE TO EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL SCHEME (TAC NOS. ME1014,
ME1015, AND ME1016)

Dear Mr. Ridenoure:

By letter dated March 31, 2009, as supplemented by letter dated January 22, 2010, Southern California Edison (SCE or the licensee), requested prior U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approval for proposed changes to the emergency action levels (EALs) for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 1, 2, and 3, and the associated independent spent fuel storage installation. The requested changes to the EALs for SONGS support a conversion from the current EAL scheme to a scheme based on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99-01, "Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels," Revision 5, dated February 22, 2008.

The NRC staff performed a review of the proposed changes to the licensee's EALs as directed by Appendix E to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50, Section IV.B.(1). The NRC staff determined that incorporation of the proposed changes meets the standards in 10 CFR 50.47(b) and the requirements of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50, and provides reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the licensee's proposed changes to the EALs for SONGS, as outlined in its application dated March 31, 2009, and as supplemented by letter dated January 22, 2010, are acceptable.

The NRC expects the licensee to implement the EALs as approved in the enclosed safety evaluation, which includes the implementation of the EAL technical basis document. If SCE changes the EALs, as approved, through 10 CFR 50.54(q) before implementation, the licensee shall ensure that it provides the changes to the NRC during the next emergency preparedness baseline inspection. SCE's March 31, 2009, letter stated that the revised EALs will be implemented at SONGS at the licensee's earliest convenience. The NRC requests that SCE notify the staff if implementation will not be completed within 12 months of the date of this letter.

R. T. Ridenoure

- 2 -

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Randy Hall, the NRC Project Manager for SONGS, at (301) 415-4032, or through e-mail to randy.hall@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E. J. Leeds". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "E" and "L".

Eric J. Leeds, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-206, 50-361, and 50-362

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: Listserv



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

CHANGE TO EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL SCHEME

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1, 2, AND 3

DOCKET NOS. 50-206, 50-361, AND 50-362

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated March 31, 2009 (Reference 1), and supplemented by letter dated January 22, 2010 (Reference 2), Southern California Edison (the licensee) requested prior U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approval for proposed changes to the emergency action levels (EALs) for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 1, 2, and 3, and the associated independent spent fuel storage installation.

The requested changes to the licensee's EALs support a conversion from the current EAL scheme to a scheme based on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99-01, "Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels," Revision 5, dated February 2008 (Reference 3); henceforth will be referred to as NEI-99-01. San Onofre currently uses an EAL scheme based on NUREG-0654, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants" (Reference 4).

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

The NRC staff reviewed the proposed revision against the following regulations and guidance described below.

2.1 Regulations

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.47, "Emergency plans," sets forth emergency plan requirements for nuclear power plant facilities. The regulations in 10 CFR 50.47(a)(1)(i) state in part "... no initial operating license for a nuclear power reactor will be issued unless a finding is made by the NRC that there is reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency." Section 50.47(b) establishes the standards that the onsite and offsite emergency response plans must meet for NRC staff to make a positive finding that there is reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency.

Enclosure

One of these standards (10 CFR 50.47(b)(4)) stipulates that emergency plans include a standard emergency classification and action level scheme.

Section IV.B of Appendix E, "Emergency Planning and Preparedness for Production and Utilization Facilities," to 10 CFR Part 50, states, in part,

The means to be used for determining the magnitude of, and for continually assessing the impact of, the release of radioactive materials shall be described, including emergency action levels that are to be used as criteria for determining the need for notification and participation of local and State agencies, the Commission, and other Federal agencies, and the emergency action levels that are to be used for determining when and what type of protective measures should be considered within and outside the site boundary to protect health and safety. The emergency action levels shall be based on in-plant conditions and instrumentation in addition to onsite and offsite monitoring. These initial emergency action levels shall be discussed and agreed on by the applicant or licensee and state and local governmental authorities, and approved by the NRC. Thereafter, emergency action levels shall be reviewed with the State and local governmental authorities on an annual basis. A revision to an emergency action level must be approved by the NRC before implementation if:

- (1) The licensee is changing from one emergency action level scheme to another emergency action level scheme (e.g., a change from an emergency action level scheme based on NUREG-0654 to a scheme based upon [Nuclear Management and Resources Council, Inc./National Environmental Studies Project] NUMARC/NESP-007 or NEI-99-01);
- (2) The licensee is proposing an alternate method for complying with the regulations; or
- (3) The emergency action level revision decreases the effectiveness of the emergency plan.

2.2 Guidance

As specified in Section IV.B of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50, if a licensee wishes to revise an entire EAL scheme, from NUREG-0654 to another NRC-endorsed EAL scheme, the licensee must submit the change for prior NRC approval. The statement of considerations for the final rule amending the NRC's regulations relating to NRC approval of EAL changes (70 FR 3591; January 26, 2005), states in part,

The Commission believes a licensee's proposal to convert from one EAL scheme (e.g., NUREG-0654-based) to another EAL scheme (e.g., NUMARC/NESP-007 or NEI-99-01 based) ... is of sufficient significance to require prior NRC review and approval. NRC review and approval for such major changes in EAL methodology is necessary to ensure that there is reasonable assurance that the final EAL change will provide an acceptable level of safety.

NRC Regulatory Guide 1.101, Revisions 3 and 4, "Emergency Planning and Preparedness for Nuclear Power Reactors" (References 5 and 6, respectively), endorsed NUMARC/NESP-007 and NEI 99-01, Revision 4, EAL guidance, respectively, as acceptable alternatives to the guidance provided in NUREG-0654 for development of EALs to comply with 10 CFR 50.47 and Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50. A change in an EAL scheme to incorporate the improvements provided in NUMARC/NESP-007 or NEI-99-01 would not decrease the overall effectiveness of the emergency plan; however, due to the potential safety significance of the change, the change needs prior NRC review and approval.

In a letter dated February 22, 2008 (Reference 7), the NRC staff concluded that the guidance contained in NEI 99-01, Revision 5, is an acceptable method to develop an EAL scheme that meets the requirements in Section IV of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR 50.47(b)(4).

In summary, the NRC considers the following methods acceptable for use in developing EALs that meet the requirements of Section IV of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR 50.47(b)(4):

- Appendix 1, "Emergency Action Level Guidelines for Nuclear Power Plants," to NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants," dated November 1980;
- NUMARC/NESP-007, Revision 2, "Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels," dated January 1992;
- NEI 99-01, Revision 4, "Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels," dated January 2003; and
- NEI 99-01, Revision 5, "Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels," dated February 2008.

NRC Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) 2003-18, with Supplements 1 and 2, "Use of NEI-99-01, Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels" (Reference 8), also provides guidance for developing or changing a standard emergency classification and action level scheme. In addition, the RIS provides recommendations to assist licensees, consistent with Section IV.B of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50, in determining whether to seek prior NRC approval of deviations from the guidance.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

In its application and supplemental letter, the licensee submitted the proposed EALs for SONGS, the associated technical bases, a comparison matrix, the EAL numbering scheme, and an explanation for any difference or deviation from NEI-99-01. The comparison matrix provided a cross reference relating the proposed EAL scheme to the EALs in NEI-99-01. The NRC staff has reviewed the technical bases for the proposed EALs, the differences or deviations from NEI-99-01, and the licensee's justifications.

The NRC staff reviewed the proposed EALs against the guidance in NEI-99-01 to determine if the EALs for SONGS, as provided in the licensee's application and supplemental letter, meet the guidelines in that document. The staff considered the following NEI-99-01 guidance in its review:

- consistency (i.e., the EALs would lead to similar decisions under similar circumstances at different plants)
- human engineering and user friendliness
- potential for classification upgrade only when there is an increasing threat to public health and safety
- ease of upgrading and downgrading
- thoroughness in addressing and disposing of the issues of completeness and accuracy raised regarding Appendix 1 to NUREG-0654
- technical completeness for each classification level
- logical progression in classification for multiple events
- objective and observable values

The NRC staff reviewed the proposed EALs, and has determined that the proposed EALs are consistent with EALs implemented at similarly designed plants, that they use objective and observable values, and that they are consistent with the guidance in NEI-99-01 in these areas.

The NRC staff reviewed the proposed EALs to determine if they are worded in a manner that addresses human engineering and user friendliness concerns. The proposed EALs use procedure language, including specific tag numbers for instrument readings and alarms; use flow charts, critical safety function status trees, check lists, and combinations of the above. Based on this review, the staff has determined that the proposed EALs are consistent with the guidance in NEI-99-01 in these areas.

The NRC staff reviewed the proposed EAL sets¹ for technical completeness and has determined that classification upgrades are based upon an increasing threat to public health and safety, that they can effectively support upgrading and downgrading, and that they follow a logical progression for multiple events. Based on this review, the NRC staff concludes that the EALs are consistent with the guidance in NEI-99-01 in these areas.

The NRC staff also reviewed the proposed EALs for technical completeness and accuracy for each classification level. The proposed EALs are based on risk assessment to set the boundaries of the emergency classification levels and assure that all EALs that trigger that

¹ EAL sets are groups of EALs within a category related to a common concern. For example, unusual event, alert, site area emergency, and general emergency EALs related to a failure of the plant to shut down via an automatic scram would be considered an EAL set.

emergency classification are in the same range of relative risk. Precursor conditions of more serious emergencies also represent a potential risk to the public and are appropriately classified. The staff has determined that the proposed EALs are consistent with the guidance in NEI-99-01 in these areas.

Based on its review of the proposed EALs, the NRC staff concludes that these EALs are consistent with the guidance in NEI-99-01 for all of the areas listed above in this section. Therefore, the staff further concludes that the proposed EALs meet NEI 99-01, which is an acceptable method for use in complying with the regulatory requirements listed in Section 2.0 of this safety evaluation.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The NRC staff performed a technical and regulatory review of the proposed changes to the SONGS EALs. The staff has determined that the proposed changes meet the guidance in NEI-99-01, which is an acceptable alternative for development of an EAL scheme that meets the regulatory requirements. Based on this determination, the staff concludes that the proposed EALs meet the standards in 10 CFR 50.47(b) and the requirements in Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50, and that they provide reasonable assurance that the licensee will take adequate protective measures in a radiological emergency. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the proposed EAL changes are acceptable.

5.0 REFERENCES

1. Short, M. P., Southern California Edison, letter to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Request for Emergency Plan Change, Supplement 1, Proposed Emergency Action Levels Using NEI-99-01, Revision 5 Methodology," dated March 31, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML091140551).
2. St. Onge, R. J., Southern California Edison, letter to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Response to Request for Additional Information Regarding Request for Emergency Plan Change, Supplement 1, Proposed Emergency Action Levels Using NEI-99-01, Revision 5 Methodology," dated January 22, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML100261317).
3. Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99-01, Revision 5, "Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels," February 2008 (ADAMS Accession No. ML080450149).
4. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants," NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, November 1980 (ADAMS Accession No. ML040420012).
5. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Emergency Planning and Preparedness for Nuclear Power Reactors," Regulatory Guide 1.101, Revision 3, August 1992 (ADAMS Accession No. ML003740302).

6. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Emergency Planning and Preparedness for Nuclear Power Reactors," Regulatory Guide 1.101, Revision 4, July 2003 (ADAMS Accession No. ML032020276).
7. Miller, C. G., U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Letter to Alan Nelson, Nuclear Energy Institute, "U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Review and Endorsement of NEI-99-01, Revision 5, dated February 2008," dated February 22, 2008 (ADAMS Accession No. ML080430535).
8. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Regulatory Issue Summary 2003-18, with Supplements 1 and 2, "Use of NEI-99-01, 'Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels,' dated January 2003," dated October 8, 2003 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML032580518, ML041550395, and ML051450482).

Principal Contributor: D. Johnson

Date: March 22, 2010

R. T. Ridenoure

- 2 -

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Randy Hall, the NRC Project Manager for SONGS, at (301) 415-4032, or through e-mail to randy.hall@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Eric J. Leeds, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-206, 50-361, and 50-362

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
LPLIV r/f
RidsAcrcsAcnw_MailCTR Resource
RidsNrrDorlDpr Resource
RidsNrrDorlLpl4 Resource
RidsNrrPMSanOnofre Resource
RidsNrrLAJBurkhardt Resource
RidsNsrDpr Resource
RidsOgcRp Resource
RidsRgn4MailCenter Resource
DJohnson, NSIR/DPR/DDEP/ORLT
JShepherd, FSME/DWMEP/RDB

ADAMS Accession No. ML100620983

*Concurred by SE

OFFICE	NRR/LPL4/PM	NRR/LPL4/LA	NSIR/DPR/ORLOB/BC	NRR/LPL4/BC	NRR/DORL/D	NRR/D
NAME	JRHall	JBurkhardt	JAnderson*	MMarkley	JGitter	ELeeds
DATE	03/09/10	03/08/10	02/19/10	03/10/10	03/12/10	03/22/10

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY