

PMSummerColpEM Resource

From: Sebrosky, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 4:50 PM
To: PMSummerColpEM Resource
Cc: GILES, JULIE M; MONROE, AMY; Martin, Jody; Barss, Dan; Wright, Ned; Musico, Bruce; Wentzel, Michael; McGovern, Denise; Joshi, Ravindra
Subject: Summary of August 10, 2010, phone call to discuss Summer emergency planning issues
Attachments: image003.png

MEMORANDUM TO: File (Summer Units 2 and 3)

From: Joe Sebrosky, Project Manager
AP1000Projects Branch (NWE1)
Division of New reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Subject: Summary of August 10, 2010, phone calls to discuss emergency planning issues

The NRC attendees were: Ned Wright, Bruce Musico (part time), and Joe Sebrosky (full time)

The SCE&G participant was Julie Giles.

There were two calls held with SCE&G personnel to discuss the items identified below. The first call was with NRC (Joe Sebrosky) and SCE&G (Julie Giles) and discussed items 1 and 2 below. The second call involved NRC (Ned Wright, Bruce Musico, and Joe Sebrosky) and SCE&G (Julie Giles). Highlights from the call are as follows:

- 1) Regarding item 1 below, SCE&G indicated that it would like to have the option to correct emergency plan offsite deficiencies prior to operation above 5% power.

Action Item: SCE&G indicated that it would provide the NRC with a letter proposing a change to its application requesting this change.

- 2) Regarding item 2 below, SCE&G had no comments on the emergency action level (EAL) license condition that the NRC staff is considering.
- 3) Regarding item 3 below (Emergency Response Data System (ERDS) parameters), SCE&G indicated that based on a review of its application it did not specify the ERDS parameters that will be transmitted. Specifically, SCE&G reviewed the Vogtle early site permit application and indicated that SCE&G did not specify ERDS data points similar to those defined in the Vogtle early site permit emergency plan Table Annex V2 H-1, "Post Accident Monitoring Values."

In addition, the staff asked about implementation of ERDS and asked if the Summer application discussed the implementation. The staff indicated that Summer's ITAAC regarding implementation appeared to be different than what was done for Vogtle. Vogtle ITAAC 5.1.3 for the Technical Support Center (TSC) and 5.2.2 for the Emergency Operations Facility (EOF) state that the plant parameters listed in Table Annex V2 H-1, *Post Accident Monitoring Values*, can be retrieved and displayed in the TSC and EOF, respectively. SCE&G noted that there was a difference in its proposed ITAAC and was not aware of a discussion in its ITAAC or in its emergency plan that addressed when ERDS would be implemented.

Action Item: The NRC stated that it was still in the process of fully developing an RAI in this area. SCE&G indicated that it understood the underlying issue and that it would attempt to address the staff's concern in a letter that maybe provided to the NRC before an RAI is fully developed. The NRC staff

>>>>>>>>items of discussion>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

- “The exercise is completed within the specified time periods of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50, offsite exercise objectives have been met, and there are ***either no uncorrected offsite deficiencies, or a license condition requires offsite deficiencies to be corrected prior to operation above 5% of rated power.***”

2) In part 10 of your application you propose license condition 11, which states the following:

The staff intends to impose a modified version of this license condition with an additional sentence. Specifically, the staff intends to impose the following license condition:

3) Emergency Response Data System (ERDS)

2

PMSummerColpEM Resource

From: Sebrosky, Joseph
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 5:23 PM
To: MONROE, AMY; GILES, JULIE M
Cc: Joshi, Ravindra; Wentzel, Michael; McGovern, Denise; Wright, Ned; Barss, Jody; PMSummerColpEM Resource
Subject: info: potential RAI associated with ERDS data points

Amy and Julie,

The purpose of this email is to describe an issue that we are reviewing that may result in an RAI. Information that you can provide to assist us in our review would be appreciated.

Summer ERDS data point potential RAI

Describe or provide the ERDS parameters that Summer will provide for Units 2 and 3 that will comply with 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a.

The Summer emergency plan does not provide the specific ERDS values that will be transmitted to demonstrate compliance with the provisions in 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a, which :

“data points, ***if resident in the in-plant computer systems***, must be transmitted for the following types of plant conditions: Reactor core and coolant system conditions; reactor containment radioactivity release rates; and plant meteorological tower data...”

10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a(i) provides a list of parameters for a PWR, however, some parameters are not applicable to the AP1000 design. In addition, there are other parameters for the AP1000 design that may need to be transmitted to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a. For example, transmitting the passive containment cooling water storage tank (PCCWT) level would be appropriate to meet the requirement that data points associated with reactor containment conditions be transmitted. Provide or describe the list of Summer Units 2 and 3 ERDS parameters.

Sincerely,

Joe Sebrosky
Project Manager
Office of New Reactors
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
301-415-1132

Hearing Identifier: VCSummer_COL_Public
Email Number: 335

Mail Envelope Properties (36CF286628C20846A68047F2463233092914246789)

Subject: Summary of August 10, 2010, phone call to discuss Summer emergency planning issues
Sent Date: 8/10/2010 4:49:49 PM
Received Date: 8/10/2010 4:49:54 PM
From: Sebrosky, Joseph

Created By: Joseph.Sebrosky@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"GILES, JULIE M" <JMGILES@scana.com>
Tracking Status: None
"MONROE, AMY" <AMONROE@scana.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Martin, Jody" <Jody.Martin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Barss, Dan" <Dan.Barss@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wright, Ned" <Ned.Wright@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Musico, Bruce" <Bruce.Musico@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wentzel, Michael" <Michael.Wentzel@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"McGovern, Denise" <Denise.McGovern@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joshi, Ravindra" <Ravindra.Joshi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PMSummerColpEM Resource" <PMSummerColpEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5238	8/10/2010 4:49:54 PM
image003.png	335564	

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

PMSummerColpEM Resource

From: Sebrosky, Joseph
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 5:23 PM
To: MONROE, AMY; GILES, JULIE M
Cc: Joshi, Ravindra; Wentzel, Michael; McGovern, Denise; Wright, Ned; Barss, Dan; Martin, Jody; PMSummerColpEM Resource
Subject: info: potential RAI associated with ERDS data points

Amy and Julie,

The purpose of this email is to describe an issue that we are reviewing that may result in an RAI. Any information that you can provide to assist us in our review would be appreciated.

Summer ERDS data point potential RAI

Describe or provide the ERDS parameters that Summer will provide for Units 2 and 3 that will demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a.

The Summer emergency plan does not provide the specific ERDS values that will be transmitted to the NRC to demonstrate compliance with the provisions in 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a, which states in part:

“data points, ***if resident in the in-plant computer systems***, must be transmitted for four selected types of plant conditions: Reactor core and coolant system conditions; reactor containment conditions; radioactivity release rates; and plant meteorological tower data...”

10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a(i) provides a list of parameters for a PWR, however, some of these parameters are not applicable to the AP1000 design. In addition, there are other parameters based on the AP1000 design that may need to be transmitted to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, Section VI, 2.a. For example, transmitting the passive containment cooling water storage tank (PCCWST) level may be appropriate to meet the requirement that data points associated with reactor containment conditions are transmitted. Provide or describe the list of Summer Units 2 and 3 ERDS parameters.

Sincerely,

Joe Sebrosky
Project Manager
Office of New Reactors
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
301-415-1132