PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource

From: Chowdhury, Prosanta
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 3:21 PM
To: PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com
Cc: PSEGESP Resource; PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource; David.Lewis2@pseg.com; James.Mallon@pseg.com; David.Robillard@pseg.com; Vaughn, James; Huyck, Doug; Colaccino, Joseph; Price, Sarah; McLellan, Judith; Clark, Phyllis
Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 3 (eRAI 5321) SRP-13.06.03 (RSRLB)
Attachments: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 3 (eRAI 5321).pdf

Please find attached RAI 3 for the PSEG Site ESP Application. A draft of the RAI was provided to you on January 19, 2011. At your request, a clarification discussion on all questions (for DRAFT RAI 3) was held on January 28, 2011. As a result of the discussion, Question 13.06.03-3 has been deleted, and acronym “ER’s” has been inserted in Question 13.06.03-5 to clarify the reference for “aerial photograph 2.1-3”; all other Questions remained unchanged.

The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 calendar days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be responded to within 30 calendar days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30-calendar day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Prosanta Chowdhury
Project Manager
EPR Projects Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors
301-415-1647

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_RAI
Email Number: 10

Mail Envelope Properties (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7D3274B9EA82)

Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 3 (eRAI 5321) SRP-13.06.03 (RSRLB)
Sent Date: 1/28/2011 3:21:11 PM
Received Date: 1/28/2011 3:21:17 PM
From: Chowdhury, Prosanta

Created By: Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"PSEGESP Resource" <PSEGESP.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource" <PSEGESPeRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"David.Lewis2@pseg.com" <David.Lewis2@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"James.Mallon@pseg.com" <James.Mallon@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"David.Robillard@pseg.com" <David.Robillard@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Vaughn, James" <James.Vaughn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Huyck, Doug" <Doug.Huyck@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Price, Sarah" <Sarah.Price@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1102	1/28/2011 3:21:17 PM
PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 3 (eRAI 5321).pdf	45576	

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

Request for Additional Information No. 3
Application Revision 0

FINAL

1/28/2011

PSEG Site ESP
PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC
Docket No. 52-043
SRP Section: 13.06.03 - Physical Security - Early Site Permit
Application Section: 13.6

QUESTIONS for Reactor Security Rulemaking and Licensing Branch (NSIR/DSP/RSRLB)

13.06.03-1

In Part 2, Chapter 13.6, the SSAR states in part: “The characteristics of the new plant footprint are such that the applicable requirements of the following are met;” and additional text further states, “it will meet above referenced security requirements.”
The applicant is to clarify which requirements they are referring to.
Regulatory Basis:
The provisions of 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1)(xii) in part, state that the site safety analysis report shall include: “An evaluation of the site against applicable sections of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) revision in effect 6 months before the docket date of the application.”
The provisions of 10 52.17(a)(1)(x) state: Information demonstrating that site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.
The provisions of 10 CFR 100.21(f), state: Site characteristics must be such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.

13.06.03-2

In Part 2, Section 2.2.2.5.of the SSAR, the applicant discusses existing approaches or roadways to the proposed PSEG facility.
The applicant needs to address any proposed information regarding construction or planning of proposed roadways or approaches to the proposed facility.
Regulatory Basis:
The provisions of 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1)(xii) in part, state that the site safety analysis report shall include: “An evaluation of the site against applicable sections of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) revision in effect 6 months before the docket date of the application.”
The provisions of 10 52.17(a)(1)(x) state: Information demonstrating that site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.
The provisions of 10 CFR 100.21(f), state: Site characteristics must be such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.

13.06.03-3 – Question deleted

13.06.03-4

Section 13.6 of the SSAR discusses a modification of the current HGS, and HCGS Coast Guard agreement to include the PSEG site.
The applicant is to provide information which covers all primary and secondary waterways navigable or accessible, which provide access to the PSEG facility
Regulatory Basis:
The provisions of 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1)(xii) in part, state that the site safety analysis report shall include: “An evaluation of the site against applicable sections of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) revision in effect 6 months before the docket date of the application.”
The provisions of 10 52.17(a)(1)(x) state: Information demonstrating that site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.
The provisions of 10 CFR 100.21(f), state: Site characteristics must be such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.

13.06.03-5

The staff evaluated the SSAR’s Figure 1.2-3 and ER’s aerial photograph 2.1-3 and bounding locations for the power block and other facilities in an area comprising 70 acres, within which all safety-related structures and unattended openings would be located if a reactor were to be constructed within this location. The SSAR does not identify any existing or proposed, unattended openings.
The applicant is to define descriptions and locations of planned or existing culverts or unattended openings.
Regulatory Basis:
The provisions of 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1)(xii) in part, state that the site safety analysis report shall include: “An evaluation of the site against applicable sections of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) revision in effect 6 months before the docket date of the application.”
The provisions of 10 52.17(a)(1)(x) state: Information demonstrating that site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.
The provisions of 10 CFR 100.21(f), state: Site characteristics must be such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed.