



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

February 17, 2011

Vice President, Operations
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway, GSB
P.O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

SUBJECT: INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 3 - REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE REVIEW OF THE SPENT
FUEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND THE PRELIMINARY
DECOMMISSIONING COST ESTIMATE (TAC NO. ME5257)

Dear Sir or Madam:

By letter dated December 10, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML103550612), Entergy, LLC (the licensee) submitted information which addressed Entergy's Preliminary Decommissioning Cost Estimate and Irradiated Fuel Management Plan in accordance with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 50, Sections 50.75(f)(3) and 50.54(bb), at Indian Point Unit 3.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff is reviewing the submittal and has determined that additional information is needed to complete its review. The specific questions are found in the enclosed request for additional information (RAI). On February 10, 2011, the Entergy staff indicated that a response to the RAI would be provided within 45 days of the date of this letter.

Please contact me at (301) 415-2901 if you have any questions on this issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John P. Boska".

John P. Boska, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-286

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
REGARDING THE REVIEW OF THE SPENT FUEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND
THE PRELIMINARY DECOMMISSIONING COST ESTIMATE
ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 3
DOCKET NO. 50-286

Regulatory Background/Basis

In reviewing Entergy's submittal dated December 10, 2010 (NL-10-123) (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML103550612), which addressed Entergy's Preliminary Decommissioning Cost Estimate and Irradiated Fuel Management Program in accordance with Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Sections 50.75(f)(3) and 50.54(bb) for Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 3 (IP3), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has determined the following information is needed in order to complete its review.

RAIs Related to Addressing the 10 CFR 50.54(bb) Requirements

RAI No. 1: Attachment 2, Table 2

Based on the references identified below, what is basis for the difference in annual costs for spent fuel management for IP3 compared to IP2? The IP3 December 10, 2010, submittal in Table 2, "Schedule of Annual Expenditures Spent Fuel Management Allocation" (2010 dollars) identified an annual cost for the period 2024 – 2047 at \$2.3 million. In the previous submittal for IP2 dated October 23, 2008, ADAMS Accession No. ML083040378, Entergy referenced Table 4, "Indian Point Energy Center, Unit 2, Schedule of Annual Expenditures Spent Fuel Management Allocation" (2007 dollars) identified an annual cost for the period 2022 - 2044 at \$2.7 million. Recognizing that the IP2 cost was in 2007 dollars while the IP3 cost is in 2010 dollars, the difference is even greater when comparing the annual costs in current dollars. In addition, for IP3 provide a detailed break out of the major components designated "Other" at \$1.4 million annual cost.

RAI No. 2: Attachment 2, Table 2

The NRC staff requests that Entergy address the difference in annual labor costs in Table 2 between IP3 at \$0.74 million in 2010 dollars, and IP2 at \$1.6 million in 2007 dollars.

Enclosure

RAI No. 3: Attachment 2, Table 3

What caused the difference, almost double, in spent fuel management significant cost contributors when comparing the 2010 IP3 submittal to the 2008 IP2 submittal? In the IP3 submittal, Table 3, lists the total for spent fuel management significant cost contributors, in 2010 dollars, as \$121.0 million while Table 5 in the IP2 submittal (October 23, 2008) estimated the total cost significant cost contributors at \$59.1 million.

RAI No. 4: Table 4

Is the \$121.1 million cost identified in Table 4, "Estimated Expenditures for Spent Fuel Packaging, Storage, and Canister Transfer" included in the Table 2, "Schedule of Annual Expenditures Spent Fuel Management Allocation?" If not, explain why these costs were not included as part spent fuel management costs as required by 10 CFR 50.54(bb).

RAIs Related to Addressing the 10 CFR 50.75(f)(3) Requirements

RAI No. 5: TLG Preliminary Decommissioning Cost Estimate, Section 1.7.9

Identify if the demolition of any of the IP3 buildings is required to access the contaminated soil, as Table 1 did not list the costs associated with the demolition of the buildings or the associated waste volumes. If these costs are provided in the supporting documents, provide the reference that addresses the total cost of the contaminated soil removal and disposal, including the building demolition, transportation, and demolition sequence.

RAI No. 6: TLG Preliminary Decommissioning Cost Estimate, Table 1

What is the total estimated volume of contaminated soil for the site? Table 1 identified an estimated 2.4 million cubic feet of contaminated soil associated with IP3. Clarify if the 2.4 million cubic feet of potentially contaminated soil is in addition to the contaminated soil identified in the IP1 and IP2 cost estimate?

RAI No. 7 : General Site Question

How are the IP site costs divided between IP1, IP2, and IP3? The IP3 cost estimate states that property taxes were not included. What are the estimated property taxes for all three units and why are the property taxes not considered part of SAFSTOR costs for IP3? For some sites, the property taxes are significant over the SAFSTOR period, \$100 -120 million, and if not included as part of the SAFSTOR costs, what is the source of funds to address property taxes and similar costs?

February 17, 2011

Vice President, Operations
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Indian Point Energy Center
450 Broadway, GSB
P.O. Box 249
Buchanan, NY 10511-0249

**SUBJECT: INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 3 - REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE REVIEW OF THE SPENT
FUEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND THE PRELIMINARY
DECOMMISSIONING COST ESTIMATE (TAC NO. ME5257)**

Dear Sir or Madam:

By letter dated December 10, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML103550612), Entergy, LLC (the licensee) submitted information which addressed Entergy's Preliminary Decommissioning Cost Estimate and Irradiated Fuel Management Plan in accordance with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 50, Sections 50.75(f)(3) and 50.54(bb), at Indian Point Unit 3.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff is reviewing the submittal and has determined that additional information is needed to complete its review. The specific questions are found in the enclosed request for additional information (RAI). On February 10, 2011, the Entergy staff indicated that a response to the RAI would be provided within 45 days of the date of this letter.

Please contact me at (301) 415-2901 if you have any questions on this issue.

Sincerely,

/ra/

John P. Boska, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-286

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC RidsNrrDorLp1-1 RidsNrrPMIndianPoint RidsOGCRp LPL1-1 Reading File
RidsNrrLASLittle RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCTR RidsNrrDorDpr RidsRgn1MailCenter Rids NrrDprPfib
CPittiglio, NRR/DPR/PFIB

ADAMS ACCESSION NO.: ML110410136

OFFICE	LPL1-1/PM	LPL1-1/LA	NRR/DPR/PFIB:BC	LPL1-1/BC
NAME	JBoska	SLittle	CRegan	NSalgado
DATE	2/17/11	2/16/11	02/07/11	2/17/11

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY