

BellBendCOLPEm Resource

From: Canova, Michael
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 9:29 AM
To: 'Sgarro, Rocco R'; 'BBNPP@pplweb.com'; 'Freels, James'; 'melanie.Frailer@unistarnuclear.com'
Cc: BellBendCOL Resource; Colaccino, Joseph; Chowdhury, Prosanta; Temple, Jeffrey; Williams, Kevin; Vrahoretis, Susan
Subject: Bell Bend COLA - Draft Request for Information No. 92 (RAI No. 92)- NSIR-LIB - 4285
Attachments: DRAFT RAI Letter 92 - NSIR-LIB 4285.doc

Attached is DRAFT RAI No. 92 for the Bell Bend COL Application. You have ten working days to review this request and to decide whether you need an **additional** conference call to discuss it. Please notify me of your decision in this regard.

After the call, or after ten days, the RAI will be finalized and sent to you. The schedule for submittal will be established prior to formalizing this RAI .

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Michael A. Canova

Project Manager - Bell Bend COL Application

Docket 52-039

EPR Project Branch

Division of New Reactor Licensing

Office of New Reactors

301-415-0737

Hearing Identifier: BellBend_COL_Public
Email Number: 531

Mail Envelope Properties (77BCCD26C6050B42A72FE3939CF492ED1CEC54B449)

Subject: Bell Bend COLA - Draft Request for Information No. 92 (RAI No. 92)- NSIR-LIB
- 4285
Sent Date: 3/15/2010 9:29:17 AM
Received Date: 3/15/2010 9:29:18 AM
From: Canova, Michael

Created By: Michael.Canova@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"BellBendCOL Resource" <BellBendCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Chowdhury, Prosanta" <Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Temple, Jeffrey" <Jeffrey.Temple@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Williams, Kevin" <Kevin.Williams@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Vrahoretis, Susan" <Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Sgarro, Rocco R" <rsgarro@pplweb.com>

Tracking Status: None

"BBNPP@pplweb.com" <BBNPP@pplweb.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Freels, James" <James.Freels@unistarnuclear.com>

Tracking Status: None

"melanie.Frailer@unistarnuclear.com" <melanie.Frailer@unistarnuclear.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	657	3/15/2010 9:29:18 AM
DRAFT RAI Letter 92 - NSIR-LIB 4285.doc		41978

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information No. 92
Application Revision 1

DRAFT

3/12/2010

Bell Bend
PPL Bell Bend LLC.
Docket No. 52-039
SRP Section: 13.03 - Emergency Planning
Application Section: Part 5

QUESTIONS for Licensing and Inspection Branch (NSIR/DPR/LIB) (EP)

13.03-34

Supplemental RAI 13.03-01 Subject: Demand Estimation, Permanent Residents
Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section II.A.
Acceptance Criteria: Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

The applicant's response to RAI 13.03-5 (ETE-4.B), indicated that the estimates of transit dependent residents may have been based on an incorrect household size and included 1,081 residents of special facilities in the estimate; however, the response does not indicate that these assumptions have been validated. The review of the county emergency plans identified 8,174 transit dependent residents, and it is reasonable to expect 50 percent, or 4,087, of these residents to rideshare. Please provide an ETE based on the transit dependent population estimates identified by the county emergency plans with consideration of rideshare, or validate the assumptions used in developing a transit dependent estimation of 2,036 people or justify why this information is not necessary.

13.03-35

Supplemental RAI 13.03-02 Subject: ETE Methodology
Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section I.C.
Acceptance Criteria: Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

The applicant's response to RAI 13.03-4 (ETE-3.D), states that no credit is taken for expected improvement in traffic operations at sites where traffic personal are located. However, the applicant's response to RAI 13.03-4 (ETE-3.A) states that engineers at KLD adjust the allocation of green time to assure intersections appropriately represent the operating conditions during an evacuation. Please revise the text of the ETE report to clarify that the current analysis approximates the use of traffic guides, based on the manner in which the analyst adjusts green time at intersections to represent movement of traffic under evacuation conditions or justify why this information is not necessary.

13.03-36

Supplemental RAI 13.03-03 Subject: Demand Estimation, Special Facility Population

Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Sections II.C.
Acceptance Criteria: Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In the response to RAI 13.03-7 (ETE 6.D), regarding the evacuation of the SCI Retreat, a state correctional facility with approximately 1,000 inmates, the applicant identified the resources and logistics for evacuation of the facility which will require 2 waves of bus convoys. The applicant stated in its response that “a sensitivity study will be conducted to quantify the impacts on the ETE of adding the two convoys to the evacuation traffic stream” and will be included in a future revision of the ETE report. Please provide the revised ETE for the SCI Retreat.

13.03-37

Supplemental RAI 13.03-04 Subject: Demand Estimation, Transient Populations
Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Sections II.B.
Acceptance Criteria: Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

The applicant’s response to RAI 13.03-6 (ETE-5A), indicated that an estimate of 30 percent of the population at transient related facilities such as State Parks and campgrounds were non-EPZ residents. Additionally, the applicant stated in Note 1 of their response to RAI 13.03-6 (ETE-5D) that an estimate of half (50 percent) of the population at the Susquehanna Riverlands may live outside the EPZ. However, a basis for these assumed percentages was not provided. Please describe how the non-EPZ resident factor was determined, and explain the basis for using a consistent factor for all transient facilities within the EPZ. Please revise the ETE report accordingly or justify why this information is not necessary.

13.03-38

Supplemental RAI 13.03-05 Subject: Demand Estimation, Special Facility Population
Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654
Acceptance Criteria: SRP Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-7.A.2 (ETE-6), the applicant stated that some special facilities (e.g., Northeast Counseling) provide day-care to patients who drive themselves to the facility. Transit needs for Mercy Special Care Hospital and Bonham Nursing Center were not provided in the updated table; however, whether or not these facilities are daycare only is not stated. Please identify each facility in Table 8-4, “Special Facility Transit Demand,” that is day care only and revise the ETE report, as necessary, to reflect population and transit demand for the special facility residents who require public transportation, or justify why this information is not necessary.

13.03-39

Supplemental RAI 13.03-06 Subject: Analysis of Evacuation Times, Methodology, Special Facilities

Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Section IV.B of Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654
Acceptance Criteria: SRP Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-12.A (ETE-11), the applicant updated Table 8-4, "Special Facility Transit Demand" in the ETE report; however, the number of transit resources allocated in the updated Table 8-4 often does not equate to the population of the facility. For example, Sunny Knoll in Luzerne County lists 22 residents, but only 10 ambulances, which would evacuate 20 people. Guardian Elder Care Center lists enough resources to evacuate 254 people, but the maximum capacity of the facility is 110 people. The response further states that using facility peak capacity values would increase the population by 25%, which should increase the number of ambulances from 74 to 93. An additional 57 ambulances are needed for home-bound residents as identified in Table 8-4A, "Risk Municipality Medical Transportation Requirements." Therefore, approximately 150 ambulance runs are needed to evacuate special needs residents and special facility capacity populations. This would require 5 waves of evacuation using the 32 ambulances identified as available and only 2 waves are identified. Similarly, 62 wheelchair accessible vans may be required to evacuate special facility peak capacities rather than the 49 listed. Please revise Table 8-4 to be consistent with the vehicle occupancy descriptions provided in Section 3 (page 3-17) in order to ensure an accurate number of resources are quantified and provide an ETE based on the required resources. Please revise the ETE report or justify why this information is not necessary.

13.03-40

Supplemental RAI 13.03-07: Analysis of Evacuation Times, Methodology, Special Facilities

Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section IV.B.
Acceptance Criteria: Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-12 (ETE-11.B) the applicant stated that the time for school bus drivers to mobilize will vary and thus buses will arrive over some time frame. In this scenario, buses will be loaded as they arrive at schools. The loading time of 5 minutes is a representative value per bus. The applicant stated that this discussion would be included in a revised version of the ETE; however, the discussion was not included in the revised document. Please include this discussion in a revision of the ETE.