

PSEGSPeRAIPEm Resource

From: Chowdhury, Prosanta
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2012 12:05 PM
To: 'PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com'
Cc: PSEGSPeRAIPEm Resource; 'James.Mallon@pseg.com'; 'David.Robillard@pseg.com'; Segala, John; Roach, Kevin; Clark, Phyllis; McLellan, Judith; Giacinto, Joseph; Caverly, Jill
Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 68 (eRAI 6645) SRP-02.04.13 (RHMB)
Attachments: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 68 (eRAI 6645).pdf

Please find attached RAI 68 for the PSEG Site ESP application. Following issuance of the draft of RAI 68 on October 12, 2012, you informed us on October 26, 2012, that you would need clarification on this RAI. On November 1, 2012, the staff provided preliminary clarification on this RAI with the understanding that the subject matter experts (SMEs), who could not attend this telecon, might need to determine if additional and more specific clarification would be necessary. Subsequent to that, and following your internal discussion with the SMEs, you informed us on November 7, 2012, that you needed further clarification so that you could respond to this RAI with the details that the staff would be expecting. Based on this request, a clarification telecon was held on November 14, 2012. During the clarification discussion, the staff felt that additional clarifying text to the existing RAI would be useful in conveying the NRC expectation associated with the initial RAI. As a result, we have added additional clarifying text as second paragraph in the RAI which was shared with you as draft on November 19, 2012. You informed via email on November 21, 2012, that you had no comments on the additional text which provides some specifics to the original intent of the RAI. No other changes were necessary, and therefore, we are issuing this RAI as final.

The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 calendar days of receipt of RAIs. However, per your request to account for the non-working days associated with the Thanksgiving holiday, we would expect your response within 35 calendar days. If this RAI cannot be responded to within 35 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
Licensing Branch 1 (LB1)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors
301-415-1647

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_RAI
Email Number: 143

Mail Envelope Properties (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7DB9EF03FA92)

Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 68 (eRAI 6645) SRP-02.04.13 (RHMB)
Sent Date: 11/21/2012 12:05:27 PM
Received Date: 11/21/2012 12:05:32 PM
From: Chowdhury, Prosanta

Created By: Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov

Recipients:

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

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

"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

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

Tracking Status: None

"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

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

Tracking Status: None

"Caverly, Jill" <Jill.Caverly@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

| Files | Size | Date & Time |
|---|-------------|------------------------|
| MESSAGE | 2171 | 11/21/2012 12:05:32 PM |
| PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 68 (eRAI 6645).pdf | | 28470 |

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information 68

Application Revision 1

FINAL

11/21/2012

PSEG Site ESP
PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC
Docket No. 52-043

Review Section: 02.04.13 - Accidental Releases of Radioactive Liquid Effluents in Ground and
Surface Waters
Application Section: 2.4.13

QUESTIONS

02.04.13-15

Supplemental RAI

As a result of a comparative review of Subsections 2.4.12 and 2.4.13 of the Site Safety Analysis Report (SSAR) (Application Revision 1), the staff requests that the applicant demonstrate how the groundwater gradients used for the transport analysis in Subsection 2.4.13 are conservative and consistent with those gradients and velocities which would result from predicted groundwater levels in the area of the power block of 6-10 ft (1.8 – 3 m) NAVD as indicated in Subsection 2.4.12 of the SSAR.

Specifically, the staff is concerned that the groundwater elevations used to calculate the hydraulic gradient for an easterly release towards Fishing Creek (pages 2.4-209 and 2.4-210), and a westerly release towards the Delaware River (page 2.4-150 and Table 2.4.12-5, and pages 2.4-207 and 2.4-208), in the SSAR Rev 1 are inconsistent with the groundwater elevation assumed for the structural analysis and post construction modeling, 6 -10 ft (1.8 - 3 m) NAVD, presented in the SSAR Rev 1 (pages 2.4-164, 2.4-167, and 2.5-306).