

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Foster, Rocky
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2013 2:37 PM
To: Scheide, Richard
Cc: STPCOL
Subject: Draft RAIs 6987
Attachments: Draft RAIs 6987.docx

Dick,

Attached are the draft RAIs relating to STP's submittal for the Emergency Preparedness Enhancement Rule. Please review and provide me with your need for clarification during the Open Items telecom currently scheduled for Wednesday, 2:00PM – 4:00PM on January 16, 2013.

Thanks,

Rocky

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 3518

Mail Envelope Properties (26E42474DB238C408C94990815A02F09ADA462331E)

Subject: Draft RAIs 6987
Sent Date: 1/14/2013 2:36:36 PM
Received Date: 1/14/2013 2:36:42 PM
From: Foster, Rocky

Created By: Rocky.Foster@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Scheide, Richard" <rhscheide@STPEGS.COM>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	314	1/14/2013 2:36:42 PM
Draft RAIs 6987.docx	15041	

Options

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

Request for Additional Information

Issue Date:

Application Title: South Texas Project Units 3 and 4 - Dockets 52-012 and 52-013

Operating Company: South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co

Docket No. 52-012 and 52-013

Review Section: 13.03 - Emergency Planning

Application Section:

QUESTIONS

6987-1

Appendix E.IV.E.8.d requires, in part, the emergency plan include the identification of an alternative facility (or facilities) that would be accessible even if the site is under threat of or experiencing hostile action, to function as a staging area for augmentation of ERO staff during hostile action to minimize delays in emergency response and provide for a swift coordinated augmented response. The STP Unit 3 and 4 Emergency Plan, Revision 7, Section G.5, describes the location of the Alternate EOF, identifies typical equipment that could be transported to the facility, and states that the facility can be activated in four hours. The NRC staff noted that the STPEGS Emergency Plan, Revision ICN 20-11, dated 6/20/12, Section G.5, "Alternate TSC/OSC" provides a description of a different facility from that described in STP Unit 3 and 4 Emergency Plan, Revision 7, Section G.5

- a. Clarify which facility, described in Section G.5 of the respective emergency plans will be used as an alternate facility to meet the requirements of Appendix E.IV.E.8.d, or will both facilities be used?
- b. Clarify from where the "typical equipment and instrumentation" relied on to activate the Alternate Facility will be obtained. If the intent is to relocate equipment from the EOF, explain how this would be feasible if the EOF was not accessible due to hostile actions at the site.
- c. A four hour activation time is unacceptable since the facility needs to be in a ready state to accommodate augmenting ERO personnel within about 60 minutes of declaration of an emergency. Explain how the Alternate Facility will function as a staging area for augmentation of emergency response staff if the emergency response staff is expected to respond within about 60 minutes.
- d. Explain how the Alternate Facility meets the following characteristics:
 - (1) Capability to communicate with the emergency operation facility (EOF), Control Room, and security personnel.
 - (2) Capability to perform offsite notifications of a plant emergency within 15 minutes of a change in emergency classification level, or issuance of a protective action recommendation.
 - (3) Capability for engineering assessment activities, including damage control team planning and preparation.
- e. Describe how the Alternate Facility will be able to access up-to-date plant technical documentation, such as general plant drawings, system information, and plant procedures.

6987-2

Appendix E. IV.C.2 requires, in part, that a licensee shall establish and maintain the capability to assess, classify, and declare an emergency condition within 15 minutes. In the applicant's letter U7-C-NINA-NRC-120055, dated 7/31/12, ML12219A3252, Analysis 8, the applicant states that the requirement for an emergency declaration to be made within 15 minutes of the existence of the condition will be addressed in the Emergency Preparedness Implementing Procedures. The applicant proposed no revision to the STP Unit 3 and 4 Emergency Plan to address this requirement. The NRC staff noted that the STPEGS Emergency Plan, revision ICN-20-11, dated 6/20/12, Section D.1 does address the 15 minute emergency declaration requirement. Explain why the STP Unit 3 and 4 Emergency Plan does not address the 15 minute emergency declaration requirement, or revise the STP Unit 3 and 4 Emergency Plan to be consistent with the STPEGS Units 1 and 2 Emergency Plan, or justify why the change is not needed.

6987-3

Appendix E, Section IV.A.7., requires, in part, that the emergency plan include the identification of, and a description of the assistance expected from State, local, and Federal agencies with responsibilities for coping with emergency, including hostile action at the site. The applicant's letter U7-C-NINA-NRC-120055, dated 7/31/12, ML12219A3252, Analysis 4 does not explain the review the onsite emergency plan has undergone to determine the type and extent of ORO resources needed to support onsite response activities during an emergency, including hostile action. Explain where in the STP Unit 3 & 4 Emergency Plan this information is provided.

6987-4

Appendix E, Section IV.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, requires, in part, that the emergency plan include provisions for the development, updating, and use of evacuation time estimates. The applicant's letter U7-C-NINA-NRC-120055, dated 7/31/12, ML12219A3252, Analysis 10, does not address a frequency or administrative method of ETE analysis updates. Identify where in the STP Unit 3 and 4 Emergency Plan the maintenance of evacuation time estimate is discussed, or justify why this is not necessary.

6987-5

Appendix E.IV.7 requires, in part, that an applicant under 10 CFR part 52 once receiving their license, shall conduct at least one review of any changes in the population of its EPZ at least 365 days prior to its scheduled fuel load. The licensee shall estimate EPZ permanent resident population changes using the most recent U.S. Census Bureau annual resident population estimate and State/local government population data. Provide a discussion on performing at least one review of any changes in the population of the EPZ at least 365 days prior to its scheduled fuel load, or provide justification for why this is not necessary.

6987-6

Appendix E.IV.F.2.j, establishes an eight year exercise cycle. The applicant's letter U7-C-NINA-NRC-120055, dated 7/31/12, ML12219A3252, Analysis 6, identifies changes in N.1.4 and Addendum N-1, but does not identify a change in Section N.2.2. Provide for the change from six to eight years in STP Unit 3 and 4 EP, Chapter 5, Section N.2.2, "Scenario Composition," or explain why this is not necessary.

6987-7

Appendix E.IV.E.8.d requires, in part, the emergency plan include the identification of an alternative facility (or facilities) that would be accessible even if the site is under threat of or experiencing hostile action, to function as a staging area for augmentation of ERO staff during hostile action to minimize delays in emergency response and provide for a swift coordinated augmented response.

Appendix E. IV.C.2 requires, in part, that a licensee shall establish and maintain the capability to assess, classify, and declare an emergency condition within 15 minutes.

As discussed in the applicant's submittal relating to the requirements in the items 6987-1 and 6987-2 above, the NRC staff noted some minor difference in the Emergency Plan for Units 1 and 2, and Units 3 and 4 that seem to indicate an inconsistency between the two documents. Explain the administrative process that is, or will be, in place to ensure consistency in the referenced Emergency Plans.