Docket Nos.: 50-361/362

MEMORANDUM FOR: D. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, NRR

THRU: R. Tedesco, Assistant Director for Licensing, DL

F. Miraglia, Acting Chief, Licensing Branch #3, DL

FROM: H. Rood, Project Manager, Licensing Branch #3, DL

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT FOR STAFF REVIEW OF SAN ONOFRE (SONGS)

UNITS 2 AND 3

SAFETY REVIEW

A full-power SER is scheduled to be issued in February, 1981. The only review branch that has not yet provided any SER input to DOL is GSB. A favorable USGS letter was sent to GSB November 26, 1980, and final GSB input is scheduled to be provided to DOL on December 8, 1980.

Updated SER input from many review branches was scheduled to be submitted to DOL by November 1, 1980. This input is necessary to close out non-TMI open items. As of December 1, 1980, the following branches had a number of open items (work on updated SER input is in progress but not yet complete):

Reactor Systems Branch Auxiliary Systems Branch Materials Engineering Branch Core Performance Branch Containment Systems Branch Emergency Preparedness Licensing Branch

Difficulty in completing San Onofre input is due in part to competing priorities for reviewers and their management. For example, the CSB reviewer is also working on the TMI-1 restart hearing, and the RSB and CPB section leaders are unable to review their section's input on an expedited schedule due to other priority projects. Also, the applicant's reply to some concerns has been incomplete, necessitating additional questions.

Based on the SER input on hand today, there are about 50 non-TMI-related open items. We expect the input for the above branches, and a few others having one or two open items, to close about 20 open items. During the next two weeks, additional submittals and meetings with the applicant are expected to close about 10 or 15 more open items. Thus a total of 15 to 20 non-TMI items are anticipated to remain open. We have arranged for CRESS to contract out the SER typing over Christmas week and provide out with a draft for management review on or about 12/31/80.

M6m0 4

D. Eisenhut

With regard to the TMI-related issues, the applicant submitted a document addressing the NUREG-0694 items on September 12, 1980. DOL requested input from the reviewers by November 1, 1980. To date, only three branches have provided TMI-related SER input. Several review branches found it necessary to request additional information about the applicant's TMI submittal. A letter transmitting these questions as well as some non-TMI-related questions (a total of over 125 questions) was sent to the applicant on November 7, 1980.

In addition, the applicant's TMI submittal was not complete when issued, and the publication of NUREG-0737 has opened additional items not yet addressed by the applicant.

The applicant has recently provided information addressing NRC questions and open items in Amendment 21 to the FSAR, dated November 14, 1980. He has also submitted a number of letters enclosing information needed for our review. These are:

<u>Date</u>	Subject		
10/06/80 10/29/80 10/31/80 11/06/80 11/18/80 11/18/80 11/20/80	ISI/PSI HFEB control room data AFW data 4 Emergency operating procedures Fuel audit data - CEN-140 Fuel handling building calculations Appendix A Tech. Specs.		
11/24/80 11/25/80 11/26/80	AFW reliability studies Secondary Water Chemistry information Partial response to 11/07/80 questions		

Another letter submittal addressing the 11/07/80 questions is scheduled for 12/08/80, and a series of meetings between the applicant and 14 review branches has been scheduled for the week of December 15, 1980. These meetings will cover both TMI-related and non-TMI-related open items. As mentioned above, we plan to collect as much SER input as possible through the week of 12/15/80, and have a typed draft available for management review on or about 12/31/80.

It is estimated that the TMI-related section of this draft SER will resolve about 50% of the NUREG-0737 items. We hope to incorporate additional TMI items in early January, and issue the SER by February 1, 1980.

We recommend that this document be published in early February 1981, even though the TMI-related section will be incomplete and a number (probably 15 to 20) of non-TMI open items will remain. The basis for this recommendation is to be able to bring the seismic issue before the ACRS subcommittee in mid-February, and before the full ACRS in March. Since this issue is crucial to the hearing, early resolution may allow the hearing to start sooner.

The applicant has recently requested that we try to issue the SER in early January, but we believe that this would result in a document with 35-40 open items and only a few TMI issues addressed.

EFFECTS OF EARTHQUAKE ON EMERGENCY PLAN

AT EPPO's request, we have prepared a letter requesting that the applicant consider the effects of an earthquake on the ability to evacuate the plant site and the EPZ areas around the plant. This matter was discussed in a memo from R. Tedesco to you dated December 3, 1980. In that memo it was suggested that a meeting between DOL management and B. Grimes be arranged prior to dispatch of the letter.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The DES for SONGS was published in November 1978. The FES which has been delayed due to the TMI accident, now awaits the revised accident write-up (FES Section 7). The accident evaluation for the SONGS Environmental Statement is scheduled to be completed by AEB on December 17, 1980. Based on the December 17 date, the tentative schedule for issuing the accident evaluation for comment and publication of the FES is as follows:

DOL receives SONGS accident evaluation	12/17/80
Draft Supplement to printers	12/29/80
Draft Supplement to EPA	01/02/81
Notice in F.R., start of comment period	01/09/81
End comment period	02/23/81
Publish complete FES, including revised	03/31/81

The applicant has verbally requested that we issue a partial FES, without Section 7, as soon as possible, and follow this with a supplemental DES and FES containing chapter 7. The applicant believes that this "Bifurcated" FES would speed the discovery process and, therefore, the hearing. In our view, the benefits of this approach are outweighed by the disadvantages, because the partial FES could not be issued until $\sim 6*$ weeks prior to the complete FES, due to various revisions that are necessary to the sections of the FES other than Section 7. Issuance of a "Bifurcated" FES would involve expenditure of additional staff resources, and the advantages would

be minimal, since a joint safety-environmental hearing is planned, and the final SER supplement is scheduled for issuance after the combined FES.

Harry Rood, Project Manager Licensing Branch #3 Division of Licensing

cc: H. Denton E. Case R. Tedesco F. Miraglia H. Rood D. Scaletti S. Hanauer D. Ross T. Murley R. Vollmer P. Check M. Ernst D. Muller V. Noonan J. Knight W. Kreger L. Rubenstein

B. GrimesG. McCorkle

DISTIRBUTION:
Docket File
LPDR
PDR
LB#3 R/F
HRood
FMiraglia
RTedesco
bcc: NSIC
TIC
ACRS (16)
IE (3)

DL:LB#3	DL:LB#	PLO AD/L		 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
OFFICE DL:LB#2	FMil Jajia	Medesco	,	
DATE				

SCHEDULE COMPLETION OF INPUT NECESSARY FOR SONGS FES

The following review areas will need to be completed or revised prior to issuing the SONGS FES:

Response to comments (PM)	01/15/81
Revised accident section (AEB)	03/31/81
Revision to Environmental Effects of Uranium Fuel Cycle (PM)	12/31/80
Need for Station (ORNL)	01/15/81
Archeological review completed (State of Calif.)	01/30/81
Review NRC Report (ORNL)	01/30/81
Heat treatment review completed (ORNL)	01/15/81
Review of ER Supplement #6 (soon to be submitted) (ORNL-PM)	01/30/81

Assuming all areas are closed out by 01/30/81, SONGS FES could be issued within 2-4 weeks (Mid February to early March).

The above schedule is predicated ORNL completing their review areas by 01/30/81. A meeting with ORNL is planned for week of December 8, 1980 to discuss availability of ORNL resources. If we assume the FES without Class 9 accident discussion is to be issued, earliest date for that FES would be February 15, 1981. Thus, bifurcating the publication of the FES would result in only a six-week, at most, difference between an incomplete FES and complete FES.

DISTRIBUTION
Docket Files
SAB Reading
SAB Plant File
DRMuller
WHRegan

APR 14 1991

Docket Nos. 50-361 50-362

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Frank Miraglia, Chief

Licensing Branch No. 3, DOL

FROM:

Wm. H. Regan, Jr., Chief Siting Analysis Branch, DE

SUBJECT:

CULTURAL RESOURCES INPUT TO SAN ONOFRE

NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION PFES

This is in response to Dino Scaletti's request to provide a revision of the second paragraph of Section 5.2 Impacts on Land Use of the San Onofre Generating Station PFES. Attached is a copy of the insert prepared and given to Dino Scaletti on April 10, 1981, for inclusion in the SONGS-FES. The cultural resources input was prepared by Louis Bykoski who can be reached on 492-4879.

Original signed by W. H. Regan, Jr.

Wm. H. Regan, Jr., Chief Siting Analysis Branch Division of Engineering

Attachment: As stated

cc: D. Cleary

D. Scaletti

L. Bykoski





Docket Files

SAB Reading
SAB Plant File
DRMuller
WHRegan

Docket Nos. 50-361 50-262

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Frank Miraglia, Chief

Licensing Branch No. 3, DOL

FROM:

Wm. H. Regan, Jr., Chief Siting Analysis Branch, DE

SUBJECT:

CULTURAL RESOURCES INPUT TO SAN ONOFRE

NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION PFES

This is in response to Dino Scaletti's request to provide a revision of the second paragraph of Section 5.2 Impacts on Land Use of the San Onofre Generating Station PFES. Attached is a copy of the insert prepared and given to Dino Scaletti on April 10, 1981, for spinclusion in the SONGS-FES. The Cultural resources input was prepared by Louis Bykoski who can be reached on 492-4879.

Original signed by W. H. Regan, Jr.

Win. H. Regan, Jr., Chief Siting Analysis Branch Division of Engineering

Attachment: As stated

cc: D. Cleary

D. Scaletti

L. Bykoski