

PMTurkeyCOLPEm Resource

From: Comar, Manny
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2014 2:04 PM
To: orthen, Richard; Raymond Burski; Steve Franzone; STEVEN.HAMRICK; TurkeyCOL Resource; William Maher
Cc: Comar, Manny
Subject: Draft RAI 7467 related to SRP Section 02.01.03 Population Distribution for the Turkey Point Units 6 and 7 combined license application
Attachments: draft RAI 7467_TPN.docx..doc

To All,

Attached is the draft of RAI No:7467, regarding section 02.01.03 Population distribution for the Turkey Point Units 6 and 7 combined license application.

If you need a conference call to discuss the question(s) of the draft RAIs please contact me at 301-415-3863. Unless you request additional clarification we will normally issue the RAI as final within 3 to 5 days, from today.

Thanks

Manny Comar
Senior Project Manager
NRO/DNRL/NWE1
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-3863
<mailto:manny.comar@nrc.gov>

Hearing Identifier: TurkeyPoint_COL_Public
Email Number: 887

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D001652BCBD3F3)

Subject: Draft RAI 7467 related to SRP Section 02.01.03 Population Distribution for the Turkey Point Units 6 and 7 combined license application
Sent Date: 4/18/2014 2:04:15 PM
Received Date: 4/18/2014 2:04:15 PM
From: Comar, Manny

Created By: Manny.Comar@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Comar, Manny" <Manny.Comar@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"orthen, Richard" <richard.orthen@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Raymond Burski" <raymond.burski@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Steve Franzone" <steve.Franzone@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None
"STEVEN.HAMRICK" <steven.hamrick@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None
"TurkeyCOL Resource" <TurkeyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"William Maher" <William.maher@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	578	4/18/2014 2:04:15 PM
draft RAI 7467_TPN.docx..doc	43066	

Options

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

Request for Additional Information

Application: Turkey Point Units 6 and 7
Operating Company: Florida Power and Light
Docket No. 52-040 and 52-041
Review Section: 02.01.03 - Population Distribution
Application Section: COL FSAR 2.1.3

QUESTIONS

02.01.03-XX

In a letter #055, dated March 28, 2012, NRC Staff requested the applicant to provide additional information (RAI 6079), pertaining to SRP Section 02.01.03, Population Distribution, addressing population density. In a letter dated April 25, 2012, the applicant provided the response with a proposed revision to FSAR Section 2.1.3.6. The response stated that “A comparison of the environmental impacts from construction and operation for the proposed site and each of the top alternative sites indicated that environmental impacts would, in general, be higher than or similar to those at the Turkey Point Site. Therefore, based on these analyses, **FPL concluded that no alternative site is environmentally preferable to the proposed Turkey Point Site.** When identifying Turkey Point as the preferred alternative, criteria such as safety, environmental, and economic factors, including population density, were taken into account along with advantages the Turkey Point site has due to the existing nuclear units.” However, the response did not provide the basis, rationale and justification that Turkey Point had clear advantages over the alternative sites. Because Turkey Point exceeds the Regulatory Guide 4.7 criterion of population density of 500 persons/ sq. mile within 20 miles of the site, more information is needed regarding the relative merits of the proposed site.

The staff requests the applicant to explain how the Turkey Point Site fared compared to the alternative sites to finally conclude that the Turkey Point Site is the most suitable site compared to the other four sites considered for alternative site analysis. Provide documentation in the FSAR of the basis that satisfies the requirement of (10 CFR 100.21(h)), “Reactor sites should be located away from very densely populated centers. Areas of low population density are, generally, preferred. However, in determining the acceptability of a particular site located away from a very densely populated center but not in an area of low density, consideration will be given to safety, environmental, economic, or other factors, which may result in the site being found acceptable.”

“Examples of these factors include, but are not limited to, such factors as the higher population density site having superior seismic characteristics, better access to skilled labor for construction, better rail and highway access, shorter transmission line requirements, or less environmental impact on undeveloped areas, wetlands or endangered species, etc. Some of these factors are included in, or impact, the other criteria included in this section.”

To the extent that the response to this request may contradict information that has been provided in the Environmental Report or other submittals associated with the environmental review, please provide an explanation of how the new information changes the information that has been previously submitted.

