

MAR 14 1983

Docket No. 50-410

MEMORANDUM FOR: A. Schwencer, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing

FROM: Cecil O. Thomas, Chief
Standardization & Special Projects Branch
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW - NINE MILE POINT UNIT #2

The Nine Mile Point Unit #2 Physical Security and Safeguards Contingency Plans have been reviewed against the elements contained in NUREG-0800 and it has been determined that the plans are acceptable for docketing and review. The previously approved Guard Training and Qualification Plan will be used for the training of Unit #2 guards.

The Physical Security Plan does not address or commit to a pre-employment screening program for site employees as is set forth in NUREG-0800 and the Statement of Considerations associated with the publication of 10 CFR 73.55. Accordingly, the Physical Security Plan needs to include a description of the measures that will be taken to ensure that only individuals that have been determined to be trustworthy are granted unescorted access to protected and vital areas of the plant. (In this regard, the Commission noted in the Statement of Considerations accompanying the publication of 10 CFR 73.55 that applicants and licensees should continue to use the employee screening guidance from the American National Standard ANSI-N18.17, "Industrial Security for Nuclear Power Plants".)

151
Cecil O. Thomas, Chief
Standardization & Special
Projects Branch
Division of Licensing

DISTRIBUTION:

Document Control
NRC PDR
L PDR
PRC

SSPB Reading
C. Thomas
E. McPeck

B303180104 B30314
PDR ADDCK 05000410
PDR
F

OFFICE	DL:SSPB	DL:SSPB	DL:SSPB				
SURNAME	EMcPeck:cc	Anderson	CThomas				
DATE	3/11/83	3/14/83	3/14/83				

Request for Additional Information

Nine Mile Point, Unit 2

E 320.1 Provide the following:

A production cost analysis which shows the difference in system production costs associated with the availability vs. unavailability of the proposed nuclear addition. Note, the resulting cost differential should be limited solely to the variable or incremental costs associated with generating electricity from the proposed nuclear addition and the sources of replacement energy. If, in your analysis, other factors influence the cost differential, explain in detail.

- a. The analysis should provide results on an annual basis covering the period from initial operation of the first unit through five full years of operation of the last unit.
- b. Where more than one utility shares ownership in the proposed nuclear addition or where the proposed facility is centrally dispatched as part of an interconnected pool, the results of the analysis may be aggregated for all participating systems.
- c. The analysis should assume electrical energy requirements grow at (1) the system's latest official forecasted growth rate, and (2) zero growth from the latest actual annual energy requirement.
- d. All underlying assumptions should be explicitly identified and explained.
- e. For each year (and for each growth rate scenario) the following results should be clearly stated: (1) system production costs



with the proposed nuclear addition available as scheduled; (2) system production costs without the proposed nuclear addition available; (3) the capacity factor assumed for the nuclear addition; (4) the average fuel cost and variable O & M for the nuclear addition and the sources of replacement energy (by fuel type) - both expressed in mills per kWh; and (5) the proportion of replacement energy assumed to be provided by coal, oil, gas, etc. (The base year for all costs should be identified)

- E 320.2 Provide average, present worth fuel and O and M costs for the Nuclear Unit. (This cost should be calculated for both a 30 year and a forty year operating life.) Provide escalation, discount rates and all other variables assumed in calculating these costs.
- E 320.3 Provide a brief summary of the methodology used in arriving at the \$123 million decommissioning estimate provided in Section 5.9.2.1.

