

December 11, 1981.

SECY-81-669A

A-9

## INFORMATION REPORT

For: The Commissioners

From: Executive Director for Operations

Subject: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF PROMPT NOTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Purpose: To inform the Commission of licensees' status.

Discussion: I wish to call to your attention our current assessment of licensees' ability to implement advanced notification systems by the February 1, 1982 deadline proposed in SECY 81-669.

As shown in the attached table, licensee responses in August indicated 11 plants could not make the proposed deadline. This information was provided to the Commission during the staff briefing on August 27, 1981, and was the basis for our original recommendation in SECY 81-503 for a July 1, 1982 deadline. Subsequent licensee responses in December indicate 6 plants are still unable to meet the proposed deadline. This is consistent with comments received on the rule published for comment. Unfortunately, SECY 81-669 forwarding the final rule and analysis of comments did not inform the Commission of comments reiterating licensee statements that they were still unable to meet the February 1, 1982 deadline.

In light of this latest staff assessment, I go back to my original recommendation of a July 1, 1982 deadline and suggest the Commission review its earlier decision on the proposed rule for public comment setting the February 1, 1982 deadline. If the Commission retains the February 1, 1982 deadline, it is important to obtain an early decision that will provide time to develop an appropriate enforcement policy for non-complying plants.



William G. Dircks  
Executive Director for Operations

Contact: B. Grimes, IE  
(x24614)

8201250181  
EP XA

## ENCLOSURE 1

## REGION I

FACILITY.	EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE		CAUSE FOR CHANGE
	AS OF AUGUST 13, 1981	AS OF DECEMBER 8, 1981	
Calvert Cliffs	06/29/81	- Same	Complete
Maine Yankee	07/27/81	Same	Complete
Three Mile Island	08/31/81	12/01/81	Complete
Fitzpatrick/ Nine Mile Point	10/81	12/31/81	Delays in equip- ment delivery and rainy weather
Indian Point 2/3	10/22/81	12/31/81	Delays in obtaining siren sites
Salem	01/01/82	01/01/82	
Ginna	11/05/81	01/21/82	Delays in equip- ment delivery
Vermont Yankee	11/30/81	01/31/82	FCC license delays
Yankee Rowe	11/30/81	01/31/82	FCC license delays
Beaver Valley	11/81	02/01/82	Equipment received. 90% coverage by 02/01/82, possible delays in WV and OH due to right-of-way difficulties and mini- siren installation
Oyster Creek	10/15/81	02/01/82	Equipment received. Meeting deadline conditional on obtaining right-of- ways
Peach Bottom	07/82	02/01/82	Faster delivery and easier installation than anticipated
Pilgrim	12/31/81	03/31/82	See Enclosure 2
Haddam Neck	Mid 82	07/01/82	See Enclosure 2
Millstone	Mid 82	07/01/82	See Enclosure 2

REGION II

FACILITY	EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE		CAUSE FOR CHANGE
	AS OF AUGUST 13, 1981	AS OF DECEMBER 8, 1981	
Crystal River	07/01/81	Same	Complete
Hatch	07/01/81	Same	Complete
McGuire	07/01/81	Same	Complete
Oconee	07/01/81	Same	Complete
Sequoyah	08/01/81	Same	Complete
Farley	10/01/81	Same	Complete
Surry	10/31/81	10/26/81	Complete
North Anna	10/30/81	12/11/81	Delay in siren delivery
St. Lucie	01/01/82	01/01/82	
Turkey Point	01/01/82	01/01/82	
Browns Ferry	Early 82	02/01/82	
Brunswick	09/30/81	02/01/82	After testing additional sirens were required
Robinson	09/30/81	02/01/82	After testing additional sirens were required

REGION III

FACILITY	EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE		CAUSE FOR CHANGE
	AS OF AUGUST 13, 1981	AS OF DECEMBER 8, 1981	
D. C. Cook	08/07/81	Same	Complete
Davis Besse	3 months after FCC frequency approval	12/09/81	Obtained FCC license 10/21/81
Duane Arnold	10/01/81	12/30/81	Delays in trans- mitter delivery and FCC license
Kewaunee	Spring 82	01/01/82	Installation has been faster than anticipated
Point Beach	02/01/82	01/01/82	Installation has been faster than anticipated
Big Rock Point	None	02/01/82	Following NRC denial of deferral request, licensee committed to install system in 5 mile EPZ
Monticello	06/82 (5 miles proposed)	02/01/82 (0 - 10 miles)	Siren delivery sooner than anticipated
Palisades	None beyond 5 miles	02/01/82 (0 - 10 miles)	Following notice of violation, licensee committed to install system in 5 - 10 mile area
Prairie Island	05/82 (5 miles proposed)	02/01/82 (0 - 10 miles)	Siren delivery sooner than anticipated
LaCrosse	1-1/2 mile 10/12/81	1-1/4 mile 03/01/82	Licensee took no action while await- ing NRC response to 1-1/4 mile radius. Region III has initiate letter stating this is not acceptable (5 miles is acceptable)

REGION III  
(CONT.)

FACILITY	EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE		CAUSE FOR CHANGE
	AS OF AUGUST 13, 1981	AS OF DECEMBER 8, 1981	
Dresden	03/82	02/01/82	For all 3 Con Ed sites notes meeting deadline is contingent on weather conditions.  Quad Cities may have problems obtaining easement
Quad Cities	04/82	02/01/82	
Zion	04/82	02/01/82	

REGION IV

FACILITY	EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE		CAUSE FOR CHANGE
	AS OF AUGUST 13, 1981	AS OF DECEMBER 8, 1981	
Arkansas	07/01/81	Same	Complete
Cooper	07/31/81	Same	Complete
Ft. Calhoun	01/01/82	01/01/82	
Ft. St. Vrain	None	None	Licensee appealing need for prompt notification system. Response in prepara- tion

REGION V

FACILITY	EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE		CAUSE FOR CHANGE
	AS OF AUGUST 13, 1981	AS OF DECEMBER 8, 1981	
Trojan	07/24/81	Same	Complete
San Onofre	08/07/81	Same	Complete
Rancho Seco	05/82	05/82	See Enclosure 2

## ENCLOSURE 2

FACILITY	REGION	REASON GIVEN BY LICENSEE FOR NOT MEETING DEADLINE
Pilgrim	I	Licensee cites delays in equipment delivery and difficulties in obtaining right-of-ways. Equipment ordered 09/18/81
Haddam Neck/Millstone	I	Licensee cites delays in extensive equipment deliveries for 329 sirens required for both sites. Winter conditions may cause installation delays. Equipment ordered 10/81.
LaCrosse	III	Licensee had taken no action while awaiting NRC response to a request that only a 1-1/4 mile radius is needed for a notification system at a facility with such a low power (50 MWe). Region III has initiated a letter stating that this is not acceptable. (5 miles is acceptable.)
Ft. St. Vrain	IV	Licensee contends that for high temperature gas-cooled reactor facilities a prompt notification system is not necessary and is therefore in the process of appealing the enforcement of the regulation.
Rancho Seco	V	Engineering studies had to be done twice as counties within the plume exposure EPZ rejected the first study. Contract awards can only be made at public meetings held twice a month. First bids did not meet the contract specifications. Licensee expects equipment contract to be awarded 12/17/81.



*John Hickman*

DEC 21 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: Samuel J. Chilk.  
 Secretary of the Commission

FROM: T. A. Rehm, Assistant for Operations  
 Office of the Executive Director  
 for Operations

SUBJECT: SECY-81-669A - IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF PROMPT NOTIFICATION  
 SYSTEMS

On December 17, 1981, the staff was verbally informed by the utility that the Peach Bottom facility will not receive delivery of its notification systems equipment until mid to late January. This means that Peach Bottom will not meet the February 1, 1982 deadline for installation and testing. Please revise SECY-81-669A to indicate that 7 plants are unable to meet the deadline, and Enclosure 1, page 1 to read as follows:

Peach Bottom	7/82	4/1/82	Order placed in late September but not final- ized until November.
--------------	------	--------	--

One further note - the staff is continuing to watch the situation at Big Rock Point for those factors described in PNO-111-81-118 that could cause slippage in the schedule at that site.

(Signed) T. A. Rehm

T. A. Rehm  
 Assistant for Operations  
 Office of the Executive  
 Director for Operations

bcc: TAR r/f  
 EDO r/f  
 KPerkins

*PDR*

~~8205140094~~

OFFICE	OEDO <i>uf</i>	OEDO <i>TAR</i>				
SURNAME	KPerkins/kj	TAREhm				
DATE	12/21/81	12/21/81				