DIST: Document Control (50-423) NRC PDR L PDR PRC System NSIC

Docket No.: 50-423

OCT 7 1983

Mr. William G. Counsil Senior Vice President Nuclear Engineering and Operations Northeast Nuclear Energy Company P. O. Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06101 LB#1 Rdg MRushbrook EDoolittle DEisenhut/RPurpie Attorney, OELD ELJordan, OIE JMTaylor, OIE ACRS

Dear Mr. Counsil:

Subject: Request for Additional Information for Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3

Enclosed are requests for additional information which the staff requires to complete its evaluation of the environmental and safety portions of your application for an operating license for Millstone 3. These requests for additional information are the result of the staff's Environmental Site Visit held at the Millstone site on July 20 and 21, 1983 and the Supplementary Environmental Site Tour held on September 15, 1983.

It is requested that you provide responses to these questions within thirty days from the date of this transmittal to allow timely completion of our review. If you cannot meet this schedule, the Project Manager should be notified within seven days.

For further information or clarification, please contact the Licensing Project Manager, Elizabeth L. Doolittle (301-492-4911).

Sincerely,

Original signed by: B. J. Youngblood

B. J. Youngblood, Chief Licensing Branch No. 1 Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl.: See next page

B310170726 B31007 PDR ADOCK 05000423 A PDR

OFFICE	DU1L8#) ED0011tetle:e 10/6/83	DL: UB/1 s BJY gangblog 10/7/83	d			
	(10-80) NRCM 0240		OFFICIAL	RECORD C	OPY	 USGPO: 1981-335-960

Mr. W. G. Counsil Senior Vice President Nuclear Engineering and Operations Northeast Nuclear Energy Company Post Office Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06141

cc: Gerald Garfield, Esq. Day, Berry & Howard One Constitution Plaza Hartford, Connecticut 06103

> Mr. Maurice R. Scully, Executive Director Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative 268 Thomas Road Groton, Connecticut 06340

Robert W. Bishop, Esq. Corporate Secretary Northeast Utilities Post Office Box 270 Hartford, Connecticut 06141

Mr. T. Rebelowski Senior Resident Inspector Office U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Millstone III P. O. Box 515 Waterford, Connecticut 06385

Mr. Michael L. Jones, Manager Project Management Department Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company Post Office Box 426 Ludlow, Massachusetts 01056

Mr. Thomas Murley U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region I 631 Park Avenue King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Mr. Brian Norris Public Affairs Office U.S.N.R.C. - Region I King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

ENCLOSURE 1

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 3

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-423

E291.19 (2.1) There are numerous references to telephone conversations in the text of ER Section 2.1 Water Use regarding fisheries types, catch data, fishery growth, seafood consumption and water users (i.e., ER Sections 2.1.3.2.1 Recreation; 2.1.3.2.2.2 Sport Fisheries; 2.1.3.2.3 Commercial Fisheries; 2.1.3.2.4 Aquaculture; 2.1.3.2.5 Human Consumption of Seafood; 2.1.3.2.8 Waterborne Commerce and 2.1.3.2.9 Industrial and Commercial Water Users). Provide copies of these telephone conversation references including the names of the individuals providing the information, their affiliation and address, dates of the conversations and the information provided.

E290.2 During the public meeting held on July 21, 1983 to gather information on environmental concerns over Millstone Unit 3, Mr. A. Cotter of 50 New Shore Rd. in Pleasure Beach indicated that representatives of Northeast Utilities visited his residence for the purpose of obtaining noise level data in response to his complaint regarding noise from the Millstone plant site. Provide the noise level data gathered, if any, in response to Mr. Cotter's complaint. Indicate the status of construction (i.e., types of activities) ongoing at the Millstone site during noise measurements and similarly indicate the operational status for Millstone Units 1 and 2. Indicate any follow-up actions taken to resolve Mr. Cotter's noise complaint.

E290.3

Provide information on noise related complaints associated with operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station. Include date and time of complaint, the location of the complaintant, the nature of the complaint and the actions taken by Northeast Utilities to resolve the complaint and to prevent its reoccurrence.

- 241.21 The construction of shorefront slope at the circulating water pumphouse was altered. The original design proposed to use filter blankets to prevent the migration of fine soils. These filter blankets were replaced by one single layer of filter fabric. Some bare spots without the filter fabric were noticed. As a result of this construction change, the slope stability presented in the FSAR should be reanalyzed and the anticipated maintenance program associated with the migration of fine beach sand should be addressed.
- 241.22 A seawall and a retaining wall adjacent to the Unit 3 pumphouse have been identified by the applicant as safety class structures. However, the analyses and designs of these two walls were not presented in the FSAR. The design information is required for us to complete our safety review.

240.10 Section 2.4.2.3 (SRP 2.4.2) The FSAR indicates that the roofs of safety-related structures are designed to withstand a snow load of 60 lb/sq ft. However, it is not clear whether or not the rcofs of these safety-related structures have parapet walls. If roofs have parapet walls, provide the height of walls and number and size of any openings (e.g., scuppers) for each safety-related structure.

Provide your detailed analysis of the ponding levels for each safety-related structure to justify that the design roof loads account for the Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP). According to Hydrometeorological Reports No. 51 and 52, the following PMP rainfall depths for 10 and 1 square miles are applicable to the Millstone site:

	Depth for	Source		Depth for	Source	
Duration	10 Sq Mi Area (inches)	Hydromet Report #	Figure #	1 Sq Mi Area (inches)	Hydromet Report #	Figure #
5 min.	4.8	52	36	6.0	52	36
15 min.	7.5	52	37	9.4	52	37
30 min.	10.8	52	38	13.5	52	38
1 hour	14.2	52	39	17.7	52	24
6 hours	26.0	51	18	26.0	51	18
12 hours	30.5	51	19	-		
24 hours	33.2	51	20	-		
48 hours	37.5	51	21	-		
72 hours	39.0	51	22	-		

Either use these values or justify other values.

Note that standard slotted or screened roof drains can become clogged with debris and are considered ineffective during the design intense precipitation event.

240.11 Discuss the PMP ponding levels on roofs of safety-related structures 2.4.10 (SRP 2.4.10) and its elevation relative to hatch opening elevations. Also provide details of the seals for these water-tight hatches.

240.12 2.4.5 3.4.1.1 (SRP 2.4.5)

1.1.1.

Your response to Q240.5 indicated that the maximum water level within the intake structure during the design flooding event would be 24.8 ft msl and that the flood protection level is 25.5 ft msl. Using procedures described in the "Shore Protection Manual" we have calculated a flood protection water level value of 26.2 ft msl. Discuss the impacts, if any, on safety-related facilities within the service water pump cubicles if water levels were to exceed the flood protection level of 25.5 ft msl. (It was noted during the site visit that the cubicle walls extend to the ceiling of the intake structure except where electrical cable trays penetrate the wall near the ceiling.)

240.13 2.4.5 3.4.1.1 (SRP 2.4.5) Discuss details of the floor drainage system for the service water pump cubicles relative to their ability to prevent flooding of the cubicles from external leakage or internal pump or piping leakage during external high water level events which exceed the floor level of El. 14.5 ft msl.

240.14 Clarify the design low water level for the service water pumps. 2.4.11 (SRP 2.4.11) Page 2.4.17 indicates - 7.0 ft msl whereas pg. 2.4.19 indicates -8.0 ft msl.

240.15 2.4.10 3.4.1 (SRP 2.4.10)

1 2 1

The FSAR identifies that the concrete seawall and the quarrystone revetment adjacent to intake structure are safety-related flood protection structures.

- a) Provide details of your stability analysis for these structures regarding their resistance to the design wave and water level.
- b) It was observed during the site visit on September 15, 1983, that a large surface area of the quarrystone revetment has armor stone that appear considerably smaller than armor stone in adjacent areas. Substantiate that the revetment was constructed in accordance with the design details.
- c) Discuss the effects of wave induced scour behind the revetment on its stability (site visit specifically identified the area abutting the top of the quarrystone revetment).

311.5 In order to determine the degree of risk posed by hazardous material shipments via the Amtrak Rail Line near Millstone 3, we need a description of the type of materials, their quantities, and the frequency of shipment. We request that you provide shipping data for a one year period for determining the above information.