UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the matter of	)	
	)	
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company	)	Docket No. 50-395
	)	
Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Unit 1	)	

DOCKETED USNRC OCT 6 1978 Office of the Secretary Docketing & Service Section

APPLICANT'S ANSWERS TO INTERVENOR'S INTERROGATORIES TO APPLICANT

South Carolina Electric and Gas Co. (Applicant) pursuant to 10 CFR, Section 2.740b, submits its Answers to the Interrogatories posed by Intervenor, Brett A. Bursey. Applicant shall file its objections to certain of those interrogatories concurrently with these answers.

The answers below are numbered the same as the Intervenor's questions except that Applicant has sub-numbered Intervenor's multiple-part questions.

1a. The exact type of decommissioning for the V. C. Summer Station will not be selected until shortly before the end of the facility's useful life.

1b. For purposes of assuring financial qualification, Applicant assumed a cost of seven million dollars ($7,000,000.00).

1c. The necessary funds for decommisssioning will be handled the same as any other normal financing requirements of the Applicant. The decommissioning costs plus the depreciation requirements for the nuclear facility will be established and such depreciation charges recovered over the life of the plant.

2a & b Since Applicant has not selected a method of decommissioning, it is not currently prepared to answer these questions.

3a. Objection filed.

3b. For the first core, the cost of Uranium, as Uranium Hexaflouride, is approximately $16,423,000.00. If this material were all provided at the original Westinghouse contract price, the cost would be $12,270,712.66.

4a. The on site spent fuel storage capacity currently is 682 assemblies.

4b. Spent assemblies will be stored in Applicant's spent fuel pool or at another location until a federal waste repository is established.

7810190239 G

4c. Since the ultimate disposal methodology has not been finally decided upon, Applicant cannot provide a meaningful figure for these costs.

4d. The necessary funds for spent fuel disposal will be handled through the regular financing requirements of the Applicant; that is, the financing for spent fuel disposal will be the same as that of any other normal financing requirements of the Applicant.

5. Objection filed.

6. There have been no concrete pours made at the Summer Station for the purpose of geological stabilization, nor are any such concrete pours planned.

7. Objection filed.

8a & b. The clearance between the circulating water intake pipe and the floor of the circulating water pumphouse is 42". This is the Bingham Willamett specification to assure unimpeded water flow at maximum capacity.

9. Objection filed.

10. An updated assessment of the structures' ability to withstand "seismic activity" is contained in "REPORT NO. 2-Service Water Intake Structure Settlement Effects and Related Work" which was submitted to the NRC on July 10, 1978, and which has been supplied to Intervenor.

11a & b. This interrogatory is confusing and difficult to interpret. Assuming the impoundment area referred to means the Monticello Reservoir area prior to filling, Frees Creek was the principle drainage stream of the approximate 11 square mile drainage basin that includes the 6,800 acre Monticello Reservoir. No gauging station history exists for Frees Creek, so no accurate normal flow value can be stated. An estimate of the average flow which entered the Broad River behind Parr Dam is 11 CFS based on the assumption of one second' - flow per square mile drainage area. The existence of the impoundment has no effect on the low flow.

12. The maximum rise of water in the Monticello Reservoir is to elevation 425 MSL and the maximum fall is to 418 MSL.

13. As can be seen by a review of the NPES permit, the permit does contain provisions applicable to the Monticello Reservoir.

14. Using data from Alden Research Laboratories Progress Report No. 2, June 1973, the maximum temperature of the discharge from the lower impoundment of the Fairfield Pumped Storage Project of Parr Dam is estimated to be no more than 3°F above the uneffected water temperature.

15. Releases of gaseous and liquid radioactive wastes are discussed in Sections 11.2 and 11.3 of the FSAR.

16a. The original cost projection for the construction of the Virgil C. Summer Station was $234,000,000.00.

16b. The dates and amounts of subsequent upward revisions are as follows:

Date	Amount
7/15/71	$234,000,000.00
12/31/71	$234,000,000.00
6/30/72	$296,541,000.00
1/15/73	$340,950,000.00
7/16/73	$341,792,000.00
1/15/74	$350,398,000.00
7/15/74	$356,398,000.00
12/01/75	$365,895,000.00
12/15/75	$492,623,000.00
1/15/77	$635,053,000.00
6/30/77	$638,953,000.00
1/01/78	$674,853,000.00

17. Based on the first full year of operation, the present projection of the per kilowatt cost for generation of electricity at the Summer Station is 29.60 mills per KWH.

18. Objection filed.

19. Objection filed.

20. Objection filed.

21. Objection filed.

22. Objection filed.

23. Objection filed.

24. Objection filed.

25. Objection filed.

26. "Working capital" relates to investor-supplied funds necessary to cover current operating expenses during the time lag between the point when service is rendered and the related operating costs are incurred and the point when revenues to recover such costs are received. They do not reasonably relate to a non-operating facility, i.e. one under construction.

27. This question cannot, without further definition, reasonably be answered. It has been assumed from the outset that the V. C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1 will not operate forever.

28. Objection filed.

29. Because the fuel loading date for the plant is more than one year away, there are no approved yearly security budget figures for plant operation; however, we have no reason to believe it will exceed the about 0.1 mill per KWH figure used by the NRC Staff in the Blackfox proceedings and approved by the Licensing Board in its' Partial Initial Decision dated July 24, 1978 (NRC Docket Nos. STN 556,557).

30. "Gathering intelligence" on possible threats to the security of the Summer Facility is a function of law enforcement agencies. Applicant, therefore, had no budget for "gathering intelligence".

31. Objection filed.

32a. Amendment 8, Figure 13.1-5, to Applicant's FSAR, dated September, 1978 reflects a manning requirement of 109 persons. However, Applicant is currently developing a revised manning projection which will increase that figure. What that number will be and what the breakdown by function is not certain.

32b. Objection filed.

33. Objection filed.

34 - 36 The South Carolina Peacetime Radiological Plan provides a framework for the evacuation of the LPZ. Nuclear emergency plans, which will address contingencies such as transportation and evacuee relocation, are currently under development by the State and local governments within the affected area. See minutes of Meeting with Staff dated September , 1978. There, of course, no emergency plans for a Class Nine accident per se. Any emergency plan developed pursuant to Appendix E and Regulatory Guide 1.101 must meet the spectrum of postulated accidents and other conditions described therein.

37. Dames and Moore, Inc., consulting engineers in the applied earth sciences, provided the ground acceleration values associated with a design seismic event. Refer to FSAR Section 1.4.4.

38a Dames and Moore, Inc., consulting engineers in the applied earth sciences, provided the ground acceleration values used by the Applicant. Refer to FSAR Section 2.5.2.

39. Yes.

40. Compliance with regulatory requirements assures that radioactive releases from the fuel cycle associated with the V. C. Summer Nuclear Station will pose no long-term threat to life.

41. Objection filed.

42. Objection filed.

43. Objection filed.

VERIFICATION

State of South Carolina)
County of) ss

T. C. Nichols, Jr., being first duly sworn, states that he is Vice President & Group Executive - Power Productions & System Operations for the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company; that he has been duly authorized to execute, verify and file the foregoing document, APPLICANT'S ANSWER TO INTERVENOR'S INTERROGATORIES TO APPLICANT; that he has read the contents of same and that the statements contained therein are true and correct to his best information, knowledge and belief.

_____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ___ day of _____, 1978.

_____
(Notary Public)

My Commission Expires: _____.

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY	)	Docket No. 50-395
	)	
	)	
Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1	)	

DOCKETED USNRC OCT 6 1978 Office of the Secretary Docketing & Service Section

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "APPLICANT'S ANSWERS TO INTERVENOR'S INTERROGATORIES TO APPLICANT" in the above-captioned proceeding have been served on the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class this 2nd day of October, 1978:

Ivan W. Smith, Esq.
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Richard P. Wilson, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dr. Frank F. Hooper
University of Michigan
Camp Filibert Roth
Iron River, Michigan 49935

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Gustave A. Linenberger
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Panel (5)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Brett Allen Bursey
Route 1, Box 93-C
Little Mountain, South Carolina 29076

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Randolph R. Mahan
Counsel for Applicant