

in the amount of \$1.06 billion. This requirement, among other changes, increased the amount of required property insurance from \$620 million and became effective on October 5, 1987.

On October 1, 1987, the licensee filed an Application for Scheduling Exemption from the requirements for property insurance above \$620 million until such time as the Commission may grant a low power (5%) operating license. This request was supplemented by additional information dated February 29, 1988. In support of its request, the licensee indicated that "Criticality at Seabrook Station has not been achieved. The primary system is not radioactive, and, in accordance with license requirements, the reactor coolant system is maintained with a boron concentration equal to or greater than 2000 parts per million." Maintaining the boron concentration of the reactor coolant equal to or greater than 2000 parts per million ensures that the reactor cannot be made critical, even if all the control rods are fully withdrawn. The licensee also maintains that the coverage in the amount of \$620 million that it currently carries is "more than adequate to compensate for any conceivable condition that may occur." The amount of coverage should be more than adequate since the reactor does not contain a significant inventory of fission products and the 2000 parts per million boron concentration of the reactor coolant prevents the reactor from achieving criticality and thereby generating fission products. Therefore, the consequences of any credible accident would not include any significant radiological hazards and the existing insurance coverage should be adequate to compensate for any conceivable condition.

The licensee indicates that the cost of property insurance in excess of \$620 million (i.e. an additional \$440 million in coverage) would exceed \$1 million annually. In addition, by purchasing additional insurance, the licensee would be liable under the terms of the policy to pay a potential retrospective premium assessment of as much as 7.5 times the annual premium if an accident were to occur at any insured site. Thus, potential costs to the licensee of buying the additional insurance could be significant.

III.

The Commission may grant exemptions from the requirements of Part 50 "which are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security" (10 CFR 50.12(a)(1)). In its submittal, the licensee argued that the justification for its exemption request meets the "special circumstances" described in §50.12(a)(2)(ii), (iii) and (v). Section 50.12(a)(2) stipulates, "The Commission will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances are present. Special circumstances are present whenever... (ii) Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule; or (iii) Compliance would result in undue hardship or other costs that are significantly in excess of those contemplated when the regulation was adopted, or that are significantly in excess of those incurred by others

similarly situated; or... (v) The exemption would provide only temporary relief from the applicable regulation and the licensee or applicant has made good faith efforts to comply with the regulation..."

The licensee meets the conditions for granting an exemption. First, with respect to §50.12(a)(1), the exemption is authorized by law and does not present an undue risk to public health and safety. The risk to public health and safety presented by the Seabrook Station in its present state of cold shutdown is substantially lower than reactors operating at a significant percentage of rated power since the reactor is prevented from achieving criticality, it has not yet achieved criticality and does not contain a significant inventory of fission products.

The Seabrook exemption request also meets the special circumstances presented in §50.12 (a)(2)(ii). The Commission agrees with the licensee's assessment that, under the conditions proposed, a significant accident is, for all practical purposes, highly improbable since the reactor has not gone critical or been allowed to operate at any power level. Therefore requiring excessive onsite property damage insurance before the reactor achieves criticality would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule, which is to provide sufficient funds to clean up after a significant accident. The licensee is requesting a temporary exemption only until such time as it may be allowed to make the reactor critical and operate at low power. The licensee states that it will comply fully with §50.54(w) prior to initial criticality.

The Commission agrees that these factors ensure that the circumstances of the exemption from the subject requirements prior to achieving initial criticality do not present an undue risk to the public health and safety.

IV.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, a temporary exemption is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby approves the following exemption:

The licensee is exempt from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(w) with respect to on-site property damage insurance in excess of \$620 million prior to such time as Seabrook Station receives an operating license which allows the reactor to go critical or operate at any power level.

The NRC staff has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with this action. Copies of the licensee's request for exemption dated October 1, 1987 and supplement dated February 29, 1988 are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. and at the Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, New Hampshire 03833. Copies may be obtained upon written request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director of Reactor Projects I/II.

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 11th day of May, 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Walter R. Butler

Walter R. Butler, Acting Director
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby approves the following exemption:

The licensee is exempt from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(w) with respect to on-site property damage insurance in excess of \$620 million unless and until such time as Seabrook Station receives a low power (5%) operating license.

The NRC staff has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with this action. Copies of the licensee's request for exemption dated October 1, 1987 and supplement dated February 29, 1988 are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. and at the Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, New Hampshire 03833. Copies may be obtained upon written request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director of Reactor Projects I/II.

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this _____ day of _____ 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga, Director
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION

S. Varga
B. Boger
V. Nerses
PTS B R/F

C. Thomas
D. Nash
R. Wood

(PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)

OFC	: PTSB:NRR	: PTSB:NRR	: NRR:PDI-3	: PTSB:NRR	: OGC	: NRR:PDI-3	: NRR/ADRI
NAME	: RWood	: DNash	: V Nerses	: C Thomas	:	: RWessman	: BBoger
DATE	: 3/4/88	: 3/3/88	: 1/88	: 4/1/88	: 1/88	: 1/88	: 03/88

OFC	: NRR:DRP	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME	: SVarga	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE	: / /88	:	:	:	:	:	:

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 11th day of May 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

151
Walter R. Butler, Acting Director
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION

S. Varga C. Thomas
B. Boger D. Nash
V. Nerses R. Wood
PTSB R/F

(PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)

*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFC	: *PTSB:NRR	: *PTSB:NRR	: *NRR:PDI-3	: *PTSB:NRR	: *OGC	: *NRR:PDI-3	: *NRR/ADR1
NAME	: RWood	: DNash	: VNereses	: CThomas	: EReis	: RWessman	: BBoger
DATE	: 4/15/88	: 4 /18/88	: 4 /18/88	: 4 /19/88	: 5 /03/88	: 5/03/88	: 05/03/88
OFC	: NRR:DRP	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME	: SVarga	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 5/11/88	:	:	:	:	:	:

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this _____ day of _____ 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga, Director
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION

S. Varga
B. Boger
V. Nerses
PTSB R/F

C. Thomas
D. Nash
R. Wood

(PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)

OFC	: PTSB : NRR	: PTSB : NRR	: NRR : PDI-3	: PTSB : NRR	: OGC	: NRR : PDI-3	: NRR / ADRI
NAME	: R Wood	: D Nash	: V Nerses	: C Thomas	: [Signature]	: R Wessman	: B Boger
DATE	: 4/15/88	: 4/18/88	: 4/18/88	: 4/19/88	: 5/3/88	: 5/3/88	: 5/3/88
OFC	: NRR : DRP	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME	: S Varga	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 5/11/88	:	:	:	:	:	:



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

May 11, 1988

Docket No. 50-443

Mr. Robert J. Harrison
President & Chief Executive Officer
Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Post Office Box 330
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

Dear Mr. Harrison:

Subject: EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 50.43(w)
SEABROOK STATION (TAC #66469)

The Commission has issued the enclosed exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(w). The exemption was from the requirement to increase the amount of required property insurance from \$620 million to \$1.06 billion until Seabrook Station receives an operating license which allows the reactor to go critical or operate at any power level. This exemption is in response to your application of October 1, 1987 which was supplemented by additional information submitted on February 29, 1988.

Based on the staff's evaluation contained in the exemption, the Commission has granted your exemption request pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50.12. The exemption is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication. This completes our action related to the above-referenced TAC number.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Victor Nerses".

Victor Nerses, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-3
Division of Reactor Projects I/II

Enclosure:
Exemption

cc: w/enclosure
See next page

~~4805270188~~ 3PP

Mr. Robert J. Harrison
Public Service Company of New Hampshire

Seabrook Nuclear Power Station

cc:

Thomas Dignan, Esq.
John A. Ritscher, Esq.
Ropes and Gray
225 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

E. Tupper Kinder, Esq.
G. Dana Bisbee, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Attorney General
208 State House Annex
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Mr. Bruce B. Beckley, Project Manager
Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Post Office Box 330
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

Resident Inspector
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 1149
Seabrook, New Hampshire 03874

Dr. Mauray Tye, President
Sun Valley Association
209 Summer Street
Haverhill, Massachusetts 08139

Mr. A. M. Ebner, Project Manager
United Engineers & Constructors
Post Office Box 8223
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Robert Backus, Esq.
Backus, Meyer and Solomon
116 Lowell Street
Manchester, New Hampshire 03106

Steven Oleskay, Esq.
Office of the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place
P.O. Box 330
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Diane Curran, Esq.
Harmon and Weiss
2001 S Street, NW
Suite 430
Washington, D.C. 20009

Carol S. Sneider, Esq.
Office of the Assistant Attorney General
One Ashburton Place
P.O. Box 330
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Philip Ahren, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
State House, Station #6
Augusta, Maine 04333

D. Pierre G. Cameron, Jr., Esq.
General Counsel
Public Service Company of New
Hampshire
Post Office Box 330
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

Mr. Warren Hall
Public Service Company of
New Hampshire
Post Office Box 330
Seabrook, New Hampshire 03874

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Ms. Jane Doughty
Seacoast Anti-Pollution League
5 Market Street
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801

New Hampshire Civil Defense Agency
107 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Mr. Diana P. Randall
70 Collins Street
Seabrook, New Hampshire 03874

Public Service Company of
New Hampshire

- 2 -

Seabrook Nuclear Power Station

cc:

Mr. Calvin A. Canney, City Manager
City Hall Chairman
126 Daniel Street
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801

Board of Selectmen
RFD Dalton Road
Brentwood, New Hampshire 03833

Ms. Roberta C. Pevear
Town of Hampton Falls, New Hampshire
Drinkwater Road
Hampton Falls, New Hampshire 03844

Mr. Guy Chichester, Chairman
Rye Nuclear Intervention
Committee
c/o Rye Town Hall
East Kingston, New Hampshire 03827

Chairman, Board of Selectmen
RFD 2
South Hampton, New Hampshire 03827

R. Scott Hill - Whilton
Lagoulis, Clark, Hill-Whilton
& McGuire
79 State Street
Newburyport, Ma. 01950

Ms. R. Cashman, Chairman
Board of Selectmen
Town of Amesbury
Town Hall
Amesbury, Massachusetts 01913

Honorable Peter J. Matthews
Mayor, City of Newburyport
City Hall
Newburyport, Massachusetts 01950

Mr. Donald E. Chick, Town Manager
Town of Exeter
10 Front Street
Exeter, New Hampshire 03823

Mr. Alfred V. Sargent,
Board of Selectmen
Town of Salisbury, MA 01950

Senator Gordon J. Humphrey
ATTN: Tom Burack
531 Hart Senate Office Building
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Mr. Owen B. Durgin, Chairman
Durham Board of Selectmen
Town of Durham
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Ms. Sandra Gavutis
RDF 1
10 Central Road
Rye, New Hampshire 03870

Jane Spector
Federal Energy Regulatory
Commission
825 North Capital Street, NE
Room 8105
Washington, D. C. 20426

Mr. R. Sweeney
Three Metro Center
Suite 610
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Mr. Richard Strome, Director
State Civil Defense Agency
State Office Park South
107 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Adjudicatory File (2)
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel Docket
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

in the amount of \$1.06 billion. This requirement, among other changes, increased the amount of required property insurance from \$620 million and became effective on October 5, 1987.

On October 1, 1987, the licensee filed an Application for Scheduling Exemption from the requirements for property insurance above \$620 million until such time as the Commission may grant a low power (5%) operating license. This request was supplemented by additional information dated February 29, 1988. In support of its request, the licensee indicated that "Criticality at Seabrook Station has not been achieved. The primary system is not radioactive, and, in accordance with license requirements, the reactor coolant system is maintained with a boron concentration equal to or greater than 2000 parts per million." Maintaining the boron concentration of the reactor coolant equal to or greater than 2000 parts per million ensures that the reactor cannot be made critical, even if all the control rods are fully withdrawn. The licensee also maintains that the coverage in the amount of \$620 million that it currently carries is "more than adequate to compensate for any conceivable condition that may occur." The amount of coverage should be more than adequate since the reactor does not contain a significant inventory of fission products and the 2000 parts per million boron concentration of the reactor coolant prevents the reactor from achieving criticality and thereby generating fission products. Therefore, the consequences of any credible accident would not include any significant radiological hazards and the existing insurance coverage should be adequate to compensate for any conceivable condition.

The licensee indicates that the cost of property insurance in excess of \$620 million (i.e. an additional \$440 million in coverage) would exceed \$1 million annually. In addition, by purchasing additional insurance, the licensee would be liable under the terms of the policy to pay a potential retrospective premium assessment of as much as 7.5 times the annual premium if an accident were to occur at any insured site. Thus, potential costs to the licensee of buying the additional insurance could be significant.

III.

The Commission may grant exemptions from the requirements of Part 50 "which are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security" (10 CFR 50.12(a)(1)). In its submittal, the licensee argued that the justification for its exemption request meets the "special circumstances" described in §50.12(a)(2)(ii), (iii) and (v). Section 50.12(a)(2) stipulates, "The Commission will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances are present. Special circumstances are present whenever... (ii) Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule; or (iii) Compliance would result in undue hardship or other costs that are significantly in excess of those contemplated when the regulation was adopted, or that are significantly in excess of those incurred by others

similarly situated; or... (v) The exemption would provide only temporary relief from the applicable regulation and the licensee or applicant has made good faith efforts to comply with the regulation..."

The licensee meets the conditions for granting an exemption. First, with respect to §50.12(a)(1), the exemption is authorized by law and does not present an undue risk to public health and safety. The risk to public health and safety presented by the Seabrook Station in its present state of cold shutdown is substantially lower than reactors operating at a significant percentage of rated power since the reactor is prevented from achieving criticality, it has not yet achieved criticality and does not contain a significant inventory of fission products.

The Seabrook exemption request also meets the special circumstances presented in §50.12 (a)(2)(ii). The Commission agrees with the licensee's assessment that, under the conditions proposed, a significant accident is, for all practical purposes, highly improbable since the reactor has not gone critical or been allowed to operate at any power level. Therefore requiring excessive onsite property damage insurance before the reactor achieves criticality would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule, which is to provide sufficient funds to clean up after a significant accident. The licensee is requesting a temporary exemption only until such time as it may be allowed to make the reactor critical and operate at low power. The licensee states that it will comply fully with §50.54(w) prior to initial criticality.

The Commission agrees that these factors ensure that the circumstances of the exemption from the subject requirements prior to achieving initial criticality do not present an undue risk to the public health and safety.

IV.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, a temporary exemption is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby approves the following exemption:

The licensee is exempt from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(w) with respect to on-site property damage insurance in excess of \$620 million prior to such time as Seabrook Station receives an operating license which allows the reactor to go critical or operate at any power level.

The NRC staff has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), an environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with this action. Copies of the licensee's request for exemption dated October 1, 1987 and supplement dated February 29, 1988 are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. and at the Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, New Hampshire 03833. Copies may be obtained upon written request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director of Reactor Projects I/II.

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 11th day of May, 1988.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Walter R. Butler

Walter R. Butler, Acting Director
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation