#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### BEFORE THE COMMISSION

In the Matter of

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF

NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al

(Seabrook Station,
Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-443 OL
50-444 OL

AFFIDAVIT OF FRANK J. CONGEL, ADDRESSING APPLICANTS' REQUEST FOR AN EXEMPTION FRUM 10 CFR PART 50, APPENDIX E, SECTION IV.F.1

- I, Frank J. Congel, being duly sworn, state as follows:
- 1. I am employed by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission as the Director, Division of Radiation Protection and Emergency Preparedness. A copy of my professional qualifications is attached. I have read the Applicants' request for exemption and my conclusions are set forth below.
- 2. In a filing submitted to the Commission, dated August 11, 1989, the Applicants requested an exemption from the requirement of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Section IV.F.1, that an onsite emergency planning exercise be conducted within one year before the issuance of a full power operating license from Seabrook Unit 1. Section IV.F.1 provides that:
  - 1. A full participation exercise which tests as much of the licensee, State and local emergency plans as is reasonably achievable without mandatory public participation shall be conducted for each site at which a power reactor is located for which the first operating license

for that site is issued after July 13, 1982. This exercise shall be conducted within two years before the issuance of the first operating license for full power (one authorizing operation above 5% of rated power) of the first reactor and shall include participation by each State and local government within the plume exposure pathway EPZ and each State within the ingestion exposure pathway EPZ. If the full participation exercise is conducted more than one year prior to issuance of an operating license for full power, an exercise which tests the licensee's onsite emergency plans shall be conducted within one year before issuance of an operating license for full power. This exercise need not have State or local government participation. (emphasis added)

The most recent exercise of the onsite plan was held in conjunction with the full preparedness exercise at Seabrook on June 28 and 29, 1988. The Applicants project that if the licensing of Seabrook proceeds on its present course, a full power license could be issued about seventeen to eighteen months after the conduct of the June 1988 exercise and have requested an extension of the requirement in Appendix E, Section IV.F.1, that onsite exercises be held one year prior to issuance of a full power license.

3. The objective of Appendix E, Section IV.F.1, regarding the testing of the onsite emergency plans, is to assure that an adequate state of onsite emergency preparedness is demonstrated through the conduct of an emergency plan exercise within one year before a nuclear plant is authorized to exceed 5% of rated power. The importance of annual onsite emergency planning exercises by a licensee's operational staff is recognized in the Commission's regulations, which now require that after a facility is licensed to operate there must be an annual onsite exercise (10 CFR 50, Appendix E, Section IV.F.2). This annual emergency preparedness exercise ensures that the licensee's new personnel are adequately and promptly trained and that existing licensee personnel maintain their emergency response capability. The existing requirement of a pre-operational onsite exercise within one year prior to full-power license issuance is consistent with this philosophy as well as the Commission's general

desire to have pre-operational emergency planning exercises as close as practicable to the time of licensing.  $^{1/}$  Also, in revising the timing requirement for a full participation exercise prior to full power licensing, the Commission recognized the distinction in the responsibilities and training requirements for the onsite and offsite response organizations, and expressed its belief that an onsite exercise should be conducted within one year of licensing to provide assurance that an applicant's onsite response capabilities are adequate.  $^{2/}$ 

- 4. Construction of Seabrook Unit 1 was completed in 1986. A fuel load (zero-power) license was issued on October 17, 1986, and a low power testing (up to 5% of rated power) license was issued on May 26, 1989. Since the completion of construction and the loading of fuel in the fall of 1986, the pplicants have maintained the operating staff in a state of readiness to operate the plant. As a result of the approximately three year delay in the full power licensing of Seabrook, the Applicants have had the opportunity to exercise the onsite emergency plant on an annual basis since 1986.
- 5. The Seabrook Station Emergency Response Organization (ERO), which implements the Seabrook Station Radiological Emergency Plan (SSREP), the onsite emergency plan, was established in 1985. In addition to extensive training and drills, the ERO has participated in three emergency preparedness exercises which were observed by the NRC. A joint exercise of the onsite plan and the New Hampshire Radiological Emergency Response Plan (NHRERP) was held in February 1986. An exercise of the onsite plan was held in December 1987. A

<sup>1/</sup> See 52 FR 16823, May 6, 1987.

<sup>2/ 1</sup>d.

full participation exercise involving the onsite plan, the NHRERP, the Seabrook Plan for Massachusetts Communities, and the State of Maine Ingestion Pathway Plan was held on June 28 and 29, 1988. As indicated above, the onsite portions of these exercises were evaluated by the NRC.  $\frac{3}{}$  In each exercise all major facilities related to the onsite emergency plan were activated and exercised, including the Control Room, the Technical Support Center, the Operational Support Center, the Emergency Operations Facility, and the Media Center.

- 6. The results of the NRC observation of the onsite exercises are documented in NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-443/86-10, 50-443/87-25, and 50-443/88-09. In each exercise, the NRC concluded that the Applicants' emergency response actions were adequate to provide protective measures for the health and safety of the public. But each exercise also identified weaknesses or areas requiring corrective action. The Applicants satisfactorily responded to these items and they were closed out in subsequent inspections.
- 7. Since issuance of the fuel load license in October, 1986, the Applicants have had to implement portions of the onsite plan in response to two situations that were classified as "Unusual Events," the lowest level of accident severity classification. The response of the ERO to these events was much less extensive than the response which takes place during an onsite exercise. Both events involved minor equipment failures and occurred with the plant in cold shuidown having never been taken critical and no fission product inventory present. The first instance occurred in February 1987 and in an examination of the event and the Applicants' response, the NRC issued a Notice of Violation for a delay in

<sup>3/</sup> The offsite portion of the 1986 and 1988 exercises was evaluated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

notifying the Commonwealth of Massachusetts until 30 minutes after declaring the Unusual Event (See NRC Inspection Report No. 50-443/97-08). The second Unusual Event occurred on December 19, 1988. In a report related to this event, the NRC noted that all notifications to offsite authorities were made promptly and in accordance with NRC regulations and the onsite plan (See NRC Ins. ection Report No. 50-443/88-17).

8. The Applicants' onsite ERO consists of over 500 members drawn from onshift personnel, other Station personnel, corporate personnel, and Yankee Nuclear Services Division personnel. These personnel are assigned either to the Control Room, the Technical Support Center, the Operational Support Center, the Emergency Operations Facility, or the Media Center. The ERO has been involved in training and drills in an operational mode since October 1986. The average emergency preparedness experience level of the members of the ERO is over two and one-half years and at least one person currently assigned to a key ERO decisionmaking position participated in the June 1988 exercise. While many of the newer ERO members are in less critical response positions, such as Administrative Support, Auxiliary Operator, and Control Room Communicator, information provided in the August 11, 1989 filing by the Applicants indicates that 27 out of 51 assigned individuals to the key ERO positions have not participated in an exercise in their currently assigned position. In addition, almost half of the ERO have not had the opportunity to participate in any of the three annual onsite exercises. Moreover, while the June 1988 exercise demonstrated certain strengths in the ERO and the Applicants overall response was adequate, there were some questions raised concerning the performance of the ERO (See NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-443/88-09 and 50-443/88-10). Further, recent low power testing has indicated some weaknesses in control room staff performance which, while not indicative of a fundamental flaw in the training

that the conduct of another exercise of the ERO prior to full power licensing would serve to confirm the adequacy of onsite emergency preparedness at Seabrook and would provide a valuable training experience for the newer members of the organization and those in key decisionmaking positions who have not had the opportunity to participate in an exercise. The conduct of another onsite exercise would also provide an opportunity for exercising the interfaces between the onsite organization and the offsite organizations; i.e., the State of New Hampshire and the New Hampshire Yankee-Offsite Response Organization.

Based on a review of the Applicants' exemption request, the Staff concludes that Applicants have not demonstrated that the current level of experience and training of the Emergency Response Organization staff is such that an onsite emergency planning exercise within a year before full power operation is not necessary to satisfy the underlying purpose of the rule -- to confirm the adequacy of onsite emergency preparedness close to issuance of a full power license. Therefore, the Applicants' request for exemption should be denied.

The foregoing and the attached statement of professional qualifications are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Franks. Congel

Subscribed to and sworn before me this Ashday of August, 1989.

My commission expires: 7/8/90

DOCKETED

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATOR' COMMISSION

'89 AUG 28 P6:27

## BEFORE THE COMMISSION

In the Matter of

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.

(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-443 OL 50-444 OL

## NOTICE OF APPEARANCE

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned attorney herewith enters an appearance in the above-captioned matter. In accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 2.713(b), the following information is provided:

Name:

Mitzi A. Young

Address:

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of the General Counsel Washington, DC 20555

Telephone Number:

(301) 492-1523

Admission:

U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit U.S. District Court, District of Columbia

District of Columbia Court of Appeals

Name of Party: NRC Staff

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for NRC Staff

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28th day of August, 1989

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'89 AUG 28 P6:27

### BEFORE THE COMMISSION

In the Matter of

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.

(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2

Docket Nos. 50-443 OL 50-444 OL Emergency Planning

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "NRC STAFF RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS' APPLICATION FOR AN EXEMPTION FROM 10 C.F.R. PART 50, SECTION IV.F.1 (ONSITE EXERCISE ONE YEAR BEFORE FULL POWER LICENSE)" and "NOTICE OF APPEARANCE" in the above captioned proceeding have been served on the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class or, as indicated by an asterisk, by deposit in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's internal mail system, this 28th day of August 1989:

Ivan W. Smith, Chairman (2)\*
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Richard F. Cole\*
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Kenneth A. McCollom Administrative Judge 1107 West Knapp Street Stillwater, OK 74075

Diane Curran, Esq. Harmon, Curran & Tousley 2001 S Street, NW Suite 430 Washington, DC 20009

Philip Ahrens, Esq. Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General State House Station Augusta, ME 04333 H. J. Flynn, Esq, Assistant General Counsel Federal Emergency Management Agency 500 C Street, SW Washington, DC 20472

Calvin A. Canney City Hall 126 Daniel Street Portsmouth, NH 03801

John Traficonte, Esq. Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General One Ashburton Place, 19th Floor Boston, MA 02108

Geoffrey Huntington, Esq. Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General 25 Capitol Street Concord, NH 03301 Robert A. Backus, Esq. Backus, Meyer & Solomon 116 Lowell Street Manchester, NH 03106

Paul McEachern, Esq. Shaines & McEachern 25 Maplewood Avenue P.O. Box 360 Portsmouth, NH 03801

Charles P. Graham, Esq. McKay, Murphy & Graham 100 Main Street Amesbury, MA 01913

Sandra Gavutis, Chairman Board of Selectmen RFD #1, Box 1154 Kensington, NH 03827

William S. Lord Board of Selectmen Town Hall - Friend Street Amesbury, MA 01913

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

Allen Lampert Civil Defense Director Town of Brentwood 20 Franklin Exeter, NH 03833

William Armstrong Civil Defense Director Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Gary W. Holmes, Esq. Holmes & Ellis 47 Winnacunnet Road Hampton, NH 03842 Peter J. Matthews, Mayor City Hall Newburyport, MA 01950

Mrs. Anne E. Goodman, Chairman Board of Selectmen 13-15 Newmarket Road Durham, NH 03824

Hon. Gordon J. Humphrey United States Senate 531 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510

Barbara J. Saint Andre, Esq. Kopelman & Paige, P.C. 77 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110

Michael Santoscosso, Chairman Board of Selectmen South Hampton, NH 03827

Ashod N. Amirian, Esq. Town Counsel for Merrimac 145 South Main Street P.O. Box 38 Bradford, MA 01835

Richard R. Donovan Federal Regional Center Federal Emergency Management Agency 130 228th Street, S.W. Bothell, Washington 98021-9796

Robert R. Pierce, Esq.\*
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Thomas G. Dignan, Jr., Esq. Robert K. Gad, III, Esq. Ropes & Gray One International Place Boston, MA 02110 J. P. Nadeau Board of Selectmen 10 Central Street Rye, NH 03870

Judith H. Mizner, Esq. 79 State Street Newburyport, MA 01950

Robert Carrigg Board of Selectmen Town Office Atlantic Avenue North Hampton, NH 03862

Samuel J. Chilk Office of the Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555 Ms. Suzanne Breiseth Board of Selectmen Town of Hampton Falls Drinkwater Road Kampton Falls, NH 03844

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (1)\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Panel (8)\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Docketing and Service Section\*
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Mitzi A. Young Counsel for NRC Staff