

PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource

From: Chowdhury, Prosanta
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2012 2:56 PM
To: 'PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com'
Cc: PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource; 'James.Mallon@pseg.com'; 'David.Robillard@pseg.com'; Segala, John; Silvia, Andrea; Roach, Kevin; Clark, Phyllis; Canova, Michael; McLellan, Judith; Tammara, Seshagiri; Schaaf, Robert; McCoppin, Michael
Subject: PSEG Site ESPA DRAFT RAI 59 (eRAI 6255) SRP-02.01.03 (RPAC-RSAC)
Attachments: PSEG Site ESPA Draft RAI 59 (eRAI 6255).doc

Please find attached DRAFT RAI No. 59 for the PSEG Site ESP application. You have ten working days to review this request and to decide whether you need a conference call to discuss it. Please notify me of your decision in this regard.

After the call, or after ten days, the RAI will be finalized and issued to you. You will then have 30 calendar days to respond. These durations are factored into your review schedule. If additional time is required to respond, please inform me of your proposed schedule to respond at your earliest opportunity.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Prosanta Chowdhury
Project Manager
Licensing Branch 1 (LB1)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors
301-415-1647

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_RAI
Email Number: 113

Mail Envelope Properties (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7D7F5D91E91A)

Subject: PSEG Site ESPA DRAFT RAI 59 (eRAI 6255) SRP-02.01.03 (RPAC-RSAC)
Sent Date: 2/10/2012 2:56:25 PM
Received Date: 2/10/2012 2:56:27 PM
From: Chowdhury, Prosanta

Created By: Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource" <PSEGESPeRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"James.Mallon@pseg.com" <James.Mallon@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"David.Robillard@pseg.com" <David.Robillard@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Silvia, Andrea" <Andrea.Silvia@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Roach, Kevin" <Kevin.Roach@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Canova, Michael" <Michael.Canova@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Tammara, Seshagiri" <Seshagiri.Tammara@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McCoppin, Michael" <Michael.McCoppin@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	769	2/10/2012 2:56:27 PM
PSEG Site ESPA Draft RAI 59 (eRAI 6255).doc		31226

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information No. 59

Application Revision 0

DRAFT

2/10/2012

PSEG Site ESP
PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC
Docket No. 52-043
SRP Section: 02.01.03 - Population Distribution
Application Section: 2.1.3

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.01.03-7

[Follow up to RAI No. 21, Question 02.01.03-1, Item (e)]

10 CFR 52.17(a)(1)(viii), 10 CFR 100.21(h), NUREG-0800, SRP Section 2.1.3, Subsection III (Review Procedures), item 5 (Population Density) establish the need for an evaluation of the population density in the vicinity of the site. Regulatory Position C.4 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 4.7 specifies, among other things, a threshold population density criterion of 500 persons per square mile (per/sq-mi) averaged over any radial out to 20 miles.

In a June 7, 2011, response to RAI No. 21, Question 02.01.03-1, the applicant provided information pertaining to item (e) and stated that the 2018 population density at 20 miles is 494 per/sq-mi. This projection approaches the criteria provided in RG 4.7 (500 per/sq-mi).

The applicant also stated that an Alternative Site Evaluation was performed in support of the siting determination for the Early Site Permit effort, and made a reference to the Environmental Report (ER), Section 9.3. In addition to this reference, the staff requests that the applicant also present rationale and justification in the selection of this high population density site, by providing information regarding the Alternative Site Evaluation analysis summary and conclusion in SSAR, Section 2.1.3. of the application.