

NRC Staff's Responses to Questions Regarding Vermont Yankee ISFSI Security Requirements

From: prvs=933964bb0=Jack.Parrott@nrc.gov [mailto:prvs=933964bb0=Jack.Parrott@nrc.gov] On Behalf Of Parrott, Jack
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 4:44 PM
To: shadis@prexar.com
Cc: Khanna, Meena; Watson, Bruce; Kim, James; McNamara, Nancy; Powell, Raymond; Cherubini, John; Garner, Douglas; Sheehan, Neil; Purdy, Gary
Subject: RE: Vermont Yankee ISFSI security requirements

Dear Mr. Shadis,

Provided below are the staff's responses to your questions regarding the Vermont Yankee ISFSI security requirements –

1. Is Entergy VY bound by any NRC visibility requirements other than those in 10 C.F.R § 73.51 and as defined in § 73.2 (Isolation zones)?

- If by "visibility requirements" you mean an NRC requirement to have the VY ISFSI be visible from outside the protected area, NRC does not have such a requirement in the Part 73 regulations.

2. Is Maine Yankee in compliance with all NRC visibility requirements?

– In general, NRC does not have "visibility requirements" for ISFSIs as discussed above.

3. Are these two licensees regulated by an identical set of rules with respect to ISFSI protection?

- Each ISFSI may have site-specific security requirements and NRC security orders may impose Additional Security Measures (ASMs). Also keep in mind that one of the licensees is a standalone ISFSI that is not co-located with an operating power reactor and the other is on a site with other protected facilities which may result in site specific regulatory requirements. Information on any site-specific differences imposed through the license would be for official use only and may also be designated as Safeguards information (SGI) which is subject to the 10 CFR 73.21 provisions for protecting SGI against unauthorized disclosure.

4. Are there Staff interpretations, directives, orders, guidance letters, or exceptions in place that would require more stringent or different visibility requirements at Vermont Yankee's ISFSI than at Maine Yankee's ISFSI?

- Identification of any site-specific security requirements imposed on a licensee would be for official use only and may also be designated as SGI which is subject to the 10 CFR 73.21 provisions for protecting SGI against unauthorized disclosure; therefore not suitable for documentation in this e-mail. Other non-security related requirements, imposed by State or local governments, may result in different non-NRC regulated visibility requirements between sites and should be a matter of public record.

5. If there are substantive differences in the way that ISFSI regulations are interpreted and applied for the two plants please identify them and the rationale for the differences.

- With regard to ISFSI security regulations, identification of any specific differences between sites as imposed by the license would be security information for official use only.

Sincerely,

Jack D. Parrott
Senior Project Manager
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-6634

From: Raymond Shadis <shadis@prexar.com>
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2016 10:39 AM
To: Kim, James
Cc: 'Clay Turnbull, NEC'; 'Schuyler Gould'
Subject: [External_Sender] Vermont Yankee ISFSI security requirements

James Kim
Licensing Project Manager – Vermont Yankee
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dear Mr. Kim,

Good morning. Would you please take a few minutes from your busy schedule to help unravel a puzzle that has come up with respect to the planned siting of Vermont Yankee's second spent fuel storage pad. Entergy Vermont Yankee says that it is precluded from visual screening of the pad and ISFSI using plantings or berms and such by NRC regulation. We notice in the enclosed photo that Maine Yankee's ISFSI is set within foliage covered berms. Thus we are led to the following questions and I hope you can help with some authoritative answers.

1. Is Entergy VY bound by any NRC visibility requirements other than those in 10 C.F.R § 73.51 and as defined in § 73.2 (Isolation zones)?
2. Is Maine Yankee in compliance with all NRC visibility requirements?
3. Are these two licensees regulated by an identical set of rules with respect to ISFSI protection?
4. Are there Staff interpretations, directives, orders, guidance letters, or exceptions in place that would require more stringent or different visibility requirements at Vermont Yankee's ISFSI than at Maine Yankee's ISFSI? If so, please identify them.
5. If there are substantive differences in the way that ISFSI regulations are interpreted and applied for the two plants please identify them and the rationale for the differences.

I hope these questions are not too burdensome and that you will be able to just snap the answers back to me.

Thanks.

Have a great weekend. Temperatures are warming so that it is both safe and pleasant to come back to New England.

Ray
Raymond Shadis
New England Coalition
shadis@prexar.com



Aerial view of Maine Yankee's Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) located on Bailey Point, Wiscasset. Courtesy of Maine Yankee [Atomic Power Company]