

Miller, Ed

From: RILEY, Jim [jhr@nei.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2012 9:53 AM
To: Miller, Ed
Cc: NILEKANI, Vijay; HEYMER, Adrian; Abisamra, Joe; Aitken, Steve; Andrew Garrett (Andrew.Garrett@Duke-Energy.com); Attarian, George; Bell, Roderick; bolognar@firstenergycorp.com; Buman, Dan; Colin Keller; Gambrell, David; GASPER, JOSEPH K; Giddens, John; Hackerott, Alan; Heerman, John; Horstman, William R; 'Huffman, Ken'; HYDE, KEVIN C; Joe Bellini (joe.bellini@amec.com); John Lee (John.Lee@dom.com); LaBorde, Jamie; Maddox Jim (maddoxje@inpo.org); Mannai, David J; Marr, Stephen G. (INPO); Miller, Andrew; Murray, Mike; Peters, Ken; RILEY, Jim; Rob Whelan (robert.whelan@ge.com); Robinson, Mike; Rogers, James G; Rudy Gil; Scarola, Jim; Selman, Penny; Stone, Jeff; Taylor, Bob; Terry Grebel (tlg1@pge.com); Thayer, Jay; Vinod Aggarwal (Vinod.aggarwal@exeloncorp.com); Wrobel, George; Yale, Bob
Subject: Flooding Evaluation Man Hour Estimate
Attachments: SECY Item 2 1 and 2 3 Manhour Estimates Revision 2.xls

Ed;

The Flooding Task Force man hour estimates for walkdowns, evaluations, and integrated assessment are attached for your information. The following provides a context for the estimates.

- The Flooding Task Force developed these estimates based on experience and vendor input. The task force is comprised of senior engineers and engineering managers from around 15 utilities. They have extensive experience in engineering analysis and walkdowns. A few of the task force members have also done or managed flood evaluations. The estimates have gone through several rounds of comment and revision by task force members.
- The vendor manhour estimates for evaluations were based on input from vendors who have done these evaluations for COLs and some existing plants. The task force was briefed by 4 vendors during one of our meetings in January and subsequently received manhour estimates from 3 of them. The high and low values from this vendor input were used to create the spreadsheet.
- The estimates for the vendor flood evaluations for the different types of sites were developed by assuming that the sites needed the following types of evaluations:
 - Complex sites (two flood hazards): research + PMP + river flood + surge/seiche + tsunami + ice effect + wave runoff
 - River sites with dams: research + PMP + river flood + dam failure + ice effect + wave runoff
 - River sites with no dams: research + PMP + river flood ice effect
 - Coastal sites: research + PMP + surge/seiche + tsunami + wave runoff
 - Lake sites: research + PMP + surge/seiche + wave runoff
 - Land bound sites: research + PMP
 - Sites with COL docketed: research (and gap analysis) + PMP
- The flood evaluations will need significant utility support and processing as detailed in the spreadsheet
- Since we have not written the integrated analysis guidance yet, we made this estimate based on what we believe the guidance will address and related work will entail.

We believe that the estimates are representative of the level of effort that will be required. Note in particular the estimate for vendor work on flood evaluations (approximately 1.5 to 4.5 man years for the average evaluation); this will be a particular challenge due to the limited resources for this kind of work.

Thanks for taking our input.

Jim Riley

Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I St. N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006
www.nei.org

phone: (202) 739-8137
cell: (202) 439-2459
fax: (202) 533-0193

nuclear

Putting Clean Air Energy to Work.

FOLLOW US ON



This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

Sent through mail.messaging.microsoft.com

Walkdown Manhour Estimate

Flood walkdown scope activities	Number of personnel assigned	Number of weeks for the task	Number of hours per week	Man hours totals	Man hours totals -15 %	Man hours totals +15%	Calendar Days
Station - Develop Guidance and Training	2	6.0	40	480	408	552	42.0
Station - Review of BD / Develop Scope	2	6.0	40	480	408	552	42.0
Station - Build Scaffold (assume 10)	4	2.0	40	320	272	368	
Station - Open/reseal Cable chase Manhole covers (assume 20)	2	4.0	40	320	272	368	
Station - Complete and Document Required Training	5	1.0	40	200	170	230	7.0
Station - Perform Walkdown	4	8.0	40	1280	1088	1472	56.0
Station - Results Review and Disposition	2	8.0	40	640	544	736	56.0
Station - Prepare and Approve Response	2	8.0	40	640	544	736	56.0
							total days
							259.0
							man/years
Total estimated resources for a 2 unit site (the units are identical)				4360	3706	5014	2.1
Total estimated resources for a single unit site would be 70% of the effort of a 2 unit site				3052	2594	3510	1.5
Total estimated resources for a 3 unit site would be 130% of the effort of a 2 unit site				5668	4818	6518	2.7
Total estimated resources for a 2 unit site (the units are significantly different from each other), 2 times single unit site				6104	5188	7020	2.9
Number of single unit sites	28						
Number of 2 unit sites	31						
Number of significantly different 2 unit sites	2						
Number Of 3 unit sites	3						
Industry average flood walkdown effort per site				Avg 3904	Low 3318	High 4489	

Evaluation Manhour Estimate

Vendors

Flood Evaluation Vendor activities	Low estimate	High Estimate	Average
Site walkdown and research	200	500	350
Local precipitation (PMP)	1000	1600	1300
River flood (PMF)	1000	5000	3000
Dam failure	600	2000	1300
Ice effect	200	1500	850
Surge and seiche	400	2500	1450
Tsunami	200	3500	1850
Wave run-up	1000	2000	1500
Sites with CCL Docketed	1200	2100	1650
Complicated sites (on coast or lake with nearby river)	4000	16600	10300
River site with dams	4000	12600	8300
River site with no dams	2400	8600	5500
Coastal site	2800	10100	6450
Lake site	2600	6600	4600
Land bound site	1200	2100	1650
Number of sites with CCL Docketed	11		
Combined hazard complicated sites	6		
Number of river sites with dams	20		
Number of river sites without dams	8		
Number of coastal sites	9		
Number of lake sites	9		
Number of land bound sites	1		
Industry avg man hrs for vendor flood eval effort per site	Low 2909	High 9311	Avg 6110

Utilities

Flood Evaluation Utility Activities			
Compile Design Basis Flood Data/Information - Review of Vendor Products			
Activity	Man-Hour Range	Man-hour Low	Man-Hour High
1. Collect current FSAR and any past updates	20	20	20
a. Review applicable Regulatory Guides			
2. Review flood evaluation sections of FSAR:	24	24	24
a. Section 2.4, other as appropriate			
b. Determine from item a. what calculations should be made to support flood analysis			
3. Collect supporting calculations:	16 - 80	16	80
a. All supporting calculations available/ or what is missing			
b. Determine if calculations meet current QA requirements.			
4. Evaluate what additional work is needed from vendor:	40 - 160	40	160
a. All calculations have to be updated - non-QA			
b. Analysis that were not done for the licensing basis.			
c. Develop list of work elements that will be required.			
d. Develop RFP to define work for vendor bid			
5. Bidding process:	48 - 120	48	120
a. Pre-bid meeting to define work			
b. Establish criteria for vendor selection			
c. Review of bids and selection			
Total		148	404
Owner Calculation Review (1 Calculation)	32 - 48/calc		
1. Review of individual calculation for completeness, consistent with QA requirements, and technical content.			
2. Prepare list of comments/questions for resolution by vendor			
3. Follow-up review of calculations for comment resolution			
4. Complete calculation internal sign-off as required by QA requirements.			
Estimated Calculations/Flood Analysis (20 - 70)			
Low End 10 Calc/Study	320 - 480	320	480

High End 70 Calc/Study 2240 - 3360 2240 3360

Calculations are assumed to be broken into smaller pieces for review
 e.g., Unit hydrographs, inflows, storm selection, dam rating curves, model calibrations, and PMF/PMH etc.
 are all separate calculations; Note: High end is based on TVA re-evaluations. TVA sites have 70 total calculations
 but since on the same river system, many of the calculations are shared between the 3 operating sites.

Alternately, use 30% of the vendor effort 873 2793

Write response to 50.54(f) letter 320 640

Industry average flood evaluation effort per site: (some sites could be considerably higher)	Utility manhrs	Low 1341	High 3837	Average 2589
	Vendor manhrs	2909	9311	6110

Integrated Assessment

Flooding Hazards Vulnerabilities evaluation - Utilizing Integrated Assessment Guidance	Number of personnel assigned	Number of weeks for the task	Number of hours per week	Man hours totals	Man hours totals -30 %	Man hours totals +50%
Evaluate and document operability and reportability issues that arise during analysis using current day acceptance criteria (Assume 6 issues require 2 people for 2 weeks each)	2	12.0	40	960	672	1440
Identify and screen for feasibility, modifications to protect plant equipment to a new PMF design basis level using Integrated Assessment strategy	2	12.0	40	960	672	1440
Perform scoping analysis of selected prevention modifications to develop +/- 50% cost estimates	5	16.0	40	3200	2720	4800
Identify and screen for feasibility, modifications to mitigate the consequences a new PMF design basis level Integrated Assessment strategy	2	12.0	40	960	816	1440
Perform scoping analysis of selected mitigation modifications to develop +/- 50% cost estimates	5	16.0	40	3200	2720	4800
Select strategy for protection and mitigation of the PMF design basis	3	8.0	40	960	816	1440
Develop Integrated Assessment strategy with Protection and Mitigation of PMP event	3	4.0	40	480	408	720
Obtain approval of strategy	2	4.0	40	320	272	480
Prepare and Approve Response	2	4.0	40	320	272	480
Total estimated resources for a site requiring protection and mitigation				11360	9368	17040
Total estimated resources for a site requiring protection				6960	5628	10440

Industry average integrated assessment effort per site assuming even split between protection only and protection and mitigation 9160