

December 22, 1999

T5e3

The Honorable James M. Inhofe, Chairman
Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private
Property and Nuclear Safety
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has sent to the Office of the Federal Register the enclosed Federal Register Notice that will amend the Commission's regulations for licensing commercial nuclear power plants (10 CFR Part 52). Specifically, this rule (Appendix C to Part 52) will certify the AP600 standard plant design, which was submitted to the NRC for its review by the Westinghouse Electric Company LLC.

This final design certification rule is necessary to partially fulfill the objectives of Part 52, which are to provide licensing stability, early resolution of licensing issues, and to enhance the safety and reliability of nuclear power plants through standardization. Those wishing to obtain a license to build or operate the AP600 standard plant design will be able to do so by referencing the AP600 design certification rule.

Sincerely,

Original signed by DKRathbun

Dennis K. Rathbun, Director
Office of Congressional Affairs

Enclosure: Federal Register Notice
cc: Senator Bob Graham

Distribution

- RLSB
- PUBLIC
- Docket File- 52-003
- DKRathbun, OCA
- DMyer
- SCollins
- DMatthews
- SNewberry
- CGrimes
- JNWilson

URG FILE CENTER 2000

G:\RLSB\WILSON\Secy-ap6-#3.wpd

OFFICE	RLSB	OCA
NAME	JNWilson	DKRathbun
DATE	12.16.99	DKR 12.22.99

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DF03

PDR ADock 05200003

December 22, 1999

The Honorable Joe Barton, Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy and Power
Committee on Commerce
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has sent to the Office of the Federal Register the enclosed Federal Register Notice that will amend the Commission's regulations for licensing commercial nuclear power plants (10 CFR Part 52). Specifically, this rule (Appendix C to Part 52) will certify the AP600 standard plant design, which was submitted to the NRC for its review by the Westinghouse Electric Company LLC.

This final design certification rule is necessary to partially fulfill the objectives of Part 52, which are to provide licensing stability, early resolution of licensing issues, and to enhance the safety and reliability of nuclear power plants through standardization. Those wishing to obtain a license to build or operate the AP600 standard plant design will be able to do so by referencing the AP600 design certification rule.

Sincerely,

Original signed by DKRathbun

Dennis K. Rathbun, Director
Office of Congressional Affairs

Enclosure: Federal Register Notice

cc: Representative Rick Boucher

Distribution

RLSB
PUBLIC
Docket File - 52-003
DKRathbun, OCA
DMyer
SCollins
DMatthews
SNewberry
CGrimes
JNWilson

G:\RLSB\WILSON\Secy-ap6-#3.wpd

OFFICE	RLSB	OCA
NAME	JNWilson	DKRathbun
DATE	12.16.99	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

24722

Submission of Federal Rules Under the Congressional Review Act

President of the Senate

Speaker of the House of Representatives

GAO

Please fill the circles electronically or with black pen or #2 pencil.

1. Name of Department or Agency

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Subdivision or Office

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

3. Rule Title

Design Certification Rule for the AP600 Design

4. Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) or Other Unique Identifier (if applicable)

RIN 3150-AG23

5. Major Rule Non-major Rule

6. Final Rule Other

7. With respect to this rule, did your agency solicit public comments? Yes No N/A

8. Priority of Regulation (fill in one)

Economically Significant; or Significant; or Substantive, Non Significant

Routine and Frequent or Informational/Administrative/Other (Do not complete the other side of this form if filled in above.)

9. Effective Date (if applicable) 30 days after publication of final rule in the Federal Register

10. Concise Summary of Rule (fill in one or both) attached stated in rule

Submitted by: D.K. Rath (signature)

Name: Dennis K. Rathbun 12/22/99

Title: Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

For Congressional Use Only:

Date Received: _____

Committee of Jurisdiction: _____

3/23/99



24722

	Yes	No	N/A
A. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an analysis of costs and benefits?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. With respect to this rule, by the final rulemaking stage, did your agency			
1. certify that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. prepare a final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
C. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare a written statement under § 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
D. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Actg (NEPA)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Does this rule contain a collection of information requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Did you discuss any of the following in the preamble to the rule?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12612, Federalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 126630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• Other statutes or executive orders discussed in the preamble concerning the rulemaking process (please specify)			

National Technology Transfer & Advancement Act



24722

Submission of Federal Rules Under the Congressional Review Act

President of the Senate

Speaker of the House of Representatives

GAO

Please fill the circles electronically or with black pen or #2 pencil.

1. Name of Department or Agency

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Subdivision or Office

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

3. Rule Title

Design Certification Rule for the AP600 Design

4. Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) or Other Unique Identifier (if applicable)

RIN 3150-AG23

5. Major Rule Non-major Rule

6. Final Rule Other

7. With respect to this rule, did your agency solicit public comments? Yes No N/A

8. Priority of Regulation (fill in one)

Economically Significant; or Significant; or Substantive, Non Significant

Routine and Frequent or Informational/Administrative/Other (Do not complete the other side of this form if filled in above.)

9. Effective Date (if applicable) 30 days after publication of final rule in the Federal Register

10. Concise Summary of Rule (fill in one or both) attached stated in rule

Submitted by: Dennis K. Rathbun (signature)

Name: Dennis K. Rathbun 12/22/99

Title: Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

For Congressional Use Only:

Date Received: _____

Committee of Jurisdiction: _____



24722

	Yes	No	N/A
A. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an analysis of costs and benefits?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. With respect to this rule, by the final rulemaking stage, did your agency			
1. certify that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. prepare a final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
C. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare a written statement under § 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
D. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Actg (NEPA)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Does this rule contain a collection of information requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Did you discuss any of the following in the preamble to the rule?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12612, Federalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 126630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• Other statutes or executive orders discussed in the preamble concerning the rulemaking process (please specify)			

National Technology Transfer & Advancement Act

Submission of Federal Rules Under the Congressional Review Act

 President of the Senate Speaker of the House of Representatives GAO

Please fill the circles electronically or with black pen or #2 pencil.

1. Name of Department or Agency

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Subdivision or Office

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

3. Rule Title

Design Certification Rule for the AP600 Design

4. Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) or Other Unique Identifier (if applicable)

RIN 3150-AG23

5. Major Rule Non-major Rule 6. Final Rule Other

7. With respect to this rule, did your agency solicit public comments?

Yes No N/A

8. Priority of Regulation (fill in one)

 Economically Significant; or
Significant; or
Substantive, Non Significant Routine and Frequent or
Informational/Administrative/Other
(Do not complete the other side of this form
if filled in above.)

9. Effective Date (if applicable)

30 days after publication of final rule in the Federal Register

10. Concise Summary of Rule (fill in one or both)

attached stated in rule Submitted by: Dennis K. Rathbun (signature)Name: Dennis K. Rathbun12/22/99Title: Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

For Congressional Use Only:

Date Received: _____

Committee of Jurisdiction: _____



24722

	Yes	No	N/A
A. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an analysis of costs and benefits?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. With respect to this rule, by the final rulemaking stage, did your agency			
1. certify that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under 5 U.S.C. § 605(b)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. prepare a final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
C. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare a written statement under § 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
D. With respect to this rule, did your agency prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Actg (NEPA)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Does this rule contain a collection of information requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Did you discuss any of the following in the preamble to the rule?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12612, Federalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 126630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• Other statutes or executive orders discussed in the preamble concerning the rulemaking process (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

National Technology Transfer & Advancement Act
