

From: Lawrence Kokajko
To: Earl Easton, James Randall Hall, Tim McGinty
Date: Thu, Mar 30, 2000 7:01 AM
Subject: Re: NAC-UMS (Maine Yankee) and NAC-LWT High Burnup Review Schedules

As I indicated earlier, I am in agreement with the delay on both matters. LEK

>>> Tim McGinty 03/29 2:28 PM >>>
Section Chiefs:

NAC has just informed me of their projected response times for issues outstanding for the subject reviews. Their projected response time is longer than I had hoped:

**1) Maine Yankee Fuel Amendment for the NAC-UMS:
April 4 for morning delivery on April 5, 2000.**

Our Op Plan commitment for the Maine Yankee Review is April, 2000. Considering one week for a final review and finalized SER from the reviewers, one week to prep it and one week to get it out, meeting the Op Plan date is still possible. But, I think we should move the Op Plan date back one month (May) now.

Justification: Original schedule was based on a one-RAI review with response due by 1/29/00. The response was one week later. After a mid-February public meeting and some hand-wringing, a March 17th submittal was received primarily to address High Burnup fuel issues and returning to the current ISG-1 definition of damaged fuel. Now, after the team has identified their final issues, there is another submittal coming on April 5th. While we can still meet the Op Plan, I don't see a down-side to moving the Op Plan date (other than going to the alter to move the Op Plan date). An approval date has not been committed to on the public record, beyond that we anticipate completing rulemaking in time to support an April 16, 2001 initial loading date at Maine Yankee. This, we would still meet.

There have just been enough issues late in this review to justify taking a little more time to make sure that it is right.

**2) HB Robinson High Burnup Fuel Rod Amendment for the NAC-LWT:
April 7 for morning delivery on April 10, 2000.**

Push back approval date two weeks, to May 12, 2000.

Justification: This has been an expedited review from the word go (submittal on 2/11/00). There has been no formal RAI because of the tight schedule. The staff communicated their issues to NAC, on-time, in accordance with the established internal schedule (3/24). NAC is taking 11 days longer to respond than the one week Randy and I originally notified them that they would have to meet in order to get it out by the end of April (per their request). While the original schedule remains attainable, I think a corresponding delay is warranted. There were some major thermal issues identified, and Chris Bajwa will need at least a week or 2 to make sure everything is right (including the strong possibility of eliciting another NAC response). From the completion of technical review, taking two weeks to get the product out is not unreasonable.

C/19

I would like to discuss these two topics at your earliest convenience.

Tim

CC: Bernard White, Charles Interrante, Christopher B...