

From: Tim McGinty
To: Earl Easton, James Randall Hall, Lawrence Kokajk...
Date: Fri, Apr 7, 2000 11:16 AM
Subject: Status of Various NAC submittals

Section Chiefs and Team Members:

1) **NAC-LWT High Burnup Fuel:** The responses to our issues on the NAC-LWT for the HB Robinson High Burnup fuel review are being shipped Monday for a Tuesday arrival. I informed NAC that we will not make their desired date of approval by 4/28, since the responses have taken longer than the schedule anticipated (our RAI issues went out in accordance with the schedule). NAC accepted that, but they still must start fabrication, at their own risk of course, on May 1st for the new fuel rod insert, spacer, and cans. Therefore, the review team should try and ascertain as soon we can (and before 4/28), if we have issues that may result in a design change to the components to be fabricated. I will revise the schedule to reflect the new dates, effectively pushing back everything by two weeks to account for NAC being 11 days late.

2) **NAC-UMS Maine Yankee:** NUTUG made a UMS public comment asking for variable heat loading specs. Consistent with our conference call to NAC, we will not entertain this change in rulemaking. Therefore, NAC is planning to revise the NAC--UMS Maine Yankee application to ask for variable heat loads (low heat loads will give tech spec relief on some of the loading time restrictions). Thus, NAC is working on that and has delayed their responses to our remaining licensing/technical issues. They will be shipping this revision and issue responses on Friday 4/14, for arrival Monday 4/17. As we communicated to NAC, we will perform an acceptance review (one week) and then determine the overall impact this has on the Maine Yankee approval schedule. Assuming a high quality application with minimal issues, I perceive a late-May or early June approval at this point.

3) **NAC-MPC Connecticut Yankee:** The application for the CY amendment was due in March. CY/Bechtel have not given the go ahead for NAC to submit it yet, and NAC does not think it will be earlier than the end of April (and quite possibly later). The reason for the delay is unclear to me, all NAC would say was that it is related to the "commitment to dry storage by submitting, and the CY public stakeholders awareness". Pretty cryptic. I recommend that Steve O'Connor and I call CY to ascertain what the new anticipated submittal date is for the purposes of scheduling resources for all of NAC's work.

4) **NAC-UMS Transport:** We asked our initial RAI's in August 1999. NAC plans on responding on May 15th.

5) The NAC-UMS public comment period closed on April 5th, so the team will be starting that initiative to respond to the comments shortly (hopefully, after IMNS bins the comments). I would like to

I informed NAC that they should communicate to us, in writing, a new prioritization scheme for all of this work that is in front of us at the same time. Specifically, I see the most obvious conflict being whether we restart the NAC-UMS transport review, or commence the NAC-MPC CY review, in the month of June.

Tim

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

Cl/23