

June 11, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: Chairman Meserve

FROM: William D. Travers */RA/*  
Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: MAY 2001 UPDATE OF THE STAFF'S RESPONSE TO THE  
CHAIRMAN'S TASKING MEMORANDUM

Attached for your information is the May 2001 update of the staff's planned actions to address the issues raised during the July 30, 1998 hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Clean Air and Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety, and the July 17, 1998 Commission meeting with stakeholders. Please note that one new topic area has been added this month involving the agency's instrumentation and control research program. Also, the "General Licenses Registration (Part 30)" topic area has been deleted since all milestones were completed. Significant additions and changes in the May 2001 update are highlighted by redline and strikeout markings.

Since the last update, the staff completed the following significant milestones:

1. Resolved the open items from the draft safety evaluation for the South Texas Project request for exemptions from certain special treatment requirements in Part 50.
2. Issued the draft final report of the Discrimination Task Group and posted it on the NRC website for stakeholder comment.
3. Briefed the Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards on the development of risk-based performance indicators for reactor plants.
4. Met with other cognizant federal agencies to discuss potassium iodide rulemaking implementation issues.
5. Issued a 1.4% power uprate amendment for Salem Generating Station Unit 2.
6. Submitted the final Generic Aging Lessons Learned report for Commission review and approval (SECY-01-0074).
7. Submitted a recommendation to the Commission regarding the Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 1 license renewal (SECY-01-0091).
8. Completed the license transfer order for the Palisades facility resulting from the merger of Consumer's Energy Company and Nuclear Management Company LLC.
9. Completed the indirect license transfer order for Susquehanna Steam Electric Stations 1&2 transferring ownership to PPL Energy Supply, LLC.
10. Submitted to the Commission the final Part 72 rulemaking package to allow independent interim storage of Greater than Class C waste.
11. Conducted the last of three public environmental impact scoping meetings regarding the mixed-oxide fuel facility licensing.
12. Accepted the PeopleSoft software suite (STARFIRE) from the implementation contractor and completed the necessary procedures for production readiness.

Since the April 2001 update, there were several schedule changes associated with ongoing NRC staff activities, including: (1) reaching agreement with the nuclear industry on the guidance contained in Nuclear Energy Institute publication 00-04 "Option 2 Implementation Guideline" and subsequently submitting proposed Part 50 Option 2 rulemaking to the Commission, (2) developing integrated pressurized thermal shock risk estimates for plants under study, (3) revising the reactor fire protection regulations to endorse a risk-informed, performance-based industry consensus standard, and (4) completing the acceptance review of a General Electric Topical Report on Boiling Water Reactor constant pressure power uprates.

Attachment: As stated

cc: Commissioner Dicus  
Commissioner Diaz  
Commissioner McGaffigan  
Commissioner Merrifield  
OGC  
CFO  
SECY

Since the March 2001 update, there was one schedule change associated with the milestone for completing the final agreement with the Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute to obtain data on the utilization of MOX fuel in nuclear power reactors.

Attachment: As stated

cc: Commissioner Dicus  
Commissioner Diaz  
Commissioner McGaffigan  
Commissioner Merrifield  
OGC  
CFO  
SECY

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CTM\April 2001 CTM cover letter.wpd

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	ROPMS		C:ROPMS		EDO				
NAME	SMorris		JShea		WTravers				
DATE	6/4/01		6/7/01		6/11/01				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution: via e-mail

B. John Garrick, ACNW  
George Apostolakis, ACRS  
John T. Larkins, ACRS/ACNW  
G. Paul Bollwerk, III, ASLBP  
Karen D. Cyr, OGC  
John F. Cordes, Jr., OCAA  
Stuart Reiter, CIO  
Jesse L. Funches, CFO  
Hubert T. Bell, IG  
Janice Dunn-Lee, OIP  
Dennis K. Rathbun, OCA  
William M. Beecher, OPA  
Annette Vietti-Cook, SECY  
William F. Kane, DEDR  
Carl Paperiello, DEDMRS  
Patricia G. Norry, DEDM  
John Craig, OEDO  
Michael L. Springer, ADM  
Richard Borchardt, NRR  
Frank Congel, OE  
Guy P. Caputo, OI  
Irene P. Little, SBCR  
Samuel J. Collins, NRR  
Paul H. Lohaus, STP  
Fred Combs, STP  
Hubert J. Miller, RI  
Luis A. Reyes, RII  
James E. Dyer, RIII  
Ellis W. Merschoff, RIV  
Marty Virgilio, NMSS  
John Greeves, NMSS  
J. Holonich, NMSS  
Don Cool, NMSS  
Josephine Piccone, NMSS  
Michael Weber, NMSS  
Robert Pierson, NMSS  
William Brach, NMSS  
Susan Shankman, NMSS  
Wayne Hodges, NMSS  
Ashok C. Thadani, RES  
Margaret Federline, RES  
Thomas King, RES  
Richard Wessman, IRO

Gary Holahan, NRR  
Tom King, RES  
M. Johnson, NRR  
F. Gillespie, NRR  
J. Johnson, NRR  
C. Grimes, NRR  
D. Matthews, NRR  
B. Boger, NRR  
B. Sheron, NRR  
R. Wood, NRR  
T. Quay, NRR  
D. Allison, NRR  
J. Jacobson, NRR  
L. Chandler, OGC  
J. Flack, RES  
EDO Staff  
EDO R/F  
DEDR R/F

**STAFF RESPONSE TO TASKING MEMORANDUM AND STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS**

**as of May 31, 2001**

---



---

**Table of Contents**

<b>A. Risk-Informed Regulatory Initiatives</b>	<b>5</b>
1) Risk-Informing the Scope of Certain Part 50 Requirements (Option 2)	5
2) Risk-Informed Technical Requirements in 10 CFR Part 50 (Option 3)	8
3) South Texas Project Risk-Informed Exemptions to Certain Special Treatment Requirements	9
<b>B. Develop Standards for the Application of Risk-informed, Performance-based     Regulation in Conjunction with National Standards Committees</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>C. Reevaluate the Technical Basis for the Pressurized Thermal Shock Rule     (10 CFR 50.61)</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>II. Topic Area: Reactor Inspection and Enforcement</b>	<b>15</b>
A. Risk Informed Baseline Inspection Program	15
B. Enforcement Program Initiatives	17
<b>III. Topic Area: Reactor Licensee Performance Assessment</b>	<b>19</b>
A. Performance Assessment Process Improvements	19
B. Risk-based Performance Indicator Development	22
<b>IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight</b>	<b>24</b>
A. Improved Standard Technical Specifications (iSTS)	24
B. Decommissioning Regulatory Improvements	26
C. Potassium Iodide (KI) Rule Implementation	28
D. Reactor Fire Protection Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Rulemaking	31
E. Reactor Safeguards Initiatives	33
F. Utilization of MOX Fuel in Nuclear Power Reactors	36
G. High Burnup Fuel	38
H. Power Upgrades	40
I. Steam Generator Action Plan	42
J. Future Licensing Readiness	49
K. Instrumentation and Control Research Program	50
<b>V. Topic Area: License Renewal</b>	<b>52</b>
A. License Renewal (includes Plant Specific Reviews and Generic Process Improvements)	52
<b>VI. Topic Area: License Transfers</b>	<b>55</b>
A. License Transfers	55
<b>VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs</b>	<b>59</b>
A. Dual Purpose Spent Fuel Cask Reviews	59
1) NAC-UMS Cask Review	59
B. ISFSI Licensing - Private Fuel Storage	61
C. Generic Spent Fuel Transportation Studies	63

1) Re-examination of Spent Fuel Shipment Risk Estimates, NUREG/CR-6672 .....	63
2) Package Performance Study: "Update of Spent Fuel Shipping Container Performance in Severe Highway and Railway Accidents" .....	63
3) Burnup Credit for Transportation .....	65
4) Characterization of Fuel Stored in Dry Cask .....	67
D. Part 41 Rulemaking: Domestic Licensing of Uranium and Thorium Recovery Activities and Uranium Recovery Concerns (NMA White Paper Issues) ..	69
E. Part 40 Rulemaking: Licensing of Source Material .....	71
F. Atlas Bankruptcy and Site Reclamation .....	73
G. West Valley Decommissioning Criteria .....	74
H. Decommissioning Management Plan Site Status .....	75
I. Part 61: Mixed Waste Rulemaking .....	76
J. Prepare for Licensing a HLW Repository .....	77
1) Part 63 Rulemaking: HLW Repository Licensing .....	77
2) NRC Comments on DOE HLW Site Recommendation .....	78
K. Control of Solid Materials .....	79
L. Part 73 Rulemaking: Spent Fuel Shipment Information Protection Requirements .....	80
M. Part 71 Rulemaking: Packaging and Transportation of Radioactive Material .....	81
N. Part 72 Rulemaking: Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste .....	82
1) Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Waste .....	82
O. Part 70 Rulemaking: Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material .....	83
P. Develop Rulemaking for Parts 40, 75, 110, and 150 (Implement IAEA Safeguards Agreement) .....	85
Q. Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Facility Licensing .....	87
R. Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Oversight Program for Fuel Cycle Facilities .....	89
S. Threat Assessment Activities (Coordinated with Reactor Safeguards Initiatives) .....	91
T. Material Control, and Accounting (MC&A) .....	93
1) MC&A Regulatory Program Support to Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan .....	93
2) Part 74 Rulemaking: Material Control and Accounting .....	94
VIII. Topic Area: Changes to NRC's Hearing Process .....	95
A. Use of Informal Adjudicatory Procedures .....	95
IX. Topic Area: State Programs .....	96
A. Agreement with the State of Pennsylvania .....	96
X. Topic Area: NRC Administration and Support Functions .....	97
A. PeopleSoft Implementation (STARFIRE) .....	97

---

---

<b>B. Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) . . . . .</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>C. Strategic Workforce Planning . . . . .</b>	<b>102</b>

**I. Topic Area: Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Regulation****A. Risk-Informed Regulatory Initiatives****1) Risk-Informing the Scope of Certain Part 50 Requirements (Option 2)**

SES Manager: Cynthia Carpenter, Branch Chief, RGE/DRIP/NRR

Objective: To modify the scope of special treatment requirements to be risk-informed in accordance with the rulemaking plan of SECY-99-256 and its associated SRM of January 31, 2000.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. ANPR public comment period expires	5/17/00C	T. Bergman, DRIP
2. NEI preliminary draft guidelines submitted for staff endorsement	6/8/00C	NA
3. Commission paper assessing ANPR comments and other issues (199900061)	9/7/00C	T. Bergman, DRIP
4. Commission briefing	9/29/00C	S. West, DRIP
5. NEI complete draft guidelines submitted for staff endorsement	1/19/01C	NA

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
6. <del>Option 2 acceptance criteria developed</del> <b>Achieve reasonable agreement with industry on NEI 00-04 guidance</b>	<del>6/01</del> <b>8/01</b>	T. Reed, DRIP
7. Initiate pilot program	3/01C	J. Williams, M. Shuaibi, DLPM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
8. Submit proposed rulemaking to Commission (199900061)	<del>12/19/01</del> <b>5/02</b>	T. Reed, DRIP
9. Provide proposed rule to House and Senate Appropriations Committees one month after Commission approval (199900061)	SRM + 1 month	T. Reed, DRIP

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
10. Submit final rulemaking to Commission (199900061)	milestone 9 + 15 months	T. Reed, DRIP
11. Provide final rule to House and Senate Appropriations Committees one month after Commission approval (199900061)	SRM + 1 month	T. Reed, DRIP

General Comments:

- a. The June 2000 update was a complete revision of this CTM item. In a memorandum to the Commission dated April 3, 2000, the staff identified four issues that are affecting the Option 2 schedule: (1) ANPR, (2) industry guideline document, (3) pilot program, and (4) STP exemption request. The status of the first 3 issues are addressed by their associated milestone comments below. The STP exemption is now addressed in its own CTM item (I.A.3).
- b. Due to the complexity and developmental nature of Option 2, there is uncertainty associated with the schedule. As reflected in the notes below, the staff has estimated the uncertainty with several of the milestones as low (generally expect to meet the schedule within one month of estimated date), medium (within 3 months), or high (within 6 months). The above dates reflect the staff's current estimates of schedules; in parallel with this update, the staff is requesting approval to revise the milestones and schedules for these items.
- c. Routine meetings are not listed in the CTM. In general, the staff meets monthly with internal and external stakeholders.

Milestone Comments:

6. By letter dated April 4, 2001, the staff provided comments (round two of three scheduled rounds) to NEI on NEI 00-04 (ADAMS accession #ML 010930049). To support the comments, the staff made key decisions that reflect the staff's current vision of the RIP50 Option 2 regulatory framework. These decisions reflect lessons learned from the ongoing STP exemption review and stakeholder input. The staff met with NEI on April 25, 2001 and discussed comments on NEI 00-04. **Industry is currently revising NEI 00-04 to address staff comments. Staff and industry plan to hold another public meeting to discuss the revised NEI 00-04 in late June or early July 2001. Completion date changed as described in EDO memorandum to the Commission dated 6/4/01.**
7. **Plant-specific pilot activities are currently on hold pending reasonable agreement on the NEI 00-04 guidance. Of the three owners groups participating (i.e., BWROG, CEOG, WOG), the BWROG has progressed the furthest, having completed the initial categorization of the pilot systems (using the December 2000 draft version of NEI 00-04). Both the staff and industry are continuing to develop a pilot activities plan. The**

---

plan will detail, for example, the objectives of the pilot effort, the staff and pilot plant licensees' interactions, the process for revising NEI 00-04 to address lessons-learned, the supporting schedule, and the acceptance criteria for assessing pilot activities.

8. **Completion date changed as described in EDO memorandum to the Commission dated 6/4/01.** In order to meet this proposed rulemaking milestone date, the preceding milestones must be completed as indicated in the schedule. In addition, the staff has assumed that 3 cycles of staff review and comment on draft industry guidelines followed by industry revision of the guidelines. In order to facilitate completing the proposed rulemaking after 3 review cycles of the industry guidelines any remaining open issues with the draft guidelines will be addressed in the form of exceptions in the draft regulatory guide associated with the Option 2 rulemaking. Due to the uncertainties associated with the preceding milestones and the uncertainty in resolving issues with the draft guidelines, the uncertainty associated with this milestone is high.
10. The final rulemaking is contingent upon completion of all preceding milestones as scheduled, and resolution of public comments on the proposed rulemaking. The uncertainty associated with this milestone is high.

**I. Topic Area: Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Regulation****A. Risk-Informed Regulatory Initiatives****2) Risk-Informed Technical Requirements in 10 CFR Part 50 (Option 3)**

SES Manager: Mark Cunningham, Branch Chief, PRAB/DRAA/RES

Objective: To identify and evaluate technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 that are candidates to be risk-informed and then to recommend modifications to Part 50, consistent with Option 3 of SECY-98-300 and its associated SRM dated June 8, 1999. The goal is for the technical requirements of Part 50 to be commensurate with their contribution to public health and safety such that safety is maintained without unnecessary regulatory burden.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Provide status report to Commission (199900062)	4/12/00C	M. Drouin, RES
2. Identify preliminary set of proposed changes and recommendations (199900062)	9/14/00C	M. Drouin, RES
3. Hold public workshop on preliminary set of proposed changes and recommendations	10/02/00C	M. Drouin, RES
4. Status report to Commission (199900062)	02/05/01C	M. Drouin, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Feasibility study and recommendations on risk-informing ECCS (10 CFR 50.46) (199900062)	06/01	M. Drouin, RES
6. Plan and schedule for completion of Option 3 (199900062)	06/01	M. Drouin, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

1. Paper submitted to Commission on 4/12/00 (SECY-00-0086).
2. Paper submitted to Commission on 9/14/00 (SECY-00-0198).

**I. Topic Area: Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Regulation****A. Risk-Informed Regulatory Initiatives****3) South Texas Project Risk-Informed Exemptions to Certain Special Treatment Requirements**

SES Manager: John Zwolinski, Director, DLPM

Objective: To make a determination on the risk-informed exemption requests submitted by South Texas Project seeking relief from special treatment requirements for low safety significant or non-risk significant safety-related components.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Develop staff guidelines on treatment of low safety significant systems and components	7/18/00C	T. Bergman, DRIP
2. Issue draft safety evaluation	11/15/00C	J. Nakoski, PDIV-1

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Open items from draft safety evaluation resolved	<del>4/30/01</del> 5/18/01C	J. Nakoski, PDIV-1
4. Final safety evaluation completed	<del>5/8/01</del> 5/30/01	J. Nakoski, PDIV-1
5. Commission briefing on staff findings on exemption requests (200000089)	<del>TBD</del> 7/20/01	J. Nakoski, PDIV-1
6. Issue final safety evaluation and approved exemptions	<del>TBD</del> 8/3/01	J. Zwolinski, DLPM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

3. Resolution of the open items by the previous milestone date of **April 30, 2001 (originally March 9, 2001)**, was based on the staff and the licensee coming to consensus in

---

February 2001 on success paths to resolve the open items. During a 2-day meeting on February 15 - 16, 2001, the staff and the licensee were not able to determine a success path for resolving the remaining open items. One South Texas unit was in an outage during March 2001 with most of its staff unavailable to support resolution of the remaining open items. The staff and the licensee met on April 4-5, 2001, to work towards consensus on the level of information required in the FSAR to address the open items related to the treatment of low risk safety-related components. On April 30, 2001, the licensee requested that the staff defer completion of its review of the requested exemptions. This request was driven by the licensee's need to communicate the commitments they made at an April 24, 2001, public meeting with NRC staff to key members of their internal organization. Subsequently, the staff and the licensee have discussed the remaining issues and have agreed on their resolution. Based on this resolution, STPNOC indicated that it would inform provided the staff an advanced copy of the content of its final submittal by on May 18, 2001, with a and the formal written submittal was provided by on May 21 23, 2001. Receipt of the advanced copy of the final submittal provided the basis for completion of this milestone.

4. Safety evaluation and draft notices of exemptions were forwarded to the EDO's office for review on May 30, 2001. The staff also forwarded the safety evaluation to the ACRS (in support of a June 2001 meeting on the safety evaluation's content) and to STPNOC (to identify omissions or factual errors).
5. Preparation of the Commission paper will be conducted in parallel with the preparation of the final safety evaluation and exemptions to the extent practical. Completion of this milestone is driven by the timing of the resolution of the open items from the draft safety evaluation and completion of the final safety evaluation and exemptions. The target date for providing the paper to the Commission is June 6, 2001 (200000089). The date for the Commission meeting was established to support ACRS review of the final safety evaluation and taking into consideration the availability of the full Commission to support the meeting.
6. Issuance of the final safety evaluation and exemptions is scheduled to occur approximately two weeks following the Commission meeting.

**I. Topic Area: Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Regulation****B. Develop Standards for the Application of Risk-informed, Performance-based Regulation in Conjunction with National Standards Committees**

SES Manager: Mark Cunningham, Branch Chief, PRAB/DRAA/RES

Objective: To make efficient use of agency resources by actively participating in the consensus standards process to develop standards for PRA that support the implementation of risk-informed regulation in a manner that maintains safety.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Draft PRA standard on external hazards (e.g., seismic) released by the American Nuclear Society (ANS) for public comment.	01/26/01C	M. Drouin, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Final fire PRA standard issued by National Fire Protection Association (NFPA).	04/01/01C	N. Siu, RES
3. Review and provide NRC comments on ANS draft PRA standard on external hazards.	TBD 05/17/01C	M. Drouin, RES
4. Final ANS standard on external hazards completed.	TBD 09/01	M. Drouin, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Draft PRA standard on Low Power and Shutdown (LPSD) issued by ANS for public comment.	TBD	M. Drouin, RES
6. Final PRA standard on internal events issued by ASME	TBD 12/01	M. Drouin, RES
7. Final PRA standard published by ANS on LPSD.	TBD	M. Drouin, RES

Comments:

ANS PRA standards cover accidents initiated by external events (e.g., earthquakes) and accidents initiated during LPSD operations.

1. ANS schedule is subject to ASME completing the standard.
- 5,7. LPSD draft standard delayed, no new schedule has been provided by ANS. Schedule is subject to receiving input from EPRI.
6. Schedule is subject to final balloting by ASME.

**I. Topic Area: Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Regulation****C. Reevaluate the Technical Basis for the Pressurized Thermal Shock Rule  
(10 CFR 50.61)**

SES Manager: Michael Mayfield, Director DET/RES

Objective: To develop the technical basis for a risk-informed revision to the pressurized thermal shock (PTS) rule, 10CFR 50.61, screening criteria, by applying recent advances in probabilistic reactor pressure vessel (RPV) integrity analysis, methods for calculating the thermal-hydraulics (TH) response of a PWR to potential PTS loading transients, and application of PRA results in identifying key operational transients that could affect the RPV.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Present the methodology to perform PTS risk analysis to ACRS	3/16/00C	S. Malik, RES
2. Present the revised PTS risk acceptance criterion to ACRS	3/16/00C	N. Siu, RES
3. Conduct public workshops to identify and resolve open questions on analysis procedures and inputs in PFM, TH and PRA areas	5/02/00C	S. Malik, RES
4. Develop revised PTS risk acceptance criterion (199900115) (SECY-00-0140)	6/23/00C	N. Siu, RES
5. Present the PTS risk analysis of the selected PWR plants to ACRS	10/05/00C	S. Malik, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
6. Provide next updated status on PTS reevaluation to Commission (199900115)	09/28/01	N. Chokshi, RES

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. Publish NUREG/CR report describing a generic flaw density and size distribution	03/02	D. Jackson, RES
8. Develop integrated PTS risk estimate for study plants.	<del>01/02</del> 05/02	N. Siu, RES
9. Present the technical basis for proposed changes in 10 CFR 50.61 PTS screening criterion to ACRS	<del>12/01</del> 07/02	S. Malik, RES

Comments:

- 8,9. Dates for ACRS presentation and PTS risk estimates for study plants were revised to reflect difficulties encountered in completing the development of some of the details of the risk estimation analytical work, including the need for additional calculations for previously unanticipated accident scenarios. A change in the lead contractor for the work (from INEL to Sandia due to conflict of interest issues) also contributed to the delay.

---



---

**II. Topic Area: Reactor Inspection and Enforcement**
**A. Risk Informed Baseline Inspection Program**

SES Manager: Michael R. Johnson, IIPB/DIPM/NRR

Program Manager: Douglas H. Coe, IIPB/DIPM/NRR

Objective: To develop and implement a more risk informed, efficient, and effective baseline inspection program. By risk informed, it is meant that the inspection program's scope will be defined primarily by those areas that are significant from a risk perspective and that the inspection methods used to assess these areas will take advantage of both generic and plant specific risk insights.

Coordination: Issues II.A. "Risk Informed Baseline Inspection Program," II.B. "Enforcement Program Initiatives," III.A. "Performance Assessment Process Improvements", and III. B. "Risk-Based Performance Indicator Development," require close coordination and the integration of specific tasks by the NRC staff. Responsible project managers are coordinating these activities by assessing the impact of proposed program changes with the other ongoing activities and ensuring that the overall objectives for each project are achieved. Examples include intra-project task force participation, workshop attendance, concurrent review of projects and periodic senior management briefings.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Issue Commission paper and brief Commission on the Revised Reactor Oversight Process results of the pilot program and staff recommendation for Initial Implementation (199900070)	3/00C	W. Dean, DIPM
2. Commence initial implementation of the risk informed baseline inspection program at all operating sites	4/00C	W. Dean, DIPM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Conduct internal lessons learned workshop to identify Revised Reactor Oversight Process initial implementation issues, propose recommendations to address these issues, and issues to be considered for discussion in the lessons learned public workshop	3/01C	W. Dean, DIPM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
4. Conduct lessons learned public workshop to obtain stakeholder feedback on Revised Reactor Oversight Process initial implementation issues	3/01C	W. Dean, DIPM
5. Complete evaluation of implementation and effectiveness of the first year of implementation of the risk informed baseline inspection program (199900070) including issuance of Commission paper	6/01	D. Coe, DIPM
6. Brief Commission on the results of initial implementation of the Revised Reactor Oversight Process (199900070)	7/01	M. Johnson, DIPM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

## II. Topic Area: Reactor Inspection and Enforcement

### B. Enforcement Program Initiatives

SES Manager: Frank J. Congel , Director, Office of Enforcement

Objective(s): Develop and implement improvements to the Enforcement program to increase efficiency and effectiveness, reduce unnecessary regulatory burden, and be aligned with the reactor oversight process.

Prior to February 28, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Develop Enforcement Policy for the new reactor oversight process. (200000022)	3/9/00C	B. Westreich, OE
2. Publish Revised Enforcement Policy incorporating Reactor Oversight changes.	5/1/00C	R. Pedersen, OE
3. Develop 10 CFR 50.59 Enforcement Guidance (related to IV.B)	5/1/00C	R. Reis, OE
4. Revise Enforcement Manual to incorporate Reactor Oversight Program changes.	6/1/00C	R. Pedersen, OE
5. Publicly announce establishment of the Discrimination Task Group.	7/27/00C	B. Westreich, OE
6. Conduct Discrimination Task Group Stakeholder Meetings.	11/02/00C	B. Westreich, OE

Through September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. Provide to Commission Draft Recommendation from Discrimination Task Group. (200000090)	4/30/01C	B. Westreich, OE
8. Provide recommendation on Enforcement Program following first year of ROP implementation.	6/01	J. Luehman, OE
9.. Staff Recommendation to Commission regarding use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Enforcement (200000070)	8/7/01	T.Reis/C.Cameron, OE/OGC

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

7. Discrimination Task Group draft recommendations report is available on the Office of Enforcement web site.

### III. Topic Area: Reactor Licensee Performance Assessment

#### A. Performance Assessment Process Improvements

SES Manager: Michael R. Johnson, IIPB/DIPM/NRR

Program Manager: Mark A. Satorius, IIPB/DIPM/NRR

Objective: The objective of this task is to develop and implement improvements to the NRC plant performance assessment process (and the overall reactor oversight process) to make it more risk-informed, efficient, and effective while combining the best attributes of the IRAP effort, the regulatory oversight approach proposed by NEI, and the staff efforts designed to develop risk-informed performance indicators.

Coordination: Issues II.A. "Risk Informed Baseline Inspection Program," II.B. "Enforcement Program Initiatives," III.A. "Performance Assessment Process Improvements," and III.B. "Risk-based Performance Indicator Development," require close coordination and the integration of specific tasks by the NRC staff. Responsible project managers are coordinating these activities by assessing the impact of proposed program changes with the other ongoing activities and ensuring that the overall objectives for each project are achieved. Examples include, intra-project task force participation, workshop attendance, concurrent review of projects and periodic senior management briefings.

Prior to February 28, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Complete NRC training and licensee workshops on new reactor oversight process in preparation for initial implementation	4/7/00C	A. Madison, DIPM
2. Issue Commission paper and brief Commission on the Revised Reactor Oversight Process results of the pilot program and staff recommendation for initial implementation (199900070)	3/00C	W. Dean, DIPM
3. Commence initial implementation of new reactor oversight process at all operating sites	4/00C	W. Dean, DIPM
4. Final Senior Management Meeting to assess plant performance	5/00C	W. Dean, DIPM

Through September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Conduct internal lessons learned workshop to identify Revised Reactor Oversight Process initial implementation issues, propose recommendations to address these issues, and issues to be considered for discussion in the lessons learned public workshop	3/01C	W. Dean, DIPM
6. Conduct lessons learned public workshop to obtain stakeholder feedback on Revised Reactor Oversight Process initial implementation issues	3/01C	W. Dean, DIPM
7. Conduct end-of-cycle review meetings for each plant	5/01C	Regional Administrators
8. Conduct Agency Action Review Meeting to discuss agency response for plant performance assessment inputs	6/01	M. Johnson, DIPM
9. Complete evaluation of implementation and effectiveness of the first year of implementation of the revised assessment process (199900070) including issuance of Commission paper	6/01	M. Johnson, DIPM
10. Complete draft report on the assessment of human performance attributes derived from precursor events that could be incorporated into the inspection program	6/01	J. Kramer, RES
11. Complete plant specific SDP notebooks for all plants	6/01	J. Kauffman, RES
12. Issue Commission paper on Industry Trends Program	6/01	M. Satorius, DIPM
13. Brief Commission on the results of initial implementation of the Revised Reactor Oversight Process (199900070)	7/01	M. Johnson, DIPM
14. Conduct public meetings at all operating sites to discuss the results of plant performance	7/01	Regional Administrators
15. NRR and RES decision on direction of future RBPI program developments, including resolution of stakeholder comments on the Phase-1 RBPI report and consideration of a User Need letter for appropriate changes to the Phase-1 and Phase-2 RBPI reports.	8/01	M. Johnson, NRR T. King, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
16. Issue annual SECY paper to the Commission on the Accident Sequence Precursor (ASP) program (199200101)	03/02	P. Baranowsky, RES

Comments:

---

**III. Topic Area: Reactor Licensee Performance Assessment**


---

**B. Risk-based Performance Indicator Development**

SES Manager: Patrick Baranowsky, Branch Chief, OERAB/DRAA/RES

Program Manager: Hossein Hamzehee, RES

Objective: The objective of this task is to develop risk-based performance indicator (RBPIs) which will be considered for use as part of the risk-informed plant performance assessment process. Risk-based performance indicators will help the agency make regulatory decisions to maintain plant safety while not imposing unnecessary regulatory burden.

<b>Prior to February 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Brief ACRS on RBPI program overview white paper	4/05/00C	H. Hamzehee, RES
2. Provide the Commission with a SECY paper containing RBPI's program overview white paper (199800160) (RES) (SECY-00-0146)	6/28/00C	H. Hamzehee, RES
2. Brief Commission TAs on RBPI program overview white paper	7/20/00C	H. Hamzehee, RES
4. Issue Phase-1 RBPI development progress report for external stakeholder comment	01/29/01C	H. Hamzehee, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Brief ACRS on Phase-1 RBPI development progress	<del>05/01</del> 05/10/01C	H. Hamzehee, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. Issue Phase-2 RBPI progress report for external stakeholder comment	07/02	H. Hamzehee, RES
8. Brief ACRS on Phase-2 RBPI development progress	11/02	H. Hamzehee, RES

Comments:

The status of Phase-1 RBPI development efforts will be included in the NRR briefing to the Commission on the results of initial implementation of the ROP (CTM III.A, Milestone 12). The Commission briefing on the Phase-2 RBPI development progress will be incorporated into future Commission briefings on the ROP.

In addition, NRR has added a new milestone under CTM III.A to determine future RBPI developments and resolution of stakeholder comments on the Phase-1 RBPI development report.

---



---

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight**
**A. Improved Standard Technical Specifications (iSTS)**

SES Manager: William Beckner, Branch Chief, RTSB/DRIP/NRR

Lead: RTSB Lead PM for each facility conversion

Objective: Conversion of facility technical specifications to the improved standard technical specifications (iSTS) will promote more consistent interpretation and application of technical specification requirements, thereby reducing the need for interpretations and frequent changes to the technical specifications. The goal for each milestone listed below is to complete the conversions currently under review such that the above objectives are met for the affected facilities.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Issue iSTS Amendment for NMP-2	2/15/00C	R. Tjader, DRIP
2. Issue iSTS Amendment for IP-3	2/28/01C	R. Tjader, DRIP

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Issue iSTS Amendment for LaSalle	3/01/01C	C. Schulten, DRIP
4. Issue iSTS Amendment for Quad Cities	3/01/01C	C. Schulten, DRIP
5. Issue iSTS Amendment for Dresden	3/01/01C	C. Schulten, DRIP
6. Issue iSTS Amendment for Point Beach	8/01	C. Harbuck, DRIP

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. Issue iSTS Amendment for ANO, Unit 1	10/01	C. Harbuck, DRIP

8. Issue iSTS Amendment for FitzPatrick	11/01	T. Le, DRIP
---	-------	-------------

Comments:

- ~~7. Licensee has not yet responded to Requests for Additional Information. A revised schedule was discussed with the licensee and documented in letters dated January 31 and April 12, 2001.~~

---



---

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight**
**B. Decommissioning Regulatory Improvements**

SES Manager: William Beckner, Acting Branch Chief, RGE/DRIP/NRR

Objective: Initiate rulemaking activities based on an integrated approach to decommissioning nuclear power plants as discussed in SECY-99-168.

Coordination: This issue requires close coordination with internal and external stakeholders. The internal stakeholders include NMSS and RES. The external stakeholders include the public (interested individuals and public interest groups), various federal and state regulatory organizations, and the industry. Responsible staff, supervisors and managers are insuring that each step in the development of the various milestones is evaluated for its need to have active participation by the stakeholders. There have been numerous meetings, correspondence and telephone conversations throughout the process with the stakeholders. Examples of stakeholder involvement have included placing public and industry representatives on the agenda for Commission meetings with the staff, stakeholder attendance and participation at decommissioning workshops, and various public meetings to provide input into the staff's regulatory development activities.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Submit an integrated, risk-informed rulemaking plan for decommissioning nuclear power plants that addresses emergency planning, insurance, safeguards, operator staffing & training, and possibly other areas.	6/30/00C	B. Huffman, PDIV-3
2. Technical staff to finalize decommissioning spent fuel pool draft study and risk objectives that can be used for decommissioning regulatory decision making. (199900132)	12/20/00C	G. Hubbard, SPLB/DSSA
3. Submit a revised schedule to the Commission for completing the spent fuel pool risk study and developing a long-term plan for decommissioning regulatory improvement.	9/11/00C	G. Hubbard SPLB/DSSA

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4. Submit policy options paper to the Commission (200000126)	5/31/01	B. Huffman RGE/DRIP

5. Submit a long-term plan of action for broad-scope decommissioning regulatory improvement (199900133)	TBD	D. Dudley RGEB/DRIP
6. Revise as necessary and resubmit the integrated decommissioning rulemaking plan based on conclusions of finalized decommissioning spent fuel pool risk study. (199900072)	TBD	B. Huffman, RGEB/DRIP

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

2. The Final Technical Study of Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk at Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants was forwarded to the Commission on December 20, 2000, and released to the public on January 19, 2001.
4. ~~As stated in a December 20, 2000, memorandum to the Commission, an options paper will be forwarded to the Commission by May 31, 2001.~~ A policy options paper to the Commission is in concurrence.
- 5, 6 The long-term plan for broad-scope decommissioning regulatory improvement and the integrated decommissioning rulemaking plan schedule will be provided to the Commission within 60 days of receiving the Commission response to the policy options paper.

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight****C. Potassium Iodide (KI) Rule Implementation**

SES Manager: Glenn Tracy, Branch Chief, IOLB/DIPM/NRR (Program Implementation)  
Richard Wessman, Director, IRO (KI Federal Policy)

Objective: To implement the Commission's decision regarding the consideration of KI as a supplemental protective measure for the general public after a severe reactor accident. In addition, to work with other Federal agencies to revise the Federal policy on the use of KI in the event of a severe nuclear power plant emergency and to establish procedures, processes, and guidance for KI program implementation.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Publish Final Rule (199800173) (NRR)	1/19/01C	M. Jamgochian, DRIP

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Provide draft NUREG-1633 to Commission ( <del>199700193</del> ) (NRR) (200100005)	4/24/01C	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
3. Publish final NUREG-1633	TBD	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
4. Provide draft public information brochure on use of KI to Commission for review ( <del>199700193</del> ) (NRR) (200100005)	TBD	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
5. Provide final public information brochure on use of KI to FEMA for publication	TBD	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
6. Develop procedures, processes and guidance for KI program implementation	TBD	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
7. Provide draft KI program implementation procedures, processes and guidance to Commission for review (20010020) (NRR)	TBD	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
8. Provide final KI program implementation procedures, processes and guidance to FEMA for publication	TBD	K. Halvey Gibson, DIPM
9. Develop final KI Federal policy FRN reflecting FRPCC review and send to Commission (199700193)	8/31/01	Richard Wessman, IRO

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
10. Publish KI Federal Policy FRN	12/31/01	Richard Wessman, IRO

Comments:

- 2,3. SRM-00-040 directed the staff to submit the revised draft NUREG-1633 within 90 days after the FDA issues the draft FDA guidance for public comment, for Commission approval prior to publication for a 60-day public comment period. The draft FDA guidance was issued for public comment on January 4, 2001, for a 30-day comment period. Due to requests from stakeholders, the FDA extended the public comment period to 4/27/01. The draft FDA guidance, as well as draft EPA PAGs, should be finalized prior to final publication of NUREG-1633.

The staff prepared a Commission paper in April 2001 that includes a revised draft NUREG-1633 and a status report of staff KI activities including the options being considered for the implementation program for funding KI for States.

- 4,5. The development of the public information brochure will follow completion of NUREG-1633.
- 6,7,8. During an FRPCC meeting on January 17, 2001, NRC and FEMA informed the FRPCC that the implementation program for KI will be developed by a subcommittee of the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee. The NRC/FEMA Steering Committee co-chairs met on January 29, 2001, to discuss formation of the subcommittee including membership, activities, and schedule. The first meeting of the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee KI Subcommittee was held on February 26, 2001. The subcommittee developed a draft charter, task list, communication plan and KI implementation plan for presentation at the full Steering Committee meeting scheduled for March 1, 2001. The Steering Committee approved the KI subcommittee charter and task list.

A KI website was posted on the NRC external web on 4/18/01.

~~On March 14, 2001, a meeting of the KI subcommittee was held at FEMA Headquarters. As an action item from the March 1, 2001, NRC/FEMA Steering Committee meeting, the subcommittee began to draft a memo to be distributed jointly by FEMA and NRC to Regional Directors in FEMA and NRC Regional Administrators to provide a status of the KI implementation program development and issuance of NRC guidance on the use of KI. The FEMA letter was issued on 3/28/01 and the NRC letter was issued on 4/9/01.~~

A meeting of the KI subcommittee was held April 18, 2001. NRC/FEMA roles and responsibilities, as well as an action plan and milestone schedule were discussed, but could not be finalized until FEMA briefed and obtained approval/guidance from their new Director. Additionally, the milestone schedule is dependent on final FDA guidance being

---

issued. The subcommittee began to draft a memo to be distributed to States informing them of the process by which to obtain KI, as well as the program and procedures to implement this process. The subcommittee also reviewed the draft FAQs to be posted on the NRC KI website.

On May 8, 2001, representatives of NRR and IRO participated in a meeting of the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordinating Committee (FRPCC) held at FEMA Headquarters. The Committee was briefed on the status of NRC/FEMA actions to implement the KI rule and discussed the status of the KI policy. It was reported that FEMA had sent the NRC a letter stating that FEMA did not believe the final policy should be issued until after the FDA guidelines and NUREG-1633 were completed. The FDA representative stated that only five comments had been received, and that finalization was expected in late June/early July. EPA reported that it had received a number of comments on the PAG revision that were a mix of technical and editorial. The EPA representative asked that all comments be received by May 18. Finalization of the revision was dependent on the FDA final KI guidelines, and was expected in mid to late December.

Also on May 8, 2001, a meeting of the KI subcommittee was held at FEMA Headquarters. The subcommittee continued to discuss the process by which States will obtain KI funding, as well as the program and procedures to implement this process. The subcommittee conducted a briefing for the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee on May 24, 2001, on the options for funding and processing the requests for funding. The subcommittee also reviewed the draft FAQs to be posted on the NRC KI website. The next meeting of the KI subcommittee is scheduled for June 1, 2001.

- 9,10. The Federal policy will be revised to include the FDA's revised position. The Commission issued an SRM on this topic on December 22, 2000. The Commission's revision of the KI Federal Policy was given to the FRPCC for review and comment on January 19, 2001. The projected milestone completion dates are set conservatively to reflect the staff's best estimate of when the FRPCC will complete their review.

Staff participated in a Federal Radiological Protection Coordinating Committee (FRPCC) retreat held on March 7-8, 2001. The staff requested a commitment from the Committee on approval of the Federal KI Policy which was distributed for comment at the last FRPCC meeting (1/19/01). The committee committed to vote on approval of the Federal KI Policy at the next FRPCC meeting scheduled for May 8, 2001. A special meeting of the FRPCC may need to be convened if the May 8 vote cannot be realized due to a delay in forwarding their comments to the NRC.

A meeting between NRC and FEMA was held on May 23, 2001, to coordinate the process and time line for revising the federal KI policy.

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight****D. Reactor Fire Protection Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Rulemaking**

SES Manager: J. Hannon, Branch Chief, SPLB/DSSA/NRR

Objective: To revise the fire protection regulations to endorse a risk-informed, performance-based consensus standard, National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 805, "Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light Water Reactor Electric Generating Plants," as an alternative to the existing requirements.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Update Commission on status of NFPA activities (199900032). Commission paper signed 12/22/00.	12/22/00C	E. Connell, SPLB

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Develop a revised rulemaking plan based on interactions with industry regarding their concerns with NFPA 805	9/01	E. Connell, SPLB
3. Conduct public meeting with interested stakeholders	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB
4. Brief ACRS fire protection subcommittee on rulemaking efforts	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB
5. Brief CRGR on rulemaking efforts	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
6. Publish proposed rule change for public comment	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB
7. Resolve public comments	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB
8. Brief ACRS & CRGR on final rule	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB
9. Submit final rule for Commission approval (199900032)	TBD	E. Connell, SPLB

Comments:

2. Informal contacts by the staff at NEI Fire Protection Information Forum Feb 5-7, 2001, did not identify licensees that would use a rule endorsing NFPA 805 in its current form.

---

At a March 15, 2001 meeting with the staff, NEI provided details regarding industry's specific concerns with NFPA 805. In a May 15, 2001, memorandum to the Commission, (ADAMS ML011280084), the staff provided the following information regarding the rulemaking plan for NFPA 805:

- In January 2001, NEI sent a letter to the Chairman stating that industry had concerns that the staff's plans to adopt NFPA 805 would not achieve the Commission's objectives and that licensees would not use NFPA 805 to meet fire protection requirements. The Commission asked the staff to meet with industry and discuss these concerns in more detail. NRC staff and senior management met with industry March 15, 2001 for this purpose. At that meeting, NEI detailed most of their concerns about NFPA 805. They also asked for the staff's concerns and requested a follow up meeting. The staff exchanged letters with NEI to identify NRC and industry concerns. The staff reviewed the concerns and believes that the issues can be resolved through the rulemaking process with NEI-developed implementation guidance. The staff is in the process of holding followup meetings with NEI to resolve the outstanding issues. After these meetings, the staff will revise its rulemaking plan to adopt NFPA 805 to reflect our interactions with the industry and will provide a submittal to the Commission.
- Pending the submittal to the Commission of the revised plan, the staff has delayed the rulemaking activities described in SECY 00-0009, "Rulemaking Plan, Reactor Fire Protection Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Rulemaking," dated January 13, 2000, and the Commission Tasking Memorandum. An updated schedule for the rulemaking will be included in the revised rulemaking plan which is expected to be issued in September 2001.

---



---

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight**
**E. Reactor Safeguards Initiatives**

SES Manager: Glenn Tracy, Chief, IOLB/DIPM

Objective: Revise physical security requirements to require power reactor licensees to identify target sets of equipment that must be protected to maintain safe operation or shutdown of the plant, develop protective strategies to protect against an armed assault by the design basis threat of radiological sabotage, and exercise these strategies periodically. Determine the feasibility of the Safeguards Performance Assessment (SPA) program, an industry initiative, as a suitable replacement for the Operational Safeguards Response Evaluation (OSRE) program. Update power reactor safeguards and security regulatory guidance for the revision to 10 CFR Part 73.55 requirements.

Coordination: Issues IV. E. "Reactor Safeguards Initiatives," and VII.T, "Threat Assessment Activities," require close coordination between NRR and NMSS staff and the integration of specific tasks. Responsible project managers from both offices are coordinating these activities by incorporating insights from threat assessment activities, as applicable, into the ongoing considerations in revising power reactor physical security requirements.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestones	Date	Lead
1. Conduct public meetings with industry groups and other stakeholders	4/00C	R. Rosano, DIPM
2. ACRS Briefing	10/00C	R. Rosano, DIPM
3. CRGR Briefing	1/01C	R. Rosano, DIPM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestones	Date	Lead
4. Issue Commission paper providing third update on the Safeguards Performance Assessment (SPA) pilot program including implementation and policy issues (199800188) (SECY-01-0060)	4/5/01C	<del>V. Ordaz</del> R. Albert, DIPM
5. Proposed rule to Commission (199800188)	5/01	R. Rosano, DIPM

Through September 30, 2001		
6. Initiate SPA pilot program	TBD	<del>V. Ordaz</del> R. Albert, DIPM

Beyond September 30, 2001		
7. Proposed rule published in the Federal Register with a 75-day comment period	11/01	R. Rosano, DIPM
8. Resolution of public comments	3/02	R. Rosano, DIPM
9. Final rule ACRS Briefing	3/02	R. Rosano, DIPM
10. Final rule CRGR Briefing	4/02	R. Rosano, DIPM
11. Completion of SPA pilot program	TBD	<del>V. Ordaz</del> R. Albert, DIPM
12. Lessons Learned from SPA pilot	TBD	<del>V. Ordaz</del> R. Albert, DIPM
13. Final rule to EDO (199800188)	5/02	R. Rosano, DIPM
14. Final rule to Commission	7/02	R. Rosano, DIPM
15. Publication of final rule	11/02	R. Rosano, DIPM

Comments:

1. The staff is conducting public working meetings on a routine basis to obtain stakeholder input for the rulemaking effort.
2. During the 476<sup>th</sup> meeting of the ACRS, October 5-7, 2000, the Committee considered a proposed revision to 10 CFR 73.55. The Committee decided not to review the proposed revision and has no objection to the staff issuing it for public comment. The Committee will review the proposed final revision after the staff has resolved public comments.
3. CRGR has deferred its review of the proposed rule revising 10 CFR 73.55 until the final rule stage, after the staff has received and addressed public comments on the proposed rule.
4. SECY-01-0060, "The Safeguards Performance Assessment (SPA) Pilot Program," was issued on April 5, 2001. This paper informed the Commission of implementation and policy issues associated with the initiation of the pilot program.
5. **Proposed rule for Commission consideration is in concurrence.**
6. Date dependent upon Commission approval of SPA pilot implementing guidance.

15. The SRM for SECY-99-241 was issued on November 22, 1999 and approved Option 3 of the rulemaking plan. The SRM for SECY-00-0063 was issued on April 12, 2000, and approved the staff's proposed approach to re-evaluate the power reactor physical protection regulations and the proposed definition of radiological sabotage by providing performance criteria as the basis for physical protection regulations. The staff issued SECY-01-0023 on February 5, 2001, providing an evaluation of public comments on SECY-00-0063. The staff has incorporated issues raised in the public comments into the performance criteria for the proposed rule. ~~which was submitted to the Commission in May 2001.~~

---

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensee Performance Assessment**


---

**F. Utilization of MOX Fuel in Nuclear Power Reactors**

SES Manager: Farouk Eltawila, Acting Director DSARE/RES

Program Manager: Richard Lee, RES

Objectives: To modify NRC neutronics and fuel codes, to obtain the necessary experimental data needed to confirm these codes, which will be used to perform analyses to assess the risk associated with the use of MOX fuel in commercial PWRs. This program will also develop the technical basis to evaluate whether the regulatory criteria and guidelines developed for UO<sub>2</sub> fuel is adequate for MOX fuel.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Complete agreement with Institute de Protection et de Surte Nucleaire (IPSN), France, to obtain data on MOX fuel.	12/13/00C	A. Szukiewicz, RES
2. Issue draft agreement with Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute (JAERI) Japan, to obtain data on MOX fuel.	01/26/01C	A. Szukiewicz, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2a. Complete final agreement with JAERI and NRC.	07/01	A. Szukiewicz, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Issue draft PIRT report on RIA, PWR LOCA and the Applicability of NUREG-1465 Source Term to MOX fuel	12/01	R. Lee, RES
4. Meet with the ACRS subcommittee to discuss PIRT results and proposed research plan to address source term issues	02/02	C. Tinkler, RES
5. This activity is long-term with an anticipated completion date (e.g., SRM, Regulatory Guide) in 2005	06/05	<del>F. Eltawila</del> R. Lee, RES

Comments:

2. The agreement with JAERI, Japan includes data for both MOX and high Burnup fuel (IV.G. - High Burnup Fuel). RES office director traveled to Japan in September 2000 for negotiations. It will take several months to get interagency approvals of non-technical issues. Additional time needed for inter-division review of draft agreement. Date for final agreement is conditional on JAERI review and comment. Draft agreement sent to JAERI for review in January 2001. Due to recent re-organization in JAERI, additional time is needed for them to review the agreement.
  3. Combine with PIRT for high burnup fuel. \*\*
  4. Combine ACRS briefing on PIRT for high burnup fuel and MOX. \*\*
- \*\* Delayed because the PIRT panel has not yet been established and NRC is awaiting agreement from EPRI and foreign countries on their participation.

#### IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight

##### G. High Burnup Fuel

SES Manager: Farouk Eltawila, Acting Director, DSARE/RES

Objectives: To develop the technical bases for confirming or revising existing criteria and analytical methods for high burnup fuel with respect to reactivity insertion accident, the loss-of-coolant accidents and requirements in 10 CFR 50.46, Appendix A and Appendix K, and related source term.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Meet with the ACRS subcommittee to discuss RIA Phenomena Identification and Ranking Tables (PIRT) results and proposed research plans	3/03/00C	R. Meyer, RES
2. Hold a public meeting to identify phenomena affecting high burnup fuel behavior under BWR anticipated transient without scram	4/06/00C	R. Meyer, RES
3. Complete umbrella agreement with Institute de Protection et de Sûrté Nucléire (IPSN), France, to obtain data on RIA Tests for high burnup fuel.	10/23/00C	A. Szukiewicz, RES
3a. Complete bilateral agreement between IPSN and NRC.	01/26/01C	
4. Issue draft agreement with Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute (JAERI) Japan, to obtain data on RIA Tests for high burnup fuel.	01/26/01C	A. Szukiewicz, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4a. Complete final agreement with JAERI and NRC.	07/01	A. Szukiewicz
5. Issue PIRT report summarizing the expert elicitation to identify, important rank phenomena affecting high burnup fuel behavior under reactivity insertion accidents (RIA), BWR stability, and LOCAs to high burnup fuels	06/01	R. Meyer, RES
6. Meet with the ACRS subcommittee to discuss PIRT results (Milestone 5) and proposed research plans	04/04/01C	R. Meyer, RES
7. Complete LOCA Oxidation tests for Zircaloy-2	9/01	S. Basu, RES

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
8. Issue an interim PIRT report on Applicability of NUREG-1465 Source Term on high burnup fuel.	12/01	C. Tinkler, RES
9. Summarize the results from 2 RIA tests at the Cabri (sodium loop) reactor and issue confirmatory assessment.	12/03	R. Meyer, RES
10. The activity is long-term with an anticipated completion date for the RIA tests and issuance of modification to (e.g., the SRM or Regulatory Guide) in 2008	06/08	F. Eltawila, R. Meyer, RES

Comments:

3. Umbrella agreement for CABRI project signed October 23, 2000. Bilateral agreement between IPSN/NRC signed in January 2001.
4. The agreement with JAERI includes data for both high burnup fuel and MOX (IV. F. - MOX). RES office director traveled to Japan in September 2000 for negotiations. It will take several months to get interagency approvals of non-technical issues. Additional time needed for inter-division review of draft agreement. Date for final agreement is conditional on JAERI review and comment. Draft agreement sent to JAERI for review in January 2001. Due to recent re-organization in JAERI, additional time is needed for them to review the agreement.
5. To minimize duplication of efforts, in the May 2000 update of the CTM it was decided to publish a single PIRT report that combines three of the high burnup phenomena ranking for BWR stability, and LOCAs. The PIRT on RIA has also been added to this one report. The PIRT on source term will not be included in this combined report and has been added as a separate item.
8. Delayed because the PIRT panel has not yet been established and NRC is awaiting agreement from EPRI and foreign countries on their participation.
9. Testing in the CABRI sodium loop has been delayed until June 2003 to obtain agreement among all participants on the remaining tests to be run in sodium loop; consequently, the associated findings have been delayed. Dates for the performance of CABRI tests are decided by a foreign entity and are not controlled by the NRC.
10. Date to complete RIA tests and issue modifications to SRM and RG revised due to the delay in completing CABRI tests by the end of CY 2007.

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight****H. Power Uprates**

SES Manager: **S. Singh Bajwa, Director, Project Directorate III, DLPM**

Objective: Review licensee applications for increased reactor power levels.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Issue safety evaluation report for the ABB "Cross Flow" Meter Topical Report	3/20/00C	I. Ahmed, DE
2. Issue Final Rule change revising 10 CFR 50, Appendix K	5/3/00C	J. Donoghue, DSSA
3. Issue 5% power uprate amendment for Lasalle units 1 and 2	5/9/00C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
4. Issue 5% power uprate amendment for Perry	6/1/00C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
5. Issue 5% power uprate amendment for River Bend	10/6/00C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
6. Issue 2% power uprate amendment for Diablo Canyon Unit 1	10/27/00C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
7. Issue 1.4% power increase amendment (w/ flow meter) for Watts Bar Unit 1	1/19/01C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
8. Issue 5% power uprate amendments for Byron/Braidwood	<del>05/01/01</del> 05/04/01C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
9. Issue 1.4% power increase amendment (w/ flow meter) for Salem. Application received on 11/10/00.	<del>5/31/01</del> 5/25/01C	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
10. Acceptance Review of GE topical report on BWR Constant Pressure Power Uprate	<del>5/31/01</del> 6/30/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
11. Complete review of Susquehanna 1.4% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 10/30/00.	6/30/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
12. Complete review of Hope Creek 1.4% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 12/01/00.	7/30/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM

Through September 30, 2001		
13. Complete review of Shearon Harris 5% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 12/14/00.	9/1/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
14. Complete of review of Duane Arnold 15% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 11/17/00.	10/30/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
15. Complete review of Beaver Valley 1.4% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 1/18/01.	10/30/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
16. Complete review of Dresden/Quad Cities 17% power uprate amendment requests. Applications received on 12/29/00.	11/30/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
17. Complete review of Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 2 7.5% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 12/19/00.	12/19/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
18. Complete review of San Onofre 2&3 1.4% power uprate amendment request. Application received on 04/03/01. NRR projects pursuing on an expedited basis.	TBD	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
19. Issue SER on the GE topical report on the BWR Constant Pressure Power Urate	12/31/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM
20. Complete review of Comanche Peak 1.4% and 0.4% power uprate amendments. Applications received on 4/5/01.	12/31/01	M. Shuaibi, DLPM

Comments:

Brunswick application for 15% power uprate is expected in mid-2001.

In 2001-2002, an application for a 5% uprate is expected for Grand Gulf.

The licensee for Clinton has indicated their plan of submitting an application for 20% uprate in mid-2001.

TVA (Brown's Ferry Units 2 and 3) has indicated its plan of submitting an application for 15% uprate in late 2001.

10. Rescheduled meeting with GE, from May to June to accommodate GE's request and the staff's availability to discuss the topical report

#### IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight

##### I. Steam Generator Action Plan

SES Manager: Jack Strosnider, Director, DE

Objective: The objective of the Steam Generator Action Plan (SGAP) is to ensure that safety from a steam generator tube integrity standpoint is maintained, that public confidence associated with steam generator tube integrity is improved, and that NRC and stakeholder resources are effectively and efficiently utilized. The SGAP is intended to direct and monitor the NRC's effort in this area and to ensure that related issues are appropriately tracked and dispositioned.

Through September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. (SGAP Item 1.5) Staff review of ACRS recommendations on DPO and develop detailed milestones and evaluate impact on other action plan milestones. Invoke PBPM process, as appropriate. (200100026)	05/11/01C	R. Ennis, DLPM
2. (SGAP Item 1.6) Determine GSI-163 resolution strategy and revise steam generator action plan milestones, as appropriate	05/11/01C	E. Murphy, DE
3. (SGAP Item 1.9) Review NRC inspection program and, if necessary, revise guidance to inspectors on overseeing facilities with known steam generator tube leakage	03/30/01C	L. Lund, DE
4. (SGAP Item 1.10) Reassess the NRC treatment of licensee steam generator inspection results summary reports and conference calls during outages. Evaluate need for review guidance.	04/30/01C	S. Coffin, DE
5. (SGAP Item 1.11) Review the NRC inspection program and, if necessary, revise guidance to inspectors on overseeing facility eddy current inspection of steam generators. This involves the following major substeps: a) review and revise the baseline inspection program. b) review and revise how inspection results/degraded conditions/events are assessed through a risk-informed process (e.g., SDP or CCDP) c) review and revise the training program for inspectors	04/30/01C 07/31/01 09/28/01	C. Khan, DE S. Long, DSSA S. Malur, DIPM
6. (SGAP Item 1.12) Determine need for formal written guidance for technical reviewers to utilize in performing steam generator tube integrity license amendment reviews	04/30/01C	S. Coffin, DE

Through September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. (SGAP Item 1.13) Staff provides EDO with update on status of action plan (200000112)	05/17/01C	R. Ennis, DLPM
8. (SGAP Item 1.14) Staff completes review and draft safety evaluation of NEI 97-06 including addressing issues raised in OIG report and IP2 lessons learned report	<del>05/31/01</del> TBD	E. Murphy, DE
9. (SGAP Item 1.16) Staff briefs CRGR on NEI 97-06	<del>07/31/01</del> TBD	T. Sullivan, DE E. Murphy, DE
10. (SGAP Item 1.17) Publish SE on NEI 97-06 in FR for public comment	<del>07/31/01</del> TBD	R. Rothman, DE
11. (SGAP Item 1.18) ACRS review of NEI 97-06	<del>08/31/01</del> TBD	T. Sullivan, DE E. Murphy, DE
12. (SGAP Item 1.19) Issue generic communication related to steam generator operating experience and status of steam generator issues	09/28/01	Z. Fu, DE
13. (SGAP Item 2.3) Review and revise, as appropriate, the policy for project manager involvement with the morning call between the resident inspectors and the region	03/23/01C	R. Ennis, DLPM
14. (SGAP Item 2.4) Review program requirements for routine communications between the resident inspectors and local officials based on public interest. Based on weighing current resident inspector responsibilities (e.g., inspection requirements, following up on plant events) against this review, revise program requirements if needed.	04/03/01C	T. D'Angelo, DIPM
15. (SGAP Item 2.5) Develop, revise, and implement, as appropriate, a process for the timely dissemination of technical information to inspectors for inclusion in the inspection program	04/03/01C	G. Klinger, DIPM
16. (SGAP Item 2.6) Incorporate experience gained from the IP2 event and the SDP process into planned initiatives on risk communication and outreach to the public	<del>05/31/01</del> TBD	P. Prescott, IRO
17. (SGAP Item 2.7) Investigate possibility of establishing protocol with OIG regarding review of draft reports for factual/contextual errors	06/29/01	R. Ennis, DLPM

Through September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
18. (SGAP Item 2.8) Review and revise, as appropriate, the amendment review process, including concurrence responsibilities, supervisory oversight, and second-round requests for additional information.	06/29/01	R. Ennis, DLPM

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
19. (SGAP Item 1.20) Staff briefs Commission on endorsing NEI 97-06 (199400048)	10/31/01 TBD	T. Sullivan, DE
20. (SGAP Item 1.21) Staff issues endorsement package on NEI 97-06 in a safety evaluation and includes the approval of the generic technical specification change in a Regulatory Issue Summary	10/31/01 TBD	R. Rothman, DE
21. (SGAP Item 3.1) In order to address ACRS comments on current risk assessments, develop a better understanding of the potential for damage progression of multiple steam generator (SG) tubes due to depressurization of the SGs (e.g., during a main steam line break (MSLB) or other type of secondary side design basis accident).	02/28/05	J. Uhle, RES J.Muscara, RES S. Long, DSSA
22. (SGAP Item 3.2) Confirm that damage progression via jet cutting of adjacent tubes is of low enough probability that it can be neglected in accident analyses. Specific tasks include:	12/31/01	J.Muscara, RES
a) Complete tests of jet impingement under MSLB conditions.	12/31/01	
b) Conduct long duration tests of jet impingement under severe accident conditions.	12/31/01	
c) Document results from tasks a and b.	12/31/01	
23. (SGAP Item 3.3) When available, use data from the ARTIST program (planned in Switzerland) to develop a better model of the natural mitigation of the radionuclide release that could occur in the secondary side of the SGs.	09/30/04	R. Lee, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
24. (SGAP Item 3.4) In order to address ACRS criticism of current risk assessments, develop a better understanding of RCS conditions and the corresponding component behavior (including tubes) under severe accident conditions in which the RCS remains pressurized. Specific tasks include:	11/30/05	C. Tinkler, RES C. Boyd, RES J.Muscara, RES S. Long, DSSA
a) Perform system level analyses to assess the impact of plant sequence variations (e.g., pump seal leakage and SG tube leakage).	10/01/01	
b) Re-evaluate existing system level code assumptions and simplifications.	12/31/01	
c) Examine 1/7 scale data to assess tube to tube temperature variations and estimate variations for plant scale.	08/31/02	
e) Examine SG tube severe accident T-H conditions using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) methods. This includes the following:		
e.1) Benchmark CFD methods against 1/7 scale test data.	08/31/01	
e.2) Perform full scale plant calculations (hot leg and SG) for a 4 loop Westinghouse design. Evaluate scale effects.	12/31/01	
e.3) Perform plant analysis to address the effects on inlet plenum mixing resulting from tube leakage and hot leg orientation (CE design impact).	07/31/02	
25. (SGAP Item 3.5) Develop improved methods for assessing the risk associated with SG tubes under accident conditions. Specific tasks include:	06/28/03	E. Thornsby, RES
a) Development of an integrated framework for assessing the risk for the high-temperature/high-pressure accident scenarios of interest.	03/29/02	

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
26. (SGAP Item 3.6) To address an ACRS report conclusion that improvements can be made over the current use of a constant probability of detection (POD) for flaws in SG tubes, RES has recently completed an eddy current round robin inspection exercise on a SG mock-up as part of NRC's research to independently evaluate and quantify the inservice inspection reliability for SG tubes. This research has produced results that relate the POD to crack size, voltage, and other flaw severity parameters for stress corrosion cracks at different tube locations using industry qualified teams and procedures. Complete analysis of research results and prepare topical report to document the results.	12/31/01	J.Muscara, RES
27. (SGAP Item 3.7) Assess the need for better leakage correlations as a function of voltage for 7/8" SG tubes.	04/30/03	E. Murphy, DE
28. (SGAP Item 3.8) Develop a program to monitor the prediction of flaw growth for systematic deviations from expectations.	01/31/02	J. Tsao, DE
29. (SGAP Item 3.9) Develop a more technically defensible position on the treatment of radionuclide release to be used in the safety analyses of design basis events. Specific tasks include:	08/15/02	J. Hayes, DSSA
a) Assess Adams and Atwood and Adams and Sattison spiking data with respect to the ACRS comments.	10/31/01	
b) Based upon the assessment performed in task a, develop a response to the ACRS comments.	12/31/01	
c) Publish in the Federal Register for public comment, the response to ACRS' comments.	02/15/02	
d) Complete review of public comments.	06/30/02	
e) Based upon task d, determine if additional work needs to be performed.	08/15/02	

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
30. (SGAP Item 3.10) Perform tasks to address concerns in the ACRS report regarding our current level of understanding of stress corrosion cracking, the limitations of current laboratory data, the difficulties with using the current laboratory data for predicting field experience (crack initiation, crack growth rates), and the notion that crack growth should not be linear with time while voltage growth is.	12/31/06	J.Muscara, RES
31. (SGAP Item 3.11) In order to resolve GSI 163, it is necessary to complete the work associated with SGAP Items 3.1 through 3.5 and 3.7 through 3.9. Upon completion of those tasks, develop detailed milestones associated with preparing a GSI resolution document and obtaining the necessary approvals for closing the GSI, including ACRS acceptance of the resolution.	12/31/06	R. Ennis, DLPM

General Comments:

1. The SGAP was originally issued via a memorandum from B. Sheron and J. Johnson to S. Collins dated November 16, 2000, "Steam Generator Action Plan" (ADAMS ML003770259).
2. The SGAP was revised via a memorandum from J. Zwolinski, J. Strosnider, B. Boger and G. Holahan to B. Sheron and R. Borchardt dated March 23, 2001, "Steam Generator Action Plan Revision and Completion of Item Nos. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.15, 2.1 and 2.2" (ADAMS ML 010820457), and via a memorandum from S. Collins and A. Thadani to W. Travers dated May 11, 2001, "Steam Generator Action Plan Revision to Address Differing Professional Opinion on Steam Generator Tube Integrity (WITS Item 200100026)," (ADAMS ML011300073).

Milestone Comments:

- 1,2. These milestones were completed via issuance of a revision to the SGAP dated May 11, 2001 (ADAMS ML011300073).
3. Details discussed in a memorandum from J. Strosnider to B. Sheron and R. Borchardt dated March 30, 2001 (ADAMS ML010920112).
- 4,6. Details regarding completion of these milestones are discussed in a memorandum from J. Strosnider to B. Sheron and R. Borchardt dated April 30, 2001 (ADAMS ML011220621).
- 5a. Details regarding completion of this milestone is discussed in a memorandum from J. Strosnider to B. Sheron and R. Borchardt dated April 30, 2001 (ADAMS ML011210293).

- 
7. This milestone completed via a briefing of the EDO by the staff on May 17, 2001.
  - 8-11,19,20. The scheduled completion dates for these milestones are dependent on industry actions related to NEI 97-06, "Steam Generator Program Guidelines." The schedule is currently being reevaluated.
  13. Details regarding completion of this milestone are discussed in a memorandum from J. Zwolinski to B. Sheron and R. Borchardt dated April 12, 2001 (ADAMS ML011020026).
  - 14,15. Details regarding completion of these milestones are discussed in a memorandum from B. Boger to B. Sheron and R. Borchardt dated April 3, 2001 (ADAMS ML010890426).
  16. The lead responsibility for this milestone has recently been changed from DE to IRO. The schedule is currently being reevaluated.
  - 21-31. These milestones were added based on the May 11, 2001 revision of the SGAP (see General Comment 2). The final completion date for each milestone is shown in the above table along with specific subtasks that are scheduled for completion prior to the end of FY2002 (i.e., prior to October 1, 2002).

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight****J. Future Licensing Readiness**

SES Manager: Richard J. Barrett, Director, NRR/ADIP/FLO

Objective: Prepare the NRC staff for new applications, (i.e. early site permits, design certifications, and combined licenses), assessing technical, licensing, and inspection capabilities, and identifying any necessary enhancements.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Staff Requirements Memorandum	2/13/01	n/a

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. SRM response describing future licensing preparation activities (20010018)	4/30/01 5/01/01C	J. Sebrosky, FLO
3. <b>Submit a SECY paper (with recommendations) to the Commission resulting from the Future Licensing and Inspection Readiness Assessment (FLIRA)</b>	TBD 9/28/01	N. Gilles, FLO

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
To be determined as part of the above-noted FLIRA effort		

Comments:

**IV. Topic Area: Reactor Licensing and Oversight****K. Instrumentation and Control Research Program**

SES Manager: Sher Bahadur, Chief, ERAB/DET/RES

Objective: To assure that the current level of plant safety is maintained as digital systems are integrated into current and future plants in the face of ever changing technology.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1. Issue Reg. Guide 1.180 on EMI/RFI in safety-related instrumentation and control (I&C)	01/31/00C	C. Antonescu, RES
2. Issue report documenting the technical issues associated with test coverage for digital systems.	11/31/00C	J. Calvert, RES
3. Issue report documenting the state-of-the-art in software testing and reliability modeling.	11/31/00C	B. Brill, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Lead</b>
4. Issue Commission paper on the Digital Instrumentation and Control Research Plan.	07/01	S. Arndt, RES
5. Issue complete report on the status of Emerging Technologies.	09/01	J. Calvert, RES
6. Issue for public comment Draft Regs Guide 1077 on effects of temperature, humidity and smoke effects on digital system.	09/01	C. Antonescu, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. Issue for public comment Reg. Guide 1.180 Rev 1 on EMI/RFI in safety related I&C.	12/01	C.Antonescu, RES
8. Issue report on the effects of emerging digital technology on the potential vulnerabilities of nuclear power plants to cyber-terrorism.	03/02	R. Shaffer, RES
9. Issue report on the advantages and disadvantages of digital system diagnosis and fault tolerant techniques.	12/02	J. Calvert, RES
10. Issue report on the use of wireless technology in nuclear power plant applications.	12/03	C.Antonescu, RES

Comments:

**V. Topic Area: License Renewal****A. License Renewal (includes Plant Specific Reviews and Generic Process Improvements)**

SES Manager: Chris Grimes, Director, RLSB/DRIP/NRR

Objective: Demonstrate that license renewal applications submitted under 10 CFR Parts 54 & 51 can be reviewed effectively, efficiently, and promptly.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Receive Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1, (ANO-1) license renewal application	2/1/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
2. Issue Supplemental SER and Final Environmental Impact Statement - Oconee	2/3/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
3. ACRS subcommittee meeting on Oconee Supplemental SER	2/24/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
4. Receive Hatch, Units 1 and 2, license renewal application	3/1/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
5. ACRS full committee meeting on Oconee Supplemental SER	3/2/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
6. License renewal Commission decision complete for Calvert Cliffs	3/23/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
7. License renewal Commission decision complete for Oconee	5/23/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
8. Issue draft Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) report, Standard Review Plan (SRM), and Regulatory Guide (RG)/industry implementation guideline (NEI 95-10) for public comment (199900103)	8/31/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
9. Receive Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4, license renewal application	9/11/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
10. Issue ANO-1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Supplement	10/3/00C	C. Carpenter, DRIP
11. Issue Hatch Draft Environmental Impact Statement Supplement	11/3/00C	C. Carpenter, DRIP

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
12. Commission briefing on GALL report, SRM, and RG/NEI 95-10 public comments (199900103)	12/4/00C	C. Grimes, DRIP
13. Issue ANO-1 Safety Evaluation Report (SER) and identify open items	1/10/01C	C. Grimes, DRIP
14. Issue Hatch SER and identify open items	2/7/01C	C. Grimes, DRIP

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
15. Submit final GALL report to the Commission for approval (199600056)	<del>4/01</del> 4/26/01C	C. Grimes, DRIP
16. Issue ANO-1 Final Environmental Impact Statement Supplement	4/5/01C	C. Carpenter, DRIP
17. Issue Hatch Final Environmental Impact Statement Supplement	7/01	C. Carpenter, DRIP
18. Issue Turkey Point Draft Environmental Impact Statement Supplement	7/01	C. Carpenter, DRIP
19. Issue Turkey Point SER and identify open items	8/01	C. Grimes, DRIP
20. Provide recommendations to the Commission regarding potential rulemaking (199900104)	8/01	C. Grimes, DRIP
21. Issue ANO-1 Supplemental SER	4/12/01C	C. Grimes, DRIP
22. Commission decision on ANO-1 license renewal	TBD	C. Grimes, DRIP

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
23. Issue Hatch Supplemental SER	10/01	C. Grimes, DRIP
24. Issue Turkey Point Final Environmental Impact Statement Supplement	1/02	C. Carpenter, DRIP
25. Commission decision on Hatch license renewal	3/21/02	C. Grimes, DRIP
26. Issue Turkey Point Supplemental SER	4/02	C. Grimes, DRIP
27. Commission decision on Turkey Point renewal	3/10/03	C. Grimes, DRIP

---

Comments:

9. On February 26, 2001, the ASLB ruled that both parties in the Turkey Point license renewal proceeding had standing to intervene but that neither petitioner identified admissible contentions. Therefore, ASLB concluded that the intervention petitions were denied and the hearing proceedings terminated. By letter dated March 19, 2001, one petitioner has filed an appeal of the ASLB's decision.
- 16,21,22. The review of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1) renewal application is proceeding ahead of schedule. Based on the lessons learned and implemented by the applicant and NRC staff from the Oconee Nuclear Station license renewal (a similar plant to ANO-1), the safety evaluation report was issued on January 10, 2001, with only six non-safety significant open items. The open items have been resolved and the final safety evaluation report was issued April 12, 2001, 5 months ahead of schedule. The final supplemental environmental impact statement was issued on April 5, 2001. **The staff's recommendation to the Commission was made on May 21, 2001 (SECY-01-0091).**

**VI. Topic Area: License Transfers****A. License Transfers**

SES Manager: John Zwolinski, Director, DLPM

Objective: To ensure that license transfers are conducted in a timely and technically correct manner and that review and submittal guidance is appropriately disseminated.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1. Complete the order and conforming amendment for the direct license transfer for Oyster Creek resulting from the sale to AmerGen. (02000105)	6/6/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
2. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for the direct license transfers for Monticello and Prairie Island 1/2 resulting from the merger of Northern State Power and New Central Energy. (02000106)	5/15/00C	S. Bajwa, PDIII
3. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for the license transfers for Duane Arnold, Kewaunee, Monticello, Point Beach 1/2, and Prairie Island 1/2 resulting from the formation of the Nuclear Management Company, LLC, to operate these facilities. (02000107)	5/15/00C	S. Bajwa, PDIII
4. Complete the orders for the indirect license transfers for Hope Creek, Peach Bottom 2/3, and Salem 1/2 resulting from the acquisition of Conectiv's interest in the facility by PSEG Nuclear. (02000108)	4/21/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
5. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for the direct license transfers for Susquehanna 1/2 resulting from the restructuring of PP&L Inc. to PPL Susquehanna, LLC. (02000109)	6/6/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
6. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Braidwood 1/2, Byron 1/2, Dresden 1/2/3, LaSalle 1/2, Limerick 1/2, Peach Bottom 2/3, Quad Cities 1/2, Salem 1/2, and Zion 1/2 resulting from the merger of UNICOM and PECO. (02000110)	8/3/00C	S. Bajwa, PDIII
7. Complete the order and conforming amendment for the acquisition of Vermont Yankee by AmerGen. (02000112)	7/7/00C	E. Adensam, PDI

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
8. Complete the order for the acquisition of Florida Progress (Crystal River 3) by Carolina Power & Light. (020000113)	5/22/00C	H. Berkow, PDII
9. Complete the order and conforming amendment for Trojan resulting from the acquisition of Portland General Electric by Sierra Pacific Resources. (02000115)	7/27/00C	S. Richards, PDIV
10. Complete the order and conforming amendment for Waltz Mills resulting from the merger of CBS Corporation and VIACOM.	4/13/00C	L. Marsh, REXB
11. Complete the orders for Seabrook and Millstone 3 resulting from a minority owner reorganization (United Illuminating Company). (02000114)	7/18/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
12. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Calvert Cliffs 1/2 resulting from the restructuring of Baltimore Gas & Electric, and its parent company (Constellation Energy).	6/30/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
13. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Palo Verde 1/2/3 resulting from the reorganization of Public Service Company of New Mexico (minority owner).	9/29/00C	S. Richards, PDIV
14. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Indian Point 3 and Fitzpatrick resulting from the acquisition of the plants by Entergy.	11/9/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
15. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Palo Verde 1/2/3 resulting from the restructuring of El Paso Electric Company.	12/04/00C	S. Richards, PDIV
16. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Clinton, Oyster Creek, and TMI 1, resulting from the merger of UNICOM and PECO (AmerGen).	12/21/00C	E. Adensam, PDI
17. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for transfer of ownership of Salem 1/2, Hope Creek, and Peach Bottom 2/3 from Atlantic City Electric and Delmarva Power to PECO and PSEG Nuclear LLC.	12/27/00C	E. Adensam, PDI

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
18. Complete the order and conforming amendment for Vermont Yankee resulting from the merger of UNICOM and PECO/AmerGen.	TBD	E. Adensam, PDI

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
19. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Millstone 1/2/3 resulting from the acquisition of the plants by Dominion Nuclear Connecticut.	3/9/01C	E. Adensam, PDI
20. Complete the order and conforming amendments for the indirect transfer of TMI 2 and Saxton (demonstration reactor) resulting from the proposed merger of GPU, Inc. and First Energy Corporation.	3/07/01C	S. Richards, PDIV
21. Complete the license transfer order for Wolf Creek resulting from the restructuring of Kansas City Power & Light into a corporate holding company	<del>5/30/01</del> 6/01/01	S. Richards, PDIV
22. Complete the orders and conforming amendments for Indian Point 1/2 resulting from the acquisition of the plants by Entergy Corporation from Consolidated Edison	<del>5/11/01</del> 8/20/01	E. Adensam, PDI
23. Complete the order and conforming amendment for Palisades resulting from the merger of Consumers Energy Company (owner of Palisades) with Nuclear Management Company LLC.	<del>5/15/01</del> 4/19/01C	S. Bajwa, PDIII
24. Complete the license transfer order for Calvert Cliffs 1/2 resulting from a corporate realignment of Constellation Energy Group, Inc., which will transfer control of the plant to Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, LLC.	5/31/01	E. Adensam, PDI
25. Complete the license transfer order for Nine Mile Point 1/2 transferring ownership of the plant to Constellation Nuclear, LLC.	6/01/01	E. Adensam, PDI
26. Complete the indirect license transfer order for Susquehanna 1/2 transferring ownership of the plant to PPL Energy Supply, LLC, a newly-formed and intermediary parent company.	<del>5/28/01</del> 5/25/01C	E. Adensam, PDI

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

18. The 2/28/00 and 8/11/00 applications for Vermont Yankee had been combined into one Order that would allow AmerGen to purchase the plant under any one of the four scenarios defined in the 8/11/00 application. Review of the 2/28/00 and 8/11/00

---

applications was completed. However, processing of the license transfer package is on hold based on a recent order from the Vermont Public Service Board (PSB).

Because of an Entergy Corporation bid for purchase of Vermont Yankee, which is substantially higher than the purchase price previously proposed by AmerGen, the PSB has dismissed the AmerGen proposal. On January 14, 2001 the PSB issued an order dismissing the original AmerGen proposal, and the amended proposals, based on findings that they did not reflect the fair market value of the plant. This order permits Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. to re-evaluate its decision to sell the plant. The Vermont Yankee board of directors decided to determine the new owner by a public auction. This auction process commenced on April 16, 2001. **The auction process is expected to be completed within six months, with the selection of the successful bidder by the end of 2001. This would place the new application for the license transfer to the successful bidder in early 2002.**

~~The 3/31/01 target date for issue of the Order was based on AmerGen purchasing the plant under the same conditions presented in the 2/28/00 application. This schedule date will be re-defined based on Vermont Yankee's decision re: the revised process and timing for sale of the plant. completion of the public auction process.~~ **The 3/31/01 target date for issue of the Order was based on AmerGen purchasing the plant under the same conditions presented in the 2/28/00 application. This schedule date will be redefined based on Vermont Yankee's decision regarding the revised process and timing for sale of the plant. completion of the public auction process. On 1/6/00 Vermont Yankee and AmerGen applied for the transfer of the license held by Vermont Yankee for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power station. On 7/7/00, the staff issued an Order approving the transfer. Subsequent to the initial 1/16/00 application, AmerGen involved in transfers with other licensees that resulted in 2/28/00 and 8/11/00 applications. Vermont Yankee has said that they do not intend to request an extension of the 7/1/00 Order issued by the staff, which expires on 7/1/01. The staff will close the two outstanding applications when the Order expires.**

21. **The license transfer order has been signed by NRR management, and will be issued on 6/1/01 which is the expiration date of the Federal Register Notice.**
22. **The staff issued an RAI regarding decommissioning funding and licensee financial qualifications. As a result of the recent cancellation of the Entergy/FPL merger, the staff issued another question regarding Entergy's financial qualifications. Based on the licensee's 4/16/01 response to the RAI, the staff determined that further details are required, and a supplemental RAI was issued with a request for licensee response by 6/4/01. The additional review required has resulted in revision of the Order issue target date.**
23. **The license transfer order for Palisades was issued on 4/19/01, ahead of the 5/15/01 scheduled date.**

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**A. Dual Purpose Spent Fuel Cask Reviews**
**1) NAC-UMS Cask Review**

SES Manager: Charles L. Miller, Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO)

Patricia K. Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Project Manager: Timothy McGinty **Steven Baggett (SFPO)**

Objective: To issue a Part 72 storage Safety Evaluation Report (SER) and certificate of compliance (through rulemaking) and a Part 71 transportation certificate of compliance (CoC) for the NAC-UMS dual purpose cask system.

Coordination: The Part 72 storage SER and certificate of compliance have been issued in draft for rulemaking. SFPO coordinated with OGC and IMNS to complete the rulemaking, and issued the certificate of compliance for use in October 2000.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Staff completes rulemaking; issues CoC for use under Part 72	10/02/00C	M. Tokar, SFPO

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Staff issues Part 71 SER and CoC	TBD	S. Baggett, SFPO

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

- On July 16, 1999, NAC submitted an amendment request for the Part 72 application to include all fuel to be stored at Maine Yankee. At the request of NAC to expedite the review of the storage amendment, the staff agreed to a delay in the review of the NAC-

UMS transportation application, after issuing a Request for Additional Information (RAI) in August 1999. NAC responded to the staff's August 1999 RAI on June 29, 2000.

On October 26, 2000, NAC withdrew its June 29, 2000 RAI response, based on deficiencies identified by the staff. On January 12, 2001, NAC met with the staff and indicated that they will submit additional information, including an evaluation of additional cask drop testing, in March 2001. NAC submitted two supplements dated March 14 and March 30, 2001 to address the original RAI. SFPO staff is currently reviewing the submittals and will develop a revised review schedule for the Part 71 transportation application.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****B. ISFSI Licensing - Private Fuel Storage**

SES Manager: Charles L. Miller, Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO)

Project Manager: Mark Delligatti

Objective: Complete all actions associated with the review of the Private Fuel Storage, LLC application (includes: development of a Safety Evaluation Report, an Environmental Impact Statement, and completion of adjudicatory hearings before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board).

Coordination: The SFPO coordinates with the OGC, particularly on matters associated with the adjudicatory proceedings before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board. In addition, the staff has sought and received review assistance for the review of the financial aspects of the license application, accident analysis, and review of the Emergency Plan and geotechnical issues from NRR. Review assistance is also being received from NMSS for the review of the physical security plan and fire protection issues. This assistance has also extended to activities related to the hearings.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Issue Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	6/23/00C	M. Delligatti, SFPO
2. Staff issues supplement to Safety Evaluation Report (SER)	9/29/00C	M. Delligatti, SFPO
3. Begin ASLB Hearing on Safety Contentions (Round 1)	6/19/00C	G. P. Bollwerk, ASLB
4. Issue Final SER	9/29/00C	M. Delligatti, SFPO

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Issue Final EIS	TBD	M. Delligatti, SFPO

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
6. Hearing on Environmental Contentions and Remaining Safety Contentions (Round 2)	11/01	G. P. Bollwerk, ASLB

Beyond September 30, 2001		
7. Final Decision on Licensing	5/02	Commission

Comments:

5. In letters dated December 11 and December 22, 2000, PFS informed the staff that it planned to submit, in early March 2001, amendments to the PFS Safety Analysis Report (SAR) and Environmental Report (ER) to include analysis of additional geophysical characterization data for the PFS site. In addition, PFS committed to submit a SAR amendment addressing new data and analyses regarding aircraft crash hazards in January 2001. The staff's review of these proposed SAR amendments may result in the development of a supplement to the staff's September 29, 2000, Safety Evaluation Report; or in changes to staff responses to the public comments on the Draft EIS; or in changes to the FEIS itself. Therefore, publication of the FEIS will be delayed until the staff has had an opportunity to evaluate the revised information to be submitted by PFS in the proposed SAR and ER amendments. The staff notified PFS of the impact of this new information in a letter from E. W. Brach to J. D. Parkyn, dated January 19, 2001. By letters dated March 30, April 5, April 10, April 13, and April 16, 2001, PFS submitted the revised information on aircraft hazards and geotechnical analyses. The staff is currently evaluating the information and will determine the necessary actions and revise the schedule accordingly.
6. As a result of the new information identified by PFS, as discussed in Comment 5. above, the start of the second round of ASLB hearings has been rescheduled by the Board for November 2001.
7. Due to the new information identified by PFS, and the resultant delays in milestones 5 and 6, a final Commission decision on licensing is currently anticipated in May 2002.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**C. Generic Spent Fuel Transportation Studies**

- 1) Re-examination of Spent Fuel Shipment Risk Estimates, NUREG/CR-6672
- 2) Package Performance Study: "Update of Spent Fuel Shipping Container Performance in Severe Highway and Railway Accidents"

SES Manager: Michael Mayfield, Director, DET/RES

Project Managers: Andrew Murphy, DET/RES

Objective: Reassess previous assumptions and analysis contained in: (1) NUREG-0170, "Final Environmental Statement on the Transportation of Radioactive Material by Air and Other Modes," and (2) NUREG/CR-4829, "Shipping Container Response to Severe Highway and Railroad Accidents."

Coordination: SFPO will coordinate internally with HLW, OGC, NRR, RES, OPA, OCA, and OSTP, and externally with the U.S. Department of Transportation to ensure that all technical, regulatory and stakeholder issues are considered and addressed.

Staff conducted a series of public meetings in November-December 1999 and in August/September 2000 to obtain public stakeholder views on spent fuel package performance under severe accidents. NMSS and RES are coordinating on possible follow-on analyses and testing, which may be recommended. As of March 2001, RES has assumed the lead on this issue, as some additional confirmatory analyses and/or testing is planned. NMSS/SFPO will continue to provide support for further public interaction.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Publish reassessment of NUREG-0170 (NUREG/CR-6672)	3/29/00C	J. Cook, SFPO
2. Publish Phase I of Package Performance Study report: results of public meetings and contractor reviews	6/30/00C	R. Lewis, SFPO
3. After NRC review and assessment of public comments on NUREG/CR-6672 and Phase I of Package Performance Study report, NMSS determines if additional actions are required	12/00C	S. Shankman, SFPO

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
TBD		RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
TBD		RES

Comments:

3. NMSS and RES have agreed that additional actions are required, some of which were previously discussed in a March 31, 2000 user need memorandum from W. Kane, NMSS, to A. Thadani, RES. On March 1, 2001, SFPO/NMSS met with DET/RES to confirm the transfer of lead responsibility for this item from NMSS to RES. Additional milestones are currently being developed between NMSS and RES.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials Programs and Waste Programs**


---

**C. Generic Spent Fuel Transportation Studies**  
**3) Burnup Credit for Transportation**

SES Manager: Farouk Eltawila, Acting Director, DSARE/RES

Objective: To develop the technical bases to allow the utilization of burnup credit in such areas as spent fuel transportation packages, on-site dry storage, reactor pool storage, and disposal of high level waste in a repository. The information would be used by the staff to develop a Regulatory Guide and a Standard Review Plan to assist the staff in properly reviewing licensee requests for use of burnup credit.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Hold a series of three public meetings to identify phenomena affecting burnup credit	05/16-18/00C-PWR 08/22-24/00C-PWR 12/12-14/00C-PWR	NMSS/RES
2. Develop proposal for activities with France Institute de Protection et du Surte Nucleaire (IPSN)	06/29/00C	A. Szukiewicz, RES
3. Present proposal to Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute (JAERI) to obtain data on burnup credit	09/29/00C	A. Szukiewicz, RES
4. Issue draft Phenomena Identification and Ranking Tables (PIRT) report summarizing the expert elicitation to identify, and rank important phenomena affecting burnup credit	02/26/01C	D. Ebert, RES

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Meet with the ACRS/ACNW subcommittee to discuss PIRT results and proposed research plans to address source term issues	TBD	R. Lee, RES
6. Develop the technical bases to reduce uncertainty and refine the NRC technical position on review and acceptance of extended burnup credit package design	09/01	R. Lee, RES

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
<del>7. Issue a Standard Review Plan to assimilate the technical areas and provide the NRC staff with criteria and processes to review and approve burnup credit in safety analysis</del>	<del>09/02</del>	<del>W. Hodges, SFPO</del>
<del>8. This activity is long-term with an anticipated completion date (e.g., SRM, Regulatory Guide) in 2004</del>	<del>06/04</del>	<del>F. Eltawila, RES</del>

Comments:

5. Meeting delayed since joint ACRS/ACNW subcommittee has not yet scheduled a meeting.
- 7,8. Milestones deleted because they are no longer needed. The progress made in burnup credit, reported in Research Information Letter 178, provides a validated approach to reduce conservatism while maintaining an adequate margin of safety in criticality analysis of spent fuel casks. Interim staff guidance will be provided to assist the staff in properly reviewing licensee requests for use of burnup credit. This decision was coordinated with NMSS.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials Programs and Waste Programs**
**C. Generic Spent Fuel Transportation Studies**
**4) Characterization of Fuel Stored in Dry Cask**

SES Manager: Michael Mayfield, Director DET/RES and  
Farouk Eltawila, Branch Chief, SMSAB/DSARE/RES

Objective: Develop the technical basis to establish standard review plans for the renewal of certificates for Spent Fuel Storage Dry Casks.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Complete scoping study on the effects of zinc vapor on the mechanical properties of fuel cladding, assess the need for additional research	4/06/00C	M. Mayfield, DET

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestones	Date	Lead
2. Provide preliminary consequence analysis for PRA for dry storage of spent fuel.	06/01	J. Schaperow, RES

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Perform destructive and nondestructive examinations on the Surry fuel; compare results from the Surry fuel examinations to segments from controlled environment to determine if there are any differences between the condition of the two claddings	04/02	S. Basu, RES
4. Meet with the ACRS/ACNW subcommittee to discuss results and proposed research plan	3/02	S. Basu, RES
5. Develop technical bases for evaluating the high-burnup nuclide inventories and associated source terms to be used for the cask license renewal	9/03	C. Tinkler, RES

6. Provide data and reports (NUREG/CRs) that can be used to update the Standard Review Plan for Dry Cask Storage Systems (NUREG-1536) and to develop a Standard Review Plan for Renewal of Licenses and Certificates of Compliance for Spent Fuel Dry Cask Storage System.	9/03	M. Mayfield, DET
7. Develop the technical bases for evaluating high burnup cladding integrity by performing creep tests on high burnup fuel rods.	9/03	S. Basu, RES

Comments:

3. Surry fuel rods were shipped from INEEL to Argonne National Laboratory (ANL)- West (Idaho Falls) on October 15, 2000, and from ANL-West to ANL-East on February 21, 2001. The characterization work at ANL-West took longer than expected and has resulted in a slippage of one month for milestone 2.

---



---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**D. Part 41 Rulemaking: Domestic Licensing of Uranium and Thorium Recovery Activities and Uranium Recovery Concerns (NMA White Paper Issues)**

- Dual regulation of ground water at in situ leach (ISL) facilities
- Expanded use of mill tailings impoundments to dispose of other material
- Eliminate consideration of economics in the processing of alternate feedstock

SES Manager: Melvyn Leach, Chief, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Objectives: Identify and implement appropriate regulatory program for the uranium recovery industry, including ways to: (1) eliminate dual regulation of ISLs facilities; (2) reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on uranium mills wanting to expand the use of impoundments for disposal of other materials besides mill tailings; and (3) reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on uranium mills who want to engage in recycling of materials for their uranium content. The three issues were raised in a Senate report and were addressed in the National Mining Association White Paper which was presented to the Commission in April 1998.

Coordination: OGC and OSTP

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Briefed TAs on the 4 Commission papers	02/10/00C	Dan Gillen, FCSS
2. Respond to EPA comments w/ copy to Commission (200000011)	03/02/00C	Jim Kennedy, DWM
3. Issue revised draft guidance as necessary on disposal capability with any Commission-approved revisions (200000028)	11/30/00C	M. Fliegel, FCSS
4. Implement any changes in review of alternate feedstock that result from hearing and Commission review of previous hearing orders (200000028)	11/30/00C	M. Fliegel, FCSS
5. Issue revised interim guidance to implement Commission decisions on ISL issues. (200000028)	11/30/00C	M. Fliegel, FCSS
6. SECY-01-0026 to the Commission (199800177)	02/15/01C	Mark Haisfield, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
7. TBD based on Commission response to SECY-01-0026 (item 6. above) (199800177)	TBD	Mark Haisfield, IMNS

Comments:

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**


---

**E. Part 40 Rulemaking: Licensing of Source Material**

SES Manager: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Objective: Develop risk-informed and coherent regulations for licensing of source material and work towards addressing the jurisdictional and technical issues associated with regulating low-level source material (excluding uranium recovery), minimizing duplication in regulatory authority between NRC under the Atomic Energy Act (AEA), the States under State law, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) under various Federal statutes.

Coordination: STP, OGC, OE, ADM, CIO, CFO. RES is developing technical basis for exemptions in Parts 30 and 40.

The proposed rule on transfers from licensees (related to Milestone 1 below) was sent to the Commission in September 2000. A status report on interaction with States, EPA, etc. (related to Milestone 2 below) was sent to the Commission in March 2001. The draft rule plan on control of distribution (related to Milestone 3 below) was sent to the Commission in April 2001. Working groups continue to meet on Milestone 2 and 3 issues.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Proposed rule (on transfers from licensees) to Commission (200000041) (SECY-00-0201)	9/25/00C	C. Prichard, IMNS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Status report on interaction with States and other Federal Agencies (199800203) (SECY-01-0051)	3/23/01C	T. Taylor, IMNS
3. Rulemaking plan (on control of distribution) to Commission (200000042)	4/25/01C	G. Comfort, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4. Final rule (on transfers from licensees) to Commission (200000041)	End of comment period in response to milestone 1 + 6 mos.	C. Prichard, IMNS
5. Provide additional recommendations to Commission on exemption issues based on results of ORNL's report (199000208) (In addition to source material, this paper will also include recommendations on byproduct material.)	12/28/01	C. Mattsen, IMNS

Comments:

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**


---

**F. Atlas Bankruptcy and Site Reclamation**

SES Manager: Melvyn Leach, Chief, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Objective: Transfer of Atlas Site in Moab, Utah to the Department of Energy and terminate the NRC license

Coordination: OGC

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. NRC approve tailings dewatering plan	09/12/00C	M. Fliegel, FCSS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. NRC complete informal consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service on interim site activities	03/23/01C	M. Fliegel, FCSS
3. Licensee initiates interim activities	<del>05/31/01</del> 05/15/01C	M. Fliegel, FCSS
4. Licensee completes interim activities	09/30/01	M. Fliegel, FCSS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Terminate license; transfer site to DOE	10/30/01	M. Fliegel, FCSS

Comments:

- 2-5. On October 30, 2000, the President signed H.R.4205, as PL 106-398. PL 106-398 contains a provision to transfer the Atlas site to the Department of Energy for remediation under Title I of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA) and terminate the NRC license no later than 1 year after enactment. As a result, licensee work on reclamation of the site has terminated. Instead, work will be focused on interim measures to control erosion and dust from the site, cover tailings as the central pond evaporates and control water from the tailings dewatering system.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****G. West Valley Decommissioning Criteria**

SES Manager: J. Greeves, Director, Division of Waste Management

Objective: Prescribe decommissioning criteria for use by the Department of Energy for the West Valley Demonstration Project and for any follow-on licensing activities.

Coordination: Region I

A public meeting on the policy statement for the West Valley site was conducted on January 5, 2000, at the Ashford Office Complex, West Valley, New York. The end of the comment period on the Draft Policy Statement was extended 60 days from February 1, 2000, to April 1, 2000. Public comments have been incorporated into revised draft policy statement as of August 2000.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Commission Paper, with revised policy statement, to Commission for approval (199800178)(SECY-00-0226)	12/04/00C	J. Parrott, DWM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Publish revised policy statement in <u>Federal Register</u>	TBD	J. Parrott, DWM
3. After publication of West Valley Supplemental EIS, approve specific criteria for West Valley site	TBD	J. Parrott, DWM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

2. Timing of final decommissioning criteria issuance will depend on DOE publication of the West Valley Supplemental EIS.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****H. Decommissioning Management Plan Site Status**

SES Manager: J. Greeves, Director, Division of Waste Management

Objective: Implement the Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP).

Coordination: Region I

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. SDMP Master Schedule developed	3/31/00C	L. Camper, DWM
2. Remove the Watertown Mall site from SDMP	9/00C	R. Bellamy, R-I
3. Remove the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Site from SDMP	9/00C	L. Camper, DWM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4. 2001 Annual Update to Commission - Status of Decommissioning Program (199900100)	<del>6/20/01</del> 08/1701	L. Camper, DWM
5. Complete EA/SER for Cabot-Revere site	6/01	L. Camper, DWM
6. Commission Paper to remove Cabot-Revere site from SDMP (20010035)	8/01	L. Camper, DWM
7. Remove the Cabot-Revere site from SDMP	9/01	L. Camper, DWM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

4. The Commission rescheduled the briefing associated with this paper from 07/01 to 9/28/01.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**


---

**I. Part 61: Mixed Waste Rulemaking**

SES Managers: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

John Greeves, Director, Division of Waste Management (DWM)

Objective: Develop final rule for disposal of low activity mixed waste in a RCRA facility following promulgation of EPA final rule.

Coordination: OGC, OSTP

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Staff comments on EPA proposed rule to the Commission (199900116)	EPA publication date + approx. 60 days	T. Harris, DWM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Paper to Commission on proposed rule following publication of EPA's proposed rule (199900116)	EPA publication date + 9 months	M. Haisfield, IMNS
3. Paper to Commission on final rule (199900116)	Close of public comment period + 9 months	M. Haisfield, IMNS

Comments:

- 1-3. The vehicle for providing comments has not yet been established; comments may be provided in the form of a Commission paper, or a meeting with the Commissioner's assistants. EPA has currently put this effort on hold due to higher priority work and has withdrawn its proposed rule from OMB.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****J. Prepare for Licensing a HLW Repository:****1) Part 63 Rulemaking: HLW Repository Licensing**

SES Managers: Donald Cool, Director, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety  
Bill Reamer, Division of Waste Management

Objective: To develop licensing criteria for disposal of high-level radioactive waste at the proposed geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

Coordination: OGC

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Draft final rule to Commission. (199800029) (SECY-00-0084)	4/12/00C	T. McCartin, DWM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

1. Staff Requirements Memorandum for SECY-00-0084 has not been issued.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**J. Prepare for Licensing a HLW Repository**
**2) NRC Comments on DOE HLW Site Recommendation**

SES Manager: Bill Reamer, DWM

Objective: Provide DOE with the Commission preliminary comments concerning the extent to which the in-depth site characterization analysis and waste form proposal seem sufficient for inclusion in the license application.

DOE plans to incorporate the Commission's comments in its Site Recommendation Report to the President in mid-FY 2001. These activities are required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

Coordination: OGC

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Paper to Commission on Final Staff Guidance for Site Recommendation Review (199900117)	11/13/00C	Manny Comar, DWM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Paper to Commission on Final Site Recommendation Review (199900117)	TBD	Manny Comar, DWM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

- Commission paper and comments to DOE are subject to receiving DOE Site Recommendation report. The timing for receipt of the report is uncertain.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****K. Control of Solid Materials**

SES Managers: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

John Greeves, Director, Division of Waste Management, (DWM)

Cheryl Trottier, Chief, Radiation Protection, Environmental Risk and Waste Management Branch, DRAA, RES

Objective: To examine NRC's regulatory approach for control of solid materials, including enhanced public participation in such a process.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Issue Commission paper (SECY-00-0070) (199400059)	3/23/00C	F. Cardile, IMNS
2. Initiate quarterly reports per Commission SRM on SECY-00-0070 (200000039)	12/29/00C	F. Cardile, IMNS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestones	Date	Lead
3. Quarterly report (200000039)	03/30/01C	F. Cardile, IMNS
4. Quarterly report (200000039)	06/29/01	F. Cardile, IMNS
5. Issue draft report on methods to survey material containing low levels of radioactivity.	09/01	C. Trottier, RES
6. Quarterly report (200000039)	09/28/01	F. Cardile, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestones	Date	Lead
7. Issue final NUREG-1640 on individual doses, incorporating comments	12/01	C. Trottier, RES

Comments:

Further milestones are dependent upon completion of the National Academy of Sciences contract which was awarded on 8/31/00. The NAS contract is expected to be completed in February 2002.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**L. Part 73 Rulemaking: Spent Fuel Shipment Information Protection Requirements**

SES Manager: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Charles L. Miller, Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO)

Objective: This rule would require licensees to notify federally recognized Native American tribes of certain radioactive waste shipments, including spent nuclear fuel, before shipments are transported to or across the boundary of tribal lands.

Coordination: OSTP, OE, OGC, NRR

<b>Prior February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Rulemaking plan to Commission for approval (199900123) SECY 01-0021	02/02/01C	R. Broseus, IMNS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Proposed rule to Commission (199900123)	02/20/02	R. Broseus, IMNS
3. Final rule to Commission (199900123)	Public comment period close date + 12 mo.	R. Broseus, IMNS
4. Publish final rule	Approx. 90 days after OMB approval of info collection requirements	R. Broseus, IMNS

Comments:

- Commission approved the rulemaking plan in an SRM dated 2/20/2001. This plan states that a period of 12 months is needed to complete the proposed and final rules.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****M. Part 71 Rulemaking: Packaging and Transportation of Radioactive Material**

SES Manager: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Charles L. Miller, Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO)

Objectives: To prepare a rule to revise Part 71 to: (1) make it compatible with the IAEA Transportation Standards, (2) revise the fissile material exempt and general license provisions to address any unintended economic impact caused by the 1997 emergency final rule, and (3) implement other changes directed by NRC Management (in accordance with Commission's SRM - SECY-99-200 dated 9/17/99).

Coordination: SFPO, OSTP, OGC

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Revised Commission paper to the Commission (199800008) (SECY-00-0117)	5/31/00C	N. Tanious, IMNS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Proposed rule to Commission (199800008) (SECY-01-0035)	3/02/01C	N. Tanious, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Final rule to Commission (199800008)	12 months after the end of the public comment period	N. Tanious, IMNS

Comments:

2. Briefing of the ACNW held on 3/22/01, and a Commission briefing held on 4/9/01.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**N. Part 72 Rulemaking: Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste**
**1) Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Waste**

SES Manager: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Charles L. Miller, Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO)

Objective: Staff response to Commission SRM dated March 12, 1999, to develop a proposed rule to allow the interim storage of GTCC waste under the provisions of 10 CFR Part 72. This responds to PRM-72-2 from Portland General Electric Company.

Coordination: OSTP, OGC

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Publish proposed rule (65 FR 37712)	06/16/00C	M. Haisfield, IMNS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Final rulemaking package to Commission (199600157)	6/01/01C	M. Haisfield, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

2. **Rulemaking package forwarded to Commission on 6/01/01.**

~~This date is delayed because of an unresolved issue concerning jurisdiction that OGC is still considering. This issue and the OGC position needs to be thoroughly discussed with the Office of State and Tribal Programs. The rule provides for federal authority over GTCC waste, however, South Carolina has allowed reactor-related GTCC waste to be temporarily stored at Barnwell prior to disposal. EDO approved extension 3/23/01.~~

---



---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**O. Part 70 Rulemaking: Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material**

SES Manager: Melvyn Leach, Chief, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch (FCLB),  
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Project Manager: Yawar Faraz, FCLB/FCSS

Objectives: Now that the amendments to Part 70 have been published (65 FR 56211 dated September 18, 2000) the objective is to complete the associated guidance documents. The amendments to Part 70, identify appropriate consequence criteria and the level of protection needed to prevent or mitigate accidents that equal or exceed these criteria; require affected licensees to perform an integrated safety analysis (ISA) to identify potential accidents at the facility and the items relied on for safety necessary to prevent these potential accidents and/or mitigate their consequences; require the implementation of measures to ensure that the items relied on for safety are available and reliable to perform their function when needed; require the inclusion of the safety bases, including a summary of the ISA, with the license application; and allow for licensees to make certain changes to their safety program and facilities without prior NRC approval.

Coordination: The Part 70 guidance development will involve close coordination with the stakeholders. These include representatives of the fuel cycle industry, DOE, private citizens, and other groups who declare an interest. OGC will be consulted as legal matters arise.

NMSS' new Risk Task Group will be informed of new guidance, such as the Standard Review Plan, that defines acceptable licensee responses to the rule's requirements to evaluate and manage risk.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Final rule and draft Standard Review Plan to Commission (199500041) (SECY-00-0111)	5/19/00C	A. Persinko, FCSS
2. Develop guidance document regarding §70.62 ISA plans	2/06/01C	T. Cox, FCSS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Develop guidance document regarding performing backfit analyses for fuel cycle facilities	9/18/01	Yawar Faraz, FCSS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
4. Develop guidance document regarding the §70.72 change process	9/18/01	Yawar Faraz, FCSS
5. Develop guidance document regarding §70.74 reporting requirements.	9/18/01	M. Lamastra, FCSS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**P. Develop Rulemaking for Parts 40, 75, 110, and 150 (Implement IAEA Safeguards Agreement)**

SES Manager: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

~~Theodore Sherr~~ Catherine Haney, Chief, Safety and Safeguards Support Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Objective: To incorporate into NRC's regulations the requirements contained in a new Protocol agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Coordination: OIP, OSTP, OGC

Draft rulemaking plan was sent for Agreement State review on February 8, 2000.

<b>Prior February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Draft rulemaking plan posted on the (Agreement State) website	02/08/00C	J. Telford, IMNS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Submit Options paper to Commission (SRM dated 05/18/01) (200100047)	08/24/01	B. Moran, FCSS
3. Submit final rulemaking plan to Commission for approval (199900118)	TBD (Based on SRM in response to Milestone 2)	J. Telford, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4. Submit proposed rule to Commission for approval (199900118)	SRM in response to Milestone 3 + 6 months	J. Telford, IMNS

---

Comments:

1. The **draft** rulemaking plan was posted on the (Agreement State) web site on 2/8/00 for 45-day comment period. The Agreement State comment period ended on March 27, 2000. No comments on the rulemaking plan were received. However, seven States provided information on the number of their licensees that will be impacted.

~~In a memorandum to the Commission dated June 5, 2000, the staff recommended putting this action on hold until the State Department provides the NRC with formal request that they are ready to submit the treaty for ratification or that they want the NRC to prepare the rulemaking package. The staff will then develop the rulemaking plan in accordance with direction from the Commission.~~

~~The basis for the recommendation to put this action on hold was provided in the memorandum. The State Department has informed the NRC that NRC will most likely be asked to accept an additional responsibility (Additional Protocol) involving the collection of certain information. The NRC does not currently have statutory authority to implement the new responsibility and legislation establishing NRC authority would be needed. The State Department does not expect to submit the Additional Protocol to the Senate for confirmation as a treaty (along with the implementing legislation) until after calendar year 2000. A specific target date has not yet been set.~~

2. The SRM, dated May 18, 2001, directs the staff to prepare an options paper, which includes the process, procedures, resources, and costs. Also, the SRM directs the staff to provide to the Commission any draft rule language that may currently exist.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****Q. Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Facility Licensing**

SES Manager: Eric J. Leeds, Chief, Special Projects Branch, FCSS

Project Manager: Andrew Persinko, SPB/FCSS

Objective: To review license applications for the construction and operation of the MOX fuel fabrication facility and to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

Coordination: NMSS has the agency lead for coordination with the MOX consortium and internally with NRR, RES, OIP, and ADM on issues concerning MOX fuel fabrication licensing and subsequent irradiation. OGC will be consulted on legal matters regarding MOX.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Publish Standard Review Plan (SRP)	8/00C	M. Galloway, FCSS
2. Initiate NEPA review	12/00C	J. Davis, DWM

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Initiate review of construction authorization application received 3/1/01	3/1/01C	A. Persinko, FCSS
4. Issue Notice of Intent for environmental impact scoping meetings	3/07/01C	T. Harris, DWM
5. Complete acceptance review of construction authorization application	3/28/01 C	A. Persinko, FCSS
6. Conduct environmental impact scoping meetings	4/17/01C 4/18/01C 5/08/01C	T. Harris, DWM
7. Issue environmental impact statement scoping meeting summary report for MOX fuel fabrication facility	7/01	J. Davis, DWM

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
8. Issue draft environmental impact statement for MOX fuel fabrication facility for public comment	2/02	J. Davis, DWM
9. Issue draft safety evaluation report for MOX fuel fabrication facility	4/02	A. Persinko, FCSS
10. Issue final environmental impact statement for MOX fuel fabrication facility	9/02	J. Davis, DWM
11. Issue final safety evaluation report for the MOX fuel fabrication facility	9/02	A. Persinko, FCSS
12. Issue Record of Decision and licensing decision on MOX fuel fabrication facility construction authorization application	10/02	A. Persinko, FCSS

Comments:

This program depends on a number of factors outside of NRC control, including national policy, DOE funding, and Russian progress on dispositioning excess plutonium.

---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**R. Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Oversight Program for Fuel Cycle Facilities**

SES Manager: Catherine Haney, Chief, Safety and Safeguards Support Branch (FSSB),  
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Program Manager: Patrick Castleman, Inspection Section, FSSB/FCSS

Objective: To develop and implement a revised oversight program for fuel cycle facilities that is more risk-informed and performance-based. The revised oversight program is intended to: maintain safety and national security; increase public and other stakeholder confidence; increase effectiveness, efficiency and realism; and reduce unnecessary regulatory burden. Revision of the oversight program will address licensee performance indications, risk-informed inspections, risk significance determination, enforcement, assessment of licensee performance, and communication of risk significant performance to the licensee, public, and other stakeholders. **The work products that will result from this effort in FY 2001 include the guidance documents for conducting inspections and assessing performance, and changes to the enforcement policy for fuel cycle facilities.**

Coordination: NMSS is soliciting public and other stakeholder views in developing revisions to the oversight program. Program development is coordinated with NMSS organizations; Regions II, III, and IV; NRR; OPA; OCA; OSTP; OE; and OGC. Program development is also integrated with other NRC initiatives, such as described in CTM items II.A., Risk-Informed Oversight Program (for reactors), and VII.P., Part 70 Rulemaking, to ensure the revised oversight program will comport with emerging requirements, guidance, and policies pertaining to fuel cycle facilities.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Information Paper to Commission concerning the status of revising the oversight program (199900120)	11/27/00C	P. Castleman, FCSS
2. Commission Briefing on Status of the Oversight Program Revision	12/20/00C	P. Castleman, FCSS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Commission Briefing on Status of the Oversight Program Revision	TBD	P. Castleman, FCSS

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4. Implement Revised Guidance for Fuel Cycle Facility Oversight	10/01	P. Castleman, FCSS

Comments:

2. The SRM resulting from the 12/20/00 Commission briefing on this effort directed the staff to continue the project as planned. ~~A revised work plan was distributed to stakeholders for review, and a public meeting was held on 2/8/01 to discuss this plan. As a result of this meeting, the work products that will result from this effort (including guidance for conducting inspections, assessing performance, and taking enforcement action), as well as the project's timetable, have been more clearly defined.~~

A public stakeholders' meeting was held on 5/8/01 to discuss the role of licensee problem identification and resolution programs in the revised oversight process. As a result of this meeting, a policy is being developed for use in the fuel cycle facility oversight program's inspection and performance assessment guidance.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****S. Threat Assessment Activities (Coordinated with Reactor Safeguards Initiatives)**

SES Manager: Catherine Haney, Chief, Safety and Safeguards Support Branch (FSSB),  
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Project Manager: Roberta Warren, Team Leader, Threat Assessment Team/FSSB/FCSS

Objectives: To coordinate with FBI, NSC, DOE, and other agencies on national initiatives to protect against weapons of mass destruction and related activities involving NRC licensed facilities or materials. To complete a range of threat assessment activities in a timely manner to assure an adequate response to all reported threats involving NRC licensed facilities or materials; the continuing validity of the NRC design basis threat statement and associated safeguards and security regulations; to advise the Commission and NRC staff of significant threats, incidents, and associated interagency issues.

Coordination: Staff will coordinate with NMSS, NRR, OSTP, ADM, regions, OGC, and IRO.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Memo to Commission: Restoration of NRC Funding For Interagency Credibility Assessment Team (199900136)	04/00C	R. Warren, FCSS
2. Paper to Commission: Semi-Annual Threat Environment (199900076)	9/5/00C	A. Danis, FCSS
3. Paper to Commission: Process for Developing the Adversary Characteristics Document (SECY-01-0015) (200000115)	02/1/01C	J. Davidson, FCSS
4. Paper to Commission: Semi-Annual Threat Environment (199900076) (SECY-01-0018)	02/1/01C	A. Danis, FCSS
5. Commission Briefing on Semi-Annual Threat Environment (199900076)	02/27/01C	A. Danis, FCSS

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
6. Paper to Commission: Semi-Annual Threat Environment Review (199900076)	08/01	A. Danis, FCSS
7. Commission Briefing on Semi-Annual Threat Environment	09/01	A. Danis, FCSS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

Comments:

Additional milestones will be added upon Commission's issuance of the Staff Requirements Memorandum for SECY-01-0015.

---



---

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs**
**T. Material Control, and Accounting (MC&A)****1) MC&A Regulatory Program Support to Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan**

SES Manager: Catherine Haney, Chief, Safety and Safeguards Support Branch (FSSB),  
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Project Manager: Michael Kelly, Safeguards Section/FSSB/FCSS (MC&A)  
Nancy Fragoyannis, Safeguards Section/FSSB/FCSS (physical protection)

Objective: To provide MC&A regulatory program support to the regulatory agencies of  
Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan.

Coordination: OIP, OCFO, OGC

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Consult with the Commission on the status of the NRC's MC&A support efforts under the Department of Energy's Interagency Agreement funding.	07/01	M. Kelly, FCSS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Meet with the regulatory agencies of Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan.	TBD	M. Kelly, FCSS

Comments:

In July 2000, the NRC signed an Interagency Agreement with DOE to continue MC&A support to the regulatory agencies of Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. With the exception of providing limited direct support to DOE in its MC&A support program activities to Russia, limited progress to date has occurred with regard to the NRC's providing direct assistance to Russia. Discussions continue with DOE management to pursue funding for Ukraine and Kazakhstan.

**VII. Topic Area: Materials and Waste Programs****T. Material Control, and Accounting (MC&A)****2) Part 74 Rulemaking: Material Control and Accounting**

SES Manager: Patricia Holahan, Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety (IMNS)

Catherine Haney, Chief, Safety and Safeguards Support Branch, Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards (FCSS)

Objective: To amend the material control and accounting (MC&A) requirements. The reporting requirements for submitting Material Balance Reports and Inventory Composition Reports are being revised to reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on licensees. The remaining MC&A requirements are being relocated to Part 74 (from Part 70) and the requirements for Category II facilities are being more risk-informed.

Coordination: OGC

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Proposed Rule to Commission (200000088) (SECY-01-0066)	4/20/01C	M. Horn, IMNS
2. Publish proposed rule (200000088)	TBD 6/29/01	M. Horn, IMNS

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
3. Final rulemaking package to EDO (200000088)	12 months after end of public comment period	M. Horn, IMNS

Comments:

---

**VIII. Topic Area: Changes to NRC's Hearing Process**
**A. Use of Informal Adjudicatory Procedures**

SES Manager: Joe Gray, OGC

Objective: Streamline the hearing processes required by Part 2 of the regulations for license applications and amendments.

Prior to February 28, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Commission decision on proposed rulemaking	02/16/01C	OGC S. Treby

Through September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
2. Publish proposed rules for comment	04/16/01C	OGC S. Treby
3. Comment period ends	09/15/01	OGC S. Treby

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
4. Submit Final rules to Commission	01/30/02 10/31/01	OGC S. Treby
5. Commission approves/affirms final rules	04/30/02 1/31/02	OGC S. Treby
6. Publish final rules in Federal Register	05/15/02 2/15/02	OGC S. Treby
7. Final Rules effective	06/15/02 3/15/02	OGC S. Treby

3. Comment period was extended from 07/15/01 to 09/15/01.

4-7. Adjustments were made to subsequent milestones to reflect the granting of the extension of the comment period.

**IX. Topic Area: State Programs****A. Agreement with the State of Pennsylvania**

SES Manager: Frederick Combs, Deputy Director, Office of State and Tribal Programs

Objective: To enter into an Agreement with the State of Pennsylvania pursuant to Section 274b of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended.

<b>Prior to February 28, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
None		

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestones	Date	Lead
None		

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Pennsylvania Governor to file application for an Agreement	1/01/02	R. Blanton, STP
2. Negative consent paper to Commission (199900121)	9/01/02	R. Blanton, STP
3. Negative consent SRM to publish proposed agreement	10/01/02	
4. Commission paper reconsidering final agreement	1/02/03	R. Blanton, STP
5. Commission SRM approving the Agreement	2/02/03	
6. Agreement effective	2/02/03	

Comments:

Based on comments from Pennsylvania on September 18, 2000, Pennsylvania now believes that the Agreement will be delayed at least one full year, thereby pushing the assumption for Pennsylvania's achieving Agreement State status to mid-FY 2003. The delay is a result of recent activities associated primarily with Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) sites within the Commonwealth, hiring of staff and establishment of a new fee schedule.

**X. Topic Area: NRC Administration and Support Functions****A. PeopleSoft Implementation (STARFIRE)**

SES Manager: Jim Turdici OCFO/DAF

Program Manager: John Bird OCFO/DAF

Objective: To implement the integrated PeopleSoft Human Resources, Payroll, and Time and Labor modules in conjunction with the cost accounting module. This integrated solution allows for single entry processing for payroll, fee billing, cost accounting, and financial statement preparation as well as meeting internal and external NRC management reporting requirements.

Coordination: The offices of CFO, CIO, and HR are working together as an integrated team with Accenture (PeopleSoft implementation contractor) to implement the PeopleSoft modules. Additionally, to fully implement this portion of the STARFIRE system coordination of all NRC offices and personnel is occurring as this system requires individuals to record their own time and labor. All external organizations associated with the agency's payroll cycle (e.g., Treasury, OPM), will also have the proper coordination to ensure that all tapes and electronic files are tested prior to the implementation date.

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Notify staff of PeopleSoft revised implementation date and new plan for parallel testing.	3/01C	J. Bird, OCFO
2. Validate whether Accenture (PeopleSoft implementation contractor) solution resolves data configuration problem.	4/01C	J. Bird, OCFO
3. Accenture completes outstanding Systems Investigation Requests and Reports.	5/01	Accenture
4. Complete remaining work on Payroll module patches and fixes.	5/01	Accenture
5. Complete procedures for PeopleSoft production readiness.	5/01C	J. Schaeffer, OCIO
6. Turn PeopleSoft system over to OCIO - transition to operational status.	5/01C	J. Bird, OCFO
7. Complete additional test data conversion.	5/01C	Accenture
8. Complete second interface for cost accounting module.	5/01	G. Johnson, OCFO

Through September 30, 2001		
9. Complete mandatory SWAT 2 fix for Payroll	5/01	Accenture
10. Test CITRIX software to improve response time from icon to application appearing on screen.	6/01C	J. Schaeffer, OCIO
11. Begin phase-in remaining employees on PeopleSoft system.	6/01	J. Bird, OCFO
12. Complete transition to operational status.	6/01	J. Schaeffer, OCIO
13. Begin operations and maintenance on PeopleSoft system.	7/01	Accenture
14. Implement Edit Time and Apply Rules performance recommendations	7/01	J. Bird, OCFO
15. Finalize cost accounting reports.	8/01	G. Johnson, OCFO
16. Complete phase-in of employees on PeopleSoft system.	8/01	J. Bird, OCFO
17. Run entire agency in parallel for 2 pay periods.	9/01	J. Bird, OCFO

Beyond September 30, 2001		
Milestone	Date	Lead
18. PeopleSoft modules and Cost Accounting module operational	10/07/01	J. Bird, OCFO

Comments:

1. The OCFO memorandum of March 19, 2001 provides information on the latest status of the STARFIRE project.
2. ~~Milestone 2 was completed but did not resolve the problem associated with Edit Time/Apply Rules of configuration. PeopleSoft offered two additional solution options on April 19. We are investigating how long it will take to test these options.~~
3. PeopleSoft announced that a mandatory fix was necessary for the payroll module, called SWAT 2. Added Milestone 9 addresses this implementation. **All critical Systems Investigation Requests and Reports have been completed except the Edit Time and Apply Rules performance. A PeopleSoft tuner was contracted for 30 days to analyze the Edit Time and Apply Rules process. The tuner provided us with several recommendations which the staff is in the process of implementing. A milestone for completion of the Edit Time and Apply Rules performance process has been added.**

- 3,4,8,9. Accenture has completed the necessary program changes and these changes are currently being reviewed as part of user acceptance. Projected reports have been completed except the report for the GL interface which cannot be completed until user acceptance of the GL interface program change.
- 5,6. OCIO has completed the necessary operational procedures so that they may initiate the transition to a production status.
10. OCIO has completed the testing and improved the access time for the Headquarters and Regions without requiring the use of CITRIX. This change has been programmed for June implementation. Use of CITRIX by resident inspectors was required and has been implemented.

**X. Topic Area: NRC Administration and Support Functions****B. Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS)**

SES Manager: Lynn Scattolini, OCIO/ADAMS

Program Manager: Lynn B. Scattolini, OCIO/ADAMS

Objective: To execute tasks in the ADAMS program plan to improve ADAMS functionality, reliability, and document and data integrity. ADAMS supports electronic document creation or capture, distribution, records management, and search and retrieval by both NRC staff and the public.

Coordination: CIO is coordinating with the ADAMS Steering Group, ADAMS Working Group, ADAMS Partners, and office and regional management as necessary to implement policy/procedural changes and software upgrades.

<b>Through September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Transfer responsibility for completing the processing of staff generated documents to OCIO	06/01	L. Scattolini, OCIO
2. Deploy ADAMS legacy library	07/01	A. Levin, OCIO
3. Complete development and deploy ADAMS Version 3.3	09/01	A. Levin, OCIO
4. Implement ADAMS as an electronic recordkeeping system. Obtain final NARA approval and begin filing records electronically	09/01	L. Scattolini, OCIO

<b>Beyond September 30, 2001</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
5. Complete development and deploy ADAMS Version 4.0	11/01	A. Levin, OCIO
6. Improve ADAMS data integrity by completion of cleanup of ADAMS database	04/02	L. Scattolini, OCIO

Comments:

6. Offices are responsible for modifying internal operating procedures (if they exist), updating document templates, identifying document submitters who will participate in a short orientation session, and changing to a new approach of entering their documents into ADAMS.

3. Software installation will be via an automated upgrade at the user's workstation that will take 20-30 minutes. There will be no formal training in the PDC. Office staff will be encouraged to attend a demonstration of new features and software fixes. They will be provided with an updated ADAMS Desk Reference Guide.
  
6. OCIO is providing offices with printouts of discrepancies in the database pertaining to record status, availability, sensitivity, and access rights. Based on office feedback, OCIO is adjusting document profiles, and taking appropriate actions regarding public availability of these documents. OCIO also has refined data standards and is cleaning up the values of other data elements in the database to ensure that documents are properly profiled for subsequent search and retrieval.

**X. Topic Area: NRC Administration and Support Functions****C. Strategic Workforce Planning**

SES Manager: James McDermott, Deputy Director, Office of Human Resources

Project Manager: Mabel Lee, Chief, Human Resources Information Management, Office of Human Resources

Objective: Take steps to plan for, acquire, develop, maintain, deploy and retain NRC's core scientific, engineering and technical staff capacity in support of current and future NRC strategic goals.

Coordination: Staff will coordinate with EDO, NMSS, NRR, RES, CIO, CFO, OGC, and other NRC offices as appropriate.

<b>Through September 30, 2001*</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
1. Submit Action Plan for Maintaining Core Competence	1/31/01C	Bird/ McDermott
2. Survey Program Office Directors (NRR, NMSS, RES) on critical skill needs for current, FY 2003 PBPM cycle, and future needs	2/28/01C	Bird/ McDermott/ Office Directors
3. Analyze Office Director survey results and identify skill gaps	3/31/01C	Lee
4. Develop and implement sourcing strategies to address skill gaps identified by Office Directors	3/31/01C	Lee
5. Survey selected NRR, NMSS, and RES Branch/Section Chiefs on critical skill needs for current and future needs	4/30/01C	Lee
6. Brief PRC on Core Competency/Human Capital Initiatives and funding requirements for FY 2002 and FY 2003	4/27/01C	Bird/ McDermott
7. Develop pilot skills survey to assess core competencies within selected NRR, NMSS, RES branches/sections	<del>5/01</del> 5/23/01C	Lee
8. Conduct pilot skills survey within selected branches/sections in NRR, NMSS, and RES	6/01	Lee
9. Evaluate and select an automated strategic workforce planning (SWP) software tool	7/01	Lee

<b>Through September 30, 2001*</b>		
10. Analyze branch/section pilot survey results and identify skill gaps	7/01	Lee
<b>Beyond September 30, 2001*</b>		
Milestone	Date	Lead
11. Evaluate pilot implementation of skills survey to assess core competencies and incorporate lessons learned as appropriate	10/01	Bird/ McDermott Office Directors
12. Identify with Program Office Directors (NRR, NMSS, RES) and other offices, as appropriate, critical skill needs, skill gaps, and gap closure strategies for the FY 2004 PBPM cycle	12/01	Lee
13. Conduct skills survey within next set of branches/sections in NRR, NMSS, RES	12/01	Lee
14. Implement Strategic Workforce Planning software	3/02	Lee
15. Continue skills survey roll out to succeeding sets of branches/sections in NRR, NMSS, RES, and other offices as appropriate	Ongoing	Lee

\*Subject to funding