

From: Thomas Bergman
To: Amy Cabbage
Date: Mon, Jun 10, 2002 4:44 PM
Subject: Additional :) comments

Please add these

1. The paper should make it clear why these issues need to be resolved and when. We indicate that recommendations will be made in the Fall, but is there any urgency to the decision or can the issues be set aside? That is, if a Commission decision is critical to a vendor making a proceed decision for design certification, then we should point that out to the Commission so they understand the relative priority of the issues that will be coming before them. For example, issues of containment/confinement and EPZ size would seem to be important to whether GT-MHR & pebble bed proceed, whereas generic improvements in the regulatory framework are not nearly as important.

2. [This could be added to comment #4] The paper should clearly state that these issues are not relevant for any of the LWRs currently under or near term expected for review for design certification; AP1000, ESBWR, SWR-1000 (and ACR?).

E-6

TAB 064