

From: E. Jacobs-Baynard
 To: Claudia Seelig; John Linehan
 Date: 3/23/01 11:02AM
 Subject: Re: PEBBLE BED-PER SCHUM

) N M S S

I spoke with Mike Case this morning and NRR is planning the following for Pebble Bed:

They have created two new planned accomplishments:

- 1. Future Reactor Activities
- 2. Construction Application

They have used the term "planning wedge" for the Pebble Bed activities and other future reactor activities. The work for the Pebble Bed and other future reactor activities is beyond the base budget and kept separate.

They used two scenarios in formulating resources for Pebble Bed and future reactor activities, which are

1. Assumption as written from 2/22/01 budget assumptions:
 Pre-application review activity for the Pebble-Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) is expected to continue and conclude late in FY 2002. An application for a Combined Operating License (COL) for a PBMR is possible in late FY 2002.

2. Incorporated other insights as NRR now realize and hear from industry and others for future work.

Resources for Scenario 1 are:

FY 2002: 24.5FTE/\$2mil
 FY 2003: 54.5FTE/9.1mil
 FY 2004: 55FTE/7.2mil

Resources for Scenario 2 are:

FY 2002: 35.5FTE/\$2mil
 FY2003: 64FTE/\$12.6mil
 FY2004: 65FTE/\$7.7mil

As part of NRR's budget submission, NRR is providing these resources in Attachment 5B-Activities Above Threshold and adding in the new planned accomplishments with resources mentioned above for scenarios.

>>> Martin Virgilio 03/22/01 08:26PM >>>
 John

We need a meeting with the DEDOs, NRR and RES to harmonize the approach and the products. I understand that Carl would have us first develop and SRP. This approach appeals to me.

M

>>> John Linehan 03/22 7:45 PM >>>
 Let me know what you find out from NRR. I'm passing this along to LT.

>>> Claudia Seelig 03/22/01 05:59PM >>>
 Connie's had been out sick but just returned my call. She confirmed my understanding that:
 1. Pebble Bed is definitely part of our budget request. We must include it in 5A, CARDS, etc. Her email from last week was just trying to make the point that we don't get penalized from having to put more stuff

K/8

N M S S

on the threshold list due to the amount of Pebble Bed resources we are including in our budget request.

2. We definitely need to submit assumptions documenting what our resource estimates are based on (e.g., when is the new fuel facility application coming in, that we expect to receive transportation cask applications - list how many and in what years, any assumption that is prompting rulemaking or whatever IMNS' resources are for, etc.).

So above is Connie's input. Separately, Liz JB is checking with NRR on how they are treating Pebble Bed in their budget request. Connie confirmed NRR has 2 alternative PB assumptions (the one in the official PRC endorsed package, and a new one). NRR is presenting resources against the 2 different assumptions (I believe they had that information in their PRC prioritization package). In any event, Liz will confirm what NRR is doing tomorrow.