MEMORANDUM FOR: Charles L. Miller, Chief

Emergency Preparedness and Rad Protection Branch

Division of Reactor Program Management

Christopher I. Grimes, Director License Renewal Project Directorate Division of Reactor Program Management

FROM:

Thomas H. Essig, Acting Chief Frank Akstulewicz/for

Generic Issues and Environmental Projects Branch

Division of Reactor Program Management

SUBJECT:

REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS

At the time of the final 10 CFR Part 51 rulemaking in December 1996, the Commission found there was not sufficient information to support rulemaking on cumulative and generic impacts from the transportation of high-level waste (HLW) such that the impacts could be excluded from a plant specific license renewal review. The staff has performed additional analyses to evaluate the generic and cumulative impacts from the transportation of HLW. By memorandum dated October 20, 1997, the Office of Research (RES) provided the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) with the report: "Supplemental Analysis: Cumulative Environmental Impacts of Spent Nuclear Fuel Transport in the Vicinity of the Proposed Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Repository Attributable to License Renewal, and Implications of Higher-Burn-Up Fuel for the Conclusion in Table S-4" (attached). RES provided the report to support a rule change such that the cumulative impacts from the transportation of HLW could be considered a Category 1 issue, and no plant-specific analysis of the issue would be required.

In preparation for future rulemaking, we request your review and comment on the subject report by December 5, 1997. Of particular interest is what, if anything, would be needed to supplement the analysis to support a rulemaking to amend 10 CFR Part 51 to change the issue of generic and cumulative impacts from HLW transportation to a Category 1 issue. This information will prepare NRR to initiate rulemaking in the future. Please provide your comments to Ms. Claudia Craig of my staff.

Attachment: As stated

DISTRIBUTION:

✓ Central Files

PGEB R/F

BZalcman

DCleary

CCraig

MCase

TEssig

*See Previous Concurrence

DOCUMENT NAME: G:CMC1\YUCCA

OFFICE	PGEB	(A)SC:PGEB	(A)BC:PGE
NAME	CCraig (MCase*	Jestig V
DATE	\\ <i>I</i>) /97	11/ 6/97	1 11 7 197

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

tiim tin tin imin in imin ii

MRC FILF CENTER COPY

9711200081 971107 NMSS SUBJ 102 CF



UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 7, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR: Charles L. Miller, Chief

Emergency Preparedness and Rad Protection Branch

Division of Reactor Program Management

Christopher I. Grimes, Director

License Renewal Project Directorate

Division of Reactor Program Management

FROM: Thomas H. Essig, Acting Chief

Generic Issues and Environmental Projects Brance

Division of Reactor Program Management

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS

At the time of the final 10 CFR Part 51 rulemaking in December 1996, the Commission found there was not sufficient information to support rulemaking on cumulative and generic impacts from the transportation of high-level waste (HLW) such that the impacts could be excluded from a plant specific license renewal review. The staff has performed additional analyses to evaluate the generic and cumulative impacts from the transportation of HLW. By memorandum dated October 20, 1997, the Office of Research (RES) provided the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) with the report: "Supplemental Analysis: Cumulative Environmental Impacts of Spent Nuclear Fuel Transport in the Vicinity of the Proposed Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Repository Attributable to License Renewal, and Implications of Higher-Burn-Up Fuel for the Conclusion in Table S-4" (attached). RES provided the report to support a rule change such that the cumulative impacts from the transportation of HLW could be considered a Category 1 issue, and no plant-specific analysis of the issue would be required.

In preparation for future rulemaking, we request your review and comment on the subject report by December 5, 1997. Of particular interest is what, if anything, would be needed to supplement the analysis to support a rulemaking to amend 10 CFR Part 51 to change the issue of generic and cumulative impacts from HLW transportation to a Category 1 issue. This information will prepare NRR to initiate rulemaking in the future. Please provide your comments to Ms. Claudia Craig of my staff.

Attachment: As stated