

March 1, 2005

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: Planning Meeting Related To Possible Combined Construction and
Operating License Application

Duke Power Company is currently performing a study of the COL (Combined Construction and Operating License) application process. This study is focused on identification of complete scope of work, estimated costs (resources, etc.) and overall schedule for developing the COL application, including NRC review and hearings associated with the application. Duke Power has contracted ENERCON Services, Inc. to complete this study by March 31, 2005.

As discussed in our initial conference call on this subject on February 24, 2005, a follow-up meeting is requested on March 14, 2005, to gather NRC input on resource estimates and schedule for reviewing a COL application. An agenda and a list of specific questions Duke Power wants to discuss are attached.

We appreciate your support of this planning meeting related to Duke Power's COL application study. Once the study is complete, Duke Power plans to issue requests for quotes from vendors to actually support Duke Power in preparing a COL application. Assuming our work in this area continues to move forward, we anticipate award of contract and start of work on a COL application around mid May, 2005.

Duke Power plans to send a separate letter of intent to prepare a COL application to NRC management later this week.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Bob Gill at (704) 382-3339.

Sincerely,



Henry B. Barron

Attachments

xc w/atts: William Beckner, USNRC
Laura Dudes, USNRC

Agenda
Meeting on March 14, 2005
Duke Power and NRC Staff
Planning Meeting Relating to Possible COL Application

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 30 minutes | Executive Overview – Duke Power Plans and Objectives |
| 30 minutes | <p>Discuss NRC Review Resources and Schedule for COL Scenarios (with no ESP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Base Case: Certified Design with Greenfield site- Scenario 1: Certified Design with previously characterized site- Scenario 2: Certified Design with existing reactor site- Scenario 3: Non-Certified Design with Greenfield site |
| 30 minutes | <p>Implications of Direct to COL with non-certified design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Use of FDA for a design undergoing certification review- Implications for ASLB hearing scope- Separating the Design Certification and COL application review proceedings |
| 30 minutes | <p>Possible strategies to improve overall COL application preparation and review timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Early submittal of portions of the application as technical reports- Staff input on meteorology data requirements- Staff insights on anti-trust review |
| 30 minutes | <p>Pre-submittal Interactions with staff on Application Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Quality Assurance Program Review- Seismic data collection- Emergency Planning- Engineering Design Verification- Others? |
| 15 minutes | Site Redress Plans and timing for limited site development activities |
| 15 minutes | Identifying critical path for NRC review |
| 30 minutes | Summary of discussions and action items |
| | Adjourn |

Specific Questions Duke Power Hopes to Address

1. What is the NRC's best current estimate of the review schedule that would be required to prepare a draft Safety Evaluation Report and a draft Environmental Impact Statement for each of the identified scenarios?
2. What is the NRC's best current estimate of the level of resources required to perform the review of the COL application in FTEs for the identified scenarios?
3. Does one NRC FTE equate to 1460 review hours?
4. Are there any available drafts of NRC inspection modules for design and construction review during the COL application process?
5. What elements of the COL application review does the NRC staff view as "critical path"?
6. In addition to items identified by Duke Power, what other pre-application submittal interactions might the NRC foresee?
7. What is current NRC thinking on performing engineering design verification?