

August 4, 2005

ORGANIZATION: Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF APRIL 7, 2005, MEETING WITH NEI TO DISCUSS
NEI 04-01, REVISION D, "DRAFT INDUSTRY GUIDELINE FOR
COMBINED LICENSE (COL) APPLICANTS UNDER 10 CFR PART 52,"
AND THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW PERFORMED DURING
THE EVALUATION OF A COL APPLICATION

On April 7, 2005, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) held a public meeting with NEI at the Ramada Inn in Rockville, MD. The purpose of the meeting was to let NEI brief the NRC staff on NEI 04-01, Revision D, and discuss the staff's approach to making first-round comments on the document. In addition, the staff discussed the review of inservice testing and inspection and fire protection operational programs in a COL application. The meeting attendees are listed in Attachment 1 and the meeting agenda is given in Attachment 2.

Several handouts were distributed during this meeting. They are listed at the end of this memorandum with their accession numbers. All the handouts can be accessed through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) by accession number. This system provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if you have problems in accessing the handouts in ADAMS, call the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737 or e-mail pdr@nrc.gov.

OPENING REMARKS

This was the third in a series of public meetings discussing NEI 04-01. NRC said that it was providing preliminary comments on NEI 04-01 and planned to provide formal comments to NEI in June 2005. NRC said that the meetings are behind the schedule proposed by NEI in the February 2005 public meeting. NRC also said that, after this meeting, 10 of the 14 COL operational programs identified in NEI's May 14, 2001, letter will have been discussed. NRC said the staff owners of each of the operational programs discussed to date frequently ask two questions: when will the operational program document be available and what is the implementation schedule of the operational program? Both NEI and NRC considered the meetings to be successful in identifying issues that need to be addressed in NEI 04-01 and in informing the NRC's work in reviewing operational programs.

NEI asked NRC to clarify the schedule for the issuance the new proposed Part 52 rule. NRC said that an extension request has been made but the revised schedule was still being discussed internally. NRC said that the changes to Part 52 were clarifications and the staff intends to post draft rule language on the NRC Web Site this summer.

NRC slides are in Attachment 6. Below is a summary of the meeting. All section numbers refer to NEI 04-01, Revision D, unless otherwise indicated.

REVIEW OF NEI 04-01

New NEI 04-04 Discussion Topics

Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls (Section 4.3.9.7)

NRC provided information to NEI to support this meeting in a letter dated March 16, 2005 (Accession No. ML050750083). NRC said that the implementation of design acceptance criteria (DAC) is peculiar to a few areas of all certified designs because much of the design of the I&C system has been deferred. The inspections, tests, analyses, and acceptance criteria (ITAAC) ensure that the certified I&C system conforms with the design acceptance criteria, which includes the design verification as well as the implementation of the design through a structured design development process covering the system hardware and software life cycle that extends from the concept stage to full power operation. NRC said that the NRC and the COL applicant will need to establish review points in the I&C system design development process. Attachment 3 includes a description of the system and software lifecycle stages.

NEI said it agreed with everything the staff said and recognized that a COL applicant would have to discuss the DAC implementation details with the NRC, including a review of the ITAACs and the establishment of a review schedule. NEI said that it wants to minimize the number of findings in NRC audits.

A member of the NEI task force said that Westinghouse Electric Corporation plans to complete the I&C design for the AP1000 before the NRC receives a COL application. He said Westinghouse believes that the design-specific requirements are established by the AP1000 design. The NRC said that the AP1000 design control document (DCD) does not cover site-specific interfaces between the factory tested I&C system and the site-specific interfaces which can only be done by a combination of site acceptance tests, startup tests, and full power operation. NRC was asked if it could review the completed AP1000 I&C system. NEI said that the work on the I&C design needs to start now because if the COL application is to be completed in the 2009 timeframe, the design needs to be frozen relatively soon.

NRC said it interacts with the applicant on ITAAC. Once an applicant has selected a site, NRC starts discussions on the ITAAC. One concern is having to rereview these completed ITAAC after the COL application is submitted. NRC said it was working on an inspection procedure for the ITAAC. NEI asked how much advance notice NRC needs to have to resolve any of the design acceptance criteria (DAC) inspections. NRC said it needs at least a year's advance notice to resolve any DAC. The time is needed to plan technical reviewer and inspector resources and get any contracts that are needed in place.

NEI said applicants are currently planning I&C activities. NEI asked whether NRC would review a topical report supported by an applicant in the area of I&C DAC. NRC said it might be possible but did not commit.

NEI said that human factors engineering DAC are related to the I&C DAC and suggested that NRC may need to develop inspection modules in these areas sooner than anticipated. NRC said that a number of inspection procedures would be transferred to Manual Chapter 2503 to address ITAAC inspections and noted that inspections in these areas would be through the life of the project. Manual Chapter 2502, which covers pre-COL inspections, will be issued later this year. The NRC technical staff will perform audits to help the staff make a decision on a COL application.

NEI said the industry needs to document what matters need to come forward for NRC review before and after the submission of a COL application. NEI said it would look at the timing of the I&C activities and present this information to NRC in a future NEI 04-01 public meeting. NEI will use Figure 2 (in Attachment 3 of this meeting summary) to show the schedule of industry activities. NRC said from this discussion it understands that the industry wants to come in earlier than anticipated to address certain activities and the NRC staff needs to see if this can be done and on what timetable.

Report on Departures From Generic Design Control Document (Section 4.5)

NRC had no preliminary comments on this section, except to say that there would be no discussion of issues related to the new proposed Part 52 rule until it was issued for comment. In addition, NRC said that the frequency of submission to NRC of reports summarizing changes to the design control document is not the same in the AP1000 design certification rule as for the other three certified designs. The Commission's staff requirements memorandum on the AP1000 proposed design certification rule directs the staff to make similar changes to the other three certified designs.

Pre-COL Phase Activities (Section 5)

NRC said that other activities, such as procurement, would fall under quality assurance program activities performed in the pre-COL phase.

Regarding the discussion on fitness for duty (FFD) in Section 5, NRC said that the FFD program should be described in the FSAR. NEI said security plan templates that have been provided by NRC have the FFD program in the security plan. NEI said it will change the language in NEI 04-01 to reference the security plan.

NEI said that many changes will probably be made to Section 5 to reflect the pre-COL activities for I&C and human factors engineering DAC.

Change Control for COL Application Information (Section 6)

NRC said that, contrary to the statement made in NEI 04-01, which implied that only applicants and licensees could make changes to the generic DCD, anyone can make a change to a certified design because the certified design is a part of the regulations. Attachment 4 contains a diagram outlining the change process for design control documents.

Departures From Tier 2 Design Information (Section 6.2.2.1)

NRC said that design certification applicants were not consistent in where severe accident design features were described in their respective DCDs. For example, General Electric described such design features in Chapter 19 of the advance boiling water reactor (ABWR), while Westinghouse provided links in Chapter 19 of the AP1000 DCD to other chapters in the DCD. NEI 04-01 should be revised to reflect these differences.

Regarding departures affecting resolution of a severe accident issue, NRC said that NEI 04-01 states that "a severe accident is generally not considered credible if its probability is less than 10^{-6} per year." For the AP1000, which claims a core damage frequency of 10^{-7} per year, NEI 04-01 appears to imply that all severe accidents are not credible. NRC said that while it agreed that implementing guidance was necessary for this issue, the criterion proposed by NEI 04-01 for severe accidents is not acceptable. The proposed criterion could lead to the conclusion that certain systems in place for severe accident mitigation, such as passive core flooders, can be eliminated. This was not the intent of the Commission.

NRC proposed that NEI work on this issue by picking a system, such as the ABWR passive core flooding system, and evaluate a modification to that system. NEI said that one issue was defining a substantial increase in the probability of occurrence. NRC said it has similar concerns but noted a similar issue in the revision of 10 CFR 50.59. Substantial increases resulted from a desire to establish some different change criteria. NRC said this is the time to discuss what substantial means. NEI said they would review this issue further.

Departures from Generic Technical Specification Requirements and Other Operational Requirements (Section 6.3)

NRC said that based on the discussion in the March 3-4, 2005, meeting on NEI 04-01, NRC made changes to the section-by-section discussion of the change process for operational requirements in the AP1000 proposed design certification rule. NRC encouraged NEI to review and comment on the proposed rule, including the status of bracketed information in the DCDs of each certified design. NRC believes the revisions have made the rule much easier to understand.

The NRC continues to have concerns about a single exemption included in a COL application for multiple changes to the technical specifications of certified designs. In addition, NRC is considering whether the technical specification bases should be part of the generic technical specifications included in the design certification rules.

NEI said that in Section VIII, "Processes for Changes and Departures," which is included in each of the design certification rule appendices, paragraph VIII.C.6 is not clear to the industry. NRC said that this remains an action item from the March 3-4, 2005, NEI 04-01 public meeting. NEI said that the industry was considering recommending the use of paragraph VIII.C.3 to address making changes to the technical specifications with a single exemption. NRC said that paragraph VIII.C.3 was intended for situations where NRC imposes changes.

ESP Final Environmental Impact Statement (Section 6.4.1)

This discussion extended the March 3, 2005, discussion on the February 10, 2005, letter into the context of NEI 04-01. The industry is very interested in obtaining a timely NRC response to the February 10, 2005, letter. The staff promised an expeditious response consistent with competing priorities.

The staff recognized that NEI 04-01 was prepared and submitted in advance of the supplemental correspondence and the staff's initial reaction at the March 3, 2005, meeting. Consequently, the staff indicated that a number of the comments on this section repeat the information provided earlier. In general, the staff expressed concern that Section 6.4.1 at least paraphrases regulatory requirements rather than quoting verbatim from the regulations, probably with the intention of producing a "plain language" users guide. However, fidelity to the regulatory language reduces ambiguity. There is little value in changing the language when there is no intent to change the meaning. The industry requested that the staff identify the appropriate citations to ensure clarity. For the rest of the discussion on Section 6.4.1, the staff identified citations when quoting from the rule.

NRC must effectively discharge its National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) responsibilities to make a decision on a licensing action. The staff repeated that the environmental record of decision is based on NRC's environmental impact statement (EIS) and not on the applicant's environmental report (ER). NRC's regulations place certain requirements on applicants to assist NRC in fulfilling its NEPA responsibilities; the ER is expected to contain this information and NRC's environmental audit and review process will ensure that the information is on the record. There may very well be differences between the ER and the EIS, but it is the EIS that establishes the environmental envelope. This is in contrast to the importance of the safety analysis report in the safety review.

For issue preclusion, pursuant to §52.39(a)(2), "... the Commission shall treat as resolved those matters resolved in the proceeding on the application for issuance or renewal of an early site permit,..." The staff said the issuance of an early site permit (ESP) is a major Federal action and that the issuance of a combined construction permit and operating license (COL) is a separate major Federal action. Contrary to the representation in NEI-04-01 connecting the actions, the issuance of an ESP completes one Federal action and the issuance of a COL completes another. That said, the supplemental EIS provision, §51.92, that was cited is appropriate if NRC does not take an action on an application in a timely fashion. As an example, NRC determined that it was appropriate to supplement an EIS in the case of the Watts Bar operating license (OL) application. The OL EIS was finalized more than a decade before NRC was ready to issue the OL; consequently, the staff supplemented the EIS before taking the action.

At the time of the COL, an applicant may seek to change the environmental record of decision pursuant to §52.79(a)(1): "... the application ... must contain ... information sufficient to ... resolve any other significant environmental issue not considered in any previous proceeding on the site or the design." The applicant cannot change the EIS, but must request the change of NRC and provide the basis for the request. NRC will independently determine whether the change involved is significant. If the information is considered significant, the staff does not revisit the entire evaluation from the ESP stage but rather limits the analysis to whether the new information changes the result obtained at the ESP stage. In addition to addressing changes

and information to address environmental matters not previously considered (i.e., issues deferred at the ESP stage and newly identified issues), pursuant to §52.79(a)(1) "... the application ... must contain ... information sufficient to demonstrate that the design of the facility falls within the parameters specified in the early site permit ..." The ER submitted in support of an application should contain sufficient information to aid the Commission in its development of an independent analysis (see, §51.41). The ER needs to contain the relevant information for NRC consideration in building the record prior to taking the action; the applicant's bases should not be relegated to an internal document subject to audit. The staff expects that the applicant's approach to identifying new and significant information be described in the ER. The applicant's approach could take the form of the inquiry found to be acceptable for license renewal applications; i.e., an executive summary of the technical material reviewed, the interactions with the applicant's environmental staff, the interactions with Federal, State, Tribal, and local organizations, and with academic and consulting organizations, and the findings.

As noted earlier, the NRC staff will prepare an EIS as part of the COL review. To the degree that the staff can use tiering concepts and incorporate resolved issues from the ESP or design certification, it will. This is entirely consistent with the concept being used today by the NRC staff for license renewal and other licensing applications. If the values in the COL application fall within the bounds of the values specified in the ESP and there is no new and significant information, then, from the NRC staff's perspective, the issue remains resolved and it is so disclosed in the COL EIS. As for the review standards, pursuant to §52.81, the application "... will be reviewed according to the standards set out in 10 CFR [part] ... 51 ... as [it applies] to applications for construction permits and operating licenses for nuclear power plants ..."

The staff took issue with the NEI 04-01 statement "[i]f the changes and new information are bounded by the information in the ESP FEIS or do not affect the conclusions of the ESP FEIS, the COL applicant need not document the changes or new information as part of its COL application." The latter concept is not consistent with regulatory practice; the changes or new information are to be included in the COL application; NRC will prepare a COL EIS and will independently determine whether the changes are significant and disclose the bases for its determination.

NEI 04-01 provided three examples in Section 6.4.1 of NEI 04-01 of changed or new information that may impact an ESP FEIS. The NRC provides the following comments:

In Example 1, both NRC and the COL applicant must meet regulatory and statutory requirements at the time of the COL application. For example, one way to invoke the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is by a major Federal action; a COL is a major Federal action separate from the ESP. NRC regulations do not override the ESA; even if no new species have appeared since the ESP was issued, the COL review will fully comply with the ESA requirements. Some licensees may be familiar with the consultation under the ESA and how NRC engages the Fish and Wildlife or Fisheries Services. If NRC reinitiates consultation, the consultation still relies heavily on the record already established in the site vicinity; NRC supplements the record. Consequently, the consultation should not be considered a *de novo* review.

The NRC considers Example 2 an acceptable description of the change scenario discussed in the example. In addition, the applicant would have to obtain the appropriate State or Federal permits.

The NRC also considers Example 3 an acceptable description of the change scenario discussed in the example; however, license renewal analyses and concepts (i.e., Part 51, Table B-1, and NUREG-1437) may not always apply to COL or ESP circumstances. There is valuable information in NUREG-1437, but there needs to be an explanation of why the information is relevant to a licensing action at a nearby location.

There were additional concept discussions on the limited closure that the industry believes is being realized by the ESP process in advance of a COL. These discussions were tied to the expectations for new and significant information. Industry representatives had concerns that the applicants would have to revisit issues at the COL stage that could be resolved at the time of the ESP. The staff suggested that part of the issue resolution concern resulted from the use of a plant parameter envelope (PPE) concept; the PPE does not provide the detailed and specific information for all issues that a specific design does. The industry representatives suggested that the principal concern was more related to the data collection expectations of the staff at the COL stage. The staff indicated that some issues will require the collection and submittal of information; insofar as the actual design selected may vary from the parameters considered or environmental changes may occur during the intervening years, the NRC staff will determine whether there is new and significant information on resolved issues. Thus, an COL applicant must provide the same environmental information, but it should be limited to information sufficient to demonstrate that the design of the facility is bounded by the ESP and to resolve any other significant environmental issues not considered in any previous proceeding on the site or the design.

[The information provided in this meeting summary is for the purpose of documenting the meeting. Subsequent to this meeting, in a letter dated July 6, 2005 (ADAMS Accession No. ML051050031), the staff issued its response to NEI's February 10, 2005, letter. Please refer to this response letter for the staff's guidance on the environmental review at the COL stage of nuclear plant licensing. This letter provides the NRC position regarding the environmental review at the COL stage of nuclear plant licensing.]

Changes in Approved Emergency Planning Information (Section 6.4.3)

NRC said that this issue is currently being considered in the ongoing Part 52 rulemaking. NRC noted in the second paragraph of Section 6.4.3 that a COL applicant may make changes to approved major features of a referenced ESP emergency plan. NRC asked NEI to comment on when the provision regarding 10 CFR 50.54(q) would be invoked. NEI said that this would be invoked from the issuance of an early site permit to the issuance of a COL. NRC said that 10 CFR 50.54(q) applies to licensed operating plants. A COL applicant who has an ESP does not have an operating license. The applicant may have to request an exemption to the emergency planning requirements. NRC said that it does not expect to see changes to an ESP's emergency planning information until a COL application referencing the ESP is submitted. NRC said that changes are allowed under 10 CFR 50.54(q) for an operating plant but when an operating plant's emergency plans are mixed with an ESP, 10 CFR 50.54(q) would not allow changes to the combination.

NEI asked NRC to comment on a situation where a COL applicant came in with a proposed complete emergency plan. NRC said 50.54(q) was not appropriate for issuing an ESP. When NRC submits formal comments on a COL application, the emergency plan for the proposed

new reactor is still a static plan. NEI asked what the affect would be if there was a proposal for a new high-technology system to replace the sirens. NRC said that if the new system was for the operating plant, it would affect the operational side. NEI asked what would happen if this was a condition of the permit similar to fire protection conditions on a license. NRC said it might consider this, but noted resource issues necessary to evaluate the scenario. NRC said further that once a COL is issued, 10 CFR 50.54(q) would be a condition of the license and would be used for any changes. In addition, emergency planning will have ITAAC and 10 CFR 50.54(q) would not let the applicant change the ITAAC.

Followup NEI 04-04 Discussion Topics

Electronic Submission of Documents

NEI provided NRC with a list of electronic formatting issues for a COL application (see Attachment 7). NEI requested that these issues be discussed at a future meeting with the appropriate NRC staff in attendance.

OPERATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW DISCUSSION TOPICS

Implementation of Operational Programs Identified in NEI Letter Dated May 14, 2001

NEI provided its draft operational program implementation matrix (see Attachment 5) as a starting point for discussing the implementation of operational programs. The matrix covers 9 of the 14 programs that were identified in the May 14, 2001, NEI letter. NEI said that it would be easy to complete the matrix for all 14 programs although there may be more that 14 because inservice testing and inservice inspection are considered separate programs and security is actually a combination of several programs. The matrix shows significant milestones in implementation. The descriptions are brief and therefore can be a bit misleading. NEI said a future update would provide additional words to clarify.

NRC said that it had reviewed the matrix prior to the public meeting. NRC discussed information provided in the November 9, 2004, meeting between NRC and NEI concerning COL application issues. The meeting summary (ADAMS Accession No. ML043240352) includes NRC's proposed approach to responding to SRM-SECY-04-0032, "Programmatic Information Needed for Approval of Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria." Attachment 4 of the meeting summary states that a possible approach being considered by the staff has the COL application containing FSAR-level information and additional information where implementation choices could materially and negatively affect the program effectiveness, and a discussion of implementation. The COL would include license conditions for timing of implementation of operational programs that will not be implemented at the time of the application.

Although the matrix did include some significant milestones, it does not contain any timing information. NRC also said it expects to discuss all 14 programs listed in the May 14, 2001, NEI letter in a future Commission paper. NRC asked NEI to cover 14 programs in the implementation matrix.

After some discussion, including what constitutes a program and when is that program implemented, NEI said it had a better understanding of the information that NRC needed. NEI said that it would consider the NRC comments and modify the matrix to include all 14 programs listed in the May 14, 2001, NEI letter.

New Operational Review Discussions

FSAR Chapter 17, Quality Assurance (Section 4.3.9.17) and the Maintenance Rule

NRC said it was developing a new Standard Review Plan (SRP) Section 17.1-3 to replace SRP Sections 17.1, 17.2, and 17.3. This update is in progress. NRC said that Regulatory Guides 1.28 and 1.33 are outdated but are not being withdrawn. NRC will look at previously issued safety evaluations before updating the SRP and try to place as much information in the SRP as possible, minimizing the references to additional documents. The revised SRP will be issued for public comment. NRC said the 1996 draft version SRP Chapter 17 was being put on its Web site. NEI asked NRC to consider having separate meetings to discuss the update of this SRP section. NRC said it would consider this request.

NRC said that the design reliability assurance program is included in SRP Chapters 14, 16, 17, and 19. NRC asked why COL applicants can't put these descriptions in the FSAR. NEI said that it expects COL applicants will provide a description of the design reliability assurance program in FSARs.

NRC said it will be revising SRP Section 17.4 to include the maintenance rule (once called the "operational reliability assurance process"). NEI asked what information should be put into a COL application so that NRC would not need to request any additional information. NEI said that NEI 04-01 does not include the details of what to provide for NRC review of the maintenance rule operational program.

NRC said it envisions getting one quality assurance program from an applicant, not separate programs for construction and operation, and noted that RG 1.70 asks the applicant to describe its QA program in this manner. NEI agreed that one program can be provided up front. In addition, NEI suggested that the description of reliability during operations could be included in SRP Section 17.5.

Followup Operational Program Review Discussions

Radiation Protection

NRC and NEI staff summarized the status of the working group on the radiation protection program for the NEI COL guidance. The group has had two meetings so far and has scheduled four more meetings. In the first meeting the group discussed the scope of NEI 04-01 and in the second meeting the group developed draft guidance for the radiation protection organization (Section 12.1 of the FSAR). The group plans to work on guidance for FSAR Sections 12.2 and 12.3 in the next four meetings and to complete the draft guidance by June 2005. NRC said it expects to complete an update to SRP 12.5 by the end of FY 2005.

NRC said the working group cannot complete the guidance document until it answers a policy question. The question involves the phased implementation of the radiation protection program after the combined license is issued. Specifically, the licensee will need to get a Part 30 license

to bring radioactive sources on site and a Part 70 license to bring nuclear fuel on site. Both of these actions will take place before Commission authorization to load fuel. The question is, will the COL license cover these other licenses as with operating licenses issued in the past. The answer to the question will affect the group's guidance for the radiation protection program. Some members of the NEI working group recalled that the generic COL license attached to SECY-00-0092, "Combined License Review Process," (see Appendix D to NEI 04-01) addressed this point. NRC said it would review this issue further and discuss it during a future NEI 04-01 public meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

A member of the public said that Section 5 of NEI 04-01 departs from the objective of guidance on information needed in a combined license application. This member of the public further said that a decision will have to be made as to what is included in NEI 04-01 and what is included in a future guidance document. NEI said that an "NEI 06-01" guidance document was being considered, noting that NEI 04-01 takes an applicant to a COL application. NEI said the next guidance document would cover post COL application guidance including ITAAC determinations and transition to operations. NEI said it would use its 2001 white paper as a starting point and may start work on this document later this year.

ACTION ITEMS

NEI Action Items

- Overlay the instrument and control development schedule using the software lifecycle provided by NRC in Figure 2 of Attachment 3, and present this information at a future NEI 04-01 public meeting.
- Review proposed severe accident criteria and, using the AP1000 passive core flood system as an example, develop acceptance criteria that address a substantial increase in probability of occurrence and discuss the criteria at the NEI 04-01 public meeting when discussing comments on the treatment of probabilistic risk assessment issues in NEI 04-01.
- Review operational program implementation matrix further and discuss at the next NEI 04-01 public meeting.

NRC Action Items

- Evaluate whether changes to the technical specification bases in DCDs require an exemption from the regulations.
- Consider holding separate meetings to discuss the operational quality assurance program.

- Review SECY-00-0092 to see if this generic COL license includes a provision to bring radioactive sources on site.

/RA/

Joseph Colaccino, Senior Project Manager
New Reactors Section
New, Research and Test Reactors Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachments: 1. List of attendees
2. Agenda
3. Guidance for COL Applicants on Design Implementation of Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems in Nuclear Power Plants (ML050960503)
4. Change Process for Design Control Documents (ML050960501)
5. April 4, 2005, E-Mail from NEI on Draft Operational Program Implementation Matrix (ML050970140)
6. NRC Handout - Slides from April 7, 2005, NEI 04-01 Public Meeting (ML051100051)
7. NEI Handout - Combined License Applications Electronic Formatting Issues (ML051010191)

cc: See next page

- Review SECY-00-0092 to see if this generic COL license includes a provision to bring radioactive sources on site.

/RA/

Joseph Colaccino, Senior Project Manager
New Reactors Section
New, Research and Test Reactors Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachments: 1. List of attendees
2. Agenda
3. Guidance for COL Applicants on Design Implementation of Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems in Nuclear Power Plants (ML050960503)
4. Change Process for Design Control Documents (ML050960501)
5. April 4, 2005, E-Mail from NEI on Draft Operational Program Implementation Matrix (ML050970140)
6. NRC Handout - Slides from April 7, 2005, NEI 04-01 Public Meeting (ML051100051)
7. NEI Handout - Combined License Applications Electronic Formatting Issues (ML051010191)

cc: See next page

*See previous concurrence

ADAMS ACCESSION NO. ML051110016

OFFICE	PM:RNRP*	SC:RLEP-C*	SC:RNRP
NAME	JColaccino	AKugler w/comment	LDudes
DATE	07/22/2005	07/25/2005	08/02/2005

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution for April 7, 2005, Meeting Summary dated August 4, 2005

Hard Copy

RNRP R/F
JColaccino
LDudes

E-Mail

PUBLIC
JDyer (RidsNrrOd)
RBorchardt
BSheron (RidsNrrAdpt)
FElawila
NRR/ADPT Secretary [RidsNrrAdpt]
NEI 04-01 Reviewers
RNRP Group
DMatthews
BBoger
CCarpenter
SRichards
DCoe
TQuay
JHannon
SWeerakkody
JWermiel
FAkstulewicz
WBateman
ESullivan
MMitchell
TChan
JCalvo
RJenkins
TJKim, EDO
MJohnson
CCasto
MStutzke
DRoberts
STingen
PSeckerak
DJohnson
RMcIntyre
TFoley
SAlexander
TMensah (NRR Communication Coord)
ACRS (RidsAcresMailCenter)
OPA
MEI-Zeftway
JBlake
RGardner
CPaulk

LCampbell
Mltzkowitz, OGC
GMizuno, OGC
TKenyon
PQualls
DNelson, OE
JBongarra
MChiramal
PLoeser
HLi
GBagchi
MAAshley
STingen
JJennings
DTrimble
YLi
NKTrehan
DBarss
BMusico
AKugler
DThatcher
RWeisman

External e-mail

bhupinder.singh@hq.doe.gov
tom.miller@hq.doe.gov
Vanessa.Quinn@dhs.gov
Kenneth.Wierman@dhs.gov
James.Purvis@dhs.gov

Combination List:

cc: Mr. Charles Brinkman
Westinghouse Electric Co.
Washington Operations
12300 Twinbrook Pkwy., Suite 330
Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. David Lochbaum, Nuclear Safety Engineer
Union of Concerned Scientists
1707 H Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006-3919

Mr. Paul Gunter
Nuclear Information & Resource Service
1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 404
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. James Riccio
Greenpeace
702 H Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001

Mr. Adrian Heymer
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. George Alan Zinke
Project Manager
Nuclear Business Development
Entergy Nuclear
M-ECH-683
1340 Echelon Parkway
Jackson, MS 39213

Mr. Thomas P. Miller
U.S. Department of Energy
NE-20, Rm. A286
Headquarters-Germantown
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874-1290

Ms. Marilyn Kray
Vice President, Special Projects
Exelon Generation
200 Exelon Way, KSA3-E
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. Laurence Parme
Manager, GT-MHR Safety &
Licensing
General Atomics Company
P.O. Box 85608
San Diego, CA 92186-5608

Mr. Joseph D. Hegner
Lead Engineer - Licensing
Dominion Generation
Early Site Permitting Project
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060

Mr. Edward L. Quinn
MDM Services Corporations
Utility Operations Division
28202 Cabot Road, Suite 205
Laguna Nigual, CA 92677

Ms. Lynn Connor
Doc-Search Associates
2211 sw 1ST Ave - #1502
Portland, OR 97201

Mr. Paul Leventhal
Nuclear Control Institute
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Patricia Campbell
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. W. Edward Cummins
AP600 and AP1000 Projects
Westinghouse Electric Company
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0355

Dr. Robert E. Gamble
Manager, ESBWR
GE Nuclear Energy
1989 Little Orchard St., M/C 365
San Jose, CA 95125-1030

August 4, 2005

Dr. Jack W. Roe
Vice President
Advanced Technologies & Laboratories
International, Inc.
20010 Century Boulevard, Suite 500
Germantown, MD 20874

Mr. Stephen P. Frantz
Morgan, Lewis, & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Gary Wright, Manager
Office of Nuclear Facility Safety
Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
1035 Outer Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62704

Mr. Brendan Hoffman
Research Associate on Nuclear Energy
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy
and Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Mr. Tom Clements
6703 Gude Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Mr. Lionel Batty
Nuclear Business Team
Graftech
12300 Snow Road
Parma, Ohio 44130

Mr. Ian M. Grant
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
280 Slater Street, Station B
P.O. Box 1046
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5S9

Mr. Edward F. Sproat, III
Vice President - Int'l Projects
Exelon Generation
200 Exelon Way
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. Glenn H. Archinoff
AECL Technologies
481 North Frederick Avenue
Suite 405
Gaithersburg, MD. 20877

Dr. Regis A. Matzie
Senior Vice President and
Chief Technology Officer
Westinghouse Electric Company
2000 Day Hill Road
Windsor, CT 06095-0500

Mr. Ed Wallace, General Manager
Projects
PBMR Pty LTD
PO Box 9396
Centurion 0046
Republic of South Africa

Mr. Dobie McArthur
Director, Washington Operations
General Atomics
1899 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006

Mr. Russell Bell
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Ms. Vanessa E. Quinn, Chief
Radiological Emergency Preparedness
Section
Nuclear & Chemical Hazards Branch
Federal Emergency Management
Agency/DHS
500 C Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20472

Mr. Ron Simard
6170 Masters Club Drive
Suwanee, GA 30024

Mr. Jerald S. Holm
Framatome ANP, Inc.
3315 Old Forest Road
P.O. Box 10935
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935

Ms. Kathryn Sutton, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Ms. Anne W. Cottingham
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3817

Mr. Robert E. Sweeney
IBEX ESI
4641 Montgomery Avenue
Suite 350
Bethesda, MD. 20814

E-Mail:

gerald.holm@framatome-anp.com
mwetterhahn@winston.com
gcesare@enercon.com
whorin@winston.com
rob.sweeney@ibexesi.com



**NRC Meeting with Nuclear Energy Institute to Discuss NEI's Combined License
Application Guidance Document (NEI 04-01) and the Operational Program
Review Performed During the Evaluation of a Combined License Application
Thursday, April 7, 2005
9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Ramada Inn, Rockville**

Name	Organization
Joseph Colaccino	NRR/DRIP/RNRP
Carl Berger	Energetics
Bob Fraser	Black & Veatch
Matt Chiramal	NRR/DE/EEIB
John O'Hara	Brookhaven National Laboratory
Paul Loeser	NRC
Hulbert Li	NRC/DE/EEIB
Glenn Goodson	Black & Veatch
Tom Hayes	Westinghouse
Martha Shields	Dept. Of Energy - NE30
Kevin Lyall	Duke
Goutam Bagchi	NRC/NRR/DE
Al Passwater	EPRI Consultant
Joe Hegner	Dominion
Sandra Sloan	Framatome ANP
Mark Stofko	Westinghouse
Eddie R. Grant	Exelon
George Zinke	Entergy/NuStart
Mary Ann Ashley	NRC/NRR/DIPM
Anne Cottingham	Winston & Strawn
Ken Thomas	Duke Energy
Joe Mihalcik	Constellation Energy
Shinichi Hayafune	Energy USA
Dan Williamson	Exelon

Stephen Tingen	NRC
Jason Jennings	NRC
Ben George	Southern Nuclear/NuStart
Russ Bell	NEI
Guy Cesare	Enercon Services
Dave Trimble	NRC
Jerry Wilson	NRC/NRR
Patricia Campbell	Morgan Lewis
Tom Houghton	NEI
A. Heymer	NEI
Yong Li	NRC
John Thrasher	Duke Power
Dale Smith	Duke Power
John Segala	NRC/NRR
Alan Beard	GE Nuclear
N. K. Trehan	NRC/NRR
Dan Barss	NRC/NSIR/DPR/EPD
Bruce Musico	NRC/NSIR/DPR/EPD
Andrew Kugler	NRC/NRR/DRIP/RLEP
Laura Dudes	NRC/NRR
Dale Thatcher	NRC/NRR
Robert Weisman	NRC/OGC

Agenda*

April 7, 2005, Meeting with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) to Discuss NEI's Combined License (COL) Application Guidance and the Operational Program Review Performed During the Evaluation of a Combined License Application

8:30 a.m.	Introductions/Opening Remarks	NRC/NEI
8:40 a.m.	Discussion of NEI 04-01, Section 4.3.9.7, "FSAR Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls"	NRC/NEI
9:30 a.m.	Discussion of NEI 04-01, Section 4.5, "Report on Departures from the Generic DCD"	NRC/NEI
9:45 a.m.	Discussion of NEI 04-01, Section 5, "Pre-COL Phase Activities"	NRC/NEI
10:30 a.m.	Break	
10:45 a.m.	Discussion of NEI 04-01, Section 6, "Change Control for COL Application Information"	NRC/NEI
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Implementation of Operational Programs Identified in May 14, 2001, NEI Letter to NRC	NEI
1:30 p.m.	Discussion of NEI 04-01, Section 4.3.9.17, "FSAR Chapter 17, Quality Assurance"	NEI/NRC
2:30 p.m.	Break	
2:45 p.m.	New Operational Program Review Discussions - Maintenance Rule	NEI/NRC
3:00 p.m.	Followup Discussions on Operational Program Reviews and NEI 04-01	NRC/NEI
3:30 p.m.	Future NEI 04-01 and Operational Program Review Public Meeting Topics	NRC/NEI
4:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

***NOTE: Specific topics and associated discussion times may change without notice. Public comments will be solicited after each agenda item is completed.**

Contact:
Joseph Colaccino, NRR
301-415-2753, jxc1@nrc.gov