

January 6, 2011

Mr. John A. Christian, President  
ZionSolutions, LLC  
900 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 1050  
Washington, D.C. 20006

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 050-00295/10-03(DNMS);  
050-00304/10-03(DNMS) – ZION NUCLEAR STATION

Dear Mr. Christian:

On December 10, 2010, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed inspection activities for the fourth quarter of 2010 at the permanently shut-down Zion Nuclear Station in Zion, Illinois. The purpose of the inspection was to determine whether decommissioning activities were conducted safely and in accordance with NRC requirements. Specifically, the inspectors evaluated the Zion Station site organization, staffing and qualifications, the decommissioning safety review and modification process, the corrective action program, radiological access controls, process and effluent radiation monitor capability and aspects of the occupational radiation safety and emergency preparedness programs. At the conclusion of the inspection on December 10, 2010, one of the NRC inspectors involved in the inspection effort discussed the findings with members of your staff.

The inspection consisted of an examination of activities at the facility as they relate to safety and compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations. Areas examined during the inspection are identified in the enclosed report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of a selective examination of procedures and representative records, observations of activities in progress, and interviews with personnel.

Based on the results of this inspection, the inspectors did not identify any violations of NRC requirements.

In accordance with Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and the enclosed report will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>.

J. Christian

-2-

We will gladly discuss any questions you may have regarding this inspection.

Sincerely,

***/RA/***

Christine A. Lipa, Chief  
Materials Control, ISFSI, and  
Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Docket No. 050-00295; 050-00304  
License No. DPR-39; DPR-48

Enclosure:  
Inspection Report 050-00295/10-03(DNMS); 050-00304/10-03(DNMS)

cc w/encl: C. Settles, Head Resident Inspection, Illinois Emergency Management Agency  
The Honorable Suzi Schmidt, Illinois General Assembly  
The Honorable JoAnn D. Osmond, Illinois General Assembly  
Barry A. Burton, Lake County Administrator  
Mark C. Curran, Jr., Lake County Sheriff  
Laurie Cvengros, Village Clerk, Village of Beach Park, Illinois  
Willard R. Helander, Lake County Clerk  
Joseph G. Klinger, Illinois Emergency Management Agency  
Jana Lee, Village Clerk, Village of Winthrop Harbor, Illinois  
Judy L. Mackey, City Clerk, City of Zion, Illinois  
Kent McKenzie, Lake County, Illinois  
Irene T. Pierce, Lake County, Illinois  
General Manager, Zion Nuclear Power Station, ZionSolutions, LLC  
Director Regulatory Affairs, Zion Nuclear Power Station, ZionSolutions, LLC  
Security Manager, Zion Nuclear Power Station, ZionSolutions, LLC

J. Christian

-2-

We will gladly discuss any questions you may have regarding this inspection.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

Christine A. Lipa, Chief  
Materials Control, ISFSI, and  
Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Docket No. 050-00295; 050-00304  
License No. DPR-39; DPR-48

Enclosure:  
Inspection Report 050-00295/10-03(DNMS); 050-00304/10-03(DNMS)

cc w/encl: C. Settles, Head Resident Inspection, Illinois Emergency Management Agency  
The Honorable Suzi Schmidt, Illinois General Assembly  
The Honorable JoAnn D. Osmond, Illinois General Assembly  
Barry A. Burton, Lake County Administrator  
Mark C. Curran, Jr., Lake County Sheriff  
Laurie Cvengros, Village Clerk, Village of Beach Park, Illinois  
Willard R. Helander, Lake County Clerk  
Joseph G. Klinger, Illinois Emergency Management Agency  
Jana Lee, Village Clerk, Village of Winthrop Harbor, Illinois  
Judy L. Mackey, City Clerk, City of Zion, Illinois  
Kent McKenzie, Lake County, Illinois  
Irene T. Pierce, Lake County, Illinois  
General Manager, Zion Nuclear Power Station, ZionSolutions, LLC  
Director Regulatory Affairs, Zion Nuclear Power Station, ZionSolutions, LLC  
Security Manager, Zion Nuclear Power Station, ZionSolutions, LLC

DISTRIBUTION w/encl:

B. Watson, FSME	A. Boland, RIII	L. Linn, RIII
J. Hickman, FSME	P. Loudon, RIII	P. Buckley, RIII
C. Pederson, RIII	H. Logaras, RIII	T. Tomczak, RIII
S. Reynolds, RIII	C. Ariano, RIII	MCID Branch

DOCUMENT NAME:G:\DNMSIII\WORK IN PROGRESS\ZION INSP RPT 2010003 DNMS.DOC

Publicly Available       Non-Publicly Available       Sensitive       Non-Sensitive

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the concurrence box "C" = Copy without attach/encl "E" = Copy with attach/encl "N" = No copy

OFFICE	RIII DNMS	RIII DMMS	RIII DNMS	RIII
NAME	WJSlawinski: jm WGS	JETapp WGS for	CALipa CAL	
DATE	01/06/11	01/06/11	01/06/11	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**REGION III**

Docket Nos.: 050-00295; 050-00304

License Nos.: DPR-39; DPR-48

Report Nos.: 050-00295/10-03(DNMS)  
050-00304/10-03(DNMS)

Licensee: ZionSolutions, LLC

Facility: Zion Nuclear Station

Location: 101 Shiloh Boulevard  
Zion, IL 60099

Dates: On-site September 22 - 24, September 29 –  
October 1 and October 25 – 29, 2010, with  
in-office review through December 10, 2010

NRC Inspectors: Wayne Slawinski, Senior Health Physicist  
Jeremy Tapp, Health Physicist

Approved by: Christine A. Lipa, Chief  
Materials Control, ISFSI, and  
Decommissioning Branch  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Enclosure

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2 NRC Inspection Report 050-00295/10-03(DNMS); 050-00304/10-03(DNMS)**

The Zion Nuclear Power Station (Zion) is a permanently shut-down and defueled power reactor facility in SAFSTOR condition (fuel in wet storage). The site, however, is transitioning to active decommissioning as staffing is expanded, and organizational and institutional controls are being developed to support the planned escalation in work scope. This routine decommissioning inspection focused on the licensee's management organization, staffing and qualifications, facility modifications and associated safety reviews, the problem identification and resolution program and aspects of the radiation protection program.

#### **Facility Organization, Management and Controls**

- The licensee was in the process of hiring and training staff sufficient to implement quality and safety programs commensurate with planned decommissioning activities. (Section 1.1)
- Regulatory requirements and commitments were effectively implemented by the licensee including those associated with monitoring gaseous effluent and the ability to classify an event associated with an effluent release, as provided in the Zion Station Defueled Emergency Plan. (Section 1.2)

#### **Safety Reviews, Design Changes and Modifications**

- The licensee's Safety Review Committee was adequately established to meet Technical Specifications and site procedures. (Section 2.1)
- The licensee had developed an adequate process to implement facility modifications and design changes. A modification to the gaseous effluent pathway and associated effluent monitoring system was adequately evaluated by the licensee. (Section 2.2)

#### **Self- Assessment and Corrective Action Program**

- Administrative procedures that control the identification, evaluation and resolution of problems adequately delineated responsibilities and management involvement, but lacked consistent, quantitative significance level criteria to ensure uniform implementation. (Section 3.1)
- The licensee's corrective action program was implemented in accordance with station procedure; however, adjustments were being made to improve the corrective action process to better align with industry initiatives. (Section 3.2)

#### **Decommissioning Performance and Status**

- Monitoring systems in the control room that are important to safe decommissioning were functional, and operators were cognizant of their monitoring responsibilities and response actions. (Section 4.1)

- Plant material condition and housekeeping were properly maintained and have not impacted safe decommissioning. Radiological access controls were adequate to prevent unauthorized entry into high radiation areas given the limited site activities and small work force. (Section 4.2)

#### **Occupational Radiation Exposure**

- Radioactive materials and contamination were controlled to meet regulatory requirements. (Section 5.1)

#### **Radiological Effluent Monitoring and Control**

- The auxiliary building ventilation stack effluent monitoring system was functional, properly calibrated and its alarm setpoint was conservatively established. (Section 6.1)

## Report Details

### Summary of Plant Activities

During the inspection, the plant was being maintained in a SAFSTOR (safe storage of spent fuel) condition. Significant decommissioning activities had not yet commenced; however, the licensee was in the process of establishing the institutional controls, staffing and management organization to support active decommissioning.

#### **1.0 Facility Organization, Management and Controls (IP 36801)**

##### 1.1 Organization, Staffing and Qualifications

###### a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's site organization, staffing and evaluated the qualifications of selected individuals to assess compliance with the Zion Nuclear Power Station Permanently Defueled Technical Specifications and the Defueled Safety Analysis Report (DSAR). The inspectors selectively determined whether licensee and contractor staffing satisfied regulatory requirements and commitments. The inspectors assessed whether the licensee's decommissioning organization and staffing was being supplemented adequately to accommodate the planned increased scope in decommissioning activities.

###### b. Observations and Findings

During the inspection period, the licensee was continually expanding its staff to meet resource needs consistent with the planned escalation of decommissioning activities. Licensee staff was actively being trained and augmented with qualified contractor personnel in various specialty areas to support the decommissioning project.

The inspectors identified that full alignment was not yet achieved with staffing and qualification criteria provided in the licensee's Technical Specifications and Zion Administrative Procedures (ZAPs). However, the issues did not have impact on decommissioning activities since significant decommissioning work had not yet commenced. The licensee recognized the alignment issues and was taking action to resolve them.

No findings of significance were identified

###### c. Conclusions

The licensee was in the process of hiring and training staff to satisfy regulatory requirements, sufficient to implement quality and safety programs commensurate with planned decommissioning activities.

## 1.2 Licensee Commitments and Requirements

### a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors selectively reviewed licensee requirements (and commitments) specified in the Technical Specifications, the Post Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR), the DSAR and the licensee's Emergency Plan. The inspectors reviewed technical basis documents, procedures and interviewed licensee personnel to determine whether requirements were met. The inspectors' review included an evaluation of the licensee's ability to accurately monitor gaseous effluents released to the environment, and to classify an event associated with radiological effluents as provided in its emergency plan.

### b. Observations and Findings

The gaseous effluent release pathway and the associated effluent monitoring system were modified by the licensee in 2009, to enhance monitoring capabilities and to satisfy emergency plan requirements. Specifically, the licensee combined the fuel building and auxiliary building gaseous effluent pathways to a single monitored release point from the Unit-2 auxiliary building. The modification was precipitated by a change to the station emergency plan in 2006. However, for an approximate three year period leading up to the modification, the monitoring range of the fuel building effluent monitor did not satisfy the range specified in the Emergency Plan for an Alert classification. This issue was rectified by the 2009 modification.

The inspectors assessed the licensee's current methods to monitor and calculate station noble gas and particulate effluents from its monitored Unit-2 vent stack and to determine emergency plan event classification. The inspectors reviewed sample release rate determinations, reviewed associated calculational parameters, and had the licensee demonstrate its effluent release methodologies to ensure emergency plan classification requirements could be met.

No findings of significance were identified.

### c. Conclusions

Regulatory requirements and commitments were effectively implemented by the licensee including those associated with monitoring gaseous effluents including the ability to classify an event associated with an effluent release, as provided in the Zion Station Defueled Emergency Plan.

## 2.0 **Safety Reviews, Design Changes and Modifications (IP 37801)**

### 2.1 Decommissioning Safety Reviews

#### a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's Station Review Committee (SRC) to determine if the committee was staffed with trained individuals as required, and therefore could fulfill its responsibilities as provided in Technical Specifications and site procedures.



b. Observations and Findings

The SRC at Zion met on a quarterly basis in 2010, as required. The inspectors determined that a quorum existed for each quarterly meeting, and the necessary technical expertise was present for review of the subject matter under consideration. The inspectors determined that no more than two alternates participated as voting members as provided in the licensee's procedure. The inspectors also determined through a review of the qualifications of the SRC members that all were appropriately trained and qualified for their respective positions.

No findings of significance were identified.

c. Conclusions

The inspectors determined that the licensee established an adequate SRC that met the requirements of the Technical Specifications and site procedures.

2.2 Design Changes, Tests and Modifications

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed procedures that implement facility design changes and modifications to determine whether they provided adequate instruction to assure proper implementation, review and approval.

The inspectors reviewed the documentation package for the 2009 modification to the gaseous effluent ventilation system, the associated effluent monitoring system and corresponding changes to the Zion Station DSAR. The inspectors selectively reviewed operating procedures and drawings associated with the modification including those related to effluent monitor alarm setpoints and auxiliary building ventilation system operation. The inspectors determined whether the licensee evaluated the inter-relationship between the modification and other potentially affected systems and/or processes.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors determined that the change to the gaseous effluent release pathway and effluent radiation monitoring system did not adversely affect the licensee's ability to maintain proper configuration of the facility or to monitor gaseous effluents. Instead, the changes improved the effluent monitoring capability, streamlined the release pathway and simplified operations.

The inspectors discovered that although the Zion Station DSAR was revised to reflect elimination of the fuel building gaseous effluent monitor, other process radiation monitors described in the DSAR did not match actual configurations. Specifically, the inspectors noted that some gaseous effluent release pathways were not viable because they were designed for an operating reactor. As a result, certain process monitors were not maintained while the facility was in a prolonged SAFESTOR condition. The inspectors determined that these conditions had not impacted effluent monitoring given the lack of significant decommissioning. The inspectors noted that plans were being formulated by

the licensee to determine its effluent monitoring needs to support the transition to active decommissioning.

No findings of significance were identified.

c. Conclusions

The licensee had developed an adequate process to implement facility modifications and design changes. A modification to the gaseous effluent pathway and associated effluent monitoring system was adequately evaluated by the licensee and the DSAR was revised accordingly.

**3.0 Self-Assessment and Corrective Action Program (IP 40801)**

3.1 Administrative Procedure Review

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed administrative procedures that control the identification, evaluation, and resolution of problems including conditions adverse to quality. The procedures were reviewed to determine whether responsibilities were adequately delineated, conditions adverse to quality were clearly defined and adequate mechanisms were provided for management review and oversight of the corrective action process.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors determined that the procedure governing the corrective action program (CAP) clearly identified responsibilities and management review committee involvement. Also, the inspectors determined that effectiveness reviews were required by procedure to be performed by subject matter experts consistent with industry guidelines. However, the inspectors identified that some of the significance level criterion provided by the procedure were inconsistent and included qualitative criteria that could lead to subjective implementation.

No findings of significance were identified

c. Conclusions

Administrative procedures that control the identification, evaluation and resolution of problems adequately delineated responsibilities and management involvement, but lacked consistent, quantitative significance level criteria to ensure uniform implementation.

3.2 Identification, Resolution and Prevention of Problems

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed a selection of CAP documents generated in 2010, to determine whether the licensee adequately identified, evaluated and corrected conditions adverse to quality. The inspectors evaluated the condition, the licensee's problem assessment

and the adequacy and timeliness of corrective actions including the application of industry lessons learned, as applicable. Corrective action documents for a variety of issues including administrative, radiological and security issues were reviewed by the inspectors.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors found that, overall; the corrective action program was implemented as provided by station procedure. However, the licensee recognized that CAP thresholds needed to be better defined, that training of staff was advisable and that additional rigor in some evaluations was warranted to ensure the full scope of the problem was understood. The licensee was in the process of reevaluating its CAP program to ensure alignment with industry initiatives.

No findings of significance were identified.

c. Conclusions

The licensee's corrective action program was implemented in accordance with station procedure; however, adjustments were being made by the licensee to improve the corrective action process to better align with industry practices.

**4.0 Decommissioning Performance and Status Review (IP 71801)**

4.1 Decommissioning Operation - Control Room Observations

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors performed walkdowns of the control room to assess the functionality of selected systems used to monitor parameters related to safe decommissioning. These systems included those for monitoring gaseous effluents, spent fuel pool water level and temperature and to monitor the area radiological conditions in the fuel handling building. The inspectors discussed monitoring responsibilities with control room operators to assess their cognizance of facility conditions and required response actions.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors determined that control room personnel were cognizant of their monitoring duties and response actions, and aware of facility conditions important to safe decommissioning.

No findings of significance were identified.

c. Conclusions

Monitoring systems in the control room that are important to safe decommissioning were functional, and operators were cognizant of their monitoring responsibilities and response actions.

#### 4.2. Plant Tours/Walkdowns

##### a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors performed extensive plant tours to observe field conditions and to assess their potential impact on safe decommissioning. During these walkdowns, the inspectors evaluated material condition and housekeeping, area radiological conditions, radiological access control and associated posting/labeling, and assessed the overall condition of systems, structures and components that support decommissioning. Independent radiation measurements were made by the inspectors in many of the areas toured and were compared to licensee measured results and postings. In particular, the inspectors evaluated the adequacy of high and locked high radiation area controls, the storage of radioactive materials and waste, and the accumulation of combustibles. Additionally, the inspectors' walked-down infrequently accessed locked high radiation areas in the auxiliary building including the spent resin storage tank room and assessed area conditions and controls.

##### b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors found that radiological access controls were adequate to prevent unauthorized entry into high radiation areas since these areas were administratively locked and keys were controlled by the radiation protection staff. The inspectors also determined that the potential for inadvertent entry into radiologically significant areas was minimal because limited decommissioning activities were conducted while the site had been in an extended SAFESTOR condition and the plant work force was small. However, the inspectors identified problems with some high and locked high radiation area barriers, inconsistent radiological postings, and inappropriate use of flashing red lights in the containment buildings all which could lead to access control problems as decommissioning activities escalate. These problems were determined to represent violations of minor significance that are not normally cited in NRC inspection reports. The licensee entered these issues into the CAP.

No findings of significance were identified.

##### c. Conclusions

Plant material condition and housekeeping were adequate and have not impacted safe decommissioning. Radiological access controls were adequate to prevent unauthorized entry given the limited site activities and small work force.

### 5.0 **Occupational Radiation Exposure (IP 83750)**

#### 5.1 Control of Radioactive Materials and Contamination

##### a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the radiological conditions of selected areas in the auxiliary building and unit 1 & 2 containment buildings to determine whether radioactive materials and contamination were controlled to meet regulatory requirements. The inspectors also reviewed the licensee's radiological evaluation (survey results) of soils that were

excavated from areas outside the radiologically controlled area to determine if they were properly identified and controlled.

b. Observations and Findings

Radiological surveys and supporting licensee evaluations demonstrated that radioactive materials and contamination were properly controlled.

No findings of significance were identified.

c. Conclusions

Radioactive materials and contamination were controlled to meet regulatory requirements.

**6.0 Radiological Effluent Monitoring (IP 84750)**

6.1 Process/ Effluent Radiation Monitors

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM) to determine if the auxiliary building ventilation stack effluent monitoring system matched the system described. The inspectors reviewed the alarm setpoints and the associated setpoint calculations for the monitor to determine if the values were consistent with the ODCM bases and were technically sound. Additionally, the inspectors reviewed the most recent calibration records for the auxiliary building monitoring system to determine if the calibration methodologies were appropriate and met ODCM and procedural requirements.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors found that the auxiliary building gaseous effluent monitoring system was functional and properly calibrated with its alarm setpoint conservatively established to meet regulatory requirements. The inspectors determined that the system was capable of monitoring the necessary range of noble gases to encompass required emergency plan classifications.

No findings of significance were identified.

c. Conclusions

The auxiliary building ventilation stack effluent monitoring system was functional, properly calibrated and its alarm setpoint was conservatively established.

## **7.0 Exit Meeting**

One of the inspectors presented the inspection results to licensee management at the conclusion of the inspection on December 10, 2010. The licensee acknowledged the results presented and did not identify any of the documents reviewed by the inspectors as proprietary.

ATTACHMENT: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

## **SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

### **PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED**

- \* P. Daly, General Manager
  - \* G. Bouchard, Decommissioning Plant Manager
  - \* P. Thurman, Director, Radiation Protection
  - \* C. Baker, Vice President, Environmental Health & Safety
  - \* T. Tramm, Regulatory Affairs  
K. Greenlee, Radiation/Chemistry Manager
  - \* H. Farr, Consultant
- \* Present at the December 10, 2010, exit meeting.

### **INSPECTION PROCEDURES (IPs) USED**

IP 36801	Organization, Management, & Cost Controls at Permanently Shutdown Reactors
IP 37801	Safety Reviews & Modifications at Permanently Shutdown Reactors
IP 40801	Self-Assessment & Corrective Actions at Permanently Shutdown Reactors
IP 71801	Decommissioning Performance & Status Review at Permanently Shutdown Reactors
IP 83750	Occupational Radiation Exposure
IP 84750	Radioactive Waste Treatment and Effluent and Environmental Monitoring

### **ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED**

Opened/Closed	None
Discussed	None

### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

Zion Annex to Offsite Dose Calculation Manual; Chapter 10, Revision 10; Chapter 12, Revision 17 and Appendix F, Revision 3

ZRP 5821-33; Documentation and Adjustment of Radiation Monitor Parameters; Revision 10

2RIA-PR-49; Calibration of Vent Stack Air Monitoring Instrumentation; July 29, 2010

ZRP 5821-50; Documentation and Control of Radiation Monitor Setpoints; Revision 6

SOI-71D; Placing Auxiliary Building Ventilation in Service; Revision 9

EPIP-07; Calculation of Station Noble Gas and Particulate Release Rate to Determine Site Emergency Plan Classification; Revision 7

## **LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED (continued)**

Calculation No. 22S-110X-0057; Fuel Handling Accident Offsite Dose Calculation; Revision 2

Zion Defueled Station Emergency Plan; Revision 13

RWP 10009460; Walkdown of High and Locked High Radiation Area Rooms and Containments; Revision 0

Zion Administrative Procedure ZAP-700-16, Station Review Committee; Revision 2

ZAP 700-02; Corrective Action Program and Work Request Process; Revision 16

CAP 1294047; Documentation to Comply with NRC Order for Sources; dated January 4, 2010

CAP 1294837; CAP Not Used to Document Condition Adverse to Quality; dated February 15, 2010

CAP 1305623; Door Tamper Not properly Assessed by Security; dated March 1, 2010

CAP 1339330; Clearance Order Card Placed on Wrong Component; dated June 7, 2010

CAP 1328421; Particulate Release Rate; date June 28, 2010

CAP 1339326; Special Nuclear Material Check-In Findings; dated August 2, 2010

ZAP 100-06; 10 CFR 50.59 Review Process; Revision 22

ZAP 500-09; Attachment A; Qualification/Certification Documentation for Various Station Staff; dated various periods between 2002 - 2010

Letter from M. Peterson to R. Schuster, Minutes for the February 16, 2010 Station Review Committee (SRC) Meeting; February 16, 2010

Letter from M. Peterson to R. Schuster, Minutes for the April 7, 2010 Station Review Committee (SRC) Meeting; April 19, 2010

Letter from M. Peterson to R. Schuster, Minutes for the August 3, 2010 Station Review Committee (SRC) Meeting; August 3, 2010

Letter from M. Peterson to R. Schuster, Minutes for the October 26, 2010 Station Review Committee (SRC) Meeting; October 26, 2010

Letter from R. Schuster to J. Ashley, Designation of Station Review Committee membership and designated alternates for LZDO; July 8, 2008



## **LIST OF ACRONYMS USED**

ADAMS	Agencywide Document Access and Management System
CAP	Corrective Action Program
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DNMS	Division of Nuclear Materials Safety
DSAR	Defueled Safety Analysis Report
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ODCM	Offsite Dose Calculation Manual
PSDAR	Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report
SAFSTOR	Safe Storage of Spent Fuel
SRC	Safety Review Committee
ZAP	Zion Administrative Procedure