U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Standard Review Plan

NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants: Light Water Reactor (LWR) Edition," henceforth called the Standard Review Plan (SRP), provides guidance to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff in performing safety reviews of construction permit (CP) or operating license (OL) applications under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50, "Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," (including requests for amendments) and early site permit (ESP), design certification (DC), combined license (COL), standard design approval (SDA), or manufacturing license (ML) applications under 10 CFR Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," (including requests for amendments) associated with light-water reactors.

The principal purpose of the SRP is to assure the quality and uniformity of staff safety reviews. The SRP also makes the staff's review guidance for licensing nuclear power plants publicly available and is intended to improve industry and public stakeholder understanding of the staff review process. While NUREG-0800 has been developed for large-LWRs, selected information could be used in licensing reviews for non-light-water reactor designs.

Draft Revision 3 – July 2018

USNRC STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

This Standard Review Plan (SRP), NUREG-0800, has been prepared to establish criteria that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff responsible for the review of applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants intends to use in evaluating whether an applicant/licensee meets the NRC's regulations. The SRP is not a substitute for the NRC's regulations, and compliance with it is not required. However, an applicant is required to identify differences between the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for its facility and the SRP acceptance criteria and evaluate how the proposed alternatives to the SRP acceptance criteria provide an acceptable method of complying with the NRC regulations.

The SRP sections are numbered in accordance with corresponding sections in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.70, "Standard Format and Content of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)." Not all sections of RG 1.70 have a corresponding review plan section. The SRP sections applicable to a Combined Operating License (COL) application for a new light-water reactor (LWR) are based on RG 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)." These documents are made available to the public as part of the NRC's policy to inform the nuclear industry and the general public of regulatory procedures and policies. Individual sections of NUREG-0800 will be revised periodically, as appropriate, to accommodate comments and to reflect new information and experience. Comments may be submitted electronically by e-mail to NRO_SRP@nrc.gov.

Requests for single copies of SRP sections (which may be reproduced) should be made to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and Distribution Services Section, or by fax to (301) 415-2289; or by e-mail to DISTRIBUTION@nrc.gov. Electronic copies of this section are available through the NRC's public Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr0800/, or in the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html, under Accession No..ML15036A570.

Background

The NRC first issued the SRP in 1975 as NUREG-75/087. It was developed from many years of NRC experience in establishing safety requirements, and the NRC staff's experience in applying those requirements in evaluating the safety of various designs for nuclear facilities. The Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), in Office letter No. 2, dated August 12, 1975, established the SRP as a routine tool for the NRC staff to use in evaluating the safety of light-water nuclear power plant designs. Specifically, that Office letter described the SRP as representing "the integrated result of the hundreds of conscious choices made by the staff and by the nuclear industry in developing design criteria and design requirements for nuclear power plants" and "the most definitive basis available for specifying the NRC's interpretation of an acceptable level of safety for light-water reactor facilities.

Following an extensive revision program, the NRC reissued the SRP as NUREG-0800 in July 1981. This revision identified all NRC requirements that were relevant to each review topic, described how a reviewer would determine that safety requirements had been met, and incorporated a number of newly established regulatory positions, including those related to the Three Mile Island (TMI) Action Plan.

In 1991, the NRC established the Standard Review Plan Update and Development Program (SRP-UDP) to update NUREG-0800 for use in reviewing future reactor design applications. The staff subsequently issued an "Implementing Procedures Document (IPD)," NUREG-1447, in May 1992 to describe the SRP-UDP and establish procedures for updating the SRP. This update reflected the experience of the safety reviews conducted on design certification applications for evolutionary nuclear power plant designs. The SRP-UDP resulted in a draft revision to the entire SRP in 1996. The NRC staff used acceptance criteria and processes introduced in the 1996 draft in reviewing license amendment applications under 10 CFR Part 50 and ESP, COL, and DC applications submitted under 10 CFR Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, And Approvals For Nuclear Power Plants," provided that the changes embodied in it were based on new regulations or regulatory guidance approved through other means. In addition, new SRP sections issued as part of the 1996 draft were used as the primary means to evaluate new applications submitted under 10 CFR Part 52 (e.g., SRP Section 14.3, "Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria – Design Certification") since these sections represented the only guidance available for the given review area. However, the 1996 draft revision of the SRP was not approved and did not go into effect as a final SRP revision. Accordingly, 10 CFR § 52.79(a), which in 1996 referred to § 50.34(g), did not require applicants under 10 CFR Part 52 to address these new 1996 draft SRP sections in their applications. While 10 CFR § 50.34(g) (1996) likewise did not require applicants for CPs or OLs to address the new 1996 draft SRP sections, the 1996 draft SRP sections could also have been used for new applications for CPs and OLs under 10 CFR Part 50.

In 2005, the Commission directed the staff to revise applicable sections of the SRP, as well as other guidance documents and office procedures to ensure up-to-date guidance would be available for the next generations of staff who would be responsible for reviewing applications for new sites and new reactors. The staff was to develop an integrated and continuing plan for updating licensing review guidance and provide the plan, along with a schedule for completion, to the Commission, "Briefing of Status of New Site and Reactor Licensing," Staff Requirements

Memorandum (SRM) M050406, dated May 10, 2005 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML051300673). As a result, the staff issued a final update of the SRP in 2007.

Some of the changes incorporated into the 2007 revision included extending applicability of the SRP to 10 CFR Part 52 licensing processes; assigning review responsibilities by function (instead of by branch), with the responsible organizations maintained separately from the SRP itself to minimize impacts of office reorganizations; incorporating resolutions to unresolved safety issues (USIs) and generic safety issues (GSIs); consideration of operating experience insights from Generic Letters and Bulletins; and reconciliation of the TMI Action Plan items.

After issuing four COLs in 2012, the Office of New Reactors (NRO) issued a lessons learned report[1] recommending that the staff take several actions, including performing a yearly update of the SRP. The update to the SRP issued in 2007 and subsequent revisions to individual sections of the SRP incorporated lessons learned and added several additional areas from the most recent review of light-water reactor applications, clarifying previous guidance, and adding several additional areas covered by the staff's safety review, including:

- Guidance for reviewing allowed outage time extensions for onsite (Emergency Diesel Generators) and offsite power sources
- Guidance for reviewing the effects of open phase conditions in electric power systems
- Guidance for reviewing chilled water systems
- Guidance for reviewing access authorization operational programs
- Guidance for reviewing cyber security programs
- Guidance for reviewing fitness for duty programs
- Guidance for reviewing physical security hardware
- Guidance for reviewing the manual operator actions credited in diversity and defense-in-depth analyses
- Guidance for the regulatory treatment of non-safety systems (RTNSS) for passive advanced light-water reactors
- Guidance for reviewing strategies and guidance to address loss of large areas of the plant due to explosions and fires

[1] New Reactor Licensing Process Lessons Learned Review: 10 CFR Part 52. (ADAMS Accession No. ML13059A239)

- Guidance for reviewing the adequacy of design features and functional capabilities identified and described for withstanding aircraft impacts

Objectives of the SRP

The SRP is intended to be a comprehensive and integrated document that provides the reviewer with guidance that describes methods or approaches that the staff has found acceptable for meeting NRC requirements. Implementation of the criteria and guidelines contained in the SRP by staff members in their review of applications provides assurance that a given design will comply with NRC regulations and provide adequate protection of the public health and safety. The SRP also makes the staff's review guidance for licensing nuclear power plants publicly available and is intended to improve industry and public stakeholder understanding of the staff review process. It should be noted that the SRP is not a substitute for NRC regulations, and compliance with the SRP is not required.

In addition to documenting current methods of review, the SRP provides a basis for orderly modification of the review process. The NRC disseminates information regarding current safety issues and proposed solutions through various means, such as generic communications and the process for treating GSIs. When current issues are resolved, it is necessary to determine the need, extent, and nature of revision that should be made to the SRP to reflect new NRC guidance.

Scope of Review of License Applications – Initial Applications

The staff reviews a license application to determine whether an applicant has demonstrated compliance with the applicable requirements of 10 CFR Chapter I. Prior to the initiation of a review, the technical branch chief and assigned reviewer establish the scope and depth of the review to be performed, including the acceptance criteria and review guidelines to be used. It is important to note that because the staff's review constitutes an independent evaluation of the applicant's analysis, the staff may apply engineering judgment, with management approval, in determining the scope and depth of the review of particular aspects of an SRP section.

One example of an acceptable variation in the scope of a review is based on reliance on previous reviews in which the staff evaluated designs identical in all material respects to that of the design currently under evaluation or even based on the similarity of the design under review to one previously evaluated. Another example of an acceptable variation is an increased emphasis on certain aspects of the design review as a result of recent operating experience or consideration of unique design features that are not addressed in the SRP. Engineering judgment can also include the consideration of risk management in determining the depth of the review.

The SRP was originally written for 10 CFR Part 50 license applications. Under 10 CFR Part 50, the OL application is reviewed while the plant is under construction, allowing for the NRC to verify by inspection the final design information provided in the OL application. For DC and COL applications submitted under 10 CFR Part 52, the level of design information reviewed

should be consistent with that of a final safety analysis report (FSAR) submitted in an OL application.

Regarding the review of operational programs required by regulation for initial licensing (CP, OL or COL), SRP Section 13.4 contains a list of these programs. For a COL, the review will be performed consistent with guidance contained in SECY-05-0197, "Review of Operational Programs in a Combined License Application and Generic Emergency Planning Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria," and the related SRM dated February 22, 2006. Consistent with this guidance, the staff will review each program to ensure that the application completely describes the program and that the program, as described, satisfies the applicable NRC requirements. The staff will base a reasonable assurance finding for the program on the program description and the associated implementation schedule.

Scope of Review of License Applications – License Amendments

License amendment requests must be submitted to the NRC per 10 CFR 50.90, "Application for Amendment of License, Construction Permit, or Early Site Permit."[2] Specific requirements for license amendment requests for holders of CPs and OLs under 10 CFR Part 50, and ESPs, COLs, and MLs under 10 CFR Part 52, are located in 10 CFR 50.4, "Written Communications," and 10 CFR 52.3, "Written Communications," respectively.

Staff reviews are based on the applicable NRC regulations, the requirements in the license and any applicable NRC orders, and the safety analysis and design and operational programs described in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). When evaluating the acceptability of the proposed change to the design or operation of the facility or change to the license, the staff relies on NRC regulations and guidance provided in Regulatory Guides (RGs) and the SRP. As previously stated, because the staff's review constitutes an independent evaluation of the applicant's analysis, the staff may apply engineering judgement in determining the depth and scope of particular aspects of the review described in an SRP section, as appropriate, for the application being reviewed.

The SRP describes how the staff evaluates requests for NRC authorization under 10 CFR Parts 50 and 52, usually by referring to more detailed guidance in RGs or industry standards. The results of that evaluation are documented in an SE or SER.

Deviation from the SRP by Applicants

The SRP acceptance criteria generally describe one acceptable approach of meeting the regulations (but not necessarily the only approach). Applications may deviate from the acceptance criteria in the SRP. On March 10, 1982, the Commission approved 10 CFR 50.34(g), "Conformance with the Standard Review Plan (SRP)." The regulation 10 CFR 50.34(g) was subsequently renumbered as 10 CFR 50.34(h). Specifically, 10 CFR 50.34(h) requires an application for a light-water cooled nuclear power plant CP or OL

[2] The General Design Criteria (GDC) do not apply to plants for which the Atomic Energy Commission issued construction permits (CPs) before May 21, 1971, except to the extent a licensee of such a plant has committed in its FSAR to follow the GDC or some portion of the GDC. For these plants, the Principal Design Criteria (PDC) in the CP, which are discussed in the FSAR, apply. For amendment requests for plants to which the GDC do not apply, the review should follow the SRP in light of applicable plant-specific PDC. In addition, certain identified SRP acceptance criteria are not readily applicable to new light-water reactor designs that use simplified, passive, or other innovative means to accomplish their safety functions

docketed after May 17, 1982, to include an evaluation of the facility against the SRP in effect on May 17, 1982, or the SRP revision in effect 6 months prior to the docket date of the application, whichever is later. The evaluation must include an identification and description of all differences in design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for a facility and those corresponding features, techniques, and measures given in the SRP acceptance criteria. Where such a difference exists, the evaluation shall discuss how the alternative proposed provides an acceptable method of complying with those rules or regulations of the Commission, or portions thereof that underlie the corresponding SRP acceptance criteria. There are similar requirements for COL, ESP, DC, SDA, and ML applications, Staff guidance for reviewing the applicant's evaluation is contained in SRP Chapter 1.0, "Introduction and Interfaces."

Organization of the SRP

Each SRP section is organized as follows:

1. Review Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the primary review organization to ensure that the information in an SRP is updated in accordance with the requirements and specifications of NRO OI NRO-REG-300. Specific review responsibilities are discussed in detail in Chapter 4, "Review Organization," of NRO-REG-300.

Additionally, sections that are within the primary review responsibility of NSIR are located in the SRP Chapter 13, "Conduct of Operations" and Chapter 14, "Initial Test Program and ITAAC-Design Certification."

2. Areas of Review

The Areas of Review subsection describes the scope of review by the branch or branches having primary and secondary review responsibilities for the identified functional areas. Specifically, this subsection contains a description of the systems, components, analyses, data, or other information that is reviewed as part of the particular safety analysis report (SAR) section. Where the SRP section includes secondary review responsibilities, the areas of review are delineated by the review function. This could be done by annotating only the secondary review function, assuming the primary review function covers the rest. The Areas of Review subsection also contains a discussion of the information needed, or the review to be conducted by other organizations to permit the primary review branch to complete its review, as well as a list of applicable interfacing sections.

3. Review Interfaces

A review interface is the identification of a relationship between various SRP sections. A review interface describes an area (e.g., design, system, material, procedure) in another SRP section that is related to the assigned SRP section. There are various types of review interfaces that result in various interactions among reviewers.

The types of Review Interfaces and Associated Interactions are as follows:

a) Review interfaces are used to distinguish the scope of review between SRP sections in the same SRP chapter, or which are otherwise closely related. Typically these SRP sections are assigned to a single organization or even a single reviewer, so little or no interaction outside of the assigned review organization is required. Where closely related SRP sections are assigned to multiple organizations, and the interactions are well understood, the interactions consist of ensuring the reviews are properly sequenced, including the issuance of requests for additional information (RAIs) and SER inputs.

b) Review interfaces are identified where similar information is reviewed in multiple assigned SRP sections. The interaction is focused on ensuring consistency of review, including avoiding duplicative and conflicting RAIs.

c) Some sections of the site safety analysis report (SSAR) or FSAR rely on information in another section or chapter of the SSAR or FSAR. For example, a section of the SSAR or FSAR may provide the results of analyses that used parameters included in another section of the SSAR or FSAR. Where the review of these SAR sections is addressed by different organizations, review interfaces are identified in both assigned SRP sections. A change or open issue associated with the SSAR or FSAR section that has information relied on in another SSAR or FSAR section may impact both associated SRP sections, thus the need for reviewer interaction.

d) A section of the SSAR or FSAR may address an assigned SRP section in a general way while explicitly or implicitly pointing to another SSAR or FSAR section, such as an SSAR or FSAR section with a system description. Further, the SSAR or FSAR placement of this information in the system description may be unrelated to the SRP section associated with the SSAR or FSAR system description. The reviewer assigned to review the SSAR or FSAR section with the general description may need to review system descriptions in multiple SSAR or FSAR sections. Coordination between assigned reviewers is necessary so that the resolution of issues in one assigned SRP section does not impact an issue in another assigned SRP section.

e) A reviewer for one assigned SRP section may need a reviewer from a different organization to verify the assumptions, design features, or conclusions in the assigned SRP section, but the verification does not involve an SER or SE input. Review interfaces are identified for these verifications. Note that if an SER or SE input is typically a part of the verification, this interaction should be identified as a secondary review function and not as a review interface.

f) Several SRP sections have broad interactions with other SRP sections since their reviews cover broad portions of the plant or impact one or more operational programs. Notably, these reviews include, but are not necessarily limited to, technical specifications, instrumentation and control, human factors engineering, radiation protection (minimizing operational radiation exposures and shielding), and minimizing radiological contamination. These reviews may need broad

levels of coordination with multiple technical disciplines, including the use of a coordination meeting to facilitate an interactive review. Review interfaces, including, as necessary, custom review interfaces, are identified for the assigned SRP sections that need this type of coordination.

4. Acceptance Criteria

The acceptance criteria subsection identifies the applicable NRC requirements, including specific regulations, orders, and industry codes and standards referenced by regulations. The acceptance criteria also identifies applicable NRC guidance and other staff positions, such as Regulatory Guides. For new reactor license applications submitted under 10 CFR Part 52, the applicant is also required to address the proposed technical resolution of unresolved safety issues and medium- and high-priority generic safety issues that are identified in the version of NUREG-0933, "Resolution of Generic Safety Issues" (ADAMS Accession No. ML11353A382) that is in effect up to 6 months before the date of docketing of the application and technically relevant to the design (10 CFR 52.47(a)(21); 10 CFR 52.79(a)(20); 10 CFR 52.137(a)(21);10 CFR 52.157(a)(28)). The applicant must also evaluate the facility against the SRP in effect six months before the date of docketing of the application as required by 10 CFR 52.79(a)(41). Updates to SRP sections explicitly identify applicable operating experience and unresolved safety issues to be addressed in the specific section.

Requirements

This part of the acceptance criteria subsection identifies pertinent requirements in 10 CFR Parts 20, 50, 52, 73, and 100. The requirements listed should be all pertinent parts of sections setting forth requirements governing form and content of applications (e.g., 10 CFR 50.34, 10 CFR 52.47), as well as technical requirements (e.g., 10 CFR 50.46, 10 CFR 73.55).

Technical Bases

The SRP is not a substitute for the NRC's regulations, and compliance with it is not required. In general, the technical bases for the SRP acceptance criteria are stated in or can be derived from NRC regulations, including the General Design Criteria in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, and other NRC regulations that impose substantive design or operational requirements. However, the technical bases for some sections of the SRP are provided in Branch Technical Positions (BTPs)[3] or Appendices that are included in the SRP. These documents typically set forth solutions and approaches the staff previously determined to be acceptable for resolving a specific safety problem or addressing a specific design matter.

Further, other types of NRC guidance documents set forth the technical bases for particular matters. These types of guidance documents include, but are not limited to RGs, Commission policy as described in SRMs on Commission papers (SECY), NRC-approved or endorsed industry codes and standards, and certain technical reports (e.g., NUREGs, topical reports and corresponding safety evaluations). These solutions and approaches (including BTPs) are

[3] To the extent possible, references to BTPs should describe critical assumptions or guidance necessary for a comprehensive review of the technical area and should be referenced by the review procedures subsection for additional details. With the March 2007 SRP revision issued for COL application review, most of the BTPs from the 1996 draft version were revised and reformatted to include changes to position titles.

documented in this format to enable reviewers to take consistent and well-understood positions when similar matters arise in the review of various applications.

Lastly, this subsection also contains, as necessary, the technical bases for applicability of the requirements to the subject areas of review or the relationship of regulatory guidance to the associated requirement.

Technical Rationale

The technical rationale portion of the SRP identifies the specific applicable sections contained in 10 CFR Parts 50 and 52 whose requirements must be addressed in the licensing application.

5. Review Procedures

This subsection discusses how the review is conducted and is a step-by-step procedure to be used by the reviewer to obtain reasonable assurance that the applicable regulatory requirements have been met. For new reactor license applications submitted under 10 CFR Part 52, this subsection should address, as applicable, the staff review procedures for how insights from operating or equivalent international experience have been incorporated into the plant design.

6. Evaluation Findings

The evaluation findings subsection defines what the staff needs to achieve to develop a technical evaluation that is complete, accurate, and adequate to support a safety finding. For each SRP section, the staff's findings from its evaluation are incorporated into an SE or SER, as appropriate. For an SE, the evaluation documents the following:

1. A brief description of the proposed change described in the license amendment request,

2. The regulatory requirements related to the issue, and

3. An evaluation that explains the basis for the staff conclusion that the portion of the application reviewed satisfies the applicable regulatory requirements.

For an SER with open items, the evaluation documents the following:

1. an evaluation of whether or not the application provides reasonable assurance that applicable regulatory requirements have been met,

2. the matters for which additional information is expected to be forthcoming, such as anticipated responses to RAIs or application revisions,

3. the matters remaining unresolved,

4. deviations from the SRP in design and operational programs and the bases for the acceptability of such deviations.

For the final SER, the evaluation also discusses the closure of open items, if any, and describes the review and the aspects of the review that the staff emphasized in determining whether or not the application meets regulatory requirements. The SER also clearly identifies any requested exemptions from the regulations and the staff's bases for its determinations on these requests.

The staff should review NRC policies and requirements related to the development of SER input, such as Management Directive 12.6, "NRC Sensitive Unclassified Information Security Program," (ADAMS Accession No. ML41700603). NRR staff should also review applicable NRR Office Instructions regarding SE format and content (e.g., LIC-101 for license amendments and LIC-102 for relief requests).

7. Implementation

The implementation subsection informs the public regarding the NRC's plans for using the SRP section. The provisions in 10 CFR 50.34(h), and similar provisions in 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1)(xii), 10 CFR 52.47(a)(9), 10 CFR 52.79(a)(41), 10 CFR 52.137(a)(9) and 10 CFR 52.157(f)(30) require each application to include an evaluation of the facility against the SRP in effect 6 months before the date of docketing of the application, including all differences between the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for a facility and those corresponding features, techniques, and measures given in the SRP acceptance criteria.

Updating the SRP

The SRP will revised and updated on a 10-year cycle as mandated by the Commission in SECY-16-0009, Enclosure 1 - Re-baselining Recommendations (ADAMS Accession No. ML16028A212). The revisions will clarify guidance, correct errors, and incorporate new guidance. Office Instruction NRO-REG-300 provides guidance to the staff on updating SRP sections.

A revision number and publication date are printed on the lower right hand corner of each page of each SRP section. Since individual sections are revised as needed, the revision numbers and dates will not be the same for all sections.

References

- U.S. *Code of Federal Regulations*, "Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities, Part 50, Chapter 1, Title 10, "Energy."

- U.S. *Code of Federal Regulations,* "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," Part 52, Chapter 1, Title 10, "Energy."

- U.S*. Code of Federal Regulations*, "Material Status Reports," § 73.55, Chapter 1, Title 10, "Energy."

- U.S.Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Implementation Self-Assessment Review Report: 1 Year Post-Combined License Issuance," July 2013, ADAMS Accession No. ML13196A403.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “The New Reactor Licensing Process Lessons Learned Review,” April 2013, ADAMS Accession No. ML13059A239.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants: Light Water Reactor (LWR) Edition,” NUREG-0800. https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr0800/

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants,” NUREG-75/087, May 1980, ADAMS Accession No. ML042080088.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants,” Revision 2, NUREG-0800, July 1981, ADAMS Accession No. ML033580033.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), Office letter No. 2, dated August 12, 1975.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “NRC Action Plan Developed as a Result of TMI-2 Accident,” NUREG-0660, ADAMS Accession Nos.: ML072470526 & ML072470524.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRR SRP Matrix December 2016, ADAMS Accession No. ML17003A027.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Standard Review Plan Update and Development Program (SRP-UDP),” 1991.
- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Implementing Procedures Document (IPD),” NUREG-1447, May 1992

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Briefing of Status of New Site and Reactor Licensing,” Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) M050406, May 10, 2005, ADAMS Accession No. ML051300673.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Maintaining and Updating the Standard Review Plan,” Revision 1, NRO-REG-300, ADAMS Accession No. ML15322A278.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, SRP Update Review Responsibilities, Primary, Secondary and Review Interface Matrix, ADAMS Accession No. ML16237A047

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition),” Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.206, 2007. https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/reg-guides/power-reactors/rg/01-206/

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Relationship Between the General Design Criteria (GDC) and Exceptions to the GDC Allowed by Technical Specifications,”

Memorandum from T. Murley to J, Taylor, August 1, 1993, ADAMS Accession No. ML12115A279.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Resolution of Deviations Identified During the Systematic Evaluation Program,” SRM for SECY-92-223. September 18, 1992, ADAMS Accession No. 12256B290.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Generic Issues Program,” Management Directive 6.4. http://www.internal.nrc.gov/policy/directives/toc/md6.4.htm

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission “Licensee Oversight Program,” primarily from the “Abnormal Occurrence Reporting Procedure,” Management Directive 8.1. http://www.internal.nrc.gov/policy/directives/toc/md8.1.htm

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “NRC Incident Investigation Program,” Management Directive 8.3. http://www.internal.nrc.gov/policy/directives/toc/md8.3.htm

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “NRC Generic Communications Program,” Management Directive 8.18. http://www.internal.nrc.gov/policy/directives/toc/md8.18.htm

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Generic Communications Affecting Nuclear Reactor Licensees”, plant-specific backfits or 10 CFR 50.54(f) demands for information, NRR Office Instruction LIC-503.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Management of Facility-Specific Backfitting and Information Collection,” Management Directive 8.4. http://www.internal.nrc.gov/policy/directives/toc/md8.4.htm

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “The Rulemaking Process,” Management Directive 6.3. http://www.internal.nrc.gov/policy/directives/toc/md6.3.htm

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “NRC Sensitive Unclassified Information Security Program,” Management Directive 12.6, ADAMS Accession No. ML41700603.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Rulemaking Procedures,” NRR Office Instruction LIC-300, September 30, 2008, ADAMS Accession No. ML082460533.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Regulations Handbook, NUREG/BR-0053, Revision 6, ADAMS Accession No. ML052720461.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC Order EA-03-009, “Reactor Pressure Vessel Head and Vessel Head Penetration Nozzles.”

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Results of the Standard Review Plan Reviewer Matrix Working Group - Definitions of Primary Reviewer, Secondary Reviewer, and Review Interfaces,” dated December 16, 2014, ADAMS Accession No. ML13303B260.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, “Resolution of Generic Safety Issues,” NUREG-0933, ADAMS Accession No. ML11353A382.

- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Management Directive 12.6, “NRC Sensitive Unclassified Information Security Program,” ADAMS Accession No. ML41700603.

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT

This SRP contains voluntary guidance for mandatory information collections covered by 10 CFR Parts 50 and 52 that are subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et. seq.). These information collections were approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), under control numbers 3150-0011, and 3150-0151 respectively. Send comments regarding this information collection to the Information Services Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by e-mail to Infocollects.Resource@nrc.gov, and to the Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, NEOB-10202, (3150-0011 and 3150–0151) Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

PUBLIC PROTECTION NOTIFICATION

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the document requesting or requiring the collection displays a currently valid OMB control number.