MEETING SUMMARY

Public Meeting May 3, 2016
Regulatory Guide 1.206 Revision Project

On May 3, 2016, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff conducted a Category 3 public meeting at NRC headquarters in Rockville, MD, regarding the staff's proposed revision to Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.206, "Applications for Nuclear Power Plants," which provides the format and content guidance for Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," applications. The purpose of this meeting was to provide a venue for stakeholders to provide input to the NRC staff in the development of guidance on select topics to be included in the revised RG 1.206.

The public announcement at http://meetings.nrc.gov/pmns/mtg?do=details&Code=20160581 includes links to the agenda, staff presentations, and draft guidance documents. All meeting materials are publicly available through the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). An official transcript of the meeting, which includes identification of the participants, is attached and is an integral part of this meeting summary.

BACKGROUND

The RG 1.206 was issued in 2007 as applicant guidance in anticipation of the submittal of new combined license (COL) applications under 10 CFR Part 52. The "New Reactor Licensing Process Lessons Learned Review: 10 CFR Part 52" (ADAMS Accession No. ML13059A239) identified the need to revise RG 1.206. The NRC staff initiated the revision in 2014 with the overall intent to institutionalize lessons learned from prior and ongoing 10 CFR Part 52 application reviews and to provide updated guidance to future applicants.

In September 2014, the NRC staff held a public meeting to present the proposed RG 1.206 revision initiative and to solicit stakeholder feedback. The May 3, 2016 meeting was the latest in a series of public meetings conducted by the NRC staff to engage stakeholders and acquire feedback in the revision of RG 1.206.

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

The NRC staff presented an overview of the RG 1.206 revision initiative and an update of the draft guidance being developed for Sections C.1 and C.2. The NRC staff explained the venue for the meeting as a facilitated interactive discussion among the meeting participants and the staff for development of draft guidance for select Section C.2 topics. As identified in the agenda, the topics included: (1) C.2.4, Application Acceptance Review, (2) C.2.5, Application Review & Requests for Additional Information, (3) C.2.6, COL Application Referencing Design Certification and/or Early Site Permit, (4) C.2.10, Applicability of Consensus Standards, (5) C.2.12, Operational Programs for COLs, (6) C.2.13, 10 CFR Parts 30, "Rules of General Applicability to Domestic Licensing of Byproduct Material," 40 "Domestic Licensing of Source Material," and 70, "Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material," materials licenses for COLs, and (7) C.2.18, Limited Work Authorization. The staff also discussed the planned restructure of the RG 1.206 revision to relocate the technical information related to safety analysis reports from RG 1.206 to NUREG-0800.

The Section C.2 topics were presented by the staff and each topic engendered discussion among the NRC staff and meeting participants. The official transcript documents the details of the discussions.

ACTIONS

The NRC staff will continue the initiative to revise RG 1.206 and may conduct additional public meetings to engage stakeholders in the revision process as needed. The NRC staff will prepare guidance for the presented Section C.2 topics consistent with the discussion documented in the transcript.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
OFFICE OF NEW REACTORS
DIVISION OF ENGINEERING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND ADVANCED REACTORS
+ + + + +
APPLICATIONS FOR NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
REGULATORY GUIDE 1.206 [REVISION]
+ + + + +
PUBLIC MEETING
+ + + + +
TUESDAY
MAY 3, 2016
+ + + + +
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The Public Meeting convened at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, Room O4B06, 11555 Rockville Pike, at 1:00 p.m., Barbara D. Hayes, Project Manager, presiding.

PRESENT:
BARBARA D. HAYES, Project Manager, NRO/DEIA/NRGB
BRUCE M. BAVOL, NRO/DNRL/LB4
MANNY M. COMAR, NRO/DNRL/LB4
JOHN H. FRINGER III, NRO/DNRL/EPB
BILLY C. GLEAVES, NRO/DNRL/LB4
DONALD C. HABIB, NRO/DNRL/LB4
PAUL B. KALLAN, NRO/DNRL/LB4
SARA BROCK KIRKWOOD, OGC/GCHEA/AGCNRP
MERALIS PLAZA-TOLEDO, NRO/DSEA/RGS1*
KATHLEEN ANN PODOLAK, NRO/DEIA/ARPB
SHIRLEY S. XU, NMSS/MSTR/MSLB

ALSO PRESENT:
KATI AUSTGEN, NEI
JANA BERGMAN, Curtiss-Wright
PATRICIA CAMPBELL, GE-Hitachi*
ZACHARY HARPER, Westinghouse*
TOM HICKS, Southern Nuclear*
HOWARD MAHAN, Southern Nuclear
STEVEN POPE, NuScale Power
RUTH THOMAS, Environmentalists Inc.*
DALE WUOKKO, Global Energy Management*

*present by teleconference

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opening Remarks and Introductions	
Barbara Hayes.....	5
Overview: Regulatory Guide 1.206 Revision	
Barbara Hayes.....	10
Guidance: 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70	

Materials Licenses for COLs
Barbara Hayes..... 15
Guidance: Applicability of Consensus
Barbara Hayes..... 21
Guidance: COL Application Referencing DC and/or ESP
Barbara Hayes..... 23
Guidance: Application Review and Requests for Additional Information.
Barbara Hayes..... 40
Guidance: Application Acceptance Review
Barbara Hayes..... 46
Guidance: Operational Programs for COLs
Barbara Hayes..... 51
Guidance: Limited Work Authorization
Barbara Hayes..... 57
Review and Action Items
Barbara Hayes..... 60

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page
Adjourn
Barbara Hayes..... 61

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:02 p.m.)

MS. HAYES: So, it's one o'clock. I think most of the folks who need to be here are here. If not, we will start a little slow anyway.

There is a sign-in sheet. I think most people have signed in at this point. And there are agendas for any folks who would like a copy. There is also a feedback form here in the front for anybody who wants to do it the old fashioned way.

So, let's get started. So, this is a public meeting related to applications for nuclear power plants, Regulatory Guide 1.206 and its revision.

We want to welcome and thank everybody for coming. This is a Category 3 meeting, which means that we are trying to have good interchange and get public input in a general brief format for this particular meeting. So, the purpose of the meeting is to provide input to NRC staff on the development of this guidance related to select topics that are going to be included into Reg Guide 1.206 revision.

And we have it set up as a teleconference and we have several members who are on the telephone. So, please speak clearly. And for those folks who are on the telephone, please, if you do not understand something that is being said, please speak up so we can make sure that you do understand.

All of the reference documents for this public meeting are available on the website. The most convenient way to address it is to be on the public notice portion of the website because the presentation is directly linked there, all of the seven regulatory topics that we will be discussing are directly linked there, as well as the agenda.

So, please note we do have this session being transcribed. The purpose of the transcription is to get an accurate record of people's comments so that we can incorporate them into our future work.

Please speak clearly for the transcriber, as well. And as we go around the room to introduce ourselves, if you have an interesting spelling for your last name, please spell it out for him. And every time you have a comment, please just mention your name because that will assist in getting an accurate record.

Let's see, some administrative items. This is a Category 3 public meeting. Everything is up on the website. We do ask that everybody sign in. We do request that people provide public meeting feedback either through this form or on the website.

A number of you have security escorts. When you leave the meeting make sure that you have a security escort out of here as well, since we are above the first floor at this point.

The restrooms are directly across the elevator, gents to the left, ladies to the right.

In the case of an emergency evacuation, we will move

as a group. So, let's work together to follow the directions.

I think at this point it is a good time for introductions. Let's start with folks in the room. I will introduce myself first. I am Barbara Hayes. I am with the Office of New Reactors. I am the Project Manager for the revision of Reg Guide 1.206. And actually perhaps we will go around the room and do NRC staff and then do stakeholder participants after that. So, Shirley.

MS. XU: This is Shirley Xu. I am working in the Materials Safety Licensing Branch on the Part 30, 40 licenses.

MR. GLEAVES: Billy Gleaves, Senior Project Manager in the Office of New Reactors, Division of New Reactor Licensing.

MR. KALLAN: Paul Kallan, Senior Project Manager, Office of New Reactors, Division of Licensing.

MS. KIRKWOOD: Sara Kirkwood, Office of the General Counsel.

MR. BAVOL: Bruce Bavol, Project Manager, AP1000 Design, Office of New Reactors.

MS. HAYES: Kat.

MS. PODOLAK: Kat Podolak, NRO.

MS. HAYES: Kat has been very helpful.

And stakeholders?

MS. BERGMAN: Jana, J-A-N-A, Bergman, Curtiss-Wright.

MR. POPE: Steve Pope, NuScale Power.

MR. MAHAN: Howard Mahan, Southern Nuclear.

MS. AUSTGEN: Kati Austgen, NEI.

MS. HAYES: So, that leave our folks on the telephone.

MR. WUOKKO: Dale Wuokko, W-U-O-K-K-O, Global Energy Management.

MS. CAMPBELL: Patricia Campbell, C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L, with GE-Hitachi.

MR. HARPER: Zach Harper, Westinghouse. H-A-R-P-E-R.

MS. PLAZA-TOLEDO Meralis Plaza, NRC.

MS. HAYES: Okay, I think that completes the go around.

I think at this point let's talk about the agenda shortly. All right, move to the next slide.

So, we have seven regulatory topics that we will be talking about and we will also start with a brief overview of the overall revision process. I have set it up so that there are approximate times for each one of the sections that we will be talking about. So, it is a little bit jam-packed but I think most of the folks who are present have hopefully taken a look at what has been provided on the website already in terms of these draft regulatory topics that will be discussed and that we will probably get pretty quickly to any discussions that are appropriate.

I have given a fairly short break because the schedule is compact. I think we do have enough room in the schedule so that we can have sort of free flow during each topic so we don't have to wait until the end of

any presentations. And in fact, we will try and go fairly light on the presentations. For those who have read the --

MR. HICKS: This is Tom Hicks, Southern Nuclear.

MS. HAYES: I'm sorry, did we get that?

MR. HICKS: Tom Hicks with Southern Nuclear is here.

MS. HAYES: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Hicks. You know the focus of the workshop is for stakeholder input at this point. The regulatory topics that we will be discussing have been reviewed internally by four different offices by relevant technical reviewers, subject matter experts. And they have been reviewed by counsel.

So, if we can move to the next one, we will start with just a brief overview.

So, Regulatory Guide 1.206 Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants from 2007 was a comprehensive, fairly far-reaching document that touched on a lot of different issues that were helpful to Part 52 Nuclear Power Plant Applicants. The audience was, indeed, the applicants and the community at large. And it complemented what, at about the same time, is a major revision to the standard review plan, NUREG-0800.

As part of later lessons learned, reported in the New Reactor Licensing Process Lessons Learned Review, RG1.206 was identified as being in need of being updated at this point. That was back in 2013 or so that that document came out and by 2014, we had initiated a revision of 2007, the 2007 document.

The Reg Guide 2007 is, indeed the current reg guide and we are scheduled to complete revision sometime in the 2017 calendar year.

Just a moment, John Fringer has joined us who is with the Environmental Policy Branch -- what does EPB stand for?

MR. FINGER: Projects Branch.

MS. HAYES: Environmental Projects Branch of DNRL. So, in 2014 we started and we are actually on our fifth public meeting right now. The project is fairly well along. I think the next slide will talk about some of the changes that happened in October, when we did have a major change in the scope of the project.

Can we move to the next slide, Kat, please?

So, over on the left-hand side is the original intended format for the overall revision of the regulatory guide and over on the right is what was decided upon back in October 2015.

The September 2014 version, basically, very much followed what was in the scope and content of the regulatory guide from 2007 and it included a great deal of technical detail about FSAR and SSAR elements that should be included. This material is quite redundant with what is in the SRP and in 2015, in the fall, there were discussions and decisions made that that redundancy was not advantageous going forward.

We presented the new scope at the October 25th public meeting, and the revised reg guide will now focus more on administrative issues. So, it includes an introduction, discussion, guidance as far as application format and content, and then application regulatory topics, which is what we are currently working on now, as well as implementation.

The bulk of what was in the 2007, if you are talking about pounds and pages, really would have been in these appendices. That material is now not going to be included and we have another project that is focused on how to have a reconciliation regarding some of the technical information and the current role of the SRP, the NUREG-0800.

So, we have captured all the information that was prepared during that earlier phase of the Reg Guide 1.206 revision process and we have a project manager who is focusing on appropriate approaches and options to doing that reconciliation.

So, that leaves us, on the right-hand side, a much smaller regulatory guide. So far we have drafted materials for the introduction, discussion, and implementation, as well as the portion of the guidance that is on format and content. These have been discussed in previous public meetings.

The remainder of the work is related to application regulatory topics, of which there are 18. In the original 2007 guide, there was an application regulatory topic section and it included I think far less than 18, I think it is around 12 or 14. And basically some of those are still in here. There are some new ones but the old ones have also been revised.

So, we are currently going through a process of revising and adding to these application regulatory topics. That is, basically, where we are right now.

Any questions or discussions?

Okay, great. Let's go to the next slide, then.

So, this is what the Table of Contents for the Revised RG 1.206 is expected to look like. We have introduction, discussion and implementation, regulatory guidance. We have Section C.1 Application Format and Content, which is basically administrative and we are working through C.2, which is Application Regulatory Topics.

Next slide please.

So, looking at our regulatory topics, you will see that the check marks are ones that have been drafted, discussed at public meetings and basically we are working to make sure that we have addressed public comments appropriately.

The ones that we are talking about today have the big red arrows and there are seven of them.

There are four that have neither checkmarks nor red arrows. Those are basically associated with ITAAC, RCOL, and SCOL, Application Electronic Submittal, as well as Finalizing Licensing-basis Information for COLs. Those are still being drafted. It is unclear

exactly what they are going to look like or when they are actually going to be ready for processing. Once we are at that point and we have done our internal work, then we will be making decisions in terms of whether it is appropriate to reach out and have more discussions via a public meeting like this one.

Generally, public meetings with regulatory guides are most often after the DG, the Draft Guide, has actually been issued. And so we will wait and see what we have with those final four topics.

The seven topics we are talking about today are actually fairly mature guidance based on lessons learned and updating of previous information that we have had out there publicly. And they have all been reviewed internally by technical reviewers and also by OGC. And so we are looking for input on those now.

So, with that, I think we are ready to move to the first regulatory topic, unless there are some questions at this point.

Okay, let's take the first one. So, this is on 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70 Materials Licenses for COLs. A question for those on the phone. Anybody who has not got a copy of the presentation, please let me know. The ML number is available on the Public Notice Website.

Each one of these topics are introduced via the ML number associated with the draft regulatory topic that is being discussed plus a little bit of information regarding the history of the development of the particular regulatory topic.

So, we have ML16119A019 and this is a new topic that was not addressed in Reg Guide 1.206, in the original 2007 version, the current version.

So, just a brief overview. Additional licenses under Parts 30, 40 and 70 are needed by applicants in order to support facility construction and operation. These are related to source material, byproduct material and special nuclear materials.

When NRC does its review of the COL application, it does it for compliance with the requirements of Part 52 but also requirements with Part 50, as well as other regulations, such as 30, 40, and 70.

So, this regulatory topic basically describes the recommended approach for COL applicant to request appropriate authorizations under those other portions of Title 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70. So, that is the intent of the material.

And just a note in terms of our internal review. This topic was, indeed, reviewed by different branches within NMSS. This is probably the sole area where NMSS has reviewed regulatory topics.

So, guidance. The COL applicant should request authority for activities that are regulated under these other Parts 30, 40 and 70 and they should do it according to their needs. So, each site and each design certification is going to have different needs

in terms of what sort of licenses you will actually need. So, it is really not a one-size-fits-all situation.

You would request the relevant 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70 materials licenses to be incorporated into the COL application and into the COL. And you should identify and describe and request those material licenses in Part 1, "General & Financial Information."

It is important to provide the information that is sufficient to meet the applicable requirements in 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, and 70 in the SAR and other parts of the COL application.

So, I think the last bullet point is probably the most important one to keep in mind is that your application must satisfy the other authorizations that you are requesting in that same application.

Historically, large light water reactor applications have needed authority for receiving an possessing SNM and reactor fuel, receive, possess and use of byproduct source and SNM and sealed neutron sources, et cetera. So, there is a number of different potential uses and authorizations that you will be required to have.

So, next slide, please.

So, the guidance or the regulatory topic includes some examples of license conditions that would be appropriate. It also describes operational programs to support the Parts 30, 40, and 70 and includes associated milestones. These include radiation protection programs for COLs, Fire Protection Program; a Security Program, including physical security, Safeguards Contingency Programs, Training and Qualification Program; Fitness for Duty Program; non-licensed plant staff training; and Special Nuclear Material Physical Protection Program.

So, there is information in the regulatory guide regarding all of those matters. So, next slide, please.

So, the guidance includes Parts 30, 40, and 70 materials and use with detailed information requirements for before and after the 52.103(g) finding. It also includes guidance regarding application information needs regarding those licenses. And there is also a final note in the regulatory topic regarding applicant's potential for requesting an exemption associated with Material Control and Accounting Program for SNM materials. That exemption actually has been done by other applicants in the past successfully and basically requirements that allow you to use requirements that are consistent with a Part 50 license.

So, that basically runs through a list and description of what all is in the regulatory topic that has been developed so far. And I will open it up for discussion, questions.

So, are there any questions or comments? Anyone on

the phone?
MR. HICKS: This is Tom Hicks, Southern Nuclear. I have a question about the licensing conditions.
MS. HAYES: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?
MS. AUSTGEN: I think that was in another section.
MR. HICKS: Question about licensing conditions. Are you now saying that the applicant has to put licensing conditions in the application? I think in the past there was no requirement to put those in there. The applicant should be requesting licensing conditions now? You know licensing conditions are issued by the staff.
The question, I guess, is whether an applicant "should" or "may" request license conditions, generally, in this area but in other areas as well.
MS. AUSTGEN: Yes, so I'm not sure what exactly the text said in C.2.13 but later when we get to C.2.12 license conditions, it talks about the applicant should propose license conditions for the staff and the others. While that may be beneficial, it sort of sounds like it is now a requirement, at least in that context, which I know we are not there yet. But maybe that is better phrased that the applicant may propose license conditions.
So, I can't recall if this section had the same should language.
MS. HAYES: Well, I think the comment is clear. It has to do with the process by which license conditions are being prepared. And in terms of 30, 40, and 70, materials licenses, the point is that one would expect that there would be license conditions and there are some examples provided within the regulatory topic. But I think your point is well taken in terms of describing that process of developing that.
Okay, if there are no other questions, we can move to the next regulatory topic.
So, C.2.10, Applicability of Consensus Standards. The ML number is available for this regulatory topic. This was not addressed in Reg Guide 1.206 (2007). This came out of some earlier discussions at some of the public meetings and I believe NEI had said they are interested in having some description of it. In October there was more discussion.
At this point, we have written something that is really very brief and fairly concise. It focuses on the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 and what that requires NRC to do and how NRC has responded.
So, NTTAA basically requires that NRC consult with voluntary consensus standard bodies; participate in the development of consensus standards when in the public interest and compatible with agency mission, authorities, and priorities, and resources; and also to use consensus standards as a means to carry out agency policy objectives and activities.
So, one of the key documents is described briefly on the next slide, which is NRC's Management Directive

6.5, which describes our policy of being involved with all stakeholders in the regulatory development process; participation in the development of consensus standards that support NRC's mission; use of consensus standards developed by voluntary consensus standards bodies consistent with NTTAA; and also a note that NRC reserves the right to apply conditions on the use of those consensus standards. So, Management Directive 6.5 basically is an overall policy description.

And then if we go to the next slide, which summarizes our current use of standards, NRC applies consensus standards in numerous aspects of its regulatory activities. It incorporates them by reference in NRC regulations and it also accepts them in regulatory guidance documents, such as guides, regulatory issue summaries, NUREGs and standard review plans.

Next slide please.

COL applicants also use standards. They may apply consensus standards accepted by the NRC in its application. If the standard is not accepted in NRC regulations or a regulatory guide, then the COL must justify its use within the COL application.

Section C.2.6 of this same draft regulatory guide 1.206 provides guidance for standards incorporated by reference or applied as a general reference in the COL application.

So, that basically describes what is in the regulatory topic. It is a mere two pages but I think it concisely lays out the key ingredients that are important.

So, discussion, comments, questions?

MS. AUSTGEN: I don't think we had any comments on 2.10. We will have some to discuss on 2.6.

MS. HAYES: Okay, very good. Anyone on the phone? Okay, let's move to the next regulatory topic which is C.2.6, which is a COL application that references DC and/or an ESP.

So, this is indeed an update to Reg Guide 1.206, the 2007 version and it basically uses information from various different portions of the current version. So, that includes C.III.1, C.III.2, C.III.6, which is information needed for a COL application referencing certified design, information needed for COL referencing an ESP and a certified design, and also a section on combined license application timing.

So, in terms of an overview, the COL application can reference an Early Site Permit and/or a Design Certification. In both cases, it acquires regulatory finality regarding the site as provided by different portions of the CFR.

In addition to the finality -- would you move to the next slide, please -- requirements for FSAR and Environmental Reports change substantially. So, when referencing a Design Certification, the applicant must demonstrate now that the site characteristics fall within the permissible site parameters.

When referencing an ESP, the applicant must demonstrate that the design falls within design parameters. So, there is a requirement that they must reference the DC and/or reference the ESP and then demonstrate that there is sufficient additional information through COL action items, et cetera, to demonstrate that the characteristics fit within the parameters that are required. This isn't to say that there are not additional requirements beyond this interface issue and the referencing of the DC or the ESP.

So, after this, the presentation actually gets quite wordy. So, instead of going through all of it, the topics that are really described within the regulatory guidance include materials referenced, FSAR information, design acceptance criteria, COL action items, design interfaces, and conceptual design completion for Design Certification, departures and variances, exemptions, and then there is discussion of conformance with NUREG-0800 and regulatory guides, as well as the completeness and accuracy of a DC or ESP and what to do when there are questions arising related to that.

And then finally, there is a section discussing referencing of ESP or a DCD that is concurrently under review.

So, I don't know that we really want to go through all of the individual ones but maybe we will ask first if there are questions about the materials referenced issue.

MR. HICKS: Tom Hicks from Southern Nuclear. Do you want me to do it, Kati, or are you going to do it?

MS. AUSTGEN: Well, since you didn't have any on material referenced, right, I think we can go to the next slide. Your first comment, Tom, was on the FSAR information.

MR. HICKS: Yes, I was actually looking at the draft guide, going page by page.

MS. AUSTGEN: Right.

MS. HAYES: Okay, let's move to the next slide, then. And it sounds like there is a comment or a question on the FSAR information.

MS. AUSTGEN: Yes.

MR. HICKS: What page are we on now?

MS. AUSTGEN: We are on slide 20 and your comment is at the bottom of page 2 for C.2.6.

MR. HICKS: Oh, yes, on the format.

Again, this is Tom Hicks with Southern Nuclear. On the bottom of page 2, there is a statement that says that the organization and format of the FSAR, for a COL application referencing a Design Certification or ESP should be consistent with NUREG-0800. I think what we see clearly here is the COL application referencing a Design Certification that the FSAR requires the Design Certification format, which may not be the same as whatever the latest version of

NUREG-0800 is. I think that might be required in Part 52, I think.
But the statement here on page 2 is not consistent with what the regulations say.
Hello?
MS. HAYES: We heard you. We are absorbing your comment.
MS. AUSTGEN: Diligently taking notes, Tom. Don't worry.
MR. HICKS: That's the comment on page 2 of the draft guide.
MS. HAYES: I think we have it. I'm not sure we have any response at this point.
MR. HICKS: Okay.
MS. HAYES: We can actually pull it up on the screen, too.
MR. BAVOL: And what you are saying is -- this is Bruce Bavol, NRC -- the line item that says should be consistent with NUREG-0800.
MR. HICKS: Yes, the second sentence in the bottom paragraph.
MR. BAVOL: And what did you recommend? What was your recommendation?
MR. HICKS: Well, for a COL that references the Design Certification that format and content of the FSAR, I believe it is in Part 52. And I believe, I don't have it in front me, there is an actual regulation in Part 52 that says that apart from Design Certification format, that they actually have to take a departure. So, that is what COL application will follow for format and content, not necessarily what is in NUREG-0800.
MR. BAVOL: That's a reasonable comment.
MS. HAYES: Yes, absolutely. Thank you very much for that comment.
Any other comments on FSAR information?
So, then any comments on design acceptance criteria?
MR. HICKS: Yes, we have on page 3, do you want to pull it up? It is the second paragraph under "Design Acceptance Criteria."
MS. HAYES: Shall we pull it up, Tom?
MR. HICKS: For people to see it in the room. I have it in front of me.
MS. HAYES: Okay, pull it up.
MR. HICKS: So, do you have it?
MR. BAVOL: Not yet.
MS. AUSTGEN: We're getting there but a couple of folks have hard copies. So, why don't you go ahead.
MR. HICKS: Okay, well the second paragraph says that -- I'll read it. A COL applicant referencing a Design Certification which used DAC should include detailed design information in the design areas where DAC were used. Alternatively, the COL applicant may justify the continued use of DAC in the COL application and provide implementation plans.
Okay, right now under Part 52, if you incorporate a

Design Certification, you incorporate the whole thing. That includes Tier 1. It includes any of the DAC that are in Tier 1.
So, per the regulation, a COL applicant would be incorporating the DAC that are in any Design Certification and that, essentially, has finality and there is no requirement for a COL applicant to justify the use of something that is in the Design Certification or a requirement to provide detailed design information to supplement the Design Certification. There is no requirement for that.
And so it looks like this paragraph is changing Part 52 in a reg guide.
MR. BAVOL: So what essentially you are saying is the COL applicant is referencing Design Certification not all the DAC and the specifics.
MR. HICKS: No, they are. The FAR reference to AP1000 Design Certification for example, there are DACs in Tier 1. So, that would be incorporated into my COL application. There is no reason for me to justify continuing to have those in there. I mean that is as far a Part 52.
And I don't have to take them out, either. There is no requirement to take them out. There is no requirement to add detailed design information. All these statements are completely outside the Part 52.
MS. AUSTGEN: So, I think we have seen this in some other related discussions and for us, it looks like this is going beyond the current policy as stated in the SECY.
So, with respect to DAC, we would recommend keeping language similar to what is currently in Reg Guide 1.206.
MR. HICKS: You know a COL applicant may choose to put an exemption in a COL application to remove the DAC and then provide the detailed design information to go along with that, if they want to do that. That is an option but is certainly not a requirement.
MR. BAVOL: Under the exemption requirements.
MR. HICKS: Yes, they can take an exemption, take the DAC out, essentially reference the DAC that had been approved say to the previous plant and that is only an option. That is not a requirement to do that.
MR. BAVOL: That is a reasonable comment.
MS. HAYES: Okay, any other comments on the Design Acceptance Criteria? COL action items?
Let's move to the next slide.
So, design interfaces for both DC and ESP. Okay, anyone from the phone? Tom?
MR. HICKS: No, I have no comment.
MS. HAYES: Okay, conceptual design information for DCs?
Departures or variances?
MR. HICKS: This is Tom Hicks with Southern Nuclear again. I have a comment on the departures section of the draft guide.

This discussion in the departure section talks about COL applicants requesting a departure that requires Commission approval and there is a paragraph that talks about that. My only comment is that maybe you ought to have another paragraph for departures that do not require prior NRC approval and have a discussion about that. And this is related to discussion in Section C.2.14 on departures. But the two of them are missing from here.

MR. BAVOL: Yes, that section, it is also mentioned at the bottom of page 5 of C.2.14, has explanatory information.

MR. HICKS: All right. So, that was just a comment on this one, mentioning that.

MS. HAYES: Okay, great. Thank you very much.

Exemptions?

Comments on conformance with NUREG-0800?

MR. HICKS: Yes, we have a comment on page 7 of the draft guidance on this topic.

It is under the NUREG-0800 as well as the reg guide section. They say the COL applicant that include departures from the referenced Design Certification should evaluate the facility for conformance with the NUREG-0800 revision that is in effect six months prior to the submittal date of the application and there is a similar statement for a reg guide.

And my comment is that that is not always true. I will give you an example. If you are making a departure to a specific description in the Design Certification and let's say with Vogtle, many times for large license amendment requests, when you evaluate that license amendment request, you will reference design reg guides and so forth and standards that were used in the Design Certification for that system. You don't necessarily upgrade to a newer standard or a newer reg guide. You are talking about design information.

So, you upgrade to a later version when you are evaluating that departure from that system description.

MR. BAVOL: So, you are looking at the six months prior to submittal. So for an LAR, you are looking at the change to the existing design certification.

MR. HICKS: Yes, I mean the process is saying that just the part about COL application, using it as an example and then you have this amendment request that had been done for Vogtle. It is the idea that you are not going to -- I think you know the concept is the same. You have got to use whatever the standard is, that the Design Certification applies to that system, you know whatever year that standard is.

If it is similar to site-specific area to the design, then you would use the latest reg guide or standard but for something that clarifies the Design Certification, I believe you should use what is in the Design Certification.

MR. GLEAVES: This is Billy Gleaves, NRC. I am confused by the comment because I think this talking about a COL application versus someone that already has the COL. And the licensing process for someone that has a COL is definitely different than this process and the requirements that you would have to meet when you file a license amendment versus a COLA application. So, I am not sure where the comment is falling.

MS. AUSTGEN: Let me try it, Tom.

MR. HICKS: Well, in your COL application, you are going to make a departure to some system, I think in that system in the Design Certification, maybe it is not the reg guide which would apply the standard. This has a certain revision date to it.

You know if you are not doing departure, you are not going to have a system to change some piece of it. You are not going to say now that piece of that system now has a different year of the standard applied to it, as opposed to the rest of the system, which has standards defined by the Design Certification.

MS. AUSTGEN: Let me try. Hold on, Tom. I was waiting to see if it sunk in or not. So, let me try this.

When the applicant is referencing a Design Certification, the Design Certification already contains information about the design and it was designed to a specific standard and it likely references a specific year. So, now the applicant is coming in with their COL application. They are referencing the Design Certification and they have identified something within that Design Certification that they want to take a departure from. But the system, as a whole, is designed to that original standard revision. And so when they take their departure, they are looking at the departure with respect to that original revision and they are not doing a wholesale upgrade of the system to the latest, as may be described in NUREG-0800, at that point.

MR. GLEAVES: Just for the scope of that departure you would have to go into -- not for the entire system. Is that what you are trying to make distinguished between whether it is a piece part or whether it is the whole system? Is that what you are trying to distinguish?

MS. AUSTGEN: We are trying to distinguish that, assuming it is just a piece part, you are not going to take that piece part and apply a completely different code version to it just because that is what is currently in NUREG-0800. You are going to look at it still based upon the code of design and the Design Certification.

MR. HICKS: Yes, I mean a lot of times the reg guide that the Design Certification references will describe a particular methodology or something that was used to evaluate maybe the seismic qualification

of a system or something. Okay?
And so when a COL applicant takes a departure to that system for some reason, they are going to apply -- when they evaluate whatever the departure is, they are going to apply the same methodology that was used in the Design Certification, which in all of the cases is based on a reg guide revision or a standard, some kind of national standard with a year revision. And that is what the applicant would use to evaluate the departured system. They are not going to a later standard on the books. They are not going to go to the next revision of a reg guide.
The statement implies that it is black and white and it is not.
MR. GLEAVES: Are you referring to design finality? Because the Design Certification has finality for only the information that is part that is certified in the rule. If you make changes from that, and I assume what you are talking about in your COL application, that that is what the departure, the change from the Design Certification, I don't see why finality would protect you in that case. You are going to have to --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. HICKS: In the Design Certification rule, actually Tier 2 information has finality. And actually some departures have finality as well and that is defined in the Certification Rule of Section 6 of the Certification Rule. But that is really a whole other discussion.
MR. KALLAN: This is Paul Kallan.
MR. HICKS: I think that you guys need to take this one back and think about it. I think methodology and so forth are defined in Design Certification are the ones that COL applicants have to use to evaluate departures to those Design Certification systems.
MR. KALLAN: This is Paul Kallan. Although we are talking about an application that hasn't gone through. It is not approved yet. So, yes, you would -- I don't see how you could just take a small departure and say it is only for this section. You would have to apply whatever change to the whole application and not just one little portion. That is different for a LAR.
MR. HICKS: I didn't quite hear all that comment. Can you speak up a little louder or get closer to the microphone?
MR. KALLAN: What I was stating was this is an application that hasn't gone through yet. And so yes, if you had a revision, it would apply to the whole application and not just one little portion of it. If it was compared to when you are doing -- you are comparing it to an amendment and that is just a small little portion, but it has already been approved.
MR. HICKS: Well, I don't necessarily -- I mean you

have to distinguish between talking about new site-specific information. Let's say you had a site-specific building and that building you have to apply whatever the latest reg guide, NUREG-0800, sections that apply. I'm not talking about that.
I'm talking about something that was in the Design Certification that the COL applicant is departing from. And in most cases, the departure can be very specific to an individual system. In fact, they usually are.
But I think we need to go back and think about this a little bit maybe. I mean the staff should go back and think about it, about how we apply the Design Certification methodology to the COL applicant, the COL application and how that was done in the past.
MR. BAVOL: That's probably a good idea. We will take that question back on that paragraph.
MR. HICKS: Yes, and there is a similar one under reg guides as well.
MR. BAVOL: Right.
MS. HAYES: So, I think that was a great discussion. Are there other comments about completeness and accuracy of referenced DC and ESP? It sounds like there is not, at this time.
What about DC and/or an ESP application that is under review and is being referenced in a COLA that it is going through currently?
So, I think those are the main issues for the regulatory topic that we are discussing. But is there anything else? Because this is just sort of the highlights. Any other discussion of COLA applications referencing DC and/or ESP?
Great. Thank you very much for those comments and for the discussion.
We are actually at about the halfway point and I think we are ahead of schedule by close to an hour, about 50 minutes. Do you want to take a break now or do we just want to forge onward? It seems like we are moving more quickly than expected.
Move forward, okay, that is what I figured.
So, let's move to Section C.2.5, which is Application Review and Requests for Additional Information. This is a new topic that was not addressed in the 2007 version that is currently applicable.
It derives -- well, there are two relevant documents that are worth referencing here. The first one is the NRC Office Instruction NRO-REG-101, "Processing Requests for Additional Information," Revision 1. It is publically available and it provides guidance and instruction to NRO staff, in terms of the RAI process. It is useful for applicants to take a look at this to get an understanding of what the expectations are on our side for the rationale for and the format, et cetera for these. And that is helpful to applicants.
There is also a much shorter staff pamphlet that is, "Request for Additional Information Best Practices,"

that is a much shorter read and says similar information and provides some very short examples.
So, just briefly, the staff technical review for COL, ESP or DC often require additional information. Typical RAIs address clarifications, omissions, and technical acceptability.
The RAI process is a structured, formal, and regulation-based process. The relevant documents that I just mentioned are both useful for understanding what an applicant can expect in the process.
So, the next slide.
In terms of guidance, communications are very important. Proactive communications are key to an efficient review. There is correction. The regulatory topic refers to an attachment. There is no attachment since it was basically absorbed into the rest of this particular regulatory topic. So, there is no attachment there.
So, proactive communications are for the benefit of both NRC staff, as well as the applicant. Technical discussions via phone, meetings, or correspondence are public. If there is any sensitive information, those will basically be treated in a closed portion of that same public discussion.
There is also non-public conference calls that are permitted basically to clarify RAI information and discussion before an RAI is actually issued formally.
An important topic here is the discussion of the Project Manager role. The project manager is the primary interface between NRC staff and the COL applicant -- the applicant and the PM manages all conversations.
Next slide, please.
The applicant should know that there is RAI-related information that is readily available from previous applications and that RAIs are processed always electronically going forward. We track RAIs electronically and RAIs will be sent by email either as an attachment or directly in the body of the email.
In order to effectively respond to the RAI, it should be not only timely but it should be also comprehensive. And if there are other portions of the application that are somehow affected by the response or changed, it is best practice to include that in the response, rather than going piecemeal.
It is also important to identify if any portions of the FSAR or other documents need to be revised and if so, to provide a markup.
So, those are the highlights. So, questions? Comments?
MS. AUSTGEN: Yes, I have got one comment. Overall, this looks very good and I think we are already seeing improvements in the RAI process.
We would note that one more thing that could be added in here to help us keep on track and continue to see

progress is including some information about expectations for the RAI to include a regulatory basis for the request or a specific tie back to why it is needed for the staff's evaluation that can maybe help us avoid scope creep down the line with future RAIs.
MS. HAYES: Okay, well noted.
MS. KIRKWOOD: Just to clarify, you want the staff to include the regulatory basis.
MS. AUSTGEN: Right.
MS. KIRKWOOD: And I don't disagree with that comment. I wanted to be careful that this remain guidance to applicants and not an instruction to the staff about how to --
MS. AUSTGEN: Right.
MS. KIRKWOOD: But I agree with you that an RAI should include that.
MS. AUSTGEN: And perhaps it is maybe in the communication section or what the applicant should expect of their Project Manager. You know if they are the gatekeeper for making sure the staff provided a regulatory basis and then the applicant doesn't see that or doesn't recognize it if it is there, then that is a question they should ask their project manager. I think you could get that concept in there as guidance for the applicant.
MR. BAVOL: Word it so it is expected from the applicant.
MS. HAYES: Any other discussion?
MS. CAMPBELL: This is Patricia Campbell on the phone. I just want to ask if this ADAMS ML12220A577 is NRC staff pamphlet, which is in your slide and the last reg guide. It doesn't come up as a covered document.
MR. BAVOL: On slide 26, the --
MS. CAMPBELL: What is the ADAMS ML12220A577, the second bullet under relevant documents.
MR. BAVOL: "Request for Additional Information Best Practices?"
MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.
MS. HAYES: We'll look into that.
MS. CAMPBELL: I would let it slide -- if it were just there, it might not be a big deal but it is also in the reg guide. So, how would it be used by licensees if it is not public?
MS. HAYES: Thank you.
MS. CAMPBELL: Or applicant -- I'm sorry -- applicant or licensee.
MR. BAVOL: We'll check that.
MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.
MS. KIRKWOOD: Were you all able to see that?
MS. AUSTGEN: I honestly did not try to find it.
MS. HAYES: Yes, it was referenced in the previous attachment. In fact, the attachment contained the information from it.
MS. KIRKWOOD: Right. I just assumed it was public.
MS. HAYES: So did I.

MS. AUSTGEN: I vaguely remember discussing this I think back in October or whenever we previously discussed this RAI section conceptually what it might contain. I vaguely remember the staff mentioning this pamphlet and us going, oh, we have never heard of that or seen that.
MS. HAYES: Well, we will look into that. Thank you very much for that comment.
MR. BAVOL: And I'll bet you that is where you are going to find the regulatory requirements for RAIs.
MS. KIRKWOOD: It is, yes.
MS. CAMPBELL: So, it would be nice to have it as a public document.
MR. BAVOL: If possible, yes.
MS. HAYES: Yes, I'm assuming that the Office Instruction also says the same thing but --
MS. KIRKWOOD: Not as clearly.
MS. HAYES: And I don't think it includes the examples.
MS. KIRKWOOD: Right. So, I think the thinking was that we referenced the pamphlet and that was the guidance to the staff but that applicants can see it. Well, apparently not. And then this would be more of the guidance to the applicants.
MS. HAYES: Okay, thank you very much.
So, shall we move on to Application Acceptance Review, C.2.4?
So, this updates Reg Guide 1.206 Section C.IV.1 Combined License Application Acceptance Review Checklist. And also another important reference here is the publicly available office instruction entitled "Acceptance Review Process for Early Sit Permit, Design Certification, and Combined License Applications," NRO-REG-100. That reference is actually very valuable for applicants to look at.
So, the acceptance review is basically for completeness and sufficiency. It does not constitute a detailed review of the application itself. NRC staff looks for significant technical deficiencies and these are defined as missing information that makes the staff unable to evaluate the detailed technical information against acceptance criteria.
Now, there are two issues there, in terms of the ability to do the review and then the ability to also predict a time line that is appropriate for it.
If it is not a significant technical deficiency, it is a minor technical deficiency, there is an expectation that those issues can be resolved through the RAI process in a reasonable time frame. That is really kind of the cutoff there.
So, next slide, please.
So, NRC staff has 60 days for their review. I will talk about the second bullet point here. The communications is actually an ongoing process and the applicant should be prepared to respond to any staff initiated communications in a timely and accurate

manner and proactively initiate communication as well with the staff, as appropriate.
Staff initiates and maintains communication throughout the process and the applicant actually has the opportunity to address potential acceptance issues during that acceptance review.
The top bullet point relates to results from the docketing decision. There are three possible ones. One is that the application is acceptable and is docketed. And with that one the applicant will get a proposed schedule for the actual review that the applicant is expected to be responsive to.
With an application that is not acceptable for docketing, the applicant can withdraw the application and resubmit at a later time after addressing some of the information insufficiencies that are needed, the major technical deficiencies.
And then number three, an application is acceptable for docketing but it is contingent specific supplemental information.
So, those are the highlights of this regulatory topic. I will open it up for discussion at this point.
Do you have comments, questions? Anyone on the phone?
MS. THOMAS: Hello?
MS. HAYES: Hello.
MS. THOMAS: Yes, I had a question.
MS. HAYES: And who is this please?
MS. THOMAS: This is Ruth Thomas and I have been listening trying to follow the agenda. And I am not sure where you are on the agenda. It is hard to hear some of you. And I don't see anything on the agenda about asking questions or getting clarification.
MS. HAYES: So, Ms. Thomas, we are discussing application acceptance review on the notice on the public website, there is a document that you can click on that shows you the presentation, as well as this particular regulatory topic.
MS. THOMAS: Well, you see, I don't have a computer. So, I am following the printed out agenda and I'm not sure who is discussing it and the people who are on in the workshop. Are they discussing, are they members?
MS. HAYES: These are regulatory topics that have been drafted for inclusion in a revision to Regulatory Guide 1.206 for applications for new nuclear power plants. And the regulatory topics that are being discussed today are available publicly, at this point, in draft form and we are looking for stakeholder input in these draft regulatory topics. They have been reviewed internally at this point and we are now seeking stakeholder input and we have various representatives and participants who are on the phone, as well as here in person discussing them. We are going one by one through these draft regulatory topics and we are currently in the part of the meeting

that is on C.2.4, which is referred to as Application Acceptance Review.
MS. THOMAS: I would like to have sent to me what is under discussion. Has that been widely circulated?
MS. HAYES: It was made publicly available recently in preparation for this particular meeting.
Do we have Ms. Thomas' contact information?
MR. BAVOL: Yes. Ruth, this is Bruce Bavol. I am going to send you a hard copy of the presentation material.
MS. THOMAS: Oh, that would be great. You have got my address?
MR. BAVOL: I do.
MS. THOMAS: Who is this that is talking now? I have trouble recognizing your voices.
MR. BAVOL: Okay, I will take care of that.
MS. THOMAS: And what is your name?
MR. BAVOL: Bruce Bavol.
MS. THOMAS: Oh, Bruce Bavol. Yes, okay. Yes, that would be great. It sure would be helpful.
MR. BAVOL: Okay.
MS. THOMAS: And you have got my address?
MR. BAVOL: I do.
MS. THOMAS: Okay, thank you. I will continue listening.
MS. HAYES: Thank you very much Ms. Thomas.
So, I think we were finishing up with Application Acceptance Review. Were there any questions or comments on this section?
MS. THOMAS: Thank you.
MS. HAYES: You are very welcome.
So, we are moving on to Section C.2.12, which is Operational Programs for Combined Licenses. The draft regulatory topic is on the website and this basically represents an update to Reg Guide 1.206, the 2007 version, Section C.IV.4, Operational Programs.
There are two key documents of importance here. One is SECY-05-0197 "Review of Operational Programs in Combined License Applications and Generic Emergency Planning Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria," from 2005 and there is also a section of the standard review plan NUREG-0800 Section 13.4.
So, next slide, please Kati.
So, operational programs, as we use the terminology here within the setting, these are operational programs that are required by NRC regulations that are reviewed by NRC staff in a COL application review and they are inspected by NRC staff subsequent to license issuance to verify implementation. License conditions do apply here and there is a format that is recommended for that.
I will start the discussion now. I assume the previous discussion that you had about the approaches to license conditions would apply to this section, as well.

MS. AUSTGEN: Yes. So, this was where we had identified that in the draft document C.2.12 under the heading License Conditions, the second paragraph begins, "COL applicants should propose." And again, while we agree that that is likely and probably beneficial, it starts to sound like a requirement and we don't believe there is a requirement there. So, perhaps "may" is a better phrasing there.

MS. HAYES: Okay, duly noted. Thank you very much. So, the NRC staff uses the applicable sections of NUREG-0800 to review the COL applicant's identification and descriptions of the operational programs and in order to make a reasonable assurance finding. Staff will include a license condition on subsequent implementation milestones and that is when specific implementation requirements are not specified already in the regulations.

So, next slide.

So, program description and implementation. And here it says COL applicants should fully describe each program, including implementation and milestones in the FSAR. And the primary focus here is to not have to have ITAAC; address action items that are coming from the referenced DCD; and NUREG-0800 identifies operational programs that need to be described in the FSAR, the guidance on format and content, and description of the technical information which should be included in the FSAR.

There is additional information in this regulatory topic related to operational program options, which is to incorporate by reference the operational program description that is in the relevant DCD and also to use the described operational program approach in order to describe any additional plant-specific programs beyond that.

So, those are the high points of this draft regulatory topic and I will open it up for discussion, comments, questions.

I see nothing here in the room. Anything on the phone?

MS. THOMAS: Did you ask about being on the phone?

MS. HAYES: I was just asking if there are any comments or questions from people who are on the telephone regarding the regulatory topic on operational programs for combined licenses.

MS. THOMAS: This is Ruth Thomas. This is, then, a revision to the whole Regulatory Guide 1.206. Is that right?

MS. HAYES: Yes, that is correct. This is work that is underway to provide a revision to Regulatory Guide 1.206, based on lessons learned in recent years. And the work will culminate in a draft guidance that then goes through the regular regulatory review process that we have for regulatory guides. So, it is not a rulemaking but it is, indeed, a process of vetting it publicly and going through all of our regular reviews

for a regulatory guide.
MS. THOMAS: Now and how was it established this needed to be revised? Was that at the workshop that was held?
MS. HAYES: There have been a number of public meetings. Some of them have been referred to as workshops related to the revision of Reg Guide 1.206 but I think the rationale for doing the changes, doing the revision really comes out of a licensing lessons learned activity that was circa 2012 or so or 2013 that resulted in a report in 2013.
MS. THOMAS: Was that driven by the priorities what was received, what issues were received for your attention? Is that was this is connected to?
MS. HAYES: No, I probably would not characterize it as such. I think this is bringing up guidance that was developed in 2007 for applications that were actually expected under Part 52 and we have had lessons learned in terms of reviewing and preparing applications and so it is not a prioritization or a risk-based approach or anything like that.
MS. THOMAS: Well, is it lessons learned connected to Fukushima?
MS. HAYES: No, not specifically. It is more lessons learned associated with the Part 52 application process.
MS. THOMAS: Oh, the application of what took place?
MS. HAYES: No, the application for nuclear power plants.
MS. THOMAS: I take part in meetings all the time and I don't know how I missed, of course you have some of them that conflict but also, others in our group. And this is -- you said that there was several public meetings where this particular guidance was outlined and discussed.
MS. HAYES: That is correct. We have been working on a revision to this regulatory guide since 2014 and the information --
MS. THOMAS: Since March 15th?
MS. HAYES: I'm sorry, what?
MS. THOMAS: You have been working on it since March 15th, is that what you said?
MS. HAYES: No, since 2014. And all of the information from previous public meetings is available on the website and you will be receiving from Bruce some information on this particular meeting and the topics that are being discussed.
MS. THOMAS: And how were arrangements made for people to receive this if they didn't have the internet? Why do people think that everybody is able to get on the internet? There are places that -- maybe I am living too far in the country, but there are places around here where even if you had a computer, you couldn't get on --
MS. HAYES: I think those are separate issues and I would like to return to the agenda. We currently

have one last regulatory topic to discuss and that is Limited Work Authorizations.
The draft text is available and there are -- it basically updates the Final Interim Staff Guidance COL/ESP-ISG-04, on the "Definition of Construction and on Limited Work Authorizations." That actually replaced what was in Reg Guide 1.206 from 2007.
So, just a brief overview. LWA process allows COL applicants and applicants for and holders of ESPs to request approval to perform certain limited construction activities before the issuance of the COL.
What is important here is the definition of construction activities, as it relates to LWA. They must fall within NRC's regulatory authority because they have a reasonable nexus to radiological health and safety or the common defense and security.
There are other activities that are considered "preconstruction" within the language that we use here and they do not need any limited work authorization from NRC.
Move to the next slide, please.
MS. THOMAS: Is this Barbara Hayes?
MS. HAYES: Yes, it is.
MS. THOMAS: Well, should I direct my concerns and the concerns of others about public involvement to you?
MS. HAYES: Absolutely. That would be fine. I would welcome that.
MS. THOMAS: Okay. Let's see, I think your email address --
MS. HAYES: It is available and it sounds like you have it already, barbara.hayes@nrc.gov.
MS. THOMAS: Okay. Well, thank you.
MS. HAYES: You're very welcome.
So, guidance, it is important to note that issuance of an LWA has no bearing on the issuance of the underlying Combined License.
A COL applicant must submit a request for an LWA and that can be either as part of a complete application or it can be a partial application. When related to an ESP, it can be part of an application. An Applicant can include a request for an LWA as part of the complete ESP application or as an amendment to an existing ESP application.
So, additional guidance. A Safety Analysis Report -- I'll just go through it -- the SSAR and the FSAR must demonstrate that the limited work authorization activities will be conducted I accordance with applicable Commission requirements.
The Environmental Report for an LWA shall include elements listed in the guidance, such as description of the activities to be conducted, statement of the need for the activities, description of environmental impacts, description of mitigation measures, discussions of the reasons for rejecting additional

mitigation measures that were considered, and description of the process used to identify new and significant information for an ESP holder.

An important component is also a Site Redress Plan. The primary purpose is to address activities that were authorized under the LWA and it describes the scope of actions to be taken following the suspension of construction. Please note that this applies only to activities that are considered construction and requiring LWA. For any other ones that are considered "preconstruction," this does not apply to them.

Furthermore, the Site Redress Plan is not considered a substitute for a thorough evaluation of environmental impacts from mitigation measures associated with the LWA.

Those are the basic components that are in the draft regulatory topic. I would like to open it up for discussion, comments, questions, at this point.

I see nothing coming from participants who are in the room. How about folks who are on the phone?

It sounds like we have basically completed the agenda. I think the last item on the agenda would be follow-up action items but I think they are fairly self-evident. We really appreciate the input from everybody who has contributed in this meeting. There is an opportunity to follow-up with additional input during the upcoming period of time.

My contact information is available to all and I would be the point of contact for any further input.

I would like to thank everybody for their participation and thank our other NRC staff members for their support at this meeting. Thank you very much, everyone.

And this closes the meeting.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:29 p.m.)

1
2
3

4