

**Industry Comments Received on May 21, 2015 on NRC staff initiative to update RG 1.206,
"Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants"**

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation	NRC Staff Response
1. General	<p>How will NRC efficiently maintain alignment between RG 1.206, NUREG-0800 Standard Review Plan sections, and design specific review standards (DSRSs)? Applicants have noted a challenge to ensure application content matches various acceptance criteria in all applicable documents (at all times). We anticipate that this concern will apply to the development of the RG 1.206 appendices as well.</p>	<p>Consider how best to reference the SRP or DSRS sections and whether additional guidance, that could become out of sync, is necessary in RG1.206. Include general guidance in both RG 1.206 and NUREG-0800 to recognize and provide criteria for dealing with the misalignment that is potentially unavoidable.</p>	<p>Guidance on detailed technical content is no longer included in the draft guide (DG). See discussion section for current planning this change.</p>
2. C.1 Application Transmittal Letter	<p>NRC should not need to dictate the content of transmittal letters unless there is some reason to do so based on lessons from prior Part 52 applications. We are unaware of any lessons learned in this area and are concerned about the proliferation of apparent regulatory demands that have no tie to safety.</p> <p>The draft states that the transmittal letter should “identify information, data and calculation packages that formed the basis for conclusions in the application and the availability of these to NRC staff.” It should be acceptable to state in the transmittal letter that the information, data, and calculation packages are available for audit. This is important because it is not reasonable or practicable to <u>identify</u> this information in the transmittal letter.</p>	<p>Remove guidance for the transmittal letter.</p> <p>If guidance for the transmittal letter is retained, remove requirement for transmittal letter to identify information, data, and calculation packages.</p>	<p>Guidance on transmittal letter in Section C.1 has been modified in response to this comment.</p>

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation	NRC Staff Response
3. C.1 Part 2 – Safety Analysis Report	Part 2 does not include an option to submit an integrated safety analysis report (SAR) that leverages prior licensing experience with the same design and promotes standardization. It is reasonable to anticipate that future COL applicants may want to take the most recent final safety analysis report (FSAR) from an already licensed plant of the same standard design basis for their application. This would already have Design Certification Document (DCD) information and generic license amendments incorporated.	Consider the option and potential efficiencies of review to be gained with an application containing an integrated safety analysis report. See attached mark-up of Part 2.	Section C.1 reflects a change related to a DC or ESP that is included in a COL rather than incorporated by reference. Section C.2.7 provides some discussion of NEI's proposed integrated FSAR.
4. C.1 Part 2 – Safety Analysis Report	In Table 2, Note 1, delete "safety-relevant." It is sufficient to say "design-specific information sufficient to support issuance of a COL." "Safety-relevant" is not used in 10 CFR Part 52 and could add to the confusion of the terms "safety-related," "safety-significant," "important to safety," etc.	Delete "safety-relevant."	Recommendation accepted. Term has been deleted.

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation	NRC Staff Response
<p>5. C.1 Part 4 – Technical Specifications</p>	<p>The Part 4 description of generic technical specifications (GTS) and technical specification bases (TSB) appears to differ from 10 CFR Part 52 where the GTS and TSB are treated as one entity during the design certification (DC) application phase. The appendices of the DC rules define generic technical specifications as "...the information required by 10 CFR 50.36 and 50.36a for the portion of the plant that is within the scope of this appendix"; 10 CFR 50.36 specifies both technical specifications and bases. When "Generic Technical Specifications" or "GTS" is used, it inherently includes the associated bases. For the GTS, the technical specifications (TS) and the TSB are not separated. The DCD contains GTS, which by Part 52 definition also includes the generic bases.</p>	<p>Ensure Part 4 is clearly consistent with 10 CFR Part 52 when describing the TS and TSB. The references to GTS (i.e., DCD technical specifications) in the first, second and third paragraphs of Part 4 should be clarified. This clarification could be achieved by adding the following to the first paragraph:</p> <p>"DCs contain generic technical specifications (GTS). Throughout this guidance, when referring to the DC, it should be understood that technical specifications (TS) and technical specification bases (TSB) are encompassed in the GTS. Per the design certification rule appendices of Part 52, for the GTS, the TS and TSB are not separated. A COL applicant referencing a DC and departing from any portion of the GTS will need to include an exemption</p>	<p>Recommendation accepted. C.1.4 revised accordingly.</p>
<p>6. C.1 Part 4 – Technical Specifications</p>	<p>The information requested in the introductory section (e.g., how and why the TS differ from the standard technical specifications (STS), description of changes to the STS, reasons for new requirements) appears to be a significant expansion of what was required in RG 1.206 Rev. 0. The TSB are required in the application by 10 CFR 50.36 to provide the bases or reasons for the TS. Documenting the entire approach to developing TS may help the NRC reviewer, but it should not be an expectation in the Reg Guide. It may be more appropriate as a pre- application activity and/or a subject for audit.</p>	<p>Reconsider the expansion of information required regarding the process of developing TS.</p>	<p>Revised guidance accordingly in Section C.1.4.</p>

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation	NRC Staff Response
7. C.1 Part 4 – Technical Specifications	Why does the introductory section for a DC application need a list of topical reports that support administrative control reporting requirements, or is this referring to the licensee-controlled document that is referenced in the TS? GL 88-16 requires the TS to identify the topical reports used to determine the core operating limits. GL 96-03 requires the pressure and temperature limits methodology be incorporated by reference into the TS. Therefore, they are already embedded in the TS.	Reconsider the requirement to list topical reports in the TS introductory section.	Revised guidance accordingly in Section C.1.4.
8. C.1 Part 6 – Security Plans	Part 6 is currently listed as not applicable to design certification applications (DCA). Given the design attributes of small modular reactors (SMRs), vendors could potentially submit the Physical Security Plan as part of the DCA. Additionally, we understand that the NRC staff is planning a SECY paper to the Commission with options to consider including design requirements for cyber security at the design certification stage. The option for a DCA to include security plans should not be precluded by the language of the Reg Guide.	Part 6 should state that DCAs may, but are not required to, include aspects of Security Plans within the scope of design certification, e.g., cyber security plans, security informed design features, and a physical security plan. Allowing for this during the design certification could provide for standardization and greater certainty in security staffing and operational cost for the utility pursuing a COLA.	Revised.

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation	NRC Staff Response
9. C.1 Part 7 – Exemptions, Departures, Variances	Similar to Part 2, Part 7 does not include an option to submit an integrated SAR that leverages prior licensing experience with the same design and promotes standardization. If a future COL applicant wants to take the most recent FSAR from an already licensed plant of the same standard design and use that as the basis for their application, it would likely include the same exemptions, departures, and variances to the extent that they apply.	Provide guidance to ensure efficient review of applicable exemptions, departures, and variances that have already been dispositioned for a previously licensed plant of the same standard design. See attached mark-ups of Part 2 and Part 7.	Please see C.2.7 which discusses the potential referencing of departure and variances from other COLs and COLAs.
10. C.2.1 Pre-application Activities	Is the development of a DSRS now fee-billable as stated on page 4 of this draft section?	Clarify the intent and provide basis for any change from current NRC policy.	Current with practice on NuScale and on mPower, DSRS development is fee-billable.

Input Received on May 21, 2015 for Consideration in the Staff's Development of Revised RG 1.206 Guidance

Affected Section	Input	Recommendation	NRC Staff Response
<p>1. Section C.2.10 Change Processes (Tier 1, 2, and 2*)</p>	<p>In addition to reflecting the outcome of current interactions related to the scope of Tier 2* information in future DCAs, this section should align with C.1 Part 7 – Exemptions, Departures, Variances guidance to ensure efficient review of applicable exemptions, departures, and variances that have already been dispositioned for a previously licensed plant of the same standard design.</p>	<p>Ensure that new Section C.2.10 addresses the concept that departures determined to not require prior NRC approval should not be evaluated by the staff during the COLA review and that NRC oversight can be accomplished by audits of the applicant's change process. See attached mark-up of Part 7.</p>	<p>Revised C.1.7 and C.2.14 and added C.2.7 on the design centered review approach.</p>