

**STATUS REPORT ON THE LICENSING ACTIVITIES
AND REGULATORY DUTIES OF THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION**

For the Reporting Period through August 2018

Table of Contents

RESOURCES

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Status of Project Aim and additional activities | 1 |
| 2. Incorporation of five-year workload planning into policies and procedures | 4 |
| 3. Staffing | 4 |
| 4. Actions taken or planned to reduce corporate support costs, including efforts to reduce office space | 17 |
| 5. Status of efforts to provide greater transparency, timeliness, and itemization in invoices to applicants and licensees, including any progress toward electronic invoicing and payment | 19 |
| 6. Research activities initiated during the reporting period | 20 |

URANIUM RECOVERY

| | |
|--|----|
| 7. Information regarding major uranium recovery licensing application reviews | 20 |
| 8. Status of major uranium recovery licensing actions | 22 |
| 9. Status of minor uranium recovery licensing actions | 24 |
| 10. Status of Wyoming Agreement State application | 25 |
| 11. Specific actions planned to improve the efficiency of reviews conducted for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act | 25 |
| 12. Progress of the pilot project on flat fees for uranium recovery licensees | 26 |

LICENSING

| | |
|---|----|
| 13. Information regarding license amendment reviews for operating reactors, new reactors, and uranium recovery licensees | 28 |
| 14. Information regarding decommissioning transition reviews | 39 |
| 15. List of Technical Specifications Task Force travelers under review | 39 |
| 16. Actions planned and/or taken to ensure that the Technical Specifications Task Force traveler process achieves the regulatory efficiencies that were initially projected | 40 |
| 17. Information regarding license renewal review applications | 41 |
| 18. Status of ongoing license renewal reviews | 44 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 19. Status of NRC’s readiness to review applications for subsequent license renewal | 45 |
| 20. Status of subsequent license renewal reviews | 46 |
| 21. Information regarding power uprate application reviews | 48 |
| 22. Status of power uprate application reviews | 49 |
| 23. Information regarding requests for additional information (RAIs) issued by various offices/programs | 50 |
| 24. Status of specific actions taken or planned to ensure greater discipline, management oversight, and transparency in the RAI process | 56 |
| 25. Actions taken to enhance the integration of risk information across the agency’s activities to improve the technical basis for regulatory activities, to increase efficiency, and to improve effectiveness | 58 |
| 26. Status of power reactor transition from analog to digital instrumentation | 63 |
| 27. Actions taken and planned to prepare to review industry requests to use accident tolerant fuel in existing reactors | 66 |
| 28. Actions taken and planned to improve the quality of cost benefit analyses conducted in association with new requirements, backfit analyses, or rulemaking | 66 |
| 29. Status of the revised guidance to clarify the use of qualitative factors | 69 |
| 30. List of all final generic regulatory actions issued in the last three years | 70 |
| 31. List and brief description of all facility-specific backfits issued during the reporting period | 79 |
| 32. Twelve-month and three-year rolling averages for CRGR formal and informal reviews | 79 |
| 33. Status of the application of the backfit rule in licensing and inspection programs across the agency | 80 |
| 34. Actions taken and planned to address recommendations made by the CRGR in its report “U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s Implementation of Backfitting and Issue Finality Requirements” | 82 |
| REACTOR INSPECTION | |
| 35. Reactor Oversight Process findings for year-to-date and three-year rolling metrics | 84 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 36. Percentage of Final Significance Determinations made within 90 days for all potentially greater-than-green findings, monthly for one-year rolling metrics and annually for the past 10 years | 85 |
| 37. Instances where Inspection Manual Chapter 609, Appendix M, "Significance Determination Process Using Qualitative Criteria," has been applied in the Reactor Oversight Process Significance Determination Process | 85 |
| 38. Status of potential changes to the Reactor Oversight Process and identification of any changes that may require Commission approval prior to implementation | 86 |
| 39. Progress toward utilizing an industry consensus document as a means of accomplishing predictability and consistency in operability determinations | 86 |
| 40. Information regarding Design Basis Assurance Inspections completed in the last three years | 86 |
| 41. Status of the holistic review of engineering inspection procedures and any actions taken and/or planned because of the review | 91 |

NEW REACTORS

| | |
|---|-----|
| 42. Funds budgeted, resources spent, and total Part 170 fees billed each year for the past ten years for the Office of New Reactors | 91 |
| 43. Information regarding each design certification, combined license, and early site permit application reviewed since 2007 | 91 |
| 44. Summary of the status of ongoing design certification, combined license, and early site permit application reviews | 98 |
| 45. Information on ITAAC reviews for reactors under construction | 101 |
| 46. License amendments for reactors under construction | 104 |
| 47. Budgeted resources and actual expenditures each month for the past 24 months for reactors under construction | 104 |
| 48. Summary of the status of licensing and inspection for Vogtle Units 3 and 4 | 105 |
| 49. Actions taken in the past three years or planned to improve the efficiency of new plant reviews | 106 |
| 50. Unresolved policy issues regarding the licensing of small modular light-water reactors | 106 |
| 51. Unresolved policy issues regarding the licensing of advanced non-light water reactors | 112 |
| 52. Status of preparations to review non-light water reactor applications | 112 |

RESOURCES

1. Will Project Aim 2020 conclude in early 2018, or will it continue pursuing additional improvements? If Project Aim will continue, please describe any new or additional actions taken or planned, including milestones for completion of such actions.

In the June 8, 2015, staff requirements memorandum (SRM) for SECY-15-0015, "Project Aim 2020 Report and Recommendations," the Commission approved 19 separate tasks to address the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) need to improve effectiveness and efficiency, as well as to adjust the workforce to match the workload and skills necessary to accomplish its mission. The NRC staff continues to provide a quarterly Project Aim status report to the Commission, which will be transmitted with this report each quarter.

The Project Aim effort led to several follow-on activities that are still underway. One such initiative is the enhanced Strategic Workforce Planning (SWP) process (described in response to Question 2 below). This activity is structured to better integrate the agency's workload projections, skills identification, human capital management, employee development, and workforce management activities. SWP reflects efforts in the above areas using a 5-year planning horizon. Another initiative outside the scope of the Project Aim efforts was the creation of a task force to identify process efficiencies to yield savings through the standardization or centralization of specific mission support functions. This task force identified 21 project areas for consideration and developed timelines for implementation for each project area. Some of these implementation plans have been successfully completed while others are underway.

Most recently the NRC has undertaken an initiative to identify potential activities that would transform the NRC regulatory framework, culture, and infrastructure. The initial efforts identified over 700 diverse ideas from external stakeholders, regional, and headquarters staff. A subset has been recommended to the Commission. The NRC continues to seek opportunities for innovation and efficiency improvement in its regulatory functions while it institutionalizes the actions related to Project Aim. The table below describes two activities that continue the objectives of Project Aim and demonstrate the NRC's continued commitment to effectiveness and efficiency.

| Initiative | Milestones | Notes |
|--|---|--|
| Implement an enhanced strategic workforce planning (SWP) process that will improve workforce management by focusing on strategic human capital management and longer-term planning | Annual Process began 07/17/18 | Launched Phase II to include the major program offices and regional offices. |
| | Part I Training of supervisors in SWP concepts and process - 08/31/18 | Completed |
| | Deliverable: Office/Region Environmental Scan Analysis - 11/09/18 | |
| | Deliverable: Workload Forecast (execution year +1 and +5) - 12/14/18 | |

| Initiative | Milestones | Notes |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Deliverable: Workforce Demand Analysis - 02/15/19</p> <p>Part II Training of supervisors in SWP concepts and process - 02/22/19</p> <p>Deliverable: Workforce Supply Analysis - 03/29/19</p> <p>Deliverable: Prioritized list of gaps and surpluses - 05/23/19</p> <p>Deliverable: Strategies to address gaps and surpluses - 06/21/19</p> | |
| <p>Merge the Offices of Nuclear Regulator Regulation (NRR) and New Reactors (NRO) to achieve efficiency gains, improve supervisory ratios, and provide greater flexibility and improved agility to manage a dynamic workload</p> | <p>Major NRR restructure October 2017</p> <p>Minor NRO restructure April 2018</p> <p>Proposed organizational structure submitted to the Commission for consideration December 2018</p> <p>Develop FY 2020 staffing plan with pre-merger consolidations Q4 of FY 2019</p> <p>Implement at least one pre-merger consolidation 10/01/19</p> <p>Complete the merger Mid-2020</p> | <p>Completed</p> <p>Completed</p> <p>On track</p> |

2. Consistent with the workload forecast done under Project Aim 2020, to what extent has the NRC incorporated five-year workload planning into its policies and procedures, e.g., strategic planning and budget formulation? Please describe the actions taken or planned.¹

On July 19, 2017, the NRC's Executive Director for Operations (EDO) formed a working group to develop a comprehensive, integrated, and systematic Strategic Workforce Planning Process (SWP) with the primary objective to enhance the existing SWP to better integrate the agency's workload projections, skills identification, human capital management, and workforce management activities with NRC's strategic planning and budget formulation process. As a part of this effort, a three-office pilot of the enhanced SWP process was performed, incorporating a 5-year workload planning horizon. The pilot demonstrated that the enhanced SWP framework and process, when fully implemented, can identify short- and long-term strategies and action plans that are comprehensive and provide important insights into training needs to address gaps and overages in workforce needs. These outcomes will improve the agency's human capital management activities, help identify employee opportunities for career growth, and provide for a greater understanding of the future workload of the NRC. On June 8, 2018, the pilot implementation team proposed proceeding with all the recommendations in the "Enhanced Strategic Workforce Planning Lessons-Learned Pilot Report, including implementing Phase II of the enhanced SWP process. Phase II includes the five major program offices, two corporate offices, and the four regional offices, which accounts for approximately 79 percent of the workforce. The actions planned for SWP Phase II are outlined in the table in the response to Question 1, above. The enhanced SWP process is designed to be implemented on an annual cycle to develop strategies to address workforce needs in both budget execution year + 1 year and budget execution year + 5 years. At the conclusion of Phase II in June 2019, the Office of the Executive Director for Operations (OEDO) and the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (OCHCO) will determine the extent to which the remaining agency offices should be included. When fully implemented, SWP will result in a 5-year workload projection that can be used in the budget formulation process and strategic workforce planning.

3. Please provide the total number of staff and corporate support staff (FTE), budgeted vs actual, for the agency and in each of the following offices: Nuclear Reactor Regulation, New Reactors, Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Nuclear Regulatory Research, Uranium Recovery, Decommissioning, and each regional office. Please provide this information for the current month, each of the previous eleven months, and projections for each of the twelve months going forward. Please do not divide by twelve.

¹ No new information was added to this section since the last report.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Agency Level FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 242.8 | 3240.9 | 3405 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 241.3 | 241.3 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 240.8 | 482.1 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 240.4 | 722.5 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 238.2 | 960.7 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 237.7 | 1198.4 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 236.9 | 1435.3 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 235.7 | 1671.0 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 234.5 | 1905.5 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 234.3 | 2139.8 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 234.7 | 2374.5 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 233.8 | 2608.3 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 232.2 | 2840.5 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 230.8 | 3071.3 | 3195 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 230.4 | 230.4 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 230.3 | 460.7 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 230.3 | 691.0 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 230.4 | 921.4 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 230.3 | 1151.7 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 230.4 | 1382.1 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 230.4 | 1612.5 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 230.3 | 1842.8 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 230.5 | 2073.3 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 230.6 | 2303.9 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 230.6 | 2534.5 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 230.6 | 2765.1 | 3255 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes staff in the Office of the Inspector General.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.
 - 6 FY 2019 Agency Level FTE includes FTE associated with the High-Level Waste Program (HLW) activities. The Office Level tables, however, do not include the annual budgeted FTE for the HLW program; FTE will be allocated at the Office Level in future reports, if funds are enacted.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
FTE Actuals and Projections
11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future
Data as of 09/01/2018

| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 36.1 | 485.3 | 488 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 35.9 | 35.9 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 34.7 | 70.6 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 34.5 | 105.1 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 34.5 | 139.6 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 34.3 | 173.9 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 34.4 | 208.3 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 34.3 | 242.6 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 34.1 | 276.7 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 34.0 | 310.7 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 33.9 | 344.6 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 34.0 | 378.6 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 33.7 | 412.3 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 33.7 | 446.0 | 451 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 33.6 | 33.6 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 33.6 | 67.2 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 33.6 | 100.8 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 33.6 | 134.4 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 33.6 | 168.0 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 33.6 | 201.6 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 33.6 | 235.2 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 33.5 | 268.7 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 33.5 | 302.2 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 33.6 | 335.8 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 33.6 | 369.4 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 33.6 | 403.0 | 451 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in NRR.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of New Reactors FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 22.0 | 295.5 | 313 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 22.0 | 22.0 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 21.9 | 43.9 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 21.6 | 65.5 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 20.8 | 86.3 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 20.9 | 107.2 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 20.6 | 127.8 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 20.5 | 148.3 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 20.3 | 168.6 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 20.1 | 188.7 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 19.7 | 208.4 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 19.4 | 227.8 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 19.4 | 247.2 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 19.4 | 266.6 | 275 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 19.3 | 19.3 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 19.4 | 38.7 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 19.4 | 58.1 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 19.4 | 77.5 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 19.4 | 96.9 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 19.4 | 116.3 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 19.4 | 135.7 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 19.4 | 155.1 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 19.4 | 174.5 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 19.4 | 193.9 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 19.4 | 213.3 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 19.4 | 232.7 | 263 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in NRO.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 21.9 | 288.1 | 297 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 21.5 | 21.5 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 23.1 | 44.6 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 23.2 | 67.8 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 23.3 | 91.1 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 23.4 | 114.5 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 23.3 | 137.8 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 23.0 | 160.8 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 22.7 | 183.5 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 22.6 | 206.1 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 22.4 | 228.5 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 22.2 | 250.7 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 22.2 | 272.9 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 22.2 | 295.1 | 312 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 22.1 | 22.1 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 22.1 | 44.2 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 22.1 | 66.3 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 22.2 | 88.5 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 22.1 | 110.6 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 22.2 | 132.8 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 22.2 | 155.0 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 22.2 | 177.2 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 22.2 | 199.4 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 22.2 | 221.6 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 22.2 | 243.8 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 22.2 | 266.0 | 292 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Provides all staff in NMSS, including FTE for Uranium Recovery and Reactor Decommissioning.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 15.1 | 203.7 | 197 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 15.0 | 15.0 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 14.9 | 29.9 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 15.1 | 45.0 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 15.3 | 60.3 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 15.2 | 75.5 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 15.3 | 90.8 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 15.4 | 106.2 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 15.3 | 121.5 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 15.6 | 137.1 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 16.1 | 153.2 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 15.9 | 169.1 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 15.4 | 184.5 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 15.3 | 199.8 | 201 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 15.4 | 15.4 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 15.4 | 30.8 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 15.4 | 46.2 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 15.4 | 61.6 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 15.4 | 77.0 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 15.4 | 92.4 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 15.4 | 107.8 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 15.4 | 123.2 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 15.5 | 138.7 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 15.5 | 154.2 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 15.5 | 169.7 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 15.5 | 185.2 | 208 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in RES.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 12.9 | 174.0 | 182 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 13.0 | 13.0 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 13.1 | 26.1 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 13.2 | 39.3 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 13.1 | 52.4 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 13.0 | 65.4 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 12.9 | 78.3 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 12.7 | 91.0 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 12.8 | 103.8 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 12.9 | 116.7 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 12.9 | 129.6 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 12.8 | 142.4 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 12.8 | 155.2 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 12.6 | 167.8 | 176 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 12.5 | 12.5 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 12.5 | 25.0 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 12.5 | 37.5 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 12.5 | 50.0 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 12.5 | 62.5 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 12.5 | 75.0 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 12.5 | 87.5 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 12.5 | 100.0 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 12.5 | 112.5 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 12.5 | 125.0 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 12.5 | 137.5 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 12.5 | 150.0 | 168 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in NSIR.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Uranium Recovery FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 1.6 | 22.0 | 31 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 1.6 | 1.6 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 1.6 | 3.2 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 1.6 | 4.8 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 1.5 | 6.3 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 1.5 | 7.8 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 1.5 | 9.3 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 1.4 | 10.7 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 1.4 | 12.1 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 1.3 | 13.4 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 1.3 | 14.7 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 1.3 | 16.0 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 1.3 | 17.3 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 1.3 | 18.6 | 30 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 1.3 | 1.3 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 1.3 | 2.6 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 1.3 | 3.9 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 1.3 | 5.2 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 1.3 | 6.5 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 1.3 | 7.8 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 1.3 | 9.1 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 1.3 | 10.4 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 1.3 | 11.7 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 1.3 | 13.0 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 1.3 | 14.3 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 1.3 | 15.6 | 15 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in the Uranium Recovery Branch of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS), and relevant staff in the following:
Environmental Review Branch, NMSS; Division of Materials Safety, Security, State, and Tribal Programs, NMSS; Fuel Cycle and Decommissioning Branch, Region IV;
Office of General Counsel (OGC); and Atomic Safety Licensing Board Panel (ASLB).

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Decommissioning
FTE Actuals and Projections
11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future
Data as of 09/01/2018

| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 3.5 | 43.8 | 37 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 3.5 | 3.5 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 3.5 | 7.0 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 3.5 | 10.5 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 3.4 | 13.9 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 3.4 | 17.3 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 3.4 | 20.7 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 3.3 | 24.0 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 3.3 | 27.3 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 3.2 | 30.5 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 3.1 | 33.6 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 3.1 | 36.7 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 3.1 | 39.8 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 3.1 | 42.9 | 37 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 3.2 | 3.2 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 3.2 | 6.4 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 3.2 | 9.6 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 3.2 | 12.8 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 3.2 | 16.0 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 3.3 | 19.3 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 3.3 | 22.6 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 3.3 | 25.9 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 3.3 | 29.2 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 3.3 | 32.5 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 3.3 | 35.8 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 3.3 | 39.1 | 35 | FY 2019 |

Notes:

- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
- 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
- 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
- 4 Includes all staff in the Reactor and Materials Decommissioning Branches of NMSS, plus relevant contributions from staff in OGC, R-I, and R-III. No mission support staff, second level and above supervisory staff, or staff support from other offices is included.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region I FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 15.5 | 202.7 | 209 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 15.4 | 15.4 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 15.5 | 30.9 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 15.4 | 46.3 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 15.1 | 61.4 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 14.9 | 76.3 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 14.8 | 91.1 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 14.8 | 105.9 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 14.8 | 120.7 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 14.9 | 135.6 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 15.0 | 150.6 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 14.9 | 165.5 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 14.8 | 180.3 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 14.7 | 195.0 | 198 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 14.7 | 14.7 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 14.6 | 29.3 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 14.6 | 43.9 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 14.6 | 58.5 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 14.6 | 73.1 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 14.6 | 87.7 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 14.6 | 102.3 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 14.6 | 116.9 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 14.6 | 131.5 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 14.6 | 146.1 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 14.6 | 160.7 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 14.6 | 175.3 | 195 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in R-I.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region II FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 19.8 | 261.4 | 274 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 19.7 | 19.7 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 19.6 | 39.3 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 19.6 | 58.9 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 19.4 | 78.3 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 19.3 | 97.6 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 19.2 | 116.8 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 19.2 | 136.0 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 19.1 | 155.1 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 18.8 | 173.9 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 18.8 | 192.7 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 18.5 | 211.2 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 18.3 | 229.5 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 18.1 | 247.6 | 253 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 18.1 | 18.1 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 18.1 | 36.2 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 18.0 | 54.2 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 18.0 | 72.2 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 18.0 | 90.2 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 18.0 | 108.2 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 18.0 | 126.2 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 18.0 | 144.2 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 18.0 | 162.2 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 18.0 | 180.2 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 18.0 | 198.2 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 18.0 | 216.2 | 249 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in R-II.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region III FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 14.2 | 185.6 | 197 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 14.3 | 14.3 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 14.3 | 28.6 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 14.3 | 42.9 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 14.1 | 57.0 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 14.0 | 71.0 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 13.9 | 84.9 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 13.9 | 98.8 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 13.8 | 112.6 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 13.8 | 126.4 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 13.9 | 140.3 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 13.7 | 154.0 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 13.7 | 167.7 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 13.7 | 181.4 | 188 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 13.7 | 13.7 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 13.7 | 27.4 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 13.7 | 41.1 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 13.7 | 54.8 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 13.7 | 68.5 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 13.7 | 82.2 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 13.7 | 95.9 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 13.7 | 109.6 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 13.7 | 123.3 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 13.7 | 137.0 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 13.7 | 150.7 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 13.7 | 164.4 | 182 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in R-III.

| U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region IV FTE Actuals and Projections 11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future Data as of 09/01/2018 | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | Annual Budget | |
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 12.8 | 174.6 | 187 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 12.6 | 12.6 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 12.6 | 25.2 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 12.7 | 37.9 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 12.8 | 50.7 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 12.9 | 63.6 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 12.9 | 76.5 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 12.9 | 89.4 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 12.8 | 102.2 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 12.7 | 114.9 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 12.9 | 127.8 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 13.1 | 140.9 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 12.9 | 153.8 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 12.9 | 166.7 | 175 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 12.7 | 12.7 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 12.7 | 25.4 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 12.7 | 38.1 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 12.8 | 50.9 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 12.8 | 63.7 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 12.8 | 76.5 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 12.8 | 89.3 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 12.8 | 102.1 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 12.8 | 114.9 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 12.8 | 127.7 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 12.8 | 140.5 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 12.8 | 153.3 | 169 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in R-IV.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Corporate Support Functions
FTE Actuals and Projections
11 Months Prior and 12 Months Future
Data as of 09/01/2018

| Period | Actual/ Projected FTE for the Period | Fiscal Year to Date FTE | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-----|---------|
| 09/03/2017 - 09/30/2017 | 37.3 | 513.8 | 594 | FY 2017 |
| 10/01/2017 - 10/28/2017 | 36.9 | 36.9 | | |
| 10/29/2017 - 11/25/2017 | 36.0 | 72.9 | | |
| 11/26/2017 - 12/23/2017 | 35.8 | 108.7 | | |
| 12/24/2017 - 01/20/2018 | 35.3 | 144.0 | | |
| 01/21/2018 - 02/17/2018 | 35.2 | 179.2 | | |
| 02/18/2018 - 03/17/2018 | 34.9 | 214.1 | | |
| 03/18/2018 - 04/14/2018 | 34.6 | 248.7 | | |
| 04/15/2018 - 05/12/2018 | 34.5 | 283.2 | | |
| 05/13/2018 - 06/09/2018 | 34.6 | 317.8 | | |
| 06/10/2018 - 07/07/2018 | 35.0 | 352.8 | | |
| 07/08/2018 - 08/04/2018 | 35.1 | 387.9 | | |
| 08/05/2018 - 09/01/2018 | 34.8 | 422.7 | | |
| 09/02/2018 - 09/29/2018 | 34.7 | 457.4 | 510 | FY 2018 |
| 09/30/2018 - 10/27/2018 | 34.7 | 34.7 | | |
| 10/28/2018 - 11/24/2018 | 34.7 | 69.4 | | |
| 11/25/2018 - 12/22/2018 | 34.7 | 104.1 | | |
| 12/23/2018 - 01/19/2019 | 34.7 | 138.8 | | |
| 01/20/2019 - 02/16/2019 | 34.7 | 173.5 | | |
| 02/17/2019 - 03/16/2019 | 34.7 | 208.2 | | |
| 03/17/2019 - 04/13/2019 | 34.7 | 242.9 | | |
| 04/14/2019 - 05/11/2019 | 34.7 | 277.6 | | |
| 05/12/2019 - 06/08/2019 | 34.8 | 312.4 | | |
| 06/09/2019 - 07/06/2019 | 34.8 | 347.2 | | |
| 07/07/2019 - 08/03/2019 | 34.8 | 382.0 | | |
| 08/04/2019 - 08/31/2019 | 34.8 | 416.8 | 506 | FY 2019 |

- Notes:
- 1 Data are reported in two-pay-period groups because of the biweekly payroll cycle.
 - 2 Actual/projected FTE for the period reflects FTE utilization (or projected utilization).
 - 3 Projection is approximately 1/12th of total year FTE expenditures, adjusted for known future gains and losses through the end of the fiscal year.
 - 4 Includes all staff in the following corporate support offices: Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Office of Administration, Office of Small Business and Civil Rights, and Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer.
 - 5 Includes reimbursable FTE for work performed for other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations.

4. Please describe the status of actions taken or planned to reduce corporate support costs, including efforts to reduce office space in the Three White Flint North building and in the regional offices. Please include goals for space reductions and cost savings, as well as the estimated date to achieve those goals.

The NRC remains committed to identifying and achieving efficiencies in the corporate support area, including office space reductions and the related cost savings. In the SRM to the Project Aim Report, the Commission directed the staff to re-baseline the agency’s workload—focusing on statutory mandates, as well as work pertaining to the agency’s safety and security mission. In addition, in SECY-16-0035, “Additional Re-baselining Products”, the NRC staff identified other actions that could provide additional efficiencies in the long-term. Planned corporate support reductions are shown in the table below, which will be updated in future reports as the reductions are achieved.

| Product Line | Description | Total \$ (M)* | FTE | Status | Fiscal Year |
|---|--|---------------|------------|------------|-------------------|
| Additional Re-baselining Products (SECY-16-0035) | | | | | |
| Administrative Services | Reduce Office Space in Three White Flint North | -4.0 | 0 | In process | FY 2019 – FY 2020 |
| Administrative Services | Reduce Office Space in the Regions | -1.2 | 0 | In process | FY 2019 – FY 2022 |
| Administrative Services and Information Technology | Workstation Efficiencies | TBD | TBD | In process | FY 2019 |
| Subtotal – Additional Re-baselining Reductions | | -\$5.2 | 0.0 | | |
| Other Corporate Support Reductions | | | | | |
| Information Technology | IT Infrastructure Support - the agency expects to realize a 10 to 15 percent drop in contract expenses resulting from a new acquisition strategy. | -3.6 | 0 | In process | FY 2018 - 2019 |
| Administrative Services | Utility Savings – The agency expects to realize approximately a 14 percent reduction in electrical costs and a 12 percent reduction in water costs, from the installation of high efficiency cooling equipment, automated plumbing fixtures, and lighting controls as part of the Two White Flint North renovations. | -0.9 | 0 | In process | FY 2018 – FY 2021 |
| Subtotal – Other Corporate Support | | -\$4.5 | 0.0 | | |
| Total | | -\$9.7 | 0.0 | | |

*Total includes any FTE cost.

Reduction of Office Space

NRC office space is currently comprised of a Headquarters Campus in Rockville, MD (One White Flint North (OWFN), Two White Flint North (TWFN), and partial space in Three White Flint North (3WFN)), a warehouse, four regional office buildings, and a technical training center. From FY 2013 through FY 2015, NRC relinquished a net total of 364,997 useable square feet (USF) at its headquarters by shedding a total of eight floors in the 3WFN building and four temporary satellite locations. As a result, the agency’s headquarters office space now consists of OWFN, TWFN, and five floors and the B1 level of 3WFN. On March 19, 2018, pursuant to the annual reporting requirements of the Federal Property Management Reform Act of 2016, the staff submitted its Draft FY 2019 through FY 2023 Real Property Efficiency Plan to the Federal

Real Property Council. The draft plan outlined NRC’s space reduction strategy over the 5 year period. NRC plans to relinquish an additional 141,000 USF of office space at its headquarters location and four regional office locations, from FY 2019 through FY 2022. This space consists of four floors in 3WFN totaling 93,000 USF, and approximately 48,000 USF at the regional locations, by consolidating at headquarters and within each regional office location. Since the submission of the draft plan, NRC anticipates a more expedited release of space in 3WFN than what was assumed in the draft plan. NRC now plans to complete the relinquishment of the four floors in 3WFN by FY 2020 (as opposed to the previously reported completion in FY 2021), by releasing two floors of 3WFN in FY 2019 and the other two floors in FY 2020. NRC’s updated proposed agency-wide total space reduction goals for each fiscal year are shown in the table below.

| NRC Square Foot Reduction Goals FY 2019 – FY 2022 | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | FY 2019 | FY 2020 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
| Office Target (Net SF Reduction) | 54,190 | 60,810 | 11,000 | 15,000 |

Significantly reducing costs by releasing the space will be a challenge due to the non-cancelable terms of many of the occupancy agreements and leases, including the terms of 3WFN. However, NRC is working with the General Services Administration (GSA) to identify potential tenants for both 3WFN and the regional office locations. The pursuit of backfill tenants resulted in the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) signing an occupancy agreement to backfill one additional floor in 3WFN in FY 2019, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) agreeing to backfill one floor in mid-2019 and the remaining two floors in FY 2020 as they become available. Regional office space reductions can be achieved by reconfiguring the existing space to use fewer square feet, thereby allowing for unused blocks of space to be released. However, with the exception of NRC’s Region III office in Lisle, IL, rent savings will not be achieved until GSA identifies and places a new tenant into the released space or until such time as the terms of the NRC’s current leases allow. The timing and scope of the regional reductions will be refined as NRC works to finalize each location’s relinquishment plan; however, the current square footage estimates and schedules for release are as follows: Region III, Lisle, IL, 7,000 USF in early FY 2019 timeframe, Region II, Atlanta, GA, 15,000 USF in FY 2019, Region IV, Arlington, TX, 11,000 USF in FY 2021, and Region I, King of Prussia, PA, 15,000 USF in FY 2022.

Per the terms of occupancy agreements signed by FDA and NIH regarding the backfill of the four floors to be released in 3WFN, the NRC anticipates an annual reduction of \$1 million per floor for each floor relinquished upon a new tenant taking the space. The agency now anticipates rent costs decreasing in October 2018 when FDA occupies the 2nd floor of 3WFN, and again by mid-FY 2019 and 2020 as NIH begins to occupy the remaining three floors. Once the release of this space is complete in FY 2020, the agency will realize a total annual reduction of \$4 million in office space costs going forward. Cost reductions for the regional locations are likewise dependent upon successful and timely leasing of the space to new tenants. The annual reduction in costs for the regional office space is anticipated to average approximately \$300,000 per regional office. As a result of the planned space reductions, NRC anticipates an annual total rent reduction of \$5.2 million from FY 2022 forward, as compared to FY 2018.

Reduction in IT Infrastructure Support Costs

To date, the NRC has realized more than 60 percent of the expected \$3.6 million in cost reductions through contract modifications; transitions to government-wide acquisition vehicles and more cost-effective competitive contract awards; transfer of leased end-user and infrastructure assets to NRC ownership; revised eligibility for Government-Furnished Equipment; and award of the Security Operations Center, Mobility, and End User Computing Call Orders under the new Global Infrastructure and Development Acquisition (GLINDA) Blanket Purchase Agreement. The balance of the expected cost reductions will be realized in FY 2019

and beyond through award of the GLINDA Systems, Network, and Cross-Cutting Services Call Order.

5. Please describe the status of efforts to provide greater transparency, timeliness, and itemization in invoices to applicants and licensees, including any progress toward electronic invoicing and payment. Please include near-term (within 6 months), medium-term (6 to 12 months), and long-term (greater than 12 months) milestones.

Improvements to invoices showing itemized charges by standard codes for greater transparency and timeliness.

Near-Term:

- The NRC will continue to evaluate feedback on the changes to the invoices.

Medium-Term:

- The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) is working with an intra-agency working group to implement a standardized 10 CFR Part 170 (fees for service) fee billing validation process, and establish standardized roles and responsibilities. The working group will develop, pilot, and finalize the process. OCFO will provide training to all staff involved in the billing process. OCFO has determined that system enhancements are required in order to facilitate the new standardized process, and is estimating a June 30, 2019, completion date.

Progress towards electronic invoicing and payment.

The NRC is currently in the planning phase of the electronic invoicing (eBilling) project, which includes the following tasks:

Near-Term:

- NRC acceptance and approval of the updated “as-is” fee billing processes and fee billing information technology systems (in progress).
- Select an eBilling tool. The NRC is currently in the negotiations stage of the procurement (in progress).
- Develop a phased-approach and a corresponding project plan to implement the eBilling solution based on stakeholder feedback.
- Develop the initial eBilling solution based on the tool selected, outreach activities, lesson learned opportunities, and requirements analysis.
- Reach out to stakeholders to provide the status of the initial eBilling proposed solution and to identify licensees to participate in the phased-approach implementation pilot.

Medium-Term:

- Build the eBilling solution tool.

Long-Term:

- Deploy the phased approach of the eBilling solution tool on or about October 2019.
- Continue to perform outreach activities with stakeholders.

6. Please provide a list of all new research initiated during the reporting period. For each new project, please provide the estimated timeframe and resources necessary for completion, and a description of the safety significance of the research.

During the month of August 2018, the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) substantially revised the following research:

| Name of New or Revised Project | Estimated Completion | Estimated Resources | Safety Significance of Research Activity |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Study of Steam Generator Tube Integrity Experience and Inspection Issues | Dec 2023 | 6.25 FTE / \$2.7 M | Medium – This activity supports evaluation and assessment of the effectiveness of inspection techniques |

Comments:

The table above provides projects that were reviewed and approved during the monthly reporting period for projects that exceed 300 staff hours or \$500K of program support.

URANIUM RECOVERY

7. For major uranium recovery licensing actions, please provide a table including the date the application was filed, the duration of the application review, the originally forecasted completion date, the currently forecasted completion date, and the total current amount of fees billed to the licensee/applicant for the review.

Major Uranium Recovery Licensing Actions ⁽¹⁾

| Licensee | Site/Facility Name | Licensing Action Type | Date of Submittal | Duration of Review ⁽²⁾ (months) | Originally Forecasted Completion Date | Currently Forecasted Completion Date ⁽³⁾ | Total Current Fees Billed (through July 31, 2018) ⁽⁴⁾ |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Uranium One ⁽⁵⁾ | Ludeman | Expansion | 12/06/2011 | 76.0 | 08/14/2013 | Completed 08/24/2018 | \$2,447,132.74 |
| Power Resources (Cameco) ⁽⁶⁾ | Smith Ranch | Renewal | 02/01/2012 | 74.3 | 07/05/2015 | 09/27/2018 | \$2,851,645.74 |
| Lost Creek, ISR ⁽⁷⁾ | KM Horizon/LC East | Expansion | 02/27/2017 | 16.0 | 08/07/2018 | Completed 08/07/2018 | \$1,681,804.70 |

Notes:

1. NRC staff completed a self-assessment of the uranium recovery licensing process in 2017. The review compared the uranium recovery licensing process to other licensing groups within the NRC to identify best practices. The review identified several recommendations for improvements to the uranium recovery licensing process. A number of these recommendations, such as the use of schedule letters to communicate changes in review schedules and developing tools to better track project status, have already been implemented. In addition, in 2016, the uranium recovery program established an agency metric that tracks the percentage of major milestones completed on schedule. The uranium recovery staff anticipates that implementing these changes will result in future efficiencies in the uranium recovery licensing process.
2. The “duration of review” is the total amount of time the application has been under consideration, starting when the application was accepted for review by the NRC staff. The NRC’s goal is to complete major reviews within 36 months from acceptance of the application. The duration of review includes periods of delay that could be attributed to the NRC staff, the licensee, or both.
3. Completed actions will remain in the table for this report until the final fees under 10 CFR Part 170 can be included in the Total Current Fees Billed column.
4. Fees for license-specific services under 10 CFR Part 170 are billed quarterly.
5. The duration of review has been primarily impacted by the applicant’s change in the design of the facility during the review process. The duration of review has also been impacted by a prior limited availability of health physics reviewers.
6. The duration of review has been primarily impacted by delays in applicant providing adequate responses to NRC staff’s RAI.
7. “Currently forecasted completion date” represents completion of NRC safety evaluation report. The NRC staff continues to coordinate with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in its preparation of the environmental impact statement (EIS) in accordance with the BLM/NRC Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the letter of December 4, 2014, designating BLM as the lead agency and the NRC as a cooperating agency. The BLM is scheduled to publish the final EIS in December 2018.

8. For major uranium recovery licensing actions, please provide a brief description of the status of each review, including projected budget and timeline for both the environmental impact statement and the safety evaluation report.

The table below provides the status of major uranium recovery licensing actions currently under review, the timeline for completing the associated EISs and safety evaluation reports (SERs), and the total projected budget per project.

The NRC does not formulate its budget at the project level. The budget for the Uranium Recovery Program is formulated at a higher level using budget models for the number, type, and complexity of reviews anticipated. The projected budget information reported below includes the program staff and contract support resource estimates to perform the safety and environmental reviews from submittal to licensing decision, excluding resources for OGC's reviews, hearings, mission support, supervisory support, travel, and allocated agency corporate support resources. The estimates are based on budget models for different types (such as expansions, renewals, and new licenses) and complexities of major licensing action reviews. The NRC staff's goal is to complete the review of major licensing actions within 3 years; however, the staff estimates that smaller, less complex applications may be reviewed in 2 years, while larger, more complex, applications may require up to 4 years to review.

| Uranium Recovery Applicant | Application Accepted for Review | Review Status and Projected Budget |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Cameco North Trend Expansion ⁽¹⁾ (NE) | 08/28/07 | <p>The SER for the North Trend expansion was completed in July 2013. On December 16, 2015, the licensee requested the NRC staff to stop its review of the North Trend application and to instead focus its efforts on the review of the Marsland expansion. The NRC staff has suspended its work related to the development of the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and conduct of Section 106 consultations pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act. In addition, the hearing to address contentions related to groundwater is on hold, pending completion of the NRC staff's environmental review. By letter dated April 4, 2018, Cameco reiterated its request that the staff continue to hold its review in abeyance.</p> <p>The projected total budget to conduct the review is 3.0 FTE and \$600K.</p> |
| Uranium One Ludeman Expansion (WY) | 05/16/12 | <p>The NRC staff completed the final EA on August 14, 2018. The NRC staff completed its safety review documented in the final SER on March 1, 2018. The NRC staff issued the license amendment for the Ludeman expansion on August 24, 2018.</p> <p>The projected total budget to conduct the review is 3.0 FTE and \$600K.</p> |

| | | |
|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>Cameco Smith Ranch License Renewal⁽¹⁾ (WY)</p> | <p>07/05/12</p> | <p>Environmental and safety reviews are in progress. The NRC staff and Cameco met on February 21, 2018, to discuss Cameco's RAI responses. Cameco submitted updated RAI responses related to hydrogeology on March 7, 2018. The NRC staff received Cameco's remaining updated RAI responses on July 30, 2018, and has determined that the responses are sufficient to complete the SER. The NRC staff plans to make a licensing decision by September 2018.</p> <p>The projected total budget to conduct the review is 3.5 FTE.</p> |
| <p>Hydro Resources, Inc. (HRI) License Renewal (NM)</p> | <p>06/24/13</p> | <p>The sites, located very close to Navajo Nation lands, were licensed in 1998. Construction has not yet commenced. The license renewal review was placed in abeyance on November 13, 2014, while HRI continues its work with the Navajo Nation Council. In March 2016 the NRC approved the transfer of control of the license from the HRI parent company, Uranium Resources, Inc., to Laramide Resources. The parties finalized the transaction in January 2017. The schedule for remaining milestones associated with the licensing review is to be determined.</p> <p>The projected total budget to conduct the review is 2.6 FTE.</p> |
| <p>Strata Kendrick Expansion (WY)</p> | <p>01/14/16</p> | <p>On May 27, 2016, and September 14, 2016, the NRC staff issued RAIs for the environmental review and for the safety review, respectively. On December 15, 2016, the licensee requested that the NRC cease all activities related to this review. The staff's safety and environmental reviews, including development of a Supplemental EIS, are on hold.</p> <p>The projected total budget to conduct the review is 3.5 FTE and \$1500K, which includes completing the EIS.</p> |
| <p>Lost Creek KM Horizon/East Expansion (WY)</p> | <p>05/02/17</p> | <p>By letter dated February 27, 2017, the licensee resubmitted a revised application. The NRC staff accepted the application for review on May 2, 2017. The NRC staff continues to coordinate with the BLM in its preparation of the EIS in accordance with the BLM/NRC MOU and the letter of December 4, 2014, designating BLM as the lead agency and NRC as a cooperating agency. BLM is scheduled to publish the final EIS in December 2018. The NRC staff is submitting its RAIs in batches in order to support BLM's schedule for issuing the EIS. The NRC staff issued its initial set of RAIs on July 27, 2017, its second set of RAIs on August 28, 2017, and its third set of RAIs on October 30, 2017. The final safety evaluation report was issued on August 7, 2018.</p> <p>The projected total budget to conduct the review is 3.0 FTE.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Cameco Three Crow Expansion⁽¹⁾ (NE)</p> | | <p>Three Crow is an expansion of the operating Crow Butte facility located in Crawford, NE. The NRC staff started its acceptance review on March 3, 2011, and was waiting for the licensee to complete changes in its design prior to acceptance. However, in November 2014, the licensee requested that the NRC staff place the review on hold and instead focus efforts on the review of the Marsland expansion (the Marsland application is currently in litigation before the ASLB). The acceptance review process remains on hold.</p> |
|---|--|---|

Notes:

1. On February 9, 2018, Cameco announced that it is ceasing U.S. operations due to an expectation of prolonged poor uranium market conditions. The NRC staff is proceeding with its licensing reviews while seeking further information from Cameco regarding its licensing plans.
9. For minor uranium recovery licensing actions, please provide the following information each reporting period, including any months previously reported, in this format:
- a. Size of inventory;
 - b. Number of acceptance reviews completed on time;
 - c. The number of items completed in the period being reported; and
 - d. Of the items completed in the reporting period, the number completed within the forecasted schedule.
 - e. Please identify any “unusually complex” items omitted from the inventory and provide the age of the item, a brief description of the item, the justification for omitting it from the inventory size, and an explanation for any review exceeding its original schedule by 125 percent.

| Month/Year | Size of Inventory | Number of Acceptance Reviews Completed on Time⁽¹⁾ | Number of Items Completed During Month | Number of Items Completed Within Forecasted Schedule⁽²⁾ | Unusually Complex Items Omitted from Inventory |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Nov-2017 | 21 | NA | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Dec-2017 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jan-2018 | 21 ⁽³⁾ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Feb-2018 | 19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Mar-2018 | 11 | NA | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Apr-2018 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| May-2018 | 9 | NA | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| June-2018 | 8 | NA | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| July-2018 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Aug-2018 | 6 | NA | 2 | 2 | 0 |

Notes:

1. NA means not applicable - no acceptance reviews were due in the corresponding month.
2. This column represents the total number of minor licensing actions completed within the staff's forecasted schedule in a particular month. At times, the uranium recovery staff has to divert resources from minor licensing actions to address oversight of operating sites, emergent issues, and major licensing actions. When this occurs, the NRC staff

tries to accommodate the licensee's priorities for completion of minor licensing actions. However, this has impacted the staff's ability to complete minor licensing actions within the forecasted schedule.

3. The size of the inventory for January has been decreased to account for the completion of a licensing action on January 31, 2018.

10. Please provide a concise summary of the status of the process for the State of Wyoming to become an Agreement State.

On February 27, 2015, Governor Matt Meade of Wyoming submitted a letter of intent for the State of Wyoming to become an Agreement State, under a limited agreement to regulate source and byproduct material (as defined in § 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act (AEA)). A limited agreement is an agreement where a State assumes regulatory authority for a subset of the types and quantities of radioactive material that a State could assume authority for under the AEA. This agreement would authorize the State of Wyoming to assume regulatory authority over uranium and thorium milling (e.g., conventional and in-situ uranium recovery activities), the possession and use of source material involved in the extraction and concentration of uranium and thorium in source material and ores at milling facilities, and the management and disposal of byproduct material as defined in Section 11e.(2) of the AEA.

On November 14, 2017, the State of Wyoming submitted a formal request for an Agreement. The NRC staff has reviewed the package to ensure that the State's program is adequate and compatible with the NRC's program. The NRC staff provided feedback to the State of Wyoming both officially (comment letter) and informally (bi-weekly teleconferences). On March 5, 2018, the State of Wyoming submitted revisions to its final application, addressing the NRC staff comments. The NRC staff completed its review of the State's final application and on May 25, 2018, submitted a policy paper to the Commission seeking approval to publish the draft Agreement along with the staff's draft assessment of the State of Wyoming's regulatory program. On June 19, 2018, the Commission directed staff to issue both documents for public comment. The draft documents were published in the *Federal Register* for a 30-day public comment period on June 26, 2018, and in subsequent weekly *Federal Register* notices on July 3, 2018, July 10, 2018, and July 17, 2018. The public comment period ended on July 26, 2018. The NRC staff completed its review of the public comments and submitted SECY-18-0082, "Section 274b Agreement with the State of Wyoming," to the Commission for deliberation on August 27, 2018. The paper included the final proposed Agreement between the NRC and the State of Wyoming, the NRC staff's assessment of the State of Wyoming's final application, resolution of public comments, and the NRC staff's recommendation to approve the Agreement.

11. Please provide a concise summary of the specific actions planned to improve the efficiency of reviews conducted for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, including implementation dates for completion. Please describe any progress made during the reporting period.

The Section 106 process under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment. Based on lessons learned in the uranium recovery licensing functional area, the NRC has taken a number of actions to facilitate and enhance its Section 106 reviews. Because each licensing or regulatory action differs in scope, the specific activities identified to carry out NRC's obligations under NHPA differ from one licensing or regulatory action to another. The following specific actions have been identified and are being carried out to improve and facilitate compliance with the NHPA Section 106 process.

For efficiency, the NRC conducts the Section 106 process in coordination with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process. To the extent possible, the NRC's completion date for its NHPA Section 106 review for a specific licensing action aligns with the date for publishing the final NEPA environmental review document.

In fiscal year 2013, the NRC entered into an interagency agreement with the ACHP, under which the ACHP established a dedicated liaison to provide the NRC with technical assistance with Section 106 reviews of specific licensing actions, as well as relevant training and guidance. For fiscal year 2018, ACHP is providing the following webinars to NRC staff on the Section 106 process of the NHPA to continue to improve the efficiency of the reviews:

- Planning to Involve the Public in Section 106 (Completed on April 26, 2018)
- Defining the Area of Potential Effect (Completed on May 17, 2018)
- Reasonable and Good Faith Effort (Completed on June 12, 2018)
- Confidentiality & Section 304 (Completed on July 10, 2018)
- Innovative Mitigation (Completed on August 14, 2018)
- Planning for Successful Agreements (Scheduled for September 11, 2018)

In June 2014, the NRC published its draft Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) for conducting the Section 106 process specific to uranium recovery licensing actions, "Guidance for Conducting the Section 106 Process of the National Historic Preservation Act for Uranium Recovery Licensing Actions" (FSME-ISG-02). The NRC plans to complete the ISG by the end of calendar year 2018.

To further improve the agency's NHPA and NEPA processes for licensing activities, the NRC has updated several documents regarding tribal consultation. The NRC published the final Tribal Policy Statement in the *Federal Register* on January 9, 2017 (82 FR 2402), and revised its Tribal Protocol Manual. The Tribal Protocol Manual is intended to facilitate effective consultations and interactions between the NRC and Tribes.

Consistent with NRC's MOU with BLM, the NRC staff coordinates with BLM the performance of NEPA and NHPA Section 106 reviews related to facilities that require an NRC license to possess and use source and byproduct materials, on public lands under BLM's regulatory authority. The goal of the MOU is to limit, to the extent possible, duplication of consultation, review, and evaluation efforts on a project.

The complexity of the Section 106 reviews associated with uranium recovery licensing actions has grown significantly and, as a result, NRC's consultation efforts with respect to its obligations under the Section 106 process have also increased. Activities implemented over the past several years have enhanced and facilitated NRC's Section 106 reviews for uranium recovery licensing actions. For example, the NRC staff continues to proactively reach out and interact with Tribes as early as possible to share information and explain the scope of the licensing actions via letters, e-mails, teleconference calls, and webinars prior to potential tribal site visits. The NRC staff will continue to evaluate its approach to the Section 106 process to identify additional activities that could be taken to better facilitate the process.

12. Please provide a concise summary of the progress of the pilot project to establish flat fees for uranium recovery licensees, including specific near-term (6 months), medium-term (6 - 12 months), and long-term (greater than 10 months) milestones necessary to complete the pilot program.²

² No new information was added to this section since the last report.

As directed by the Commission, the NRC staff will conduct a flat fee pilot program for routine uranium recovery licensing actions. As described in the staff paper SECY-16-0097, "Fee Setting Improvements and Fiscal Year 2017 Proposed Fee Rule," this pilot will involve evaluation of data to collect a representative sample of the costs for various licensing reviews. The staff believes that using data from the previous data recording structure that had less granularity could result in a proposed flat fee that is skewed either high or low for the work delivered. Collecting representative samples of data under the new data recording structure, described in the response to question five, will allow NRC to determine a flat fee that is fair and equitable.

The agency completed development of a new data recording structure on June 30, 2017. By September 30, 2017, the NRC trained staff to record the data using the new structure. Concurrently, the staff began outreach to Agreement States with uranium recovery licensees to understand their fee schedule development process. The new data structure was deployed on October 1, 2017.

Near-Term:

The NRC staff is recording time and attendance, which indicates the hours spent on specific work products, using the new data structure. By November 1, 2018, there will be a sufficient amount of data in the new system to begin analyzing the data to develop recommendations. By December 2018, the staff will engage stakeholders to solicit input. The analysis and draft recommendations will be completed by the end of January 2019.

Medium-Term:

- The NRC staff anticipates sending recommendations to the Commission for the FY 2020 proposed fee rule on August 15, 2019. These recommendations will continue to address requirements under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 to collect approximately 90 percent of the NRC's annual budget through fees, and under the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 to assess user fees that are fair and based on the costs to the government and certain other factors.

Long-Term:

- The Commission expects to report its decision to Congress in December 2019. The FY 2020 proposed fee rule is expected to be published for public comment in January 2020. The FY 2020 final fee rule is scheduled to be published by May 2020 and take effect 60 days thereafter.

LICENSING

13. For operating reactors, new reactors, and uranium recovery licensees, please provide the following information regarding license amendment reviews:

13.a Please provide the following information for the current reporting period, including any information previously reported in the last six months:

- i. Size of inventory;
- ii. The number of items completed in the period being reported;
- iii. Percentage of acceptance reviews completed on time;
- iv. The percentage of these items completed within the forecasted schedule;
- v. The percentage of these items completed within 125 percent of the forecasted schedule;
- vi. The percentage of items completed within ten months;
- vii. The average age for items completed during the month being reported;
- viii. The ages of the quickest three items completed; and
- ix. The ages of the slowest three items completed.

Operating Reactors

| Month/Year | Size of Inventory (Note 1) | No. of Items Completed in the Report Period | Percentage of Acceptance Reviews Completed on Time | Percentage of Items Completed within the Forecasted Schedule (Note 2) | Percentage of Items Completed within 125% of Forecasted Schedule (Note 3) | Percentage of Items Completed within 10 Months | Average Age for Items Completed During Report Period (months) | Ages of the Quickest Three Items Completed (months) | | | Ages of the Slowest Three Items Completed (months) | | |
|------------|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|----|----|--|----|----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov-2017 | 588 | 46 | 100% | 94% | 94% | 85% | 6.9 | <1 | <1 | <1 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| Dec-2017 | 579 | 93 | 100% | 94% | 94% | 91% | 9.2 | <1 | <1 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Jan-2018 | 495 | 105 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 5.7 | <1 | <1 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| Feb 2018 | 496 | 51 | 94% | 86% | 90% | 76% | 7.9 | <1 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Mar 2018 | 558 | 47 | 98% | 98% | 85% | 85% | 7.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| April 2018 | 554 | 74 | 100% | 94% | 95% | 93% | 6.1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | 17 | 17 | 12 |
| May 2018 | 610 | 50 | 97% | 94% | 96% | 89% | 6.3 | <1 | <1 | <1 | 12 | 12 | 20 |
| June 2018 | 632 | 54 | 100% | 98% | 100% | 76% | 8.3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| July 2018 | 590 | 74 | 100% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 6.2 | <1 | <1 | <1 | 12 | 17 | 17 |
| Aug 2018 | 584 | 67 | 100% | 97% | 97% | 86% | 10.5 | <1 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 12 |

Note 1: Similar to the licensing actions reported in the yearly CBJ, the inventory does not include unusually complex or Fukushima related licensing actions.

Note 2: Internal processes track licensing action completions within forecasted scheduled (+ 1 month) [this percentage does not include unusually complex or Fukushima related licensing actions].

Note 3: Internal processes track licensing action completions within 125 percent of the forecasted schedule [this percentage does not include unusually complex or Fukushima related licensing actions].

New Reactors

| Month/Year | Size of Inventory | No. of Items Completed in the Report Period | Percentage of Acceptance Reviews Completed on Time | Percentage of Items Completed within the Forecasted Schedule | Percentage of Items Completed within 125% of Forecasted Schedule | Percentage of Items Completed within 10 Months | Average Age for Items Completed During Report Period (months) | Ages of the Quickest Three Items Completed (months) | | | Ages of the Slowest Three Items Completed (months) | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|----|-----|--|---|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov-2017 | 38 | 7 | 100% | 86% | 100% | 100% | 6.4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Dec-2017 | 35 | 4 | 75% | 50% | 100% | 100% | 4.5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Jan-2018 | 30 | 2 | 50% | 50% | 100% | 50% | 8.5 | 5 | 12 | N/A | 12 | 5 | N/A |
| Feb-2018 | 32 | 6 | 67% | 67% | 100% | 83% | 6.6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 10 |
| Mar-2018 | 22 | 10 | 80% | 80% | 100% | 100% | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| April-2018 | 24 | 4 | 50% | 75% | 100% | 100% | 6 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| May-2018 | 23 | 2 | 50% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 4 | 4 | 4 | N/A | 4 | 4 | N/A |
| June-2018 | 21 | 4 | 50% | 75% | 75% | 100% | 7 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 5 |
| July-2018 | 17 | 7 | 71% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 6 |
| Aug-2018 | 18 | 5 | 80% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 3 |

Uranium Recovery

| Month/Year | Size of Inventory | Number of Items Completed in the Report Period | Percentage of Acceptance Reviews Completed on Time | Percentage of Items Completed within Forecasted Schedule | Percentage of Items Completed within 125% of Forecasted Schedule | Percent age of Items Comple ted within 10 Months | Average Age for Items Completed during Report Period (months) ⁽¹⁾ | Ages of the Quickest Three Items Completed (months) | | | Ages of the Slowest Three Items Completed (months) | | |
|------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|------|-----|--|------|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov-2017 | 24 | 2 | N/A | 50% | 50% | 50% | 24.5 | 48 ⁽²⁾ | 1 | N/A | 48 ⁽²⁾ | 1 | N/A |
| Dec-2017 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Jan-2018 | 24 ⁽³⁾ | 1 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 10 | 10 | N/A | N/A | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| Feb-2018 | 22 | 2 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 24.5 | 23.5 | 25.5 | N/A | 23.5 | 25.5 | N/A |
| Mar-2018 | 14 | 8 | N/A | 89% | 89% | 75% | 11 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 39 | 17.5 | 7.5 |
| April-2018 | 13 | 2 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 3.8 | 7 | 0.5 | N/A | 7 | 0.5 | N/A |
| May-2018 | 11 | 2 | N/A | 100% | 100% | 50% | 34.5 | 1 | 68 | N/A | 1 | 68 | N/A |
| June 2018 | 10 | 1 | N/A | 100% | 100% | 0% | 22 | 22 | N/A | N/A | 22 | N/A | N/A |
| July 2018 | 10 | 1 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0.5 | 0.5 | N/A | N/A | 0.5 | N/A | N/A |
| Aug 2018 | 6 | 4 | N/A | 100% | 100% | 0% | 55.3 | 15.5 | 64 | 66 | 76 | 64 | 66 |

Note 1: The uranium recovery staff's goal is to complete major licensing actions within 36 months of acceptance and minor licensing actions within 12 months of acceptance. At times, the uranium recovery staff has to divert resources from minor licensing actions to address oversight of operating sites, emergent issues, and major licensing actions. When this occurs, the NRC staff tries to accommodate the licensee's priorities when determining which minor licensing actions to complete first.

Note 2: One review of a minor licensing action completed in November 2017 required 48 months to complete. This review was low priority for the licensee; therefore, the uranium recovery staff focused on higher priority work until sufficient resources were available to complete the review.

Note 3: The size of the inventory for January has been decreased to account for the completion of a licensing action on January 31, 2018.

13.b For the reporting period, please also provide the following for license amendment requests:

- i. The number not accepted for review; and
- ii. A list of the requests that were withdrawn or denied after being accepted for review including the age of the request at the time it was withdrawn or denied.

Operating Reactors

| Month/Year | No. of License Amendment Requests Not Accepted for Review | List the Requests that were Withdrawn or Denied after Being Accepted for Review | Age of the Request at the Time it was Withdrawn or Denied (months) |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| August 2018 | 0 | <p>Withdrawn: Duane Arnold Energy Center – License Amendment Request TSCR-178, Application to Reduce the Required Number of Operable Suppression Chamber-to-Drywell Vacuum Breakers. (EPID: L-2017-LLA-0416)</p> <p>Withdrawn: Duane Arnold Energy Center – License Amendment - Request TSCR-179, Application to Add Technical Specification 3.2.3, 'Linear Heat Generation Rate' (EPID: L-2017-LLA-0436)</p> | <p>7</p> <p>7</p> |

New Reactors

| Month/Year | No. of License Amendment Requests Not Accepted for Review | List the Requests that were Withdrawn or Denied after Being Accepted for Review | Age of the Request at the Time it was Withdrawn or Denied (months) |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| August 2018 | 0 | N/A | N/A |

Uranium Recovery

| Month/Year | Number of Amendment Requests Not Accepted for Review | List of the Requests that were Withdrawn or Denied after being Accepted for Review | Age of the Request at the Time it was Withdrawn or Denied (months) |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| August 2018 | 0 | N/A | N/A |

13.c Please identify items considered “unusually complex” items (e.g. criticality reviews, NFPA 805 reviews) and omitted from the [licensing amendment] inventory including: the age of the item, a brief description of the item, the justification for omitting it from the inventory size and an explanation for any review exceeding its original schedule by 125 percent.

Operating Reactors

Note: Unusually complex license amendments are not included in the internal performance measures as they do not lend themselves to realistic forecasted schedule development. Rather, they are given escalated management attention to ensure progress is being made towards resolving outstanding issues and completing the reviews in a timely manner.

- Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF)-505 Reviews
 - Description: These submittals request changes to Technical Specifications (TSs) for the adoption of Risk-Informed Technical Specifications Task Force (RITSTF) Initiative 4b, specifically "TSTF-505, Revision 1, Provide Risk-Informed Extended Completion Times." This effort is associated with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 06-09, "Risk-Informed Technical Specifications Initiative 4b, Risk-Managed Technical Specifications Guidelines."
 - Justification: Risk-Informed and Voluminous - During review of the Vogtle pilot license amendment requests (LAR) for a risk-informed TS Completion time (RICT) program, a number of issues were raised by NRC staff. These issues resulted in the suspension of TSTF-505 to allow necessary revisions to the process. The NRC has been working with the TSTF group and other stakeholders to resolve the issues and lift the suspension. The four LARs currently under review are

being reviewed on a plant-specific basis in parallel with revision of TSTF-505. All of the LARs have been supplemented to address the issues raised with TSTF-505. The supplements represent significant additional information and modifications to the licensee implementation of a RICT program. Although not a complete reset of the review, the additional information and changes to the LARs have added time to the review schedule and may result in the need for additional clarification requests.

| Current Reviews | Age (Months) |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Turkey Point Units 3 & 4 | 45 |
| Saint Lucie Units 1 & 2 | 45 |
| Calvert Cliffs Unit 1 & 2 | 31 |
| Palo Verde Units 1, 2, & 3 | 38 |

- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 805 Reviews
 - Description: NFPA Standards Council approved NFPA Standard 805, "Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light-Water Reactor Electric Generating Plants, 2001 Edition," on January 13, 2001, as a risk-informed, performance-based standards for existing light-water nuclear power plants. The NRC staff cooperatively participated in the development of NFPA 805 as an alternative to the rules in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix R. Each submittal requesting implementation of NFPA 805 is over 1000 pages, requires five different technical disciplines to review, and has reviews staggered in an overlapping fashion. At any one time, 30 technical reviewers were active in the NFPA 805 LAR review process. Each NFPA 805 LAR requires at least one regulatory on-site audit; some required return regulatory audits to review on-site documentation and walk-down plant fire areas.
 - Justification: Risk-Informed and Voluminous - The NFPA 805 reviews are voluminous and technically challenging, have unique site-specific issues, have utilized unreviewed analysis methods (UAMs), and required additional response time for RAIs. Some licensees used UAMs that deviated from the acceptable methods provided in NUREG/CR-6850, "EPRI/NRC-RES Fire PRA Methodology for Nuclear Power Facilities" as endorsed in NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants; LWR Edition," Section 9.5.1.2, "Risk-informed, Performance-Based Fire Protection Program." Because these methods had not been found acceptable previously, they had to be reviewed in-depth by the staff for the first time. To resolve these UAMs, the licensees either perform a sensitivity analysis or redo their fire probabilistic risk assessment (PRA). Due to the complexity of these methods, a great deal of time is required for the staff to prepare initial RAIs, significant time may be required for licensees to provide responses, and several rounds of RAIs may be needed to resolve issues. In some cases, licensees required up to 180 days to respond to the more complex RAIs. This complexity adds greatly to the length of the review.

| Current Reviews | Age (Months) |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Davis-Besse Unit 1 | 33 |
| Hatch | 2 |

- Sequoyah Units 1 & 2 – Updated Final Safety Analysis Reports (UFSARs) Regarding Changes to Hydrologic Analysis
 - Description: To respond to a Confirmatory Action Letter, Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA or the licensee) submitted LARs on August 10, 2012, for Sequoyah, Units 1 and 2, that proposed to revise the respective UFSAR, Section 2.4, “Hydrologic Engineering,” to reflect new probable maximum flood (PMF) levels and the associated changes.
 - Justification: Resolution depended on a topical report that has not yet been approved - During the LAR review in 2013, TVA asked the staff to suspend the review in order to change the methodology from an in-house hydrology model to an industry standard model developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers and supplement the LAR. However, just before the supplement, TVA identified an error in the application of the new model in 2015 and has to re-perform the analyses. In addition, in August 2016, TVA also proposed to use another modern-day rainfall methodology that was not previously approved for licensing actions. The staff is currently reviewing this new rainfall methodology as a topical report for TVA to adopt and submit the final hydrology LAR supplement at the end of 2018. TVA cannot withdraw this LAR because it was credited to close out the 2012 Confirmatory Action Letter.
 - Current Age: 72 months

- McGuire Units 1 & 2 – Reactor Vessel Internals (RVI) Aging Management Plan License Renewal Commitment
 - Description: Materials Reliability Program: Pressurized Water Reactor Internals Inspection and Evaluation Guidelines, MRP-227-A, provides a generic program for aging management of pressurized water reactor (PWR) RVI. Many applicants made commitments during the license renewal process to implement the industry program (which became MRP-227-A) when it was completed. During calendar year 2012, the owners of seven PWRs, as part of their license renewal commitments, submitted Aging Management Programs (AMP) consistent with the MRP-227-A guidelines for RVI components and/or inspection plans.
 - Justification: Need for significant reanalysis or additional analysis by the licensee was identified during the review - Since 2013, considerable progress has been made towards resolving technical issues related to the NRC review of the plant-specific MRP-227-A inspection plans. However, responding to the RAIs related to such items as cold-worked components and core design/fuel management requires review of the fabrication records, which are usually held by the original equipment manufacturer (OEM). There is a backlog of licensee requests for the OEM to provide this information, resulting in delays of several months to a year.
 - Current Age: 7 months

- Seabrook – Alkali-Silica Reaction (ASR) Licensing Basis Amendment
 - Description: The licensee is requesting revising the current licensing basis to adopt a methodology for the analysis of seismic Category I structures with concrete affected by ASR.
 - Justification: First-of-a-kind review - Seabrook is the first US nuclear facility to exhibit ASR in concrete structures. As such, this LAR is a first-of-a-kind amendment to a plant’s licensing basis to include the effects of ASR. In addition, the LAR references licensee-conducted research to justify an analysis methodology that has never been used before.
 - Current Age: 25 months

- Brunswick Units 1 & 2 – Maximum Extended Load Line Limit Analysis Plus (MELLLA)+ Core Flow Operating Range Expansion
 - Description: The licensee is requesting to revise its technical specifications to allow operation in the MELLLA+ expanded operating domain. This domain increases operating flexibility by allowing control of reactivity at maximum power by changing flow, rather than by control rod insertion and withdrawal.
 - Justification: Dependent on Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) review - Due to the complexity of the subject, the review involves eight technical branches, and conducting ACRS subcommittee and full committee meetings.
 - Current Age: 24 months

- Browns Ferry 1, 2, & 3 – MELLLA+ Core Flow Operating Range Expansion
 - Description: The licensee is requesting to revise its technical specifications to allow operation in the MELLLA+ expanded operating domain. This domain increases operating flexibility by allowing control of reactivity at maximum power by changing flow, rather than by control rod insertion and withdrawal.
 - Justification: Dependent on ACRS review - Similar to Brunswick above, the review involves eight technical branches and conducting ACRS subcommittee and full committee meetings.
 - Current Age: 5 months

- Shearon Harris Unit 1 – Spent Fuel Pool Criticality Analysis
 - Description: The licensee is requesting to revise the TSs for fuel storage criticality to account for the use of Metamic neutron absorbing spent fuel pool rack inserts and soluble boron for the purpose of criticality control in the Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) storage racks that currently credit Boraflex. This license amendment request is required to resolve a current operable but degraded condition.
 - Justification: First-of-a-kind review - Precedents have shown that a review related to spent fuel pool criticality analyses is complex. Further, this review is considered a first-of-a-kind due to the unique configuration of the Shearon Harris spent fuel pool (SFP). Specifically, the SFP configuration is the only one in the United States that contains both pressurized water reactor fuel racks and boiling water reactor fuel racks.
 - Current Age: 11 months

- Point Beach Units 1 & 2 – Risk-Informed Approach to Resolve Construction Truss Design Code Non-conformances
 - Description: The licensee is requesting approval of a risk-informed strategy to resolve low risk, legacy design code non-conformances associated with construction trusses in the containment building.
 - Justification: Risk-informed and first-of-a-kind review - Established risk-informed applications follow endorsed guidance for the technical content that needs to be submitted. Endorsed technical guidance is not available for this first-of-a-kind application and extra review effort is needed to determine the acceptability of the proposed technical approach.
 - Current Age: 16 months

- Brunswick Units 1 & 2 – Adopt 10 CFR 50.69, "Risk-Informed Categorization and Treatment of Structures, Systems and Components [SSCs] for Nuclear Power Reactors"
 - Description: The licensee is requesting approval to allow for the implementation of the provisions of 10 CFR 50.69. The provisions of 10 CFR 50.69 allow adjustment of the scope of equipment subject to special treatment controls (e.g., quality assurance, testing, inspection, condition monitoring, assessment, and evaluation).
 - Justification: Risk-informed and first-of-a-kind review - This is a first-of-its-kind review that includes external hazard probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) models that have not been commonly submitted in support of risk-informed LARs. The NRC staff does not have extensive experience in reviewing those models. Therefore, the scope of staff review for this LAR will include evaluation of the acceptability of these relatively unique external hazard PRA models for the application and the use of those models in the licensee's categorization program.
 - Current Age: 6 months

- Wolf Creek Generating Station 1– “Transition to Westinghouse Core Design and Safety Analyses”

Description: The licensee is requesting approval to transition to Westinghouse Core design and Safety Analyses, including adoption of Alternative Source Term (AST).

 - Justification: Voluminous review - With the inclusion of the AST review, this review has expanded to over 21 reviewers and 10 Branches. AST reviews have historically taken over 12 months to complete.
 - Current Age: 15 months

- Indian Point Nuclear Generating 2 – “Spent Fuel Storage and Criticality Safety Analysis Technical Specifications”
 - Description: The proposed amendment would resolve a non-conservative TS associated with TS LCO 3.7.13, negate the need for the associated compensatory measures, and remove credit for the installed Boraflex neutron absorber panels.
 - Justification: First-of-a-kind review - This is a first-of-its-kind review because the licensee is proposing to apply axial burnup profiles in a manner that is different than the guidance which recommends using either, “Recommendations for Addressing Axial Burnup in PWR [Pressurized-Water Reactor] Burnup Credit Analyses” (NUREG/CR-6801), or site-specific profiles. Specifically, the licensee is applying profiles from both sources, as well as including modified versions of the profiles described in NUREG/CR-6801. Additionally, the licensee is proposing to perform a more realistic analysis by applying a “power peaking factor credit” instead of performing the depletion analysis at limiting conditions for legacy fuel. The staff considers this as significantly different from other applications.
 - Current Age: 7 months

- Watts Bar Nuclear Plant 1 & 2– “Request Authorization to Load Tritium Producing Burnable Absorber Rods (TPBARs)”
 - Description: The licensee is requesting approval to authorize up to 1,792 TPBARs. The LAR would also revise TSs related to fuel storage.
 - Justification: Voluminous review - This review has over 14 reviewers and 10 Branches assigned and similar reviews have taken over 16 months to complete.
 - Current Age: 6 months

New Reactors

- None

Uranium Recovery

- None.

13.d Please describe any steps taken to provide transparency into the progress of license amendment reviews, such as publicly available, real-time tracking of the completion of review schedule milestones.³

Operating Reactors

The routine interactions between licensees/applicants and the NRC project manager provide the same information, and possibly more insights, to a licensee regarding the status of an individual licensing review than would a tracking system. Therefore, the NRC does not consider such a tracking system necessary to facilitate these communications with licensees.

Project managers and licensees have routine communications regarding the status and schedules of licensing actions. During these conversations, the schedules for each licensing action are discussed, including schedule expectations, when to expect requests for additional information, and when to expect the safety evaluation, if approved. In addition, the project managers and their direct supervisors are accessible to the licensees by phone or e-mail if any other issues arise.

The NRC staff began publishing monthly performance metrics on the NRC public website in March 2018. While metrics do not provide insight into specific licensing amendment reviews, the metrics provide information on the age of the existing inventory as a whole along with the number of reviews completed. Information is also posted on the average adherence to initial schedules and resource estimates.

The NRC continues to refine its licensing process for operating reactors. Through the use of controls and metrics, the staff is currently meeting the Congressionally-reported metrics for the quantity of licensing actions reviewed annually, and the percentage of

³ No new information was added to this section since this last report.

actions completed within one year. The NRC considers the current performance metrics appropriate to balance efficiency with safety. These measures recognize that schedule performance can be affected by applicant, licensee, or NRC performance, and may need fluidity to account for emerging safety or security issues, or changes in licensee plans.

The NRC has launched several initiatives to focus on leveraging existing licensing processes to enhance efficiency, effectiveness, and predictability as a regulator, while maintaining a continued strong safety focus. For example, an initiative analyzed the issues that caused the backlog in processing amendment requests for reactor licensees, including issues related to the request for information (RAI) process, and provided recommendations to Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation management regarding enhancements to the licensing review process. Such efforts resulted in reducing the inventory of licensing actions greater than one year old by more than 95 percent over the past years and enabled the staff to maintain this inventory at historically low levels. The staff's continual efforts in this area have significantly improved the NRC's ability to monitor safety reviews and improve predictability.

New Reactors

For NRO license amendment reviews, only the final safety evaluation report (FSER) completion date is tracked as a milestone. In the amendment request, the licensee provides a date by which the amendment would need to be issued in order to facilitate the desired construction schedule. Occasionally, the staff works with the licensee to identify an alternate agreed-upon date, which is provided in a supplement or revision to the amendment request. Letters containing the requested or alternate agreed-upon date for completion of the staff's review are publicly available.

Uranium Recovery

To ensure transparency in the process of licensing reviews, the NRC's uranium recovery staff provides the status of major licensing actions on the agency's public web page. For minor licensing actions, staff discusses these schedules during phone calls with licensees. In addition, for major licensing action reviews, the uranium recovery staff issues schedule letters at the beginning of each review and subsequent letters are issued, if the schedule changes.

14. For decommissioning transition reviews, please provide the following information for the reporting period, including any months previously reported:
- Size of inventory;
 - The number of items completed in the reporting period;
 - Of the items completed in the reporting period, the number completed within the originally forecasted schedule;
 - The number of items completed within 125 percent of the forecasted schedule;
 - Please identify any “unusually complex” items omitted from the inventory including: the age of the item, a brief description of the item, the justification for omitting it from the inventory size and an explanation for any review exceeding its original schedule by 125 percent.

| Decommissioning Transition Open Inventory and Closed Reviews | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Month | Open Inventory Total (Note 1) | Closed Reviews Total |
| November 2017 | 19 | 1 |
| December 2017 | 15 | 4 |
| January 2018 | 14 | 1 |
| February 2018 | 15 | 0 |
| March 2018 | 12 | 7 |
| April 2018 | 14 | 0 |
| May 2018 | 16 | 0 |
| June 2018 | 12 | 4 |
| July 2018 | 14 | 0 |
| August 2018 | 16 | 0 |

Note 1: The inventory includes licensing actions and other licensing tasks specifically related to an operating reactor plant transitioning into a decommissioning plant.

Information responsive to #14c-e is included in the response to #13 above.

15. Please provide a list of Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) "travelers" under review, including the date filed, the milestone schedule for completing the review, and the estimated date for final agency action. Please provide an explanation for any review exceeding the original schedule by 125 percent.

| Traveler Under Review | Date Filed | Milestone Schedule (Draft SE) | Estimated Date for Final Agency Action (Final SE) |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| TSTF-541, "Add Exceptions to Surveillance Requirements When the Safety Function is Being Performed" | 09/10/2013 | 01/31/2019 | 07/31/2019 |
| TSTF-563, "Revise Instrument Testing Definitions to Incorporate the Surveillance Frequency Control Program" | 05/10/2017 | 12/31/2018 | 3/28/2019 |
| TSTF-565, "Clarify the Term Operational Convenience in the LCO 3.0.2 Bases," Revision 1 | 03/30/2018 | 11/16/2018 | 02/28/2019 |
| TSTF-564, "Safety Limit MCPR" | 08/28/2017 | 12/31/2018 | 2/28/2019 |

| Traveler Under Review | Date Filed | Milestone Schedule (Draft SE) | Estimated Date for Final Agency Action (Final SE) |
|---|------------|-------------------------------|---|
| TSTF-568, "Clarify Applicability of BWR/4 TS 3.6.2.5 and TS 3.6.3.2" | 12/19/2017 | TBD* | TBD* |
| TSTF-557, Revision 1, "Spent Fuel Storage Rack Neutron Absorber Monitoring Program" | 12/19/2017 | 09/28/2018 | 12/19/2018 |
| TSTF-566, "Revise Actions for Inoperable RHR Shutdown Cooling Subsystems" | 01/19/2018 | 12/16/2018 | 03/29/2019 |
| TSTF-569, "Revise Response Time Testing Definition" | 02/08/2018 | 11/05/2018 | 02/08/2019 |

* The NRC staff has paused its work to allow the TSTF to consider whether to withdraw or revise the traveler, based on staff questions.

There were no traveler reviews that exceeded the original schedule by 125 percent.

16. Please describe the actions planned and/or taken to ensure that the TSTF traveler process achieves the regulatory efficiencies that were initially projected. Please include progress reports with regard to any TSTF travelers adopted by the industry.

The TSTF proposes changes to the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) via a "traveler" submitted for NRC review and approval. The traveler process was collaboratively developed between NRC and the nuclear industry 20 years ago as a means to revise the STS to gain regulatory efficiencies and enhance safety. Since then, the NRC has approved over 355 travelers, and has a mature process for review and approval of plant-specific license amendment requests to adopt approved STS changes.

Over the last several years NRC introduced two enhancements to the traveler review process: (1) increased transparency and documentation through publication of safety evaluations; and (2) ensuring that all appropriate technical branches are involved early and working as a team to ensure consistency. More recently, NRC and the TSTF adopted two additional best practices to make reviews more efficient and effective: (1) establishing teams of reviewers who develop expertise on a given traveler; and (2) leveraging the staff expertise on a particular traveler through timely submission of plant specific requests for adoption. The NRC is seeing early successes from these enhancements in the reviews of licensees' adoption of TSTF-542, "Reactor Pressure Vessel Water Inventory Control." Average review times for recent traveler adoptions have dropped to 10 months, in part as a result of these above efficiencies.

The NRC will continue working with the TSTF to make improvements to the STS. In recent years, requested changes from industry stakeholders have become more complex (e.g., risk-informed STS changes). To ensure the traveler process achieves the regulatory efficiencies that were initially intended, and to align on priorities, the NRC holds quarterly public meetings and monthly status calls with the TSTF.

In 2018, one traveler has been approved by the NRC. Eight travelers are under review. The latest status report of travelers currently under review is publicly available (ADAMS Accession No. ML18221A575); this report is updated quarterly.

17. For each ongoing license renewal review, please provide the date each application was filed, the duration of the review, the original milestone schedule based on 22 months for uncontested applications and 30 months for contested applications, the actual completion dates for milestones, and the scheduled date for completion of the review. Please provide an explanation for any review exceeding the original schedule by 125 percent.

| Indian Point 2&3 | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | | 133 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Current Schedule | Completion Date |
| License Renewal Application Receipt | 04/30/2007 | | 04/30/2007 |
| Publish <i>Federal Register</i> Notice (FRN)- Acceptance/rejection and opportunity for hearing | 08/01/2007 | | 08/01/2007 |
| Public Meeting - Environmental Scoping | 09/19/2007 | | 09/19/2007 |
| Issue draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) | 07/25/2008 | | 12/22/2008 |
| Issue SER with open items | 09/05/2008 | | 01/15/2009 |
| 1 st ACRS Subcommittee meeting | 10/2008 | | 03/18/2009 |
| Issue final SER | 03/27/2009 | | 08/11/2009 |
| ACRS Full Committee meeting | 05/2009 | | 09/10/2009 |
| Issue final SEIS | 04/03/2009 | | 12/03/2010 |
| 1 st Supplement to SER | N/A* | | 08/30/2011 |
| Issue Draft 1 st Supplement to final SEIS | N/A* | | 06/26/2012 |
| Issue Final 1 st Supplement to final SEIS | N/A* | | 06/13/2013 |
| FRN – Notice of Intent to Prepare Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement | N/A* | | 09/04/2014 |
| 2 nd ACRS Subcommittee meeting | N/A* | | 04/23/2015 |
| Issue 2 nd Supplement to SER | N/A* | | 07/07/2015 |
| Issue Draft 2 nd Supplement to final SEIS | N/A* | 01/2016 | 12/22/2015 |
| End of Comment Period for Draft 2 nd Supplement to final supplemental environmental impact statement (FSEIS) | N/A* | 03/2016 | 03/04/2016 |
| Issue Final 2 nd Supplement to FSEIS | N/A* | 05/2018 | 04/30/2018 |
| Issue 3 rd Supplement to SER | N/A* | 07/2018 | 08/01/2018 |
| Decision-Director, NRR (no hearing) | 07/2009 | 09/2018 | 09/17/2018 |
| Commission decision (if hearing is granted) | TBD | N/A | |

*The NRC did not issue an official schedule for the first supplement to the final SEIS.

The Indian Point License Renewal Application schedule letters are publicly available in ADAMS at Accession Nos. ML071900365, ML080230115, ML081000441, ML082400214, ML100110063, ML101260536, ML102300092, ML14254A207, ML15147A199 and ML16153A351.

The delays in the review of the Indian Point application were associated with complex adjudicatory issues, audits, reviews of substantial new information submitted by the licensee, review of the severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMA) analyses and review of extensive public comments on NRC staff environmental review documents. In 2012, the issuance of renewed licenses was suspended pending completion of the continued storage rulemaking; the licensing reviews continued to move forward. On August 26, 2014, the Continued Storage rule

was approved and the Commission lifted the suspension on making final licensing decisions. In January 2017, the parties to the legal proceedings reached an agreement that resulted in the withdrawal of all contentions on the license renewal application. Thus, on March 13, 2017, the case before the NRC was voluntarily dismissed. The renewed licenses were issued on September 17, 2018.

| Seabrook 1 | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | | 97 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Current Schedule | Completion Date |
| License Renewal Application Receipt | 06/01/2010 | | 06/01/2010 |
| Publish FRN-Acceptance/rejection and opportunity for hearing | 07/23/2010 | | 07/21/2010 |
| Public Meeting- Environmental Scoping meeting | 08/19/2010 | | 08/19/2010 |
| Deadline for filing hearing requests and petitions for intervention | 09/21/2010 | | 10/20/2010 |
| Issue draft SEIS | 05/13/2011 | | 08/01/2011 |
| Issue SER with open items | 07/2011 | | 06/08/2012 |
| 1 st ACRS Subcommittee meeting | 09/2011 | | 07/10/2012 |
| Issue 2 nd draft SEIS | 12/2012 | | 04/22/2013 |
| Issue final SEIS | 01/07/2012 | | 07/29/2015 |
| 2 nd ACRS Subcommittee meeting | N/A | 11/2018 | |
| Issue final SER | 01/2012 | 12/2018 | |
| ACRS full committee meeting | 02/2012 | 12/2018 | |
| NRR Director Decision (no hearing) | 04/02/2012 | 04/2019 | |
| Commission Decision (if hearing is granted) | 12/03/2012 | NA | |

The Seabrook license renewal application schedule letters are publicly available in ADAMS at Accession Nos. ML101690417, ML110890319, ML11178A365, ML12074A096, ML12109A427, ML12352A075, ML13298A091, ML14148A218, ML14223B144, ML15041A449, ML15107A300, ML15293A157, and ML16074A246.

In 2011, the Seabrook schedule was updated to ensure that the applicant addressed issues related to the ASR of concrete and the SAMA analysis. In 2012, subsequent to the NRC staff issuing the draft SEIS, the applicant made significant changes to the SAMA analysis. Additionally, in 2012, the final licensing decisions were suspended pending completion of the Continued Storage rulemaking; the licensing reviews continued to move forward. The second draft SEIS was issued in April 2013 and in August 2013 an agreement regarding a contention associated with the SEIS was reached. On August 26, 2014, the Continued Storage rule was approved and the Commission lifted the suspension on final licensing decisions. The NRC staff issued the final SEIS in 2015.

In August 2016, NextEra submitted an LAR to the current license to adopt a methodology for the analysis of seismic Category I structures with concrete affected by ASR. This methodology is the basis for the aging management program being evaluated for the license renewal application review. On October 6, 2017, the ASLB granted a hearing and admitted a contention on the ASR LAR. After the NRC staff completes its safety evaluation of the ASR LAR, the ASLB hearing will be held and the ACRS will also perform its review. The review of this

amendment has a direct impact on the schedule for the license renewal review and a decision on the license renewal is currently projected to be made by April 2019.

| Waterford 3 | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | | 27 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Current Schedule | Completion Date |
| License Renewal Application Receipt | 03/23/2016 | | 03/23/2016 |
| Publish FRN-Acceptance/rejection and opportunity for hearing | 05/20/2016 | | 05/20/2016 |
| Public Meeting- Environmental Scoping meeting | 06/08/2016 | | 06/08/2016 |
| Deadline for filing hearing requests and petitions for intervention | 08/01/2016 | | 08/01/2016 |
| Issue draft SEIS | 05/2017 | 08/2018 | 08/15/2018 |
| Issue SER | 06/2017 | 08/2018 | 08/17/2018 |
| ACRS Subcommittee meeting | 07/2017 | 09/2018 | |
| Issue final SEIS | 03/2018 | 11/2018 | |
| Issue final SER | 01/2018 | 11/2018 | |
| ACRS full committee meeting | 03/2018 | 11/2018 | |
| NRR Director Decision (no hearing) | 04/2018 | 12/2018 | |
| Commission Decision (if hearing is granted) | TBD | N/A | |

The Waterford License Renewal Application schedule letters are publicly available in ADAMS at Accession Nos. ML16130A023 and ML17131A194.

The NRC staff continues work on the Waterford safety and environmental reviews. The applicant submitted an LAR in November 2017 that requests approval of its plant-specific neutron fluence methodology that is applied to the reactor vessel embrittlement analysis referred to in the license renewal application. The review of the LAR is complete and it was approved on July 23, 2018. The LAR included a supplement to the License Renewal Application and the NRC staff determined that a request for additional information was required in order to complete its review of the supplement. The NRC staff received an acceptable response to the RAI, and issued its SER on August 17, 2018. The draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) was issued for public comment on August 15, 2018, and published as NUREG-1437, Supplement No. 59 on August 29, 2018.

| River Bend | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | | 12 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Current Schedule | Completion Date |
| License Renewal Application Receipt | 05/31/2017 | | 05/31/2017 |
| Publish FRN-Acceptance/rejection and opportunity for hearing | 08/2017 | | 08/17/2017 |
| Public Meeting- Environmental Scoping meeting | 09/2017 | | 09/19/2017 |
| Deadline for filing hearing requests and petitions for intervention | 10/2017 | | 10/13/2017 |

| River Bend | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | | 12 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Current Schedule | Completion Date |
| Issue draft SEIS | 05/2018 | | 05/25/2018 |
| Issue final SER | 07/2018 | 08/2018 | 08/16/2018 |
| ACRS Subcommittee meeting | 09/2018 | 09/2018 | |
| Issue final SEIS | 11/2018 | 11/2018 | |
| ACRS full committee meeting | 11/2018 | 11/2018 | |
| NRR Director Decision (no hearing) | 02/2019 | 02/2019 | |
| Commission Decision (if hearing is granted) | TBD | TBD | |

The River Bend license renewal application review schedule is publicly available in ADAMS at Accession No. ML17187A035. While the River Bend license renewal application review currently remains on schedule, a late breaking issue identified by the applicant caused a minor delay in issuing the safety evaluation report. The applicant stated that an error was discovered in a fuel vendor's fluence calculation report used to support the application. Based on the applicant's submitted documentation regarding this matter, the safety evaluation was updated to describe the staff's finding. The safety evaluation report was issued on August 16, 2018, to support the ACRS subcommittee meeting in September 2018.

18. Please provide the status of ongoing license renewal reviews.

| Applicant | Application Accepted for Review | Review Status for Long-Term Application Reviews |
|------------------|--|--|
| Indian Point 2&3 | 08/01/2007 | The renewed operating licenses for both units were issued on September 17, 2018. |
| Seabrook 1 | 07/21/2010 | As discussed above, the NRC staff continues discussions with NextEra to ensure that technical issues related to the ASR open item in the SER are properly addressed. In August 2016, NextEra submitted a LAR to the current license to adopt a methodology for the analysis of seismic Category I structures with concrete affected by ASR. This methodology is the basis for the aging management program being evaluated under the license renewal application review. The ASLB has granted a hearing on the ASR LAR. After the NRC staff completes its safety evaluation of the ASR LAR, the ASLB hearing will be held and the ACRS will also perform its review. The review of this amendment has a direct impact on the schedule for the license renewal review. A decision on the license renewal is currently projected to be made by April 2019. |
| Waterford | 05/31/2016 | The NRC staff continues their safety and environmental reviews, including the resolution of specific questions regarding the Waterford neutron fluence time-limited aging analysis. The staff issued the DSEIS on August 15, 2018, and it was published as NUREG-1437, Supplement 59, on August 29, 2018. The SER was issued on August 17, 2018, to support the ACRS Subcommittee meeting in September 2018. The decision regarding the renewal of the |

| Applicant | Application Accepted for Review | Review Status for Long-Term Application Reviews |
|------------|---------------------------------|---|
| | | operating license is expected to be issued in the 1st quarter of FY 2019. |
| River Bend | 08/07/2017 | The NRC staff continues the safety and environmental reviews. The SER was issued on August 16, 2018. The next milestone is the September 2018 ACRS subcommittee meeting. The DSEIS was issued for public comment on May 25, 2018, and was subsequently published as a supplement to the “Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants” (NUREG-1437, Supplement 58), on May 30, 2018. The comment period on the DSEIS closed in July 2018 and the staff is working to respond to these comments as it develops FSEIS, which is expected to be issued in November 2018. |

19. Please provide the status of the NRC’s readiness to review applications for Subsequent License Renewal (SLR).⁴

In August 2014, the Commission affirmed that no revisions to either the safety or environmental regulations are needed to support the assessment of a SLR application. However, the Commission directed the staff to update license renewal guidance, as needed, to provide additional clarity on the implementation of the license renewal regulatory framework. The main guidance documents for initial license renewal are:

- Standard Review Plan for Review of License Renewal Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (SRP-LR), Revision 2;
- Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report, Revision 2; and
- Standard Review Plan for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants, Supplement 1: Operating License Renewal (Revision 1).

The guidance in these documents is based on plant operation up to 60 years. The staff evaluated this guidance to determine what, if any, revisions were necessary to address issues for plant operations up to 80 years under SLR. The staff determined that no revisions were needed to the NRC guidance document entitled, “Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants,” to support environmental reviews from 60 to 80 years. However, the staff determined that the GALL Report and the SRP-LR should be updated to facilitate more effective and efficient reviews of SLR applications.

On July 14, 2017, the NRC published “Generic Aging Lessons Learned for Subsequent License Renewal (GALL-SLR) Report” (NUREG-2191, Volumes 1 and 2), and “Standard Review Plan for Review of Subsequent License Renewal Applications for Nuclear Power Plants” (SRP-SLR) (NUREG-2192). On December 29, 2017, the NRC staff published NUREG-2221, “Technical Bases for Changes in the Subsequent License Renewal Guidance Documents NUREG-2191 and NUREG-2192,” and NUREG-2222, “Disposition of Public Comments on the Draft Subsequent License Renewal Guidance Documents NUREG-2191 and NUREG-2192.”

On November 6, 2015, Dominion Virginia Power notified the NRC of its intent to submit an SLR application in the first quarter of 2019 for Surry Power Station. On November 9, 2017, Dominion

⁴ No new information was added to this section since the last report.

Energy Virginia notified the NRC of its intent to pursue subsequent license renewal for North Anna Power Station Units 1 and 2, in the 4th quarter of 2020. As noted above, on January 30, 2018, Florida Power & Light Company submitted the first subsequent license renewal application for Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Units 3 and 4. On July 10, 2018, the NRC received Exelon's application for subsequent license renewal for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3. In addition, Dominion has recently provided verbal notification to the NRC of an acceleration in its schedule for submitting its subsequent license renewal application for the Surry Power Station to October 2018.

On December 20, 2017, the staff issued a letter to NEI providing interim approval for use of guidance documents NEI 17-01, "Industry Guideline for Implementing the Requirements of 10 CFR Part 54 for Subsequent License Renewal [SLR]," and NEI 17-04, "Model SLR New and Significant Assessment Approach for SAMA, Revision 0." These documents will provide interim guidance to licensees that have notified the NRC of their intent to submit SLR applications while formal NRC endorsement of the NEI guidance document is considered. The NRC expects that issuance of formal revisions to Regulatory Guides 1.188, "Standard Format and Content for Applications to Renew Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses," and 4.2, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications," by December 31, 2019, will supersede the interim guidance.

20. Once Subsequent License Renewal reviews begin, please report progress similarly to current license renewal reviews, including: the date each application was filed, the duration of the review, the original milestone schedule based on an 18-month review, the actual completion dates for milestones, and the scheduled date for completion of the review.

| Turkey Point | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | 3 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Completion Date |
| Receive subsequent license renewal application (SLRA) | 01/2018 | 01/30/2018, as supplemented on 04/10/2018 |
| Publish FRN – License Renewal Application availability | 04/2018 | 04/18/2018 |
| Publish FRN – Acceptance/Rejection and Opportunity for Hearing | 05/2018 | 05/02/2018 |
| Publish FRN – Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Scoping | 05/2018 | 05/22/2018 |
| Public Meeting – License Renewal Overview and Environmental Scoping meeting | 05/2018 | 05/31/2018 |
| Environmental scoping period ends | 06/2018 | 06/21/2018 |
| Deadline for filing hearing requests and petitions for intervention | 07/2018 | 08/01/2018* |
| Issue SEIS | 01/2019 | |
| Public Meeting – draft SEIS meeting, if needed | 02/2019 | |
| End of draft SEIS comment period | 03/2019 | |
| Issue safety evaluation report (SER) | 04/2019 | |
| ACRS Subcommittee meeting | 05/2019 | |

| Turkey Point | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | 3 |
| Milestone | Original Schedule | Completion Date |
| Issue final SEIS | 08/2019 | |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency FRN Published – availability of final SEIS | 08/2019 | |
| ACRS full committee meeting | 07/2019 | |
| Decision – Director, NRR | 10/2019 | |

* Order (Granting a Partial Extension of Time) (ADAMS Accession No. ML18180A185)

The staff issued the acceptance letter dated April 26, 2018, with the review schedule. The notice of application acceptance and opportunity for hearing was published in the *Federal Register* on May 2, 2018.

The staff has begun its detailed environmental and safety review of the Turkey Point subsequent license renewal application. Between May 7 and May 18, 2018, the staff conducted an audit of FPL’s operating experience information in support of the staff’s safety review. The staff performed its in-office regulatory audit between June 18 and July 13, 2018, to (1) review the applicant’s scoping and screening methodology used to identify SSCs within the scope of license renewal and subject to aging management review (AMR) and (2) (a) examine FPL’s AMPs, AMR items, and time-limited aging analyses (TLAAs) for Turkey Point; (b) verify FPL’s claims of consistency with the corresponding GALL-SLR Report AMPs, and AMR items, and (c) assess the adequacy of the TLAAs. The results of the audit will be issued in an audit report within 90 days after the end of the audit. The NRC staff performed an issue-specific on-site audit at Turkey Point during June 17 – 20, 2018, to inform its review of the applicant’s approach on aging management of irradiated concrete for subsequent license renewal and is continuing with the in-office phase of this audit. This audit was extended and the staff will return to the Turkey Point site during the week of September 17, 2018. During the week of August 27, 2018, the staff conducted its subsequent license renewal on-site audit and will document the results in an audit report within 90 days after the end of the audit.

On May 22, 2018, the staff issued a *Federal Register* Notice announcing its intent to conduct the environmental scoping process and to prepare an environmental impact statement. On May 31, 2018, the staff held two public environmental scoping meetings in Homestead, FL, near the Turkey Point site. Between June 19 and June 22, 2018, the staff was on-site to conduct an environmental audit in support of the staff’s review of the subsequent license renewal application. The results of the audit were issued on August 1, 2018.

In early August, three petitions for hearing were submitted for the Turkey Point subsequent license renewal application by (1) Friends of the Earth, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Miami Waterkeeper, (2) Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, and (3) Mr. Albert Gomez. The applicant and staff have filed answers to the petitions. The ASLB has indicated its intention to hold oral argument on the petitions in November or December 2018.

Peach Bottom

On July 10, 2018, the NRC received its second application for subsequent license renewal from Exelon Generating Co. for Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3. The application was made publicly

available on July 26, 2018. The staff informed the applicant in a letter dated August 27, 2018, that the application is accepted for detailed technical review.

| Peach Bottom | | |
|---|------------------|---------------|
| Application Review Time from Acceptance Review Date (Months) | | 0 |
| Milestone | Scheduled | Actual |
| Receive subsequent license renewal application (SLRA) | 07/10/2018 | 07/10/2018 |
| Publish FRN – LRA availability | 08/2018 | 08/01/2018 |
| Publish FRN – docketing acceptance/rejection and opportunity for hearing | 09/2018 | |
| Publish FRN – Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process | 09/2018 | |
| Public Meeting – Overview of Subsequent License Renewal Process and Environmental Scoping Process | 09/25/2018 | |
| Environmental scoping process period ends | 10/2018 | |
| Deadline for filing hearing requests and petitions for intervention | 11/2018 | |
| Issue DSEIS | 07/2019 | |
| Issue SER | 09/2019 | |
| Public Meeting – draft SEIS meeting, if needed | 09/2019 | |
| End of DSEIS comment period | 09/2019 | |
| ACRS Subcommittee meeting | 10/2019 | |
| ACRS Full Committee meeting | 12/2019 | |
| Issue final SEIS | 01/2020 | |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency FRN Published – availability of final SEIS | 02/2020 | |
| Decision – Director, NRR | 03/2020 | |

21. For each ongoing power uprate review, please provide:

- a. The date the application was filed;
- b. The duration of the review;
- c. The original milestone schedule;
- d. The actual completion dates for the milestones; and
- e. The scheduled date for completion of the review based on the metrics in SECY-13-0070.

| Plant Name | Uprate Type (Note 1) | Date Filed | Planned Issue Date | Actual Issue Date | Planned Review Duration (Months) (Note 2) | Actual Review Duration (Months) | Notes |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| None | | | | | | | |

Note 1: MUR = measurement uncertainty recapture power uprate
EPU = extended power uprate

Note 2: For licensing actions, with an application date of October 1, 2016, or later, the duration of the review of the licensing action will be measured starting when the acceptance review is complete.

22. Please provide a brief status of power uprate application reviews.

No power uprate reviews are ongoing at this time.

23. Please provide the following information below regarding Requests for Additional Information (RAI) issued by each of the following offices: Nuclear Reactor Regulation, New Reactors, Nuclear Security and Incident Response, Uranium Recovery, and Decommissioning. The number of RAIs includes the total number of questions or requests contained in a letter or email. For example, if a letter requests five items, the number of RAIs is five. For each office and for the period being reported, please provide:
- Number of RAIs issued;
 - The number of RAIs issued prior to preparation of a draft safety evaluation with open items;
 - The number of RAIs issued in an additional round, subsequent to previous RAIs, in specific technical area or by a technical branch;
 - The percentage of RAI responses provided by licensees within 30 days of the date mutually agreed upon;
 - The number of RAIs prepared or responses reviewed by contractors; and
 - The number of RAIs prepared or responses reviewed by NRC staff.
 - Once sufficient data becomes available please provide 12-month rolling average number of RAIs issued by each office.

NOTE: Information for the Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response is included within each of the other entities or programs reporting below.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

| Month/Year | Number of RAIs Issued | Number of RAIs Issued Prior to the Preparation of a Draft Safety Evaluation with Open Items | Number of RAIs Issued in an Additional Round, Subsequent to Previous RAI's in Specific Technical Area or by a Technical Branch | The Percentage of RAI Responses Provided by Licensees within 30 Days or the Date Mutually Agreed Upon | The Number of RAIs prepared by NRC staff | The Number of RAI Responses Reviewed by NRC Staff | 12 Month Rolling Average, Number of RAIs Issued by Each Office |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| August 2018 | 183 | Note 1 | 9 | 100% | 114 Note 2 | 90 | Note 3 |

- Note 1: The database systems do not have readily available information that distinguishes between item 23a and 23b. Accurately compiling the number of RAI questions issued prior to preparation of a draft safety evaluation with open items would require extensive manual document searches and analysis to cover the significant volume of project reviews. The count of RAIs is presented collectively under Item 23a.
- Note 2: The NRC employs contractors to supplement the staff in selected critical skill areas; however, all RAIs identified by contractors are evaluated by NRC staff to verify that they are necessary to support a regulatory finding. If the RAIs are necessary, they are formally prepared and issued by NRC staff. The NRC does not track the number of draft RAIs prepared by contractors. In addition, the NRC staff is responsible for making the final determination on the acceptability of all RAI responses.
- Note 3: A 12-month rolling average will not be available until November 2018.

Office of New Reactors

| Project Name | Number of RAIs Issued in Aug 2018 | Number of RAIs Issued Prior to Preparation of a Draft SER with Open Items in Aug 2018 | Number of RAIs Issued in an Additional Round, Subsequent to Previous RAIs, in Specific Technical Area or by Technical Branch in Aug 2018 (Note 1) | Percentage of RAIs Responses Provided by the Applicant/Licensee within 30 Days or the Date Mutually Agreed Upon in Aug 2018 | Number of RAIs Prepared or Responses Reviewed by Contractors in Aug 2018 (Note 2) | Number of RAIs Prepared or Responses Reviewed by NRC Staff in Aug 2018 (Note 2) | 12-Month Rolling Average (Note 3) |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| APR1400 Design Certification (DC) | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 6 (All revised responses) | N/A |
| U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor (US-APWR) DC | 1 | 0 | 1 | N/A | 0 | 1 | N/A |
| Advanced Boiling Water Reactor (ABWR) DC Renewal (General Electric Hitachi (GEH)) | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Clinch River Early Site Permit (ESP) | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| NuScale Small Modular Reactor (SMR) DC | 9 | 9 | N/A | 34% | 0 | 65 | N/A |
| NuScale Topical Reports | 2 | 2 | N/A | 22% | 0 | 17 | N/A |

| Project Name | Number of RAIs Issued in Aug 2018 | Number of RAIs Issued Prior to Preparation of a Draft SER with Open Items in Aug 2018 | Number of RAIs Issued in an Additional Round, Subsequent to Previous RAIs, in Specific Technical Area or by Technical Branch in Aug 2018 (Note 1) | Percentage of RAIs Responses Provided by the Applicant/Licensee within 30 Days or the Date Mutually Agreed Upon in Aug 2018 | Number of RAIs Prepared or Responses Reviewed by Contractors in Aug 2018 (Note 2) | Number of RAIs Prepared or Responses Reviewed by NRC Staff in Aug 2018 (Note 2) | 12-Month Rolling Average (Note 3) |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Vogtle LARs | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A |

Note 1: NRO does not currently have an electronic system to track how many RAIs are issued in an additional round as a subsequent RAI to a previous RAI issued. To develop this capability within the current electronic system used to track RAIs would be labor and resource intensive.

Note 2: The NRC employs contractors to supplement the staff in selected critical skill areas; however, all RAIs identified by contractors are evaluated by NRC staff to verify that they are necessary to support a regulatory finding. If the RAIs are necessary, they are formally prepared and issued by NRC staff. The NRC does not track the number of draft RAIs prepared by contractors. In addition, the NRC staff is responsible for making the final determination on the acceptability of all RAI responses.

Note 3: A 12-month rolling average will not be available until November 2018.

Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

Uranium Recovery

| Month/Year | Number of RAIs Issued | Number of RAIs Issued Prior to the Preparation of a Draft Safety Evaluation with Open Items | Number of RAIs Issued in an Additional Round, Subsequent to Previous RAIs in Specific Technical Area or by a Technical Branch | The Percentage of RAI Responses Provided by Licensees within 30 Days or the Date Mutually Agreed Upon | The Number of RAIs prepared by Contractors | The Number of RAI Responses Reviewed by Contractors | The Number of RAIs prepared by NRC staff | The Number of RAI Responses Reviewed by NRC Staff | 12 Month Rolling Average, Number of RAIs Issued by Each Office |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| August 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |

Reactor Decommissioning

| Month/Year | Number of RAIs Issued | Number of RAIs Issued Prior to the Preparation of a Draft Safety Evaluation with Open Items | Number of RAIs Issued in an Additional Round, Subsequent to Previous RAIs in Specific Technical Area or by a Technical Branch | The Percentage of RAI Responses Provided by Licensees within 30 Days or the Date Mutually Agreed Upon | The Number of RAIs prepared by Contractors | The Number of RAI Responses Reviewed by Contractors | The Number of RAIs prepared by NRC staff | The Number of RAI Responses Reviewed by NRC Staff | 12 Month Rolling Average, Number of RAIs Issued by Each Office |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| August 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | N/A |

24. Please provide the status of specific actions taken or planned to ensure greater discipline, management oversight, and transparency in the use of the RAI process and to limit RAIs to those necessary for making regulatory decisions. The description should include: management oversight and accountability, the training necessary to provide consistency and sustainable improvement across the applicable program business lines, efforts to establish consistent procedures in relevant offices, and any gaps or trends identified by management or through internal reviews including periodic internal RAI audits.

Efforts to establish consistent procedures throughout the agency are being initiated by the establishment of a working group to align, where appropriate, licensing strategies across the agency including the RAI process. This effort, which is in the initial stages, will include representatives from NMSS, NRR, NRO, the Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response (NSIR), and OGC.

NRR Activities

NRR continues to take actions to sustain the improvements in the RAI guidance and the accountability in the process. In April 2018, mandatory RAI refresher training was conducted for applicable NRR, NSIR, and NRO staff and branch chiefs. The training emphasized (a) the explicit identification of the applicable technical and regulatory bases for RAIs; (b) ensuring that the RAIs issued are relevant to the licensing action being reviewed; (c) the requirements and expectations regarding the RAI administrative processes and records management; and (d) the expectation associated with achieving the RAIs issuance target of 5 days. Additionally, an NRR desk-top audit review guide and associated RAI quality review template is being piloted and will be finalized with lessons learned. These tools will be used to conduct RAI quality reviews that assess progress on recommendations and adherence to applicable NRR guidance. These subsequent RAI reviews of licensing actions are scheduled to be conducted on a routine basis throughout the year. Lessons learned from the NRR RAI process will be incorporated and expanded to update applicable standalone office-level guidance for other NRC programs such as license renewal and non-power production utilization facilities activities.

NRO Activities

NRO has taken several steps to ensure that its RAIs are consistently of high quality and are necessary to make a safety finding. In 2016, senior managers in NRO undertook initiatives to examine licensing activities with a goal of promoting a continued strong safety focus, consistency, efficiency, and clarity in our reviews of new reactor licensing applications. These initiatives included revising the RAI process to promote the consistent generation of high quality RAIs.

In October 2016, the NRO RAI process was revised (ADAMS Accession No. ML16280A389) to include a new quality check audit process where, in addition to the technical branch's supervisor, the division management of both the technical and project management organizations review an RAI before it is issued to the applicant or licensee. In addition, the NRO Office Director reviews a sample of RAIs to keep abreast of high-priority issues identified in reviews and to support NRO's emphasis on effectiveness and efficiency as it focuses on safety, security, and environmentally significant matters.

On October 7, 2016, the NRO Office Director issued a memorandum titled "Effective Use of Request for Additional Information, Audit, and Confirmatory Analysis in New Reactor Licensing Review," to all NRO staff, which emphasized the goals of the RAI process, described the revised process, and included a job aid that contains best practices for preparing RAIs.

The staff has incorporated many lessons-learned into its review of the active DC and ESP applications. The 2016 initiative to improve the focus of RAIs has improved the quality and safety focus of these requests. The staff is also using the regulatory audit tool earlier in the process to better inform the staff about the bases supporting the applications and therefore, better focus the staff's RAIs on information that directly relates to the staff reaching safety findings.

In early 2018, the staff conducted an audit to assess the effectiveness of the revised NRO RAI process. The audit evaluated whether the revised RAI process has yielded tangible improvements to NRO's licensing process, and if the revised RAI process should be maintained, modified, or eliminated. The RAI audit team found the quality of the RAIs that have gone through the current review process was generally excellent.

In August 2018, NRO completed a significant update to its guidance on the development, processing and issuance of RAIs. The updated guidance identifies the key attributes of high quality RAIs and provides direction for the staff in formulating RAIs to emphasize these attributes. One key attribute is ensuring that each RAI includes the safety, security, risk, and/or environmental significance of the question. This facilitates NRC's focus on the most risk and safety significant aspects of our reviews.

NMSS Activities

In NMSS, internal guidance for uranium recovery and waste program reviews includes the expectation that RAIs will be developed in conjunction with the draft SER to ensure that each RAI is necessary to reach a safety finding. In addition, the guidance contains the expectation to include a reference in the RAI to the specific relevant requirement and encourages staff to conduct telephone conferences with licensees and applicants to efficiently resolve technical issues on RAIs. The NRC staff recently finalized an internal self-assessment that identifies possible efficiency improvements within the Uranium Recovery Program. The self-assessment includes recommendations for improving the efficiency of the RAI process, such as issuing RAIs as they are written rather than as a group, and reemphasizing the expectation that staff develop the draft safety evaluation and RAIs in concert.

NMSS is also in the process of studying RAI approaches used by other offices at the NRC, developing office procedures, revising guidance, and evaluating the development of job aids to incorporate applicable RAI approaches from other NRC branches, divisions and offices. Following completion of this effort, NMSS will develop a training plan, as needed, to implement the resulting RAI process products.

In addition, NMSS is revising NUREG-1556, Volume 20, "Guidance about Administrative Licensing Procedures." Information in this NUREG regarding requests for additional information for materials licensing actions is being updated to improve consistency and management oversight between NRC headquarters and regional materials licensing staff.

In August 2016, NMSS's Division of Spent Fuel Management (DSFM) issued Division Instruction (DI) 26, DSFM-26, Rev., 0, which provided management expectations and guidance to employees with regard to meeting division and business line goals of being an independent, transparent, and effective regulator. In DSFM-26, management has specifically indicated that "DSFM's goal is one round of RAIs for a typical review and a maximum of two rounds of RAIs. RAIs and the applicant's responses need to converge on the information needed for making a regulatory finding." As part of the management oversight process, the staff has been seeking concurrence by the division-level management, in-addition to branch-level, when a second round of RAIs is being considered during the review of an application. In addition, the

staff has developed further guidance on preparing RAIs that are clear, complete, and specific with respect to the requested information, the justification for the request, and the associated regulatory basis. This guidance has been discussed with all the reviewers as part of continuous training, supplemented by a desk guide and a quick reference card. The division is conducting a self-assessment on spent fuel storage and transportation licensing RAIs that were issued in FY 2017. The self-assessment will evaluate the clarity and effectiveness of RAIs issued by DSFM, and identify any potential improvements to the RAI development process. The self-assessment will be completed by the end of calendar year 2018.

The Division of Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review (FCSE) conducted a review of the FCSE RAI process during the second quarter of FY 2017. Staff reviewed audit reports from the NRC's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and the U.S. [Government Accountability Office](#) (GAO) "Statement of Facts" (GAO Job Code 100910). The NRC staff assessment report is at ADAMS Accession No. ML17102A783. The NRC staff also reviewed the internal policies and interviewed subject matter experts in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, the Office of New Reactors, and the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. The results of this assessment, including staff's recommendations and proposed actions for implementing recommended improvements, were documented in a report to FCSE management on May 25, 2017. The report proposed revisions to the FCSE Licensing Review Handbook, including:

- Periodically reinforcing expectations of key aspects in the RAI process during licensing seminars or division meetings;
- Promoting a more consistent and uniform use and application of the guidance, particularly following the instructions on interactions with the licensee, drafting the safety evaluation report as a tool to identify any RAIs, having a sound regulatory basis for the RAIs, and maintaining licensing reviews aligned with its scope;
- The addition of clear instructions specifying that RAIs should not request information available elsewhere; and
- Continuing with current management oversight practice for RAIs process, such as elevating any challenges encountered during the RAI process to Division management for their awareness and involvement.

Based on recommendations, FCSE has conducted 2 licensing seminars on RAIs for Project Managers and Technical Reviewers, as well as a team meeting for those involved in the license renewal application review for Honeywell International. Tasks for updates to the guidance are scheduled for completion by the end of September 2018.

No adverse findings were identified in the Final GAO Report GAO-17-344, "*U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Efforts Intended to Improve Procedures for Requesting Additional Information for Licensing Action are Underway*," dated May 25, 2017.

Efforts to establish consistent procedures throughout the agency are being initiated by the establishment of a working group to align, where appropriate, licensing strategies across the agency including the RAI process. This effort, which is in the initial stages, will include representatives from NMSS, NRR, NRO, NSIR, and OGC.

25. In keeping with the Commission's policy statement on the use of probabilistic risk assessment (PRA), please describe the agency's actions to enhance the integration of risk information across the agency's activities to improve the technical basis for regulatory activities, to increase efficiency, and to improve effectiveness. Please include actions taken or planned (including milestones, where appropriate) for improving the realism of

PRA information used in regulatory decision-making, for training staff to more effectively apply risk information, for updating agency processes and procedures accordingly, and for improving consistency among NRC offices and regions.

As directed by the Commission in SRM-M170511, the staff issued SECY-17-0112, which summarizes its plans to increase staff capabilities to use risk information in decision-making activities. The paper describes five overarching strategies and summarizes associated staff actions and plans. Strategy I evaluates and updates risk-informed decision-making (RIDM) guidance to foster a collaborative review process and a broadened understanding of risk and risk insights. Strategy II develops a graded approach for using risk information in licensing reviews. Strategy III enhances training requirements related to RIDM for managers and staff. Strategy IV advances NRC and industry risk-informed initiatives, and Strategy V enhances communication on risk-informed activities. As directed by SRM-M170511, the staff will provide periodic updates to the Commission on its progress.

Each strategy with examples of specific actions taken or planned (including milestones, where appropriate) is summarized in the table below. Additional details are available in SECY-17-0112 and in an action plan that leverages best practices in RIDM from the operating and new reactor programs (current revision at ADAMS Accession No. ML18211A439). Though strategies and actions mainly focus on the reactor program, Strategies III and V will be coordinated across all agency offices and the regions, as appropriate. In addition, risk-informed approaches as applied in the materials safety and waste management arenas are described, along with reactor safety and cross cutting activities, on the “Risk-Informed Activities” page on the NRC public Web site (<https://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/regulatory/risk-informed/rpp.html>).

| Strategy Description/Background | Actions/Milestones |
|---|--|
| <p>I. Evaluate and Update Guidance</p> <p>Updated or new guidance will be developed to more fully equip staff with the tools necessary to use quantitative or qualitative risk information in both traditionally deterministic and formal risk-informed reactor licensing reviews.</p> <p>Importantly, all other strategies also involve guidance development activities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revision to NUREG-1855, “Treatment of Uncertainties Associated with PRAs in Risk-Informed Decision Making” was published in March 2017 (ADAMS Accession No. ML17062A466). • A revision to Regulatory Guide 1.174 “An Approach for Using Probabilistic Risk Assessment in Risk-Informed Decisions on Plant-Specific Changes to The Licensing Basis” was published ahead of schedule in January 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML17317A256). • New and revised inspection procedures and field guides are being developed for risk-informed initiatives. • Action plan task 4 included a review of branch technical position (BTP) 8-8, “On-site (Emergency Diesel Generators) and Offsite Power Sources Allowed Outage Time Extensions,” to determine if clarification is needed for use of a 14-day backstop for deterministic evaluations; applicability of the guidance to one-time and permanent extensions; and defense-in-depth considerations, particularly with respect to mitigating the consequences of a loss of offsite power coincident with a loss-of-coolant accident with a single failure. Milestone: The staff issued its Risk-Informed Decision Making (RIDM) Phase 1 Findings and Recommendations report on June 26, 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18169A205; Enclosure 4 consists of proposed changes to BTP 8-8 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18169A214)). The staff |

| Strategy Description/Background | Actions/Milestones |
|--|---|
| | <p>plans to complete Phase 2, which is the implementation of accepted recommendations by December 2018.</p> |
| <p>II. Develop a Graded Approach for Using Risk Information in Licensing Reviews</p> <p>A graded approach seeks to leverage risk insights across the spectrum of licensing review types (i.e., deterministic and formal risk-informed submittals). A framework that supports a graded risk-informed review approach is already described in NUREG-0800 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML070630046 and ML13207A315).</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff created a tool to guide technical reviewers to consider plant design features when formulating the scope and depth of new reactor review activities. This tool was successfully applied to the NuScale design certification review and is a critical element of the ongoing enhanced safety-focused review of this design. • The NRC has made significant progress on initiatives to enhance the regulatory framework for non-light water reactors (non-LWRs) with risk-informed performance-based technology-inclusive approaches. The actions for advanced reactor reviews are described more fully in response to question 52. • Action plan task 3 involves developing a graded approach for using risk information more broadly in operating reactor licensing reviews. This involves creating tools to facilitate the consideration of both qualitative and quantitative risk insights in licensing reviews. Action plan task 1 seeks to expand the use of license review teams with enhanced collaboration between the engineering staff and the PRA practitioners. Milestone: The staff issued its RIDM Phase 1 Findings and Recommendations report on June 26, 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18169A205). The staff plans to complete Phase 2, which is the implementation of accepted recommendations by December 2018. |
| <p>III. Enhance Training Requirements Related to Risk-Informed Decision-Making (RIDM) for Managers and Staff</p> <p>The NRC provides over 30 formal staff training courses on technical and regulatory aspects associated with RIDM. Courses are available to all staff members; however, currently, only some NRC employees are required to take these courses. Furthermore, many courses focus on the technical aspects of PRA as opposed to describing how risk information can be used to inform regulatory decisions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new course for NRC managers (“Perspectives on Risk Informed Decision-Making for NRC Managers”) has been developed and presented for the first time. It focuses on applications of PRA and describes how risk insights can inform decision making. The pilot course’s success is currently being evaluated and management will determine if the course will be made mandatory for all supervisors and senior managers in the reactor program. Milestone: Conducted pilot course on June 14, 2018. • The staff continues to offer the “Risk-Informed Thinking Workshop” that provides participants with hands-on experience in applying RIDM using scenarios of practical agency work. • The staff plans to update position-specific qualification requirements to include the newly developed “Risk-Informed Thinking Workshop” for reactor program staff. • The staff is evaluating whether aspects of the “Risk-Informed Thinking Workshop” could be integrated with appropriate modules of the Fundamentals of Reactor Licensing Workshop for Technical Reviewers. This evaluation is still ongoing. • Action plan task 2 seeks to “broaden the definition of risk |

| Strategy Description/Background | Actions/Milestones |
|--|---|
| | <p>beyond just a quantitative value.” It re-emphasizes the definition of risk to ensure awareness and common understanding between the staff and managers and clarifies the concepts of risk insights in regulatory applications. The staff issued its RIDM Phase 1 Findings and Recommendations report on June 26, 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18169A205). The staff plans to complete Phase 2, which is the implementation of accepted recommendations by December 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new course was developed for managers and staff to teach the concepts in NUREG-1855. The course is in iLearn and on the NRC public website available to external stakeholders. The course was made available in June 2018. • A training manual for NUREG-1855 is being developed. This manual will provide actual examples to show how to apply the guidance in NUREG-1855. Milestone: Complete the manual by June 30, 2019. |
| <p>IV. Advance Risk-Informed Initiatives</p> <p>The NRC primarily uses the Risk Informed Steering Committee (RISC) to advance risk-informed initiatives. RISC is a senior management committee with members from each of the program offices. The industry also has a RISC composed of senior managers. Since inception in 2014, the NRC and industry RISCs meet quarterly. The NRC RISC’s objectives include the following: engage industry and listen to concerns relative to the use of PRA to support regulatory decision-making; communicate NRC actions in the area of risk-informed decision-making; discuss what initiative can be taken by the NRC to incentivize industry to</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire PRA realism: The staff is engaged with industry to evaluate and improve, where applicable, fire PRA realism. Existing processes allow licensees to propose method improvements through the fire PRA frequently asked question (FAQ) process, by submitting a license amendment request, or by submitting a topical report. The staff has conducted a fire PRA public workshop and four fire PRA public meetings with industry stakeholders since the third quarter of 2017 to elicit new fire PRA FAQs and research activities. NRC has completed four fire PRA FAQs to improve realism and is actively working with the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) under its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to improve fire PRA methods in several areas. The NRC and NEI also are working on two additional FAQs. In addition, industry is working on an alternate method to NUREG-2180 to allow credit for Very Early Warning Detection Systems (VEWFDS) in NUREG-2180. NRC staff has provided comments on the industry's earlier proposals in this area. • Realism in the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP): The NRC continuously maintains and improves guidance documents and NRC risk tools used to support ROP activities. One such tool is the Risk Assessment Standardization Project Handbook (RASP Handbook). In March 2017, the staff transmitted plans to discuss industry concerns associated with the RASP Handbook. As a result of public meetings, industry proposed pursuing the issue on common cause failure (CCF) as the highest priority and discussed alternatives. Industry provided a document regarding CCF |

| Strategy Description/Background | Actions/Milestones |
|--|---|
| <p>continue to develop PRAs to help both reduce uncertainty and provide a framework to make decisions in light of uncertainty; and discuss industry actions necessary to achieve the vision for future use of PRA to support regulatory decisions.</p> <p>A brief summary of RISC actions to improve the realism of PRA information used in regulatory decision-making are provided here. SECY 17-0112 Enclosure 3 provides additional information on all active RISC initiatives including TS Initiative 4b, The Peer Review Facts and Observations Closure Process, 10 CFR 50.69, PRA Methods Vetting Process, and Risk Aggregation.</p> <p>Activities supplemental to the RISC that also advance risk-informed initiatives are also briefly described here.</p> | <p>modeling for staff review on December 8, 2017, with a revised White Paper on January 26, 2018. Following review of the White Paper, the staff has responded with proposed additional guidance for addressing CCF for the Significance Determination Process to be discussed in at least one upcoming public meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credit for Diverse and Flexible Coping Strategies (FLEX) in RIDM: FLEX is currently being credited in multiple risk-informed applications. The NRC staff has developed several guidance documents to promote consistency and efficiency in applications in these areas. The staff is continuing to monitor the licensees' use of FLEX and is evaluating the need for additional guidance changes. <p>Additional activities that advance risk-informed initiatives outside the RISC include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperative Research Activities with the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). To conserve resources and to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, both the NRC and EPRI have agreed to cooperate in selected research efforts and to share information and/or costs whenever such cooperation and cost sharing is appropriate and mutually beneficial. A Memorandum of Understanding with EPRI (ADAMS Accession No. ML16223A497) currently covers a number of risk-related topics, including fire, seismic, PRA methods, treatment of uncertainties, and flooding. • Update to Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.200, "An Approach for Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Results for Risk-Informed Activities." RG 1.200 provides the staff position of what constitutes an acceptable base PRA and is the agency's vehicle for endorsing the industry consensus PRA standards and related PRA peer review guidance. ASME/ANS will publish and NEI has recently published updated industry documents related to PRA standards and peer reviews, respectively. RG 1.200 will be revised to reflect the NRC's endorsement of pertinent industry documents. • Consensus Standards Development: The NRC actively participates in the development and maintenance of consensus standards. This includes PRA standards for all operating reactors, design certification, and combined licenses for advanced LWRs and non-LWR nuclear power plants; these standards address all risk levels of PRA, all reactor operating modes, and all hazards. NRC participation ensures that the NRC's views are considered in the development of the standard and industry guidance. For example, the staff issued two separate letters in May 2017 and March 2018 regarding closure of findings from peer reviews and external hazard PRA peer-review guidance, respectively. |

| Strategy Description/Background | Actions/Milestones |
|--|---|
| <p>V. Enhance Communication on Risk-Informed Activities</p> <p>The NRC is enhancing communication to ensure that its stakeholders are aware of new and enhanced risk training courses and guidance, ongoing RIDM initiatives, and plans and experience using risk information.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff with risk/PRA expertise are sharing knowledge and experience through presentations at branch and division meetings across the offices on topics such as risk-informed screening tools for operating and new reactor reviews. Knowledge and experience is also being shared through working group and review team meetings. Seminars on RIDM for NRC inspectors and enhanced inclusion of RIDM topics at regional and senior reactor analyst counterpart meetings are planned. • The action plan includes a communication plan with key messages and tools to increase awareness of NRC's efforts related to the use of risk information. |

26. The NRC has a long-standing effort to establish an efficient, reliable, and predictable licensing process for power reactors to transition from analog to digital instrumentation and control systems for safety-related applications. Please provide the date this effort began, a milestone schedule for implementation of the licensing process including the actual milestone completion dates, and the scheduled date for completion.

The NRC is implementing an integrated strategy plan to modernize the NRC regulatory infrastructure for digital instrumentation and controls (I&C), through strategic and tactical modernization plans (MPs). The plan focuses on topics identified through discussions with stakeholders that will provide confidence in transitioning from analog to digital control systems (Integrated Action Plan - ADAMS Accession No. ML17102B307)

| MP #1A: Develop guidance for near term implementation of digital upgrades without prior NRC approval under 10 CFR 50.59 (limited scope of systems)(endorsement clarification of NEI 01-01 via RIS supplement) | |
|---|---------------------|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC begins effort: Prepare preliminary drafts of RIS 2002-22, Supplement 1, clarifying the staff's previous endorsement of NEI 01-01 | March 2017 |
| Issue Draft RIS for Public Comment | July 2017 |
| Issue revised Draft RIS for 2nd Public Comment Period | March 2018 |
| RIS issued | May 2018 (complete) |

| MP #1B: NRC review and endorsement, as appropriate, of industry technical guidance for addressing common cause failure in digital I&C (NEI 16-16) | |
|--|-----------------|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC begins effort: Begin staff evaluation of the partial draft of NEI 16-16 received December 22, 2016, and develop staff comments and gap analysis | December 2016 |

| MP #1B: NRC review and endorsement, as appropriate, of industry technical guidance for addressing common cause failure in digital I&C (NEI 16-16) | |
|---|---|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NEI submits complete NEI 16-16 to the NRC for review | Review suspended per NEI's request to evaluate the pending changes to EPRI technical guidance that underpins NEI 16-16. NEI plans to submit a revised NEI 16-16 by the 1st quarter of 2019. |
| NRC decision on technical adequacy and whether to issue a potential interim endorsement letter | To be determined |
| NRC formally enters NEI 16-16 into the Regulatory Guide development process (if decision is made to endorse) | To be determined |

| MP #1C: Modernize NRC's current position on defense against potential common cause failure in I&C systems and components | |
|--|-----------------|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC efforts begin: Begin staff review to identify if there are policy issues that need to be taken to the Commission | July 2017 |
| Present SECY paper to Commission for information | September 2018 |

| MP #2: Issue durable guidance for implementation of digital upgrades without NRC approval under 10 CFR 50.59 (full scope of systems) - Endorsement review of NEI 96-07, Appendix D | |
|---|---|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC efforts begin: Initiate review and stakeholder interactions of NEI guidance document, NEI 96-07, Appendix D, Guidelines for 10 CFR 50.59 Evaluations | April 2016 |
| NRC decision on technical adequacy and whether to issue a potential interim endorsement letter | The staff plans to issue a technical alignment letter in November 2018. |
| NRC formally enters NEI 96-07 Appendix D into the Regulatory Guide development process (if decision is made to endorse) | December 2018 |

| MP #3: Review Industry's process for using commercially available digital equipment | |
|---|-----------------|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC efforts begin: Public Meeting to discuss resolution of RIS 2016-05 public comments | April 2016 |
| EPRI publishes research results | November 2018 |

| MP #3: Review Industry's process for using commercially available digital equipment | |
|--|--|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NEI Submits NEI 17-06 for NRC Review | NEI to revise the schedule for providing NEI 17-06 based on discussions during the July 12 public meeting. Submittal date of March 2019 was proposed during the meeting. |
| NRC makes decision on technical adequacy | Once a submittal date is finalized, the staff will develop a schedule. |
| NRC staff completes audits of Safety Integrity Level certification organizations and accrediting entities | NEI to submit a proposal for industry oversight of the SIL certification process leveraging the EPRI research in lieu of NRC staff audits and observations of implementation |
| NRC formally enters NEI 17-06 into the Regulatory Guide development process (if decision is made to endorse) | July 2020 |

| MP #4A: Streamline the licensing process guidance - update to Interim Staff Guidance ISG-06 | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC begins effort: Conduct a series of public stakeholder meetings (e.g., public workshops) for additional feedback | February 2017 |
| Issue final Draft revision of ISG-06 for public comment | August 2018 (complete) |
| Issue final revision of ISG-06 | December 2018 |

| MP #4B: Develop strategic activities for long-term improvements to the regulatory infrastructure | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Activity | Completion Date |
| NRC begins effort to develop strategic plan to modernize overall regulatory infrastructure | October 2017 |
| Consider evaluation of lessons learned from MP 1-4A progress | April 2018 |
| Coordinate with stakeholders to identify potential regulatory gaps and potential options for improving the regulatory infrastructure | July 2018 (complete) |
| Develop additional detailed modernization plan for implementing tactical and strategic improvements to the regulatory infrastructure | October 2018 |

27. Please describe actions taken and/or planned to prepare to review industry requests to use Accident Tolerant Fuel in existing reactors, including but not limited to actions taken and/or planned for lead test assemblies and fuel loads. Please include a milestone schedule and brief project plan for both evolutionary and revolutionary designs.

The staff issued a draft final version of the NRC's accident tolerant fuel (ATF) project plan "Project Plan to Prepare the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for Efficient and Effective Licensing of Accident Tolerant Fuels" (ADAMS Accession No. ML18236A507) on August 24, 2018. The project plan outlines the strategy for timely licensing of near-term and longer-term ATF designs. It covers all aspects of ATF regulation, including fabrication, transportation, storage, and the regulatory framework for in-reactor performance. The plan also contains tasks covering regulatory and infrastructure needs, tools and methods for safety evaluations, and accounts for interactions with our external stakeholders including industry, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), international entities and non-governmental organizations.

After issuing the draft project plan, the NRC staff held a public meeting on September 12, 2018, to discuss major changes to the plan since the previously published version (December 2017), and to update stakeholders on the NRC's next steps in preparing to license ATF designs. These steps include finalizing the project plan by the end of September 2018, enhanced engagement with the nuclear fuel vendors pursuing ATF concepts, and commencing exercises to identify the phenomena important to safety for each concept.

The staff is actively engaged with stakeholders on mitigation plans for the closure of the Halden Reactor in Norway, a key fuel research facility in which several vendors were planning experimental testing for ATF concepts. The staff participated in a DOE workshop held in July 2018, at Idaho National Laboratory to identify and mitigate potential gaps in experimental testing capability for ATF resulting from the closure. The staff is currently developing comments on DOE's draft report developed following the workshop that proposes a path forward. NRC staff and management have also held several meetings with the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to discuss a potential successor community to the Halden Reactor Project and are planning to attend a workshop in October 2018 at which NEA plans to further elaborate on the proposal.

The staff is moving forward with drafting a generic communication to obtain timeline details, fuel qualification plans, and licensing strategy information from nuclear fuel vendors for the various ATF concepts. The responses will allow the NRC to adequately resource and prepare for future ATF licensing work. The staff expects to publish a draft of this document in September 2018 while requesting Office of Management and Budget clearance to officially issue the communication.

As indicated in a previous report, the NRC steering committee for lead test assemblies (LTAs) developed a draft letter to NEI regarding the use of LTAs in commercial operating nuclear reactors, which once finalized, will clarify the NRC staff's positions stated in its June 29, 2017, letter. The draft letter was approved on May 31, 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18100A045), and was published for public comment on June 7, 2018, for 20 days (83 FR 26503). The comment period was extended for an additional 20 days and closed on July 23, 2018 (83 FR 30989). Over 250 comment letters were received. The NRC staff is currently reviewing the comments for consideration as it revises the letter. A comment response document will be generated and released to the public when the letter is finalized.

28. Please describe actions taken and/or planned to improve the quality of cost benefit analyses conducted in association with new requirements, backfit analyses, or rulemaking, including the development of metrics for assessing the quality of cost-benefit analyses.

Please include milestones for completing these actions and the guidance that is currently under revision.⁵

The NRC has taken specific actions to improve the quality of cost-benefit analyses conducted in association with new requirements, backfit analyses, or rulemaking. The key milestones for these actions are described below.

On March 19, 2013, the Commission issued a staff requirements memorandum (SRM) regarding SECY-12-0157, “Consideration of Additional Requirements for Containment Venting Systems for Boiling Water Reactors with Mark I and Mark II Containments” (ADAMS Accession No. ML13078A017). The SRM directed the staff to seek detailed Commission guidance on the use of qualitative factors.

On March 20, 2013, the Commission issued SRM-SECY-12-0110, “Staff Requirements – SECY-12-0110 – Consideration of Economic Consequences within the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s Regulatory Framework,” directing the staff to identify potential changes to current methodologies and tools to perform cost-benefit analysis in support of regulatory, backfit, and environmental analyses. The Commission also directed the staff to provide a regulatory gap analysis before developing new cost-benefit guidance. On January 2, 2014, in response to SRM-SECY-12-0110, the staff submitted SECY-14-0002, “Plan for Updating the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s Cost-Benefit Guidance.” In SECY-14-0002, the staff identified potential changes to current methodologies and tools related to performing cost-benefit analysis in support of regulatory, backfit, and environmental analyses. The staff informed the Commission of its planned two-phase approach for revising the content and structure of cost-benefit guidance documents. Phase 1 aligns regulatory guidance across NRC’s business lines by restructuring and incorporating non-policy revisions to NRC cost-benefit guidance. This phase is underway, as described below. In Phase 2, staff will identify and analyze potential policy issues that could affect the NRC’s cost-benefit guidance and present these issues to the Commission for consideration and approval. The staff then will incorporate final updates to guidance for conducting cost-benefit analyses that support backfitting decisions.

On August 14, 2014, in response to SRM-SECY-12-0157, the staff submitted SECY-14-0087, “Qualitative Consideration of Factors in the Development of Regulatory Analyses and Backfit Analyses.” In SECY-14-0087, the staff proposed updating the cost-benefit guidance to include a set of methods that could be used for the consideration of qualitative factors within a cost-benefit analysis for regulatory and backfit analyses.

On December 16, 2014, in response to Commission direction to provide a regulatory gap analysis before developing new cost-benefit guidance, the staff submitted SECY-14-0143, “Regulatory Gap Analysis of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s Cost Benefit Regulations, Guidance and Practices.” In SECY-14-0143, the staff described the review of current NRC guidance, methodologies, and tools used for cost-benefit determinations. The staff also described the results of its review of the NRC regulatory analyses that had been completed and identified differences across NRC business lines (e.g., material users, fuel cycle facilities, new and operating reactors) and procedures (i.e., regulatory analyses, backfit analyses). Finally, SECY-14-0143 included staff’s gap analysis, and identified where additional guidance is needed to ensure consistency across the agency.

On March 4, 2015, the Commission issued SRM-SECY-14-0087. The Commission approved the staff’s plans for updating guidance regarding the use of qualitative factors, including the

⁵ No new information was added to this section since the last report.

treatment of uncertainties, and directed the staff to focus the update on capturing best practices for the consideration of qualitative factors. The Commission also directed the staff to provide a toolkit for analysts regarding the consideration of qualitative factors.

In July 2015 and May 2017, the staff held two public meetings on the proposed cost-benefit guidance updates. The staff also held a public workshop in March 2016 to discuss proposed changes to the cost-benefit guidance. Meeting participants included industry representatives, government and nongovernment organizations, and other interested parties.

The Phase 1 update identified in SECY-14-0002 and described above is underway. In April 2017, the NRC issued draft NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 5, "Regulatory Analysis Guidelines of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission," and published a notice requesting public comment in the *Federal Register* (82 FR 18163; April 17, 2017). The staff received three comment submissions with a total of 58 individual comments from industry stakeholders and members of the public. The NRC staff considered this input when revising the NUREG.

The staff submitted the draft final NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 5, and five appendices to the Commission via a notation vote paper dated March 28, 2018 (SECY-18-0042). The following appendices are included in this update:

- Appendix A, "Qualitative Factors Assessment Tools"
- Appendix B, "Cost Estimating and Best Practices"
- Appendix C, "Treatment of Uncertainty"
- Appendix D, "Guidance on Regulatory Analysis Related to ASME Rules"
- Appendix E, "Special Circumstances and Relationship to Other Procedural Requirements"

Metrics for assessing the quality of cost-benefit analyses are contained in NUREG/BR-0058, Appendix B. Enclosure B-4 to Appendix B discusses the expectations for quality cost estimates and details the steps to ensure high-quality cost-benefit analyses are developed and presented to agency management. Additionally, the enclosure describes the steps to verify the quality of a cost-benefit analysis through various techniques for checking accuracy.

The Commission is reviewing the draft final Revision 5 of NUREG/BR-0058. After the Commission provides direction, the staff will conduct Phase 2 of the activity, as described in SECY-14-0002.

29. Please provide the status of the revised guidance currently under development to clarify the use of qualitative factors, including milestones and the projected date for completion. In addition to this revised guidance, please list and briefly describe any actions taken and/or planned to improve the use of quantitative factors in regulatory analyses required for rulemaking, in the regulatory analyses required under the Backfit Rule, and in the Reactor Oversight Process Significance Determination Process.⁶

As noted above, the staff completed the draft final Revision 5 of NUREG/BR-0058 and provided the document to the Commission for its review (SECY-18-0042) on March 28, 2018.

In the interim, a draft of the NUREG was issued for public comment and is available for interim staff use. In conducting its regulatory analyses, the staff is implementing the best practices and lessons learned that are contained within this draft revision of NUREG/BR-0058.

In revising this cost-benefit guidance, the staff focused on improving methods for quantitative analyses, including the treatment of uncertainty and the development of realistic estimates of the cost of implementing proposed requirements. Specifically, the staff developed two appendices to NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 5 to guide the staff in these areas.

- Appendix B, “Cost Estimating and Best Practices,” provides expanded guidance on incorporating cost-estimating best practices, including estimating life-cycle costs.
- Appendix C, “The Treatment of Uncertainty,” expands on the existing guidance for performing uncertainty and sensitivity analyses for cost-benefit analyses.

In addition to the improved methods for quantitative analyses, the revised cost-benefit guidance directs the staff to quantify the estimates of costs and benefits to the extent possible. However, the staff acknowledges that some attributes in regulatory analyses are difficult to quantify, and require additional resources to develop a strictly quantitative analysis. To address this gap, staff developed a toolkit to enable analysts to clearly present analyses of qualitative results in a transparent way that decision makers, and stakeholders can understand.

- Appendix A, “Qualitative Factors Assessment Tools,” identifies best practices for the consideration of qualitative factors and describes a number of methods that can be used to support the NRC’s evidence-based, quantitative, and analytical approach to decision-making. The guidance clearly states that these methods (1) should only be used when quantification may not be practical, (2) are not a substitute for collecting accurate information to develop realistic cost estimates, and (3) do not constitute an expansion of the consideration of qualitative factors in regulatory, backfit, or environmental analyses.

Revision 5 of NUREG/BR-0058 is intended to meet the following objectives:

- Refocus and expand guidance on cost-benefit analysis across the agency
- Emphasize quantification and provides methods for creating realistic estimates
- Provide methods for assessing factors that are difficult to quantify
- Incorporate cost estimating best practices identified in U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) guidance and in recommendations from GAO in GAO-15-98, “Nuclear Regulatory Commission: NRC Needs to Improve Its Cost Estimates by Incorporating More Best Practices,” dated December 12, 2014
- Expand guidance on the treatment of uncertainties

⁶ No new information was added to this section since the last report.

- Enhance transparency of analysis for the decision-maker

With regard to the use of qualitative factors in the ROP's Significance Determination Process, the SRM for SECY-13-0137 directed the staff, in part, to "evaluate the need to provide additional clarity on the use of qualitative factors for operating reactors to provide more transparency and predictability to the process." The staff has completed its evaluation, which was documented in Enclosure 2 of SECY-18-0045, "Reactor Oversight Process Self-Assessment for Calendar Year 2017" (ADAMS Accession No. ML18059A155). To address the results of this evaluation, the staff is currently revising Appendix M of Inspection Manual Chapter 0609, "Qualitative Significance Determination Process," which it expects to complete by the end of the calendar year 2018. This revision will clarify the entry criteria for Appendix M and provide better guidance on application of the existing decision-making attributes in the appendix, but will not expand its use.

30. Please provide a list of all final generic regulatory actions issued in the last 3 years. Please include:
- Whether the item was reviewed by Committee for the Review of Generic Requirements (CRGR);
 - Whether the CRGR review was formal or informal⁷;
 - The CRGR recommendation; and
 - The NRC's conclusions with respect to compliance with the Backfitting Rule (i.e., no backfitting, cost-justified substantial increase, compliance exception, adequate protection exception).

The majority of the final generic regulatory actions that the NRC issues do not lead to backfitting. In addition, as discussed in response #34, the agency is working to enhance oversight to prevent unintended and unsupported backfits. The NRC issues many types of final generic regulatory actions, such as rules, orders, bulletins, generic letters (GLs), regulatory information summaries (RISs), RGs, standard review plans (SRPs), and ISGs.

The CRGR Charter, Revision 8 clarifies which issues should be forwarded to the Committee for review where new or revised generic requirements could propose backfits or new staff positions. Items for CRGR review are forwarded by the agency's program offices or are directed for review by the EDO. The table below illustrates that only a few final generic agency actions are reviewed by the CRGR to assess if generic backfitting concerns exist. Most backfitting issues are resolved during management review and legal review, or identified during interactions with external stakeholders. Rules, orders, bulletins, GLs, and RISs are final generic regulatory actions that are reviewed and evaluated to screen for potential backfitting concerns and new staff positions. CRGR performs a review of these items in a formal setting with the sponsoring office representatives when certain criteria are met, including:

- Stakeholders or NRC staff identify concerns regarding backfitting or regulatory analysis
- The EDO directs the review or an office director requests review
- Use of the compliance exception or the adequate protection exceptions to justify backfitting

⁷ In accordance with the new terminology for CRGR reviews as described in the June 2018 Revision 9 of the CRGR charter (ADAMS Accession No. ML17355A532), the terms "formal" and "informal" will be replaced with the terms "complex" and "routine," respectively, in the next monthly report. In addition, a new type of CRGR review, "CRGR Complex Review with Public Participation" will also be included.

- For rulemaking, if there are finality concerns or possible backfitting qualitative factors were used to justify a rulemaking with significant costs, or substantial statistical uncertainty exists in the qualitative benefit determination in the backfit analysis.

For rulemaking, over the last 3 years CRGR reviews were not conducted because the criteria for requiring CRGR review were not met for any of the rulemakings listed in the table. However, under the revised criteria, the CRGR is now more actively reviewing rulemaking activities. For example, in June 2017, the CRGR reviewed a draft proposed rule on cybersecurity at fuel cycle facilities. This marked the first CRGR review using the new criteria and guidance. The draft proposed rule is currently with the Commission for its consideration. Also, on October 25, 2017, the CRGR reviewed the draft final rule on enhanced weapons, firearms background checks, and security event notifications. In reviewing both of these packages, the CRGR requested additional information to ensure that the staff was not unnecessarily imposing backfits on the licensees.

Regulatory guides, standard review plans, and interim staff guidance, are only reviewed by CRGR when concerns are raised during staff review regarding potential backfitting. These documents are intended to provide acceptable approaches for licensees or applicants to meet NRC requirements, or for the NRC staff to confirm the adequacy of proposed approaches. Additionally, adopting new regulatory guides is intended to be voluntary for licensees and applicants. For limited instances where regulatory guides may result in potential backfits or new staff positions, the CRGR conducts a review.

The table below provides NRC final generic regulatory actions issued within the last 3 years. For the response, the staff has included final rules, orders, bulletins, RISs, and GLs.

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| 10 CFR Parts 30, 32, and 35 | Medical Use of Byproduct Material— Medical Event Definitions, Training and Experience, and Clarifying Amendments | 07/16/18 83 FR 33046 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 1, 2, 34, 37, 50, 70, 71, 73, and 140 | Miscellaneous Corrections | 06/28/18 83 FR 30285 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 170 and 171 | Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for FY 2018 | 06/25/18 | None | NA | No Backfitting |

⁸ None – indicates that the item was administrative in nature or did not meet thresholds for CRGR backfitting review, informal reviews – were conducted by the members without a meeting. Formal Reviews – are these items that a meeting was conducted to assess potential backfitting concerns.

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| | | 83 FR 29622 | | | |
| RIS-18-03 | National Terrorism Advisory System and Protective Measures for the Physical Protection of Category 1 and Category 2 Quantities of Radioactive Material | 06/01/18 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS 2002-22, Supplement 1 | Clarifications on Endorsement of Nuclear Energy Institute Guidance in Designing Digital Upgrades in Instrumentation and Control Systems | 05/31/18 | Informal Review | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Part 75 | Modified Small Quantities Protocol | 05/04/18 83 FR 19603 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS 2017-01, Rev. 1 | Human Reliability and Human Performance Database | 03/29/18 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-18-02 | Preparation and Scheduling of Operator Licensing Examinations | 03/26/18 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-18-01 | Common Violations Cited During First 2 Years of 10 CFR Part 37, "Physical Protection of Category 1 and Category 2 Quantities of Radioactive Material," Implementation and Guidance Documents Available to Support Rule Implementation | 01/22/18 and ERRATA 03/01/18 | None | NA | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| 10 CFR Part 50 | Approval of American Society of Mechanical Engineers' Code Cases | 01/17/18 83 FR 2331 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR 2 and 13 | Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation for Fiscal Year 2018 | 01/12/18 83 FR 1515 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-08 | Process for Scheduling and Allocating Resources for Fiscal Years 2020 Through 2022 for the Review of New Licensing Applications for Light-Water Reactors and Non-Light-Water Reactors | 12/21/17 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 2, 9, 40, 50, 61, 71, 73, and 110 | Miscellaneous Corrections | 11/15/17; 82 FR 52823 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-06 | NRC Policy on Use of Combination Dosimetry Devices During Industrial Radiographic Operations | 09/19/17 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-05 | Administration of 10 CFR Part 72 Certificate of Compliance Corrections and Revisions | 09/13/17 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-04 | Clarification on the Implementation of Compensatory Measures for Protective Strategy Deficiencies or Degraded or Inoperable Security | 08/30/17 | Informal Review | NA | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| | Systems, Equipment, or Components | | | | |
| 10 CFR Part 50 | American Society of Mechanical Engineers Codes and Code Cases | <u>07/18/17;</u> <u>82 FR</u> <u>329034</u> | None | NA | Two changes resulted in an adequate protection backfit exception (Code Case N-729-4 and Code Case N-770-2) |
| 10 CFR Parts 170 and 171 | Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2017 | <u>06/30/17;</u> <u>82 FR</u> <u>30682</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-03 | Preparation and Scheduling of Operator Licensing Examinations | <u>04/05/17</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-02 | Applicability of Title 10 of the <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i> Part 37 to Non-Manufacturing and Distribution Service Provider Licensees | <u>02/08/17</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-17-01 | Human Reliability and Human Performance Database | <u>02/02/17</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 2 and 13 | Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation | <u>01/24/17;</u> <u>82 FR 8133</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Part 72 | List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks | Published 6 Certificate of Compliance (COC) rules in 2017 | None | NA | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| 10 CFR Part 140 | Increase in the Maximum Amount of Primary Nuclear Liability Insurance | <u>12/30/16;</u> <u>81 FR</u> <u>96347</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 2 and 9 | Update to Incorporate Freedom of Information Act Improvement Act of 2016 Requirements | <u>12/30/16;</u> <u>81 FR</u> <u>96344</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-12 | NRC Employee Access to Switchyards at Licensee Facilities | <u>11/22/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-11 | Requests to Dispose of Very Low-Level Radioactive Waste Pursuant to 10 CFR 20.2002 | <u>11/13/16</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-19, Rev 1 | Decommissioning Timeliness Rule Implementation and Associated Regulatory Relief | <u>09/27/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-10 | License Amendment Requests for Changes to Emergency Response Organization Staffing and Augmentation | <u>08/05/16</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Part 2 | Update to Transcript Correction Procedures | <u>07/20/16;</u> <u>81 FR</u> <u>47005</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 2 and 13 | Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation | <u>07/01/16;</u> <u>81 FR</u> <u>43019</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 9, 170, and 171 | Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2016 | <u>06/24/16;</u> <u>81 FR</u> <u>41171</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| RIS-16-09 | Preparation and Scheduling of Operator Licensing Examinations | <u>06/16/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-08 | Process for Scheduling and Allocating Resources in Fiscal Year 2019 for the Review of New Licensing Applications for Light-Water Reactors and Non-Light-Water Reactors | <u>06/07/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Parts 170 and 171 | Variable Annual Fee Structure for Small Modular Reactors | <u>05/24/16</u> ; <u>81 FR 32617</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-07 | Containment Shell or Liner Moisture Barrier Inspection | <u>05/09/16</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-06 | NRC Regulation of Radium-226 Under Military Control and for Coordination on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Response Actions at Department of Defense Sites with Radioactive Materials | <u>05/09/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-05 | Embedded Digital Devices in Safety-Related Systems | <u>04/29/16</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-04 | Clarification of 10 CFR 50.46 Reporting Requirements and Recent Issues with Related Guidance Not Approved for Use | <u>04/19/16</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| RIS-16-03 | 10 CFR 50.59 Issues Identified in NRC's San Onofre Steam Generator Tube Degradation Lessons Learned Report | <u>04/13/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| GL-16-01 | Monitoring of Neutron-Absorbing Materials in Spent Fuels Pools | <u>04/07/16</u> | Formal | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-02 | Design Basis Issues Related to Tube-to-Tubesheet Joints in Pressurized-Water Reactor Steam Generators | <u>03/23/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-16-01 | Nuclear Energy Institute Guidance for the Use of Accreditation in Lieu of Commercial Grade Surveys for Procurement of Laboratory Calibration and Test Services | <u>03/16/16</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-16, Rev 1 | Planned Licensing Action Submittals for All Power Reactor Licensees | <u>01/15/16</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Part 72 | List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks | Published 5 COC rules in 2016 | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-17 | Review and Submission of Updates to Final Safety Analysis Reports, Emergency Preparedness Documents, and Fire Protection Documents | <u>12/23/15</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| RIS-15-19, Rev 0 | Decommissioning Timeliness Rule Implementation and Associated Regulatory Relief | <u>12/21/15</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-18 | Sodium Iodide-131 (I-131) Patient Release Information Collection | <u>12/14/15</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-15 | Information Regarding a Specific Exemption in the Requirements for the Physical Protection of Category 1 and Category 2 Quantities of Radioactive Material | <u>12/04/15</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-16, Rev 0 | Planned Licensing Action Submittals for All Power Reactor Licensees | <u>11/25/15</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-13 | Seismic Stability Analysis Methodologies for Spent Fuel Dry Cask | <u>11/12/15</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-11 | Protective Action Recommendations for Members of the Public on Bodies of Water | <u>11/05/15</u> | Informal Review | Endorsed | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Part 73 | Cyber Security Event Notifications | <u>11/02/15</u> ; <u>80 FR 67264</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| RIS-15-14 | Issuance of Enforcement Guidance Memorandum – Emergency Plan and Emergency Plan Implementing Procedure Updates | <u>10/30/15</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |

| Summary of Final Generic Regulatory Actions over the Last 3 Years | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Item # | Title | Issuance Date | CRGR ⁸ Review | CRGR Recommendation | NRC Backfitting Review |
| 10 CFR Parts 2 and 150 | Hearings on Challenges to the Immediate Effectiveness of Orders | <u>10/20/15;</u> <u>80 FR</u> <u>63409</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |
| 10 CFR Part 2 | Revisions to the Petition for Rulemaking Process | <u>10/07/15;</u> <u>80 FR</u> <u>60513</u> | None | NA | No Backfitting |

31. Please provide a list and brief description of all facility specific backfits issued in the reporting period.

None.

32. For matters reviewed by the CRGR, please provide 12-month and 3-year rolling averages for the following metrics:

a. For the number of issues reviewed formally: the percentage accepted for imposition on industry and the percentage rejected based on cost-benefit or Backfit concerns; and

b. For the number of issues reviewed informally: the percentage accepted for imposition on industry and the percentage rejected based on cost-benefit or Backfit concerns.

| 12-Month Summary of CRGR Review Decisions of Potential Backfit Issues | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Review Type & Outcome | Percentage Accepted or Endorsed with Backfitting | Percentage Rejected Based on Backfit Concerns | Percentage Endorsed without Backfitting |
| Informal Reviews | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Formal Reviews | 20.0% | 20.0% | 60.0% |
| 3-Year Summary of CRGR Review Decisions of Potential Backfit Issues | | | |
| Review Type & Outcome | Percentage Accepted or Endorsed with Backfitting | Percentage Rejected Based on Backfit Concerns | Percentage Endorsed without Backfitting |
| Informal Reviews | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| Formal Reviews | 33.4% | 10.0% | 56.6% |

Comments:

1. As of August 31, 2018, for the rolling 3-year period, the CRGR has completed 26 reviews for potential backfits, including 17 informal reviews and 9 formal reviews. In the past 12-months, the CRGR has completed 4 informal reviews and 7 formal reviews. These percentages omit ongoing CRGR reviews.

2. These tables provide summaries of CRGR review results for the rolling 12-month and 3-year periods. The percentage accepted includes CRGR endorsements of generic documents that may lead to licensee backfits, the percentage rejected are reviews in which the CRGR disapproved documents due to backfit concerns, and the percentage endorsed were reviews in which the CRGR found no backfit implications.

33. Please provide the status of the application of the Backfit Rule in the licensing and inspection programs across the agency, including:

- a. The need for training on the requirements and application of 10 CFR 50.109;
- b. The need for a process, training, and/or oversight in addressing inspection issues that may redefine or reinterpret the original licensing basis (e.g., unresolved issues, task interface agreements, disputed violations) to ensure that new requirements are not imposed through the inspection program;
- c. A review of proposed regulatory changes that are currently in process to ensure that regulatory actions are appropriately informed by the requirements of 10 CFR 50.109. Examples of such actions could include but are not limited to the following:
 - i. The Draft Regulatory Issue Summary on Service Life addressing the treatment of vendor recommendations within the regulatory framework;
 - ii. 10 CFR 50.46(c) rulemaking for which the justification utilizes the adequate protection provisions of the backfit rule to obviate the need to compare the benefits of public health and safety with the cost of compliance for the three major portions of the rule;
 - iii. Use of the compliance exception backfit as proposed by the NRC staff to address the "open phase condition (OPC)" issue; and
 - iv. Possible alteration of the risk reduction credit given for Incipient Fire Protection after the modifications have been installed and received approval from the NRC crediting the technology.
- d. Please describe the progress made during each reporting period.

a, b, & d. Consistent with the EDO approved milestones in Response 34, the agency developed and implemented refresher training throughout the agency for those with responsibilities that take backfit into consideration. This refresher or "reset" training was completed in January 2018. In addition, the agency developed and implemented enhanced backfit training for identified staff with backfitting responsibilities in multiple headquarters offices and all regions. This training included interactive examples and case studies to apply backfitting concepts to daily work activities. All sessions were completed by July 31, 2018. Over 1400 NRC staff received this new training.

More detailed backfitting guidance and procedures will be developed throughout FY 2018 as discussed in Response 34.

c. The agency has incorporated the recent lessons learned from the Exelon backfit appeal decision and the Commission's direction in SRM-COMSECY-16-0020 into its reviews of proposed regulatory changes and decision making.

The table below provides a summary of the status of regulatory changes and issues as of August 28, 2018.

| Status of Select Regulatory Activities | | |
|---|---|--|
| Title | Status of Regulatory Change | Backfitting Considerations |
| RIS on Service Life - "Disposition of Information Related to the Time Period That Safety-Related Structures, Systems, or Components are Installed" | <p>RIS (ADAMS Accession No. ML17177A060) was issued for public comment and the public comments have been dispositioned.</p> <p>RIS was reviewed by CRGR on September 12 and 14, 2017. CRGR Meeting Nos. #446, #447(ADAMS Accession No. ML17276B156).</p> | While the CRGR found that the draft RIS did not contain any specific backfits or new staff positions, it did not endorse the RIS in its current form. The CRGR indicated that a RIS may not be appropriate for addressing these issues. Currently, the staff is discussing its next steps forward. |
| 10 CFR 50.46(c) Rulemaking | The NRC staff prepared a regulatory analysis for the 10 CFR 50.46c draft final rule (ADAMS Accession No. ML15323A122) to identify the benefits and costs of the particular regulatory approach for addressing emergency core cooling system performance. The regulatory analysis focuses on the marginal difference in benefits and costs for each alternative relative to the "no action" baseline alternative for the three major portions of the rule, which is consistent with the requirements of the backfit rule (10 CFR 50.109), Commission direction, and the ongoing revisions to the agency's cost-benefit guidance (e.g., NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 5). | Based on established criteria at the time, the CRGR was not required to review the rulemaking to assess potential backfits. The rulemaking is currently with the Commission for its consideration. |
| Proposed Rule, 10 CFR 73.53, "Requirements for Cyber Security at Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities" and associated draft regulatory guidance, DG-5062 "Cyber Security Programs for Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities" | The proposed rule (ADAMS Accession No. ML17145A342), if approved, would require certain Fuel Cycle Facility licensees to establish, implement, and maintain a cyber security program that can detect, protect against, and respond to a cyber-attack capable of causing one or more of the consequences of concern as defined in the proposed rule. | CRGR completed its review in two meetings, June 27 and July 12, 2017. This rule contained backfitting and was endorsed by the CRGR. This rulemaking is currently with the Commission for its consideration. |
| Regulatory Guide 5.77, Revision 1, | This regulatory guide describes an approach that the NRC staff considers acceptable for an insider mitigation program for nuclear | This item has been closed. The staff did not identify a backfitting |

| Status of Select Regulatory Activities | | |
|--|---|---|
| Title | Status of Regulatory Change | Backfitting Considerations |
| "Insider Mitigation Program" | power reactors that contain protected or vital areas. | concern. This RG is currently being reviewed by the Commission. |

34. Please provide a description of actions taken and/or planned to address recommendations made by the CRGR in their report "U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Implementation of Backfitting and Issue Finality Requirements," dated June 27, 2017. Please include a milestone schedule for completing action on each recommendation.⁹

The actions identified in the CRGR Review Report and approved by the EDO in a memo dated July 19, 2017, have been organized into the following activities:

| Backfitting Enhancement Tasks from the June 27, 2017, CRGR Review Report | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------|-----------|
| Item | Task | Lead | Due Date | Status |
| 1 | Update agency-level guidance on backfitting and issue finality to reflect Commission direction on the use of the compliance exception to the backfit rule and submit for Commission approval. | NRR | 05/02/2018 | Completed |
| 2 | Update office-level implementing guidance on backfitting and issue finality, and the Enforcement Manual to reflect Commission-approved agencywide guidance. | NRR, NMSS, NRO, NSIR, RES, all Regions, OE | 02/21/2019 | On track |
| 3 | Develop and conduct "reset" training for managers and staff on backfitting and issue finality. | CRGR | 02/28/2018 | Completed |
| 4 | Conduct interactive training on backfitting and issue finality for all staff with backfitting responsibilities. | CRGR | 08/17/2018 | Completed |
| 5 | Develop or update training and/or developmental activities on backfitting and issue finality for inclusion in office/regional qualification procedures. | CRGR, NRR, NMSS, NRO, NSIR, RES, all Regions | 05/31/2019 | On track |
| 6 | Revise office qualification procedures to require initial and refresher training and developmental activities on backfitting and issue finality. (Formerly part of Item #5) | CRGR, NRR, NMSS, NRO, NSIR, RES, all Regions | 8/31/2019 | On track |
| 7 | Make available "just-in-time" training and references on backfitting and issue | CRGR | 10/31/2018 | On track |

⁹ No new information was added to this section since the last report.

| Backfitting Enhancement Tasks from the June 27, 2017, CRGR Review Report | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Item | Task | Lead | Due Date | Status |
| | finality. | | | |
| 8 | Add backfitting information to agency knowledge management Web site. | CRGR | 09/18/2017 | Completed |
| 9 | Prepare a NUREG/Knowledge Management report on the history and activities of the Committee to Review Generic Requirements. | CRGR | 08/31/2019 | On track |
| 10 | Create a backfitting Community of Practice with office points of contact. | CRGR | 08/31/2017 | Completed |
| 11 | Conduct an effectiveness review of actions taken in response to the June 27, 2017, CRGR report. | CRGR | 07/27/2020 | On track |
| 12 | Propose a revision to the charter for the CRGR to reflect rulemaking criteria, incorporate recent Commission direction, and enhance rigor of CRGR assessments. | CRGR | 06/29/2018 | Completed |
| 13 | Report on the availability of key docketed information categories and the resources needed to make information more readily retrievable. | OCIO | 02/28/2018 | Completed |
| 14 | Report on the resources needed to implement the actions in the July 19, 2017, EDO tasking on backfitting. | CRGR | 10/02/2017 | Completed |

REACTOR INSPECTION

35. Please provide the Reactor Oversight Process findings for year-to-date and 3-year rolling metrics, including the total number and for each region for green, white, yellow, and red findings.

| Location | # of Findings | | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|------|------|------|-----------------|------|
| Nationally | Total | | 824 | 821 | 704 | 560 | 249 |
| NSIR (all regions) | | | 18 | 26 | 19 | N/A (Note 1) | N/A |
| RI | Green | | 167 | 169 | 155 | 126 | 56 |
| | White | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| | Yellow | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Red | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GTG Security | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 171 | 175 | 157 | 128 | 56 |
| | # OP Units | | 26 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| R2 | Green | | 148 | 159 | 151 | 119 | 62 |
| | White | | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | Yellow | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Red | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GTG Security | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | Total | | 152 | 160 | 152 | 124 | 62 |
| | # OP Units | | 32 | 32 | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| R3 | Green | | 221 | 202 | 177 | 133 | 52 |
| | White | | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| | Yellow | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Red | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GTG Security | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 226 | 208 | 179 | 137 | 54 |
| | # OP Units | | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| R4 | Green | | 249 | 248 | 196 | 167 | 77 |
| | White | | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | Yellow | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Red | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GTG Security | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| | Total | | 257 | 252 | 197 | 171 | 77 |
| | # OP Units | | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 18 |

NSIR: Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response*

GTG Security: Greater-than-green security;

#OP Units: Number of operating units;

Notes:

- Starting in CY 2017, these finding are included in the findings for each region.

36. Please provide the percentage of Final Significance Determinations made within 90 Days for all potentially Greater-Than-Green findings, monthly for one-year rolling metrics and annually for the past 10 years.

| 1-Year Rolling Metric | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Month | Percent Met |
| September 2017 | N/A |
| October 2017 | 100 |
| November 2017 | 0 |
| December 2017 | 100 |
| January 2018 | N/A |
| February 2018 | 100 |
| March 2018 | N/A |
| April 2018 | 100 |
| May 2018 | N/A |
| June 2018 | N/A |
| July 2018 | N/A |
| August 2018 | N/A |

| 10-Year Annual Determinations Within 90 Days | |
|--|-------------|
| Year | Percent Met |
| 2008 | 100 |
| 2009 | 100 |
| 2010 | 93 |
| 2011 | 100 |
| 2012 | 100 |
| 2013 | 100 |
| 2014 | 86 |
| 2015 | 88 |
| 2016 | 100 |
| 2017 | 93 |

Comments:

This metric, reported in the NRC's CBJ, measures the time from the issuance date of the first official correspondence that describes the inspection finding, until the final significance determination letter is sent to the licensee, which is expected to be 90 days or less.

37. For each reporting period, please describe each instance where Inspection Manual Chapter 609 Appendix M, "Significance Determination Process Using Qualitative Criteria," has been applied in the Reactor Oversight Process Significance Determination Process, including the justification for doing so.

Appendix M was not used to disposition any inspection findings finalized in August 2018.

38. Please provide the status of potential changes to the Reactor Oversight Process, and identify any changes that may require Commission approval prior to implementation.¹⁰

Significant potential changes to the ROP include the following:

- IMC 0609, “Significance Determination Process,” Appendix M, “Significance Determination Process Using Qualitative Criteria.” Having received stakeholder feedback on its initially proposed changes to Appendix M, the NRC staff is preparing a revised approach, which is described in Enclosure 2 of SECY-18-0045 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18059A155). The staff plans to re-engage with stakeholders in the coming months to review the changes and address any additional feedback. Based on the changes contemplated, at the present time, the staff does not expect that Commission approval will be required.
- Changes to the engineering inspections that will improve effectiveness and efficiency of the inspections. The changes will be implemented in CY 2020.

39. Please describe the progress toward utilizing an industry consensus document as a means of accomplishing predictability and consistency in operability determinations.


The NRC is engaged with nuclear industry stakeholders on their efforts to develop a consensus document for operability determinations. On June 26, 2018, the NRC staff held a public meeting with nuclear industry stakeholders where they presented issues for the staff’s consideration in revising IMC 0326, “Operability Determinations & Functionality Assessments for Conditions Adverse to Quality or Safety,” to improve efficiency and regulatory predictability in operability determinations. The staff is planning a series of public meetings to have more focused discussions with industry regarding operability determinations. Six areas of engagement have been agreed upon and the staff is planning a series of public meetings to have more focused discussions with industry regarding operability determinations. The first of these meetings occurred on August 30, 2018, and covered entry criteria for formal operability determinations. The next public meeting is planned for the end of September 2018.

40. For each Design Bases Assurance Inspection (formerly known as the Component Design Basis Inspection) completed in the last three years, please list the duration, amount of fees billed, and percentage of fees used to reimburse contractors.


The fees are grouped per Design Bases Assurance (DBA) inspection in order to allow easier review by the reader and facilitate comparison between the costs of DBA inspections performed at each site. Monthly comparison of DBA inspection fees will not provide an accurate representation of each licensee’s charges due to the fact that the DBA inspections span 2 months.

¹⁰ No new information was added to this section since the last report.


2015 Component Design Bases Inspections/Design Bases Assurance (DBA) Inspections Costs, Shown Alphabetically By Site




2016 Component Design Bases Inspections/Design Bases Assurance (DBA) Inspections Costs, Shown Alphabetically By Site



2017 Design Bases Assurance (DBA) Inspections Costs, Shown Alphabetically By Site



2018 Design Bases Assurance (DBA) Inspections Costs, Shown Alphabetically By Site



41. Please provide the status of the holistic review of engineering inspection procedures and any actions taken and/or planned because of the review.¹¹

NRR forwarded a Commission paper with recommendations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the engineering inspections to the OEDO in mid-August 2018. The changes being proposed will require Commission approval before they can be implemented. Many of the recommendations contained in the Commission paper are also reflected in a publicly available memorandum (ADAMS Accession No. ML18103A174), which captures the recommendations by the ROP Engineering Inspection Working Group to improve the ROP engineering inspections.

NRR management and staff are also currently working with the industry to review and provide feedback on an industry initiative associated with the use of licensee self-assessments in the engineering inspection program.

NEW REACTORS

42. Please provide a table showing the funds budgeted, the resources spent, and the total Part 170 fees billed each year for the last ten years for the Office of New Reactors.

| | FY 08 | FY 09 | FY 10 | FY 11 | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 | FY 16 | FY 17 | FY 18 |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Enacted (\$M) | 137.08 | 110.46 | 109.81 | 110.71 | 102.53 | 100.87 | 112.61 | 96.08 | 91.63 | 72.03 | 71.46 |
| Expended (\$M) | 82.57 | 81.16 | 90.55 | 89.75 | 76.06 | 89.16 | 67.03 | 61.46 | 62.63 | 54.84 | 47.89 |
| Part 170 Billed (\$M) | | | | 75.73 | 74.65 | 60.28 | 60.18 | 59.62 | 60.12 | 55.65 | 35.81 |

Enacted: Beginning in FY 2018, the NRC eliminated the allocation of mission indirect resources in the agency's budget request to increase transparency (see NRC FY 2018 Congressional Budget Justification page 161 for detailed explanation). To allow for comparison of historical budget data, FY 2008 - FY 2017 are presented in a consistent manner.

Expended: FY 2018 expenditure is as of August 31, 2018.

Part 170 Billed: For FY 2008 - FY 2010, the data in the legacy billing system is not available at the office level. For FY 2018, Part 170 billing data is as of July 31, 2018. Next quarterly billing scheduled for October 2018.

43. For each design certification, Construction and Operating License (COL), and Early Site Permit (ESP) application reviewed since 2007, please provide:

- a. The date of the first pre-application meeting;
- b. The date the application was filed;
- c. Whether the acceptance review was completed in 60 days;

¹¹ No new information was added to this section since the last report.

- d. The originally scheduled dates for completion of the safety evaluation report and environmental impact statement;
- e. The actual dates for completion of the safety evaluation report and environmental impact statement;
- f. For ongoing reviews, the projected date for final agency action;
- g. For terminated or suspended reviews, the dates of the termination or suspension; and the total fees billed for each review.

| Project Name | Date of First Pre-Application Meeting | Date the Application was Filed | Acceptance Review Completed in 60 Days (Note 1) | Original Review Schedule Dates for FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion | Actual FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion Dates | Projected Date for Final NRC Action | Date of Withdrawal or Suspension Request (for terminated projects only) | Total Fees Billed for Each Review (Note 4) |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| U.S. Advanced Pressurized Water Reactor (APWR) DC | 05/12/2006 | 12/31/2007 | Yes | FSER: 06/2012 FEIS: N/A | Application is currently under review | Not Scheduled (Note 2) | N/A | \$78,014,354 |
| APR1400 DC | 11/05/2009 | 12/23/2014 | Yes | FSER: 09/2018 FEIS: N/A | Application is currently under review | 09/2019 | N/A | \$59,745,372 |
| ABWR DC Renewal (GEH) | 02/23/2010 | 12/07/2010 | Yes | FSER: 03/2018 FEIS: N/A | Application is currently under review | Schedule currently under review | N/A | \$5,800,686 |
| Turkey Point COL | 02/10/2009 | 06/30/2009 | Yes | FSER: 12/2012 FEIS: 10/2012 | FSER: 12/2016 FEIS: 10/2016 | COLs issued on 04/12/2018 | N/A | \$35,347,473 |
| Clinch River ESP | 12/14/2010 | 05/12/2016 | No (Note 3) | FSER: 08/2019 FEIS: 06/2019 | Application is currently under review | 02/2020 | N/A | \$8,803,415 |
| NuScale SMR DC | 07/09/2008 | 01/06/2017 | Yes | FSER: 09/2020 FEIS: N/A | Application is currently under review | 01/2021 | N/A | \$27,867,061 |
| North Anna ESP | Information not known | 09/25/2003 | Yes | FSER: 06/2005 FEIS: 06/2005 | FSER: 08/2006 | ESP issued on | N/A | \$8,579,177 |

| Project Name | Date of First Pre-Application Meeting | Date the Application was Filed | Acceptance Review Completed in 60 Days (Note 1) | Original Review Schedule Dates for FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion | Actual FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion Dates | Projected Date for Final NRC Action | Date of Withdrawal or Suspension Request (for terminated projects only) | Total Fees Billed for Each Review (Note 4) |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | FEIS: 12/2006 | 11/27/2007 | | |
| Vogtle ESP | Information not known | 08/15/2006 | Yes | FSER: 05/2008 FEIS: 05/2008 | FSER: 02/2009 FEIS: 08/2008 | ESP issued on 08/26/2009 | N/A | \$11,680,269 |
| South Texas Project COL | Information not known | 09/20/2007 | Yes | FSER: 09/2011 FEIS: 03/2011 | FSER: 09/2015 FEIS: 02/2011 | COL terminated on 07/12/2018 | 6/22/2018 (<i>withdrawal request</i>) | \$58,469,726 |
| Bellefonte COL | Information not known | 10/30/2007 | Yes | FSER: 02/2011 FEIS: 01/2010 | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 03/28/2016 (<i>withdrawal request</i>) 12/02/2016 <i>Withdrawn</i> | \$21,916,556 |
| North Anna COL | Information not known | 11/26/2007 | Yes | FSER: 08/2010 FEIS: 12/2009 | FSER: 01/2017 FSEIS: 02/2010 | COLs issued on 06/02/2017 | N/A | \$33,032,175 |
| Lee COL | Information not known | 12/12/2007 | Yes | FSER: 02/2011 FEIS: 03/2010 | FSER: 08/2016 FEIS: 12/2013 | COLs issued on 12/19/2016 | N/A | \$22,778,515 |
| U.S. EPR DC | 02/08/2005 | 12/11/2007 | Yes | FSER: 05/2011 FEIS: N/A | Application review is suspended at the applicant's request | N/A | 02/25/2015 (<i>suspension request</i>) | \$82,585,674 |

| Project Name | Date of First Pre-Application Meeting | Date the Application was Filed | Acceptance Review Completed in 60 Days (Note 1) | Original Review Schedule Dates for FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion | Actual FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion Dates | Projected Date for Final NRC Action | Date of Withdrawal or Suspension Request (for terminated projects only) | Total Fees Billed for Each Review (Note 4) |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Shearon Harris COL | Information not known | 02/18/2008 | Yes | FSER: 04/2011 FEIS: 05/2010 | Application review is suspended at the applicant's request | N/A | 05/02/2013 (suspension request) | \$10,106,258 |
| Vogtle COL | Information not known | 03/28/2008 | Yes | FSER: 12/2010 FEIS: 01/2010 | FSER: 08/2011 FEIS: 04/2011 | COLs issued on 02/10/2012 | N/A | \$29,770,625 |
| V.C. Summer COL | Information not known | 03/27/2008 | Yes | FSER: 02/2011 FEIS: 02/2011 | FSER: 08/2011 FEIS: 04/2011 | COLs issued on 03/30/2012 ⁵ | 12/27/2017 (termination request) | \$28,057,913 |
| Levy COL | Information not known | 07/30/2008 | Yes | FSER: 05/2011 FEIS: 09/2010 | FSER: 05/2016 FEIS: 04/2012 | COL terminated on 04/26/2018 | 01/25/2018 (termination request) | \$27,437,303 |
| Fermi COL | Information not known | 09/18/2008 | Yes | FSER: 03/2012 FEIS: 08/2011 | FSER: 11/2014 FEIS: 01/2013 | COL issued on 05/01/2015 | N/A | \$26,413,206 |
| Comanche Peak COL | Information not known | 09/18/2008 | Yes | FSER: 12/2011 FEIS: 01/2011 | FSER: N/A FEIS: 05/2011 Application review is suspended at the applicant's request | N/A | 11/07/2013 (suspension request) | \$23,278,377 |

| Project Name | Date of First Pre-Application Meeting | Date the Application was Filed | Acceptance Review Completed in 60 Days (Note 1) | Original Review Schedule Dates for FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion | Actual FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion Dates | Projected Date for Final NRC Action | Date of Withdrawal or Suspension Request (for terminated projects only) | Total Fees Billed for Each Review (Note 4) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| River Bend COL | Information not known | 09/25/2008 | Yes | A review schedule was not developed for this application | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 01/09/2009 <i>(suspension request)</i> 12/04/2015 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$1,350,316 |
| Callaway COL | Information not known | 07/24/2008 | No | A review schedule was not developed for this application | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 06/23/2009 <i>(suspension request)</i> 08/12/2015 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$4,066,138 |
| Bell Bend COL | Information not known | 10/10/2008 | Yes | FSER: 03/2012 FEIS: 03/2011 | FSER: N/A FEIS: 04/2016 Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 02/25/2015 <i>(suspension request)</i> 08/30/2016 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$20,026,574 |
| PSEG ESP | Information not known | 05/25/2010 | Yes | FSER: 07/2013 FEIS: 03/2013 | FSER: 09/2015 FEIS: 11/2015 | ESP issued on 05/05/2016 | N/A | \$17,917,093 |
| ABWR DC Renewal (Toshiba) | Information not known | 10/27/2010 | Yes | A review schedule was not developed for this | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 06/09/2016 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$686,911 |

| Project Name | Date of First Pre-Application Meeting | Date the Application was Filed | Acceptance Review Completed in 60 Days (Note 1) | Original Review Schedule Dates for FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion | Actual FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion Dates | Projected Date for Final NRC Action | Date of Withdrawal or Suspension Request (for terminated projects only) | Total Fees Billed for Each Review (Note 4) |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | application | | | | |
| Victoria County ESP | Information not known | 03/25/2010 | Yes | FSER: 04/2013 FEIS: 08/2013 | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 08/28/2012 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$6,146,248 |
| Calvert Cliffs COL | Information not known | 07/13/2007 (Part 1 of application) 03/14/2008 (Part 2 of application) | No Yes | FSER: 07/2012 FEIS: 03/2010 | FSER: N/A FEIS: 05/2011 Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 02/27/2015 <i>(suspension request)</i> 06/08/2015 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$31,400,772 |
| Nine Mile Point COL | Information not known | 09/30/2008 | Yes | A review schedule was not developed for this application | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 12/01/2009 <i>(suspension request)</i> 11/26/2013 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$2,687,822 |
| Grand Gulf COL | Information not known | 02/27/2008 | Yes | FSER: 03/2011 FEIS: 05/2010 | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 02/09/2015 <i>(withdrawal request)</i> | \$4,719,505 |
| Grand Gulf ESP | Information not known | 10/21/2003 | Yes | FSER: 10/2005 FEIS: 10/2005 | FSER: 10/2005 FEIS: 04/2006 | ESP issued on 04/05/2007 | N/A | \$5,352,875 |

| Project Name | Date of First Pre-Application Meeting | Date the Application was Filed | Acceptance Review Completed in 60 Days (Note 1) | Original Review Schedule Dates for FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion | Actual FSER and FEIS (or EA) Completion Dates | Projected Date for Final NRC Action | Date of Withdrawal or Suspension Request (for terminated projects only) | Total Fees Billed for Each Review (Note 4) |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Clinton ESP | Information not known | 09/25/2003 | Yes | FSER: 08/2005 FEIS: 08/2005 | FSER: 02/2006 FEIS: 07/2006 | ESP issued on 03/15/2007 | N/A | \$5,186,587 |
| AP1000 DC Amendment | Information not known | 05/26/2007 | Yes | FSER: 08/2010 FEIS: N/A | FSER: 08/2011 FEIS: N/A | Final Rule published on 12/30/2011 | N/A | \$33,036,394 |
| Economic Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (ESBWR) DC | 6/20-21/2002 | 08/24/2005 | No | FSER: 06/2009 FEIS: N/A | FSER: 03/2011 Supplement FSER: 09/2014 FEIS: N/A | Final Rule published on 10/15/2014 | N/A | \$68,153,802 |
| ABWR DC Amendment | Information not known | 06/30/2009 | Yes | FSER: 04/2010 FEIS: N/A | FSER: 10/2010 FEIS: N/A | Final Rule published on 12/16/2011 | N/A | \$1,145,852 |
| Victoria County COL | Information not known | 09/03/2008 | Yes | A review schedule was not developed for this application | Application withdrawn by the applicant | N/A | 06/11/2010 (<i>withdrawal request</i>) | \$1,493,183 |

Note 1: NRO's acceptance review metric is to complete the acceptance review within 60 days and to issue a letter to the applicant documenting the staff's findings on acceptability within 75 days.

Note 2: The NRC is performing the review of the US APWR at a very reduced pace at the request of the applicant and will continue at this pace until notified by the applicant of a change in its plans. Therefore, no completion date has been established.

- Note 3: The acceptance review for the Clinch River ESP application was extended at the request of the applicant, TVA, by letter dated August 19, 2016.
- Note 4: The NRC's 10 CFR Part 170 charges are billed on a quarterly basis. Therefore, updates will be provided in this report to Question 43.h during the reporting periods for January, April, July, and October.
- Note 5: On July 31, 2017, two of the V.C. Summer Units 2 & 3 licensees, South Carolina Electric & Gas (SCE&G) and SCANA, announced their decision to terminate construction at the site. On December 27, 2017, SCE&G and SCANA requested termination of the V.C. Summer Units 2 & 3 combined licenses. On January 8, 2018, the third licensee, Santee Cooper, opposed termination of the combined licenses. These requests are currently under review. On January 25, 2018, as part of a proposed merger between Dominion Energy and SCANA, Dominion, SCANA, and SCE&G applied for an indirect transfer of SCANA and SCE&G's 2/3 ownership interest in V.C. Summer Units 1, 2, 3, and the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation, to Dominion Energy. On September 7, 2018, the NRC approved this indirect transfer. Santee Cooper's 1/3 ownership interest in V.C. Summer Units 1, 2, 3, and the ISFSI is not affected.

44. Please provide a concise summary of the status of ongoing design certification, COL, and ESP application reviews. Please include a discussion of the issuance of RAIs and receipt of responses.

In addition to the updates provided here, each of the DC, COL, and ESP milestone schedules that are under review are publicly available on the NRC website.

DC Applications

The NRC employs a 6 Phase schedule to monitor progress towards completion of the safety review. These phases are:

- Phase 1 – Preliminary SER with RAIs issued to applicant
- Phase 2 – SER with Open Items issued
- Phase 3 – Response to ACRS regarding SER with Open Items issued
- Phase 4 – Advanced SER with no Open Items issued
- Phase 5 – Response to ACRS regarding SER with no Open Items issued
- Phase 6 – Final SER issued

US-APWR

Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (MHI) submitted its US-APWR DC application on December 31, 2007. The staff is currently in Phase 2 of the review. By letter dated November 5, 2013, MHI initiated a coordinated slowdown of NRC licensing activities in order to focus its resources towards supporting the restart of the Mitsubishi-designed reactors in Japan following the Fukushima event. The NRC staff has been performing the review of the US-APWR DC application at a very reduced pace and will continue at this reduced pace until further notice from the applicant. As of August 31, 2018, the staff has issued 5,683 RAIs and the applicant has responded to 5,534 of them.

APR1400

On December 23, 2014, Korea Electric Power Corp. and Korea Hydro & Nuclear Power Co., Ltd. (KHNP), submitted to the NRC its application for the certification of the APR1400 standard plant design for use in the U.S. domestic energy market. The NRC completed the Phase 5

review on July 30, 2018, meeting the public milestone. The staff is currently in Phase 6 of its review, which is scheduled to be completed in September 2018. As of August 31, 2018, the staff had issued 2,225 RAI questions and the applicant has responded to all 2,225 of them. The staff has received the final safety analysis report, verified that the applicant incorporated all changes in accordance with previously submitted RAI responses, and closed all RAIs.

NuScale

On January 6, 2017, NuScale submitted the first SMR DC application for review by the NRC. On March 15, 2017, the NRC completed its acceptance review and docketed the application. The staff issued the acceptance review letter to NuScale on March 23, 2017, and developed a full review schedule with public milestones that was transmitted to NuScale on May 22, 2017. On April 11, 2018, the staff completed Phase 1 of the review. The staff's review is currently in Phase 2 and Phase 3. To date the NRC has identified 27 significantly challenging issues requiring resolution and that have the potential to adversely affect the review schedule. Of these 27 issues, 8 are now considered resolved. As of August 31, 2018, the staff has issued 502 RAIs, which included 1289 questions and the applicant has responded to 1065 of these questions. Of the 502 RAIs issued, 175 RAIs (~35%) are now closed. As of August 2018, NuScale has responded to approximately 66% of RAI questions within the 60 days agreed to in the staff's May 22, 2017, schedule letter for the design certification review.

DC Renewal Applications

ABWR Renewal (General Electric-Hitachi (GEH))

On December 7, 2010, GEH submitted an application for renewal of the ABWR DC. The NRC staff is currently preparing the safety evaluation with no open items. The NRC staff issued a letter to GEH on July 20, 2012, describing 28 design changes that GEH should have included in the application. By letter dated September 17, 2012, GEH stated it planned to address the 28 items in its Revision 6 of the ABWR DCD. By letter dated February 19, 2016, GEH submitted its revised application incorporating the changes to the ABWR DCD. On August 30, 2016, the staff issued a schedule letter to GEH based on resolving all open items by January 2017. However, some open items associated with the review of the application remain unresolved. On August 3, 2017, the staff issued a letter to GEH stating that the NRC will not be able to meet the original schedule outlined in the August 30, 2016, letter due to unresolved issues with the application. The letter also stated that the NRC will issue a revised schedule letter to GEH after additional interactions with the applicant are held to resolve these issues and the staff receives complete responses to the NRC's RAIs. As of August 31, 2018, the staff has issued 37 RAIs and the applicant has responded to all of them.

ESP Applications

The NRC employs a 4 Phase schedule to monitor the progress towards completion of the safety review. These phases are:

- Phase A – Preliminary SER and RAIs issued to the applicant
- Phase B – Advanced SER with No Open Items Developed
- Phase C – ACRS meeting on Advanced SER
- Phase D – Final SER issued

The NRC also employs a 4 Phase schedule to monitor completion of the environmental impact statement. These phases are:

- Phase 1 – Scoping Summary Report issued
- Phase 2 – Draft EIS issued to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Phase 3 – Responses to draft environment impact statement (DEIS) comments completed
- Phase 4 – Final EIS issued to EPA

Clinch River

On May 12, 2016, TVA submitted an ESP application for the Clinch River Nuclear Site located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. By letter dated August 11, 2016, TVA identified certain aspects of the application for which it intended to provide supplemental information. The NRC responded to TVA in a letter dated August 19, 2016, and informed TVA that its application would remain in a tendered but not docketed status until all of the supplemental information was provided to NRC. By December 15, 2016, TVA had provided the supplemental information in support of its application, and by letter dated January 5, 2017, the NRC staff informed TVA that its application, as supplemented, was acceptable for docketing and detailed technical review.

NRC staff began its detailed technical review of the ESP application in January 2017 and developed a full review schedule with public milestones that was transmitted to TVA on March 17, 2017. The Phase A safety review for all chapters of the application was completed by the staff on August 4, 2017 (consistent with the established schedule). The staff is currently in Phase B of its review, which is scheduled to conclude in October 2018. Phase C review activities are also now underway (in parallel with Phase B) for some safety evaluations sections, and Phase C is expected to be completed in March 2019. As of July 31, 2018, the staff has issued 50 safety-related RAI questions and the applicant has responded to all 50 RAI questions. One hundred percent of the RAI questions issued and responded to are closed. The final SER is currently scheduled to be issued in August 2019. For the environmental review, NRC staff completed Phase 1 of the review ahead of schedule on October 30, 2017. Additionally, the NRC staff completed Phase 2 ahead of schedule by issuing the DEIS on April 27, 2018. The public comment period for the draft EIS closed on July 13, 2018. The final EIS is scheduled to be complete by June 2019.


On June 12, 2017, the SACE, Tennessee Environmental Coalition (TEC), and Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League filed petitions seeking a hearing. On October 10, 2017, the ASLB issued a decision that denied the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League's petition to intervene and granted the SACE and the TEC's joint petition to intervene and admitted two contentions. SACE/TEC filed a motion for reconsideration of the Board's dismissal of the third contention and the motion was dismissed. Separately, TVA appealed the admission of the two contentions to the Commission, and the Commission upheld the admission of one contention and dismissed the other. In April 2018, the staff published its draft EIS two months ahead of the public milestone. On May 21, 2018, SACE/TEC submitted two new contentions on the draft EIS. On July 31, 2018, the ASLB issued a memorandum and order (LBP-18-04) denying the Intervenor's motion for leave to file new contentions, granted TVA's and the NRC Staff's Motions to dismiss the remaining admitted contention, and terminated the contested proceeding. The Board's decision was not appealed. The Commission will conduct the mandatory hearing on the application. The schedule for the mandatory hearing will be established after the final EIS and FSER are completed.

45. For reactors under construction, please provide:

| Project Name | Project Type | Licensing Status |
|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Vogtle Unit 3 | COL Holder | COL issued on 02/10/2012 |
| Vogtle Unit 4 | COL Holder | COL issued on 02/10/2012 |

a. The number of NRC inspections and ITAAC reviews forecast to be completed per month versus the number completed each month;

NRC Inspections Test Analyses and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC) Inspections:



Comments:

The graph above tracks, by month, the number of ITAAC inspections completed and the number of ITAAC inspections not completed for ITAAC Closure Notifications (ICNs) that had been received. For each ITAAC, there are predetermined inspections to be completed in order to provide assurance that the licensee has met the design commitments and that the ITAAC acceptance criteria are met. An ITAAC inspection is comprised of multiple inspection activities that may be performed over days, weeks, or months.

For this graph, the term “ITAAC Inspections Completed” means that all the associated NRC inspection activities tied to that ITAAC have been completed, verified, and marked “Inspection Complete” in the NRC database. The term “ITAAC Inspections Not Complete for ICNs Submitted” represents the number of ITAACs for which the completed box in the NRC database has not been checked for ICNs that had been submitted by the licensee. All ITAAC inspections associated with ICN submittals were completed for August.


Because of the coordination between the NRC’s inspections and the licensee’s construction activities, the majority of the required inspections are scheduled and completed prior to the ICN submittal. The completion of these ITAAC-related inspections closely mirrors the completion status of the licensee’s (Southern Nuclear Operating Company) associated work activities. Changes to the licensee’s construction schedule due to weather conditions, work sequencing, and other factors impact when NRC inspections can be performed.

ITAAC Closure Notifications Reviews:

The NRC’s goal is to complete 90% of ICN reviews within 60 days. However, some ICN reviews may be completed in significantly less time. Conversely, complex ICN reviews may require more than 60 days to complete. For this reason, it is difficult for the NRC to forecast in which month a specific ICN review will be completed based on its submittal date. Therefore, the NRC relies on the metrics reported in its response to question 45.b.

- b. The percentage of NRC inspections and the percentage of ITAAC reviews completed within 30 days and within two months;

New Reactor Inspection Status:



Comments:


This graph represents the percentage of NRC inspections associated with ITAAC that have been completed with respect to the total number of inspections required for the Vogtle facility. Planned inspection activities are evaluated and updated to ensure they align with licensee’s work activities.

For this graph, the term “ITAAC Inspections Completed” means a specific inspection activity/plan is completed, verified, and approved in the NRC database. Monthly, this number of completed ITAAC inspection activities is compared to the total number of all the required ITAAC inspection activities/plans for the Vogtle Units 3 and 4 ITAAC inspection program.

Once all the associated ITAAC inspection activities are completed, verified, and approved, then “Inspection Complete” is marked in the NRC database. This information is presented earlier in Graph 45.a.

The graph reports “Program Inspections Completed” since the start of construction for the Vogtle facility, which include both programs required for construction and operation of Units 3 and 4. There are a total of five construction programs, which include Quality Assurance, Fitness for Duty, and ITAAC Management. In addition, there are a total of 20 operational programs, which include Fire Protection, Emergency Preparedness, Reactor Operator Training, and Security. The graph depicts the percentage of planned inspections that are completed, and does not account for the level of effort required for inspections.

Timeliness of ITAAC Closure Notification Reviews:



Comments:

This bar chart shows the percentage of ICN reviews completed each month within 30 days and within 60 days. For the reporting period of August 2018 no ICNs were submitted, however, one review was completed for an ICN submitted the last week of July.

- c. For ITAAC reviews completed during the reporting period, please provide the date when the NRC received the ITAAC closure notice and the date when the review was completed.

For the current reporting period of August 2018, one ICN review was completed.

| Review Month | Unit | ITAAC | Received Date | Approval Date |
|--------------|------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| August 2018 | VOG3 | 2.3.05.03a.i | 07/27/2018 | 8/22/2018 |

46. For reactors under construction, please provide:
- The number of license amendment reviews forecast to be completed in the reporting period;
 - The number completed in the reporting period; and
 - The number of those that were completed within 30 days.

| Reporting Period | Number of License Amendment Reviews Forecast to be Completed in the Reporting Period | Number Completed in the Reporting Period | Number of Those that were Completed within 30 Days |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| August 2018 | 3 | 5 | 0 |

47. For reactors under construction, please provide the budgeted resources versus actual expenditures each month for the last 24 months.

The NRC does not formulate the budget on a monthly basis. The annual budget for construction resources is provided below. The monthly budgeted resources provided below are calculated as 1/12th of the annual budgeted construction resources.

| FY 2016 Enacted Budget (\$K) | | \$17,169 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| FY 2017 Enacted Budget (\$K) | | \$14,191 |
| FY 2018 Enacted Budget (\$K) | | \$10,467 |
| Month | Budgeted Resources (\$K) | Total Expended (\$K) |
| Sep-2016 | \$1,431 | \$921 |
| Oct-2016 | \$1,183 | \$829 |
| Nov-2016 | \$1,183 | \$882 |
| Dec-2016 | \$1,183 | \$935 |
| Jan-2017 | \$1,183 | \$983 |
| Feb-2017 | \$1,183 | \$845 |
| Mar-2017 | \$1,183 | \$1,048 |
| Apr-2017 | \$1,183 | \$859 |
| May-2017 | \$1,183 | \$990 |
| Jun-2017 | \$1,183 | \$1,058 |
| Jul-2017 | \$1,183 | \$1,129 |
| Aug-2017 | \$1,183 | \$886 |
| Sep-2017 | \$1,183 | \$808 |
| Oct-2017 | \$872 | \$837 |
| Nov-2017 | \$872 | \$926 |
| Dec-2017 | \$872 | \$882 |
| Jan-2018 | \$872 | \$878 |
| Feb-2018 | \$872 | \$706 |
| Mar-2018 | \$872 | \$810 |

| FY 2016 Enacted Budget (\$K) | | \$17,169 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| FY 2017 Enacted Budget (\$K) | | \$14,191 |
| FY 2018 Enacted Budget (\$K) | | \$10,467 |
| Month | Budgeted Resources (\$K) | Total Expended (\$K) |
| Apr-2018 | \$872 | \$811 |
| May-2018 | \$872 | \$871 |
| June-2018 | \$872 | \$764 |
| July-2018 | \$872 | \$760 |
| Aug-2018 | \$872 | \$828 |

48. Please provide a concise summary of the status of licensing and inspection for Vogtle 3 & 4, including any challenges to the timely resolution of: licensing issues, 10 CFR Part 52 interpretations, completion of inspections, or completion of ITAAC reviews.¹²

The NRC issued COLs to SNC and several co-owners on February 10, 2012, for two AP1000 units at the Vogtle site near Augusta, GA. As construction progresses, the NRC has increased the pace of construction inspections to verify compliance with the agency's regulations and to ensure that the new plants are constructed in accordance with their COLs. A summary of the license amendment inventory for Vogtle 3 & 4 is included in response to question 13. There are currently no challenges with timely resolution of licensing issues for Vogtle 3 & 4.

The graphs provided in Item 45 of this report represent the completion status of ITAAC inspections and ICN reviews. The completion of these ITAAC-related inspections closely mirrors the completion status of the licensee's work activities associated with the ITAAC. The graphs also display the percentage of completed program inspections, which are separate from the ITAAC-related inspections, and include both construction and operational programs. For ITAAC reviews, the NRC tracks the timeliness of ICNs reviewed and closed. In the past year the NRC has increased communication with the licensee and other external stakeholders through various public meetings and workshops to improve processes that support ICN closure, including inspection related activities. The NRC is implementing an integrated project plan that overlays key NRC activities on top of the licensee's construction and start-up schedule. In addition, the Vogtle Readiness Group (VRG) was created to provide division-level management attention to the timely implementation of the integrated project plan. NRC management is in regular contact with the VRG and the licensee to ensure effective communication and the timely resolution of issues.

Additionally, NRC has established metrics to represent the different aspects of the ICN review process and the inspection program. The metrics track performance, reinforce accountability, and communicate issues needing attention at the appropriate management levels. These metrics enhance early engagement of NRC management and are key internal and external communications tools. With the improvements identified to the processes and increased communication with the licensee, the staff does not foresee any major challenges for 2018.

¹² No new information was added to this section since the last report.

49. Please describe any actions taken in the past 3 years or planned to improve the efficiency of new plant reviews, including milestone schedules to implement efficiency improvements. Please include any concerns arising from review experience in the past 3 years.

The NRC proactively identifies ways to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of its new reactor reviews. For oversight of licensing activities at the Vogtle site, NRO senior managers have established quarterly meetings with the licensee executives to monitor progress of licensing activities supporting construction at the site. The Licensing Action Review Meetings provide an opportunity for both the NRC and SNC to be strategic in identifying and resolving topics that are needed to support construction.

Similarly, for the NuScale review, the NRC senior managers meet with NuScale executives quarterly. These meetings provide executives from both organizations the opportunity to discuss progress on known review challenges, to identify emerging issues, and to establish timelines for resolving these emerging issues to keep the project review on schedule.

Starting in mid-2017, the NRO management team developed and implemented new internal metrics to better track the timeliness related to the review of license amendment requests supporting Vogtle licensing efforts. These metrics have identified license amendments that have been under lengthy reviews and have focused management's attention on the actions necessary to complete these reviews. The management and project managers meet biweekly to identify amendment requests that may require elevated management attention and to track the progress of license amendments, with particular attention to amendment requests that have been in review for 120 days or longer. NRO management has set an internal goal of completing all license amendment reviews within 180 days of their acceptance. With additional management attention and better use of pre-application meetings, NRO has been able to improve the timeliness of reviews.

NRO has also incorporated many of the lessons-learned from previous new reactor reviews into its review activities for the active DC and ESP applications. As discussed in response to question 24, NRO implemented an initiative in 2018 to improve the quality and safety focus of requests for additional information. The staff is also enhancing use of the regulatory audit tool.

NRO has instituted an "Enhanced Safety Focus Review" initiative for the NuScale design certification review. This initiative focuses the staff's review on first-of-a-kind or high safety, high risk areas of the design, and simplifies the review of lower safety or risk significant areas.

In addition, the NRC has made significant progress on initiatives to enhance the regulatory framework for non-light water reactors (non-LWRs). For example, in December 2017, the NRC issued the "Regulatory Review Roadmap for Non-Light Water Reactors," which described flexible review options including the use of a staged-review process and the use of conceptual design assessments during the pre-application period. The actions for advanced reactor reviews are described more fully in response to question 52.

50. Please provide a list of any unresolved policy issues with regard to the licensing of small modular light-water reactors (SMRs). Please include an approximate date for when each issue was first raised, any actions taken or planned to resolve the issue, the milestone scheduled for resolution, and the projected date for resolution.

| Issue Title/Applicability | Status | References |
|---|---|--|
| <p>I. Appropriate Source Term, Dose Calculations, and Siting for SMRs</p> <p>Applicability: SMRs and non-LWRs</p> | <p>In the December 29, 2011, memorandum to the Commission, the staff stated it would remain engaged with SMR stakeholders regarding applications of mechanistic source term (MST) methods, review of pre-application white papers and topical reports it receives from potential SMR applicants concerning source term issues that discuss design-specific proposals to address MST, and considerations of research and development in this area. If necessary, the staff would propose revised review guidance or regulations, or propose new guidance to support reviews of SMRs.</p> <p>In Commission Memoranda dated May 30, 2013, and June 20, 2014, the staff provided updates on interactions with DOE and nuclear industry organizations regarding MST. On February 7, 2016, the staff provided the Commission SECY 16-0012, which addressed this item. The paper concluded that (1) SMR and non-light water reactor (non-LWR) applicants can employ modern analysis tools to demonstrate quantitatively the safety features of those designs, and (2) MST analysis methods can also be used by applicants to demonstrate the ability of the enhanced safety features of plant designs to mitigate accident releases, allow future COL applicants to consider reduced distances to Exclusion Area Boundaries and Low Population Zones and potentially increase proximity to population centers.</p> <p>Disposition: The staff has engaged with interested stakeholders on this issue in 2017. The staff developed a draft white paper summarizing the assessment of current siting regulations, guidance, and Commission policy and discussed it in a public meeting on December 14, 2017. During a May 3, 2018, public meeting, NEI provided feedback on this topic on behalf of the nuclear industry. The NEI stated their position that Regulatory Guide (RG) 4.7 should be updated to scale the population density guidance based on the smaller source term and lower probability of release anticipated for SMRs and advanced reactors. The NEI plans to consider this topic further and make a more specific proposal on potential updates to</p> | <p>Staff Draft White Paper (11/29/17)</p> <p>SECY-16-0012 (02/07/16)</p> <p>Commission Memo (06/20/14)</p> <p>Commission Memo (05/30/13)</p> <p>Commission Memo (12/29/11)</p> |

| Issue Title/Applicability | Status | References |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>the RG. The staff will consider insights obtained from stakeholder discussions and determine whether clarifications to siting guidance or other actions would be beneficial to address siting criteria for SMRs and non-LWRs. The staff will report to the Commission on any proposed actions, as described in SECY-16-0012.</p> | |
| <p>II. Offsite Emergency Planning (EP) Requirements for SMRs and other new technology.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u> SMRs and non-LWRs</p> | <p>In SECY-11-0152, staff identified a possible approach for a scalable emergency planning zone for SMRs. The NRO staff is working with NSIR and NRR on an internal working group to review these issues further. As part of the approach, the staff would liaise with other stakeholders (Department of Homeland Security/Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of State, Department of Commerce, NEI, American Nuclear Society, and the public), consider NEI position papers on this topic and develop recommendations.</p> <p>In a May 30, 2013, Commission Memorandum, the staff provided updates on its EP activities. The staff stated that it would not propose new policy or revise guidance for specific changes to EP requirements absent specific proposals from industry stakeholders.</p> <p>On December 23, 2013, NEI submitted a white paper on this topic. The staff conducted a public meeting to discuss the white paper on April 8, 2014, issued follow-up questions to NEI on June 11, 2014, and received NEI responses in November 2014. On May 29, 2015, staff issued SECY-15-0077 regarding EP for SMRs and non-LWRs. On August 4, 2015, the Commission approved the staff's recommendation to initiate a rulemaking. Staff developed SECY-16-0069, which discussed the rulemaking plan and schedule. On June 22, 2016, the Commission approved the staff's plan and schedule for the rulemaking.</p> <p>Disposition: The rulemaking will address EP issues for future SMRs, non-LWR, and other new design technologies such as isotope producing facilities. The Commission directed the staff to utilize exemptions in the interim (e.g., for the TVA ESP) until completion of the EP rulemaking. The draft regulatory basis was</p> | <p>Final Regulatory Basis (10/16/17)</p> <p>SRM-SECY-16-0069 (06/22/16)</p> <p>SECY-16-0069 (05/31/16)</p> <p>SRM-SECY-15-0077 (08/04/15)</p> <p>SECY-15-0077 (05/29/15)</p> <p>NEI Response to NRC Questions on White Paper (11/19/14)</p> <p>NRC Letter to NEI (R. Bell) (06/11/14)</p> <p>NEI White Paper (12/23/13)</p> <p>Commission Memo (05/30/13)</p> <p>SECY-11-0152 (10/28/11)</p> |

| Issue Title/Applicability | Status | References |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>published for public comment in the <i>Federal Register</i> on April 13, 2017. A public meeting was held May 10, 2017, to discuss the draft regulatory basis. The public comment period closed on June 27, 2017. After considering the public comments, the staff issued the final regulatory basis on October 16, 2017. The staff discussed this rulemaking during a June 14, 2018, stakeholder meeting. The staff released the draft proposed rule language on August 1, 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18213A264) to support an ACRS briefing on August 22, 2018. The proposed rule is scheduled to be provided to the Commission for its consideration in October 2018.</p> | |
| <p>III. Insurance and Liability for SMRs</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u> SMRs and non-LWRs</p> | <p>In SECY-11-0178, the staff identified a potential inequity between the insurance requirements for power reactors producing electrical power equal or greater than 100 MWe per unit and those SMR designs with individual modules producing less than 100 MWe. Specifically, staff raised the question of whether there would be insurance and indemnity coverage sufficient to pay all public claims in the case of an insurable event for an SMR with an individual module sized at less than 100 MWe under the current Price-Anderson Act and associated regulatory language.</p> <p>Since completing that paper, staff prepared a comparative analysis of different SMR designs to further explore the potential inequity. Staff is using this analysis, and other inputs, to develop a SECY paper for this topic. In the paper, staff will identify whether rulemaking or a change to the current interpretation of the definitions given in the Price-Anderson Act is recommended.</p> <p>Disposition: In accordance with the latest version of the Price-Anderson Act, the NRC will prepare a report to Congress, and an associated SECY paper, recommending the need for continuation or modification of the provisions of the Price-Anderson Act by December 31, 2021. Any changes that may be needed for non-LWRs and SMRs will be addressed by the staff in that report and SECY paper.</p> <p>The staff engaged stakeholders on this topic during a November 2, 2017, public meeting and</p> | <p>SECY-11-0178 (12/22/11)</p> |

| Issue Title/Applicability | Status | References |
|---|--|---|
| | the staff will continue to keep stakeholders informed as the report to Congress is prepared. | |
| <p>IV. Security and Safeguards Requirements for SMRs</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u> SMRs and non-LWRs</p> | <p>In SECY-11-0184, staff informed the Commission of its determination that the current regulatory framework is adequate to certify, approve, and license light-water SMRs, the manufacturing of SMR fuel, transportation of special nuclear material and irradiated fuel, and the interim storage of irradiated fuel proposed for light-water SMRs under 10 CFR Parts 50, 52, 70, 71, and 72, respectively. The staff also determined that security and material control and accounting requirements in 10 CFR Parts 72, 73, and 74, respectively, are also adequate.</p> <p>In the case of non-LWRs, the staff's preliminary conclusion is that the current security regulatory framework is comprehensive and sufficiently robust to certify, approve, and license non-LWRs. Sufficient provisions are available to provide flexibility for designers and applicants to meet performance-based and prescriptive security requirements and to apply methods or approaches to achieve the objective of high assurance that activities involving special nuclear materials are not inimical to the common defense and security and do not constitute an unreasonable risk to public health. On December 14, 2016, NEI submitted a white paper on a "Proposed Consequence-Based Physical Security Framework for Small Modular Reactors and Other New Technologies." This paper "... proposes an approach to security that considers the enhanced safety and security incorporated into these designs and provides a more effective and efficient means to protect the public health and safety." In the transmittal letter, NEI requests that "... the NRC establish regulatory positions on this approach and the associated policy and technical issues." NEI submitted a fee waiver request for NRCs review of this white paper.</p> <p>Disposition: The NRC approved NEI's fee waiver request and met with NEI on May 3, 2017, to discuss the review of their submittal. The NRC provided feedback on NEI's white paper in July 2017, and met with NEI again on October 12, 2017. The staff prepared a draft white paper to facilitate stakeholder interactions.</p> | <p>SECY-18-0076 (08/01/18)</p> <p>Staff Draft White Paper (11/29/17)</p> <p>NEI White Paper (12/14/16)</p> <p>SECY-11-0184 (12/29/11)</p> |

| Issue Title/Applicability | Status | References |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The staff discussed this white paper with NEI and other stakeholders on December 13, 2017. The staff considered stakeholder input and prepared SECY-18-0076, "Options for Physical Security For Light-Water Small Modular Reactors And Non-Light-Water Reactors," which was sent to the Commission on August 1, 2018.</p> | |
| <p>V. Functional Containment Performance</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u> Non-LWRs</p> | <p>In SECY-93-0092, "Issues Pertaining to the Advanced Reactor (PRISM, MHGTR, and PIUS) and Candu 3 Designs and their Relationship to Current Regulatory Requirements," the staff proposed to evaluate the acceptability of proposed designs using a standard based upon containment functional performance rather than to rely exclusively on prescriptive containment design criteria. The staff also informed the Commission that it intended to approach this by comparing containment performance with the accident evaluation criteria. In SRM-SECY-93-0092, the Commission approved the staff's recommendation.</p> <p>Subsequently, in SECY-03-0047, the staff recommended that the Commission approve the use of functional performance requirements to establish the acceptability of a containment or confinement structure (i.e., a non-pressure retaining building may be acceptable provided the performance requirements can be met) and the staff proposed that functional performance requirements be developed. In SRM-SECY-03-0047, the Commission disapproved the staff's recommendation stating that there was insufficient information at the time for the Commission to prejudge the best options and make a decision on the viability of a confinement building. The Commission directed the staff to develop performance requirements and criteria working closely with industry experts (e.g., designers, EPRI, etc.) and other stakeholders regarding options in this area, taking into account such features as core, fuel, and cooling systems design. The Commission also directed the staff to pursue the development of functional performance standards and then submit options and recommendations to the Commission.</p> <p>In SECY-05-0006, the staff discussed many of the concepts developed in previous communications between the staff and</p> | <p>Staff Draft White Paper (11/27/17)</p> <p>SECY-05-0006 (01/07/05)</p> <p>SMR-SECY-03-0047 (06/26/03)</p> <p>SECY-03-0047 (03/28/03)</p> <p>SRM-SECY-93-092 (07/30/93)</p> <p>SECY-93-092 (04/08/93)</p> |

| Issue Title/Applicability | Status | References |
|---------------------------|---|------------|
| | <p>Commission on the topic of functional containment performance and, as directed in SRM-SECY-03-0047, outlined the attributes for a functional containment. The topic of functional containment was also addressed as part of the next-generation nuclear plant (NGNP) project in the context of high-temperature gas-cooled reactors. More recently, in light of the broad range of non-light water designs under consideration, the staff has determined that it would be beneficial to seek Commission direction to support development and possible deployment of advanced reactor technologies. The staff plans to engage the Commission to confirm whether the Commission direction in SRM-93-0092 should be applied more broadly to additional advanced reactor designs and to propose a risk-informed, performance-based approach to establishing performance criteria for structures, systems, and components and corresponding programs to limit the release of radioactive materials from advanced reactors.</p> <p>Disposition: The staff has engaged stakeholders on this topic at several public meetings. The staff prepared a draft white paper on functional containment performance to facilitate stakeholder interactions. The staff discussed this white paper with stakeholders on December 14, 2017, and February 1, 2018, and with the ACRS on February 22 and April 5, 2018. The ACRS provided a letter on May 10, 2018. The staff will consider ACRS and stakeholder feedback and plans to prepare a SECY paper in 2018 to address this issue.</p> | |

51. Please provide a list of any unresolved policy issues with regard to the licensing of advanced non-light water reactors. Please include an approximate date for when each issue was first raised, any actions taken or planned to resolve the issue, the milestone schedule, and the projected date for resolution.

See response to question 50. All of the SMR policy issues listed in that response are also applicable to non-light water designs. In addition, there is one non-light water specific issue included on that list: functional containment performance.

52. Please describe the status of preparations to review non-light water reactor applications including a milestone schedule and completion dates.

The agency has developed a vision and strategy to assure NRC readiness to conduct its mission for these technologies effectively and efficiently as described in “NRC Vision and

Strategy: Safely Achieving Effective and Efficient Non-Light Water Reactor Mission Readiness,” which was published in the *Federal Register* on July 21, 2016, for stakeholder input. The NRC updated this document (ADAMS Accession No. ML16356A670) to reflect stakeholder feedback and made it publicly available in December of 2016.

The NRC’s non-LWR vision and strategy has three strategic objectives—enhancing technical readiness, optimizing regulatory readiness, and optimizing communication. The NRC has developed implementation action plans (IAPs) to identify the specific activities the NRC will conduct in the near-term (0-5 years), mid-term (5-10 years), and long-term (beyond 10 years) timeframes to achieve non-LWR readiness. In the fall of 2016, the NRC released its draft near-term IAPs to obtain stakeholder feedback. The staff also developed draft mid- and long-term IAPs, which were released to the public in February of 2017. The staff updated its IAPs to reflect stakeholder feedback in July of 2017 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML17165A069 and ML17164A173).

The staff issued SECY-18-0011, "Advanced Reactor Program Status" (ADAMS Accession No. ML17334B217) on January 25, 2018. This paper provides the status of the NRC staff’s activities related to advanced reactors, including the progress and path forward on each of the IAP strategies. It also provides an overview of the various external factors influencing the staff’s activities to prepare for possible licensing and deployment of advanced reactors. Additionally, on April 24, 2018, industry, the Department of Energy, and NRC staff briefed the Commission on activities to prepare for effective and efficient reviews of advanced reactor applications and to provide stakeholder perspectives on advanced reactor development activities, including projected policy and program issues that need to be resolved.

There are 6 individual strategies addressed in the near-term IAPs. These strategies, and the activities in support of each strategy, are discussed below.

| Strategy | Activities in support of the strategy |
|--|--|
| 1) Acquire/develop sufficient knowledge, technical skills, and capacity to perform non-LWR regulatory activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRC contracted with the Oak Ridge National Laboratory to develop a 12-module training course on Molten Salt Reactors (MSRs). The course provided background on various MSR concepts presently under development, including history of earlier MSR projects, descriptions of conceptual designs, and expected technical and regulatory challenges. About 90 NRC staff attended the training along with several DOE staff in three separate 2-day sessions in May, August, and November 2017. Additional training on sodium-cooled fast reactors and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors will be made available to the staff in FY 2019. • NRC developed models of the competencies required for reviewing advanced reactor designs. Project managers and technical reviewers in NRO are currently in the process of assessing their skills against the models. Supervisors will also be able to complete an independent assessment of their employees’ skills. Based on assessment results, any |

| Strategy | Activities in support of the strategy |
|---|---|
| | <p>skill gaps that may exist can be identified and the system will help the employee identify developmental activities and create an individual development plan to close those gaps.</p> |
| <p>2) Acquire/develop sufficient computer codes and tools to perform non-LWR regulatory reviews</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff attended DOE and NRC-sponsored workshops and technology working groups, sought additional information through pre-application interactions, and focused its training efforts to better understand the reactor systems under development. In the near-term, these efforts are focused on the following areas: Reactor Kinetics and Criticality, Fuel Performance, Thermal-Fluid Phenomena, Severe Accident Phenomena, Offsite Consequence Analysis, Materials and Component Integrity, and PRA. • An initial screening of analysis codes for design-basis and beyond-design-basis event simulation was completed, and a suite of tools for further examination and consideration has been identified. The code suite comprises both NRC-developed and DOE-developed codes. Future efforts will evaluate codes in the code suite against analysis requirements. • A Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table (PIRT) exercise was conducted for molten salt reactors. The PIRT focused attention on fuel salt MSR due to their novel and unique feature of fuel being part of the coolant. The PIRT is considered preliminary in that design specifics are not available, but it is useful in that several phenomena requiring simulation could be identified based on existing information. • Staff completed a PRA report that summarizes previous work and issues for non-LWRs and identifies several policy decisions that may need to be made for non-LWRs. • On August 21, 2018, DOE briefed the ACRS on advanced computer models for reactor safety applications including models under development for non-light water reactors. A follow-up ACRS briefing is planned for November 16, 2018, when the NRC staff would brief the ACRS on the role of confirmatory calculations in regulatory decision making, and non-LWR developers would discuss their plans for modeling and simulation tools. |
| <p>3) Develop guidance for a flexible non-LWR regulatory review process</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In October 2017, the staff issued a preliminary draft of “A Regulatory Review Roadmap for Non-Light Water Reactors” (ADAMS Accession No. ML17279B177), |

| Strategy | Activities in support of the strategy |
|--|--|
| <p>within the bounds of existing regulations, including the use of conceptual design reviews and staged-review processes</p> | <p>and discussed it with stakeholders on November 2, 2017. The NRC issued the final regulatory review roadmap on December 26, 2017 (ADAMS Accession No. ML17312B567).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In June 2017, the NRC issued a preliminary draft document, "Nuclear Power Reactor Testing Needs and Prototype Plants for Advanced Reactor Designs," to solicit stakeholder feedback (ADAMS Accession No. ML17025A353). This document describes the relevant regulations governing the testing requirements for advanced reactors, describes the process for determining testing needs to meet the NRC's regulatory requirements, clarifies when a prototype plant might be needed and how it might differ from the proposed standard plant design, and describes licensing strategies and options that include the use of a prototype plant to meet the NRC's testing requirements. The NRC addressed stakeholder feedback and issued the final prototype document as part of the Regulatory Review Roadmap on December 26, 2017. • On February 3, 2017, the NRC issued draft regulatory guide DG-1330, "Guidance for Developing Principal Design Criteria for Non-Light Water Reactors" for formal public comment. The staff briefed the ACRS subcommittee on the draft final regulatory guide in February 2018 and the ACRS full Committee in March 2018. On April 3, 2018, the NRC issued the Final Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.232 (ADAMS Accession No. ML17325A611), along with the, "Public Comment Resolution Table" (ADAMS Accession No. ML17325A616). The notice of availability of RG 1.232 was published in the <i>Federal Register</i> on April 9, 2018. • The NRC is supporting activities related to the Licensing Modernization Project (LMP) being led by Southern Company, coordinated by the NEI, and cost-shared by DOE. The LMP's objective is to develop technology-inclusive, risk-informed, and performance based regulatory guidance for licensing non-LWRs for the NRC's consideration and possible endorsement. The NRC has reviewed four LMP white papers and provided feedback to industry stakeholders: "Modernization of Technical Requirements for Licensing of Advanced Non-Light Water Reactors - Selection of Licensing Basis Events" (ADAMS |

| Strategy | Activities in support of the strategy |
|--|--|
| | <p>Accession No. ML17104A254), "Modernization of Technical Requirements for Licensing of Advanced Non-Light Water Reactors - Probabilistic Risk Assessment Approach" (ADAMS Accession No. ML17158B543), "Modernization of Technical Requirements for Licensing of Advanced Non-Light Water Reactors: Safety Classification and Performance Criteria for Structures, Systems, and Components" (ADAMS Accession No. ML17290A463), and "Modernization of Technical Requirements for Licensing of Advanced Non-Light Water Reactors: Risk-Informed and Performance-Based Evaluation of Defense-in-Depth Adequacy" (ADAMS Accession No. ML17354B174). As discussed in the NRC's letter dated February 28, 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18047A149), these interactions have helped set the stage for developing more formal guidance. On March 29, 2018, industry submitted a working draft of a consolidated guidance document titled "Risk-Informed Performance-Based Guidance for Non-Light Water Reactor Licensing Basis Development," for discussion. The staff met with NEI, Southern and other non-LWR stakeholders to discuss this draft LMP guidance document on April 5 and 6, 2018. The staff held another meeting on June 5 and 6, 2018, to discuss the draft guidance document. The staff briefed the ACRS Future Plant Subcommittee on June 19, 2018. A public meeting on the LMP guidance was held on August 21, 2018. To support this meeting, the NRC released a preliminary draft of a planned regulatory guide, "Guidance for a Technology-Inclusive, Risk-Informed, and Performance-Based Approach to Inform the Content of Applications for Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Non-Light-Water Reactors," (ADAMS Accession No. ML18226A212). Subsequently, Southern provided revision "N," (ADAMS Accession No. ML18242A469) of the draft LMP guidance document for staff review. The staff is also scheduled to brief the ACRS Future Plant Designs Subcommittee again in October 2018 and the ACRS Full Committee in December 2018.</p> |
| <p>4) Facilitate industry codes and standards needed to support the non-LWR life cycle (including fuels and materials)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NRC staff is actively participating in subgroups and working groups associated with the development of ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel (B&PV) Code, Section III, Division 5. NRC staff is also participating in the "Task Group on ASME/NRC Liaison for Division 5" that seeks NRC, DOE, and industry stakeholder input in identifying gaps in ASME B&PV Code Section III, Division 5, which need to be resolved prior to |

| Strategy | Activities in support of the strategy |
|--|--|
| | <p>considering endorsement in 10 CFR 50.55a. The staff discussed this topic during a public meeting on December 14, 2017. ASME sent a letter to the staff confirming that advanced reactor developers support NRC endorsement of the 2017 edition of ASME Section III, Division 5. Therefore, the staff is initiating the endorsement process. ASME also plans to submit a technical basis document for the 2017 edition. The staff discussed its plans for endorsement of ASME Section III Division 5 during the NRC’s annual standards forum on September 11, 2018, and during the next periodic advanced reactor stakeholder meeting on September 13, 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff is actively participating on several American Nuclear Society (ANS) standards working groups and consensus committees related to non-LWR safety standards and the joint ASME/ANS non-LWR PRA standard. • On September 26, 2017, the NRC held the second annual NRC Standards Forum, which was attended by representatives from many standards development organizations, representatives from industry (NEI, the Electric Power Research Institute, and Technology Working Groups for non-LWRs), and representatives from DOE and DOE national labs. A portion of this year’s standards forum was devoted to non-LWRs with the intent of working with stakeholders to identify new codes and standards needed for non-LWR development and to facilitate the codes and standards development and eventual endorsement by the NRC, as appropriate. A follow-up workshop on advanced reactor standards development was held on May 2, 2018. |
| <p>5) Identify and resolve technology-inclusive (not specific to a particular non-LWR design or category) policy issues that impact regulatory reviews, siting, permitting, and/or licensing of non-LWR nuclear power plants</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NRC’s key activities related to the resolution of policy issues in support of near-term IAP strategy 5 are discussed in response to questions 50 and 51 above. In addition, an April 2018 Commission briefing on advanced reactors included an overview of near term policy issues. |
| <p>6) Develop and implement a structured, integrated strategy to communicate with internal and external</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NRC is conducting public meetings with stakeholders every 4 to 6 weeks. The most recent of these meetings was held on July 26, 2018, and the next one is scheduled for September 13, 2018. The |

| Strategy | Activities in support of the strategy |
|--|--|
| <p>stakeholders having interests in non-LWR technologies</p> | <p>NRC uses these stakeholder meetings to solicit input on policy and process issues related to the possible licensing and regulation of non-LWR technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NRC and DOE hosted a series of three Advanced Non-LWR Workshops. The most recent workshop was held on April 25 and 26, 2017. This series of workshops focused on opening a dialogue between key stakeholders to discuss challenges in the commercialization of non-LWR technologies and to discuss possible solutions. • On November 10, 2016, the NRC and DOE signed a MOU (ADAMS Accession No. ML16215A382) on the Gateway for Accelerated Innovation in Nuclear (GAIN) Initiative. GAIN is an initiative that is intended to provide the nuclear energy community with increased access to the technical, regulatory, and financial support necessary to move new or advanced nuclear reactor designs toward commercialization while ensuring the continued safe, reliable, and economic operation of the existing nuclear fleet. As described in the MOU, the NRC is responsible for providing DOE and the nuclear energy community with accurate, current information on the NRC’s regulations and licensing processes. • The NRC will continue to share information with various international groups, including the NEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Generation IV International Forum, and the NRC’s international regulatory counterparts. The NRC chairs NEA’s ad hoc group for international regulators of non-LWRs known as the Group on the Safety of Advanced Reactors. The purpose of the group is to bring interested regulators together to discuss common interests, practices, and problems, and address both the regulatory interests and research needs. |