

NRE POR



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUL 18 1979

Mr. John L. Koehne, Jr.
Route 1, Box 284
Shipman, Virginia 22971

Dear Mr. Koehne:

Your letter of June 21, 1979 to the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (formerly the Directorate of Licensing) inquired as to the status of and requested copies of correspondence concerning American Electric Power's (AEP) plans for a proposed nuclear power plant to be located in Nelson County, Virginia near Norwood.

Enclosed is a copy of a summary of a meeting we held with AEP in November of 1978. You will note that at the time the meeting was held, the proposal for a nuclear plant was in the very early planning stages. Our understanding is that AEP plans to submit in the spring of 1980 an application for early review of one or more site suitability issues related to the construction of a nuclear power plant. However, since we have had no official confirmation of this in the past few months, you may wish to contact AEP directly regarding the status of their plans.

Sincerely,

D. B. Vassallo, Acting Director
Division of Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
Meeting Summary dated
January 3, 1979

7908140 489 626 243



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JAN 3 1979

APPLICANT: American Electric Power
FACILITY: Central Virginia 1 & 2
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING WITH AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER

Representatives of American Electric Power (AEP) met with members of the staff on November 1, 1978 to discuss AEP plans for a nuclear plant, and associated facets of the NRC review process. An attendance list is attached. The major subjects discussed are summarized below.

1. Standardization Program

For informational purposes, the staff reviewed briefly its standardization program including the following principal areas:

- History of standardization
- Concepts of standardization
- NRC organization for review
- Examples
- Resultant reduction of effort
- Effect on schedules
- Recent changes to the standardization program.

2. AEP Plans Regarding A New Nuclear Plant

AEP indicated a desire to improve their coal-nuclear power generation mix. Toward this end, they propose undertaking a program to receive a construction permit for a nuclear plant probably in the central Virginia area. After receiving a CP, a decision would then be made on building that plant, based on factors including cost, schedule, and regulatory climate, which would all presumably be better defined at that time.

In order to benefit from the standardization program, AEP has requested bids from the four domestic reactor vendors based on the following "standard" plants:

Combustion Engineering	Palo Verde
Babcock & Wilcox	Pebble Springs
General Electric	Shagit
Westinghouse	SNUPPS

626 244 dupe
#798159946

JAN 3 1979

AEP is attempting to evaluate the licensability, operability, and constructability of such plants, as well as the potential for design duplication at the selected site.

Their generalized schedule was tentatively identified as follows:

5/1/79 Complete evaluation process, select "standard" plant design, select site, make initial decision to proceed further,

5/1/80 Tender application for CP.

3. Licensing Situation For Possible Standard Plant Designs

A discussion ensued on the licensing situation for each standard plant candidate.

Palo Verde

AEP is considering a design referencing CESSAR-80 with a custom balance-of-plant design, similar to Palo Verde. Differences from Palo Verde would be identified in their application using color-coded pages in the PSAR.

It was noted that none of the Palo Verde plants are replicatable -- Units 1, 2 and 3 are too old (docketing must be within 3 years of base plant SER), and Units 4 and 5 are themselves replicates and as such may not be again replicated. However, if the application were to include a System 80 NSSS and a custom BOP, our review would be somewhat simplified, and no questions would be expected on the System-80 portion.

Skagit

AEP would propose to replicate the entire Skagit plant.

We noted that such an application would have to be docketed by 9/1/80 (see above schedule), and as in all replications, it would be subject to a qualification

626 245

JAN 3 1979

Pebble Springs

AEP had considered referencing BSAR-205 with a Pebble Springs BOP design. We noted that Pebble Springs can no longer be replicated under our rules, and AEP then suggested the application might reference BSAR-205 with a custom design BOP which would however be the same as Pebble Springs. This situation would be similar to Palo Verde above, but we noted there could be additional interface problems since Pebble Springs did not reference BSAR-205.

SNUPPS

It was pointed out that SNUPPS refers to RESAR-3, which is no longer replicatable. Referencing the SNUPPS (or any other) FSAR for the AEP plant is not acceptable under our standardization policy. RESAR-3S could be referenced with a BOP identical to the SNUPPS design, which would be similar to the situation described under Palo Verde above.

We pointed out that, in general, use of a well-known plant design (not a referenced standard) might be beneficial if the design were recent. Further discussions took place on a number of other questions on the various options under consideration. We noted our willingness and availability to discuss the above or any other standardization alternatives at any time.

NUREG-0292

We indicated we would apply the features of NUREG-0292 to facilitate the review of this plant. The process should begin one year in advance of the expected tender of the applications, or approximately April or May, 1979. Our intent would be to maintain the same reviewers for the actual review as the pre-tendering effort, and both the safety and environmental aspects are included in the entire process. (The NRC intends to prepare further documentation within a few months to define our effort during the pre-tendering phase.) After tendering, we would conduct an expanded 60-day acceptance review, then issue an SER within six months. The hearing process would of course follow. Potential benefits and problems of near-site meetings and other features of this procedure were discussed.

626 246

JAN 8 1979

Siting

AEP stated that a contractor has been surveying sites in central Virginia, mostly along the James and Roanoke rivers, but others as well. Their criteria include engineering, economic, environmental, and sociological factors. One potential site was identified as an area at the confluence of the Tye and James rivers.

We noted that the Environmental Report must identify and describe (reconnaissance-level data) alternate sites resulting from the site-screening process. It was suggested that a careful review be made of recent hearing board decisions regarding region of interest, including Seabrook, Pilgrim 2, and also Bailly, St. Lucie 2, Midland, and Sterling. These decisions indicate, among other things, that it must be shown that environmentally preferable sites which could satisfy the power demand are not precluded by selection of the region of interest. (We noted that the staff is submitting to the Commission very soon a paper on this matter, and that Commission action may include open meetings and possible rule-making.)

Miscellaneous

AEP asked what would be the minimum amount of meteorological data which could be acceptable by docketing, considering the shortened review time contemplated. (In a subsequent telephone conversation, we informed AEP that 6 months of 90% recovery data is the minimum required, but that less than one year of data may necessitate assumptions by the staff which might unnecessarily penalize the design.)

Closing remarks were made by AEP and the staff. Staff contacts at this time were identified as follows:

Environmental: Bennett L. Harless (EPM)
William H. Regan, Chief, Environmental
Projects Branch No. 2

626 247

Jan 3 1970

-5-

Safety:

Harley Silver (LPM)
Domenic B. Vassallo, Assistant Director
for Light Water Reactors, DPM

Original signed by:
H. Silver

Harley Silver, Project Manager
Light Water Reactors Branch No. 4
Division of Project Management

626 248