COMMISSION MEETING

In the Matter of: PUBLIC MEETING

AFFIRMATION SESSION 80-46

POOR ORIGI

DATE: October 23, 1980 PAGES: 1 - 3

Washington, D. C.

ALDERSON REPORTING

400 Virginia Ave., S.W. Washington, D. C. 20024

Telephone: (202) 554-2345

MU11070613

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING
4	AFFIRMATION SESSION 80-46
5	
6	
7	
8	Poom 1130
9	1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.
10	Thursday, October 23, 1980
11	The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 2:00 p.m.
12	PRESENT:
13	
14	JOHN F. AHEARNE, Chairman of the Commission VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner PETER A. BRADFORD, Commissioner
15	STAFF PRESENT:
16	SAMUEL J. CHILK, Secretary
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

POOR ORIGINAL

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on 1.25.1985 in the Commission's offices at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determinations or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of or addressed to any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

PROCEEDINGS

- 2 CHAIRMAN AHEARNE: The Commission meets this
 3afternoon for an affirmation session. The secretary will
 4lead us through it.
- 5 MR. CHILK: The first one is SECY-80-35 A,
 6 proposed revision to 80-365, fees for withdraw, applications
 7 for CPs, OLs, and other approvals or reviews. The
 8 Commission unanimously has approved for publication in the
 9 Federal Register a proposed interpretive rule which
 10 clarifies what fees will be collected when a review is
 11 completed, of an application is completed, or the
 12 application is withdrawn.
- 13 Would you please affirm your votes?
- (Chorus of ayes)

1

- MR. CHILK: The second one is 80-223A. The

 16Commission has unanimously approved an amendment to its

 17rules of practice to conform the regulations regarding

 18adjudicatory reviews with its internal operating procedures,

 19which authorize the Commissioners ten working days to review

 20decisions, and so forth.
- 21 Yould you please affirm your votes?
- (Chorus of ayes)
- 23 MR. CHILK: The third one is 80-375. The 24 Commission has unanimously approved a Federal Register 25 notice for a proposed rule which amends the NRC regulations

1 that specify fracture toughness requirements for nuclear
2 power reactors and requirements for reactor vessel material
3 surveillance programs.

- 4 Would you please affirm your votes?
- 5 (Chorus of ayes)
- 6 MR. CHILK: Thank you, gentlemen. That completes

7it-

8 (Where pon, at 2:04 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

	Session 80-46
Date of Proceeding: October 23	3, 1980
Docket Number:	
Place of Proceeding: Washingto	on, D. C.
re held as herein appears, and that this is ereof for the file of the Commission.	the original

Official Reporter (Typed)

Official Reporter (Signature)

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

September 15, 1980

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM

SECY-80-2LJA

For:

The Commissioners

From:

James A. Fitzgerald
Assistant General Counsel

Subject:

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO 10 CFR 2.786(a)

AND 2.206(c)

Purpose:

To solicit Commission approval for an amendment to 10 CFR 2.876(a) and 2.206(c) to conform the regulation regarding adjudicatory review time with the internal Com-

rission procedures.

Discussion:

Cn April 30, CGC submitted proposed amendments to 10 CFR Part 2 to extend generally the times for Commissioner action on decisions under 10 CFR 2.206(c), 2.786(a), and 2.786(b). SECY 80-223 (April 30, 1980). Upon consideration, the Commission approved only the amendments to 2.786(b) to provide 30 days (instead of 20 days) for Commission action when a petition to review is filed and to 2.786(a) to clarify that action under 10 CFR 2.786(a) is automatically coextensive with 10 CFR 2.786(b). Those amendments are now effective. 45 Fed. Reg. 45890 (July 8, 1980) (Attachment 1).

Since those changes were approved, the Commission has expressed a desire to have ten working days (i.e., two weeks) to consider items in the normal course of Commission review and action. We believe that the recent amendment to 10 CFR 2.786(b) will be sufficient in the normal case to permit receipt

of answer drafting the Comm the matt for OGC existing 2.206(c)

DUPLICATE DOCUMENT

Entire locument previously entered into system under:

ANO 8009290516

No. of pages:

Contact: 8049 5905/ Hark E. Chopko, GC August 7, 1980

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR 6 JULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SECY-80-375

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM

For:

The Commissioners

From:

Robert B. Minogue, Director, Office of Standards, Development Li Arch

Thru:

Executive Director for Operations

Subject:

10 CFR Part 50--GENERAL REVISION OF APPENDICES G AND H. FRACTURE TOUGH-NESS AND REACTOR VESSEL MATERIAL SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

Purpose:

Inform the Commission of the need to amend Appendices G and H. and obtain Commission approval of a notice of proposed rulemaking.

Issue:

Proposed modification of NRC regulations involving the requirements for fracture toughness of the reactor coolant pressure boundary, including surveillance of neutron radiation embrittlement of the reactor vessel beltline materials.

Discussion:

Appendix G, "Fracture Toughness Requirements", and Appendix H, "Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program Requirements," have undergone only limited revision in over six years of use. In this proposed general revision, the requirements of Appendices G and H have been updated to be more consistent with current technology and pertinent National Standards. Some of the proposed amendments are intended to clarify the applicability of these requirements to old plants, those built to an ASME Code earlier than the Summer 1972 Addenda to the 1971 Edition, which often require consideration of proposed alternatives to specific requirements. Two of the proposed amendments modify requirements that have proved to be unduly conservative, and a number of other amendments shorten and simplify these regulations by replacing technical detail with references to appropriate National Standards.

The proposed amendments also address a procedural issue involving the need for an exemption when a licensee proposes an alternative action to that described in the regulation. These amendments describe two routes that may be followed. In § 50.47, which would take the place of § 50.55a(i) in making Appendices G and H a part of the regulations, the exemption route is described. Proposed alternatives may be used when an exemption is granted by the Commission. The applicant must demonstrate that his request meets the requirements of §50.12, and he must demonstrate that (a) the specified requirement would result in hardship without a compensating increase in quality and safety, and (b) the proposed alternative would pre

The keyword, "adequate," is achieved by the proposed a would be achieved by follow nevertheless acceptable. posed alternative, which a

DUPLICATE DOCUMENT

Entire document previously entered into system under:

ANO 8009040888

No. of pages:

Contact: P. N. Randall

443-5997 dupe 206969694888