

TERA



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

FEB 9 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman Ahearne

FROM: Harold R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
(Signed) William J. Dircks

THRU: William J. Dircks, Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: PROJECTED TARGET SCHEDULES FOR PENDING CP APPLICATIONS

The enclosed is in response to your recent request on the subject matter.

Original Signed by
H. R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: Commissioner Gilinsky
Commissioner Hendrie
Commissioner Bradford
OPE
OGC
SECY



8102280289

Licensing Schedules for Pending Construction Permit Applications

The staff has continued its effort to propose the manner and extent to which the TMI Action Plan should be applied to pending CP applications. The staff has assessed the public comments received and has developed a proposed revision of NUREG-0718, Proposed Licensing Requirements for Pending Applications for Construction Permits and Manufacturing License. The staff met with the ACRS and presented staff recommendations to the Commission (Policy Paper SECY 81-20) in January 1981. At the request of one construction permit applicant, further discussion with the ACRS and the Commission has been scheduled in February. Following a Commission decision on the staff recommendations, further case-specific action to include TMI-related requirements can be undertaken for the pending CP applications.

A schedule for issuance of construction permits for pending CP applications based on the NUREG-0718 is difficult to predict at this time. This difficulty arises from two major factors. First, the schedule for applicant submittals of TMI-related of PSAR amendments is not known with certainty. Second, each of the near-term/construction permit applications must complete the hearing process and the nature of the contentions that will be considered in the hearings as a result of TMI is not yet clear. Both of these factors are heavily dependent on the scope of the TMI-related requirements.

NRR has developed a plan to resume the review of construction permits and manufacturing license applications dealing with non-TMI items that have been outstanding for some time and in some cases are delaying hearings. At this time, there are six construction permit applications (11 units) and one manufacturing license (8 units) pending. The pending construction permit applications are (1) Allens Creek Nuclear Station, (2) Black Fox Nuclear Station, (3) Pilgrim Unit 2 Nuclear Station (4) Pebble Springs Nuclear Station, (5) Perkins Nuclear Station, and (6) Skagit Nuclear Station. The pending manufacturing license application is the Floating Nuclear Plant.

The first four construction permits (on the above list) and the manufacturing license applications are to be given priority, since the Skagit Plant is being relocated to a new site and the applicant for the Perkins Plant has withdrawn his financial commitment to the project. We anticipate that these latter two reviews will not be resumed until late 1981 at the earliest.

The status of the first four CP and one ML applications with respect to non-TMI issues is as follows:

- Allens Creek - A second supplement to the Allens Creek FES regarding the issues of alternative sites and transportation of the reactor vessel to the site was issued in December 1980. The hearing on environmental issues resumed on January 12, 1981. Testimony on selected non-TMI safety issues is to be prepared by May 31, 1981 and it is anticipated that the safety hearings on these matters will resume in early July 1981.

- Pilgrim 2 - All non-TMI issues were closed, environmental and safety hearings were held. The ASLB issued a partial initial decision on February 2, 1981 on all issues except TMI-2 issues and emergency planning.
- Black Fox 1 and 2 - All non-TMI environmental and safety issues are complete. An LWA-1 was issued on July 26, 1978. Safety hearings were completed on February 28, 1979. Motion to reopen safety hearings to address the impact of TMI requirements is pending.
- Pebble Springs 1 and 2 - The applicant has indicated that he desires to go forward with the completion of the environmental and site suitability review at this time. Staff effort is underway to close out alternative sites, Table S-3, Appendix I and Class 9 accident considerations. Testimony on environmental issues (including alternative sites) is in preparation and is expected to be submitted to the ASLB in June 1981. Hearings on these environmental matters will resume shortly thereafter. However, the applicant has not provided the necessary input to evaluate the need for power and alternative energy sources. Thus the environmental record will remain open on these issues. The two remaining non-TMI safety issues (unresolved safety issues and cold shutdown using only safety-grade systems) will be considered in the preparation of the TMI supplements to the SER.
- FNP 1-8 - Only TMI-related issues are pending before ASLB's.

Using the following assumptions, projected target schedules for the four pending CP's and one ML can be made:

- (1) Commission approval of NTCP TMI requirements effective - March 1981
- (2) CP/ML applicants provide PSAR amendments to address TMI requirements as follows: 3 by April, 2 by June.

(3) NRC staff prepares TMI SSERs in 60 days following receipt of last necessary information on TMI-issues. To accomplish this very short review schedule, the staff will be utilizing some form of special review process.

*(4) ACRS meetings, 30 days after SSERs issued.

(5) NRC staff prepares Supplemental SER subsequent to ACRS in 30 days.

The enclosed schedules to the near-term CP's reflects the above discussions. It should be noted that the pacing items for these schedules is the issuance of Commission approved NTCP requirements in March 1981 and applicant PSAR submittals. In addition, while limited resources are available to resume CP application reviews in FY 1981, the uncertain scope of TMI-related contentions to be dealt with in forthcoming hearings may result in the need for resource expenditures in excess of those allocated. In such instances, available resources will be allocated in the following priority order: First, to operating reactors, second to operating license reviews and third to construction permit reviews. Selection of priorities would depend upon the responsiveness of the applicants in providing the required information.

*Due to significant ACRS involvement and interest in the development of the NTCP requirements, it appears prudent to assume plant specific ACRS meetings on each pending CP will result. In addition, the Regulations require the ACRS to review each CP application.

TABLE 1

NOTE

The attached table assumes staff SERs issued sequentially, one per month, starting in June 1981. The ordering of these plants may change and will be based on such prioritization factors as status of plant hearings, amount and dates of input information, etc.

STATUS AND PROJECTED TARGET SCHEDULES
FOR PENDING CONSTRUCTION PERMIT APPLICATIONS

PLANT	PSAR Docketed	ER Docketed	SER	ACRS Mtg.	Latest non- TMI SSER	FES	Hearing non-TMI Start	Hearing non-TMI End	(4) TMI SER	ACRS TMI	TMI SSER
Allens Creek 1	12/73C	12/73C	11/74C	12/74C	03/79C	12/80C	01/81C	09/81	07/81	08/81	09/81
Black Fox 1 & 2	12/75C	12/75C	06/77C	06/77C	03/79C	02/77C	08/77C	02/79C	08/81	09/81	10/81
Pebble Springs 1 & 2	10/74C	08/74C	01/76C	02/76C	05/78C	04/75C	05/78C	(1)	09/81	10/81	11/81
Perkins 1-3	05/74C	06/74C	03/77C	04/77C	07/77C	10/75C	11/75C	02/79C	(2)	(2)	(2)
Pilgrim 2	12/73C	12/73C	06/75C	11/75C	01/79C	10/75C	10/75C	08/79C	06/81	07/81	08/81
Skagit 1 & 2	01/75C	09/74C	08/77C	11/77C	10/78C	06/75C	07/75C	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
BNP 1-8	07/73C	07/73C	08/75C	Series	02/80C	10/75C	06/76C	10/79C	10/81	11/81	12/81

- (1) Seismic issues delayed safety review. Alternative site review based on the Seabrook decision resulted in FES supplement on this matter. Hearings not concluded; in addition to TMI-2 issues, generic issues (ALAB-444), need-for-power, and alternative site matters are pending. Site Certification by State is not complete.
- (2) Motion was filed to reopen to consider TMI-2 issues. Applicant indicated in July 1979 that no final decision has been made by them on the construction of Units 1, 2 and 3.
- (3) As a result of field explorations conducted by USGS, the seismic design of the facility must be reexamined. Applicants indicated in September 1980 that proposed facility to be relocated to site on the Hanford reservation. Amended ER and PSAR will be filed in September 1981.
- (4) Schedules shown are based on preliminary estimates of when PSAR amendments will be filed.