

# NOTATION VOTE

RELEASED TO THE PDR

## RESPONSE SHEET

6/19/90  
date

initials

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION  
FROM: COMMISSIONER ROGERS  
SUBJECT: SECY-90-146 -PROCESS, SCHEDULE, AND  
RESOURCES FOR THE REVIEW OF EVOLUTIONARY AND  
PASSIVE ADVANCED LIGHT-WATER REACTORS

APPROVED in part DISAPPROVED in part ABSTAIN \_\_\_\_\_  
KCH KCH

NOT PARTICIPATING \_\_\_\_\_ REQUEST DISCUSSION \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: SEE ATTACHMENT  
KCH

Kimble C. Rogers  
SIGNATURE

RELEASE VOTE ☐

May 16, 1990  
DATE

WITHHOLD VOTE ☐

ENTERED ON "AS" YES No \_\_\_\_\_

9006220335 900516  
PDR COMMS NRCC  
CORRESPONDENCE PDC

2F02  
1/10

Comments on SECY-90-146

Approved:

1. I approve the staff's recommended reprogramming of some of the available resources to achieve gains in the review schedules.
2. I approve the staff recommendations on the fifteen technical issues presented in SECY-90-016, subject to comments in my vote sheet on SECY-90-016, and subject to any unexpected new issues that may be presented by representatives of the Electric Power Research Institute in their briefing of the Commission on June 4, 1990.
3. I approve the staff's continuing with it's technical review activities on any matters which are unaffected by technical policy issues awaiting ACRS review and comment or by policy issues awaiting Commission disposition.

Disapproved:

4. I disapprove the revised process for the review of ALWR projects in SECY-90-016. I agree with Commissioner Curtiss that the process set forth in previous Commission guidance and articulated in SECY-90-065 is a preferred approach to conducting these reviews. This approach in my opinion will ensure active Commission involvement in numerous policy issues that will emerge in the review of evolutionary and passive advanced light water reactors, the two DOE Modular Advanced Reactors, and other advanced reactors that may be brought to the Commission in the future.

I agree with Commissioner Remick as to the necessity for a thorough review process consistent with available resources, the importance of early reviews and feedback to vendors on safety related aspects of conceptual advanced designs, and the benefits of a combined serial and parallel approach which would permit the Commission to participate actively in policy issues as they emerge throughout the review process.

I also agree with Commissioner Remick that "unified" NRC reviews by personnel from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation and Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research of advanced reactors are desirable. Unified reviews may be possible through a matrix type organization of NRR and RES staff headed by an NRR manager.

My opinion on the sufficiency and comprehensiveness of agency resources for such reviews is still pending awaiting the results of a staff response to my request of April 16, 1990 for the numbers of qualified reviewers by reactor type in the agency.

KCR  
5/16/90