

April 15, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: John Clark
 Office of Management and Program Analysis

FROM: Hugh L. Thompson, Acting Director
 Planning & Program Analysis Staff, NRR

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM CONGRESSMEN M. UDALL AND B. VENTO

In accordance with your April 9, 1981 memo, the NRR material required for the response to Congressmen M. Udall's and B. Vento's March 16, 1981 letter is provided in enclosure 1. These resource levels represent our best estimate from a limited data base.

Hugh L. Thompson
 Hugh L. Thompson, Acting Director
 Planning & Program Analysis Staff
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
 As stated

(3)

8302180041 830111
 PDR FOIA
 KNOWLES82-607 PDR

Total Manpower and Dollars
FY 1980
(Dollars In Thousands)

Office of: Nuclear Reactor Regulation

<u>Staffyears:</u>	<u>CP Review</u> ^{a/}	<u>OL Review</u> ^{b/}	<u>All Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Professional Direct	5.0	78.4	331.0	414.4
Professional Support	2.0	31.6	117.3	150.9
Organizational Support	0.5	7.6	54.6	62.7
Total	7.5	117.6	502.9	628.0 ^{1/}

<u>Dollars:</u>	<u>CP Review</u> ^{a/}	<u>OL Review</u> ^{b/}	<u>All Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Program Support	\$500	\$9,900	\$18,091	\$28,491
Administrative Support (IE only)				
Travel	30	540	619	1,189
Equipment (IE only)				
Total	\$530	\$10,440	\$18,710	\$29,680 ^{2/}

^{1/} Must be in line with end-strength reported in the FY 1980 column of the FY 1982 budget to Congress.
^{2/} Must agree with the FY 1980 column of the FY 1982 budget to Congress for all offices except IE.

Current Average Estimated Manpower and Dollar
To Process A Single Custom Plant
(Dollars In Thousands)

Office of: Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Staffyears:

Professional Direct
Professional Support
Organizational Support

CP Review c/
Range :

OL Review d/
Range

14.0 - 21.0
4.5 - 7.5
1.5 - 1.5

20.0 - 30.0

16.5 - 18.5
5.0 - 6.0
1.5 - 1.5

23.0 - 26.0

Total

Dollars:

Program Support
Administrative Support (IE only)
Travel
Equipment (IE only)

\$500 - \$600
50 - 55

\$550 - \$655

\$450 - \$500
65 - 75

\$515 - \$575

Total

Note: If necessary, this data may be expressed in a range.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Footnotes to Accompany Forms 1 and 2 as Requested
in J. Clark's April 9, 1981 Memorandum to Compile
Resource Estimates for CP and OL Reviews

All resource estimates are provided in accordance with the instructions and definitions provided in J. Clark's April 9, 1981 memorandum.

a/ Includes Casework effort related to CP reviews.

As a result of the accident at Three Mile Island and of the need to carefully re-examine the way in which the NRC and the nuclear industry fulfill their shared responsibility for safety, construction permit reviews have been delayed for the six applications currently in house.

b/ Includes Casework effort related to OL reviews and Operator Licensing effort related to licensing reactor operators for new facilities.

c/ Represents the current Casework estimate of the average overall cost for the case review of each of the CP's currently in-house.

d/ Represents the current estimate of the Casework effort related to OL reviews and the Operator licensing effort related to licensing reactor operators for new facilities.

The operating license (OL) applications surveyed to develop this estimate were the only units licensed since the TMI-2 accident and hence the manpower expenditures are probably the upper limits for processing a reactor operating license. Thus, they experienced extensive licensing and construction delays and were the "first-of-a-kind" with respect to implementation of new policies and requirements.

Narrative for ASLBP Resource Estimates in Answer
To Cong. Vento Questions

The percentages listed below were prepared by stating hearing days for each type of case as a percentage of total hearing days in FY 1980. This data base furnishes the most representative estimate of the allocation of professional staff (ASLBP members) and/or support personnel costs during FY 1980. The same percentages may be used to allocate travel costs after \$25,000 is subtracted from the total travel costs recorded for ASLBP in the accounting offices. The amount subtracted represents our best estimate of travel costs for the ASLBP meeting held November 27 through 29, 1979.

Construction Permit	5%
Construction Permit Amendment	1%
Operating License	12%
Operating License Amendment	23%
Order for Modification of License	10%
Special	12%
Antitrust	12%
Early Site Review	0% (less than 1%)
Confirmatory Order	25%
Show Cause	0% (less than 1%)

In accordance with the definitions provided for "CP Review" and "OL Review," CP Review constitutes 5% (Construction Permit) of ASLBP activity and OL Review constitutes 13% (Construction Permit Amendment + Operating License) of ASLBP activity. Forms 1 and 2 reflect these percentages. Professional Direct staff includes the executive secretary, permanent panel members, and an administrative law judge; Professional Support staff includes secretaries; and Organizational Support staff includes the assistant executive secretary, legal counsel, administrative secretary, docket supervisor, management services assistant, technicians, and clerks.

For Form 2, estimates for single plant resource requirements for ASLBP were calculated in the following manner: In 1980, 3 CP's were under review; they require approximately two years each to complete; thus $1\frac{1}{2}$ were completed with the 1980 resources; and the average resources per license equal the 1980 resource estimates from Form 1 divided by $1\frac{1}{2}$. In 1980, 7 OL's were under review; they also require about two years to complete; thus $3\frac{1}{2}$ were completed with 1980 resources; and the average resources per license equal the 1980 resource estimates divided by $3\frac{1}{2}$.

The ASLBP records board time for non-contested CP safety, environmental, or antitrust hearings, for input to the License Fee Management Branch. Otherwise, the office does not record actual time. Therefore, most of the actual "professional time" for each (case type) is not directly available.

Total Manpower and Dollars
 FY 1980
 (Dollars In Thousands)

Office of: ASLBP

	<u>CP Review</u>	<u>OL Review</u>	<u>All Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Staffyears:</u>				
Professional Direct	0.7	1.7	10.6	13
Professional Support	0.5	1.2	7.3	9
Organizational Support	0.5	1.2	7.3	9
Total	1.7	4.1	25.2	31 <u>1/</u>

<u>Dollars:</u>				
Program Support	0	0	10	10
Administrative Support (IE only)				
Travel	4	11	92	107
Equipment (IE only)				
Total	4	11	102	117 <u>2/</u>

1/ Must be in line with end-strength reported in the FY 1980 column of the FY 1982 budget to Congress.

2/ Must agree with the FY 1980 column of the FY 1982 budget to Congress for all offices except IE.

Current Average Estimated Manpower and Dollars
To Process A Single Custom Plant
(Dollars In Thousands)

Office of: ASLBP

	<u>CP Review</u>	<u>OL Review</u>
<u>Staffyears:</u>		
Professional Direct	0.5	0.5
Professional Support	0.3	0.3
Organizational Support	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	1.1	1.1

<u>Dollars:</u>		
Program Support	0	0
Administrative Support (IE only)		
Travel	3	3
Equipment (IE only)	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total	3	3

Note: If necessary, this data may be expressed in a range.

FORM 1 - NARRATIVEPREFACE

ACRS reviews of CPs and OLs are conducted on subcommittee/Full Committee meeting basis. When an application for a CP is received by NRC, the ACRS management designates a project review subcommittee consisting of a chairman, two to four members, a staff engineer, and those consultants for which there is an anticipated need. For each CP application there is always a site visit, usually two to three days of subcommittee meetings, culminating in a report to the Full Committee, and at least one day of Full Committee meeting time, culminating in a report to the Commission. For OL applications there may or may not be a site visit, there is usually two to three days of subcommittee meeting time required, again culminating in a report to the Full Committee, and one to two days of Full Committee meeting time, culminating in a report to the Commission. Complex or controversial cases require more time, of course.

ACRS professional direct effort includes monitoring the progress of the application before it reaches ACRS, review of the application by ACRS staff engineers when it reaches ACRS, distribution of application documents to ACRS members and consultants on the project subcommittee; researching or otherwise obtaining answers to ACRS members' questions on the project application; scheduling a site visit and one or more subcommittee meetings on the project and coordinating the attendance of the applicant, architect

engineer, vendor, NRC staff and others at the subcommittee meeting(s).

It also includes ensuring that conflicts-of-interest checks are made for each ACRS Consultant present; that Federal Register notices of the meeting are issued on a timely basis; that the meeting is conducted in accordance with FACA procedures and service as the Designated Federal Employee for the meeting. In addition, professional direct effort includes writing and distributing the minutes of the subcommittee meeting; researching technical questions from the members which surface at the meeting, or later; assisting with preparation of the subcommittee chairman's report which is to be presented to the Full Committee and answering questions from the press and others.

Professional direct effort applied to the CP and OL review process at Full Committee meetings include distribution of application documents to all Committee members (15) and to those consultants assigned to the project review; coordination of attendance by the applicant, vendor, architect engineer, NRC staff and others; serving as the Designated Federal Employee for the part of the meeting concerned with that particular application; obtaining answers to members' and consultants' technical questions and assistance in preparation of the draft Committee report to the Commission.

Following the issuance of the ACRS Letter Report to the Commission, the ACRS technical staff continues to monitor the application until the CP or OL is issued by the Commission as well as between the CP issuance and OL application. This is also considered professional direct effort to the licensing process.

FORM 1 - NARRATIVE - PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT

Professional Support of the ACRS license application review process includes 50% of the Project Review Branch Chiefs' time (they are working supervisors); the Technical Secretary's time; all the branch secretaries (total of four); the docket and file room staffs; the distribution center staff; the technical librarian; the information systems engineer, and the administrative staff who arrange for the members' (15) and consultants' (105) travel to and from meetings, process their compensation claims, arrange for out-of-town meeting rooms, process Federal Register notices of meetings and otherwise support the Committee meeting process.

FORM 1 - ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

ACRS organizational support includes the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director, two Assistant Executive Directors, their secretaries and that part of the program support staff that prepares the ACRS budget, arranges for members' and consultants' appointments and reappointments, prepares the numerous administrative reports to comply with the FACA and to meet other NRC requirements, handles conflict-of-interest requirements for members and consultants and handles requests for license fee information as well as responding to requests from Congress on the Committee's operation.

STATEMENT

Narrative for Form 2 is same as Form 1.

Total Power and Dollars
 FY 1980
 (Dollars In Thousands)

Office of: Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards

	<u>CP Review</u>	<u>OL Review</u>	<u>All Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Staffyears:</u>				
Professional Direct	None	.67	10.33	11
Professional Support	in	.31	16.69	17
Organizational Support	<u>1980</u>	<u>.16</u>	<u>8.84</u>	<u>9</u>
Total		1.14	35.86	37* ^{1/}

Dollars:

Program Support	None	5	95	100
Administrative Support (IE only)	in	-	--	---
Travel	1980	3	275	278
Equipment (IE only)	<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>---</u>
Total	---	8	370	378 ^{2/}

^{1/} Must be in line with end-strength reported in the FY 1980 column of the FY 1982 budget to Congress.
^{2/} Must agree with the FY 1980 column of the FY 1982 budget to Congress for all offices except IE.

*Does not include ACRS Members and Consultants who serve on a WAE Basis.

Current Average Estimated Manpower and Dollars
To Process A Single Custom Plant
(Dollars In Thousands)

Office of: Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards

	<u>CP Review</u>	<u>OL Review</u>
<u>Staffyears:</u>		
Professional Direct	.20 to .60	.30 to .70
Professional Support	.25 to .45	.25 to .50
Organizational Support	<u>.15 to .20</u>	<u>.15 to .25</u>
Total	.60 to 1.25	.70 to 1.50

<u>Dollars:</u>		
Program Support	5. to 10.	5 to 15 ✓
Administrative Support (IE only)	----	----
Travel	4 to 6	3 to 5
Equipment (IE only)	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>
Total	9. to 16	8 to 20

Note: If necessary, this data may be expressed in a range.

1
1
1