

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

RELEASED TO THE PDR

4/12/94
date

g
initials

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION
FROM: COMMISSIONER ROGERS
SUBJECT: SECY-94-017 - OPTIONS WITH REGARD TO
REVISING 10 CFR PART 100, REACTOR SITE
CRITERIA

APPROVED ^{WITH} _{COMMENTS} KCR DISAPPROVED _____ ABSTAIN _____
NOT PARTICIPATING _____ REQUEST DISCUSSION _____

The staff has done an excellent job in addressing the many concerns associated with developing new reactor site criteria and is to be complimented for its efforts on this difficult task.

I approve the staff recommendations given in the paper (Option 4 in the Non-Seismic and Option 2 in the Seismic sections of the rule) and agree with the comments made by Chairman Selin in his vote on this paper. In addition, I offer the following comments:

1. It should be made totally clear, in the statement of considerations (SoC) and possibly in the requirements themselves, that the new reactor siting requirements apply only for initial siting for new plants and are not to be used for evaluating applications for the renewal of existing nuclear power plant licenses.
2. The SoC should clarify and amplify the points raised in the Commission meeting of March 1, 1994 regarding the relationships, tradeoffs and amount of coupling between standardized reactor designs and site acceptability.

9404140147 940307
PDR COMMS NRCC
CORRESPONDENCE PDR

Kenneth C. Rogers

SIGNATURE

RELEASE VOTE

March 7, 1994

DATE

WITHHOLD VOTE

ENTERED ON "AS" YES No _____

100003

FOI
01