

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

RELEASED TO THE PDR

4/12/94
Date

J
Initials

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: THE CHAIRMAN

SUBJECT: SECY-94-017 - OPTIONS WITH REGARD TO
REVISING 10 CFR PART 100, REACTOR SITE
CRITERIA

APPROVED x ^{with comments} DISAPPROVED _____ ABSTAIN _____

NOT PARTICIPATING _____ REQUEST DISCUSSION _____

COMMENTS: See attached.

*WELL DONE - I BELIEVE WE ARE
RIGHT ON TRACK NOW.*

[Signature]

SIGNATURE

March 3, 1994

DATE

9404180154 940303
PDR COMMS NRCC
CORRESPONDENCE PDR

RELEASE VOTE

WITHHOLD VOTE

ENTERED ON "AS" YES No _____

*LF02
0/1*

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS ON SECY-94-017, PART 100 REVISIONS

1. The basic reactor site criteria should be amended to include the principle that the site selected should be the "best reasonable choice" from the available sites. The criteria to apply in assessing the various site elements to judge their relative rankings should be provided in the Regulatory Guide or Standard Review Plan. I would expect this guidance to be in the form of general decision criteria for weighing various site elements to generate composite rankings. It will likely be necessary to include both quantitative and qualitative elements in the decision criteria.
2. When the proposed rule is submitted to the Commission, outlines of the draft regulatory guides and Standard Review Plan section should be provided to demonstrate how the basic site criteria will be implemented. Of particular interest are the numerical criteria for population density and exclusion boundaries.
3. Due to the extensive changes made to the rule, it should be reissued for public comment (both seismic and non-seismic portions), prior to the final rulemaking. Due to the extensive comment periods already provided, this final comment period should be for the minimum allowable duration.