

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

RELEASED TO THE PDR

12/14/90

date

initials

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION
FROM: COMMISSIONER REMICK
SUBJECT: SECY-90-362 - STAFF COMMENTS ON THE CONTINUING NEED FOR A LICENSING REVIEW BASIS DOCUMENT FOR EACH PASSIVE DESIGN

APPROVED ^{w/comment} DISAPPROVED ABSTAIN
NOT PARTICIPATING REQUEST DISCUSSION

COMMENTS:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS

9012200095 90110B
PDR COMMS NRCC
CORRESPONDENCE PDR

12/14/90 *COMMS NRCC*

[Signature]
SIGNATURE

RELEASE VOTE

WITHHOLD VOTE

8 Nov 90
DATE

ENTERED ON "AS" YES No

[Handwritten initials]

Commissioner Remick's comments on SECY-90-362.

I approve staff's proposals with a minor modification to permit greater flexibility in the review process. I concur with staff that it appears at this time that an LRB for the MHTGR, PRISM, PIUS, and CANDU-3 designs would be a logical step to follow. However, future developments might cause a change in this view; for example, if a Canadian contract with EPRI, as they are *apparently* planning to, for requirements document for the CANDU-3 design.

Therefore, I would prefer the following changes to staff's second recommendation in order to provide greater flexibility in the review process: "It appears at this time that the LRB documents for the MHTGR, PRISM, PIUS and CANDU are needed would provide a more stable and predictable regulatory process. However, if an LRB document becomes an element on the critical path in the review schedule of a specific advanced reactor design or new developments suggest that an LRB document is no longer necessary, staff will promptly notify the Commission of such developments and recommend appropriate options for Commission consideration."