



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

May 27, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO: David B. Matthews, Chief  
Generic Issues and Environmental  
Projects Branch  
Division of Reactor Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

50-317/318

FROM: Claudia M. Craig, Senior Project Manager  
Generic Issues and Environmental  
Projects Branch  
Division of Reactor Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

*Claudia M. Craig*

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING WITH BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC (BGE) TO  
DISCUSS LICENSE RENEWAL ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT (ER) TEMPLATE  
PROCESS

The subject meeting was held at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) offices in Rockville, Maryland on May 19, 1997, between representatives of BGE and the NRC staff. The purpose of the meeting was for the staff to provide BGE comments on the revised ER template, the four examples of the level of detail of the ER, and to discuss selected issues. Attachment 1 is a list of meeting participants.

BGE proposed the ER template process in order to develop a format and content guide for the ER to be submitted in support of a license renewal application. Existing NRC guidance is currently being updated to reflect the revised 10 CFR Part 51, which includes the environmental requirements of a license renewal application. BGE anticipates completing their ER prior to final guidance being issued by the Commission, thus, the effort on the template to determine an acceptable format and content. It is the staff and BGE's objective that the completed environmental report template outline a format and content such that if an ER is submitted which follows the template and contains sufficient information, it is likely the report would be accepted for review.

The staff and BGE discussed issues regarding the BGE responses to the NRC questions and comments and the examples provided by BGE. Discussions included NRC's preference that the specific impacts of alternative energy sources be assessed separate from the no-action alternative such that a comparison of the alternative energy sources and license renewal may be made. The staff recognizes that as a result of the no-action alternative, replacement power will be needed and therefore, alternative energy sources should be addressed under the no-action alternative as well. Additionally, the no-action alternative should include decommissioning and termination of the license impacts. The staff also agreed that the level of detail in the ER should be such that a comparison can be made between the alternatives and license renewal.

080016

9706090282 970527  
PDR ADOCK 05000317  
P PDR

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

*1/1 Draft*

Regarding mitigative measures, the staff agreed with BGE's position that mitigative measures need not be considered for impacts resulting from Category 2 issues that are not applicable to BGE. However, the staff disagreed with BGE on the position that for Category 2 issues that meet certain criteria, such as providing the appropriate Clean Water Act 316 documentation, no mitigative measures need to be considered. The staff recognizes that even while operating within the bounds of a permit issued by the State under the Clean Water Act, there are impacts and mitigative measures should be considered. If the best available technology is being implemented, there may be no mitigative measures available, but that needs to be discussed. Additionally, the staff disagreed with BGE position that mitigative measures need not be discussed for de minimis impacts. The staff believes that NEPA and CEQ guidance states that even for impacts that by themselves would not be considered significant, mitigative measures need to be considered. The level of detail for addressing mitigative measures, however, should be commensurate with the level of impact.

The staff agrees that BGE is not required to include further analyses in the ER for Category 1 issues. However, in fulfilling our NEPA responsibilities, NRC would rely, in part, on information and representations made by the applicant. To do so, the staff would likely determine whether the applicant has objective evidence to support a determination under 10 CFR 51.53(c)(3)(iv) that it is not aware of new and significant information. The objective evidence may be in the form of a systematic process to ensure that new and significant information may be identified by an applicant. The staff would review the process to gain confidence in the completeness of the information provided in the ER. Although the staff did not review the basis for the BGE statement addressing 10 CFR 51.53(c)(3)(iv) for new and significant information as part of the template effort, the staff would find the BGE proposed language to be acceptable.

The staff agrees that BGE need only address transportation impacts on public services for license renewal refurbishment activities. A possible rule modification may add a requirement to address transportation impacts on public services for the license renewal term. The Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) supports this rule modification. It was stated that NEI has identified several areas where the Part 51 rule and GEIS appear inconsistent. Staff stated they would like to have dialogue with industry to identify those areas such that a revision to the rule would capture all of them.

The staff understands BGE's unique transmission line situation and at this time considers BGE's treatment of electric shock to be consistent with the rule.

The staff informed BGE of its intent to initiate a generic transportation analysis to address the generic and cumulative environmental impacts of transportation operation in the vicinity of a high-level waste repository. It is envisioned that this generic analysis could be referenced by future license renewal applicants. It is hoped that information will be publicly available in the next several months.

The staff also discussed comments on the examples BGE provided to demonstrate the level of detail that will appear in the ER. Based on the examples reviewed, the ER appears to be of sufficient level of detail and addresses the appropriate issues such that it is likely it would be accepted for review. The staff stated requests for additional information based on technical questions during the ER review would be generated.

A senior management meeting has been scheduled for June 5, 1997, to inform upper levels of BGE and NRR management of the ER template effort and the results. After that meeting, it is not anticipated that further interactions between the staff and BGE will be needed as part of the template process.

Docket Nos. 50-317, 50-318

Attachment: As stated

cc w/att: See next page



The staff also discussed comments on the examples BGE provided to demonstrate the level of detail that will appear in the ER. Based on the examples reviewed, the ER appears to be of sufficient level of detail and addresses the appropriate issues such that it is likely it would be accepted for review. The staff stated requests for additional information based on technical questions during the ER review would be generated.

A senior management meeting has been scheduled for June 5, 1997, to inform upper levels of BGE and NRR management of the ER template effort and the results. After that meeting, it is not anticipated that further interactions between the staff and BGE will be needed as part of the template process.

Docket Nos. 50-317, 50-318

Attachment: As stated

cc w/att: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:w/attachment:

Hard Copy

✓ Central File

PUBLIC

PGEB R/F

RArchitzel

CCraig

E-Mail

SCollins/FMiraglia

RZimmerman

TMartin

MSlosson

PTKuo

SFlanders

DMatthews

BZalcman

LChandler, OGC

JMoore, OGC

GHoller, OGC

CMarco, OGC

DCleary, RES

JWilson

SBajwa

ADromerick

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CMC1\5 19 97.MIN

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PGEB <i>AK</i>	PGEB:SC <i>AK</i>	PGEB:BC <i>AK</i>
NAME	CCraig <i>sw</i>	RArchitzel	DMatthews
DATE	5/21/97	5/21/97	5/21/97

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

BGE / NRC MEETING  
ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT TEMPLATE PROCESS  
MAY 19, 1997

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Claudia Craig	NRC/NRR/PGEB
Barth W. Doroshuk	BGE
Julea Bradley	HNUS/BGE
Robert Tucker	BGE
Jim Bennett	BGE
Scott Flanders	NRC/NRR/PDLR
Frank Akstulewicz	NRC/NRR/PGEB
Jim Wilson	NRC/NRR/PGEB
Don Cleary	NRC/RES/DRA
Gene Holler	NRC/OGC
Catherine Marco	NRC/OGC
Barry Zalcman	NRC/NRR/PGEB
Steve Mixon	NUS Information Services
Tricia Heroux	for EPRI

cc:

President  
Calvert County Board of  
Commissioners  
175 Main Street  
Prince Frederick, MD 20678

D. A. Brune, Esquire  
General Counsel  
Baltimore Gas and Electric Company  
P.O. Box 1475  
Baltimore, MD 21203

Jay E. Silberg, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. Thomas N. Pritchett, Director,  
NRM  
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant  
1650 Calvert Cliffs Parkway  
Lusby, MD 20657-47027

Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
P.O. Box 287  
St. Leonard, MD 20685

Mr. Richard I. McLean  
Administrator - Radioecology  
Department of Natural Resources  
580 Taylor Avenue  
Tawes State Office Building, B3  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Regional Administrator, Region I  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
475 Allendale Road  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. Joseph H. Walter, Chief Engineer  
Public Service Commission of  
Maryland  
Engineering Division  
6 St. Paul Centre  
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Kristen A. Burger, Esquire  
Maryland People's Counsel  
6 St. Paul Centre  
Suite 2102  
Baltimore, MD 21202-1631

Patricia T. Birnie, Esquire  
Co-Director  
Maryland Safe Energy Coalition  
P.O. Box 33111  
Baltimore, MD 21218

Mr. Larry Bell  
NRC Technical Training Center  
5700 Brainerd Road  
Chattanooga, TN 37411-4017

Mr. Barth Doroshuk  
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant  
1650 Calvert Cliffs Parkway  
Lusby, MD 20657-47027

Mr. Robert Tucker  
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant  
1650 Calvert Cliffs Parkway  
Lusby, MD 20657-47027

Mr. Doug Walters  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
1776 I Street, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006-3708