



SECRETARY

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

RELEASED TO THE PDR
10/28/99
date initials

October 1, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Karen D. Cyr
General Counsel

William D. Travers
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: *Andrew L. Bates*
Andrew L. Bates

SUBJECT: STAFF REQUIREMENTS - SECY-99-220 - PROPOSED RULE --
CLARIFICATION OF REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE TO
EXPLICITLY LIMIT WHICH TYPES OF APPLICATIONS MUST
INCLUDE ANTITRUST INFORMATION; DISPOSITION OF WOLF
CREEK ANTITRUST LICENSE CONDITIONS

The Commission has approved publication of the proposed rule and draft guidance documents in the Federal Register, and approved the draft letter regarding the Wolf Creek antitrust conditions, subject to the changes provided in the attachment.

The Commission-made changes to the press release contained in the attachment should be made and the press release should then be circulated through the normal concurrence process.

(OGC/EDO)

(SECY Suspense:

10/29/99)

Attachment: Changes to the Rulemaking Package in SECY-99-220

- cc: Chairman Dicus
- Commissioner Diaz
- Commissioner McGaffigan
- Commissioner Merrifield
- CIO
- CFO
- OCA
- OIG
- OPA
- Office Directors, Regions, ACRS, ACNW, ASLBP (via E-Mail)
- PDR
- DCS

1/0
DF03

SECY NOTE: THIS SRM AND SECY PAPER WILL BE RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC
FIVE WORKING DAYS AFTER ISSUANCE OF THE LETTER.

290097

0 JM-6 SRM

Changes to the Rulemaking Package in SECY-99-220

Changes to the FRN

1. Add to page 17, at the end of first partial paragraph at the top of the page, the following footnote:

"The same principle holds in the context of Part 52 of the Commission's regulations. Under that Part, the operating license is issued simultaneously with the construction permit in a combined license. The application for the combined license is subject to the agency's antitrust review, but antitrust reviews of post-combined license transfer applications are not authorized or, if authorized, are not required and not warranted."

2. Add to page 17, at the end of 1st sentence of the first full paragraph, the following footnote:

"The paragraph speaks only to the historically typical case in which a construction permit (CP) is issued first, and then years later an operating license (OL). Under Part 52, the CP and OL are issued simultaneously, and the antitrust review is done before issuance. Thus, there could be no direct transfer of the facility CP before issuance of the initial OL."

3. On page 20, paragraph 1, revise line 9 to read ' ... because the proposed revisions only affect ~~only~~ when antitrust information'

Changes to the Draft Standard Review Plan

4. On page 1-3, revise the last line to read ' ... conduct antitrust reviews ~~after issuance of a COL under Part 52 at the OL stage for COL Part 52 applications.~~
5. On page 1-4, in the 1st paragraph under section 1.4, revise the last sentence to read ' ... one-time antitrust review, with ~~a no significant changes review at the OL stage after construction but before operation under the COL.~~

Changes to the letter to Messrs. Miller and Elliott

6. On page 1, paragraph 3, revise the 1st sentence to read ' ... review of post-operating license transfer applications (or, if it had authority, would not perform as a matter of policy).'
7. On page 1, paragraph 3, revise lines 7 and 8 to read ' ...review the Commission decided not it had no authority to perform ~~(or, if it had authority, would not perform as a matter of policy).~~
8. On page 2, 2nd full paragraph, revise line 2 to read ' ... to conduct the kind of antitrust review (or, if it had authority, would not perform as a matter of policy)'

Changes to the Press Release

9. On page 1, paragraph 3, revise the last sentence to read '... types of applications that must include antitrust information in the to applications for a construction permit, initial operating license, and preoperating transfers of a construction permit before issuance of an initial operating license, or combined construction permit/operating license.'