

December 3, 1999

LICENSEE: SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY (SNC)

FACILITIES: EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY OF SNC LICENSING WORKSHOP

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) jointly sponsored a licensing workshop on November 3 and 4, 1999, in Birmingham, Alabama. The goals of the workshop included improving the quality of licensing submittals and improving the licensing interface between SNC and the NRC.

Major topics of discussion included an overview of various regulatory processes, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation project manager responsibilities, changes to 10 CFR 50.59, electronic information exchange, licensee submittal breakout discussions, and related regulatory topics. A copy of the workshop book is available under ADAMS accession number ML993200248. The workshop book contains the agenda, a list of attendees, and presentation slides. Enclosure 1 is an analysis of the feedback forms received after the workshop. Enclosure 2 is a list developed during the workshop of the attributes of a quality submittal.

Please direct any inquiries concerning this workshop to Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager, who can be reached at 301 415-1419 or [LNO@NRC.GOV](mailto:LNO@NRC.GOV).

Original signed by:  
Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321, 50-366, 50-348, 50-364, 50-424, and 50-425

- Enclosures: 1. Feedback Form Analysis  
2. Attributes of a Quality Submittal

cc w/encls: See next page

Distribution:

E-MAIL

- J. Zwolinski/Black
- H. Berkow
- R. Emch
- C. Hawes
- L. Olshan
- J. Yerokun
- P. Skinner, RII
- M. Padovan
- R. Assa
- L. Wiens

HARD COPY

- File Center
- PUBLIC
- PDII-1 Reading
- OGC
- ACRS

**NRC FILE CENTER COPY**

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDII-1\HATCH\workshopsum.wpd

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box C=Copy w/o attachment/enclosure E=Copy with attachment/enclosure N = No copy

OFFICE	PDII-1/PM	PDII-1/LA	E	PDII-1/SC				
NAME	LOlshan:mw	CHawes	CMM	REmch	R/E			
DATE	12/3/99	12/3/99		12/3/99				

DF01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

PDR ADOCR 0500 0321



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 3, 1999

**LICENSEE:** SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY (SNC)

**FACILITIES:** EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

**SUBJECT:** MEETING SUMMARY OF SNC LICENSING WORKSHOP

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) jointly sponsored a licensing workshop on November 3 and 4, 1999, in Birmingham, Alabama. The goals of the workshop included improving the quality of licensing submittals and improving the licensing interface between SNC and the NRC.

Major topics of discussion included an overview of various regulatory processes, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation project manager responsibilities, changes to 10 CFR 50.59, electronic information exchange, licensee submittal breakout discussions, and related regulatory topics. A copy of the workshop book is available under ADAMS accession number ML993200248. The workshop book contains the agenda, a list of attendees, and presentation slides. Enclosure 1 is an analysis of the feedback forms received after the workshop. Enclosure 2 is a list developed during the workshop of the attributes of a quality submittal.

Please direct any inquiries concerning this workshop to Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager, who can be reached at 301 415-1419 or [LNO@NRC.GOV](mailto:LNO@NRC.GOV).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. N. Olshan".

Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager, Section 1  
Project Directorate II  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321, 50-366, 50-348, 50-364, 50-424, and 50-425

**Enclosures:** 1. Feedback Form Analysis  
2. Attributes of a Quality Submittal

cc w/encls: See next page

**Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant**

cc:

Mr. Ernest L. Blake, Jr.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts  
and Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. D. M. Crowe  
Manager, Licensing  
Southern Nuclear Operating  
Company, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1295  
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Resident Inspector  
Plant Hatch  
11030 Hatch Parkway N.  
Baxley, Georgia 31531

Mr. Charles H. Badger  
Office of Planning and Budget  
Room 610  
270 Washington Street, SW.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Harold Reheis, Director  
Department of Natural Resources  
205 Butler Street, SE., Suite 1252  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Steven M. Jackson  
Senior Engineer - Power Supply  
Municipal Electric Authority  
of Georgia  
1470 Riveredge Parkway, NW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30328-4684

Mr. H. L. Sumner, Jr.  
Vice President - Nuclear  
Hatch Project  
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.  
Post Office Box 1295  
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Charles A. Patrizia, Esquire  
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker  
10th Floor  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Washington, DC 20004-9500

Chairman  
Appling County Commissioners  
County Courthouse  
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. J. D. Woodard  
Executive Vice President  
Southern Nuclear Operating  
Company, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1295  
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Mr. P. W. Wells  
General Manager, Edwin I. Hatch  
Nuclear Plant  
Southern Nuclear Operating  
Company, Inc.  
U.S. Highway 1 North  
P. O. Box 2010  
Baxley, Georgia 31515

Mr. R. D. Barker  
Program Manager  
Fossil & Nuclear Operations  
Oglethorpe Power Corporation  
2100 East Exchange Place  
P. O. Box 1349  
Tucker, Georgia 30085-1349

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY  
WRITTEN FEEDBACK ANALYSIS**

Feedback forms were issued as part of the workshop book and all attendees were requested to complete the forms so that improvements could be made for future workshops. Twenty-two forms were returned.

The following are general trends or highlights:

1. The average overall rating for the workshop was approximately 8, which fell into the "Very Good" category.
2. The responses to "Comment on Format and Context of the Workshop" were all positive, with one exception that stated that the room was a bit too large for the group.
1. Typical responses to the question, "What were the workshop's strength?" included:
  - a. The discussions were open and candid.
  - b. The presentation on relief requests was very good.
  - c. The discussion on the qualities of a good submittal was useful.
4. Typical responses to the question, "What were the workshop's weaknesses?" included:
  - a. Some of the presentations were not needed, such as the ones on deregulation and probabilistic risk assessment.
  - b. Some of the discussions went on too long. Time management could have been better.
5. Typical responses to the question, "What would you change for future workshops?" included:
  - a. The submittals that were critiqued should have been distributed earlier to the workshop participants.
  - b. A presentation of significant results from other workshops should be considered.
  - c. Include more breakout sessions and make it a 2-day workshop.
  - d. Leave more time for discussion on evolving topics, such as 10 CFR 50.59.
  - e. Include timely topics, such as current industry issues.
  - f. Involve the Region people.
  - g. Conduct workshops away from the workplace to keep participants more focused.

6. Typical responses to the question, "How will you use what you've learned at the workshop?" included:
  - a. Learned more about Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) and their processes.
  - b. Better understanding of relief requests and the attributes of a good submittal.
  - c. Will improve communications between NRC and SNC.
  
7. About half of the responses to the question, "Should these workshops be held periodically and, if so, at what frequency?", suggested that the workshops be held every 2 years; about one quarter of the responses suggested that the workshops be held every year and about one quarter suggested that the workshops be held every three or more years.

**ATTRIBUTES OF A QUALITY SUBMITTAL**  
**SNC Licensing Workshop**

**A. COVER LETTER**

Provide clear, descriptive title.

Reference previous related submittals and/or similar submittals by other plants, as applicable.

State if you are the lead plant. Either reference Owners Group (OG) submittal or state that subject submittal is the OG submittal.

State clearly:

- What change is.
- Why change is needed.
- When change is needed and basis for requested date. Include special conditions, if appropriate.

Indicate whether submittal affects other submittals under review, as applicable.

Include proprietary information statement, if applicable.

Indicate if submittal is risk informed, if applicable.

Describe enclosures.

Include oath with affirmation.

Reference applicable regulation(s).

**B. BASIS FOR PROPOSED CHANGE/JUSTIFICATION**

Provide detailed description of change.

Write section to stand alone.

Use clear, concise language (layman's terms to the extent possible).

Define acronyms.

Include supporting analyses (summary of methods, assumptions, and results).

Provide background section, if appropriate.

Include clear, system/process description, providing appropriate detail.

Include condition to be resolved.

Reference Standard Review Plan, Topical Reports, and Regulatory Guides, as applicable.

Summarize previous submittals on issue, if appropriate.

Provide sound technical and safety basis.

State current licensing basis/design of plant.

Provide sound references (if brief, write out; if lengthy, point to reference).

Avoid extraneous, repetitive information.

Provide enough information to help support 50.92 evaluation.

Summarize and/or quote docketed or attached generic topical reports, as applicable.

Include environmental impact statement/justification.

**C. 10 CFR 50.92 EVALUATION**

State technical basis and conclude why change is acceptable (from item B above).

Make as "press-ready" as possible (ready for cut and paste).

Redefine acronyms when answering the three questions.

Answer three questions clearly, concisely, and in a straight-forward manner. (Three questions are stand-alone.)

Avoid excessive numeric and technical details.

Provide conclusion statement - reason for no significant hazards determination.

**Attributes of a Quality Submittal  
SNC Licensing Workshop (continued)**

**D. ACTUAL Technical Specifications (TS) PAGES**

Include list of affected pages (i.e., enclosed TS pages).

Ensure:

- Marked-up pages and revised pages agree.
- Marked-up pages are legible and provide adequate margins.