

September 17, 1999

COMMISSION VOTING RECORD

DECISION ITEM: SECY-99-192

TITLE: PROPOSED RULE: REVISION OF PART 50, APPENDIX K, "ECCS EVALUATION MODELS"

The Commission (with all Commissioners agreeing) approved the subject paper as recorded in the Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) of September 17, 1999.

This Record contains a summary of voting on this matter together with the individual vote sheets, views and comments of the Commission, and the SRM of September 17, 1999.

Annette Vietti-Cook
Secretary of the Commission

Attachments: 1. Voting Summary
2. Commissioner Vote Sheets
3. Final SRM

cc: Chairman Dicus
Commissioner Diaz
Commissioner McGaffigan
Commissioner Merrifield
OGC
EDO
PDR
DCS

VOTING SUMMARY - SECY-99-192

RECORDED VOTES

	APRVD	DISAPRVD	ABSTAIN	NOT PARTICIP	COMMENTS	DATE
COMR. DICUS	X					9/3/99
COMR. DIAZ	X				X	8/26/99
COMR. McGAFFIGAN	X				X	8/31/99
COMR. MERRIFIELD	X				X	9/1/99

COMMENT RESOLUTION

In their vote sheets, all Commissioners approved the staff's recommendation and some provided additional comments. Subsequently, the comments of the Commission were incorporated into the guidance to staff as reflected in the SRM issued on September 17, 1999.

Commissioner Comments on SECY-99-192

Commissioner Diaz

" I approve publication of the proposed rulemaking for 10 CFR 50, Appendix K in the Federal Register notice for a 75-day public comment period. I recommend the following clarification for the last sentence of the proposed rule language (p. 24 of the Federal Register notice): "The selected combination of power distribution shape and peaking factor should be the one that results in the most..." In the section "Issues for public comment",

staff should also seek comments on the impact of this rule change to the power level assumptions used in the non-LOCA accident analyses in the FSAR."

Commissioner Merrifield

I approve the staff's request to publish the proposed changes to 10 CFR 50, Appendix K as described in SECY 99-192.

In reviewing this paper, I have benefitted from the comments provided by the ACRS in its letter dated July 22, 1999. I have also reviewed the staff's response dated August 18, 1999. I accept the staff's assurance that, as a matter of course during power uprate reviews, it reviews the impact of power level assumptions on all relevant safety analyses, including the non-LOCA analyses which may be limiting at certain plants or types of plants.