



NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE

Project 689

**Anthony R. Pietrangelo**  
DIRECTOR, RISK and  
PERFORMANCE BASED REGULATION  
NUCLEAR GENERATION

March 21, 2001

Ms. Suzanne C. Black  
Deputy Director, Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O8E1  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Ms. Black:

The final draft of an NEI white paper entitled "Standard Format for Operating License Amendment Requests from Commercial Reactor Licensees" was distributed to industry Administrative Points of Contact on March 20, 2001. A copy of the paper is enclosed for NRC staff review and comment.

The NEI Licensing Action Task Force would like to discuss the paper, including options for NRC endorsement, at its next meeting with the NRC Licensing Action Task Force.

If you have any questions, please contact Mike Schoppman at (202) 739-8011 ([mas@nei.org](mailto:mas@nei.org)).

Sincerely,

Anthony R. Pietrangelo  
MAS/

Enclosure

DOH



# **NEI White Paper**

## **March 15, 2001 (final draft)**

### **STANDARD FORMAT**

### **FOR OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUESTS**

### **FROM COMMERCIAL REACTOR LICENSEES**

This paper outlines a standardized format that licensees may use on a voluntary basis to prepare a proposed plant-specific amendment to the Operating License for a commercial reactor. Italicized information in brackets should be provided by the licensee.

This paper uses footnotes to explain certain concepts. Thus, they are part of the White Paper, not part of the LAR format.

*[Licensee's letterhead]*

*[Date]*

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Attn: Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

SUBJECT:           *[Plant/Unit Name(s)]*  
                  *Docket No(s) [50-\_\_\_\_, 50-\_\_\_\_]*  
                  *[Title]<sup>1</sup>*  
                  *[Brief description & affected Tech Spec(s), if any]<sup>2</sup>*

REFERENCES:   *[as necessary]*

Dear Sir or Madam:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, *[license holder]* hereby requests the following amendment: *[brief summary of the proposed amendment and the results of the corresponding "no significant hazards determination"]*.

*[License holder]* requests approval of the proposed amendment by *[date + justification]*.<sup>3</sup> Once approved, the amendment shall be implemented within *[ ]* days.<sup>4</sup>

*[Include or attach a listing of formal licensee commitments that would derive from NRC's approval of the proposed amendment.]*

*[If the proposed amendment is "risk informed," include a statement that the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.174, "An Approach for Using Probabilistic Risk Assessment In Risk-Informed Decisions on Plant-Specific Changes to the Licensing Basis," has been followed.]*

---

<sup>1</sup> The title used by many licensees is "License Amendment Request (LAR)." Other licensees use "Proposed License Amendment (PLA)." These and other equivalent terms are acceptable titles.

<sup>2</sup> Usually, but not always, the proposed amendment is intended to revise particular Technical Specifications. However, there will be some cases that result in a license amendment, but do not change any Technical Specification (for example, an amendment to incorporate a change to the updated FSAR or Technical Specification Bases that requires prior NRC approval in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59 (c)(2)).

<sup>3</sup> Provide justification in the cover letter for the "need date." For example, approval by that date is necessary to prepare for the scheduled startup following a refueling outage.

<sup>4</sup> A 60-120 day implementation period is typical. If additional implementation time is needed, provide justification in the cover letter, e.g., significant procedure changes are required to support implementation.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact  
*[Mr./Mrs./Ms., licensee's point of contact for the NRC Office of Nuclear Reactor  
Regulation] at [telephone number].*

Sincerely,

*[Signature]*

*[Name]*

*[Title]*

Attachments:

1. Notarized Affidavit<sup>5</sup>
2. Licensee's Evaluation
3. Markup of Technical Specification pages and Bases (for information only) pages  
*[4. Retyped Technical Specification pages and Bases (for information only) pages<sup>6</sup> -  
OPTIONAL]*
- [5. Regulatory Analysis Summary Table<sup>7</sup> – OPTIONAL]*

cc: *[Region \_\_ ]*  
*[NRR Project Manager]*  
*[Plant/Unit Resident Inspector(s)]*  
*[State contact]*

---

<sup>5</sup> As an alternative to a notarized "oath & affirmation" affidavit, a licensee may substitute the following statement in the cover letter: "I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date)." The alternative statement is pursuant to 28 USC 1746. It does not require notarization.

<sup>6</sup> This attachment is OPTIONAL. Many licensees defer submittal of retyped Technical Specification pages until the end of the process, thereby permitting the incorporation of any revisions derived from responses to NRC Requests for Additional Information or other sources.

<sup>7</sup> This attachment is OPTIONAL.

**AFFIDAVIT**

*[Licensee's standard affidavit. This attachment is not required if the licensee chooses to use the standard language from 28 USC 1746 in the cover letter – see footnote 5.]*

## **LICENSEE'S EVALUATION**

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT
- 3.0 BACKGROUND
- 4.0 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS & GUIDANCE
- 5.0 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS
- 6.0 REGULATORY ANALYSIS
- 7.0 NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION (NSHC)
- 8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION
- 9.0 PRECEDENT
- 10.0 REFERENCES

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This letter is a request to amend Operating License(s) *[license number(s)]* for *[plant/unit name(s)]*.

The proposed change(s) would revise the Operating License(s) to *[provide a brief general description of the proposed amendment, the reason for the amendment, and any timing constraints.]*<sup>8</sup>

## 2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

*[Provide a detailed description of individual changes addressed within the proposed amendment. The degree of detail should be consistent with the degree of complexity of the proposed amendment.]*

In summary, *[provide a paragraph containing a few descriptive sentences suitable for use by NRC in the Federal Register notice that will be published to seek public comment on the proposed amendment. Avoid slang words or undefined abbreviations or acronyms. This summary may duplicate wording in the licensee's cover letter and should bound the detailed changes being proposed.]*

*[Describe associated changes to the Technical Specification Bases, if any.]*

## 3.0 BACKGROUND

*[Include:*

- *System description(s).*
- *Applicable references to updated FSAR text and figures.*
- *Discussion of conditions that the proposed amendment is intended to resolve.*
- *An explanation of the circumstances that establish a need for the proposed amendment(s), for example, historical information, prior communication or correspondence with NRC staff, relevant reference documents, etc.]*

---

<sup>8</sup> In some cases, the amendment will affect only the Operating License, for example, when a license amendment is necessary in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59(c)(2). However, in most cases, the amendment will affect one or more Technical Specifications.

## 4.0 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS & GUIDANCE

*[Describe applicable regulatory requirements or guidance associated with the proposed amendment, for example, specific sections of 10 CFR 50, general design criteria, regulatory guides, standard review plans, etc. Explain how this information may apply to the plant in general and to the proposed amendment in particular. Be sure to differentiate between guidance that is part of the licensing basis and guidance that is not part of the licensing basis.]*

## 5.0 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

### 5.1 Design Basis

*[Include:*

- A detailed explanation of why the proposed amendment meets the plant's design basis and is, therefore, acceptable.*
- A detailed description of analytical methods, applicable standards, data, and results.*
- Technical details in support of safety arguments.*
- The impact on updated FSAR accident analyses.*
- Briefly summarize the preceding arguments at the end of this section.*

*[The Technical Analysis section should be written such that it may be used with minimal modification in the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation (SE).]*

### 5.2 Risk Information

*[If the proposed amendment is risk-informed, include information in accordance with the Regulatory Guide series 1.174 – 1.178 on “risk-informed decision-making.” These five Regulatory Guides address plant-specific changes to the licensing basis, inservice testing, graded Quality Assurance, Technical Specifications, and inservice inspection, respectively).]*

## 6.0 REGULATORY ANALYSIS

*[This section describes in detail how the licensee's technical analysis (Section 4), which may or may not include risk information, satisfies all applicable regulatory requirements and guidance (Section 3). Any formal commitments to administrative controls needed to ensure compliance should be included in this section. The Regulatory Analysis provides a basis that the NRC staff may use to find the proposed amendment acceptable. It should be written such that it may be used with minimal modification in the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation (SE).]*



*[To assist the NRC staff, the licensee may choose to include a "Regulatory Analysis Summary Table (Attachment 6 - OPTIONAL).]*

In conclusion, based on the considerations discussed above, (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

## 7.0 NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

*[Licensee name]* has evaluated whether or not a significant hazards consideration is involved with the proposed amendment(s) by focusing on the three standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92, "Issuance of amendment," as discussed below:

1. **Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?**

Response: No.

*[Explanation/basis for the response.]* Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. **Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?**

Response: No.

*[Explanation/basis for the response.]* Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. **Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?**

Response: No.

*[Explanation/basis for the response.]* Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above, *[licensee name]* concludes that the proposed amendment(s) present no significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), and, accordingly, a finding of “no significant hazards consideration” is justified.

## 8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

*[The identification of licensing and regulatory actions eligible for categorical exclusion or otherwise not requiring environmental review is the subject of 10 CFR 51.22. The categories of actions deemed “categorical exclusions” are specified by 10 CFR 51.22(c). The licensee’s consideration of environmental factors should include sufficient detail to support a finding of categorical exclusion. For the majority of changes, it is clear that the environment will not be affected (e.g., extending a surveillance interval). Therefore, a simple statement (see below) is sufficient. If appropriate, the licensee can provide more detailed information to strengthen the justification of categorical exclusion.]*

A review has determined that the proposed amendment would change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area, as defined in 10 CFR 20, or would change an inspection or surveillance requirement. However, the proposed amendment does not involve (i) a significant hazards consideration, (ii) a significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluent that may be released offsite, or (iii) a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the proposed amendment meets the eligibility criterion for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the proposed amendment.

*[and/or]*

The proposed amendment is confined to (i) changes to surety, insurance, and/or indemnity requirements, or (ii) changes to recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, the proposed amendment meets the eligibility criterion for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the proposed amendment.

## 9.0 PRECEDENT

*[If precedent can be identified, the licensee should reference the affected power plant(s) and amendment number(s), and briefly discuss how the precedent applies to the specific circumstances of the proposed amendment. If there are any differences between identified precedent and the proposed amendment, the licensee should explain the differences and describe their impact on the acceptability of the proposed amendment. Precedent, by itself, does not demonstrate the acceptability of a proposed amendment, but it does give the NRC staff information about how they have treated similar changes in the past. This may simplify the NRC staff's review.]*

## 10.0 REFERENCES

*[Identify and number all references used to prepare the proposed amendment. Each reference should be cited at least once in this attachment (Licensee's Evaluation). If a reference is needed to understand, review, or approve the proposed amendment, it should be included as an enclosure and identified with a suitable enclosure number or letter.]*

**Markup of  
Technical Specification pages  
&  
Bases (for information only) pages**

*Attachment 4*  
*(OPTIONAL)*

*Retyped*  
*Technical Specification pages*  
*&*  
*Bases (for information only) pages*

**Regulatory Analysis Summary Table**

| <i>TS #</i>  | <i>Regulatory Requirements</i> | <i>Design Basis</i>              | <i>Analysis (linked to Design Basis column)</i> | <i>Conclusion + Licensee Actions</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| <i>x.x.x</i> | <i>10 CFR, GDC, etc.</i>       | <i>1.<br/>2.<br/>3.<br/>etc.</i> | <i>1.<br/>2.<br/>3.<br/>etc.</i>                |                                      |
| <i>y.y.y</i> | <i>10 CFR, GDC, etc.</i>       | <i>1.<br/>2.<br/>3.<br/>etc.</i> | <i>1.<br/>2.<br/>3.<br/>etc.</i>                |                                      |
| <i>z.z.z</i> | <i>10 CFR, GDC, etc.</i>       | <i>1.<br/>2.<br/>3.<br/>etc.</i> | <i>1.<br/>2.<br/>3.<br/>etc.</i>                |                                      |