

April 23, 2014

MEMORANDUM FOR: Stewart Magruder, Chief  
Small Modular Licensing Branch 1  
Division of Advanced Reactors and Rulemaking  
Office of New Reactors

FROM: Joseph F. Williams, Senior Project Manager /RA/  
Small Modular Licensing Branch 1  
Division of Advanced Reactors and Rulemaking  
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF JANUARY 23, 2014, PUBLIC MEETING ON DEVELOPMENT OF  
THE CLINCH RIVER CONSTRUCTION PERMIT APPLICATION

On January 23, 2014, a meeting was held in Rockville, MD between representatives of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to discuss development of the Clinch River construction permit (CP) application. Meeting attendees are listed in Enclosure 1. Presentation materials used by TVA can be found in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) at accession number ML14017A005.

TVA had planned to submit a 10 CFR Part 50 construction permit application for up to 4 mPower small modular reactors at the Clinch River site near Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in the second quarter of calendar year 2015. It was expected that NRC review of this application would proceed in parallel with review of the mPower 10 CFR Part 52 design certification application. However, this plan is likely to change as result of a recent decision by the mPower reactor designer, Babcock & Wilcox (B&W), to significantly reduce resources devoted to design development.

TVA provided a brief overview of project activity, including work to characterize the site geology and hydrology. A flooding analysis is also being conducted in coordination with other currently operating TVA nuclear facilities which are conducting evaluations in response to the Fukushima accident of March 11, 2011. TVA is also working with its partners at Generation mPower during development of the design certification application. TVA has started development of the Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (PSAR) and environmental reports which will provide much of the basis of much of the CP submittal. A draft of the emergency plan has also been developed.

The bulk of TVA's presentation focused on development of the PSAR from the content of the design certification application (DCA). TVA emphasized that it expects a high degree of consistency between the content of the CP application and the DCA. The presentation described how TVA intends to structure the CP application so that readers will be able to easily discern where the content matches the DCA and where there are differences.

Meeting participants discussed the need for configuration control to maintain consistency between the CP application and the DCA as changes arise out of the NRC staff's review of those applications. It is expected that review of the two applications will be closely coordinated, reflecting differences between the regulatory frameworks and outcomes.

The NRC staff received several questions from members of the public who participated in the meeting by telephone. One participant questioned why TVA and Generation mPower are being given the latitude to use both the 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR Part 52 licensing processes. NRC staff stated that both processes are acceptable regulatory processes, so prospective applicants are permitted to choose the approach which fits their individual plans. The staff stated that it is expected that each process will yield equivalent outcomes. A participant expressed an opinion that the approach is problematic with regard to public participation. NRC staff stated that the NRC intends to conduct a public meeting in the site vicinity prior to submittal of the application. This meeting will describe the licensing process, and the means interested members of the public can use to monitor and participate in that process.

Another participant asked if a schedule of new reactor licensing activities posted on the NRC's website is current. Staff replied that the schedule reflects current publicly-available information. The participant asked about the expected effect if the planned design certification application is delayed. NRC staff responded that the agency conducts its planning based upon the best available information.

PROJ0785

Enclosure: Attendees

cc: Distribution via Listserv

those applications. It is expected that review of the two applications will be closely coordinated, reflecting differences between the regulatory frameworks and outcomes.

The NRC staff received several questions from members of the public who participated in the meeting by telephone. One participant questioned why TVA and Generation mPower are being given the latitude to use both the 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR Part 52 licensing processes. NRC staff stated that both processes are acceptable regulatory processes, so prospective applicants are permitted to choose the approach which fits their individual plans. The staff stated that it is expected that each process will yield equivalent outcomes. Ms. Barczak expressed an opinion that the approach is problematic with regard to public participation. NRC staff stated that the NRC intends to conduct a public meeting in the site vicinity prior to submittal of the application. This meeting will describe the licensing process, and the means interested members of the public can use to monitor and participate in that process.

Another participant asked if a schedule of new reactor licensing activities posted on the NRC's website is current. Staff replied that the schedule reflects current publicly-available information. The participant asked about the expected effect if the planned design certification application is delayed. NRC staff responded that the agency conducts its planning based upon the best available information.

PROJ0785

Enclosure: Attendees

cc: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

ABradford  
JColaccino  
GHolahan  
MMayfield  
MCheok  
SCoffin  
FAkstulewicz  
SFlanders  
CAder  
CSchum  
GTracy

**ADAMS Accession No.: ML14112A400**

**NRO-002**

<b>NAME</b>	JWilliams	SMagruder
<b>OFFICE</b>	NRO/DARR/SMRLB1	NRO/DARR/SMRLB1
<b>DATE</b>	04/23/2014	04/23/2014

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

Enclosure 1  
Attendees  
Clinch River Construction Permit Application Development  
January 23, 2014

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Richard Emch	AdSTM
Alice Carson	Bechtel
Steve Routh	Bechtel
Martha Shields	Department of Energy
Don Calsyn	Generation mPower
Darrell Gardner	Generation mPower
Jim Smit	Nexus Engineering
Sardar Ahmed	NRC
Dan Barss	NRC
Scott Bussey	NRC
Marcia Carpentier	NRC
Mark Caruso	NRC
Pei-Ying Chen	NRC
Theresa Clark	NRC
Arlon Costa	NRC
David Diec	NRC
Steven Downey	NRC
Bob Fitzpatrick	NRC
Joe Giacinto	NRC
Ann Hove	NRC
A. H. Hsia	NRC
K. R. Hsu	NRC
Thomas Kendzia	NRC
Ron LaVera	NRC
Myrisha Lewis	NRC
Renee Li	NRC
Stu Magruder	NRC
Michael Mazaika	NRC
Jan Mazza	NRC
Mike McCoppin	NRC
Mark Notich	NRC
Sunwoo Park	NRC
Rick Pelton	NRC
Sundar Shankar	NRC
Swagata Som	NRC
Courtney St. Peters	NRC
Jim Strinisha	NRC
Dinesh Taneja	NRC
Kenny Thomas	NRC
Lisa Walsh	NRC
Joe Williams	NRC

Enclosure 1  
Attendees  
Clinch River Construction Permit Application Development  
January 23, 2014

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Andrew Yeshnik	NRC
Jake Zimmerman	NRC
Tom Clements	South Carolina Sierra Club
Sara Barczak	Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
Mandy Hancock	Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
Don Safer	Tennessee Sierra Club
Pete Gaillard	TVA
Dan Stout	TVA