

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: BRIEEING ON STATUS OF PROPOSED RULE FOR
LICENSE RENEWAL

Location: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

Date: JUNE 22, 1989

Pages: 75 PAGES

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

SECRETARIAT RECORD COPY

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on June 22, 1989 in the Commission's office at One White Flint North, Rockville, Maryland. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determination or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of, or addressed to, any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

(202) 232-6600

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + +

BRIEFING ON

STATUS OF PROPOSED RULE FOR LICENSE RENEWAL

+ + + +

JUNE 22, 1989

+ + + +

The briefing was held in the conference room,
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North,
Rockville, Maryland, at 10:00 a.m., LANDO W. ZECH,
JR., Chairman, presiding.

+ + + +

PRESENT:

LANDO W. ZECH, JR., Chairman of the Commission
THOMAS M. ROBERTS, Member of the Commission
KENNETH M. CARR, Member of the Commission
KENNETH C. ROGERS, Member of the Commission
JAMES R. CURTISS, Member of the Commission

ALSO PRESENT:

SAMUEL J. CHILK, Secretary
WILLIAM C. PARLER, General Counsel
DON CLEARY, Staff
JAMES SNIEZEK, Staff
THOMAS MURLEY, Staff
THEMIS SPEIS, Staff
WAYNE HOUSTON, Staff

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(10:00 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN ZECH: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The purpose of this morning's meeting is for the NRC staff to brief the Commission on the status of the proposed rule for license renewal.

The Commission was last briefed on this subject of license renewal rulemaking on the 12th of July of 1988 and subsequently approved publication of an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking to solicit public comment.

Those comments have been received, as I understand it, and we will hear about that this morning. Copies of the slide presentation should be available at the entrance to the meeting room.

Do any of my fellow Commissioners have any opening comments to make before we begin?

(No response.)

Dr. Murley, you may proceed.

DR. MURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know, Mr. Stello and Mr. Taylor are out today. With me at the table are my Deputy, Jim Sniezek; on my left Don Cleary, who is the leading Staff Manager in Research for this project; Themis Speis; and Wayne Houston. We are here to brief the Commission today on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the status of license renewal activities, staff
2 activities.

3 The Research staff has done a good deal of
4 preparatory work on license renewal issues in the past
5 few years. This work, we believe, will form a good
6 solid basis for the technical issues that must be
7 addressed in license renewal.

8 Now, the staff; and that is, NRR and
9 Research, in conjunction with OGC, are working on some
10 of the basic regulatory issues that have to be thought
11 through before we are able to present a draft rule to
12 the Commission later on this year.

13 Mr. Beckjord and I have been given
14 instructions from the Executive Director for
15 Operations to develop some recommendations for
16 addressing these regulatory issues. I believe the
17 Commission has received a copy of these instructions.

18 Mr. Sniezek was asked to coordinate staff
19 efforts so we can provide our recommendations to the
20 Executive Director by late July. The staff is working
21 now on those recommendations and active activities
22 underway.

23 In addition, the staff has been working
24 closely with NUMARC on this subject in recent months.
25 NUMARC is leading the industry effort to develop

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 technical reports on the issues that need to be
2 addressed during license renewal.

3 We are aiming to reach agreement on these
4 technical issues so that we can evaluate lead plants
5 in 1991. As you probably know, there are two lead
6 plants in this area: Yankee Rowe and Monticello.
7 They are developing detailed technical evaluations of
8 their plants, and we expect to receive renewal
9 applications from them in 1991.

10 I will now turn to Themis Speis, who will
11 talk a bit about some schedule aspects. Thank you.

12 MR. SPEIS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, the
13 main presentation will be made by Dr. Houston, but I
14 would like to add a few things initially. If you will
15 recall, our schedule called for coming up with a final
16 rule by December 1990, from Mr. Stello's schedule.
17 There is a change in that plan.

18 Our present schedule calls for a final rule
19 by April 1992, or a delay of approximately one and a
20 half years.

21 CHAIRMAN ZECH: You are going to tell us
22 about that this morning, I presume?

23 MR. SPEIS: I will tell you, yes.

24 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right.

25 MR. SPEIS: But I would like to make some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 points about that, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you.

3 MR. SPEIS: Our earlier approach called for
4 a more general rule with more details to be included
5 in a number of regulatory guides. And those guides
6 were not to be completed at the same time as the rule,
7 but one or two years later.

8 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Excuse me. I thought
9 that the reg guide was supposed to be ready in early
10 1990. That was the schedule that was --

11 MR. SPEIS: That was a year and a half or so
12 later than the rule itself. So that is the schedule.
13 Right, Don?

14 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: The schedule that was
15 presented to us last July? I don't believe so.

16 MR. CLEARY: I believe that schedule said
17 that the regulatory guides would be available in the
18 early 1990s.

19 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: That's right, early
20 1990 was what the --

21 CHAIRMAN ZECH: 1990s with an "s" on the end
22 of it?

23 MR. CLEARY: Yes, sir.

24 DR. HOUSTON: If I may, there is more than
25 one regulatory guide that is contemplated. And one to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 which you refer, Commissioner Rogers, I believe, is
2 one that we would call the "information requirements
3 regulatory guide." It's a guide that's analogous to
4 Reg Guide 1.70, which sets out information
5 requirements for initial applications.

6 The information requirements draft guide was
7 expected to be out prior to the initiation of lead
8 plant reviews. But the point of the lead plant
9 reviews was as a learning experience, which would then
10 give us an opportunity to finalize the guidance, --

11 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: I see.

12 DR. HOUSTON: -- including any additional
13 positions that would require a regulatory guide.

14 MR. SPEIS: My next point was that the
15 information for these guides were to come from three
16 sources: research; our experience gained from the
17 view of the two lead plants; as well as the technical
18 information that would be coming from industry, so
19 those three sources.

20 Now, our process changed somehow, but I
21 don't think there will be any effect on the industry.
22 Our approach now calls for much more specificity in
23 the rule itself versus the general one.

24 Also we are planning to proceed with a
25 generic environmental impact statement versus a more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 limited environmental assessment contemplated earlier.
2 Our objective is to resolve as many NEPA-related
3 issues generically as possible and then having to
4 avoid addressing NEPA issues in detail for every
5 plant.

6 I am not too sure we can still eliminate
7 completely addressing plant specific issues, but at
8 least they will be minimized substantially and that
9 will substantially resolve or conserve staff
10 resources.

11 We will expand on these things in more
12 detail, but I wanted to sensitize you to the change in
13 direction and some of the basic reasons for that.

14 Wayne?

15 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you very
16 much. You may proceed.

17 DR. HOUSTON: If I may have the first page
18 of the viewgraphs, please? I would like to summarize
19 what we are going to talk about during the briefing
20 this morning.

21 The major headings are a few words about the
22 accomplishments to-date, where we stand; and then a
23 discussion somewhat more in detail on the guidelines
24 which the EDO has recently given us for dealing with
25 major policy issues; and then speak to the question of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the technical issues that are involved in license
2 renewal, which are, of course, the dominant safety
3 issues that are associated with that process; and then
4 say a few words about our interaction with the
5 industry, which is predominantly with NUMARC, but also
6 with the staffs of the lead plants; and, finally, a
7 summary of our general approach, then, to rulemaking
8 as we see it now, including the schedule question.

9 Next page, please? We start here with the
10 identification primarily of things that have happened
11 during the past year, since the briefing on July 12th,
12 for which a SECY 88-180 was transmitted to the
13 Commission on June 27th.

14 As you observed, Mr. Chairman, advanced
15 notice was approved and went out, published in the
16 "Federal Register" in August of '88. Accompanying
17 that was a NUREG document that described in somewhat
18 detail regulatory options for nuclear plant license
19 renewal.

20 These three options that are the primary
21 three options that were identified there dealt with
22 the original licensing basis as amended, something
23 that we are currently calling the "current licensing
24 basis." "Current" means as of the time of essentially
25 an application for license renewal.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 The second option was to consider license
2 renewal in exactly the same category as an application
3 by a new applicant for a new license to operate a
4 plant.

5 The third option was a modification that is
6 a median between those two, if you will, modified or
7 supplemental additional requirements supplementing the
8 current licensing basis in safety significant areas
9 that are believed to be appropriate for extended life
10 of the plants.

11 Next viewgraph, please?

12 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Before you go off to that
13 one, could you describe in general detail some of the
14 comments you received in the advanced notice of
15 proposed rulemaking and the accompanying NUREG-1317?

16 DR. HOUSTON: I would like to ask, Don, if
17 you could address that, I would appreciate it.

18 MR. CLEARY: Generally, let's see, we had 53
19 responses. Most of the responses were from industry.
20 Generally, the industry supported the first
21 alternative that we put out, which was the more basic
22 approach of heavy reliance on existing regulatory
23 requirements.

24 Several intervenor public interest groups
25 were supportive of the third requirement, the third

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 alternative, which would basically require analysis,
2 require that current regulatory requirements for new
3 plants as of the time of license application be met
4 for relicensing.

5 That was the general breakdown of the
6 responses.

7 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you very
8 much. You may proceed.

9 DR. HOUSTON: If I may have Page 3 of the
10 viewgraphs, please?

11 The summary of analysis, of course, has been
12 published, which has more detail in response to your
13 question, Mr. Chairman.

14 In January of this year, the Office of
15 General Counsel transmitted to the Executive Director
16 for Operations an analysis and recommendations
17 regarding the strictly procedural issues associated
18 with license renewals. We will talk about these at
19 the latter part of the briefing.

20 But a point that might, I think, be made at
21 this point is that in that summary, the Office of
22 General Counsel gave considerable emphasis to the fact
23 that the safety questions that are associated with
24 license renewal rulemaking are purely technical,
25 should be subject to scientific and engineering

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 consideration, and really are separate from the purely
2 procedural issues discussed in the paper.

3 Next are the NEPA issues. Generally, I
4 think the consensus is that the issuance of a renewal
5 rulemaking activity represents the beginning of a
6 major federal action and the issuance of each license
7 could be perceived to be a major federal action.

8 In any event, the track that the staff has
9 been on for some time has been to prepare an
10 environmental assessment of generic character. A
11 draft was initially made available in May, which needs
12 a considerable amount of work. I believe a copy of
13 that has been provided to each of you.

14 It does consist of a broad range of
15 alternatives under the NEPA category for alternatives.
16 You might say it included consideration of the
17 alternative that a decision might be made that
18 licenses should not be renewed, as a starter.

19 But there are other alternatives, of course,
20 that are analyzed for NEPA purposes. And, of course,
21 as you recognize, the essence of NEPA is to consider
22 the alternatives to the action that is proposed to be
23 taken.

24 Finally, where we stand today is we have
25 recently received the EDO guidelines by memorandum

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 dated June 16th and it discusses our present approach
2 to major policy issues.

3 We may go to Slide 4, please? These
4 guidelines encompass the concept of the license
5 renewal basis and the scope of the license renewal
6 process.

7 I would emphasize it is basically that the
8 goal is continued assurance of adequate protection.
9 What this means is that we are not proposing, we are
10 not considering proposing in license renewal any
11 redefinition of the concept of adequate protection;
12 nor are we considering the license renewal process as
13 an opportunity for significant safety improvements
14 that might be perceived that have nothing to do with
15 an extended term of license.

16 These guidelines discuss the role of the
17 current licensing and design basis. In particular,
18 what is needed here in proposing to identify, define,
19 and use the concept of a current license basis
20 involves a description of the system that we have in
21 place for continued regulatory oversight.

22 In other words, the part of the process will
23 involve a justification for why all of the activities
24 in NRR and in the regions dealing with license changes
25 and dealing with an inspection, surveillance, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 enforcement activities are adequate, but there will be
2 some additions and modifications in the rule to deal
3 specifically with safety issues arising as a result of
4 life extension.

5 In the rulemaking, however, the point of the
6 guidelines is to try to define as clearly and sharply
7 as possible that the scope of the rulemaking is
8 intended to achieve an objective of adequate control
9 of those safety issues that are posed solely by the
10 extended life of the plants. These, of course, are
11 dominated by questions associated with the aging of
12 plants, the aging of the structures, the systems and
13 the components in nuclear power plants.

14 The extended life of the plants means
15 generally a life beyond the terms of their present
16 licenses, which in most cases is 40 years. And it is,
17 as I have indicated, primarily to control the effects
18 of aging.

19 The next slide, please? A significant or
20 major policy issue that is associated in our minds
21 that needs to be clarified and crystallized in this
22 process deals with severe accident issues. Our
23 thinking is that, in general, in one way or another,
24 by various optional mechanisms that have yet to be
25 fully analyzed, it is the intent of the staff to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 recommend that, in effect, severe accident issues be
2 closed for each plant before it gets a renewed
3 license.

4 We are currently in the process of analyzing
5 potential options, including a separate rulemaking,
6 including part of the license renewal-making, and
7 other options.

8 The Commission is aware, I am sure, that at
9 present we are on a track to close severe accident
10 issues with the individual plant examination program,
11 our efforts on containment performance improvements,
12 and accident management.

13 For most plants, the renewal application
14 considerations are far enough into the future so that
15 we would expect that these would not be issues at that
16 time. But for some of the earliest plants, there is
17 the potential for that, and we wish to deal with that
18 subject.

19 Finally, the generic treatment of
20 environmental issues. One thing that I want to make
21 very clear is that our existing regulations in 10 CFR
22 Part 51 do require the issuance by the staff of an
23 environmental impact statement in conjunction with
24 each license renewal that is granted.

25 The objective that we have and the guidance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 from the EDO is to try to resolve as many
2 environmental issues as possible within the context of
3 the rulemaking process itself; that is, support the
4 rulemaking with the appropriate NEPA considerations.

5 The first step that we are taking in this
6 vein has been and continues to be the preparation of a
7 generic environmental assessment. This we perceive at
8 the present time as becoming a basis, then, for the
9 preparation of a generic environmental impact
10 statement. We will talk about that a little bit more
11 later on.

12 And, of course, we recognize that in taking
13 this tact, that we will need to deal with the impact,
14 which is not yet entirely clear to us, of the Limerick
15 decision.

16 We expect to be able to draw from the
17 experience that the staff is currently having with the
18 Limerick decision insofar as Limerick Unit II is
19 concerned. This, of course, deals with the issue of
20 severe accident mitigation design alternatives.

21 If I may have the next viewgraph? Turning,
22 then, to the technical issues, the major safety issue
23 really is aging degradation. What we need is
24 screening criteria for structures, components, and the
25 systems that are both safety significant and subject

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 to significant aging degradation.

2 The sources of information and data
3 available to us at this time and will continue to be
4 available to us are: predominantly from the research
5 program on aging, which is still going to continue for
6 several more years; and, of course, from actual
7 operating experience of plants.

8 I would like to emphasize that the aging
9 research program has not had, by any matter of means,
10 as its sole purpose the development of license renewal
11 considerations, because aging can occur at various
12 rates and at various times in plants and may be just
13 as relevant during the initial 40 years as beyond a
14 40-year lifetime for plants.

15 Part of the technical problem, then, is to
16 sort out those issues that are really associated with
17 extended plant life, as distinct from those issues
18 that are germane within the first 40 years.

19 As you will note, one of the major things
20 that we need to do and are in the process of doing is
21 to determine by careful analysis of our present rules,
22 regulations, and regulatory requirements just to what
23 extent these are, in fact, and will continue to be
24 applicable in an extended term and, in fact, should be
25 the major source of reliance on the part of the staff

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and the Commission with respect to adequate control
2 over aging degradation.

3 The experience that we draw on includes not
4 only experience in the United States, but also
5 particularly through the aging research program. We
6 get a lot of useful information from foreign operating
7 experience and a lot of interchange and communication
8 of concerns and actual experience data.

9 There remains, of course, the fact that each
10 operating plant in the United States is likely to have
11 in some respects very specific and plant-unique
12 operating experience, which they will need to analyze
13 and bring to the process of license renewal when each
14 makes its application for a renewed license.

15 If I may go to Page 7, please? The
16 principal focus of interest and concern here under the
17 category of technical issues is just how it should be
18 treated in the rulemaking process itself. What we are
19 faced here with is the question of degree of
20 specificity that can or should be in the rule versus
21 the degree of specificity that can be left, as it
22 were, for additional staff guidance in the form of
23 regulatory guides.

24 As I mentioned earlier, one of the
25 activities currently in process is a careful analysis

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 of existing regulations and requirements to assess the
2 adequacy of these requirements in the context of an
3 extended term for a plant license.

4 I might give an example at this point in
5 time. As you are well aware, there is on the books at
6 the present time a rule associated with equipment
7 qualification for electrical equipment.

8 Now, for the most part, a fair reading of
9 that rule would suggest that if continued compliance
10 with the rule for an extended life were reasonably
11 assured, there may be no need to address that as a
12 special issue. I'm not saying that it won't be, but
13 there may be no need for addressing that as a special
14 issue.

15 The thing that is required, the thing that
16 we do recognize, is that much of the equipment that
17 has already been qualified pursuant to that rule has
18 been qualified only for the initial term of the
19 license.

20 To assure continued compliance would mean,
21 at the very least, an effort on the part of the
22 licensees to go back and readdress the question of
23 qualification of that same equipment for an extended
24 term, whatever that may be, in accordance with the
25 requirements of the rule because the rule itself does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 not limit it to a 40-year term. Basically, it limits
2 it to the expected operating life of the equipment.

3 But I believe the information that we have
4 is that when that rule went into place and when it was
5 complied with on the part of licensees, then expected
6 term was considered to be 40 years. And that is the
7 maximum length of time to which equipment was
8 qualified.

9 Going to Page 8, one of the things that has
10 been mentioned so far, and I would like to stress, is
11 that we have been engaged for quite some time,
12 actually well over the course of a year, -- it is
13 probably more like three years -- in interaction with
14 industry efforts associated with what the industry has
15 called the "NUPLEX" program; that is, Nuclear Plant
16 Life Extension.

17 With the appearance of NUMARC a while back,
18 that has become part of the NUMARC effort. And I
19 highlight here the fact that industry participants
20 here in this program include the Electric Power
21 Research Institute, EPRI; various owner's groups,
22 utilities; and some support from the Department of
23 Energy, some significant financial support,
24 particularly, from the Department of Energy.

25 So we have been and are and are continuing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 to work very closely with the industry, primarily with
2 the NUMARC-NUPLEX effort, but also, and rather more
3 recently, the NRR staff has undertaken to interact
4 very closely with personnel in an organization
5 associated with the license renewal application
6 efforts on the part of both Yankee and Monticello.

7 One two-day trip occurred in the very recent
8 past up to Yankee to gain further insights into their
9 program, and another is scheduled, I think, in the
10 next few weeks to visit Monticello and Northern States
11 Power Company to review their efforts. This,
12 incidentally, may involve some pre-application review
13 on the part of the NRR staff for some of the things
14 that they are doing.

15 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Excuse me. Just
16 before you leave that, does that NUMARC-NUPLEX group
17 include technical specialists on aging and equipment
18 functionality?

19 DR. HOUSTON: I believe it does. I think
20 they are in a better position to answer that question
21 than I am, but yes. It involves a lot of technical
22 consideration on the part of those, particularly those
23 --

24 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: I'm not talking about
25 just the owners, but I'm talking about people who are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 not owners, but make a specialty of functionality and
2 application.

3 DR. HOUSTON: One of the national
4 laboratories who has been a strong participant in our
5 research program is also contributing to the NUPLEX
6 Program. That is Sandia National Laboratories.

7 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you. You may proceed.

9 DR. HOUSTON: The NUMARC-NUPLEX Program has
10 already submitted to the staff for its consideration
11 several reports. The one is identified as
12 "Methodology to Identify and Evaluate Plant Equipment
13 for License Renewal," which came to us in November.

14 The staff has reviewed this, has held a
15 meeting with NUMARC on it. We have commented on it
16 and indicated some concerns.

17 The concerns go primarily to the question of
18 not what is said, but what is not said; that is, the
19 question of detail which lead to specific screening
20 criteria. We had been furnished some draft screening
21 criteria, and we expect to have further discussions
22 with NUMARC-NUPLEX on these.

23 The intent here is that it would be very
24 helpful to both them and us if we can come to an
25 agreement on the usefulness and the adequacy of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 methodology and the screening criteria. What is not
2 quite so clear is whether or not it really will, in
3 fact, be possible to generate a fully generic set of
4 screening criteria.

5 As we see it right now, we still may need to
6 be prepared with certain aspects of screening criteria
7 for plant components, et cetera, that may be somewhat
8 plant-specific. This, of course, will depend upon the
9 length and character of their operating history and
10 the particular programs that they have in place.

11 Another one has been the "NUMARC NUPLEX
12 Position Paper on License Renewal Rulemaking," which
13 has been submitted to us in draft form in just April
14 of this year, which has provided the staff with some
15 useful insights to their thinking. The position
16 paper, I think, can be characterized as recommending
17 rulemaking. It is rather general in character.

18 Finally, they have submitted to us more
19 recently, on a date of May 9th, 1989, a "Study of
20 Generic Environmental Issues Related to License
21 Renewal." And we expect to find this very helpful.
22 It is providing useful input to the staff's NEPA
23 efforts.

24 We further understand that NUMARC-NUPLEX is
25 working on a document which might have a title

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 something like "The Applicability of Current
2 Regulations." And we hope and expect that we might
3 receive this document to get the benefit of their
4 thinking as soon as possible. We don't have an
5 expected target date for that just yet.

6 Turning to Page 9, some of the major
7 technical work that is being done under the NUMARC-
8 NUPLEX effort is the drafting and the drawing up of a
9 fair number of what are described as "industry
10 technical reports," which are to be submitted, the
11 first of which we would expect to receive perhaps
12 within the next month.

13 These deal with particular structures,
14 systems, or components that the industry considers
15 important and relevant to license renewal. And I will
16 identify in a few moments the subject titles that have
17 been given to us with respect to those technical
18 reports.

19 As has been indicated, also part of the
20 interaction with industry has been the concept
21 proposed by industry to have two lead plants submit
22 their renewal applications, Yankee anticipated in June
23 of '91, and Monticello in December of '91.

24 It may be of interest that currently the
25 Yankee license would terminate in the year 2000. So

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 we are getting close to 10 years prior to the
2 termination of that license.

3 For Monticello, however, the current license
4 is set to expire in the year 2010, so that their
5 application is expected roughly 19 years before the
6 termination of their current license.

7 We understand that other licensees are
8 actively working on their license renewal issues.
9 This includes, among others, Surrey, Virginia Power,
10 Calvert Cliffs, Baltimore Gas and Electric, and
11 Susquehanna, Pennsylvania Power and Light. I think
12 there are others also.

13 I might note in passing that there is an
14 IEEE working group that is also working on a PLEX
15 standard. I think I can say we have very little
16 familiarity with that, but there may be people on the
17 staff who are more familiar with the status of that
18 than I am.

19 The next two viewgraphs, Page 10 and Page
20 11, identify the subject areas associated with the
21 industry technical reports that have been proposed to
22 be submitted to us.

23 Perhaps the schedule has called for
24 submittals that go on into 1991 and perhaps even into
25 1992 dealing with, as we have already mentioned, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 screening methodology and criteria, which I think they
2 don't regard really as one of their industry technical
3 reports, but it is a set of reports from NUMARC.

4 But the technical reports would deal with
5 PWR containments, the pressure vessels, the reactor
6 internals, and, going to Page 11, the problem of aging
7 with cables in containment, -- of course, there are
8 thousands of cables in site containment and they might
9 be subject to aging degradation -- BWR MkI
10 containments, the reactor coolant systems, and the BWR
11 primary pressure boundary, and certain other age
12 degradation mechanisms that may affect plant license
13 renewal.

14 One might note in passing here that not
15 included in the list of industry technical reports are
16 dealing with the other BWR containments, namely MkIIs
17 and MkIIIs.

18 However, it might be interest to note that
19 with one single exception, the earliest term
20 expiration for a MkII or MkIII plant is in the year
21 2022. So it is quite a ways down the line. The only
22 exception to that is Shoreham, which currently has an
23 expiration date of 2013.

24 I might just say a word, again, with respect
25 to the current approach of the staff to deal with the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 technical issues. The last item of the last technical
2 report listed here is called "low temperature neutron
3 embrittlement."

4 I might call your attention to the fact that
5 you recently have received a SECY paper, 89-180, on
6 this subject, Generic Issue 15, the subject of which
7 was entitled "Radiation Effects on Reactor Vessel
8 Supports."

9 And here again is an area where there is an
10 opportunity for the staff, in the resolution of this
11 issue, to have a resolution which would be effective
12 for license renewal as well as for the existing term
13 of life.

14 So whether or not this becomes a specific
15 subject that needs to be addressed in license rule is
16 still an open question.

17 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: How many technical
18 reports have been completed?

19 DR. HOUSTON: We haven't seen any yet.

20 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: These are the titles
21 of those in the works?

22 DR. HOUSTON: Yes. We were given a listing
23 of these titles and a proposed schedule. Now, the
24 NUMARC-NUPLEX is a little bit behind the front end of
25 the schedule, but we understand that the first one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 will be here in the relatively near future.

2 And they do expect to make up the time,
3 because I think they have come to better grips with
4 their own internal organization of how they get these
5 reports reviewed and approved before they transmit
6 them.

7 The first one was sort of the trial case, if
8 you will, of how they expected to proceed with the
9 rest of these.

10 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Where did this list
11 come from of reports? I mean, how was that generated
12 of the topical list of reports to be done?

13 DR. HOUSTON: Of course, it came to the
14 staff in the form of a letter. I can't answer your
15 question, Commissioner Rogers, as of yet.

16 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Well, I'm not
17 interested so much in the industry end, but to what
18 extent was NRC involved.

19 MR. SPEIS: Can we have Mr. Bosnak address
20 that, Mr. Chairman?

21 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you.
22 Please identify yourself for the Reporter.

23 MR. BOSNAK: Yes. I'm Bob Bosnak, the
24 Division of Engineering, Office of Research.

25 The staff has had several groups that have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 been involved in, call it, the "aging, life extension
2 issue." This started several years ago with the
3 TIRGALEX. That's the Technical Integration Review
4 Group for Aging and Life Extension. It was followed
5 by a group called "ALEXI."

6 And we met from time-to-time with the
7 industry and discussed issues that we felt were of
8 prime importance, technical importance. From those
9 issues, I believe NUMARC-NUPLEX put together this list
10 of topical reports that are due to come in for the
11 staff review.

12 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: I take it there are no
13 topics which we feel should be reported on that aren't
14 on the list?

15 MR. BOSNAK: Well, we didn't look through
16 the list in the idea of whether it is a complete list
17 or not, but those were the principal things that we
18 were talking about, sir.

19 DR. MURLEY: I must say, Commissioner, that
20 I wouldn't rule out that there could well be other
21 topics when we get into the review. I think that
22 these are clearly the ones that would come to mind --

23 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Yes.

24 DR. MURLEY: -- in any first look, but there
25 may be others.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. SNIEZEK: I would like to add one other
2 thing. I think the assignment from Mr. Stello in the
3 recent guidance, as the staff is looking over the next
4 month and a half or so, that is one of the issues we
5 will be looking very hard at: Are there other things
6 that we want to get copies of the reports from the
7 industry on?

8 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: The question of
9 exactly what's in the report. I mean, it's not just
10 the topical list, but how it's handled with respect to
11 reliability questions, how those are handled. So it
12 would be very useful to see a report, a big report.

13 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Let's proceed,
14 please.

15 DR. HOUSTON: All right. Go to Page 12.
16 For the balance of the briefing this morning, I want
17 to summarize the approach to rulemaking that we are
18 currently taking, dealing first with some of the major
19 policy issues, and then finally the procedural issues
20 in which I think you also may be interested.

21 With respect to the technical and the safety
22 issues, we are now proposing a rule to define as
23 specifically as possible the scope of the application
24 that would be required focused primarily on the
25 assessment and control of safety significant aging

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 degradation due to extended life.

2 There will be, of course, certain
3 information requirements, which might, for example,
4 conceptually involve a new part of 10 CFR 50.34, which
5 deals with the question of contents of applications.

6 The nature of the detail that we expect to
7 get into may, but not necessarily will, lend itself to
8 the creation of a new appendix to Part 50 to identify
9 that kind of detail. So that is a possibility.

10 We had not previously been on a track which
11 would have suggested the need for an appendix to Part
12 50 to identify the needs for license renewal
13 rulemaking.

14 Finally, although the guidance that we now
15 have from the EDO on dealing with the major issues
16 should reduce to some extent, if not to a considerable
17 extent, the needs for a number of regulatory guides
18 which otherwise might have been required to clarify
19 what the staff would consider to be acceptable in
20 terms of a license renewal application to comply with
21 whatever the rule requirements are.

22 But we do anticipate there will certainly be
23 an initial regulatory guide, very likely, which will
24 describe the information requirements and will be a
25 companion to information requirements identified in,

1 for example, a modification or addition to Part 50.34.

2 Whether or not additional regulatory guides
3 will be needed to address anything that will be
4 addressed in terms of the details, the specific
5 details, which might be an appendix to Part 50, we are
6 unable at this time to identify any specific number or
7 specific subject areas.

8 But we would expect that there will be some
9 need for that, which will come out of the lead plant
10 review process, the aging research program, and our
11 interactions with industry, and the review of the
12 industry technical reports.

13 Finally, and perhaps in one sense a key
14 consideration, going to Page 13, the approach to
15 rulemaking now involving the proposed preparation of
16 an environmental impact statement is, in fact, the
17 single thing that is the pacing item for getting the
18 final rule on the street.

19 We estimate that from the time that -- we
20 will need, of course, some contractor assistance to
21 carry out a generic environmental impact statement.
22 And we estimate that from the time of selection of
23 such a contractor, at least one and a half years will
24 be necessary in order to produce a draft generic
25 environmental impact statement. The cost may be on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the order of \$2 to 3 million.

2 The major reason for the amount of time that
3 it takes is the collection of environmental
4 information that represents if not, in fact, every
5 single plant that is operating and has an operating
6 license in the United States, but a sufficient cross-
7 section of those plants to identify what is considered
8 to be all of the significant environmental issues.

9 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: You mentioned earlier
10 in your briefing that you intend to prepare what you
11 called a "generic environmental assessment" that would
12 precede the GEIS.

13 If you have made the decision to prepare a
14 GEIS, what's the purpose of a GEA, I guess it is, an
15 assessment?

16 DR. HOUSTON: The difference, Commissioner
17 Curtiss, is that the generic environmental assessment
18 is something that we have been working on for the last
19 few years, and it is still useful and helpful. It
20 gives us at least a leg up on the preparation of an
21 impact statement.

22 One possible course of action that we might
23 follow -- this has not yet been well-defined and we
24 hope to come to grips with this roughly within the
25 next month, in accordance with the EDO guidance. But

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 one possible path that seems to suggest itself would
2 be we think we could probably issue a proposed rule
3 dealing with the technical and procedural issues,
4 still possibly in this calendar year or, at the very
5 latest, perhaps early in 1991. We think we can come
6 to grips with the scope and content of what needs to
7 be in the rule and what is not in the rule.

8 Now, to support the issuance of a proposed
9 rule in this area, we could then, and would perhaps
10 expect to be able to, issue a for-public-comment draft
11 generic environmental assessment.

12 At the same time, however, we might announce
13 the staff intent to prepare a generic environmental
14 impact statement ultimately.

15 Then we would begin to get the comments back
16 on the technical and procedural issues in the proposed
17 rule, meanwhile proceeding on a tact to prepare the
18 draft generic environmental impact statement, which
19 possibly could be issued then in early 1991, perhaps,
20 at the earliest, and get that out for comment,
21 recognizing that that will then be the support for the
22 final rule.

23 So that when the final rule is issued
24 sometime in 1992, it would be issued with the final
25 generic environmental impact statement. And this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 would also include possibly some changes in 10 CFR
2 Part 51 that deal with license renewal rulemaking.

3 Now, that is just a possible track that you
4 can have.

5 DR. MURLEY: These are the sorts of options
6 that the EDO directed the staff to look into, and we
7 will be doing that over the next month. And we are
8 just not prepared yet to tell you all the pros and
9 cons of these various --

10 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: I raise that question
11 because, as I understood it, an assessment is
12 typically the vehicle to assess whether there is a
13 significant environmental impact and, if so, to
14 proceed with an EIS.

15 But it sounds here as if you have made the
16 determination to prepare a GEIS and, hence, the
17 finding that there will be a significant impact.

18 I guess when you get to that point, I would
19 be interested in not only the procedural, but the
20 legal underpinnings for publishing a draft GEA, having
21 made the decision to go with the GEIS.

22 COMMISSIONER CARR: As I read the current
23 regulations, you have got no option but to provide an
24 environmental impact statement, unless we change the
25 regulation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: That's in addition to
2 the GEIS.

3 DR. HOUSTON: That's in addition.

4 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER CARR: One of the requirements
6 to renew the license.

7 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER CARR: If you go with a generic
9 environmental impact statement, won't each plant still
10 be required to have some kind of supplement to that
11 and, further, the process of site-specific problem?

12 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Yes.

13 DR. HOUSTON: One would, I think, reasonably
14 anticipate that, at least for some plants, there may
15 be some site-specific environmental concerns which
16 have to be addressed on a site-specific basis.

17 The object here is to try, however, to see
18 if we can't resolve as many environmental issues
19 generically so that what is left to be necessary for
20 an environmental statement on each individual
21 application is then minimized.

22 That's the objective, but it may not be
23 totally eliminated. It would be desirable, I think,
24 from a resource point of view of eliminating.

25 COMMISSIONER CARR: I understand what you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 are doing.

2 DR. HOUSTON: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER CARR: But it seems to me
4 simpler to just require the licensee to amend or to
5 supplement his current environmental impact statement.
6 Is that more work for us to review those or --

7 DR. HOUSTON: Over the long haul, yes. Over
8 the long haul, yes. That is, this is, in part, a
9 resource-savings effort. It is, putting more effort
10 in up front, we will save a lot of resources later on
11 potentially.

12 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Those may well be
13 litigable, the individual ones, and end up as
14 proceedings.

15 DR. MURLEY: We are proceeding on the basis
16 that there will be an opportunity for a hearing for
17 each one of these license renewals. The question is:
18 What should be the scope of those hearings?

19 And our idea was to try to see if we could
20 settle as many issues generically. That's the whole
21 purpose of what we will be looking at for the next
22 month.

23 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Do you envision the
24 possibility that if you prepared a GEIS, that for some
25 of the plants when you get to the analysis of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 individual impacts, that the GEIS could be broad
2 enough that you might end up with EA rather than EIS?

3 DR. HOUSTON: That's the goal.

4 DR. MURLEY: That's correct.

5 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: In order to do that,
6 would we then have to amend Part 51?

7 DR. MURLEY: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Let's proceed.

10 DR. HOUSTON: Turning to Page 14, the last
11 two viewgraphs reflect our approach and consideration
12 of the procedural issues. These largely come from the
13 analysis and recommendations made by the Office of
14 General Counsel.

15 I would like to just discuss each of these
16 items rather briefly. And I'm sure if I make a
17 misstatement here, we can expect the General Counsel
18 to correct anything I may say on this.

19 A determination has been made in the first
20 instance that it would be inappropriate for the
21 Commission to renew licenses by amendment. And so we
22 consider that these must be, in a sense, new licenses,
23 that they are renewed licenses and not amended
24 licenses. I think that is the major concern.

25 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: On that point, is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 there any practical difference between those two, an
2 amendment versus a license renewal, either technically
3 or legally?

4 MR. PARLER: From the legal standpoint, I
5 will answer that. As a matter of fact, I will answer
6 the advice that we give on the technical thing, too.
7 We give them the advice that, from a technical
8 standpoint, it doesn't make any difference.

9 From the legal standpoint, it would seem to
10 me that there would be no real practical advantages to
11 be gained by calling an extended license an amendment
12 since those advantages, procedural advantages, are not
13 apparent to me.

14 It would seem to me that perhaps common
15 sense should prevail and the thing should be called
16 what it really is; that is, a renewed operating
17 license.

18 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Under either case,
19 upon the application, do these individual utilities
20 continue to operate under timely renewal?

21 MR. PARLER: That is correct. Of course, we
22 have said in the prior meeting that what is a timely
23 renewal will probably have to be specified and changed
24 from the present provision, which I think that permit
25 a 30-day filing prior to the expiration as a timely

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 renewal.

2 As Mr. Houston has pointed out, some of
3 these applications will be filed many years ahead of
4 time.

5 There has been some indication at one of the
6 meetings that I gather this Agency may have had some
7 months ago that perhaps the timely renewal doctrine
8 would not apply. But, certainly, from a legal
9 standpoint, that is not correct.

10 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you very much. Let's
11 proceed.

12 DR. HOUSTON: We do propose, as is
13 recommended by the General Counsel, to recommend to
14 the Commission that in each proceeding; that is, in
15 each application for license renewal, there be an
16 opportunity for formal adjudicatory hearings.

17 General Counsel has determined that an
18 antitrust review by the Attorney General is not
19 required.

20 Then we come -- there are a number of kind
21 of interesting, I think, procedural issues associated
22 with matters of timing, including of renewal
23 applications and their approvals, and the first of
24 which Commissioner Curtiss has mentioned is timely
25 renewal policy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Presently Part 2.109 would permit any NRC
2 licensee to submit a renewal application for his
3 license within no shorter than 30 days before the
4 termination of his license. And in accordance with
5 the Administrative Procedures Act, the license is
6 automatically extended until the Agency acts upon it.

7 I think many people would perceive that this
8 might be an unnecessarily short period of time for an
9 action as complex as renewal of a nuclear power plant
10 license. That has been suggested in the General
11 Counsel's memorandum.

12 I might call attention here to the fact that
13 in the recent enactment of Part 52, that subject was
14 dealt with specifically in the context of Part 52 and
15 calls, in the case of both early site permits and, I
16 think, for the certified designs, if a holder of
17 either of these wishes to have them renewed, they must
18 make application not less than one year nor more than
19 three years prior to the termination of the permit or
20 the certification.

21 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Just one quick
22 question on that. Did I understand you to say earlier
23 that, from the standpoint of equipment that's
24 qualified in the plants, that the equipment has been
25 qualified for a maximum life of 40 years?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 DR. HOUSTON: Well, I guess I can't assert
2 that as a fact, but I think our experience in
3 monitoring and in dealing with the application of the
4 EQ rule, I believe that many -- I can't really assert
5 most plants or all plants -- probably have tried to
6 qualify their equipment to what they then perceive to
7 be the expected life of the plant, which probably was
8 tied to the term of their operating license, because
9 this goes back a number of years.

10 If that's the case and now they want to
11 operate beyond 40 years, they may have to re-qualify
12 in order to continue to comply with the EQ rule. This
13 is a point that I was trying to make.

14 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Our regulatory
15 understanding, though, is limited to 40 years? Is
16 that --

17 DR. HOUSTON: No. In the EQ rule, it
18 doesn't specify the number of years.

19 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Okay.

20 DR. HOUSTON: It really refers to the
21 expected life, operating life, of the piece of
22 equipment under consideration. And for some of these,
23 it might be as short as 10 years, and they might have
24 a reasonable expectation that certain items would last
25 the expected operating life.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 But the testing that they may have done to
2 support that decision may have been limited to 40
3 years or 30 years or some number such as that. And it
4 will vary with different items.

5 MR. SNIEZEK: Commissioner Curtiss, that's a
6 good example that we have to look at. We may not have
7 to address that in any rulemaking for life extension
8 because our present rules may be adequate. It is
9 either qualified or it has to be replaced.

10 Our current rules already say that, so we
11 don't have to address it. It's an issue for the
12 licensee to make sure they have the right equipment in
13 there qualified, but from a regulatory posture, we may
14 have to take no further action. They just have to --

15 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: I guess what I'm
16 getting at is that we have the basis for determining
17 that the equipment is qualified up to 40 years, but
18 not beyond.

19 Would we be comfortable for an applicant
20 that comes in fairly late in the operating license,
21 files, gets timely renewal, if the timely renewal
22 would permit the operation past the 40-year period?

23 MR. PARLER: Mr. Chairman, may I comment on
24 that?

25 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Yes, please.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. PARLER: If a license is renewed, of
2 course, the renewal doesn't give the licensee any
3 additional benefits than the licensee would have under
4 the existing license, which was renewed.

5 So if, as Mr. Sniezek pointed out, there was
6 a problem which had to be rectified, it would have to
7 be rectified under the renewed license, even though
8 the license would not automatically expire.

9 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Excuse me.

11 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Go ahead.

12 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Just on this timing,
13 how does the decommissioning rule come into play here?
14 In other words, there's an advanced decision that has
15 to be made on decommissioning.

16 If that date has passed relative to the end
17 of the license, do we expect to be in communication
18 with a licensee and ask them what their intentions are
19 so we don't come up against this 30-day period, which
20 is absurd?

21 DR. MURLEY: Jim?

22 MR. SNIEZEK: Are you going to address that,
23 Wayne? I mean, otherwise, I --

24 DR. HOUSTON: I can. I mean, yes, we
25 recognize that there can be some unnecessary, perhaps

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 lack or an appearance of lack of coordination between
2 two difference requirements.

3 Of course, if a licensee plans to try to get
4 a renewed license, we have given consideration to the
5 possibility of making certain adjustments in what
6 would otherwise be requirements for submitting
7 decommissioning plans. And we already have language
8 for that in some of our straw man rulemaking things.

9 Yes, that is an important question. Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: We can write these
11 rules ultimately to make sure that the two fit
12 together properly.

13 DR. HOUSTON: That's correct. Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. You may proceed.

15 DR. HOUSTON: I would like to just -- on the
16 subject of timely renewal policy, there are two other
17 things that I would like to say. One is that it
18 appears that the industry, as reflected in a NUMARC
19 report, is suggesting that perhaps an appropriate
20 period of time for a timely renewal to be effective
21 would be something on the order of one year, rather
22 than 30 days.

23 But we are considering also the possibility
24 of even longer periods of time for that and may, in
25 fact, with the issuance of a proposed rule, ask for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 specific additional public comment on that particular
2 point.

3 But there is another aspect of it, which is
4 identified in the next subtopic there, the sufficiency
5 of the renewal application. At the present time Part
6 2.109 does not use wording that reflects a sufficient
7 or appropriate application. Merely, it says the
8 "application."

9 I guess a literal interpretation would be:
10 A one-line letter might be considered to be an
11 application. In practice, of course, this has not
12 been treated that way. And I think even in the
13 materials licensing area, the experience has already
14 reflected that.

15 So if it becomes necessary or desirable to
16 modify some of the language in Part 2.109 to deal with
17 a somewhat different period of time from which time
18 the renewal policy would occur, we might also
19 recommend a slight change in the language to assure
20 that it is a sufficient application.

21 This also, I think, comes about from a
22 recommendation of the General Counsel.

23 The earliest filing date is also a matter of
24 some interest. It clearly is of great interest on the
25 part of the utilities in order to plan adequately for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 future generating capacity to have ample time for that
2 planning.

3 And, of course, they can't in the final
4 analysis be assured if they wish to renew the
5 operating license for a nuclear power plant. They
6 need to have very strong assurance, if not, in fact, a
7 renewal in place, a fair number of years ahead of the
8 time when they would actually need the additional
9 generating capacity or need to make a decision
10 regarding alternative forms of meeting their system
11 needs.

12 Typically, a period on the order of 10 to 12
13 years might be necessary on the part of utilities. So
14 we are certainly considering the possibility for
15 taking applications 10 to 12 years ahead of time.

16 We are also thinking as much as early as 20
17 years ahead of time. As I mentioned earlier, in the
18 case of Monticello as one of the lead plants, that
19 application would come in almost 19 years ahead of the
20 termination date of their present license. So it's a
21 consideration there.

22 The final bullet on Page 14, on the
23 effective date of the renewed license, brings to mind
24 two options that can be under consideration, one of
25 which we call a "supersession license," and another is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 a "tack-on license."

2 Given that a renewal license application
3 might be made, let's say, for sake of argument, 10
4 years ahead of time and the staff takes action on it,
5 say, within 2 years of that time, then the question
6 is: Does one issue a renewed license that is tacked
7 onto the term of the initial license or make it
8 immediately effective as a renewed license?

9 The path that seems to be the better one
10 that the staff is likely to recommend in this case is
11 the supersession license. That is, it would become
12 immediately effective on issuance and would supercede
13 the original license.

14 But then one would distinguish between what
15 I will call the "renewal term" of the license, of the
16 renewed license, and the extended term, which would be
17 the term of years beyond the initial term of 40 years.
18 And we may find it necessary to make that distinction
19 in some parts of the rulemaking.

20 Finally, on the last viewgraph, Page 15, the
21 final procedural issues that I wanted to discuss were
22 the length of a renewal license. And here again, the
23 distinction that I just made between a renewal term
24 and a subset of that, which would be the extended term
25 beyond 40 years, needs to be understood.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Clearly, the maximum length of a renewal
2 term, by statute, would be 40 years. That is in
3 accordance with the same statutes that apply to an
4 initial application for a license.

5 The staff is considering recommending a
6 somewhat shorter period of time for the extended term.
7 I may call your attention to the fact that in another
8 very different context, in dealing with the vendor
9 designs for future light water reactors, the staff is
10 proposing to review the application with the prospect
11 that a 60-year length lifetime might be appropriate.
12 And so what we are thinking here is something that
13 might be consistent with that.

14 On the other side of the coin, there's a
15 question of whether or not the staff would recommend
16 or the Commission should have some minimum
17 specification of the length of a renewed license.

18 OGC has addressed this, suggested that if
19 there were no specification of minimum, there is a
20 potential that you might have some more or less last
21 minute applications on the part of some licensees
22 because of delays in construction of new plants or for
23 some other reason that they might want a one-year
24 extension or a two-year extension and this might even
25 become a repetitive process. So this is another issue

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 that we have to deal with.

2 At the present time the staff is sort of
3 leaning in the direction of not having a minimum
4 specified term, but merely to set, once and for all,
5 so to speak, the requirements for a license renewal.
6 And maybe the same requirements would apply whether
7 they are asking for 1 year or for 20 years, for
8 instance. That's just a possibility, but that is
9 another procedural issues which we are addressing.

10 That concludes the remarks that I intended
11 to make, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you.

13 DR. MURLEY: I should add, Mr. Chairman,
14 that there's a great deal of international interest,
15 of course, in the subject of plant aging. And we are
16 staying in very close touch with the international
17 community on technical issues.

18 We have a good deal to learn from them on things
19 like pressure vessel embrittlement and annealing and
20 that sort of thing. And there will no doubt be strong
21 interest from the international community on the
22 approach that we take here in this proceeding.

23 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you very
24 much.

25 DR. MURLEY: That concludes our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 presentation.

2 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you very much.

3 Does General Counsel have a comment?

4 MR. PARLER: Mr. Chairman, I have one point
5 that I would like to make briefly on a procedural item
6 relating to hearings. There, indeed, would, as Mr.
7 Houston has said, be an opportunity for hearing.
8 These would be reactor-type hearings, which we have
9 described as formal adjudications, at least in the
10 past.

11 The point that I would like to make is this:
12 The law has developed in this area since these plants
13 were initially licensed. And I would certainly think
14 that the hearings would be more focused, more
15 efficient, less cumbersome.

16 We are working on procedural changes to
17 achieve that objective.

18 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you very
19 much.

20 Any questions from my fellow Commissioners?
21 Commissioner Roberts?

22 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: You cited the final
23 rule is going to be issued in '92. But are Yankee and
24 Monticello still going to submit in '91 and are they
25 comfortable with that?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Maybe I should ask them, but what's your
2 impression?

3 DR. MURLEY: Well, our intention is to have
4 the outlines of the rule itself this summer, later
5 this summer. In fact, we will bring it to the
6 Commission.

7 It is the backup material and the details
8 that would have to go in the technical details that we
9 believe will take the staff quite a bit of time. But
10 in terms of the approach that we are having, that
11 should be clear later on this summer, is our intent.

12 So the answer your question is yes, even
13 though the final rule would not be in place until '92,
14 we believe we can start reviewing it, their
15 application, in '91.

16 MR. SNIEZEK: I would like to add on that.
17 I think consistent with the EDO's guidance, the
18 proposal is to the EDO that we expect to have about
19 the end of July, we give a clear indication at least,
20 subject to the Commission review, that this is the
21 staff's intent, where the staff wants to go and be,
22 make it fairly clear to utilities what would be
23 expected of them, at least that the staff intends as
24 we sit here this year.

25 CHAIRMAN ZECH: This July, next month?

1 MR. SNIEZEK: The proposal to Mr. Stello
2 that he asked for --

3 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Right.

4 MR. SNIEZEK: -- at the end of July.

5 CHAIRMAN ZECH: In draft?

6 MR. SNIEZEK: I would envision our goal is
7 to have what I would call a "draft final rule" from
8 the staff perspective, what we would really like to
9 do.

10 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Right. Right.

11 MR. SNIEZEK: But it would be minus the
12 detailed statement of considerations, which, by the
13 time we get done, may be about that thick for the
14 supporting justification. That's what's really going
15 to take the time, plus developing the generic
16 environmental impact statement.

17 But what is in the process, what is going to
18 be out of the process, we expect to have language
19 there to make it clear to everyone, subject to the
20 Commission review, at that time.

21 CHAIRMAN ZECH: All right. Thank you very
22 much.

23 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Let me pick up on
24 that point.

25 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Yes. Go ahead.

1 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: If a hearing is
2 requested in either or both of those two pilot
3 proceedings, will the rule, the final rule, be in
4 place before the hearing begins?

5 In the absence of that, it looks to me like
6 we are going to litigate these issues in the
7 individual proceedings.

8 DR. MURLEY: Yes. The intention would be
9 that we would have the rule in place before we go to
10 hearings on this matter --

11 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Okay. Fine.

12 DR. MURLEY: -- before we issue the SCR.

13 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Commissioner Roberts,
15 anything else?

16 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I have no further
17 questions. I have just a comment. I think this is a
18 very important undertaking, and I encourage you to
19 continue with the diligence you have already shown.
20 That's all I have.

21 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Commissioner Carr?

22 COMMISSIONER CARR: I have a question along
23 the same lines, and I certainly agree with the
24 approach of trying to get as much information in the
25 rule as you can get without reg guides to follow it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 But my concern is that in the sufficiency of
2 the application, I can see a lot of back and forth
3 where you are going to go up and ask them, "You didn't
4 send us this and we now need it," and that's going to
5 continue.

6 Unless we get that particular thing solved,
7 I can see their application being amended right on up
8 until the bitter end.

9 MR. SNIEZEK: I think for the lead plants,
10 that is going to be true. There is going to be more
11 difficulty there. But I envision when the final rule
12 comes out, at that time whatever final staff guidance
13 we need for a staff review and guidance to industry on
14 what's really expected will come out contemporaneously
15 with the final rule, so that it will be locked in
16 place what the real expectations are. And there
17 shouldn't be that much information to follow. That is
18 our goal.

19 COMMISSIONER CARR: I hope you are right.

20 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Commissioner Rogers?

21 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: How do you see the
22 Offices of Nuclear Regulatory Research and Regulation
23 working together to assure integration of severe
24 accident phenomena in the license extension?

25 DR. MURLEY: That is one of the tasks that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the Executive Director has given us. The idea that --
2 well, I shouldn't speculate how it is going to turn
3 out, but, in principle, one can say that what we
4 should try to do is memorialize in this rule the
5 closure process that we are on now and, therefore,
6 make it -- and, in effect, it will make it a condition
7 of a renewal license that the severe accident issues
8 be closed.

9 Absent a severe accident rule, we have, as
10 you know, a process that we are on to close the severe
11 accident issue, nonetheless. And so that would be the
12 approach.

13 Now, I don't think we can go much further
14 until we talk it out amongst ourselves.

15 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: It seems to me that
16 there are some questions as to the direction that we
17 have given the industry with respect to the IPE
18 examinations and beyond design basis accidents as to
19 how well they will be able to actually satisfy some of
20 our requests in that direction and how those matters
21 will be resolved in time to be folded into our life
22 extension rule or guidance, whatever it is that we are
23 intending to come up with in the near future.

24 I have some concerns about that, and I just
25 wonder how you see some of those issues, particularly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 that one.

2 COMMISSIONER CARR: I think a Level III PRA,
3 if I were going to apply for an extension, I think I
4 would start one of those now, but I can't imagine not
5 requiring that, which we have been through before, you
6 know.

7 DR. MURLEY: We will have to think these
8 things through very carefully.

9 The question with regard to how do we treat
10 beyond design basis accidents, I am treading in new
11 water here, but, in general, I think that the process
12 that we are on for closing the severe accident issue
13 is a careful, comprehensive program.

14 And it could very well be that it is
15 sufficient in this rule to memorialize that process
16 and not require that it be completed before we issue
17 the rule.

18 That is to say, we could say that before
19 they get a renewed license, of course, they must have
20 completed the work. But we may be able to issue the
21 rule that just outlines --

22 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: By reference to that
23 --

24 DR. MURLEY: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: -- without specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 things?

2 DR. MURLEY: That references that process.

3 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: And if there are any
4 problems in that, when you work them out, they will
5 automatically be included in the life extension --

6 DR. MURLEY: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: -- procedures of those
8 licenses.

9 DR. MURLEY: The work on the IPE would
10 clearly have to be done before we could -- under this
11 scenario, would clearly have to be done before we
12 would grant them a renewed license for a period of
13 time.

14 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: It looks like the
15 external events might be the pacing of it.

16 MR. SNIEZEK: What we are saying is that for
17 the licensee, if they would go up for renewal, would
18 need it the year 2000. The work that is going on now,
19 that gives them 11 years.

20 DR. MURLEY: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Anything else, Commissioner Rogers?

22 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Well, just your own
23 opinion as to what impact the existence or
24 nonexistence of a maintenance rule might be on the
25 development of screening criteria for aging

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 degradation issues.

2 DR. MURLEY: Gee, I don't know that we have
3 really thought about that.

4 MR. SNIEZEK: I have given that some
5 thought. I believe that if we had a maintenance rule,
6 it would give us a better opportunity to screen some
7 things out of the process, because we already have a
8 rule that addresses the care and feeding of the
9 equipment now and in the long-term.

10 Now, what it would screen out, I can't say
11 here, but I think it could have helped us in arriving
12 at that conclusion to screen some things out.

13 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: This touches on the
14 question of what kind of records we are going to
15 insist on with respect to equipment maintenance in
16 addressing a plant life extension.

17 How specific is our thinking with respect to
18 those requirements?

19 DR. MURLEY: There I don't think we have
20 firm recommendations at this time. Clearly, that is
21 one of the issues that we have to think on.

22 DR. HOUSTON: That would be tied very
23 closely to the screening criteria because one will
24 need records in order to utilize the screening
25 criteria they propose. So it becomes sort of a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 hierarchy. And you get down to the question of
2 records, and so forth, when you get down towards the
3 bottom of it.

4 One, I think, probably anticipated the
5 potential in the future for a regulatory guide that
6 may devote itself exclusively to the question of
7 record requirements or record needs for license
8 renewal applications to support the use of screening
9 criteria, methodology, et cetera, for addressing the
10 important issues.

11 I would add that with respect to the
12 maintenance rule, I think it, with its apparent
13 postponement for some period of time, does provide an
14 opportunity, at any rate, for the staff now to get a
15 better linkage and coordination between license
16 renewal requirements and any prospective maintenance
17 rule requirements.

18 As Jim has said, it would be very useful, I
19 think, in the license renewal process to have
20 requirements, general requirements, in the maintenance
21 area in place.

22 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: I know Commissioner
23 Carr has somewhat given the answer, but I'm not sure
24 that's a total answer of your thinking on what has led
25 the staff to adopt a more specific, rather than a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 general, approach to rulemaking here, this change in
2 point of view that you referred to very early on in
3 your presentation.

4 DR. MURLEY: Yes. There are several
5 reasons. Let me take a cut, Jim. First of all, the
6 Limerick case has caused us to realize, I think, that
7 the more that you have and can pin down in a rule like
8 this early on, the better.

9 Also, as I think we got into the details of
10 how we were going to do the reviews and the scope of
11 individual license proceedings, we realized that it
12 was going to be an enormous impact on the staff coming
13 toward the end of the '90s probably.

14 We took to heart the guidance that we got
15 from Mr. Parler in his January 13th memo to Mr.
16 Stello. Let me just read this. "The life extension
17 rulemaking should specify the technical requirements
18 and standards which must be met by each application
19 for license renewal. Otherwise, the review and
20 proceeding will be open-ended."

21 I think it was mainly for those reasons that
22 we concluded we should try to settle as many things as
23 we could in the rule and limit the scope of staff
24 review and proceedings.

25 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: This strikes me as a

1 very excellent example of the kind of total systems
2 look that we have to take about things. And it sounds
3 to me like you are doing that quite well, that the
4 coordination between the OGC and --

5 DR. MURLEY: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: -- the past experience
7 in these matters is now being brought to bear on our
8 approach. And I think that is very good. I am
9 pleased to hear that you are willing to take a little
10 change in direction based on a review of everything we
11 know.

12 DR. MURLEY: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: That sounds very
14 healthy to me, and I certainly join Commissioner
15 Roberts in feeling this is a very important kind of
16 activity that we really have to do our very best on
17 and try to move as quickly as we can.

18 That relates to what the problems are with
19 resources. Do we have adequate resources now,
20 projected in the future to be able to deal with this?
21 Are we going to be hung up on a lack of either people
22 or dollars to do the job?

23 DR. MURLEY: We are going to be planning on
24 that. And that is one of the things that Jim Sniezek
25 and our colleagues in research will be looking at over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the next month, resources needed to do this.

2 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you very much.

4 Commissioner Curtiss?

5 COMMISSIONER CURTISS: I guess I just have
6 one comment, not any questions. I do want to add my
7 voice to what I think everybody has said here so far.
8 I am pleased to see that, from the standpoint of
9 technical requirements and environmental issues,
10 severe accident as well, it seems to me like you are
11 really endeavoring to address these issues in a
12 generic way across the board, to the extent that they
13 are generic questions.

14 We talked a little bit about that yesterday
15 in the context of the GEA BWR. I think this is an
16 approach that looks like it avoids much of the case-
17 specific litigation that might otherwise result. It
18 is an approach that seeks to identify the generic
19 issues that might arise and address them generically.
20 I think that is a sound approach.

21 I guess I am also pleased to see that we may
22 see some streamlining in the process that will be
23 applied if and when we get into hearings on individual
24 cases.

25 That is an area where recently I think we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 have seen some more flexibility employed in the
2 standardization rule and materials licenses and
3 operator licensing. I think that is certainly worth
4 pursuing.

5 That's all I have.

6 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you very much.

7 Well, let me just say the staff is well-
8 aware of my interest in this license renewal issue.
9 And we have discussed it now for some time in the past
10 year or so.

11 I guess I am a little disappointed that we
12 have slipped our date from 1990, I think we had
13 planned at one time, to 1992, although I must say I
14 think the staff has put in an awful lot of effort and
15 thought now. And I feel more comfortable about the
16 fact that I think you do have a much better handle on
17 what we have to do.

18 So I hope 1992 can be a firm date. We are
19 getting to the point where I think the utilities do
20 need to have sufficient time. The staff needs to have
21 sufficient time to review applications in the future.

22 I think that we are getting to the point now
23 where that ought to be looked at as a real firm
24 commitment on our part, at least to be met with a lot
25 of attention and effort to make that date a reality.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Resources are important, too, and I
2 appreciate the fact that Mr. Sniezek has kind of been
3 designated the coordinator, as I understand it, of
4 this program recently.

5 On the other hand, I think that the plan is
6 that he will only be in that coordinating role until
7 sometime in late July, next month. So we need another
8 coordinator, it seems like to me.

9 I would suggest, Dr. Murley, that perhaps
10 you discuss it with the EDO and also with your
11 colleague, Mr. Beckjord, because this is an NRR and a
12 Research joint effort.

13 I know the Research people have, up until
14 now, pretty much taken a lead because it is a
15 rulemaking action. And I think Dr. Speis and his
16 colleagues have done an excellent job in trying to
17 coordinate the program.

18 But I do think at this stage, it would seem
19 to me, anyway, that it is probably more appropriate to
20 shift to NRR for the lead, with support from Research,
21 -- at least that would be my view -- and also strong
22 support from the Office of General Counsel, because we
23 are at the point right now where we really have to
24 move, move forward.

25 If Mr. Sniezek is not going to be the

1 permanent coordinator -- and I know he has got a lot
2 of other duties, but we should, I think, look
3 seriously at appointing somebody who can be the focal
4 point for this and be looked upon by the Commission,
5 anyway, as one that is going to really follow this
6 program through working, coordinating, of course, with
7 Research and General Counsel's Office and others who
8 might have responsibility.

9 So the program itself is extremely
10 important. I think it is one that we have a large
11 responsibility in the future, and time is really
12 running by because, although we are talking a few
13 years in advance for license renewal, years go by too
14 quickly. And we must not, as far as I am concerned,
15 slip any more.

16 Resources have to be looked at very
17 carefully, too, and I appreciate the fact that you are
18 going to be doing that. It is a program that we have
19 an obligation, a responsibility to cover. And I think
20 that we have to look at that in a priority sort of
21 way.

22 I think the discussion on the maintenance
23 rule is also very important, too, because I agree with
24 Mr. Sniezek's comment that if we did have a
25 maintenance rule, it might provide more confidence for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the staff in coming up with some of these future
2 determinations that you are thinking about as far as
3 license renewal is concerned.

4 We don't have that rule yet. I hope we will
5 have one in the future. I hope the industry, the
6 utilities will assist in drawing up a meaningful
7 maintenance rule.

8 I do think it is in their best interest,
9 recognizing that, as you approach license renewal, the
10 more specific we can be, as Dr. Murley has emphasized,
11 too, on several occasions this morning, I think the
12 better off we will all be and the more confident we
13 will be that we will have a licensing renewal program
14 that will satisfy us as far as continuing, ongoing and
15 continuing, maintenance programs are concerned.

16 Well, let me just say I appreciate the work
17 the staff has done on this. Also I agree that it is a
18 very important program, and it is one of the ones that
19 I wanted to be sure was put on the calendar before my
20 term expired. I appreciate the staff's gathering
21 information together and working so hard in order to
22 bring us this briefing today.

23 Although we have a couple affirmation
24 sessions scheduled, I think, this week and next week
25 perhaps, this may be my last meeting, public briefing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 by the staff to the Commission.

2 And so let me just take a couple of minutes
3 to, first of all, thank my fellow Commissioners for
4 the excellent support that they have given me over
5 these past five years, and especially the last three
6 as Chairman.

7 I am grateful to my fellow Commissioners for
8 their confidence and their professionalism, their
9 dedication to the task and as well as to their
10 personal friendship.

11 It has been a great privilege of mine to
12 serve with such fine Commissioners, and I will be
13 watching their activities with great interest, but I
14 want them to know that I am grateful for their support
15 these past few years.

16 Also I mention very briefly here at these
17 meetings, I would like to thank our Secretary, Sam
18 Chilk, who sits at the other end of the table for all
19 of these meetings and provides all the wherewithal
20 that results in the meetings, and for his fine staff
21 that behind the scenes does so much to make our public
22 meetings possible and to help us present them in a
23 meaningful and professional manner.

24 The General Counsel sits at the other end of
25 the table and is always available to make sure we keep

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 on track for all of the discussions we have at this
2 table.

3 Bill Parler is certainly one of the finest
4 general counsels in our country, as far as I am
5 concerned, and a great public servant. And I know all
6 of the Commissioners would join me, Bill, in our
7 respect and our gratitude for your competent advice
8 and counsel.

9 Dr. Murley, I hope you will relate to Vic
10 Stello and to Jim Taylor and Hugh Thompson and as well
11 as your other fellow office directors, certainly to
12 you personally, and to all of your colleagues, those
13 of you here today and those of you who have been
14 before us many times, my own personal respect and
15 gratitude for your great service to our country.

16 Your professional performance and your
17 dedication to your scientific and engineering
18 responsibilities in order to provide the Commission
19 with the best advice you can has been impressive to me
20 over these past five years.

21 I want to express to you and to all of the
22 staff, all the staff, those in the residence, those in
23 the regions, and all of our headquarters people,
24 whatever responsibilities they may have, whether they
25 are senior people or junior people, whether they are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 secretaries, or whatever they do, they all have an
2 important role to play in helping all of us to carry
3 out our responsibilities.

4 So, Dr. Murley, I hope you will pass my
5 respects to Mr. Stello and --

6 DR. MURLEY: I will. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN ZECH: -- to his fine people,
8 because we do have an outstanding staff here that
9 supported this Commission so well.

10 We have accomplished a great deal. And I am
11 not going to go into all of those things that we have
12 done in the past few years, but in the past three
13 years, we have authorized more than 30 plants for full
14 power operation, and we have done it carefully and
15 responsibly. The Commission has decided on those,
16 with the support of the staff and others, of course.

17 But we have reorganized the staff to more
18 functionally work at our responsibilities in the 1990s
19 and in the future. I think the staff is functioning
20 and focusing on operational safety matters, perhaps
21 better than we had in the past. But every so often,
22 it is important to look to the future and make sure
23 that we are attending to our responsibilities. And I
24 think we have done that very well.

25 We have consolidated. We all know what a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 great boon it has been to be in this building. And I
2 think that it is pretty evident to all of us that
3 working together in an atmosphere of teamwork and
4 mutual respect has been enhanced by being able to work
5 closer together.

6 We have adopted, as you all know, a five-
7 year plan and put it in place. And it is functioning
8 very well right now. I appreciate the tremendous
9 support of my colleagues on the Commission as well as
10 their assistance and as well as all of the staff
11 members who have helped and been involved in
12 developing that five-year plan. I think it is
13 providing professional management to our Agency.

14 We have been involved in a lot of important
15 rulemakings and some of the more recent ones. As we
16 know, the standardization combined licensing
17 rulemaking was significant historical development as
18 far as improving our licensing process, I believe.

19 We have been involved with some very
20 important decisions on emergency planning. We have
21 been involved in many other issues, rulemakings, which
22 I will not try to review at this moment.

23 But we have focused, I believe, on the power
24 plants themselves, and we can take, I think, some
25 credit for the improved performance of the utilities

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 throughout the country.

2 All of the safety parameters, as we know,
3 have been improved. Those that we track, we can take
4 some credit, I believe, for the improving performance.
5 And certainly we give great credit to the utilities
6 and the industry for their continuing efforts to
7 achieve excellence. They are improving.

8 And our fellow citizens, our country should
9 be encouraged by that improved performance of our
10 power plants in our country. They are getting safer.
11 They are operating safely now and they are getting
12 safer. It is very encouraging. It is an important
13 message.

14 On the other hand, we shouldn't be
15 complacent. We have room for improvement, here in our
16 Agency as well as the utilities. The power plants can
17 all improve, but it should be acknowledged that they
18 have done a great deal to improve themselves, as well
19 as to respond to our regulations. And the result has
20 been improved safety of operations in power plants
21 throughout the country.

22 That doesn't mean, again, that we don't have
23 some plants that we are concerned about. We know we
24 have a watch list, and we have some plants that aren't
25 performing as well as they should, but we have a great

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 number of them performing in a very, very fine manner,
2 excellent manner. And so we have to look at the total
3 picture.

4 We also have focused on the material
5 licensees and tried to improve our emphasis on them.
6 I think that has been important. So to those in the
7 NMSS organization, to all of those who follow those
8 activities, I commend them for their performance.

9 And also, though, I offer a word of caution
10 there. We again have room to improve, in my view, in
11 that field, too. We have material licensees. We have
12 state programs and agreements with states, and so
13 forth, and there is a lot of important work going on,
14 but that doesn't mean that we should be complacent
15 there either. And I think that everyone is aware of
16 that. So there is much still to be done.

17 We have the waste program issue that is
18 clearly before us and will be for some time, both low-
19 level waste and high-level waste, repository issue.
20 We have many important things ahead of us.

21 The past week, if you will recall, we have
22 had a meeting earlier in the week on the certification
23 of our lead plant for the possibility, essentially, of
24 moving into the advanced reactors in our country,
25 important briefing, General Electric, Westinghouse,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and Combustion Engineering, all involved in that.
2 EPRI, others are moving toward the future of nuclear
3 energy in our country.

4 This briefing today on license renewal was
5 an important one, I think, and I am pleased that I
6 could participate in this last important effort to
7 give emphasis to renewal of licenses in our country.

8 So, as I move along here shortly, I want to
9 wish Commissioner Carr the very best. I have great
10 confidence that he will show strong leadership for
11 this Agency. I have known him for many years. We
12 have been together in the Navy on many occasions,
13 shipmates three times.

14 I think that his competence, his dedication
15 to nuclear energy and to our country will bring this
16 Agency to even stronger heights than it is now. And
17 some of the comments that I have received from
18 Congress and elsewhere indicating that our Agency has
19 the highest credibility now than it has ever had has
20 made me feel very good.

21 I give great credit for that to my
22 colleagues on the Commission and to the staff for
23 their hard work. That's an accolade that I certainly
24 am proud of, but it is the staff's performance and the
25 Commission's performance, our Agency's performance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 So I do think our Agency has achieved a
2 credible rating by those who know what's going on.
3 They know we are a tough, firm agency. They know we
4 are criticized from time-to-time. But they also know
5 we stand tall. We take whatever criticism is
6 necessary.

7 And we do what's right. We try to do what's
8 right. That doesn't mean we are perfect. We're not.
9 But we certainly try, with all of our God-given
10 talents, to do what is right. We're supported in
11 these decisions by a fine staff and some excellent
12 public servants.

13 Let me just conclude by saying that, in my
14 view, there's no finer way to spend your life than
15 public service. And to all of you on this Agency who
16 are devoting your life to service of your fellow man,
17 you have my greatest respect and my gratitude and my
18 great admiration for your service to our country.
19 You're doing it well, and I wish you the best.

20 Thank you very much. We stand adjourned.

21 (Applause.)

22 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Commissioner Carr, you want
23 to have the last word?

24 COMMISSIONER CARR: Certainly I ought to
25 have equal time.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 CHAIRMAN ZECH: You have equal time.

2 COMMISSIONER CARR: I'm sure I speak for
3 everybody on the staff and also for my fellow
4 Commissioners when I publicly thank you for your
5 superb leadership over the last three years. I will
6 give you a true "Well done."

7 I wish you fair winds and following seas and
8 maybe, in NRC fashion, a blackboard. Thanks.

9 CHAIRMAN ZECH: Thank you very much.

10 Thank you all and God bless you. We stand
11 adjourned.

12 (Whereupon, the foregoing briefing was
13 concluded at 11:47 a.m.)
14

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

This is to certify that the attached events of a meeting
of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission entitled:

TITLE OF MEETING: BRIEFING ON STATUS OF PROPOSED RULE FOR
LICENSE RENEWAL

PLACE OF MEETING: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

DATE OF MEETING: JUNE 22, 1989

were transcribed by me. I further certify that said transcription
is accurate and complete, to the best of my ability, and that the
transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing events.

Sarah Veach

Reporter's name: Miles Anderson

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

STATUS OF
LICENSE RENEWAL RULEMAKING

PRESENTED BY
R. WAYNE HOUSTON
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REGULATORY RESEARCH
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

COMMISSION BRIEFING
JUNE 22, 1989

SUMMARY

- o ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- o GUIDELINES FOR MAJOR POLICY ISSUES
- o TECHNICAL ISSUES
- o INTERACTION WITH INDUSTRY
- o APPROACH TO RULEMAKING

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- o SECY 88-180, LICENSE RENEWAL RULEMAKING, JUNE 27, 1988
- o COMMISSION BRIEFING, JULY 12, 1988
- o ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING,
F.R. AUGUST 29, 1988
- o NUREG-1317, REGULATORY OPTIONS FOR NUCLEAR PLANT
LICENSE RENEWAL, AUGUST 29, 1988
- o NUREG/CR-5332, SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC
COMMENTS ON NUREG-1317, MARCH 1989

ACCOMPLISHMENTS (CONT'D.)

o PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- OGC ANALYSIS, JAN. 12, 1989

o NEPA ISSUES

- DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, MAY 1989
- ALTERNATIVES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL

o EDO GUIDELINES, MID JUNE 1989

- MAJOR POLICY ISSUES

GUIDELINES FOR MAJOR POLICY ISSUES

o LICENSE RENEWAL BASIS AND SCOPE

- GOAL IS CONTINUED ASSURANCE OF ADEQUATE PROTECTION
- ROLE OF CURRENT LICENSING AND DESIGN BASIS-SYSTEM

FOR CONTINUED REGULATORY OVERSIGHT

- RULEMAKING TO REQUIRE ADEQUATE CONTROL OF SAFETY

ISSUES POSED SOLELY BY EXTENDED LIFE OF PLANTS

o CLOSURE OF SEVERE ACCIDENT ISSUES

o GENERIC TREATMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

TECHNICAL ISSUES

- o MAJOR SAFETY ISSUE - AGING DEGRADATION
 - NEED SCREENING CRITERIA FOR STRUCTURES, COMPONENTS, SYSTEMS:
 - (A) SAFETY SIGNIFICANT, AND
 - (B) SUBJECT TO DEGRADATION
 - SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND DATA
 - RESEARCH PROGRAM ON AGING
 - OPERATING EXPERIENCE
- o TREATMENT IN RULEMAKING
 - SPECIFICITY IN RULE, OR
 - SPECIFICITY IN STAFF GUIDANCE

INTERACTION WITH INDUSTRY

- o NUMARC-NUPLEX
 - EPRI, OWNER'S GROUPS, AND DOE SUPPORT
- o RECENT REPORTS SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR CONSIDERATION
 - "METHODOLOGY TO IDENTIFY AND EVALUATE PLANT EQUIPMENT FOR LICENSE RENEWAL" NOV. 29, 1988
 - "NUMARC NUPLEX POSITION PAPER ON LICENSE RENEWAL RULEMAKING," (DRAFT) APRIL 18, 1989
 - "STUDY OF GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RELATED TO LICENSE RENEWAL," MAY 9, 1989
- o INDUSTRY TECHNICAL REPORTS - TO BE SUBMITTED
- o LEAD PLANTS FOR LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
 - YANKEE - JUNE 1991
 - MONTICELLO - DEC. 1991

INTERACTION WITH INDUSTRY

INDUSTRY TECHNICAL REPORTS - NUMARC

- o SCREENING METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA
- o PWR CONTAINMENTS
- o BWR REACTOR PRESSURE VESSELS (RPV)
- o PWR REACTOR PRESSURE VESSELS
- o BWR RPV INTERNALS
- o PWR RPV INTERNALS
- o CABLES IN CONTAINMENT
- o BWR MkI CONTAINMENTS AND CLASS 1 STRUCTURES
- o PWR REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM
- o BWR PRIMARY PRESSURE BOUNDARY
- o FATIGUE EVALUATIONS
- o CAST AUSTENITIC COMPONENTS
- o LOW TEMPERATURE NEUTRON EMBRITTLEMENT

APPROACH TO RULEMAKING

- o TECHNICAL - SAFETY
 - RULE TO DEFINE AS SPECIFICALLY AS POSSIBLE SCOPE OF APPLICATION FOCUSED ON ASSESSMENT AND CONTROL OF SAFETY SIGNIFICANT AGING DEGRADATION DUE TO EXTENDED LIFE
 - INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS
 - DETAIL IN APPENDIX TO PART 50
 - REGULATORY GUIDANCE
- o PREPARATION OF GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
- o FINAL RULE - 1992

APPROACH TO RULEMAKING
PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- o RENEWED LICENSE - NOT AMENDED LICENSE
- o OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARINGS IN EACH PROCEEDING
- o ANTI-TRUST REVIEW BY ATTORNEY GENERAL NOT REQUIRED
- o TIMING OF RENEWAL APPLICATIONS AND APPROVALS
 - TIMELY RENEWAL POLICY
 - SUFFICIENCY OF RENEWAL APPLICATION
 - EARLIEST FILING DATE
 - EFFECTIVE DATE OF RENEWED LICENSE
- o LENGTH OF RENEWAL
 - MAXIMUM
 - MINIMUM