May 15, 2000

COMMISSION VOTING RECORD

DECISION ITEM: SECY-00-0083

TITLE: PROPOSED RULE:REVISION OF 10 CFR PART 55, "OPERATORS' LICENSES," REGARDING THE USE OF SIMULATION FACILITIES IN OPERATOR LICENSING

The Commission (with all Commissioners agreeing) approved the subject paper as recorded in the Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) of May 15, 2000.

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

_____
Annette Vietti-Cook
Secretary of the Commission

Attachments: 1. Voting Summary
2. Commissioner Vote Sheets

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

VOTING SUMMARY - SECY-00-0083

RECORDED VOTES

	APRVD	DISAPRVD	ABSTAIN	NOT PARTICIP	COMMENTS	DATE
CHRM. MESERVE	X				X	5/3/00
COMR. DICUS	X					5/6/00
COMR. DIAZ	X				X	5/8/00
COMR. McGAFFIGAN	X					4/25/00
COMR. MERRIFIELD	X				X	4/26/00

COMMENT RESOLUTION

In their vote sheets, all Commissioners approved the staff's recommendation and some provided additional comments. Subsequently, the comments of the Commission were incorporated into the guidance to staff as reflected in the SRM issued on May 15, 2000.

Commissioner Comments on SECY-00-0083

Chairman Meserve

I join in Commissioner Merrifield's comments about the need to revise the Congressional letters.

Commissioner Diaz

I approve the staff's recommendation to publish the proposed rule in the *Federal Register* for a 75-day public comment period. However, the experience gained from manipulating reactivity on a power reactor or a training reactor is invaluable. I encourage licensees to provide those opportunities, when possible, to their operator license applicants.

Commissioner Merrifield

Although I approve SECY-00-0083, I must convey some disappointment over the Congressional letters. The letters do not "tell the story" in a manner that facilitates stakeholder understanding. For example, I doubt that many members of Congress would understand the third paragraph of the letters or what terms like "validated scenario sequences" mean. I encourage the staff to revise the Congressional letters so that they clearly lay out: 1) how the proposed rule would affect licensees, 2) the impetus for the change, and 3) why, from a safety perspective, the NRC is comfortable with the proposed changes. I believe it would be a disservice to the staff who worked on this proposed rule to shortchange their efforts by ineffectively communicating with Congress at this stage.