UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

October 7, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Brian E. Thomas, Director
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: John D. Monninger, Director **/RA/**
Division of Safety Systems & Risk Assessment
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: RESULTS OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF REGULATORY GUIDE (RG) 1.217

This memorandum documents the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) periodic review of regulatory guide (RG) 1.217, "Guidance for the Assessment of Beyond-Design-Basis Aircraft Impacts." The RG describes consideration of aircraft impacts for new nuclear power reactors, published in August 2011. In particular, this RG endorses the methodologies described in the industry guidance document, Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 07-13, "Methodology for Performing Aircraft Impact Assessments for New Plant Designs," Revision 8, dated April 2011. As discussed in Management Directive 6.6, "Regulatory Guides," the NRC staff reviews RGs approximately every 5 years to ensure that the RGs continue to provide useful guidance. Documentation of the NRC staff review is enclosed.

Based on the results of the periodic review, the staff concludes that no changes to RG 1.217 Revision 0 are warranted. The staff did not identify any technical or regulatory issues in the review.

Enclosure:
Periodic Review of Regulatory Guide 1.217

CONTACT: Jim Xu, NRO/DSRA/SPSB
301-415-5793

October 5, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Brian E. Thomas, Director
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: John D. Monninger, Director **/RA/**
Division of Safety Systems & Risk Assessment
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: RESULTS OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF REGULATORY GUIDE (RG) 1.217

This memorandum documents the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) periodic review of regulatory guide (RG) 1.217, "Guidance for the Assessment of Beyond-Design-Basis Aircraft Impacts." The RG describes consideration of aircraft impacts for new nuclear power reactors, published in August 2011. In particular, this RG endorses the methodologies described in the industry guidance document, Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 07-13, "Methodology for Performing Aircraft Impact Assessments for New Plant Designs," Revision 8, dated April 2011. As discussed in Management Directive 6.6, "Regulatory Guides," the NRC staff reviews RGs approximately every 5 years to ensure that the RGs continue to provide useful guidance. Documentation of the NRC staff review is enclosed.

Based on the results of the periodic review, the staff concludes that no changes to RG 1.217 Revision 0 are warranted. The staff did not identify any technical or regulatory issues in the review.

Enclosure:
Periodic Review of Regulatory Guide 1.217

CONTACT: Jim Xu, NRO/DSRA/SPSB
301-415-5793

DISTRIBUTION:
Tom Boyce, RES/DE/RGGIB
Mekonen Bayssie

ADAMS Accession No: ML16279A194

OFFICE	NRO/DEIA/NRGB	NRO/DSRA/SPSB	SUNSI Review	NRO/DSRA/ SPSB	NRO/DSRA
NAME	B. Hayes	J. Xu	J. Xu	A. Dias	J. Monninger (M. Mayfield for)
DATE	08/ 23 /16	08/ 23 /16	08 / 23 /16	08 / 23 /16	10/ 07 /16

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Regulatory Guide Periodic Review

Regulatory Guide Number: **1.217**
Revision number: **0**

Title: **Assessment of Beyond-Design-Basis Aircraft Impacts**

Office/division/branch: **NRO/DSRA/SPSB**
Technical Lead: **Antonio Dias**

Staff Action Decided: **Reviewed with no issues identified**

1. What are the known technical or regulatory issues with the current version of the Regulatory Guide (RG)?

RG 1.217 endorses the publicly available version of NEI 07-13, Revision 8, "Methodology for Performing Aircraft Impact Assessments for New Plant Designs." Revision 8 is the most current version of the document and therefore, there are no issues with RG 1.217.

2. What is the impact on internal and external stakeholders of <u>not</u> updating the RG for the known issues, in terms of anticipated numbers of licensing and inspection activities over the next several years?

There are no known impacts.

3. What is an estimate of the level of effort needed to address identified issues in terms of full-time equivalent (FTE) and contractor resources?

Not applicable because there are no issues identified above.

4. Based on the answers to the questions above, what is the staff action for this guide (Reviewed with no issues identified, Reviewed with issues identified for future consideration, Revise, or Withdraw)?

Reviewed with no issues identified.

5. Provide a conceptual plan and timeframe to address the issues identified during the review.

Not applicable.

NOTE: This review was conducted in October 2016, and reflects the staff's plans as of that date. These plans are tentative and are subject to change.