

1 MR. VINE: The GT-MHR. The CANDU design  
2 I know has been working very aggressively in  
3 discussions with individual utilities around the  
4 country. And I honestly can't speak to where they  
5 stand on that, but AECL may want to comment.

6 I think the point here is that if that  
7 market interest isn't significant, the mere fact that  
8 there is a design out there that has a fan that wants  
9 to come in and begin to work with NRC doesn't  
10 necessarily mean it has to go to the top of the heap.

11 It's not a first come, first served thing.  
12 It really ought to be, "Is this design likely to be  
13 deployed in the foreseeable future in the United  
14 States?" because if it's not, you're essentially  
15 expending resources on an option that won't be used.  
16 So you wait until you're more confident that it will  
17 be used before you expend those resources.

18 That's the logic, easy to say, obviously  
19 a little bit more difficult to manage practically  
20 because the degree to which all of these business  
21 interests are being shared with the staff.

22 MEMBER ROSEN: What's a more appropriate  
23 test for a utility interest that we should apply?

24 MR. VINE: I think one very clear test  
25 will be as we proceed on the future, the degree of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 industry cost share put on the table to match DOE to  
2 bring these designs to fruition. That is really a  
3 very valid measure.

4 There are other ways to measure it. For  
5 example, in license renewal, especially in the early  
6 days, where utilities were a little less reluctant to  
7 formally state their license renewal intentions, there  
8 was a mechanism for confidential discussions with the  
9 staff to discuss some of these business interests that  
10 were being considered. So there are ways to  
11 communicate the interest, but I think cost-share is a  
12 clear indicator.

13 So here are some areas where we think real  
14 priorities should be placed, again by both NRR and  
15 RES, anything to support ESP and COL application  
16 needs. Obviously if NRR says, "I've got a technical  
17 issue I need some research on to resolve because it's  
18 going to be a generic hurdle for all the applicants,"  
19 that's something we all ought to jump on, either RES  
20 on its own or industry and RES together and jointly  
21 and resolve that technical issue.

22 We have already talked about NEI 02-02.  
23 That is clearly what we think is an important  
24 priority. And we have recommended in one of these  
25 letters that NRC rely on the proposed PIRT redeveloped

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 by NRR.

2 We think a priority should be on  
3 supporting designs that are under global design  
4 certification review. That clearly shows an intent  
5 because of the significant costs associated with  
6 design certification, there's clearly an intent to get  
7 through and deploy that design. There are obviously  
8 some generic -- there is a research where it's  
9 appropriate to collaborate.

10 You know, I talked about things like AIMS  
11 and construction technologies. Those are probably not  
12 appropriate for NRC research, but there are certain  
13 technology hurdles or opportunities, for example, in  
14 the I&C area, where there needs to be some clear area,  
15 if not actual work, done by RES to prepare the staff  
16 for some of these advanced technologies as they come  
17 through the process. So that is clearly an area.

18 And then you're out into this murky area  
19 beyond design certification where designs are engaged  
20 in preapplication reviews and you really have to  
21 decide to what degree do I expend NRC resources in  
22 that area. Again, some market interest ought to be a  
23 measure there.

24 And the final point, which leads into my  
25 next slide, is the issue of research not getting out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D C. 20005-3701

1 in front of the applicant's own design development  
2 research work because it is really the applicant who  
3 is primarily responsible for making a safety case.  
4 And it doesn't make a lot of sense for NRC to have  
5 research programs running out ahead of the design  
6 program.

7 MEMBER WALLIS: On the other hand, there  
8 is no research falling too much behind.

9 MR. VINE: Right. So there is a balance  
10 there. This last question about getting out in front  
11 of the designer became a major point of discussion on  
12 this expert panel that I talked about that was  
13 convened a couple of years ago.

14 I am on this slide trying to share what  
15 the results of that debate were. There were,  
16 interestingly enough, some members of that expert  
17 panel, both on the industry side and on the public  
18 interest group side, that felt that NRC had no  
19 business doing research on advanced reactors at all.

20 Some of the utility executive feelings in  
21 that direction kind of went like this, "I think the  
22 Office of Research ought to be working on problems  
23 with current plants," "I don't intend to buy a new  
24 plant," "The NRC research budget is paid for out of my  
25 user fees. Therefore, I don't think NRC should be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 doing research on something that I don't need." I  
2 mean, that is kind of the logic that some utility  
3 execs have expressed. And I am sure there are others  
4 in the industry who feel that way. So there is a  
5 sensitivity there that needs to be appreciated.

6 On the public interest side, I think, if  
7 I remember correctly, it was Paul Leventhal who  
8 articulated very strongly the point. And I think he  
9 was probably involved in the legislation in '74, where  
10 they modified the Atomic Energy Act and split NRC and  
11 ERDA. He argued that all research responsibility was  
12 left on the DOE side and NRC had no research  
13 responsibility.

14 So he dug out the references. And you can  
15 see the quotes here. The point if you really look at  
16 the words that really establish the Office of Research  
17 at NRC, it does give NRC a specific responsibility for  
18 verifying the safety case made by the designer.

19 I think the next to the last bullet says  
20 it most succinctly. It says basically that the  
21 concern is about licensee submittals and the potential  
22 that the Office of Research could get in a position of  
23 assuming any part of the burden of the applicant to  
24 prove the adequacy of the license application.

25 The sole burden for proving the adequacy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the design rests on the applicant. The NRC must  
2 verify that that case has been made properly, but if  
3 the NRC is paying for and conducting the research to  
4 make the safety case, they can't turn around, then,  
5 and be the judge of whether that case has been made  
6 properly.

7 MEMBER WALLIS: The NRC doesn't do design,  
8 but I think the NRC needs to have tools --

9 MR. VINE: Absolutely.

10 MEMBER WALLIS: -- which are as good as  
11 the industry. We shouldn't be playing catch-up all  
12 the time.

13 MR. VINE: I don't disagree at all. And  
14 I think you see that embedded in the quotes. I mean,  
15 we debated this and I think convinced those who felt  
16 that NRC had no role here and convinced them that the  
17 charter for the Office of Research does, in fact, give  
18 them that responsibility.

19 I think there are some phrases I would --  
20 the bottom bullet I think helps enlighten that. And  
21 it's paraphrased. The actual wording kind of runs as  
22 follows. It says in keeping with the concept of  
23 confirmatory assessment, it is not intended that the  
24 condition build its own laboratories and facilities  
25 for R&D or try to duplicate the R&D responsibilities

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of ERDA.

2 So the point there is it gets to your  
3 earlier comment about collaboration between NRC and  
4 DOE. This clearly encourages that. It is just trying  
5 to prevent a situation where DOE has a test facility,  
6 NRC builds a separate test facility when they could be  
7 doing a lot of work together and saving a lot of  
8 resources.

9 MEMBER WALLIS: Well, let's see now. We  
10 had a lot of discussion this morning about  
11 uncertainties in models and codes. It may be that  
12 industry is not doing the intellectual work necessary  
13 to develop a proper framework for handling these  
14 uncertainties. It would seem that then the NRC has to  
15 take some responsibility to provide some intellectual  
16 leadership, not wait for industry to come up with  
17 something. This isn't unimportant.

18 MR. VINE: There is a fine line there. I  
19 am not quite sure how to answer, but I think it is  
20 probably fair to say -- let's take a new design for  
21 which there is not currently an adequate, let's say,  
22 thermal hydraulics or maybe a core neutronics code  
23 that models that new design, there is nothing  
24 available. I think the first responsibility to  
25 develop that code rests with the applicant. If he

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 doesn't take the initiative to develop a code  
2 sufficient to make the safety case, I don't think it  
3 -- and he may be able to obtain assistance. And maybe  
4 DOE as a partner will help in that development. I  
5 don't think it should fall on NRC as their first  
6 responsibility to develop that before the applicant  
7 does.

8           You know, it is also very possible that  
9 particular design may never make it to the  
10 marketplace. So the NRC --

11           MEMBER WALLIS: Yes. But there are  
12 certain cases where NRC is responsible for safety. So  
13 there are some certain aspects of safety, such as  
14 uncertainty in the spaces and how you incorporate it  
15 into decision-making. That would seem to be their  
16 prerogative.

17           So they may in certain areas want to stay  
18 ahead of it because that is their bailiwick. I mean,  
19 how do you make decisions in the presence of  
20 uncertainty? That is their job to make decisions.

21           MR. VINE: Right. I agree with you they  
22 have to stay ahead in terms of knowledge. But, again,  
23 I will argue that if that particular design never  
24 makes it to the marketplace, NRC spent \$10 million  
25 developing a computer code that is wasted resources

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 until you have greater assurance that that design is  
2 going to make it --

3 MEMBER WALLIS: Knowing how to make use of  
4 the computer code to determine uncertainties and how  
5 to fold them into your decision-making process may  
6 well be something that NRC needs to do ahead of  
7 industry.

8 MR. VINE: And I think maybe implied in  
9 your comment is perhaps an area where there may be  
10 generic benefits to that effort that go beyond a  
11 particular design phase, going to get insights from  
12 one that apply to another.

13 You know, you're into some qualitative  
14 areas. And I think you are right. How you define  
15 that line is really a management decision that the  
16 staff and Commission and you all have to struggle  
17 with.

18 I am just trying to alert you to the  
19 discussion and what it resulted in in this sense that  
20 at least some of the utilities are pretty sensitive  
21 about prudent use of NRC resources because they look  
22 at it as money that they're contributing to part of  
23 the cost of the --

24 MEMBER WALLIS: The framework issue, the  
25 framework, the technology-neutral framework, is an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interesting case. You would think that it ought to be  
2 in NRC's interest to develop a framework.

3 MR. VINE: Absolutely.

4 MEMBER WALLIS: But it seems as if NRC's  
5 developing the framework.

6 MR. HEYMER: No. We're making the  
7 proposals. And then the NRC is going to look at those  
8 and say, "We agree with this," "We don't agree with  
9 that." And they will be responsible for --

10 MEMBER WALLIS: It seems a bit strange,  
11 though, that you should be telling them how they  
12 should regulate the industry.

13 MR. HEYMER: No. We're just giving them an  
14 idea to improve the way it is regulated.

15 MEMBER RANSOM: Well, I think the original  
16 act was to prevent the situation where the NRC  
17 generated the data and the utility or the vendor would  
18 come in and say, "Well, we used your data. So you  
19 should approve it," which puts the NRC then in a  
20 position of criticizing their own or having to judge  
21 their own result.

22 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: I'm reminded of all of  
23 the severe accident research that NRC did during the  
24 past decade. That was to assure themselves of the  
25 safety of all the operating reactors.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           They were all licensed. They had a  
2 license. They were operating. They had met adequate  
3 protection. Now, should they have done this research  
4 or not?

5           MR. VINE: I would say yes up to the point  
6 where you're satisfied that there is not a significant  
7 safety issue here that you don't know about. At the  
8 beginning of that --

9           CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: I think the same  
10 comment applies to the future reactors. They have to  
11 be ready to assure there is no significant safety  
12 issue that they haven't overlooked.

13          MR. VINE: I agree with you, but you just  
14 said the future reactors. My point is we don't know  
15 what those future reactors are.

16          CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: Well, you have an  
17 idea.

18          MR. VINE: Yes. And you can't just guess  
19 that these 15 reactor designs are going to be built  
20 and, therefore, we need to start a research program.  
21 I think the industry would probably object if there  
22 were a big research program here on molten salt  
23 reactors.

24          CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: Oh, I agree with that.

25          MEMBER BONACA: I dare say for future

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reactors, actually, the framework will specify some  
2 need for that work to be done by the industry. I  
3 think for the past reactors, they were licensed with  
4 no specific commitments to beyond design basis.

5 And that's why the NRC ended up trying to  
6 get whatever they could of information to ascertain  
7 that there wasn't a safety issue that would require to  
8 go after the core licensing basis and expand it. I  
9 expect that for future reactors, -- at least that is  
10 what we heard this morning -- a licensing basis will  
11 include design basis and beyond design basis to some  
12 degree.

13 MR. HEYMER: And that's why we had a set  
14 of what we called events which are design, what we  
15 call design basis events. And then there is another  
16 group that we called emergency preparedness basis  
17 events, which are those things which are what we to  
18 date now call design basis. And we didn't have that  
19 up front in the current plant.

20 So I think that is how you deal with those  
21 issues, is that you identify a series of beyond design  
22 basis or potential accident conditions that could  
23 occur and how the designs address those. I think that  
24 was done and, in fact, in SECY-90-16, the staff made  
25 some recommendations. And they were incorporated in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the ALWR designs dealing with these beyond design  
2 basis activities. That's how it was done there. We  
3 see it being a little more structured.

4 Should that research have been done? I  
5 think it was a good idea to do it then because we just  
6 had it on a design basis. Would it be done now? I  
7 think that is already incorporated into the process.

8 MR. VINE: Let me try to reduce this down  
9 to a simple issue of communication. You know, the  
10 industry is acutely aware that the staff has limited  
11 resources. And we have and can foresee a lot of  
12 future needs in the area of advanced reactor  
13 development, research, licensing, and so forth. I  
14 think it is certainly in our interest to have maximum  
15 communications between the industry and staff to  
16 project as best we can what the needs are going to be,  
17 what the priorities are going to be, what the timing  
18 is going to be so that they can meet those needs.  
19 That is all we are saying.

20 Maybe we don't have a good process for  
21 doing that yet. Maybe the industry is not ready to  
22 engage in that kind of a discussion yet. But as we  
23 move forward and we get to a point where that kind of  
24 a discussion is appropriate, it would really help both  
25 industry and staff to make sure we are not wasting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resources in an area that will never see a plant that  
2 uses that particular technology or that particular  
3 computer code.

4 MEMBER BONACA: But you don't disagree  
5 with the fact that the staff needs to have some  
6 independent ability to evaluate the case the licensee  
7 is making?

8 MR. VINE: Absolutely. Now, whether that  
9 has to be a separate computer code or not is a  
10 separate question. I think we are beginning to talk  
11 now about the possibility of having more joint codes  
12 between industry and NRC in areas where we have high  
13 confidence in the models for a new design for which  
14 there are high degrees of uncertainty. Maybe that is  
15 not possible.

16 But, again, you know, that is where ACRS  
17 is very important in helping advise on those kinds of  
18 issues, where you draw the line.

19 MEMBER LEITCH: You had a slide about 12  
20 or so back about issues and gaps, gaps and issues.

21 MR. VINE: Right.

22 MEMBER LEITCH: You briefly mentioned  
23 public acceptance and nonproliferation. It seems to  
24 me that in the whole issue of safeguards and security,  
25 public acceptance is going to be one of the major

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hurdles that we have to get by construct a new  
2 reactor. I didn't hear much of that coming out in the  
3 presentation.

4 MR. VINE: Let's keep the nonproliferation  
5 issue separate from the security issue.

6 MEMBER LEITCH: Okay. Yes. They are  
7 really two things.

8 MR. VINE: I think the view of the public  
9 was based primarily on data that NEI provided to us  
10 that the public acceptance issue is very well in hand.  
11 It's something that has to be constantly worked on and  
12 improved on in terms of our communications. The most  
13 recent NEI data shows greater public acceptance today  
14 than we have ever seen. And that is after 9/11.  
15 Okay?

16 MEMBER LEITCH: As I talk to my friends  
17 and neighbors, I don't get that sentiment at all.

18 MR. VINE: That is what the data shows.  
19 The issue of nonproliferation is a legitimate and  
20 important issue as we look at international  
21 deployment, but it's not an issue for U.S. deployment.  
22 And then the whole question of how we move forward  
23 post-9/11 in advanced reactor development is an issue  
24 that the staff and industry have to talk about. But  
25 it's probably going to be done in the context of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D C. 20005-3701

1 kind of discussions that are going on right now on  
2 what the appropriate measures are for the current  
3 plans and, again, with the same falloff we have used  
4 here with enhanced safety not heading down the path  
5 and creating a double standard that says "This class  
6 of plants has to be able to do this, but this class of  
7 plants has to do something completely different."

8           Where is your constant philosophy of  
9 adequate protection if you've got different standards?  
10 We have got to work through all of those kinds of  
11 questions.

12           MEMBER LEITCH: I am sure your view of  
13 construction costs and so forth -- well, maybe I  
14 should ask the question, rather than say "I am sure."  
15 Does your view of construction costs have any estimate  
16 of costs of hardening some of these?

17           MR. VINE: The utility requirements  
18 document had as one of its 14 key policy requirements  
19 enhanced sabotage protection. That was focused  
20 primarily on plant layout and not on the major, major  
21 hardening activities.

22           Now, the designs are for various reasons,  
23 severe accident management reasons and others, more  
24 robust than our current plans. So we think that the  
25 safety is going to be even better than our current

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plans. But we haven't engaged in a detailed  
2 discussion with the staff on it.

3 Adrian, do you have anything?

4 MR. HEYMER: Yes. As Gary said, the  
5 utility requirements document and the three  
6 certifications did incorporate some additional  
7 features. But the whole issue of security barriers,  
8 measures to be taken, and how we deal with that is  
9 still playing out. I think that still has to be  
10 assessed and estimated, and it is an issue that needs  
11 to be looked at.

12 I think as regards the public confidence,  
13 when something happens of an event of the magnitude of  
14 sort of 14 months ago, there is uncertainty. And  
15 people get concerned.

16 But I think if you look at the results of  
17 recent exercises that have been done by independent  
18 organizations, it shows that the nuclear plants at the  
19 moment are very well-protected compared with some  
20 other industrial facilities that might present some  
21 hazard to the public. But that whole issue has got to  
22 play out. You make a good point.

23 MEMBER ROSEN: Gary, I would like to come  
24 back to your earlier comment about the staff and the  
25 industry having the same codes, working towards just

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 having one code. Would that extend to PRA codes; in  
2 other words, if you believe that the staff and the  
3 industry could have one thermal hydraulics code, work  
4 on it together and jointly, jointly use the same code,  
5 rather than two separate codes to do the same thing?

6 MR. VINE: In theory. I need to kind of  
7 step back.

8 MEMBER ROSEN: Would that extend to the  
9 staff and the industry having one model for, say,  
10 South Texas rather than having the SPAR models to --  
11 you know, the South Texas, very advanced South Texas  
12 model and the SPAR models that are probably at 30  
13 percent of the South Texas model.

14 MR. HEYMER: There have been several  
15 discussions about that very issue. One point is  
16 perhaps the NRC needs some sort of independent look at  
17 it. But, on the other hand, if I am a licensee and I  
18 give NRC the complete PRA and say, "That is what I am  
19 using. These are the assumptions" and they may agree  
20 or disagree with the assumptions but reach some  
21 understanding between you both, "These are the  
22 assumptions. We are going forward," then you are  
23 working from a common document, I think it would help  
24 enormously in some of the discussions that are going  
25 on with the SDP determinations, where you seem to get

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 into "Well, that is what the SPAR model says, but this  
2 is what my model says," et cetera. So I think that is  
3 a good observation.

4 MEMBER ROSEN: Well, I'm just using Gary's  
5 point.

6 MR. VINE: I need to clarify my point.  
7 This was just a beginning informal discussion about  
8 "Is this possible?" We have no plans. We have made  
9 no formal proposals. But I think in areas where we  
10 have reasonably high confidence, it is certainly  
11 something we ought to discuss.

12 MEMBER RANSOM: In the past, these issues,  
13 it seems to me, have been taken care by the fact that  
14 the NRC information is public domain. Then the  
15 utility or vendor wants to protect his information as  
16 being proprietary.

17 So, consequently, there have been cases  
18 where the vendor has taken, say, NRC products, worked  
19 on them to their own needs, and then made them their  
20 own proprietary property. But it seems to me if there  
21 is a completely collaborative type area, then it has  
22 to be shared by everybody.

23 Would that be acceptable, I guess?

24 MR. VINE: And that was one of the  
25 obstacles to our attempts two or three years ago to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 try to get on the industry side a willingness to get  
2 down to a single set of codes. Vendor proprietary  
3 issues were an obstacle.

4 Looking at the whole issue now, there are  
5 significant similarities between RELAP and RETRAN,  
6 similarities with severe accident codes. We are being  
7 very open with our codes. All the utilities have it.  
8 NRC is licensed to use it. We give royalty-free  
9 licenses to all the universities. Anyone who wants to  
10 use it can basically have it. So we're pretty open  
11 with our codes. That is an area we can discuss.

12 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off  
13 the record briefly.)

14 MEMBER BONACA: It would give me concern,  
15 however, if I knew that all it would depend on is one  
16 methodology, particularly for thermal hydraulic  
17 analysis, for example, and there is no diverse  
18 approach, analysis that at least helps me put into  
19 context where the uncertainties are and issues.

20 I've got to tell you I can tell you one  
21 fact. We went from one vendor to another vendor for  
22 fuel. And we got the local analysis results. Both of  
23 them are credible vendors. What we discovered in a  
24 way is that the peak flow temperature versus the  
25 charge condition for one vendor was going down with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 increasing break size and the other one was going up.  
2 That was the first pretty interesting trend. I mean,  
3 we were comparing things.

4 If you tracked flow to the core during the  
5 blow-down, one vendor was showing flow upward. The  
6 other was showing flow downward. Everything was  
7 different. And then, however, as you began to compare  
8 and to look, you realize there was something built in  
9 conservatisms that gave you some confidence that if  
10 you had the best estimate calculation, which you  
11 didn't always perform, you had a very large margin.  
12 Much of these differences were really tied to probably  
13 some artificiality in the model, whatever.

14 But the fact is that I don't have the  
15 confidence that any one of these computer codes gives  
16 you the true answer. So I think it is important that  
17 a regulator is able to in my judgment view independent  
18 of the dollars to do some verification. I think it is  
19 important that, particularly examining the dollars he  
20 has, have a different root, some different approaches  
21 and something of that kind. I think it is essential  
22 for the certification of this price.

23 MR. VINE: We have the same concerns. So  
24 does RES. We may look at this very closely and decide  
25 we can't do it. I think we will talk about it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: I'd like to bring this  
2 --

3 MR. VINE: There are ways of going it that  
4 solve your issue and give us more efficiency in the  
5 way the management goes.

6 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: I'd like to bring this  
7 topic to a close. Are there any last questions for  
8 Gary and Adrian?

9 I would like to finish up. We started off  
10 this meeting today essentially just to let the members  
11 be aware of the changes in the infrastructure report  
12 so that we could go into writing our report on that  
13 document for the full information base. Plus, we had  
14 all of these gentlemen in this afternoon to give us  
15 more background.

16 Could we just go around the members and  
17 see if there are any last minute questions either for  
18 these gentlemen or to John and his colleagues?  
19 Graham?

20 MEMBER WALLIS: I don't have more. I  
21 learned some things which I think will help me in  
22 revising drafts of the research report that I think  
23 were very helpful on thermal hydraulics and model  
24 uncertainties. I think I learned about this  
25 framework.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think we have encouraged the staff to  
2 develop a technology-neutral framework and language to  
3 some extent. Maybe we have got more material for  
4 encouraging that. Those are the three things. We  
5 have made a lot of notes.

6 I have done quite a bit today. It's been  
7 too much. I will need to go back and review it.

8 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Vic?

9 MEMBER RANSOM: Well, the main thing that  
10 I guess I have been puzzled by is there didn't seem to  
11 be much relationship between what is really going on  
12 and what is written in the advanced reactor research  
13 infrastructure assessment, which presumably we are  
14 writing a document assessing this, --

15 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: That's exactly what we  
16 are doing.

17 MEMBER RANSOM: -- which was the HTGR  
18 focus. So it's almost inverted from what has really  
19 happened. And I am a little concerned how we are  
20 going to deal with that, I guess.

21 In fact, I have learned that this came  
22 from Graham Leitch, which writes it up pretty much the  
23 way it actually is in terms of this inverted  
24 structure. And, yet, I don't see very much of that in  
25 the current draft.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D C 20005-3701

1 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: John, would you like to  
2 respond to that?

3 MR. FLACK: Well, of course, things have  
4 changed since this document had begun with Exelon, as  
5 we discussed earlier, being withdrawn from the  
6 preapplication.

7 Nevertheless, I think the issue is how  
8 much do we do on this, recognizing these other things  
9 are coming along, which we briefed you on today. So  
10 the question, I guess, is is there a balance between  
11 this one versus the other and how seriously do we need  
12 to move forward, for example, in understanding TRISO  
13 fuel and the graphite and all of these other things?  
14 I guess that is something the Committee has to come to  
15 grips with as well as ourselves and the Commission as  
16 we move forward, you know, to look at these advanced  
17 designs.

18 So I think it is all in front of us. It's  
19 just a matter of sorting it out and again placing  
20 priorities and understanding on what is happening in  
21 the world today and what we think is going to happen  
22 tomorrow. And it's not an easy thing to do.

23 MEMBER RANSOM: Well, I think my comment  
24 was more along the lines not necessarily attacking  
25 this report but what are we reviewing.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: We're reviewing that  
2 report in its entirety with all appendices, which  
3 include advanced light water reactor. We will discuss  
4 this tomorrow. In the current draft, we do do that in  
5 the current.

6 Graham's comments are exactly on line,  
7 which is I think the way the majority of us feel. And  
8 that's the way the report will be written, our report  
9 will be written. It is on the floor for structure  
10 assessment.

11 Mario?

12 MEMBER BONACA: I cannot comment on the  
13 second part of the meeting. I wasn't here at the  
14 afternoon meeting, but I felt that this morning's  
15 presentation was helpful. I think it provided some  
16 insights in the work. I thought Steve's presentation  
17 was very informative. It was limited to the thermal  
18 hydraulic issues, but I think it is important to step  
19 into the PRA and actually analyze these issues,  
20 although there are other issues that we need to cover.

21 I think still that I second what Vic said,  
22 that we got information today about three advanced  
23 light water reactors that will have to be part of our  
24 evaluation. So I don't know how we are going to form  
25 it or where we are going to put it here but would like

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to discuss it tomorrow.

2 MEMBER ROSEN: Just a quick one. Given  
3 the lateness of the hour, a discussion with Gary about  
4 what test do we apply to decide where we should advise  
5 the staff to apply their resources, we need some  
6 information about who is cost-sharing? His answer was  
7 you should help, especially the research areas where  
8 there is an applicant who is cost-sharing.

9 We don't know who is cost-sharing. So if  
10 we knew that, it would be useful to us writing the  
11 report.

12 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: In the infrastructure  
13 report, -- John, you please correct me if I am wrong  
14 -- in most of the areas, primarily for the gas-cooled  
15 reactors, there is a fair amount of reference to where  
16 collaborative programs will be occurring. There are  
17 with the United Kingdom, with Japan, with Germany,  
18 whatever. And the details of those collaborative  
19 programs in terms of cost-share or whether it is equal  
20 information, value information share, that information  
21 is not given.

22 MEMBER ROSEN: I think you're getting to  
23 a bigger problem than I am trying to solve. I think  
24 what I was wanting to know is which domestic licensees  
25 are cost-sharing.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Oh, I apologize. I  
2 didn't understand.

3 MEMBER ROSEN: And if there is a list of  
4 that that somebody could provide us and maybe a little  
5 detail of how much cost-sharing there is if that is  
6 the test to apply? We are not prepared to apply it  
7 because we don't have that.

8 MR. VINE: I'm not sure that that  
9 information is available, but we could find out for  
10 you.

11 MEMBER SIEBER: Individual licensees. I  
12 don't know that you will have it available. They  
13 don't advertise that.

14 MR. HEYMER: Yes. There are some  
15 licensees who may be cost-sharing who may not want to  
16 go public with that information, which that is the  
17 problem Gary is relating to.

18 MR. VINE: I think if your question is  
19 which designs are obtaining either from licensees or  
20 from other sources, if the issue is a question of  
21 which designs enjoy market interests, you don't have  
22 to identify the individual licensees by name. You can  
23 just total up and say, you know, there is --

24 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Five, ten.

25 MR. VINE: -- roughly this kind of money

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D C 20005-3701

1 supporting AP1000, roughly this kind of money  
2 supporting this design.

3 MEMBER ROSEN: If I could get some sort of  
4 information like that that I knew was valid, I would  
5 be satisfied.

6 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Can you do that with  
7 Vic?

8 MR. VINE: It's a challenge. We can work  
9 together and see if that kind of information is  
10 available.

11 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: I appreciate that.

12 MR. CORLETTI: If I just may add, I think  
13 if you really, though, look at the list of which  
14 plants are getting interest, part of that is due to  
15 the maturity where they are and how much closer they  
16 are to market.

17 I think when you are considering where you  
18 need research activities, that is not always the only  
19 element of who is getting market interest. You have  
20 to look at what are the safety issues associated with  
21 each one. What is the basis for your understanding of  
22 each plant design as well.

23 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: I'm glad he said that  
24 because that was going to be my comment.

25 The other comment I have -- I wasn't here

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 most of this afternoon either, but I think we have to  
2 recognize that the document we are reviewing started  
3 some time ago. And the fact that conditions have  
4 changed changes our viewpoint should not be a  
5 criticism of the document. We should just recognize  
6 that. I think the staff recognizes it.

7 And we shouldn't be a slavish reviewer of  
8 the document as it is. We should recognize it. The  
9 staff knows these changes change. And our  
10 recommendations, research, and priorities ought to  
11 recognize the current situation, not just be a  
12 critique of the document.

13 MEMBER ROSEN: Just trying to use the test  
14 that EPRI suggested.

15 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: I think that is just  
16 one input. I'm in agreement with Mike. We should  
17 have other criteria. What we ought to do research.

18 MEMBER ROSEN: And what our criteria are  
19 should be clear to all of us. We should debate that.

20 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: We should have some  
21 criteria, yes.

22 MEMBER ROSEN: We should discuss that.  
23 Maybe we can this Saturday.

24 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: In our criteria, we  
25 should decide whether or not we agree with those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 criteria.

2 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Graham?

3 MEMBER LEITCH: We already reviewed  
4 revision one of this document and sent a letter on it.  
5 And there were those ten comments that I guess it was  
6 you, John, who had listed them there. And revision  
7 two is not --

8 MEMBER SIEBER: It's not different.

9 MEMBER LEITCH: -- is not radically  
10 different except that now we have two addenda --  
11 really, three addenda. I mean, the original document  
12 becomes one. And there's ESBWR, and there's ACR-700  
13 and then the last single page, which is just the  
14 schedule of 2003 activities. So the document has to  
15 a certain extent been updated, and we have to do that.

16 I think the purpose for going around the  
17 room now for comments is not really to work on the  
18 research report. That will be a future effort here in  
19 a couple of days. So I have a number of comments  
20 about that, but I will defer those until that time.

21 I would like to say, however, that I think  
22 the NEI document, 02-02, is really a good start. I  
23 think NEI should be complimented for taking this  
24 initiative and getting this document into this form  
25 because it was hard for me to conceptualize exactly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what this framework would look like.

2 I think this is a good effort at getting  
3 started, not to say that, I mean, I am sure there has  
4 got to be a -- what I am saying is viewed in the sense  
5 of being, if you will, a strawman or something that we  
6 can begin discussing. I think it is an excellent  
7 starting point.

8 The last time we talked about this, we  
9 were talking about vague generalities, and it was hard  
10 to really know exactly where were headed in that. I  
11 think now we have got at least something to begin  
12 discussing and begin taking exception to. I didn't  
13 want to put it quite that way, but perhaps that's the  
14 case. So I really think it is a good piece of work.

15 That's about all I have to say, Peter.

16 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Jack?

17 MEMBER SIEBER: I guess when I was doing  
18 the review work and preparing the write-up for my  
19 assigned section of our response to the research  
20 report, I was wondering what it is that research is  
21 trying to accomplish.

22 I came to a couple of conclusions. Of  
23 course, my area is limited. It's not specific to any  
24 reactor type. So it makes it a little different than  
25 all of these others because, really, if I look at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 29 tasks in my area, most of them seem to be for the  
2 staff to maintain its knowledge base and improve it to  
3 the point where they can deal with these advanced  
4 concepts. I think that is a worthy goal myself.

5 I think that if the staff has to stay  
6 up-to-date has to stay familiar with the evolving  
7 technology, not necessarily do the work, not  
8 necessarily do the research, but be able to be  
9 knowledgeable or not with what is going on in the  
10 industry to be able to make judgments as to whether  
11 licensee submittals are acceptable or not.

12 My perception of what I read in my area  
13 leads me to that conclusion. And I think that is  
14 important. The area I reviewed was instrument and  
15 control. And there was a lot about the hardware which  
16 engineers always love, but they forgot the most  
17 important element -- didn't forget it but didn't play  
18 it up enough, which is the human being who is supposed  
19 to interpret all of this stuff that they see in the  
20 control room so when it comes time to write the final  
21 report, they will be able to comment.

22 My perception is I think that research is  
23 pretty much on the right track. On the other hand,  
24 when the time comes to say -- some licensee comes in  
25 and says, "I am ready to give a letter of intent," I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think the research is going to be tremendously busy  
2 getting ready to review that application.

3 And I think it is extremely important that  
4 the industry, vendors, and the staff work together so  
5 that they can readily resolve emerging safety issues  
6 and ask the right questions. I think that my sense is  
7 that we are sort of headed in that direction.

8 I do think it's a mistake to pick out of  
9 six concepts or eight concepts that out there one  
10 advanced reactor type and say, "I think this is going  
11 to be the one" and then spend a lot of resources and  
12 somebody else buys something different. I think that  
13 is a mistake. I think you have to be patient and wait  
14 and build your expertise and resources in the process.  
15 So I guess that would be my comment.

16 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Bill?

17 MEMBER SHACK: I don't think I have  
18 anything to add after everybody's. The last man is  
19 worn out.

20 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: Next time we'll start  
21 on this side.

22 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: Joe? Where is Joe?

23 MR. MUSCARA: Just a brief comment. Joe  
24 Muscara again. The discussion going along the lines  
25 that when we started out this plan, we were, of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 course, concerned with the PBMR. Now things have  
2 moved. Now we are interested in advanced light water  
3 reactors.

4 I would like to say that with respect to  
5 the materials work, we are still on the right track.  
6 I think with advanced light water reactors, we are  
7 looking generally at the same materials, same  
8 environments. There is not a great deal of need for  
9 additional data. On the other hand, for the  
10 gas-cooled reactors, these are the areas where we need  
11 long lead times to get our work done.

12 So I think the emphasis for the materials  
13 work still is get that work doing for the gas-cooled  
14 reactor so that when they come back three or four  
15 years down the road, I think we have been lucky. We  
16 had this breather where we can develop the information  
17 we need so we can ask the right questions when it  
18 comes back on the table.

19 CO-CHAIRMAN KRESS: I think with the  
20 respect to the question of wasting money on concepts  
21 that never come to light, I think you just have to  
22 accept that that is going to happen.

23 You can't be completely prescient and know  
24 what is going on. You just have to anticipate. And  
25 if you have good enough reason to expect something is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coming in the near future and there are long lead  
2 times, I think you just have to go ahead and do it.

3 MEMBER BONACA: I have just one question  
4 I want to ask, if I could, because I wasn't here and  
5 I am very intrigued. You talk about the framework and  
6 this overhead that you presented regarding strong PRA  
7 emphasis to us in these categories.

8 All we are doing, option two, now, I agree  
9 with the approach that it has to be very much  
10 risk-informed. But if it is technology-neutral, it  
11 means that it would be applicable to light water  
12 reactors, advanced light water reactors, as well as  
13 advanced any plant out there that was presented this  
14 morning.

15 Do we know enough about those plants to  
16 really develop an adequate PRA as well as sufficient  
17 database to support the risk-informed approach? I  
18 mean, I am trying to -- I am sure you had this  
19 question before from somebody and I wasn't here to  
20 hear the answer.

21 MR. HEYMER: We acknowledged that we have  
22 done a lot of work in light water reactor PRAs. And  
23 there is a standard out there for the internal events.  
24 There is some work going on on external events.

25 It is also recognized that a PRA for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 HT-MHR may be a little bit different than a light  
2 water reactor PRA. And, therefore, perhaps there  
3 needs to be an appendix or a guideline on a gas  
4 reactor PRA, one of the things you should look at. So  
5 there is that issue.

6 There was also the issue that we discussed  
7 and acknowledged that important measures and the risk  
8 metrics and the performance measures for a gas reactor  
9 or the ACR700 may be different. We need to look at  
10 those and reach a determination what are those for  
11 those different types of reactors.

12 And you are quite right. You can't  
13 actually do something like an option two type  
14 categorization unless you have got a new understanding  
15 of those. And we acknowledged that work needs to be  
16 done in that area, but we think it's work that needs  
17 to be done based on the fact that we know that there  
18 is an application coming in.

19 We know that there is an interest in this  
20 area. Okay. That's something that we can have  
21 confidence that we can work on. We're going to get  
22 there. So I don't know in a short period of time if  
23 that answers your question.

24 MEMBER BONACA: No, I understand as long  
25 as there is the recognition that you can go to PRA as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much as you can. It depends so much on experience at  
2 the basis.

3 MR. HEYMER: And we also had a discussion  
4 about defense-in-depth and the application of  
5 deterministic measures where there is uncertainty and  
6 the consequences are significant. And we went through  
7 that process.

8 CO-CHAIRMAN FORD: I would like to thank  
9 all of the speakers. John, thank you and your team.  
10 And thank you, gentlemen. We are adjointed.

11 (Whereupon, at 5:52 p.m., the foregoing  
12 matter was adjourned.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: Advisory Committee on  
Reactor Safeguards Safety  
Research Programs and Future  
Plant Designs - Joint  
Subcommittee Meeting

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Rockville, Maryland

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

15 / Rebecca Davis  
Rebecca Davis  
Official Reporter  
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

**NEAL R. GROSS**  
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N W  
WASHINGTON, D C. 20005-3701

**AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 6, 2002 JOINT MEETING OF THE ACRS SAFETY RESEARCH PROGRAM/FUTURE PLANT DESIGNS SUBCOMMITTEES**

**Lead members/staff: Peter Ford/ Thomas Kress/Richard Savio**

**Key Documents** RES Advanced Reactor Research Plan—predecisional copy available to ACRS on 10/7/02  
DOE GEN IV roadmap document—available on 9/22/02  
NEI proposed regulatory framework document— Issued

**Purpose:** To gather needed information for the 2003 ACRS report to the Commission on NRC sponsored research, provide a opportunity for stakeholder comment, and to discuss the initial draft of the 2003 ACRS research report.

**Meeting location:** NRC headquarters at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, 20852-2738. Room TWFN 2-B3

**INTRODUCTION--- Peter Ford/Thomas Kress-----15 minutes** **8:30am to 8:45am**  
Scope and purpose of the Subcommittee meeting,  
Invitation for participation of attendees in Subcommittee discussions  
Status of the Subcommittee's work  
ACRS schedule for completion of this report.

**NRR PRESENTATIONS---- James Lyons et al-----1 hour** **8:45am to 9:45am**  
Schedule for expected new applications and current milestones  
Expected NRR user needs for evolutionary and advanced reactors.

**BREAK—15 minutes**

**RES PRESENTATIONS----- John Flack, et al-----2 hours** **10:00am to 12:00am**  
Discussion of RES's Advanced Reactor Research Plan and response to ACRS coments  
NRC work on a generic regulatory framework

**LUNCH-----1 hour (approximately 12:00am to 1:00pm)**

**DOE PRESENTATIONS-----Rob Versluis----- 1 hour** **1:00pm to 2:00pm**  
Expected deployment schedule for GEN IV reactors  
Research needs for US near-term deployment options

**DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE-- 30 minutes** **2:00pm to 2:30pm**

**BREAK--- 15 minutes**

**NEI PRESENTATIONS-----Adrian Heymer, et al-----1 1/2 hours** **2:45pm to 4:15pm**  
NEI proposed new regulatory framework  
Anticipated new applications and current schedules  
NEI views on expected research needs and NRC's role in sponsoring research

**EPRI PRESENTATIONS—1 hour**

**4:15pm to 5:15pm**

Overview of EPRI programs and completed work


EPRI views as to issues that will have to be addressed in research programs and associated schedules

**ACRS SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF DRAFT NRC-SPONSORED RESEARCH REPORT-----**

**5:15pm to 6:30pm**

Additional discussion of the ACRS report is currently scheduled on Saturday, November 9, during the ACRS's November meeting


ACRS/ACNW contact: Dr. Richard Savio—301-415-7362/rps1@nrc.gov




# Presentation to the ACRS regarding New Reactor Licensing Projects


---

James E. Lyons, Director  
New Reactor Licensing Project Office  
November 6, 2002



# New Reactor Licensing Schedule






NRR User Need Requests  
For  
ESBWR And AP1000 Applications

S. Lu, W. Jensen, A. Drozd  
NRR/DSSA/SRXB, SPSB

ACRS Meeting  
November 6, 2002




## NRR Advanced Reactor User Need Requests

### ESBWR


1. Development Of Advanced BWR Fuel Channel Models In TRAC-M Code.  
Issued on 07/03/02.
2. Improvement Of TRAC-M Code For ESBWR Pre-application Review.  
( Under Discussion With RES )

### AP1000

1. Technical Support In AP1000 Phase 3 Review.  
Issued on 04/25/02.
2. Severe Accident Review For AP1000 Design Certification Review.  
Issued on 05/20/02.



# User Need #1: Advanced BWR Fuel Model



Interactive Channel

Upper Tie Plate


Water Rods


Part Length Fuel Rods

Zircaloy Ferrule Spacers

Lower Tie Plate Debris Filter


## GE-12 Fuel Configuration






# User Need #1: Advanced BWR Fuel Model


ATTRIUM-10  
Framatome



SVEA-96 (ABB)  
Westinghouse



1/3 part length  
full length  
2/3 part length



## User Need #1: Advanced BWR Fuel Model


### Features of advanced BWR fuel:

- Lower linear heat generation rate;
- Lower pressure drop;
- Higher fuel economy;
- More margins for PCT and MCPR.

### Requested Assistance:

A TRAC-M model to analyze up to 12x12 bundle with part length rods and water rods.

Status: On going. First set of deliverables received by NRC on schedule (10/30/2002).



## Draft User Need #2: TRAC-M Improvements For ESBWR

---

### Unique ESBWR Safety Features:


- Closely Coupled Containment/Vessel Interactions
- For ECCS Operations;
- Gravity Driven ECCS Injections, etc.

### NRR Confirmatory Analyses:

- TRAC-M code is being considered as the major evaluation tool to assist the pre-application reviews;


Other issues under consideration.

User Need #3: Technical Support In AP1000 Phase 3 Review.




- A previous user need request regarding AP1000 Phase 2 review was successfully executed.
- This user need requests RES assistance in the following areas:

1. Review revisions of WCOBRA/TRAC to calculate liquid entrainment in the hot legs/ADS4.
2. Review the experimental basis for the liquid entrainment correlations.




# User Need #3: Technical Support In AP1000 Phase 3 Review.



Safety Concerns:

Vessel Coolant Inventory.  
Depressurization Rate.

Status: On schedule.



## User Need #4: AP1000 Severe Accident Review.

NRR SPSB requests support from RES in the following area:

1. Performing MELCOR analyses of selected risk-dominant accident sequences;
2. Evaluate the applicability of the conclusions from the AP-600 In-vessel Retention and Fuel-Coolant Interaction review.

### Scheduled Tasks and Status

Provide recommended RAIs	Completed on 9/20/02
Prepare MELCOR input deck	Completed on 10/02
Review AP-600 in-vessel FCI	Completed on 10/02

Other requested tasks are on schedule.



**ACRS Joint Subcommittee on  
Safety Research Program  
and  
Future Plant Designs  
November 6, 2002**

**Advanced Reactor Research Plan,  
Infrastructure Assessment**

**John H. Flack  
Steven M. Bajorek  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission**

# Overview

- Background
- Response to ACRS Comments
- Overview of SECY on Research Infrastructure Assessment
- ESBWR and ACR-700 Additions
- FY03 Advanced Reactor Research
- Summary

# Key Meetings

## Workshops:

- ACRS Workshop on Advanced Reactors, June 4, 2001
- NRR Workshop on Future Licensing Activities, July 25, 2001
- RES Workshop on HTGR Safety and Research Issues, October 10-12, 2001

## Interactions with the ACRS:

- 491<sup>st</sup> Full Committee, April 11, 2002
- Subcommittee on Future Plant Designs, July 8, 2002
- 494<sup>th</sup> Full Committee, July 11, 2002
  - Letter to EDO, July 18, 2002
  - Response, August 29, 2002
- ACNW 136<sup>th</sup> Meeting, July 24, 2002
- Joint Subcommittee on Safety Research Program/Advanced Reactors November 6, 2002

## **Response to ACRS Comments (Letter dated 07/18/02)**

Response noted that:

- Priorities had shifted based on Exelon's decision to withdraw from Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) pre-application review.
- Scope had been expanded to include additional advanced light water reactors.
- Generally agreed with ACRS comments:
  1. Focus HTGR research at the generic level.
  2. Fission product release models for TRISO key research area.
  3. Framework for licensing reactors is high priority.
  4. Important to consider fission product release for high burnup fuel.

## **Response to ACRS Comments (continued)**

5. Selection of design-basis events to be risk-informed.
6. Use of Phenomena Identification Ranking Table (PIRT) and Planning, Budgeting and Performance Management (PBPM) process to prioritize research.
7. Research to study the relationship between coolant activity and latent fuel particle failures.
8. RES will remain cognizant of Near Term Deployment and Generation IV activities.
9. Research activities will assess the full range of ex-vessel severe accident phenomena for each reactor design.
10. The “license by test” concept, and need for large-scale testing discussed.

## Framework

- Plan for “framework” is currently under development.
- Activity will build on the concept used to risk-inform Part 50 framework, i.e., utilize a top-down approach that begins with a goal supported by cornerstones, strategies, and tactics.
- Undertaking will capitalize on experience gained from risk-informing current LWRs.
- Resolution of policy and technical issues will need to be integrated.
- Will use input from NEI-02-02 and other stakeholders as appropriate

## **Commission Paper on Advanced Reactor Research Plan: Infrastructure Assessment**

- Responds to Future Licensing and Inspection Readiness Assessment (FLIRA) Commitment.
- Identification of technology gaps (infrastructure needs) in terms of expertise, analytical methods, tools, data.
- Identified research is not NRC specific, i.e., applicants are expected to play a key role.
- Domestic and international cooperative research agreements are an important element.
- Stakeholders' input critical to process.

# Commission Paper

## (Continued)

- Most infrastructure needs relate to non-LWRs:
  - new passive designs with little operating experience,
  - new materials and fuels in different operating conditions,
  - different severe accident behavior,
  - applicant shift towards automation, digital I&C,
  - larger number of reactor cores or modules,
  - more reliance on PRA insights.
  
- Scope expanded to include ESBWR, ACR-700, SWR-1000.
  
- Generation IV early stage of development.
  
- Framework research to be initiated in FY03.

# Commission Paper

## (Continued)

Research areas identified:

- **Reactor Safety:**
  1. Accident Analysis
  2. Reactor Systems Analysis
  3. Fuel Analysis
  4. Materials Analysis
  5. Structural Analysis
  6. Consequence Analysis
- **Nuclear Materials**
- **Nuclear Waste Safety**

# RESEARCH ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE ESBWR AND ACR-700 ADVANCED LIGHT WATER REACTORS

Stephen M. Bajorek  
Division of Systems Analysis and Regulatory Effectiveness  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards  
Subcommittees on Safety Research Program and Future  
Plant Designs

November 6, 2007

## INTRODUCTION

- There has been a re-emergence in design certification activity for advanced water reactors in over the past several months.
- Several designs now under various stages of review

Design	Applicant	Type
AP1000	Westinghouse	Passive PWR
ESBWR	GE	Passive BWR
SWR1000	Framatome/ANP	Passive BWR
AGR-700	AECN	LW Cooled/HW Moderated
IRIS	Westinghouse	Passive PWR

## Objectives / Outline


- Summarize features of ESBWR and ACR-700 that are likely to require additional code and/or model development
- Identify the Division's initial thoughts on those nuclear, thermal-hydraulic, and severe accident physical processes of most importance to ESBWR and ACR-700

## Why Are There Research Related Issues?

- Passive safety features result in transients dominated by natural circulation and flows driven by small driving heads
- Some "traditional" accident scenarios eliminated by design
- New plant components and design concepts
- State-of-the-art in boiling, condensation and two-phase flow


## ESBWR Design Summary

- 4000 MWe / 1390 MWe BWR
- No recirculation pumps - total reliance on natural circulation
- Passive safety systems for decay heat removal



Parameter	NUREG Clinton	ABWR	SWR	ESBWR
Power (MWe)	2894	3926	2000	4000
Power (MWt)	950	1350	670	1390
Vessel height (m)	219	211	246	277
Vessel diameter (m)	5.5	7.1	6.0	7.1
Fuel Bundles (number)	624	872	732	1028
Active Fuel Height (m)	3.7	3.7	2.7	3.0
Power density (kw/l)	52.4	51	42	54
Number of L.RDs	145	205	177	121


## ESBWR Passive Safety Systems



## ESBWR Fuel & Neutronics Issues


- ESBWR fuel will be similar to GE-12 fuel bundle design, which includes water rods and part length rods. Active core is 3.05 m (compared to typical 3.66 m)

- Power stability during startup is likely to receive attention during review. Differences affecting stability map are shorter, wider core and start-up operations without recirculation pumps



**Preliminary Assessment - Existing computational tools and data probably sufficient for fuel/neutronics evaluations**

## ESBWR Passive Containment Cooling (PCC)



Initial blowdown energy release transferred to containment heat sink (suppression pool) and PCC heat exchangers

Long term decay heat removal is accomplished through PCC heat exchangers. Flows are driven by drywell to wetwell ΔP

Condensate drains to holding tank before returning to vessel; non-condensable gas purged to lower wetwell

## ESBWR Thermal-Hydraulic Modeling Issues

- Distribution and effect of non-condensable gas on passive component performance and natural circulation are important processes.
- Passive Containment Cooling (PCC) heat exchangers must condense steam in presence of non-condensable gas. Tests have shown periodic venting of non-condensable gas to wetwell.
- Close coupling between primary and containment. Containment pressure determined by non-condensables in wetwell airspace & vapor pressure.
- Suppression pool condensation, heat transfer & stratification.

**Preliminary Assessment:** Improvements to TRACE-V models for condensation w/non-condensables probably necessary. Code assessment for integral tests involving natural circulation and for tracking distribution of non-condensables also necessary.


## ESBWR Severe Accident Issues

- ESBWR severe accident strategy assumes drywell flooding. Improved ex-vessel cooling may prevent lower head failure.
- Other severe accident issues expected to be similar to those in conventional BWRs.

**Preliminary Assessment:** Existing computational tools (MELCOR) expected to be sufficient. No significant modeling or experimental needs identified.

## ACR-700: Advanced CANDU Reactor

- 1982 WMC/731MWe
- Light-water coolant (in fuel bundles)
- Heavy-water moderator (in calandria)
- Slightly enriched uranium fuel (2%)
- Negative void reactivity coefficient
- Modular horizontal fuel channels
- On-power refueling
- Conventional steam generators (2) and heat transport pumps (4) above core




### Emergency Core Cooling System

- Accumulators for high pressure injection
- Low pressure pump injection for long term decay heat removal

## ACR-700 Fuel & Neutronics Issues


- A thermal-hydraulic coupled, kinetic code (TRAC-M/PARCS) needed for ACR-700 transient analysis
- Modeling is complicated by the CANFLEX design, two enrichments, 4% dysprosium in central elements, reactivity feedback of LW coolant and HW moderator
- Validation needed for reactivity feedback from LW coolant/ HW moderator
- Nuclear data libraries need updated
- Potential data need for fuel rod burst and pellet-clad interactions



Preliminary Assessment: Difficult geometry but kinetics infrastructure probably sufficient. Possible need for fuel data.


## ACR-700 Thermal-Hydraulic Modeling Issues

- Existing state thermal hydraulic codes (TRAC-M and RELAP) designed for vertical rod bundles. Need to model/assess codes for horizontal flow patterns and pattern transitions in fuel bundle.
- Lateral quench and rewet processes, formation of dry patches within pressure tube, CHF and post-dryout behavior in fuel.
- Two-phase flow distribution from inlet/outlet headers to pressure tubes.



## ACR-700 Thermal-Hydraulic Modeling Issues

- Heat transfer between pressure tube and calandria tube. Pressure tube "sagging" may occur during some accident scenarios, resulting in contact between pressure tube and calandria tube.



**Preliminary Assessment:** Several thermal-hydraulic processes expected in ACR-700 transients that will require model development & assessment, and may require experimental work.

## AGR-700 Severe Accident Issues

- Staff severe accident code (MELCOR) designed for vertical cores. Modifications and new models will be necessary to simulate accident progression in AGR-700 core.
- Code modifications necessary for:
  - Pressure tube / calandria tube failure
  - Fuel failure propagation
  - Debris / melt progression
  - Calandria and shield tank failure

## AGR-700 Severe Accident Issues

- Potential need for additional data for:
  - Melt relocation stages in horizontal core geometry
  - Heat transfer to moderator from sagging fuel and pressure tube

**Preliminary Assessment:** Severe accident modeling for AGR-700 may require a significant effort. Modification of MELCOR may be necessary, and several physical processes may not have a suitable experimental database.

## Relevant Research Activities

- Office of Research (RES) experimental and code development plans will evolve as proposed systems reach Design Certification stage

- ESBWR Advanced Research Plan (draft)
- ACR-700 Advanced Research Plan (draft)
- SWR-1000 Advanced Research Plan (not started)
- IRIS Advanced Research Plan (not started)

- Current relevant projects include:

TRAC-M/CONTAIN coupling  
TRAC-M BWR Specific Developmental Assessment  
Review of INEEL Recommendations for CANDU

## Summary

- There has been renewed activity and interest in advanced light water reactors in 2002
- For new applications (ESBWR, SWR-1000, ACR-700, IRIS) focus is on identification of issues (fuel & neutronics, thermal/hydraulics, severe accident) and physical processes of importance that may require infrastructure development

# Planned Activities for FY03

FY03 research activities center on:

- (1) expanding current capabilities,
- (2) establishing cooperative agreements,
- (3) performing scoping studies.

Areas include:

- Framework
- Accident Analysis (PRA, Human Factors)
- Systems Analysis (T/H Analysis, Nuclear Analysis, Severe Accident Analysis)
- Fuels Analysis
- Materials Analysis
- Structural Analysis

## Conclusion and Status

- Infrastructure gaps are primarily associated with non-LWR designs, although some ALWR infrastructure needs were identified.
- Premature to include Gen IV at this time
- FY03 activities primarily focus on establishing cooperative agreements, and expanding current codes and modeling capability
- Infrastructure assessment due to the Commission in November 2002
- Policy issue paper due to the Commission in December 2002



# DOE Outlook on Future Plant Deployment



## Joint Meeting of the ACRS Safety Research Program/Future Plant Designs Subcommittee

Dr. Rob M. Versluis  
Office of Advanced Nuclear Research  
Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology  
U.S. Department of Energy  
November 6, 2002




## Overview

- ◆ **Near-Term Deployment of Nuclear Reactors in the U.S.**
- ◆ **Gas-Reactor Fuel Development and Qualification**
- ◆ **Generation IV R&D Nuclear Energy Systems**



## Near-Term Deployment - Nuclear Power 2010

- ◆ New initiative unveiled February 2002
- ◆ Based on Near-Term Deployment Roadmap
- ◆ Public/private partnership to:
  - Explore sites that could host new nuclear power plants
  - Demonstrate new regulatory processes
  - Develop advanced reactor technologies
  
- ◆ ***Goal - Achieve industry decision by 2005 to deploy at least one new advanced nuclear power plant by 2010***








## Nuclear Power 2010 - Activities

### ◆ Regulatory Demonstration Projects:

- Early Site Permit (ESP) - 3 projects awarded
  - Applications to NRC in FY 2003
- Combined Construction and Operating License (COL)
  - Earliest initiation in FY 2004
  - Earliest application to NRC FY 2005






## Nuclear Power 2010 - Activities

### ◆ Reactor Technology Development Projects

- **Advanced Reactor Design Certification (DC)**
  - Solicitation planned in November 2002
  - Up to 2 awards
- **First-of-a-kind engineering for a standardized plant**
  - Schedule driven by COL activities
- **Assessment of Construction Technologies and Schedules**
- **Systems, Materials and Component Testing**
  - Canned-rotor pumps
  - Direct-cycle helium turbine
  - Helical steam generators





## Nuclear Power 2010 - Role of NRC

### ◆ Near-Term Deployable Designs (2010-2015)

- Likely ABWR, AP 1000, ACR 700
- Less Likely SWR-1000, ESBWR, GT-MHR, PBMR
- Not likely IRIS



## Nuclear Power 2010 - Role of NRC

Evaluation, Assessment, Confirmatory Testing and Analysis in the following areas:

### ◆ I&C HMI

- Digital instrumentation and controls
- Human-machine interface
- Safety-grade software

### ◆ Fuels

- Gas-reactor fuel performance and fabrication
- ACR 700 fuel assessment

### ◆ Materials

- Structural materials for gas-reactor and ACR 700

### ◆ Thermal-Hydraulics and Neutronics Analysis


- Passive safety systems -- model validation
- ACR 700 models
- Gas reactor thermal hydraulics and physics

### ◆ Innovative construction technologies and first-of-a-kind components

### ◆ Use of international codes and standards




# Advanced Gas Reactor Fuel Development and Qualification --A Shared Need for NP-2010 and Generation IV





# AGR Fuels -- Ceramic Fuel



- Pyrolytic Carbon
- Silicon Carbide
- Porous Carbon Buffer
- UCO Kernel




L-029(5)  
4-14-94


TRISO Coated fuel particles (left) are formed into fuel rods (center) and inserted into graphite fuel elements (right).



PARTICLES



COMPACTS



FUEL ELEMENTS



# ACR Fuels - Builds on a Solid Foundation

## Hydrogen Production

Very high temperature  
Advanced fuels

Electricity Generation

ZrC

SiC

<b>Peach Bottom</b>	<b>U.S. HTGR Programs (60's, 70's, 80's, 90's)</b>	<b>NPR</b>
<b>German coating process</b>		<b>FSV</b>



## Review of Gas Reactor Fuel Program

- ◆ Build on U.S. capability, technology to incorporate best German fabrication experience into U.S. fuel manufacturing capability
- ◆ Manufacture of high quality coated fuel particles for irradiation and accident testing (LEU with GT-MHR focus)
- ◆ Design and fabrication of irradiation testing capsules for ATR tests
- ◆ Provide irradiation data, PIEs to demonstrate improved gas reactor fuel manufacturing process
- ◆ Build foundation required for U.S. pursuit of Generation IV gas-reactor development



## **Gas Reactor Fuel Program -- Major Program Goals**

- ◆ **Manufacture high-quality fuel kernels, particles and compacts to get improved manufacturing specifications and actual test specimens**
- ◆ **Improve understanding of how TRISO fuel characteristics and fabrication process relate to fuel performance**
- ◆ **Demonstrate gas reactor fuel performance during normal and accident conditions by performing irradiations, safety testing, and PIEs**
  - **Eight irradiation capsules planned for ATR irradiation testing and PIEs**
- ◆ **Improve gas reactor fuel behavior and fission product transport modeling capability**
- ◆ **Reduce market entry risks associated with gas reactor fuel production and qualification**



## Reactor Fuel Program -- Schedule

- ◆ Program extends through 2012
- ◆ Qualification tests complete 2010
- ◆ FY 03 Work concentrates on:
  - Fuel kernel manufacture, coating process development, and QC methods development
  - Making first fuel specimens for the first irradiation capsule design
  - Designing first capsule and formulating ATR test specifications
  - Initiating fuel performance modeling efforts, getting thermochemical and thermophysical properties



## Gas Reactor Fuels Program -- Schedule (continued)

- ◆ **FY 04 work concentrates on:**
  - Continuation of fuel manufacture, properties testing
  - First capsule insertion (October 2004)
  - Early feedback to fabrication process
  - Initial fission product and gas release transport studies in kernels



## Generation IV Gas Reactors

### ◆ Very High Temperature Reactor (VHTR)


- Primary mission -- Nuclear heat applications
- Secondary mission -- Electricity production
- Deployable by 2020

### ◆ Gas Fast Reactor (GFR)

- Primary mission -- Electricity production, actinide management
- Secondary mission -- Nuclear heat applications
- Deployable by 2025




# AGRs -- High Temperatures Enable a Range of Process Heat Applications




Primary nuclear application considered for VHTR – H<sub>2</sub> production

Thermochemical cycles for Hydrogen production >750 C






# Important Missions for Generation IV





## Very High Temperature Reactor (VHTR) -- Description

- ◆ Thermal spectrum graphite-moderated helium-cooled reactor
- ◆ Supplies high-temperature process heat (1000+ °C) for nuclear heat applications (e.g., hydrogen production)
- ◆ Fueled by ceramic-coated (U,Pu)-oxide particles in prismatic or pebble bed configuration






## Very High Temperature Reactor (VHTR) -- R&D Needs

- ◆ **Novel fuel and materials development to allow**
  - Increasing output temperature from 850 °C to above 1000 °C
  - Maximum fuel temperature of 1800 °C
  - Permit fuel burn-up of 150-200 GWD/MTHM
  - Uniform core temperatures
- ◆ **Energy coupling technologies for use of nuclear heat (e.g., hydrogen production)**
- ◆ **Development of direct-cycle helium turbine for electricity production**



## Gas-cooled Fast Reactor (GFR) -- Description

- ◆ Fast spectrum helium-cooled reactor
- ◆ Direct-cycle helium turbine for electricity production
- ◆ High temperature will also allow for hydrogen production (outlet 850 °C)
- ◆ Fueled by closely packed ceramic-coated (U,Pu)C kernels or fibers or ceramic-coated solid solution metal fuels





## **Gas-cooled Fast Reactor (GFR) -- R&D Needs**

- ◆ **Fuel forms for fast-neutron spectrum**
- ◆ **Materials research for fuels and structural components**
- ◆ **Optimal core design**
- ◆ **Reactor safety improvements (e.g., decay heat removal systems)**
- ◆ **Fuel cycle technology including spent fuel treatment and fuel re-fabrication**
- ◆ **Development of high-performance helium turbine for electricity production**
- ◆ **Energy coupling technologies for process heat applications (e.g., hydrogen production)**




## Other Generation IV Reactor Concepts

- ◆ **Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (SFR)**
  - Deployable by 2020
- ◆ **Supercritical Water Reactor (SCWR)**
  - Deployable by 2025
- ◆ **Lead-cooled Fast Reactor (LFR)**
  - Deployable by 2025
- ◆ **Molten Salt Reactor (MSR)**
  - Deployable by 2025



## Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (SFR) -- Description

- ◆ Fast spectrum sodium-cooled reactor
- ◆ Outlet temperature is 530-550 °C
- ◆ Used for electricity production and actinide management
- ◆ Fueled by (Pu,U)-oxide fuel or (U,Pu)-alloy metal fuel






## **Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (SFR) -- R&D Needs**

- ◆ **Passive safety response improvements**
- ◆ **Accommodation of bounding events**
- ◆ **Capital cost reduction**
- ◆ **Scale-up of spent fuel treatment technologies to accomplish high minor actinide recovery**
- ◆ **Development of minor actinide bearing fuel fabrication technology with remote operation and maintenance**
- ◆ **In-service inspection and repair**



# Supercritical Water-cooled Reactor (SCWR) -- Description

- ◆ Thermal or fast spectrum supercritical water-cooled reactor
- ◆ Outlet temperature 510 °C
- ◆ Used for electricity production and for actinide management when fast spectrum is used
- ◆ Fueled by conventional LEU fuel






## **Supercritical Water-cooled Reactor (SCWR) -- R&D Needs**

- ◆ **SCWR safety, including power-flow stability during operation and LOCA behavior and response**
- ◆ **Plant design**
- ◆ **Materials and structures**
  - Resistance to corrosion, cracking, embrittlement, creep
  - Dimensional and microstructural stability
  - Stability in high radiation fields
- ◆ **Advanced fuel cycle development for fast reactor option**



## Lead-cooled Fast Reactor (LFR) -- Description

- ◆ Fast spectrum lead-cooled reactor
- ◆ Outlet temperature between 550 and 800 °C
- ◆ Used for electricity production, actinide management and nuclear heat applications
- ◆ Higher temperature version used for nuclear heat applications.
- ◆ Fueled by (U, Pu) metal alloy or (U, Pu) nitride






## Lead-cooled Fast Reactor -- R&D Needs

- ◆ **Fuels and materials research**
  - Nitride fuels development, including fuel/clad compatibility and performance
  - High-temperature structural materials
- ◆ **LFR systems design**
- ◆ **Energy coupling technologies for use of nuclear heat**
- ◆ **Reduction of capital costs**
- ◆ **Fuel cycle technology**



## Molten Salt Reactor (MSR) -- Description

- ◆ Thermal spectrum molten salt-cooled reactor
- ◆ Uses dissolved U, Pu and TRU fluorides as fuel source
- ◆ Outlet temperature between 700 and 850 °C
- ◆ Used for electricity production and actinide management





## Molten Salt Reactor (MSR) -- R&D Needs

### ◆ Viability Issues


- Solubility of minor actinides and lanthanides in salt and mitigation of material precipitation problems due to saturation of salt
- Lifetime behavior of salt
- Materials compatibility
- Salt processing

### ◆ Performance issues

- Fuel development
- Materials performance and stability
- Detailed conceptual design studies



# Concept Development Phases





## EPRI Programs and Views on Advanced Reactor Research

*Joint Meeting of ACRS  
Subcommittees on Safety  
Research Programs and  
Future Plant Designs*

6 Nov. 2002

Gary Vine  
Sr. Washington Rep., EPRI  
202-293-6347  
gvine@epri.com



### Presentation Overview


- EPRI's Nuclear R&D Programs: participation, scope, strategic planning
- Industry Linkage
- Collaboration with NRC and DOE
  - Memoranda of Understanding
  - NRC-Industry Collaboration -- Historical Perspective
  - Collaboration While Maintaining Independence
  - RES-EPRI MOU. Areas of Cooperation
- EPRI R&D on Advanced Reactors; Enhanced Safety
- DOE Near Term Deployment Roadmap
- EPRI views on issues to be addressed in research programs and needed timelines

ACRS 11-02 2



## EPRI Nuclear Program Participants


- Belgium (Electrabel)
- Bulgaria (NEK)
- Brazil (Eletronuclear)
- Canada (Ontario Power Generation, Bruce Power, New Brunswick, Hydro Quebec)
- Finland (TVO, Fortum)
- France (EdF)
- Germany (RWE, E.ON)
- Italy (SO G.I.N.)
- Japan (TEPCO, Chubu, Chugoku, Hokkaido, Hokuriku, JAPC, Kansai, Kyushu, Shikoku, Tohoku)
- Korea (KEPCO)
- Mexico (CFE)
- Netherlands (NRG)
- Romania (Nuclearelectrica, S.A.)
- Slovenia (Krsko)
- Spain (Iberdrola, UNESA, Endesa, Union Fenosa, Nuclenor)
- Sweden (OKG, Vattenfall, Barsebaeck)
- Switzerland (KKL, KKM, NOK)
- Taiwan (Taiwan Power Company)
- United Kingdom (British Energy)
- United States (all 28 nuclear utilities)



ACRS 11-02 3



## EPRI Nuclear Power Business Organization to Address Future Business



ACRS 11-02



## Nuclear Strategic Plan (NSP) Strategic Objectives

- Maintain safety and promote public acceptance
  1. Preclude safety event surprises
  2. Allay concerns of public safety
- Maximize productivity of existing assets
  3. Achieve maximum plant useful life
  4. Improve plant capacity, reliability, and availability
  5. Develop technology to address material aging
  6. Add cost-effective innovation to existing plants
- Facilitate waste disposal
  7. Resolve on-site spent fuel and waste issues
  8. Resolve technical high-level waste issues

ACRS 11-02 5



## Strategic Objectives (cont.)

- Promote deployment of new reactor systems
  - 9 Evaluate evolutionary and new designs including gas-cooled
  - 10 Adopt advances in manufacturing and construction technology
  - 11 Provide basis for simplified licensing process
- Maintain critical infrastructure
  12. Optimize technology transfer and collaboration
  13. Employ advances in information technology to design & operations
  14. Meet increasing demand for skilled, productive work force
- Improve risk management
  15. Achieve cost-/risk-focused decision-making in regulation, operation, and design
- Optimize fuel utilization
  16. Advance the use of high-performance fuel
  17. Develop high-utilization fuel cycles to extend resources

ACRS 11-02 6



## Value of Nuclear Strategic Plan

- Provides opportunity for the market to help define the future and to identify and prioritize R&D needs
- Permits a robust plan for dealing with uncertainties and timing and funding issues
- Permits a quantification of the value of R&D for decision-making and resource allocation
- Supports Industry's Vision NEI's Vision 2020
- Provides opportunity to influence government R&D policy

ACRS 11-02 7



## Industry Linkage



- EPRI/INPO/NEI Memorandum of Agreement (MOA):
  - Commitment to cooperation, mutual support, close communications, minimizing overlap
  - Agreement to share data, reports, websites, etc.
  - Maintains comprehensive list of technical liaisons
- Growing trend for coordinated/linked/common advisors
- Growing opportunities for joint planning (strategic, tactical)
- Improving relations with NSSS Owners Groups, Vendors

ACRS 11-02 8



## Memoranda of Understanding among EPRI, DOE and NRC

- NRC, DOE, and EPRI have executed bilateral MOUs with each other
- NRC (RES) - EPRI MOU:
  - Executed Nov. 1997
  - Basis for cooperation of data phase of R&D
- DOE-EPRI MOU:
  - Executed Sept. 1999
  - Basis for cooperation on all LWR R&D
  - Initial focus: NEPO Program
- DOE-NRC MOU executed in 1999

ACRS 11-02 9



## NRC - Industry Cooperation in R&D -- a Perspective

- Extensive collaboration among NRC, DOE, EPRI, NSSS Vendors on nuclear R&D in 1970s, early 80s
- R&D collaboration rare during last decade
  - Legal concerns with "independence"
- Independent R&D became obstacle to issue closure
  - Lack of agreement up-front on definition/scope of issue
  - Lack of agreement on R&D needs, assumptions, data
- What has changed?
  - Greater appreciation of common R&D goals
  - Diminished resources for R&D suggests leveraging
  - Risk-informed regulation encourages convergence on R&D assumptions, data, models, etc.
- RES and EPRI both encouraged to increase collaboration

ACRS 11-02 10



## NRC-Industry R&D Collaboration – Without Compromising Regulatory Independence

- RES-EPRI MOU focuses on data needs and joint efforts to collect the data needed to support issue resolution.
  - Collaboration limited to defining issue & data needs, joint collection of data, including review for completeness and accuracy, data validation, formal reporting to decision-makers.
  - Collaboration does not extend into efforts to develop specific solutions to regulatory issues. RES provides research results to Program Office(s); EPRI provides same data to NEI/industry
  - NRR/NMSS independently develop NRC's regulatory position; NRC interaction with industry on issue resolution is via NEI.
  - Issue resolution greatly enhanced because NRC and industry are starting with the same technical basis for resolution –fewer disagreements over whose data should be used.
- No “conflict of interest” under this process.

ACRS 11-02 11



## Research Cooperation under EPRI/NRC MOU

- Formal Addenda to MOU on
  - Testing of High Burnup Fuel
  - Fabrication Flaw Distribution in RPVs
  - Fire Risk
  - Treatment of Proprietary and Commercial Info
  - Welding of Highly Irradiated Materials
  - Dry Cask Storage Project at INEEL
  - Seismic Behavior of Spent Fuel Storage Cask Systems
- Other areas of cooperation:
  - RIR: RI-ISI, PSA Standards, other RI issues
  - Steam Generator Tube Integrity
  - Aging Issues (e.g , cable aging, fatigue, corrosion, SCC, crack initiation)
  - Digital I&C, S A close-out, Advanced Reactor R&D, etc.

ACRS 11-02 12



## Examples of Research Successes

- License Renewal – twenty years of research on aging of SSCs, combined with “Life Cycle Management” programs set the stage for regulatory acceptance of cost-effective license renewal
  - ALWR Program – 15 year, industry-DOE multi-phased effort to:
    - Identify & resolve regulatory issues applicable to new designs
    - Develop detailed owner/operator requirements for new plants
    - Develop new passively-safe designs and achieve design cert.
    - Complete First-of-a-Kind Engineering on two ALWRs
  - Steam Generator Management Program (SGMP) – 25 year effort to identify and manage wide range of degradation mechanisms. Program evolved to manage regulatory issues, new inspection technologies, better materials in replacement SGs, enhanced water chemistry guidelines, etc.
- Close relationship with NEI and INPO key to implementation

ACRS 11-02 13



## Other R&D Successes

- Development of PRA techniques, models, and data
- Resolution of LBLOCA and severe accident concerns
- BWR pipe cracking and vessel internals cracking resolution
- Application of digital controls to nuclear safety & plant equipment
- Development of safe, more reliable high burnup fuel
- Improved equipment reliability and maintenance technologies
- Improved inspection & repair technologies w/ reduced rad. exp.
- Improved spent fuel storage and transportation technologies
- Advanced analysis methods for SNF repository assessment
- Integrated chemistry strategies to optimize fuel & materials mgt
- Advanced seismic hazards analysis methods

ACRS 11-02 14



## ALWR Program Perspectives

- Started in 1983 with utility executive survey "What would it take to rekindle US utility interest in the nuclear option?"
  - Nuclear power plants must be:
    - **Safer and simpler**, with greater design margins
    - **Competitive** with other forms of generation
    - **Standardized**
    - **Pre-licensed** by the USNRC
  - Supported making improvements to established LWR technology, rather than develop radically new concepts
- Developed Utility Requirements Document (URD) as "bid spec" for designers; basis for standardization & regulatory stabilization
- Strategic Plan to Build New Nuclear Power Plants (1990-98) integrated all project-specific and institutional "building blocks"
- Utility consensus with major international participation

ACRS 11-02 15



## Enhanced Safety in New Nuclear Plants

- Severe Accident Policy and Advanced Reactor Policy Statements:
  - expectation for enhanced safety (E.S.) directed to vendors
  - encouraged industry, not regulations to provide enhanced safety
  - industry responded Utilities, via URD, set E.S. requirements
- Utilities needed to be able to decide how best to comply with regs.
- Utilities needed to design-in extra margins for investment protection, operational flexibility, flexibility for siting and emergency response, assured licensability (i.e., margin for analysis and R&D uncertainties)
- "Vendor or EPRI goals that go beyond our regulations should not be imposed as requirements" (SRMs SECY-89-102 & 311)
- Commission disapproved reqt for 10E-5 CDF (SRM SECY-89-016)
  - Imposing utility requirements avoids Commission Safety Goal Policy
- S.A. rulemaking for ALWRs could not be justified (1989-93)
- "Applicable Regs" (proposed 9/92), disapproved (12/96)
  - "AARs" circumvented Backfit Rule & all above Comm. Policies
- Absorbing E.S. features into regs is counterproductive

ACRS 11-02 16



## EPRI's Current New Nuclear Plant Programs

- EPRI Projects of "Generic" Applicability
  - Information Management System
  - Construction Modeling
  - Early Site Permit
  - Combined Licenses
- Vendor LWR Design-Specific Projects
  - Westinghouse AP1000
  - GE ESBWR
- EPRI Projects on HGTR Technology
  - Inspectability and Maintainability
  - Silver Isotope Behavior and Management
  - Helium Seals
  - Economics of Hydrogen Production

ACRS 11-02 17




## Advanced Information Management (AIMS) Approach

- Operating plants have experienced difficulty in managing licensed bases
  - Too many separate databases
  - Too costly to manage and resolve integrity issues
- AIMS addresses these issues
  - Integrated off-the-shelf products
  - Implementing AIMS approach for AP1000


ACRS 11-02 18




# Viewed As One Database In AIMS



ACRS 11-02 19



# Construction Modeling



ACRS 11-02 20



## Benefits of Construction Modeling

- Develop improved construction sequencing to improve overall time
- Verify accuracy and achievability of schedules
- Eliminate problems before they are encountered in the field
- Generate increased investor confidence in construction schedules

ACRS 11-02 21



## ESP Products



Industry Guideline for Preparing an ESP Application



Siting Guide: Site Selection and Evaluation Criteria for an ESP Application



ESP/COL Model Program Plan

ACRS 11-02 22



## LWR Design-Specific Projects

- Vendor Initiatives
  - Westinghouse - AP1000
  - GE - ESBWR
- EPRI provides:
  - direct (W) or indirect (GE) financial support
  - plus monitoring regarding utility design requirements
- Large plants based on passive technology Projected costs ~ 30% below ALWR program's estimated costs for already certified plants

ACRS 11-02 23



## HTGR Projects

- Auxiliary Bearings
  - Technical Status and R&D Requirements Evaluation
  - Auxiliary Bearing Materials Assessment
- Inspectability and Maintainability
- Silver Isotope Behavior and Management
- Helium Seals
- Graphite Materials Design Data
- Materials Assessments
  - Metallics
  - Composites
- Economics of Hydrogen Production (on-going)

ACRS 11-02 24



## U.S. DOE Interactions




- EPRI has a long history of cooperation with DOE:
  - Various MOUs & Cooperative Agreements for Joint R&D
  - Public-Private Partnerships Cost-shared R&D Programs
- Current EPRI-DOE cooperation:
  - NEPO (Nuclear Energy Plant Optimization) ~\$5M/year DOE funding
  - NP2010 (DOE/industry program to build new plants this decade)
- Significant EPRI role in advising DOE on its R&D programs.
  - Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee (NERAC)
    - Generation IV Roadmap NERAC Subcommittee (GRNS)
      - Near Term Deployment Roadmap
      - Generation IV Goals, program direction, and Roadmap
  - NEPO: Coordinating Committee for Joint Strategic R&D Plan; NERAC Operating Plant Subcommittee, Long term R&D Plan, etc.

ACRS 11-02 25



## Energy Supply R&D at DOE by Technology Area



## Near-Term Deployment Group

- **Mission** - Identify the technical, institutional and regulatory gaps to the near term deployment of new nuclear plants and recommend actions that should be taken by DOE.
  - Orders by 2005
  - Multiple plants in commercial operation by 2010
- **Participants** - multi-disciplined nuclear industry group
  - Nuclear Utilities - Duke, Southern Nuclear, Exelon
  - Reactor Vendors - Westinghouse, General Electric, General Atomics
  - National Laboratories - ANL, INEEL
  - Academia - Penn State
  - Industry - EPRI
  - Government - DOE-NE
  - NERAC

ACRS 11-02 27



## NTD Designs Evaluated

Eight designs were evaluated by the NTDG for possible deployment by 2010:

Design	Supplier	Features
ABWR	GE	1350 MWe BWR, design certified by NRC and built and operating in Japan
SWR-1000	Framatome ANP	1013 MWe BWR, being designed to meet European Requirements
ESBWR	GE	1380 MWe passively safe BWR, under development
AP600	Westinghouse	610 MWe passively safe PWR, design certified by NRC
AP1000	Westinghouse	1090 MWe PWR with passive safety features Higher capacity version of AP-600, not yet certified
IRIS	Westinghouse	100-300 MWe integral primary system PWR, under development
PBMR	ESKOM	110 MWe modular direct cycle helium-cooled pebble bed reactor, currently planned for construction in South Africa
GT-MHR	General Atomics	288 MWe modular direct cycle helium-cooled reactor, being licensed for construction in Russia.

ACRS 11-02 28



## NTD Roadmap: Generic Gaps/Issues

- Five generic "gaps" identified -- significant obstacles to NTD; subject to recommendations (i.e., needs priority attention by industry and government to permit NTD by 2010).
  - Nuclear plant economic competitiveness
  - Business implications of deregulated electricity marketplace
  - Efficient implementation of 10CFR52
  - Adequacy of nuclear industry infrastructure
  - National Nuclear Energy Strategy
- Four generic "issues" identified -- not necessarily obstacles to NTD -- longer term in nature, less critical to NTD; need to be monitored and managed. Progress should be made on each to allow nuclear energy to reach its full potential.
  - Nuclear safety
  - Spent fuel management
  - Public acceptance of nuclear energy
  - Non-proliferation of nuclear material

ACRS 11-02 29



## NTD Roadmap Conclusions

- New nuclear plants can be deployed in the U S in this decade -- with sufficient, timely private sector investment
- To have new plants operating by 2010, O/Os must commit to orders by ~2003. Requires very near term action
- Economic competitiveness is key area of uncertainty
- Efficient implementation of Part 52 is most urgent
- Excellent candidates available. Certified designs ready; other candidates show promise for improved economics
- Achieving near term deployment will require close collaboration between industry and government.

ACRS 11-02 30



## NTD Conclusions (continued)

- Selections of new projects must be market driven and primarily supported by private sector investment, but government support is essential, in the form of:
  - Leadership and effective policy
  - Efficient regulatory approvals
  - Cost sharing of generic and one-time costs
- Industry-Government collaboration essential to success
  - Will provide needed resource leveraging
  - Will greatly enhance investor confidence
  - Better standardization of designs and processes

ACRS 11-02 31



## NTD Roadmap Recommendations -- an Overview

- A "Phased Plan of Action" with three phases
  - Regulatory Approvals
  - Design Completion
  - Construction and Startup
- "Dual Track" implementation for both ALWR & Gas-cooled
  - Both tracks required to address different market scenarios
- Market-driven initiatives, with DOE cost-sharing of regulatory-related generic & 1st-time design-specific costs
  - DOE \$ only for initiatives that obtain  $\geq 50\%$  private sector funding
  - ESP and COL demonstrations
  - Design Certifications (ALWRs) and COLs w/o DC (gas reactors)
  - First Time Engineering Completion
- Development of National Nuclear Energy Strategy to complement new National Energy Policy

ACRS 11-02 32



## NTD Recommendations: A Phased Plan of Action

- Phase 1: Regulatory Approvals
  - Develop generic guidance for ESP, COL, ITAAC
  - Industry and DOE cost share (market-driven initiatives):
    - ESP and COL applications to demonstrate processes
    - Complete DC (FDAs for gas reactors) for selected designs
    - Risk-informed, performance-based regulatory framework being developed (may be applied as elements become available)
- Phase 2: Design Completion
  - Complete detailed engineering for at least one design in each track (ALWR, gas-cooled) to allow deployment by 2010
    - Industry and DOE cost share (market-driven initiatives)
- Phase 3: Construction and Startup
  - privately funded but supported by appropriate government incentives

ACRS 11-02 33



## New Plant Implementation

- Economics/business case for new plants: daunting
  - capital costs, deregulated marketplace, reg. uncertainty
- Cannot achieve Vision 2020 without help from DOE
  - must have cost-sharing of 1-time costs, level playing field
- Public-Private Partnership: MUST be market-driven
  - marketplace must select designs and sites, not government
  - O/Os must be able to manage new projects w/o strings
  - must maintain dual track approach until plant orders start
  - Unified utility leadership required for stable success path
- Phased approach needed to build investor confidence
- First plants built must be across-the-board successes
  - "just go build something" mentality is counterproductive

ACRS 11-02 34



## EPRI Views on NRC Advanced Reactor Research Program

- Primary References for EPRI views presented today:
  - Expert Panel Review of NRC Research Programs
    - Letters from Dr. Ted Marston to Dr. Kenneth Rogers dated 2 Oct. 2000, 14 Feb 2001, and 12 March 2001
  - Response to FRN request for identification of anticipatory research projects, and for comments on factors that should be considered when anticipatory research topics are prioritized
    - Letter from Dr. Ted Marston to Dr. James Johnson, 5 June 2002

ACRS 11-02 35



## Priorities for NRC Resources

- Industry priorities for both NRR and RES work on advanced reactors: matters that support Near Term Deployment
  - Designs lacking current market interest should be given low priority at NRC, including research efforts
  - Commission supported market-interest-based prioritization ('90)
- Specific priorities for research
  - Support for ESP and COL application needs
  - New [technology-neutral] Reg. Framework (EPRI recommended that NRC rely on the proposed Part 53 developed by NEI)
  - Support for designs under Design Certification review
  - Collaborative generic research (e.g., enabling technologies, I&C)
  - Support for designs engaged in pre-application review, if:
    - Market interest verified
    - RES doesn't get our front of applicant's design development/research

ACRS 11-02 36



## Roles and Responsibilities

- Primary responsibility for making safety case for a new reactor design rests with applicant, including supporting research if needed
- NRC role is to confirm safety case has been made
- 1974 Energy Reorganization Act (ERA) requires RES to not engage in research that is licensee/vendor responsibility in support of a submittal:

"The regulatory agency should never be placed in a position to generate, and then have to defend, basic design data of its own. The regulatory agency must insist on the submission of all of the data required to demonstrate the adequacy of the design contained in a license application or amendments thereto. This requires professional competence in the regulatory agency to make such determinations as whether substantive data are lacking or whether experimental or analytical data provided by an applicant or licensee are scientifically adequate."
- The sole ERA concern relates to licensee submittals and the potential that RES could get in a position of "assume [ing] any part of the burden of the applicant to prove the adequacy of a license application."
- ERA "It is not intended that the Commission build its own facilities for R&D"

ACRS 11-02 37



## EPRI Recommendations to RES on Longer Term Research Priorities

- Library of realistic data/methods to resolve regulatory issues
  - Replace data that is out of date, excessively conservative, etc.
- Research to support NRC's timely review of YM licensing app.
- Technologies to improve plant performance & reliability (e.g., I&C)
- Technologies for generic regulatory improvement (e.g., RIR)
- Materials degradation, crack growth, inspection/mitigation/repair
- High Burnup Fuels
- Advanced reactor work to support licensing applications
- Monitor industry research on human-machine interface

ACRS 11-02 38



# **New Regulatory Framework & Future Plant Research Needs**

ACRS Subcommittee Meeting

November 6, 2002

Adrian Heymer, NEI

(202-739-8094, e-mail [aph@nei.org](mailto:aph@nei.org))



## **Need for a New Framework**

- Adjust & improve regulatory safety focus
  - Risk-analyses, operating experience and new technical information indicate that regulations may not be correctly focused on those matters that have safety significance
- Current regime based on LWR technology
- Renewed interest in non-LWR designs provides impetus for a technology neutral regulatory approach
- Change management & cultural issues



## Development of New Framework

- NEI Task Force – Vendors, utilities, consultants developed NEI 02-02
  - Defines need & safety benefits
  - Principles & acceptance criteria
  - Regulatory bases and framework
  - Draft regulations to help identify & emphasize issues
  - Frame and emphasize policy and technical issues
  - Catalyst to start the discussion process
- Proposed rule language is secondary to the public discussion on the issues

NEI  
6

## Framework

- Strong PRA emphasis
- Two SSC categories
  - Safety-significant & industrial
    - ◆ SSC categorized using process based on risk-insights – Similar to Option 2
  - Programmatic requirements only focus on safety-significant equipment
- Minimal change to design & configuration control processes
- Focus is on new plants
  - Potential for use by existing plants providing provisions are satisfied

NEI  
6

## Baseline Cornerstones

- Modeled on ROP Framework & Cornerstones
  - Initiating events & prevention
  - Mitigation
  - Functional barriers to radionuclide release
  - Emergency preparedness
  - Safeguards – physical security
  - Radiation safety
  - Worker radiation safety
  - Defense-in-depth
- Design, mitigation, operational, administrative elements

NEI

## Mitigation

- For LWRs
  - Design to assure that initiating events (AOOs, PDBEs & PPEs) have mean CDF  $<10^{-4}/\text{yr}$
  - Mean Large Release Frequency from AOOs, PDBEs, PPEs, & EPBEs  $<10^{-5}/\text{yr}$
- For non-LWRs – criteria to be determined in design approval activities
- Need for plant performance monitoring, configuration controls & condition monitoring

NEI

## Barriers to Radionuclide Release (Containment)


- Focus on functional barrier requirement not terminology
- Sufficient functional barriers to radionuclide release to assure mean frequency of a Large Release from all initiating events defined in the regulations  $<10^{-5}/\text{yr}$ 
  - Large Release
    - ◆ Release of volatile radionuclides that could result in a prompt fatality to a member of the general public

NEI

## Defense-in-Depth

- Should be defined
- Integration of :
  - Process,
  - Probabilistic insights, and
  - Application of deterministic design and operational features
    - ◆ Compensate for events that have high uncertainty and significant consequences

NEI



## Examples of New Framework

- EQ (§50.49), ECCS (§50.46 & App. K) not replicated in new Part
  - Incorporated into design specifications that, when implemented, satisfy mean probability requirements
- Codes & Standards
  - General requirement relating to use of consensus codes and standards
    - ◆ No equivalent regulation to §50.55a.
  - Applicable codes & standards for safety-significant equipment approved in design approval/licensing process
    - ◆ Listed in design specific Reg. Guides & licensee FSARs
    - ◆ Controlled through §50.59

**NEI**

## Use & Approval of Non-US Codes, Standards & Designs

- Establish protocols with foreign national nuclear regulatory agencies to exchange information on designs, codes and standards that have not been approved for use in the US.
- Need for reciprocity
- NRC review should take into consideration information and approvals made by foreign national regulatory agencies
- Long range activity for establishing reciprocity in approvals of reactor designs
  - Secondary to the establishment of protocols for taking credit for technical reviews by foreign regulatory agencies

NEI

## Potential Areas for Additional Research

- Issues identified in the development and implementation of technology neutral NRC requirements
  - What are acceptable and unacceptable uncertainties?
    - ◆ Define key uncertainties
  - Risk metrics for non-LWRs that reflect the intent of the LWR surrogate safety goals of CDF and LERF
    - ◆ Acceptance criteria and importance measures
  - Determination of early/late radionuclide release methodologies

NEI

## Potential Areas for Additional Research

- Materials issues, as identified through pre-application process
  - New cladding materials
  - New nuclear fuel configurations
- As identified by the periodic NRC-industry interactions and regulatory interactions on pre-applications
- Scope of research defined by market interest, issues raised in pre-application process & in operational feedback
  - Unique reactor component designs or component materials that US licensees wish to use



## Example of Potential Research Needs Linked to a Specific Reactor Design – Westinghouse IRIS



## EXAMPLES OF IRIS RESEARCH PROGRAM NEEDS

---

### Testing

#### In-Vessel Components

- Helical steam generators (e.g., T&H behavior, parallel channel stability)
- Immersed spool pumps (bearing and insulating material for nuclear applications qualification)

#### Integral Effects

- Response of thermal-hydraulically coupled vessel/containment to small and medium LOCAs



10/29/02 VG 1



## EXAMPLES OF IRIS RESEARCH PROGRAM NEEDS (Cont'd)

---

### Analysis

Assessment and Development of coupled evaluation models for integral systems

### Operation

Advanced control and diagnostic systems

- Silicon carbide in-core instrumentation
- Electromagnetic acoustic transducers

### Licensing

Risk informed regulation



10/29/02 VG 2

