



Meeting on Criteria to Review Alternative Sites

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
January 28, 2003

1

WELCOME

- Meeting Format
- Ground Rules
- Agenda Overview

2

Purpose of Meeting

- Why Hold This Meeting
- Issue: Alternative Site Reviews
- Benefits in Solving the Issue
- What We Plan to Accomplish Today

3

To Accomplish Today

- Obtain your views on criteria to consider in reviewing alternative sites
- Summarize the issues and views
- Decide how to proceed from here

4

The Task Before Us

- Definition of Regulatory Issue
 - History and Background
- How the NRC's Current Regulatory Structure Addresses the Issue
- Options

5

The Regulatory Issue

- Fulfill National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] requirement to review alternatives
- Why an Issue?

6

History and Background

- Seabrook Litigation (1973-1979)
- 1978 Policy Statement
- Early Rulemakings (1980s)
- Current Need (Early Site Permit Applications)

7

Current Regulatory Structure for Alternative Sites

- Rules:
10 CFR Parts 2, 50, 51 and 52
- Guidance
Regulatory Guides 4.2 and 4.7
- Environmental Standard Review Plan
NUREG-1555

8

Options

- No Action
- Generic Communication
- Revise Regulatory Guidance
- Revise Environmental Standard Review Plan
- Rulemaking

9

Summary

- The Regulatory Issue
- Current Regulatory Structure for Alternative Sites
- Options

10



11

Selecting Candidate Sites

- Focus on Process
- Focus on Sites
- Combination

12

Region of Interest

- What is a region of interest?
- Why have a region of interest?
- Consider: area, size, location

13

NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVE SITES

- Should the NRC specify the number of sites to be considered?
- If so, options might include:
 - Approach taken in 1980 proposed rule
 - Approach taken by prospective ESP applicant

14

INTRODUCTION OF SITES BY OTHER PERSONS

- Should the NRC specify when non-applicants may introduce candidate sites?
 - Such requirements may be inappropriate.
 - Nevertheless, the 1980 proposed rule included some conditions.

15

OBVIOUSLY SUPERIOR TEST

- First determine if an alternative site is environmentally preferable considering biological resources, land use, socioeconomics, and population.
- Then determine if it's also obviously superior considering project economics, technology, and institutional factors.

16

Emergency Preparedness (EP)

- Currently part of safety review.
- Options for alternative sites:
 - Continue current practice
 - Consider EP in environmental review:
 - Require description of significant impediments
 - Establish exclusionary standards
 - Weigh degree of impediment, with other factors

17

Emergency Preparedness (EP)

- Should the NRC consider EP in alternative site reviews and, if so, how?
- One option is to continue current practice - review EP for the proposed site as part of the safety review
- On the other hand, if EP considerations are incorporated into alternative site reviews, the options might include
 - -Require description of significant impediments at alternative sites
 - - Establish exclusionary standards for alternative sites (go - no go test)
- -Weigh the degree of impediment, along with other factors, in determining whether an alternative site is obviously superior

18

Comparing Proposed Site and Alternative Sites

- Obviously superior standard:
 - NRC's approach in the past; documented in the 1980 proposed rule.
 - NRC would reject the application only if it finds an alternative site obviously superior.

19



20