

July 22, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: David C. Lew, Chief
Probabilistic Risk Analysis Branch
Division of Risk Analysis & Applications
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Mary Drouin */RA/*
Probabilistic Risk Analysis Branch
Division of Risk Analysis & Applications
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF A PUBLIC MEETING WITH INTERESTED
STAKEHOLDERS REGARDING THE STAFF'S PLAN TO DEVELOP A
PROGRAM PLAN TO MAKE A RISK-INFORMED PERFORMANCE-
BASED REVISION TO 10 CFR PART 50

DATE AND TIME: August 25, 2005
1:30pm to 4:30 pm

LOCATION: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Two White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Room T-9A1

PURPOSE: To discuss and solicit stakeholder input regarding the staff's effort "to develop a formal program plan to make a risk-informed and performance-based revision to 10 CFR Part 50, including revisions to the applicable Regulatory Guides, Standard Review Plans, or other guidance documents" per the Commission's staff requirements memorandum of May 9, 2005 (ML #051290351).

This meeting was originally noticed on July 15, 2005 (ML # 051960340). An agenda of the meeting is attached. Also attached is a list of topics (questions) that the staff is soliciting stakeholder input.

Persons other than NRC staff and NRC contractors interested in making a presentation at the meeting should notify Mary Drouin, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, MS: T-10E50, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, (301) 415-6675, e-mail: mxd@nrc.gov.

CATEGORY* This meeting is a Category 2 public meeting. The public is invited to participate in this meeting by discussing technical issues with NRC staff at designated points during the meeting.

*Meetings between the NRC technical staff and external stakeholders are open for interested members of the public, petitioners, interveners, or other parties to attend as observers pursuant to "Commission Policy Statement on Enhancing Public Participation in NRC Meetings," 67 *Federal Register Notice* 36920, May 28, 2002.

PARTICIPANTS:

NRC

M.Tschiltz
J.Monninger
M.Rubin
H.Hamzehee

M.Leach
M.Drouin
D. Harrison

NEI

A. Pietrangelo
A.Heymer

*Meetings between the NRC technical staff and external stakeholders are open for interested members of the public, petitioners, interveners, or other parties to attend as observers pursuant to "Commission Policy Statement on Enhancing Public Participation in NRC Meetings," 67 *Federal Register Notice* 36920, May 28, 2002.

PARTICIPANTS: NRC
 M.Tschiltz M.Leach
 J.Monninger M.Drouin
 M.Rubin D. Harrison
 H.Hamzehee

NEI
 A. Pietrangelo
 A.Heymer

Distribution:

Hard Copy	JMoore	SCollins
DAA Chron	CPaperiello	WTravers
PRAB r/f	JWiggins	JCaldwell
ACRS (M.Snodderly)	WBorchardt	BMallett
JDyer	JMonninger	DLew
CAder	HHamzehee	OPA
MDrouin	MMayfield	DMatthews
JLyons	CGrimes	WBeckner
TMartin	MRubin	DHarrison
MTschiltz	LDudes	PMNS
GMizuno	MLaur	
MAitcheson		

DOCUMENT NAME: g:\MDrouin\meeting notice.srm part 50 agenda topics 8-25-05.wpd
 OAR in ADAMS? (Y or N) Y ADAMS ACCESSION NO.: ML052030442 TEMPLATE NO. NRC-001
 Publicly Available? (Y or N) Y DATE OF RELEASE TO PUBLIC Immediate SENSITIVE? N
To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	*DRAA/PRAB		*DRAA/PRAB		*DRAA/PRAB	
NAME	DWatkins		MDrouin		DLew	
DATE	7/22/2005		7/22/2005		7/22/2005	

*SISP/Review		*SISP/Review	
DLew		MDrouin	
7/22/2005		7/22/2005	

(RES File Code) RES _____

PUBLIC MEETING
AUGUST 25, 2005

STAFF'S PLAN TO DEVELOP A PROGRAM PLAN TO MAKE A RISK-INFORMED
PERFORMANCE-BASED REVISION TO 10 CFR PART 50

Conference Room T-9A1

Agenda

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1:30 to 1:45 pm	Introduction
1:45 to 2:15 pm	NRC presentation
2:15 to 2:45 pm	Stakeholders presentations (if requested)
2:45 to 3:00 pm	BREAK
3:00 to 4:00 pm	Open Discussion (see attached list of topics for discussion)
4:00 to 4:30 pm	Meeting wrapup

PUBLIC MEETING
AUGUST 25, 2005

STAFF'S PLAN TO DEVELOP A PROGRAM PLAN TO MAKE A RISK-INFORMED
PERFORMANCE-BASED REVISION TO 10 CFR PART 50: STAFF SOLICITING INPUT ON THE
FOLLOWING LIST OF TOPICS (QUESTIONS)

1. In developing a risk-informed performance-based revision to 10 CFR Part 50 (and associated regulatory guidance documents), the following possible approach has been identified:
 - (1) Revise each existing regulation (and associated regulatory guidance documents) one at a time, and
 - (2) Write a new alternate technology-neutral "Part 50" (and associated regulatory guidance documents)What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach? Should only one of the proposed paths be pursued? Is there another approach of interest? Would a current licensee be interested in changing their licensing basis to this new Part 50?
2. Given the first path identified in #1, should the entire Part 50 (and associated regulatory guidance documents) be revised? If so, why? Which regulations would be the most beneficial to revise? What would be the anticipated safety benefits? Which regulations in particular are stakeholders interested in having revised?
3. Given the first path identified in #1, should only the technical regulations be risk-informed and performance-based? What are the benefits in risk-informing performance-basing the "administrative" regulations or a specific administrative regulation? For example, 50.2, 50.59, 50.73, 50.92?
4. Given the first path identified in #1, are there any particular regulations that do not need to be revised, but their associated regulatory guides, for example, need to be risk-informed and performance-based? What are the safety benefits associated with revising these guides? Which ones in particular are stakeholders interested in having revised?
5. The first path identified in #1 maintains the focus for LWRs. For the second path, should the focus be for LWRs or should it be applicable for all/any reactor technology, that is, should it be technology-neutral, or should it be focused to another specific reactor technology?
6. In developing the associated regulatory guides for a technology-neutral "Part 50," should the first guides be LWR focused, or some other reactor technology focused (e.g., PBMR)? Is a stakeholder interested in a specific reactor technology?
7. In the short-term (2006-2008), what are industry's needs, expectations and priorities regarding the implementation of existing and future risk-informed activities?
8. To achieve a risk-informed performance-based regulatory structure, industry work is also needed (e.g., codes, standards, industry guidance documents, training, research). What work is industry pursuing or planning to pursue to support development of a risk-informed performance-based regulatory structure?