December 2, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Marissa G. Bailey, Deputy Director
Special Projects and Technical
Support Directorate
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

THRU: Patricia Silva, Chief **/RA/**
Technical Support Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Soly I. Soto, Chemical Engineer **/RA/**
Mixed Oxide and Uranium
Deconversion Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE MEETING WITH INDUSTRY ON THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S DRAFT PAPER COMPARING INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSES FOR FUEL CYCLE FACILITIES AND PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR REACTORS

On November 5, 2010, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff met with representatives from Nuclear Energy Institute and industry, to discuss the NRC's draft paper comparing Integrated Safety Analysis for fuel cycle facilities and Probabilistic Risk Assessment for reactors.

Please see the enclosed meeting summary for more details (Enclosure 1). The meeting attendance list is also enclosed (Enclosure 2). The attachments do not contain any official use only material.

Enclosures:
As stated

MEMORANDUM TO: Marissa G. Bailey, Deputy Director
Special Projects and Technical
Support Directorate
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

THRU: Patricia Silva, Chief **/RA/**
Technical Support Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Soly I. Soto, Chemical Engineer **/RA/**
Mixed Oxide and Uranium
Deconversion Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE MEETING WITH INDUSTRY ON THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S DRAFT PAPER COMPARING INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSES FOR FUEL CYCLE FACILITIES AND PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR REACTORS

On November 5, 2010, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff met with representatives from Nuclear Energy Institute and industry, to discuss the NRC's draft paper comparing Integrated Safety Analysis for fuel cycle facilities and Probabilistic Risk Assessment for reactors.

Please see the enclosed meeting summary for more details (Enclosure 1). The meeting attendance list is also enclosed (Enclosure 2). The attachments do not contain any official use only material.

Enclosures:
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:

FCSS r/f	PMNS	C. Haney, NMSS	D. Dorman, NMSS
M. Tschiltz, NMSS	P. Habighorst, NMSS	B. Smith, NMSS	M. Raddatz, NMSS
L. Campbell, NMSS	T. Hiltz, NMSS	L. Reyes, RII	V. McCree, RII
S. Vias, RII	A. Frazier, NMSS	M. Sykes, RII	J. Henson, RII
A. Gody, RII	E. Cobey, RII		

ML103280091

OFFICE:	**FCSS**	**FCSS**	**FCSS**
NAME:	SSoto	DDamon	PSilva
DATE:	11/19/2010	12/22/2010	12/2/2010

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING WITH INDUSTRY ON THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S DRAFT PAPER COMPARING INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSES FOR FUEL CYCLE FACILITIES AND PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR REACTORS

DATE November 5, 2010

PLACE Atlanta, Georgia

ATTENDEES See Enclosure 2

PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC's) draft paper comparing Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA) for fuel cycle facilities and Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) for reactors and obtain stakeholders insights and feedback.

DISCUSSION

The NRC staff presented an overview of the draft paper comparing ISAs and PRAs.

Industry proposed that the ISA-PRA paper separate the tasks mandated by the Staff Requirements Memoranda (SRMs) as:

1) an ISA-PRA comparison in the context of compliance and safety
2) the use of ISA and/or PRA in a Significance Determination Process (SDP)

Industry representatives also commented that although there were no technical mistakes in the paper, some statements could give a false impression that ISAs were deficient with respect to achieving acceptable safety. In other words, the paper does not strongly make the point that the existing ISAs provide adequate safety.

As requested by NRC staff, several comments were made on Section V Table 3 on grounds similar to the previous comment. Specifically, statements regarding the possibility of incorrect evaluation often apply to both PRA and ISA.

There was also a discussion of the differences in risk between fuel facility processes and nuclear reactors.

A comment was made that the section on SDP for the fuel cycle oversight process should mention methods other than quantitative for significance determination, especially in non-ISA areas.

The NRC staff requested that any comments on this paper be provided by November 19, 2010. Nuclear Energy Institute committed to submit a letter to the NRC before this date. The ISA/PRA comparison paper will be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards by December 15, 2010.

No regulatory decisions were made at the meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Meeting Attendees
November 5, 2010, ISA/PRA Draft Paper Discussion with Industry

Dennis Damon	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Marissa Bailey	NRC
Patricia Silva	NRC
Soly I. Soto	NRC
Christian Fisher	NRC
Mark A. Wolf	Honeywell
Jennifer Wheeler	NFS
Al Kennedy	GNF-A
Jim Kay	AREVA (AES)
Larry Parscale	Honeywell
Dealis Gwyn	MOX Services
William Gloersen	NRC
Janet Schlueter	Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)
Victor McCree	NRC
Michael Greeno	Honeywell
Nicole Coovert	NRC
Brian Wagner	NRC
Phill Reed	NRC
Chris Tripp	NRC
Larry Campbell	NRC
Dennis Hankle	GE-Hitachi
Steven Badder	AREVA
Kevin Morrissey	NRC
David Tiktinsky	NRC
Robert Link	AREVA
Doug Yates	MOX Services
Gerard Couture	Westinghouse
Dallas Gardner	Honeywell
Scott Murray	Global Nuclear Fuel
Chad Cramer	NRC
Tony Gody	NRC
Christopher Ryder	NRC
Jeannette Arce	NRC
James Hammelman	NRC
Cinthya Roman	NRC
Felix E. Gonzalez	NRC
Wendy Reed	NRC
Brian Smith	NRC