December 14, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Shana R. Helton, Chief
Rulemaking and International Projects Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Tara Inverso, Project Manager **/RA/**
Rulemaking and International Projects Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 2, 2010 PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS PLANT SPECIFIC EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) held a Category 3 public meeting on December 2, 2010 to discuss the industry's project plan to provide plant specific Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) performance assessments to the NRC. The workshop was held in Rockville, MD at the Bethesda North Marriott Hotel and Conference Center. The meeting was attended by 24 individuals. Additional individuals remotely participated in the meeting through audio teleconferencing. Since the NRC was not accepting public comments, a transcript of the meeting was not obtained.

The NRC staff did not present any material. The industry provided a presentation which discussed the industry evaluation, including survey approach, process of determining clad performance margin, and the plant grouping process.

1. Industry Presentation

The basic approach for this project was summarized. First, plant Analyses of Record (AOR) will be surveyed. Raw margins would then be established by determining allowable local oxidation relative to research results. Margins to research results would be determined subsequent to grouping plants into similar categories. The presenter stated that it is likely that no additional assessment calculations would be required to demonstrate plant ECCS performance results in oxidation below the research results, and that credits would be identified and applied. (Such credits include credits for the use of Cathcart/Pawel, best estimate methods, decay heat, and reduced PCT.)

The industry presented various survey examples, specifically a pressurized-water reactor with Zircaloy-4 cladding, a Babcock & Wilcox reactor design, and a boiling-water reactor design. The presenter noted that the details and values for the examples provided were not from specific plants, but instead were numbers generated to demonstrate what the deliverable will detail. These example spreadsheets are provided in the industry presentation Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession no. ML103410136).

The industry also discussed the grouping of plants into similar categories. Because the results of the AOR loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) survey would provide the major basis for the grouping process, grouping details could not be provided at this time. The industry indicated that reactors will be categorized according to physical characteristics such as core size, loop configuration, and ECCS differences. Additional grouping could be necessary based on margin results identified by the AOR LOCA survey.

The industry noted that the report would be issued by the pressurized-water reactor and boiling-water reactor owner's groups, combined under a Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) cover letter. This report would describe the groups of reactors, and describe why and how the groups meet the research findings.

The industry also presented the milestone schedule. Under this schedule, vendors would issue the draft clad performance margin assessment report to the owner's groups and NEI in March 2011. Subsequently, NEI would provide the assessment to the NRC in April 2011.

2. Post-Presentation Discussion

The NRC staff meeting attendees participated in a caucus period to consider the presentation, and generate questions and comments. The NRC staff then returned to the meeting and asked various questions, including those regarding the use of credits, the development of a line to bound the plot of pin power versus burnup, and whether or not any new calculations would be performed as part of this assessment.

The NRC staff commented that, in parallel to this effort, work on the generic letter continues. Additionally, the NRC noted that any information provided through this project would be subject to audit performed by the NRC staff.

3. Need for Follow-on Interaction

Both the industry and the NRC expressed the need for additional interaction between now and the completion of this project, perhaps at a six week to two month interval. Further, the milestone schedule established by the industry contains a placeholder for a May 2011, post-submittal meeting.

The industry indicated that teleconference or videoconference would be preferable due to the cost of travel. The NRC notes that additional interaction will be formally noticed and be open to all external stakeholders.

Enclosure:
Attendee List

The industry also discussed the grouping of plants into similar categories. Because the results of the AOR loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) survey would provide the major basis for the grouping process, grouping details could not be provided at this time. The industry indicated that reactors will be categorized according to physical characteristics such as core size, loop configuration, and ECCS differences. Additional grouping could be necessary based on margin results identified by the AOR LOCA survey.

The industry noted that the report would be issued by the pressurized-water reactor and boiling-water reactor owner's groups, combined under a Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) cover letter. This report would describe the groups of reactors, and describe why and how the groups meet the research findings.

The industry also presented the milestone schedule. Under this schedule, vendors would issue the draft clad performance margin assessment report to the owner's groups and NEI in March 2011. Subsequently, NEI would provide the assessment to the NRC in April 2011.

2. Post-Presentation Discussion

The NRC staff meeting attendees participated in a caucus period to consider the presentation, and generate questions and comments. The NRC staff then returned to the meeting and asked various questions, including those regarding the use of credits, the development of a line to bound the plot of pin power versus burnup, and whether or not any new calculations would be performed as part of this assessment.

The NRC staff commented that, in parallel to this effort, work on the generic letter continues. Additionally, the NRC noted that any information provided through this project would be subject to audit performed by the NRC staff.

3. Need for Follow-on Interaction

Both the industry and the NRC expressed the need for additional interaction between now and the completion of this project, perhaps at a six week to two month interval. Further, the milestone schedule established by the industry contains a placeholder for a May 2011, post-submittal meeting.

The industry indicated that teleconference or videoconference would be preferable due to the cost of travel. The NRC notes that additional interaction will be formally noticed and be open to all external stakeholders.

Enclosure:
Attendee List

DISTRIBUTION:
PUBLIC RidsOgcMailCenter RidsNrrDpr

ADAMS Accession No: ML103470106 (Summary); ML103410136 (Slides)

OFFICE	DPR:PM	DPR:BC
NAME	TInverso	SHelton
DATE	12/13 /2010	12/14 /2010

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

LIST OF MEETING ATTENDEES, DECEMBER 2, 2010

*** Participated via teleconference**

Name	Organization
Ralph Landry	NRC
Tara Inverso	NRC
Maurice (Mo) Dingler	PWROG/WCNOC
Mike Crowthers	BWROG/PPL Susquehanna
Kurt F. Flaig	Dominion
Darius Ahrar	Westinghouse
John Voglewede	NRC
Gordon Clefton	NEI
Adam Gendelman	NRC
David Beaulieu	NRC
Tom Eichenberg	TVA
Mitch Nissly	Westinghouse
Jim Smith	PWROG/ Westinghouse
Ken Yueh	EPRI
Bob Schomaker	PWROG/AREVA
Kurshad Muftuoglu	GE Hitachi
Bert M. Dunn	AREVA
Don Notigan	BWROG
Harold Scott	NRC
Edwin Lyman	UCS
Paul Clifford	NRC
Chris Brown	NRC
Michelle Flanagan	NRC
Cynthia Tully*	SouthernCo
Ken Petersen*	WCNOC
Tom Remick*	SCE
Dana Knee*	Dominion
Ryan Joyce*	SouthernCo
Adel Alapour	SouthernCo

ENCLOSURE