

November 23, 2011

MEMORANDUM TO: Kevin Coyne, Branch Chief
Probabilistic Risk Assessment Branch
Division of Risk Analysis
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Anders Gilbertson, Project Coordinator */RA/*
Performance and Reliability Branch
Division of Risk Analysis
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE SITE SELECTION
CRITERIA FOR THE NRC'S FULL-SCOPE COMPREHENSIVE
SITE LEVEL 3 PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT PROJECT

On November 10, 2011, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff met with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), the Union of Concerned Scientists, various licensees, consultants, and other members of the public at NRC headquarters to discuss the site selection criteria for the NRC's full-scope comprehensive site Level 3 probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) project. The meeting announcement and agenda were issued on October 27, 2011 and posted on the NRC's external web page (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML113000114 and ML113000121).

The purpose of the meeting was to (1) provide the background and objectives of the full-scope comprehensive site Level 3 PRA project and (2) obtain external stakeholder views on the draft criteria for selecting a site for the project. The discussions with external stakeholders included several issues related to the draft site selection criteria and the planning and logistics for a potential volunteer licensee.

NRC Presentation on the Level 3 PRA Project and the Draft Site Selection Criteria

The staff gave a presentation that described the purpose, objective, and goal of the NRC's full-scope comprehensive site level 3 PRA project. The staff presentation covered the following topics: background, current activities, and the draft site selection criteria. Enclosure 2 provides the associated slides. Following the staff's presentation, external stakeholders were invited to participate and give feedback on the staff's draft site selection criteria and other relevant issues.

CONTACT: Anders Gilbertson, RES/DRA
301-251-7592

External Stakeholder Discussion

The open discussion with external stakeholders consisted primarily of a discussion of the draft site selection criteria proposed by the staff and a discussion of issues associated with planning and licensee participation.

In general, external stakeholders were supportive of the staff's draft site selection criteria, though they did recommend some additional criteria, as well as reprioritization of some of the criteria. Some of the specific recommendations provided by external stakeholders included:

1. Increased priority should be given to a site that is in a fairly populated area and that also includes agricultural use.
2. The site should not be within 50 miles of the U.S. border so that information does not have to be collected from other countries.
3. Risk significance should be considered as a criterion.
4. The staff should pick a site with reactors that are of similar design to those at Fukushima Daiichi, so the results of the study can be validated against an actual severe accident.
5. Increased priority should be given to plants that were analyzed as part of the State-of-the-Art Reactor Consequence Analyses (SOARCA) project.
6. More insights can be obtained if there are shared systems between the different units on the site.

External stakeholders also expressed opinions or raised questions regarding the planning of the site selection process and licensee participation, including (1) how new areas of research would be handled; (2) the calculation engine to be used for the quantification of the risk models; (3) whether the project would serve to help inform the development of standards; (4) the transfer and availability of licensee information; (5) how a volunteer licensee might benefit from participating in the project; and (6) the regulatory applicability of the PRA model that results from the project.

Additionally, external stakeholders expressed concern that the current timeframe for selecting a site (by the end of calendar year 2011) poses a challenge for securing a licensee commitment and that more detailed information about the anticipated level of licensee involvement would help greatly.

Enclosures:

1. List of Meeting Attendees
2. Presentation slides (ADAMS Accession No. ML113130254)

The open discussion with external stakeholders consisted primarily of a discussion of the draft site selection criteria proposed by the staff and a discussion of issues associated with planning and licensee participation.

In general, external stakeholders were supportive of the staff's draft site selection criteria, though they did recommend some additional criteria, as well as reprioritization of some of the criteria. Some of the specific recommendations provided by external stakeholders included:

1. Increased priority should be given to a site that is in a fairly populated area and that also includes agricultural use.
2. The site should not be within 50 miles of the U.S. border so that information does not have to be collected from other countries.
3. Risk significance should be considered as a criterion.
4. The staff should pick a site with reactors that are of similar design to those at Fukushima Daiichi, so the results of the study can be validated against an actual severe accident.
5. Increased priority should be given to plants that were analyzed as part of the State-of-the-Art Reactor Consequence Analyses (SOARCA) project.
6. More insights can be obtained if there are shared systems between the different units on the site.

External stakeholders also expressed opinions or raised questions regarding the planning of the site selection process and licensee participation, including (1) how new areas of research would be handled; (2) the calculation engine to be used for the quantification of the risk models; (3) whether the project would serve to help inform the development of standards; (4) the transfer and availability of licensee information; (5) how a volunteer licensee might benefit from participating in the project; and (6) the regulatory applicability of the PRA model that results from the project.

Additionally, external stakeholders expressed concern that the current timeframe for selecting a site (by the end of calendar year 2011) poses a challenge for securing a licensee commitment and that more detailed information about the anticipated level of licensee involvement would help greatly.

Enclosures:

1. List of Meeting Attendees
2. Presentation slides (ADAMS Accession No. ML113130254)

DISTRIBUTION:

AKuritzky, RES	DCoe, RES	MStutzke, RES	NSiu, RES
KArmstrong, RES	PAppignani, RES	JSchaperow, RES	CTinkler, RES
JGitter, NRR	MEvans, NRR	SLaur, NRR	CAder, NRO
DDube, NRO	KCompton, NMSS	DDamon, NMSS	RSullivan, NSIR

ADAMS Accession No.: ML113200061

OFFICE	RES/DRA/PRB	RES/DRA/PRAB	RES/DRA
NAME	A. Gilbertson	K. Coyne (A. Kuritzky for)	R. Correia
DATE	11/16/11	11/22/11	11/23/11

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Public Meeting to Discuss Site Selection Criteria for the
Full-Scope Comprehensive Site Level 3 Probabilistic Risk Assessment
November 10th, 2011 2:30PM – 4:15PM
21 Church Street, Rockville, MD

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Email Address</u>
K. Coyne	NRC/RES/DRA	kevin.coyne@nrc.gov
A. Gilbertson	NRC/RES/DRA	anders.gilbertson@nrc.gov
G. DeMoss	NRC/RES/DRA	gary.demoss@nrc.gov
A. Kuritzky	NRC/RES/DRA	alan.kuritzky@nrc.gov
L. Killian	NRC/RES/DRA	lauren.killian@nrc.gov
P. Appignani	NRC/RES/DRA	peter.appignani@nrc.gov
B. Holian	NRC/RES/FO	brian.holian@nrc.gov
N. Siu	NRC/RES/DRA	nathan.siu@nrc.gov
D. Aird	NRC/RES/DRA	david.aird@nrc.gov
D. Helton	NRC/RES/DRA	donald.helton@nrc.gov
S. Sancaktar	NRC/RES/DRA	selim.sancaktar@nrc.gov
M. Li	NRC/RES/DRA	ming.li@nrc.gov
E. Chelliah	NRC/RES/DRA	erulappa.chelliah@nrc.gov
B. Beasley	NRC/RES/DRA	benjamin.beasley@nrc.gov
E. Fuller	NRC/NRO/DSRA	edward.fuller@nrc.gov
A. Grady	NRC/NRO/DSRA	anne-marie.grady@nrc.gov
L. Lund	NRC/NRR/DORL	louise.lund@nrc.gov
S. Laur	NRC/NRR/DRA	steven.laur@nrc.gov
B. Bradley	Nuclear Energy Institute	reb@nei.org
E. Lyman	Union of Concerned Scientists	elyman@ucsusa.org
S. Nass	Westinghouse	nasssa@westinghouse.com
N. Chapman	Bechtel	ngchapma@bechtel.com
R. Fine	First Energy Nuclear Operating Company	krfine@firstenergycorp.com
S. Levinson	AREVA	stanley.levinson@areva.com
J. LaChance	Sandia National Laboratories	jllacha@snl.gov
J. Gabor	ERIN Engineering	jrgabor@erineng.com
G. Krueger	Exelon	gregory.krueger@exeloncorp.com
R. Grantom	South Texas Project Electric Generating Station	

DRA = Division of Risk Analysis (RES)/Division of Risk Assessment (NRR)

DORL = Division of Operating Reactor Licensing

DSRA = Division of Safety Systems and Risk Assessment

NRR = Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

NRO = Office of New Reactors

RES = Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research