

October 12, 2012

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

FROM: Alysia Bone, Project Manager */RA/*  
Probabilistic Risk Assessment Branch  
Division of Risk Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF AUGUST 29, 2012, PUBLIC MEETING ON  
CONSIDERATION OF ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES WITHIN  
THE NRC'S REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

On August 29, 2012, a Category 3 public meeting took place between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and representatives from several organizations and members of the public at the NRC Headquarters, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. Enclosure 1 contains a list of attendees who participated either in-person or via GoToMeeting. The purpose of this meeting was to inform the public of the NRC staff effort to develop a Commission (Secretary of the Commission (SECY)) paper that will provide the Commission background information on current approaches for considering offsite property damage (e.g., loss of property due to radiological contamination) in regulatory analyses, backfitting, and environmental analyses. This meeting was the second of two Category 3 public meetings on this topic; the first was held on May 24, 2012.

The meeting began with the NRC staff's delivering a presentation on consideration of offsite property damage within the agency's regulatory framework. The slides for this presentation are available in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession No. ML12241A316. After going over meeting logistics (e.g., evacuation plan, feedback forms, ground rules), the NRC staff began by informing the meeting attendees of the task to develop a SECY paper on consideration of economic consequences caused by offsite property damage arising from the unintended release of radioactivity to the environment. The staff also discussed the status of this paper. Staff members informed meeting participants that they had submitted this SECY paper, SECY-12-0110, "Consideration of Economic Consequences within the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Regulatory Framework," to the Commission earlier in August and that a commission briefing was scheduled on this topic for September 11, 2012.

CONTACT: Alysia Bone, RES/DRA  
301-251-7602

The presentation continued by the NRC stating that it considers offsite property damage in three different analyses: regulatory analysis, backfitting analysis, and environmental analyses conducted according to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). For each of these analyses, the NRC outlined the regulatory driver, the purpose, and the process. Next, the NRC staff summarized the three options proposed in SECY-12-0110, including the pros and cons for each of these options. The NRC concluded the presentation by describing the staff's recommendation for enhanced consistency of regulatory analysis guidance. The staff then made the transition to the discussion portion of the meeting by providing three suggested focus questions.

There was a considerable amount of public interest in this subject. Two groups of stakeholders—Dr. Anthony Apostolides and Ipatia Apostolides, and Drs. Richard Denning and Thomas Kress—chose to submit written comments prior to this meeting. The staff provided printed copies of these statements to in-person meeting participants and placed these documents in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML12242A209 and ML12241A168. While there was no official comment period for this SECY paper, the staff emphasized to the meeting participants that it welcomed and appreciated their feedback. Staff also told participants that they could contact Carolyn Siu ([Carolyn.Siu@nrc.gov](mailto:Carolyn.Siu@nrc.gov)) or Alysia Bone ([Alysia.Bone@nrc.gov](mailto:Alysia.Bone@nrc.gov)) for information on how to submit written input directly to the Commission.

Ace Hoffman was among the first members of the public to ask a question to the staff during the August 29th meeting, and he inquired why the SECY paper focused on offsite property damage and did not consider implications to life and safety. The staff clarified that the scope of the SECY paper presumed that the NRC provides rigorous protection for public health and safety and, thus, focused on the parts of the regulatory framework that concerned economic consequences following the unintended release of radionuclides to the environment.

Mary Lampert of Pilgrim Watch provided several comments on the staff's current practice and emphasized a different view on the pros and cons of the staff's proposed options than those in SECY-12-0110. Specifically, she said that Options 1 and 2 were not responsive to stakeholder concerns. Pilgrim Watch later submitted additional written comments for the Commission's consideration, which can be found on the NRC [public website](#).

Dr. Richard Denning described his written feedback, which recommended that the NRC pursue Option 3, exploring the merits of changes to the regulatory framework, with a particular emphasis on formulating a policy statement to address offsite property damage.

Dr. Ed Lyman of the Union of Concerned Scientists commented that the SECY should contain quantitative examples and information to assist the Commission in its direction, a sentiment Torgen Johnson of San Onofre Safety also expressed. Donna Gilmore of San Onofre Safety also provided comments regarding ports in California, and she supplemented these verbal comments with a written statement, found in ADAMS at Accession No. ML12251A005.

Furthermore, Dr. Vojin Joksimovich provided written comments following the August 29th meeting; these are in ADAMS at Accession No. ML12256A662.

K. Coyne

- 3 -

In summary, several of the comments stakeholders made during the public meeting expressed a desire for greater transparency in the way the NRC calculates potential economic consequences, as well as a preference for Option 3 in SECY-12-0110.

In summary, several of the comments stakeholders made during the public meeting expressed a desire for greater transparency in the way the NRC calculates potential economic consequences, as well as a preference for Option 3 in SECY-12-0110.

**ADAMS Accession No.: ML12283A369**

OFFICE	RES/DRA/PRAB	Tech Editor	RES/DRA/PRAB
NAME	A. Bone	J. Dougherty (via email)	K. Coyne
DATE	10/12/12	10/12/12	10/12/12

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**