

**Summary of Feedback
Public Meeting on Recommendations in NUREG-2150**

June 5, 2013

Key comments and questions received at the meeting from stakeholders are summarized below. The NRC staff will consider feedback received at the public meeting. The NRC staff will not be providing formal responses to comments and questions.

- Rod McCullum from NEI asked whether or not the Risk Management Task Force work being done for spent fuel storage was taking into consideration the petition for rulemaking (PRM) that NEI recently submitted regarding spent fuel storage. The staff responded that the staff was aware of the PRM and a group had been put together to address the PRM. In context of the RMTF work, the PRM would be a specific item that would be considered under the actions that would be taken for the RMRF, as currently being thought out.
- Marvin Lewis made numerous comments, several of which the staff stated were outside the meeting's scope. For example, he expressed his expectation/hope to see information in a report about first responders for incidents involving waste, including training and numbers such as costs. He also expressed an opinion that aspects dealing with concentration of spent fuel in pools and dry cask storage should be looked at, as well as interaction in events like what happened at Fukushima. Additionally, Mr. Lewis stated that there were additional safety concerns at multi-plant sites and multi-unit and high-density spent fuel pools that were made obvious by the Fukushima accident. He stated that he hopes the NRC will look into these issues.
- Bijan Najafi asked why decommissioning was not included in the NUREG-2150 recommendations and whether the NRC staff was going to address it. The NRC staff mentioned that it would let the Commission know that decommissioning and other issues were not addressed in NUREG-2150, but does not otherwise plan to address them in the current effort.
- Dan Cronin asked whether the NRC staff has a regulations.gov docket number for this effort. The NRC staff mentioned that it did not have a docket number. Then, Dan suggested that it would be beneficial to have one because the documents that are generated for this effort can be placed in the regulations.gov docket and it would make it easier to access the information. The NRC staff stated that it would look into creating a docket at regulations.gov.
- Ruth Thomas asked a few questions regarding the scope and origin of this effort. Moreover, she asked numerous questions that were outside the scope of the meeting and, therefore, the appropriate NRC staff to answer her questions were not present at the meeting. The NRC staff committed to sending Ms. Thomas (1) a copy of NUREG-2150, (2) information about the 10 CFR 2.802 petition for rulemaking process, and (3) information on how to contact a staff from the Office of Public Affairs to respond to her out-of-scope questions. Ms. Thomas mentioned that she would like to have on the record that (1) the appropriate NRC staff was not present at the meeting to answer her questions, and (2) all nuclear power plants should be shut down.