Advanced Reactor Stakeholder Public Meeting

February 20, 2020

Telephone Bridgeline: (888) 593-8429
Passcode: 6767863#
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:10 am</td>
<td>Opening Remarks and Agenda</td>
<td>NRC/NEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 – 9:45 am</td>
<td>Status of NRC readiness for non-LWRs and planned update of public website</td>
<td>Monninger/Hayes, NRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Nuclear Materials Management and Safeguards System (NMMSS) Overview</td>
<td>Shoemaker, NMSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30 am</td>
<td>NRC update on Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS)</td>
<td>Sutton, NRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:50 am</td>
<td>NEI Environmental Review Report</td>
<td>Austgen, NEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 – 11:00 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:45 am</td>
<td>Technology Inclusive Content of Applications Project (TICAP)</td>
<td>Afzali, Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Introduction of NRC Project on Severe Accident Phenomenology and Source Terms Calculations for Representative Designs</td>
<td>Schaperow, NRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Industry Priorities for Codes and Standards</td>
<td>Nichol, NEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Update on NRC Plan for Endorsement of Non-LWR PRA Standard</td>
<td>Phan, NRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:30 pm</td>
<td>Update from Department of Energy on Non-LWR topics including Micro Reactors</td>
<td>Sowinski, DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Update on Non-LWR Policy Issues</td>
<td>Cubbage/Reckley, NRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Physical Security Rulemaking Update</td>
<td>Valliere/Andrukat, NRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 3:45 pm</td>
<td>Emergency Planning Rulemaking Path Forward</td>
<td>Segala, NRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Future meeting planning and open discussion</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities for public comments and questions at designated times
Status of NRC Readiness for Non-LWRs and Planned Update of Public Website

• John Monninger and Michelle Hayes, NRC

– https://www.nrc.gov/reactors/operating/oversight/rop-enhancement.html
The Nuclear Materials Management and Safeguards System

Mirabelle Shoemaker
Material Control and Accounting Branch
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
The **Nuclear Materials Management and Safeguards System (NMMSS)**

- U.S. Government database for tracking physical inventory and nuclear material transactions for source and special nuclear material (SNM)
- DOE Sites and NRC licensees with source or special nuclear material that meet the requirements of the applicable regulations report to NMMSS.
- Information submitted to NMMSS allows the U.S. Government to fulfill its commitments for safeguards on material within the U.S.
### Reporting to NMMSS

- Nuclear Power Reactors
- Research and Test Reactors
- Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installations (IFISIs)
- Fuel Cycle Facilities
- Greater-Than-Critical-Mass Facilities

- Uranium Mills
- Waste Facilities
- Department of Defense (DOD)/Federal possessors of commercial material
- Agreement State Licensees

### Reportable material types and units

- Depleted Uranium (Kg)
- Natural Uranium (Kg)
- Thorium (Kg)

- Uranium-233 (g)
- Uranium-235 (g)
- Plutonium (g)
- Plutonium-238, when >10% (0.1g)
Reporting to NMMSS (cont.)

- DOE/NRC Form 741, Nuclear Material Transaction Report
- DOE/NRC Form 742, Material Balance Report
- DOE/NRC Form 742C, Physical Inventory Listing
- DOE/NRC Form 740M, Concise Note

• Key Reporting Guidance
  - NUREG/BR-0006, “Instructions for Completing Material Transaction Reports (DOE/NRC Forms 741 and 740M)”
  - NUREG/BR-0007, “Instructions for the Preparation and Distribution of Material Status Reports (DOE/NRC Forms 742 and 742C)”
  - NMMSS Report D-24, “Personal Computer Data Input for NRC Licensees”
2020 Annual NMMSS Users Training

- NMMSS Reporting
- Materials Management
- Nonproliferation
- Facility Operations

- No cost to attend training

- Registration, agenda, and lodging information: https://nmmss2020.linkssolutions.com/
Questions

mirabelle.shoemaker@nrc.gov, 301-415-7363
Update on Generic Environmental Impact Statement for Advanced Reactors

Mallecia Sutton
NRC
February 20, 2020
Status

- Comment period closed for the exploratory process - January 24, 2020
- Staff is preparing responses to public comments on the exploratory process
- Staff developing information paper to describe GEIS structure and potential benefits; currently under management review
Recommendations for Streamlining NRC Environmental Reviews

February 20, 2020
Challenges & Opportunities

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
  - intent to inform federal actions based on an assessment of their likely environmental impacts
  - implementation of NEPA has yielded unjustified increases in both length of time to complete the review and associated costs

- Advanced Reactors
  - review proportionate to potential environmental impacts
  - expected to result in small environmental risks
  - environmental benefits and avoided carbon emissions
Overview of Recommendations

1) Allow for the flexibility to use environmental assessments (EAs) and categorical exclusions
2) Increase the use of generic environmental impact statements (GEISs)
3) Incorporate existing environmental analyses into a project’s EA or EIS
4) Flexibility to use the applicant’s environmental report (ER) as the basis for the draft EA or EIS
5) Reduce unnecessary burden in alternative site analysis
6) Increase efficiency of environmental reviews
1) Allow for the flexibility to use EAs and categorical exclusions

- Requiring an EIS without consideration of the characteristics of advanced reactors and the history of current reactors is not commensurate with anticipated environmental impacts per NEPA.
- For the NRC to leverage EA’s in the environmental reviews of advanced reactors, the NRC will have to change the current regulations which prescribe to the NRC which actions require an EIS.
- This recommendation is focused on the NRC considering how it can provide more latitude to consider categorical exclusions based on the circumstances of the proposed action.
2) Increase the use of GEISs

- NEI recommends that NRC leverage the experience of the current reactor fleet, their existing GEISs and drive towards smart environmental reviews that are effective and efficient.
3) Incorporate existing environmental analyses into a project’s EA or EIS

- The NRC should streamline its NEPA reviews by codifying into Part 51 the practice of adopting other agencies’ EISs.
- The NRC should further expedite the NEPA review process by specifically codifying circumstances where EAs and EISs can reference externally prepared analyses.
- Given the often-duplicative nature of NEPA reviews, heavier reliance on existing environmental analyses has the potential to save significant time and resources for both project applicants and the NRC.
4) Flexibility to use the applicant’s ER as the basis for the draft EA or EIS.

- Preparation of the ER is an expensive endeavor for applicants and currently serves as the basis for preparation of the NRC’s EIS. Unfortunately, as conducted to-date, the NRC’s EIS preparations duplicate the applicant’s efforts to develop an ER, wasting time and level of effort, and resulting in costs that are then charged back to the applicant.

- The NRC can amend its regulations by looking to federal agencies that allow more applicant participation in the environmental review process.
  - FERC
  - FAA
5) Reduce unnecessary burden in alternative site analysis

- The CEQ has proposed a revised definition to reasonable alternatives that the NRC should consider. Reasonable alternatives should be analyzed with the lens of what is actually feasible, based on the purpose and need of the applicant’s goals and the agency’s statutory authority.

- It would be more appropriate to limit the requirement to a description of the process used to select the site, which is likely more important for advanced reactors, many of which will be sited in specific locations to meet a specific need.
6) Increase efficiency of environmental reviews

- Consistent with the NRC Principles of Good Regulation and organizational values, the agency strives for efficiency and continuous learning.
- Many of the procedural efficiencies identified for the safety review should also be considered to increase the efficiency of environmental reviews.
- Additional contributing factors that once addressed in the environmental review context should help achieve and sustain increased efficiency.
## Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEPA milestones</th>
<th>Jan-20</th>
<th>Feb-20</th>
<th>Mar-20</th>
<th>Apr-20</th>
<th>May-20</th>
<th>Jun-20</th>
<th>Jul-20</th>
<th>Aug-20</th>
<th>Sep-20</th>
<th>Oct-20</th>
<th>Nov-20</th>
<th>Dec-20</th>
<th>1Q21</th>
<th>2Q21</th>
<th>3Q21</th>
<th>4Q21</th>
<th>1H22</th>
<th>2H22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEQ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI CEQ Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamlining NRC Environmental Reviews</strong></td>
<td>NEI ER Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 EA or CatEx</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Rec. RM in SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RM Basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 ANR GEIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRN Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NUREG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final NUREG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency NUREG update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incorp. Existing Analyses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Rec. Policy in SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there staff action after policy is set (e.g., guidance)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Use ER as draft EA or EIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Rec. Policy in SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM SECY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there staff action after policy is set (e.g., guidance)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Alt. Sites Scope</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue ISG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final ISG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG Update (Placeholder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Efficiency of Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC Mgmt expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- NEI Deliverable
- Interim Decision Maker Deliverable
- Final Decision Maker Deliverable
Break

Meeting/Webinar will begin shortly

Telephone Bridgeline: (888) 593-8429
Passcode: 6767863#
Mapping Fundamental Safety Functions (FSF) to Regulations

Technology Inclusive Content of Application Project (TICAP)

Frank Akstulewicz
AtoZ Reactor Consulting Services

NRC Stakeholder Meeting
February 20, 2020
Outline of the Presentation

• Background
• TICAP Goal
• Next Steps for the FSF Report
• Preview the Content of FSF Mapping Report
• Early Conclusions
• Next Steps and Schedule
• Summary and Questions
TICAP Goal

Develop an endorsable document that outlines the content of an application in a manner that is technology inclusive, risk-informed, performance-based and its scope is limited by LMP methodology and can be submitted to NRC for endorsement

• Output will likely be a process for developing content of application as opposed to a specific set of required information
Key TICAP Products

- Fundamental Safety Functions (FSFs) Definition (to NRC 11/2019)
- Regulation Mapping to FSFs (to NRC 5/2020)
- Formulation of Technology Inclusive Content of Application (to NRC 10/2020)
- NEI Guidance Document Annotated Outline (to NRC 10/2020)
- LMP-Related Safety Case (To NRC 6/2020)
- Tabletop Exercises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key TICAP Products (cont.)

Differences Between Licensing Paths (to NRC 1/2021)

NEI Guidance Document (draft to NRC 4/2021) (final to NRC 7/2021)

NRC Review

Tabletop Exercises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps for the FSF White Paper

• Comments received on January 17, 2020

• Conference call on January 29, 2020 to clarify staff comments

• General alignment on scope and direction of paper
  – Comments in two specific areas
    » FSF and adequate protection
    » Hierarchy of FSF

• Next steps
  – Update the paper to align with SECY 19-0117 hierarchy of FSF
  – Continue discussion about role of FSF in determining adequate protection
  – Return FSF paper to TICAP internal review process
Purpose of the FSF Mapping Report

• The purpose of the FSF Mapping Report is to demonstrate that the existing body of Part 50 regulatory requirements will map to one or more fundamental safety functions

• This is not a gap analysis exercise in that we are looking for where holes exist for licensing non-LWR technologies

• Will demonstrate equivalence between prescriptive regulatory requirements and performance based fundamental safety functions
Structure of Report

- Background Section
- Section that discusses several efforts related to mapping
- Fundamental safety functions and mapping process
- Overview results table
- Conclusion
- References
- Appendices for content of application mapping
• Mapping follows outline of Part 50
• Mapping tracks
  – Design requirements
  – Programmatic requirements
  – Administrative requirements
• Mapping applied to regulations at a macro level
• Mapping applied to contents of applications sections at the sub-paragraph level for both Part 50 and 52
• Mapping summarizes the safety objective for each regulation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Description of the regulation and summary of safety objective, when appropriate</th>
<th>Controlling Reactivity (1)</th>
<th>Removing Heat from the Reactor and Waste Stores (2)</th>
<th>Retaining Radioactive Materials (3)</th>
<th>Programmatic Requirements that support all three FSFs (4)</th>
<th>Administrative or Procedural</th>
<th>Basis or Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>Hearings and ACRS reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>Process for changes to approved licensing bases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes process for changes to approved licensing basis – preserves integrity of approved licensing basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.61</td>
<td>Preserve integrity of reactor vessel from temperature event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.61a</td>
<td>Alternatives to 50.61 requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.62</td>
<td>Mitigate worst case failure to scram event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions from Mapping

• All design requirement regulations contained in Part 50 and the Appendices can be mapped to one or more fundamental safety functions – notable exception is emergency preparedness

• There are a few additional requirements for contents of applications in Part 52
  – ITAAC
  – Results of PRA

• Referenced regulations also mapped to FSFs
Next Steps

• Complete the mapping process to assure that fundamental safety functions provide comprehensive examination of initiating events and external hazards appropriate for the technology

• Obtain review and comment from ARRTF

• Provide to NRC for review and comment in May 2020.
• Questions and Comments?
List of Abbreviations

- ARRTF – Advanced Reactor Regulatory Task Force
- FSF – Fundamental Safety Functions
- ITAAC – Inspections, Tests and Acceptance Criteria
- LMP – Licensing Modernization Project
- LWR – Light Water Reactor
- PRA – Probabilistic Risk Assessment
- TICAP – Technology-Inclusive Content of Application Project
Advanced-Reactor Source Term

Jason Schaperow  
Hossein Esmaili

Advanced Reactor Stakeholder Meeting  
February 20, 2020
• Overall strategy

• Code strategy for source term
• Technology inclusive
  – Water-cooled reactor
  – Gas-cooled reactor
  – Sodium-cooled and heat-pipe-cooled
  – Salt-cooled and salt-fueled reactor
• SCALE – calculates fission product inventories and decay power

• MELCOR – calculates source term to environment
  – Inputs
    • Fission product inventory and decay heat (from SCALE)
    • Geometry of reactor, containment, reactor building
    • Operation of pumps and valves
• Two staff efforts
  – Advanced-reactor technology-inclusive guidance for developing mechanistic source terms
  – Non-LWR pilot studies to illustrate how to perform source term analysis with MELCOR
    • Supports guidance development
• Phase 1
  – MELCOR full-plant simulations for 3 representative non-LWR designs
  – Based on publicly available design information
    – E.g., LANL Megapower heat-pipe-cooled reactor
• Phase 2
  – Workshops to train the staff on source term analysis for the 3 representative non-LWR designs
  – One workshop for each design
  – Prepare staff for design reviews
• Phase 3
  – Workshops to inform stakeholders on the staff’s approach to source term analysis for the 3 representative non-LWR designs
  – One workshop for each design
  – Promote dialogue between NRC and stakeholders
• Schedule
  – 6 months for each of the 3 representative designs
  – Work starts February 2020
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Benefits of Advanced Reactor Codes and Standards

- Codes and Standards help to:
  - reflect interests from all relevant organizations
  - establish conservatism in the designs
  - provide a framework for standardization

- When endorsed by the regulator, they can:
  - make the regulatory process more efficient and predictable
  - enable more efficient approvals internationally
ANS SPECIAL REPORT: Recommendations

- Congress should fund a DOE program to
  - Assist SDOs and developers
  - Accelerate development/update to key standards

- Department of Energy should
  - Coordinate with SDOs
  - Solicit input from developers, NGOs, other stakeholders
  - Identify and prioritize key codes and standards needs
  - Establish time frame for development and regulatory acceptance
ANS SPECIAL REPORT: Recommendations (cont)

- Department of Energy should
  - provide incentives to national laboratories
  - ensure proactive participation in developing data and methods
  - support a comprehensive overhaul of priority codes and standards

- Nuclear Regulatory Commission should
  - implement process improvements and/or provide the resources
  - ensure timely adoption of advanced reactor standards
  - reevaluate the need for imposing margins in excess of standards

- DOE and/or NRC
  - establish a formal process with the SDOs
  - achieve harmonization of safety margins among consensus standards
Challenges

- **Timeliness**
  - development needs to support developer plans for licensing, construction and operations
  - important to developers who are making multiyear capital investments

- **Resources**
  - availability of funding resources to fully develop the desired codes and standards

- **Re-invigoration of SDOs**
  - potential delays due to lack of resources and/or support information

- **Decision process**
  - needed to facilitate prioritization of codes and standards development
NEI 19-03, [Rev 0]

Purpose:

- To identify and prioritize needed codes and standards
  - provide the greatest benefit for designs types being developed today

- To identify the need for more streamlined and timely efforts
  - in the development and endorsement of codes and standards
Assessing priorities for what needs to be done

- NEI 19-03 criteria utilized to rank importance of code/standard include, the code /standard will:

1. Support design efforts;
2. Support licensing review;
3. Reduce component fabrication time and costs;
4. Reduce facility construction time and costs; and
5. Reduce O&M costs.
Assessing priorities for what needs to be done (cont)

NEI 19-03 then ranked Codes and Standards determine priority (High, Medium or Low) based on the following:

1. **High** - Codes and Standards that (1) support design and licensing, (2) support either design or licensing and at least two other criteria, or (3) satisfy at least three of the other criteria

2. **Medium** - Codes and Standards that satisfied two of the criteria not specifically related to design or licensing

3. **Low** - Codes and Standards that satisfied one of the criteria not specifically related to design or licensing
A total of 36 standards were included in the prioritization;
- 18 identified as “High Priority” for near-term development

Need for new standards on advanced manufacturing methods
- should be evaluated for prioritization (see NEI Report on Advanced Manufacturing)

Need to establish an ongoing process to engage DOE, developers and SDOs in determination of near-term development activities

Recommended that public-private partnerships be formed to provide financial support
- situations where R&D or other special needs is essential
- on a schedule that supports the deployment of advanced reactors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEI 19-03 High Priority Standard (or Equivalent)</th>
<th>SDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to ANSI/ANS 6.4-2006, Concrete for Passive Heat Removal Systems - Irradiation and Thermal Limits</td>
<td>ANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS-30.1-201x Risk-informed Performance-Based Principles and Methods</td>
<td>ANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS-30.2-201x Categorization and classification of SSCs</td>
<td>ANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME/ANS RA-S-1.4-2013 PRA for Non-LWRs (trial use)</td>
<td>ASME/ANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME BPVC Division 1 and 2, Subsection NCA, Containment Barrier</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New standards equivalent to SFR-DC 73 for sodium leak detection and mitigation (see NRC RG 1.232)</td>
<td>ANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME AG-1-2009, Air and Gas Treatment</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME BPVC Section III, Construction of plant components</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Standards for Advanced Manufacturing Techniques, including Additive manufacturing</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME BPVC Section III Division 1, Subsection NE and Division 2, Containment</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME BPVC Section III, Division 5, High Temperature Reactors</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME N509-2002, Air Cleaning Units and Components</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME QME-1-2007, Qualification of Active Mechanical Components</td>
<td>ASME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 251, Methods of Tests of Fire Resistance of Building Construction and Materials</td>
<td>NFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI 349.1R-07, Reinforced Concrete Design for Thermal Effects</td>
<td>ACI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI 349-2013, Nuclear Safety-related Concrete Structures and Structural Members</td>
<td>ACI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Process for coordination between DOE, C&S Organizations and Developers

**Funding**
- Form Public Private Partnerships
- Establish criteria for funding and procedures to address conflicts of interest
- Assess proposed Code support activities against criteria and provide support via government contracts
- Place contracts and establish schedules for providing results
- Manage work to completion and provide cognizant Code committee with results and regular progress reports

**Identification of Need**
- Need for development or revision of specific Code provisions submitted to cognizant SDO Committee. Submittals can come from a variety of sources:
  - Code Participants
  - Designers
  - NGOs
  - Government organizations or labs
  - Suppliers
  - Fabricators/constructors
  - Consultants
  - Etc.
- Cognizant Code committee assesses proposal against traditional criteria and identifies:
  - Need for experimental work
  - Need for detailed analytical work
  - Other special needs which could include support to individuals to develop the Code provisions and language
- Develop funding needs specification to submit to partnership(s)
  - Establish priority of work (criteria in Section 4.3 of report, for example)

**Development of Code Language**
- Code committee establishes activity to develop Code provisions and language
  - Development schedule based on priority and R&D schedule
  - This may warrant support for individuals developing the provisions and language
- Follow accepted SDO practice to finalize and publish new or revised Code language
QUESTIONS?
Update on NRC Plan for Endorsement of ASME/ANS RA-S-1.4 “PRA Standard for Advanced Non-LWR Nuclear Power Plants”

Advanced Reactor Stakeholder Meeting

Hanh Phan, NRR/DANU
Michelle Gonzalez, RES/DRA

February 20, 2020
Objective

• Update on the staff’s endorsement plan
• Update on the gap analysis of PRA standard
• Update on the industry peer review guidance
Regulations and Guidance

10 CFR 52.47 & 52.79
10 CFR 50.71
ASME/ANS RA-S-1.4
RG 1.200
Background

• **June 27, 2019**, staff informed the stakeholders of its plan to:
  1. Endorse the ASME/ANS trial use advanced non-light-water reactor (non-LWR) PRA standard, developed by the ASME/ANS Joint Committee on Nuclear Risk Management (JCNRM), and
  2. Perform a gap analysis of non-LWR PRA standard to ensure fit for Licensing Modernization Project (LMP) purpose

• **August 15, 2019**, staff updated the stakeholders of its plan and discussed industry guidance on the peer review process

• **August 16, 2019**, staff established the guidelines for review and endorsement of non-LWR PRA standard (ML19235A285)

• **September 26, 2019**, staff notified the JCNRM of its endorsement Plan

• **October 2, 2019**, staff briefed the ACRS on its endorsement plan

• **November 26, 2019**, JCNRM transmitted a letter to the NRC (ML20031D602) expressing concerns about the staff’s endorsement of the trial-use standard and proposing that the NRC wait for a new version
Staff’s Endorsement Plan

• JCNRM’s letter indicated changes in priority and schedule to ballot the standard in March 2020 and issuing the pre-final-editing version of the standard by December 2020

• Staff considered the JCNRM’s schedule and agreed to endorse the pending revision to the standard

• Staff to issue the endorsement plan in March 2020, which includes:
  ◆ Task 1 - Supporting development of the standard
  ◆ Task 2 - Preparation for review of the standard
  ◆ Task 3 - Reviewing the standard
  ◆ Task 4 - Maintaining PRA standard
  ◆ Task 5 - Development of schedule
  ◆ Task 6 - Identification of resources
  ◆ Task 7 - Development of communication plan
Staff’s Endorsement Plan

- Staff to endorse the PRA standard with the development of a new regulatory guide (RG), similar to RG 1.200
- Staff to include an appendix on peer review process and PRA acceptability for LMP, risk-informed applications, and the uses of PRA during DC and COL stages
- Staff anticipates publishing the draft RG for public review and comment by Summer 2021 and the final RG by Summer 2022
- The staff’s schedule is dependent on the JCNRM adhering to their proposed schedule of issuance of the standard
Gap Analysis of PRA Standard

• Assess the technical applicability of ASME/ANS non-LWR PRA standard to PRAs developed for the DC and COL LMP applications to ensure fit-for-purpose standard requirements

• To be performed between March and September 2020 using the pre-final-editing version of the standard

• Results will be incorporated into the RG to convey the staff’s position on the use of the non-LWR PRA standard for LMP
PRA Peer Review Guidance

All three elements must work together
A. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This regulatory guide (RG) describes an approach that is acceptable to the staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for determining whether the acceptability of the probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) results, used in support of an application, is sufficient to provide reasonable confidence in the results. Such that the PRA can be used in support of an application, this regulatory guide will cover the need for a high-level review of the base PRA to ensure that the results are shown to be reasonable. In-depth review of the base PRA and the results will require the PRA to be reviewed and submitted to the NRC staff and subjected to in-depth review of the PRA documentation and any additional information that may be necessary. This approach is expected to be consistent with the NRC’s PRA Process Statement and will reflect and update guidance provided by standards-setting and nuclear industry organizations.

Applicability

This RG applies to U.S. licenses subject to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, “Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities” (Rev. 1), and 10 CFR Part 52, “Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants” (Rev. 7).

Applicable Regulations

PRA Peer Review Guidance

• An acceptable PRA peer review is one that is performed according to an established process and by qualified personnel, documents the results, and identifies both strengths and weaknesses of the PRA.

• Staff to review the industry guidance for an acceptable peer review process, acceptable team qualifications, and acceptable documentation.

• Staff to document its position in the RG describing the needed attributes and characteristics for an acceptable peer review process of a PRA for a non-LWR.

• Is NEI going to develop the guidance? If so, when?
Update from Department of Energy on Non-LWR topics including Micro Reactors

- Tom Sowinski, DOE
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Update on Policy Issues

• Amy Cubbage and Bill Reckley, NRC
## February 2020 UPDATE: Policy Issues – Non-Light Water Reactors

| Updated Note/Status to specifically address activities related to non-LWRs |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| License for Prototype Reactors | Action Complete Discussion incorporated (Enclosure 1) into NRC’s “A Regulatory Review Roadmap for Non-Light Water Reactors” (ML17312B567) |
| Key Component and System Design Issues | See SECY-19-0117 |
| Offsite Emergency Planning (EP) Requirements | Preparing to publish proposed rulemaking for public comment |
| Insurance and Liability | Issue discussed during November 2, 2017 stakeholder meeting, including presentation from American Nuclear Insurers. NRC preparing report to Congress with discussion planned at future stakeholder meeting |
| Use of Probabilistic Risk Assessment in the Licensing Process | See SECY-19-0117 and activities related to non-LWR PRA Standard |
| Implementation of Defense in Depth (DiD) Philosophy for Advanced Reactors | See SECY-19-0117 |
| Security and Safeguards Requirements for SMRs | Preparing proposed limited-scope rulemaking Wider discussions of safeguards/security to be pursued in future stakeholder meetings, microreactor discussions, and development of Part 53 |
| Licensing Basis Event Selection | See SECY-19-0117 |
| Fuel qualification, materials qualification | See technology specific activities (TRISO, metal fuel, MSRs). Preparing generic paper on fuel qualification. |
| Fuel cycle facilities (front end) | NEI provided a draft white paper on issues related to industry acquisition and use of higher assay low enriched uranium (HALEU) and fuel cycle facilities needed to support advanced reactors (ML17341A604). Updates on fuel cycle issues in future stakeholder meeting |

- Increased enrichments
New Policy Issues - Warranting Immediate Actions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Containment Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Addressed by SECY-18-0096 and related SRM approving approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Manufacturing Techniques</td>
<td>Staff including advanced reactors within broader action plan on advanced manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microreactor issues</td>
<td>(Including some items previously listed as no ongoing activities such as manufacturing licenses, staffing (including remote/autonomous operation, and aircraft impact assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Feburary 2020 UPDATE: Policy Issues – Non-Light Water Reactors

## Policy Issues – Non-Light Water Reactors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue as presented on web page &amp; previous meetings – raised questions related to applicability for LWR SMRs and non-LWRs</th>
<th>Updated Note/Status to specifically address activities related to non-LWRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open issues for non-LWRs but no current activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Annual Fees | Final Rule (May 2016)  
- Annual fees scalable based on licensed thermal power rating, applicable only to LWR SMRs | Staff initiating changes (rulemaking) that will be needed to widen scope to address non-LWRs  
Moved to immediate actions |
| Manufacturing License Requirements | Pending determination of possible interest from non-LWR developers | SECY-14-0095 states no interest in obtaining a manufacturing license from near-term SMR applicants was expressed. Questions raised by stakeholders regarding possible approaches for non-LWRs given desire to use manufacturing/modular approaches. Staff exploring in light of microreactor development. |
| Industrial Facilities Using Nuclear-Generated Process Heat | SECY-11-0112 (assess as necessary) | Expect that additional guidance will be needed to address non-LWRs and possible process heat applications (also tied to siting and EP issues) |
| Fuel cycle facilities (front in) | Ongoing discussions | One issue (increased enrichments) has been moved to ongoing activities portion of the table |
| Waste Issues (back end) | Ongoing discussions | Generally deferred to NRC mid-term IAP activities pending specific needs/timeline for technology or design-specific licensing and deployment. |
## New Policy Issues - Warranting Longer-Term Actions?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Periodic Advanced Reactor Stakeholder Meeting

Rulemaking for
ALTERNATIVE PHYSICAL SECURITY REQUIREMENT FOR ADVANCED REACTORS

Proposed Rule
(NRC Docket ID: NRC-2017-0227)

February 20, 2020
Purpose

PURPOSE

• Discuss NRC staff’s proposed rule approach
• Discuss staff’s review and screening of the December 12, 2019 public meeting comments
• Discuss development of guidance
• Discuss next steps
Performance Criteria

The staff identified the following three performance criteria that could be used to identify reactors that could make use of the alternative security requirements provided in this proposed rule:

1) The radiological consequences from a hypothetical, unmitigated event involving the loss of engineered systems for decay heat removal and possible breaches in physical structures surrounding the reactor, spent fuel, and other inventories of radioactive materials result in offsite doses below the reference values defined in 10 CFR 50.34(a)(1)(ii)(D) and 52.79(a)(1)(vi); or

2) The plant features necessary to mitigate an event and maintain offsite doses below the reference values in 10 CFR 50.34(a)(1)(ii)(D) and 52.79(a)(1)(vi) cannot reasonably be compromised by the Design Basis Threat for radiological sabotage; or

3) The plant features include inherent reactor characteristics combined with engineered safety and security features that allow for facility recovery and mitigation strategy implementation if a target set is compromised, destroyed, or rendered nonfunctional, such that offsite radiological consequences are maintained below the reference values defined in 10 CFR 50.34(a)(1)(ii)(D) and 52.79(a)(1)(vi)
Most likely, 10 CFR 73.55(a) would contain the three performance criteria with applicability and process language
    • Used to identify reactors that could make use of the alternatives provided in this proposed rule

Most likely, a new paragraph under 10 CFR 73.55 would contain the proposed alternative security requirements
    • Staff reviewed and screened proposed alternatives identified during the December 12, 2019 public meeting
    • Staff identified several for potential inclusion in the proposed rule
Proposed Alternatives

- Alternative to the requirement in 10 CFR 73.55(k)(5)(ii) that the number of armed responders shall not be less than ten
- Alternative to the requirement in 10 CFR 73.55(i) for the secondary alarm station to be onsite
- Alternative to the requirements in 10 CFR 73.55(e)(9) addressing the designation of vital areas
- Alternative to certain requirements in 10 CFR 73.55(e) addressing physical barriers
Draft Guidance

• Staff plans to develop a draft Regulatory Guide that will:
  • endorse NEI guidance that NRC finds acceptable for use in meeting one or more of the three performance criteria
  • identify existing relevant NRC guidance or develop new guidance, if needed, for the alternatives
Next Steps

• Next Public Meeting: April 2020 (tentative)

• Proposed Rule and Draft Guidance
  ▪ Provide to the Commission in December 2020
  ▪ Issue for public comment in early 2021

• Final Rule and Final Guidance
  ▪ Provide to the Commission in May 2022

• Contact: Dennis Andrukat, Rulemaking Project Manager
  Email: Dennis.Andrukat@nrc.gov
NON-LWR STAKEHOLDER MEETING

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL MODULAR REACTORS AND OTHER NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Proposed Rule
(NRC Docket ID: NRC-2015-0225)

February 20, 2020
Major provisions of the proposed rule include:

- Performance-based alternative to the current EP framework.
- Provision for a scalable determination of the plume exposure emergency EPZ size.
- Requirement to describe ingestion pathway planning capabilities.
- Provision for a hazard analysis of nearby facilities.
• NRC staff submitted the draft proposed rule package to the Commission on October 12, 2018, for review and approval (ADAMS Accession No. ML18134A086).

• The Commission issued SRM-SECY-18-0103 and approved the publication of the proposed rule in the Federal Register in December 2019 (Accession Number: ML19351C729).

• Commission comments were made publicly available in Enclosure 1 of the SRM.
• The staff is addressing the Commission comments.

• The revised proposed rule package will be sent to the Commission Secretary (SECY) by March 6th.

• If the Commission approves the revised package, the proposed rule will be subsequently published in the Federal Register for a 75-day comment period.

• After a period of approximately 30-45 days, the staff will hold a public meeting during the comment period.
## Future Meeting Planning and Open Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Tentative Schedule for Periodic Stakeholder Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>