

May 11th NRC Public Meeting – ALWR EP

The table below represents industry issue discussed during the NRC public meeting:
For each issue, NEI provides the industries understanding of the responses in the meeting.

Presentation	Presenter	Questions or Discussion Items
Regulations	Barss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We understand that the Emergency Plan will be part of an independent licensing action based on applicable regulations and guidance. <p>Response: The COLA application, in the case of a new reactor co-located on an existing site, may reference an existing Emergency Plan. Changes to the existing emergency plan made in support of the new reactor that also affect the existing reactor are review under 10CFR50.54q. If it is determined that DIE exists, this change has to be submitted for NRC approval under the existing reactor docket.</p>
RG 1.206 NUREG 0800 NUREG-0654/0696 Cross Reference	Roach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Section C.1.13.3.1 of RG 1.206, it states the application should include a cross-reference to applicable regulatory requirements, guidance documents, generic communications, and other criteria that are used to develop the application and emergency plan. <p>In the following sentence it describes specific criteria. For example, the only guidance document listed is NUREG-0654; no generic communications are listed as part the specific guidance.</p> <p>We understand that the NUREG-0654 cross reference will be included as part of the emergency plan submittal and the cross reference addressing other regulatory requirements and guidance documents will be part of a supplemental section of the COLA submittal.</p> <p>Response: Yes. The NUREG-0654 cross reference will be included as part of the emergency plan and the cross reference addressing other regulatory requirements will be part of a supplemental section in the COLA submittal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe expectations for a transition plan. Some emergency plan changes may only be interim (example – evacuation plans for construction site) and others will be final plan requirements (table B1 requirements). The transition plan would describe when the NRC approved emergency plan changes would be implemented in the site emergency plan and in some cases be removed from the plan when no longer required. For a transition plan, it may be impossible to specify actual dates because the COLA may be approved for a period of time. Is it appropriate to specify milestones in a transition plan and tie these millstones to major construction activities? Will specific guidance on the requirements of transition plans be made available? Is it up to each

May 11th NRC Public Meeting – ALWR EP

Presentation	Presenter	Questions or Discussion Items
		<p>licensee to develop an approach? Will the transition plan be open to RAI's?</p> <p>Response: It is up to each licensee as to the format of the transition plan. If specific dates for transitions are not available a description of the millstone is appropriate. Milestones may include prior to fuel load, at fuel load and prior to exceeding 5% power. The transition plan is open to RAIs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the specific requirement regarding a transition plan? <p>Response: SECY 05-0197 states that each COL licensee provides the timing implementation of the various programs, EP being one of these programs. RG 1.206 C.I.13.4 Operational Program Implementation provides guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We understand the required implementation schedule will be addressed in Section 13.4 of the FSAR and implementation details will be provided in accordance with a proposed license condition (SECY-05-0197) beginning one year after COL is issued with updates every six months thereafter. <p>Response: This statement is contained in SECY 05-0197.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements state that offsite plans should be submitted. Applicants assume this means State and Local plans in support of the 10 mile planning zone. <p>Response: Yes.¹</p>
ITAAC	Musico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants assume ITAAC may be applied to offsite facilities, equipment and emergency plans. <p>Response: Yes. NRC will review off site ITAAC on a case by case basis. However if there are deficiencies, until the deficiencies are corrected, the unit would not be able to load fuel or go to 5% power.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the COLA process, commitments to supply additional information as it becomes available may be necessary. For instance radiological instrument set points, specified in the Emergency Action Levels, may not be available at the time of the COLA application. What type of licensing alternative to ITAAC could be used to make a commitment for this information once available? Where would these commitments be placed? <p>Response: Commitment to information would be included as part of the acceptance criteria of each applicable ITAAC. No additional ITAAC would need to be created.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide examples of level of detail required in ITAAC. Specifically in the area of acceptance

¹ This does not include plans associated with the 50 mile IPZ.

May 11th NRC Public Meeting – ALWR EP

Presentation	Presenter	Questions or Discussion Items
		<p>criteria.</p> <p>Response: ITAAC require enough detail to provide reasonable assurance that, if the licensee performs the inspections, tests and analysis and meets the acceptance criteria the facility has been constructed in conformity to the COLA. For example for onsite exercise objectives the acceptance criteria would be higher tiered categories such as Notifications and Accident Assessment and Classification. The procedural level detail of how the criteria are met is not required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We understand that EP ITAAC will not be included in the emergency plan and will reside in Part 10 of the COLA. <p>Response: Yes</p>
Shift Staffing	Robinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a co-located site, using a site plan, applicants are assuming Table B-1 requirements approved in SER's for the existing units, extend to the new units. <p>Response: No. Existing unit staffing exemptions do not apply. Any changes not consistent with Table B 1 need to be justified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the smart application template applicable to the new unit applications? <p>Response: Smart application can be used to assist an applicant for a new unit with determining the changes are either in compliance or require a justification from the rules. For instance the information suggested in section B. "Body of the application", may be submitted to provide the basis for the request.</p>
EAL	Kellum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss use of 99-01 Revision 4 or 5 for non-passive plants • We understand that the expectation is EALs as complete as possible; however certain information such as set points will not be available at COLA submittal. We will commit to that expectation through a licensing commitment. • We understand that the NRC will provide a vehicle to allow use of new/pending EAL guidance documents that have not been endorsed by the NRC at the time of COLA submittal. <p>Response to above three questions: Follow endorsed guidelines at the time of the COLA unless NRC has issued a letter allowing use of the new/pending guidance in 99-01 R5.</p>
Facilities / ANS	Sanfilippo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of possible options for TSC location. Can NRC comment on the options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Common TSC for existing units and a TSC for each of the proposed units (this is the

May 11th NRC Public Meeting – ALWR EP

Presentation	Presenter	Questions or Discussion Items
		<p style="padding-left: 40px;">option covered under the current AP1000 design)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Designated TSC inside either existing unit or in new unit that would service all units ○ Common TSC inside the PA but TSC is not contained inside any one of the units (for instance may be in the basement of an admin building inside the PA.) ○ Common TSC outside the PA. <p>Response: Staff will consider various scenarios for TSC location. Justify the location chosen and show that the location satisfies all functional criteria for each unit it services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of utilities utilize a common EOF typically off site at the utilities corporate office. If a company is licensed for this approach, applicants assume that method of providing for an EOF is extended to the new Units (New plant co-located at an existing site or Green Field). <p>Response: If a utility is currently using a common EOF any new sites to be added to that approach should provide justification as to how the common EOF will provide all necessary functions for the new plant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the basis for the lessons learned from recent ANS activities. <p>Response: Engage FEMA at the early stages. Ensure design report meets FEMA requirements. Be clear on all expectations ahead of time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why wasn't the FEMA letter on 44 CFR Part 350 referenced (ML050400336)? <p>Response: FEMA questions will be discussed in a separate meeting to be scheduled in the future.</p>
ETE	Moody	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a co-located site, discuss NRC expectations for use of the ETE data in updating existing offsite plan. <p>Response: It is expected that the most up to date information be used for a site and that information be shared with agencies responsible for off site plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss expectations for population growth discussion in ETE. If population growth is predicted, what about assumptions for infrastructure (additional roads)? What is the basis for requirement to project population growth over the life of the plant (current guidance requires an update to the ETE when significant population changes occur)? Why does this requirement not extend to new plants? <p>Response: ETEs need to incorporate a 10-20 year population projection for early site permit (ESP) applications only: to show reasonable preparedness in accommodating the possible changes in population, road-network, and land-use pattern modifications. Special attention will be on the</p>

May 11th NRC Public Meeting – ALWR EP

Presentation	Presenter	Questions or Discussion Items
		<p>approach to project the population changes and also validity of the assumptions made in the process. Focus is also on the measures to identify, mitigate and eliminate the 'impediments' to evacuation. Include available local/state/regional sources of data, assumptions on vehicle occupancy rates, local DOT plans, etc. These are areas where experience has shown the staff receives questions; thus, the intent is to advise applicants such questions will need to be answered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss guidance documents that should be used for preparation of ETE. <p>Guidance on evacuation time estimates is in Section J.8, 10l, 10m, and Appendix 4 of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants." This guidance was endorsed by NRC Regulatory Guide 1.101, Rev 2. Additional information can be found in NUREG/CR-4831, "The State of the Art in Evacuation Time Estimate Studies for Nuclear Power Plants," March 1992, and NUREG/CR-6863, "Development of Evacuation Time Estimate Studies for Nuclear Power Plants," December 2004. (NUREG/CR-4831 and NUREG/CR-6863 are NRC –issued contractor reports, however, NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1 Appendix 4 is the only endorsed guidance on the subject).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction phase Vs. Post-construction phase. <p>10CFR50 Appendix E Part IV.G requires licensees to ensure that their emergency plan and its implementing procedures are kept up to date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where in Part 52 does it require identifying measures that would mitigate or eliminate impediments to evacuation? Part 52 only discusses this in relation to impediments regarding development of emergency plans. <p>Response: 10CFR52.17(b)(1) refers identification of site-specific physical characteristics that could pose a significant impediment to the development of emergency plans.</p>
Offsite EP Review	Takacs - FEMA	It was determined that a separate meeting to clearly understand FEMA application requirements for ESP/COLA would be beneficial. NEI has requested a public meeting on either September 11 or September 18 with FEMA.
Exercise	Schmitt	No additional questions.