

August 30, 2000

Dr. Dana A. Powers
Chairman
Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

SUBJECT: ACRS LETTER DATED JULY 20, 2000, "NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE
LETTER DATED JANUARY 19, 2000, ADDRESSING NRC PLANS FOR RISK-
INFORMING THE TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS IN 10 CFR PART 50"

Dear Dr. Powers:

The subject letter to Chairman Meserve discussed the Nuclear Energy Institute's (NEI's) January 19, 2000, letter, as well as the NRC staff's work to risk-inform the technical requirements contained in 10 CFR Part 50. More specifically, your letter provided two recommendations with respect to this work. These recommendations, and our responses, are:

ACRS Recommendation 1: The staff should proceed with finalizing the framework for risk-informing the technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, including the prioritization criteria, and use the information in the NEI letter, as appropriate.

Staff Response: We agree. We are continuing to use the framework, to revise it to reflect your comments as well as the comments of others, and to apply it in the evaluation of 10 CFR 50.44 ("Standards for combustible gas control system in light-water-cooled power reactors"), 10 CFR 50.46 ("Acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling systems for light-water nuclear power reactors"), and other sections of 10 CFR Part 50. We intend to provide a revised version of the framework to the Commission for their information, and as background for recommendations on modifying 10 CFR 50.44, at the end of August 2000.

ACRS Recommendation 2: The staff will want to interact further with the industry to determine the benefits and burden reduction that could result from changes in rules in light of risk information.

Staff Response: We agree. We are planning to have additional public meetings and workshops to discuss our work, including obtaining input on the benefits of possible changes to various sections of 10 CFR Part 50.

Your letter also discussed alternative approaches to risk-informing 10 CFR 50.46, including potential changes to ECCS success criteria and the definition of challenges to the ECCS. As you know, we are now considering possible changes to Section 50.46; your ideas on this are thus particularly timely and will be considered as we proceed.

Sincerely,

/RA/

William D. Travers
Executive Director
for Operations

cc: Chairman Meserve
Commissioner Dicus
Commissioner Diaz
Commissioner McGaffigan
Commissioner Merrifield
SECY

NAME: g:\ACRS.RIR.wpd

Distribution:

DRAA Chron, Drouin, Drouin r/f, Cunningham, King, Federline, Thadani, Eltawila, Summerour, ACRS File, Millman/OEDO, Collins, Burns/Cry, Craig, Norry, Miraglia, Paperiello, Travers
RES number 2000177, EDO Number 2000364

*See Previous concurrence

OFFICE	PRAB/DRAA/RES		PRAB/DRAA/RES		DRAA/RES	
NAME	MDrouin*		MCunningham*		TKing*	
DATE	8/11/00		8/11/00		8/11/00	
OFFICE	NRR		RES:D	DEDMRS	EDO	
NAME	SCollins		AThadani	CPaperiello	WTravers	
DATE	8/25/00		8/28/00	8/28/00	8/30/00	

OAR in ADAMS? (Y or N)		Publicly Available? (Y or N)	
---------------------------	--	---------------------------------	--

Template= EDO-012 Accession Number _____ RES File Code _____

PARALLEL CONCURRENCE

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

DATE:08/11/00

MEMORANDUM TO: Dana Powers

FROM: W. Travers

SUBJECT: ACRS LETTER DATED JULY 20, 2000, "NUCLEAR ENERGY
INSTITUTE LETTER DATED JANUARY 19, 2000, ADDRESSING
NRC PLANS FOR RISK-INFORMING THE TECHNICAL
REQUIREMENTS IN 10 CFR PART 50"

ORIGINATOR/SECRETARY: ROOM NO./BLDG: T10 C 24

Patty Nielsen PHONE NO.: 415-6189

<u>SIGN AND/OR</u>	<u>CONCUR</u>	<u>DATE</u>
1. MDrouin	_____	<u> / / </u>
2. MCunningham	_____	<u> / / </u>
3. TKing	_____	<u> / / </u>
4. SCollins	_____	<u> / / </u>
5. AThadani	_____	<u> / / </u>
6. CPaperiello	_____	<u> / / </u>
7. WTravers	_____	<u> / / </u>

DUE TO EDO 8/28/00

ACTION:	CIRCULATED:	FOR YOUR INFO:
APPROVAL:	COMMENT:	SEE ME:
AS REQUESTED:	NOTE & RETURN:	PREPARE REPLY:
COORDINATION:	PER CONVERSATION:	
