

**From:** George Hubbard *nh*  
**To:** Charles Tinkler, Daniel Barss, Diane Jackson, G...  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 9, 2000 11:55 AM  
**Subject:** Goals for TWG Report

Attached are goals which Tim has developed with regard to our TWG Report. Please review and be familiar with them so we are all on the same wavelength and headed in the same direction with regard to desired outcomes and outputs. Also, I have attached, FYI, an answer to Tim's question as to "what criteria has been used in past EP exemptions."

Let me or Tim know if you have any questions.

George Hubbard  
2870

**CC:** Gary Holahan, Jared Wermiel, John Hannon, Ralph...

*m/64*

**DESIRED OUTCOMES:**

Maintain Safety at decommissioning reactor sites while reducing unnecessary regulatory burden. Enhance public confidence in the safety of decommissioning sites.

**DESIRED OUTPUTS:**

Decommissioning Rule which defines the time at which EP and Indemnity requirements can be relaxed or removed without a significant impact on safety.

Statement of consideration and technical report which are comprehensive and clear such that public confidence is maintained or enhanced.

**SITUATION:**

- ① Licensees want to eliminate EP and Indemnity requirements claiming that risk is low enough shortly after shutdown.

We do not have a good measure of the risk at decommissioning sites. *who is meant by this?*

We have no criteria for when formal EP or Indemnity should be required or relaxed. *Agreed*

- ② There is public opposition to relaxation of requirements.

EP has historically been treated differently from other requirements. *Revised S.T. is an example of this*

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS**

**TECHNICAL INFO:**

What is the current level of risk at decommissioning sites?  
What factors drive the risk?  
What risk aversion is attributable to EP?  
What is the value of EP? Indemnity?  
TH Analyses  
Seismic Analyses

**STAKEHOLDER BUY-IN:**

ACRS, NEI, UCS ✓  
Address Public Comments ✓  
ACRS Meetings ✓  
Public Meetings ✓  
Communications Plan ✓

**DECISION CRITERIA:**

What are the criteria for imposing EP and Indemnity?  
What criteria have been used in past EP decisions?  
What is the purpose of EP?

## EP HISTORY

Humbolt Bay - Shutdown 1976 -	Had no EP while operating
La Crosse - Shutdown 1987 -	EP relief given based only on consideration of DBAs - zirconium fires not considered
Rancho Seco - Shutdown 1989 -	EP relief given based only on consideration of DBAs - zirconium fires not considered
Ft. St. Vrain - Shutdown 1989 -	EP relief given based only on consideration of DBAs - zirconium fires not considered

Dick Dudley said that up until this time (~1990) they only considered DBAs and then RES told them that they could have the zirconium fire and it should be considered. Based on this they started looking at zirconium fires. As indicated below, Trojan tried using SFUEL but had problems. After that they started developing the code SHARP which we have found problems with.

*who?*

Yankee Rowe - Shutdown 1991 -	EP considered zirconium fire to some extent but granted EP relief based on fact that plant had low density racks
Trojan - Shutdown 1992 -	Considered zirconium fire - tried to use SFUEL to prove 565 °C criteria met but had problems - EP relief was granted based on SFP fragility analysis
SONGS 1 - Shutdown 1992 -	Full EP maintained due to SONGS 2&3 remaining operational
Haddam Neck - Shutdown 1996 -	EP relief granted based on meeting 565 °C criteria
Maine Yankee - Shutdown 1996 -	EP relief granted based on meeting 10 hour criteria
Millstone 1 - Shutdown 1995 -	Full EP maintained due to Millstone 2&3 remaining operational
Zion 1&2 - Shutdown 1996/7 -	EP relief granted based on meeting 565 °C criteria
Big Rock Point - Shutdown 1997 -	EP relief granted based on meeting 10 hour criteria

*what kind of relief*

*what do these mean?*