

April 8, 2014

Mr. Roy Linthicum
PWR Owner's Group
Risk Management Chairman
4300 Windfield Road
Warrenville, IL 60555

Dear Mr. Linthicum,

The purpose of this letter is to formally request the Pressurized Water Reactor Owners Group (PWROG) to perform peer reviews of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Level 3 Site Probabilistic Risk Assessment for the Vogtle site (the L3PRA project). The Vogtle site contains two Westinghouse 4-loop PWRs. The L3PRA project involves a Level 3 analysis that addresses internal and external hazards, all plant operating modes, and the risk from both reactors, both spent fuel pools, and dry cask storage. The Quality Assurance Plan developed for this project specifies the need for peer reviews in accordance with the ASME/ANS PRA standards.

We have previously discussed these peer reviews with you in public meetings on June 4, 2013 (ADAMS Accession Number ML13241A127), and January 27, 2014 (ADAMS Accession Number ML14043A364), as well as in several phone calls and e-mail exchanges. The following summarizes our preferences and understanding of the process to be followed in performing the peer reviews.

The NRC prefers to have peer reviews performed at various points throughout the study, as opposed to a single peer review at the end of the project. This preference is because (1) it will allow any needed corrections early and, therefore, minimize the amount of any re-work, and (2) a single comprehensive peer review would be difficult considering the different types of expertise needed to cover the entire scope of the project. It is our understanding that the PWROG has budgeted for four peer reviews this calendar year. As discussed in the meeting on January 27, 2014, we are now anticipating that the L3PRA project schedule will only support the following three peer reviews this calendar year:

- Level 1 internal events, and internal flooding (excluding LERF) for the week of July 21, 2014. This will be a focused scope peer review.
- Level 2 peer review the week September 29, 2014. It is anticipated that this will involve a full scope peer review.
- High winds and other hazards peer review the week of either November 3 or November 10, 2014. This will probably require only a couple of days instead of a full week.

Again, as discussed on January 27, 2014, instead of a fourth peer review, we would like to work with the PWROG to develop review criteria for two of the areas of the L3PRA project for which no PRA standard (either draft or final) currently exists (i.e., dry cask storage and the spent fuel pool). We would like to have these criteria developed by December 2014.

We are looking for the PWROG to lead each peer review, and therefore, provide the facilitator and produce the peer review report. For each peer review, the NRC will identify one or two experienced PRA analysts (e.g., Regional Senior Reactor Analysts) that will supplement the peer review team to be assembled by the PWROG. As part of documenting our request for each peer review, we will include the specific experience and capabilities of the NRC-proposed reviewers. Please see the enclosure (Table 1) for the official request for the first peer review. We will provide a similar table for the next peer reviews, as discussed above.

We greatly appreciate the PWROG's support in this effort. The peer review is a critical element in ensuring the technical quality and traceability of the work of the L3PRA project. We look forward to working with the PWROG on these peer reviews and, hopefully, others in the future, so that the entire scope of the NRC L3PRA project is fully peer reviewed. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Mary Drouin of my staff at (301) 251-7574.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard P. Correia, Director
Division of Risk Analysis
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

Again, as discussed on January 27, 2014, instead of a fourth peer review, we would like to work with the PWROG to develop review criteria for two of the areas of the L3PRA project for which no PRA standard (either draft or final) currently exists (i.e., dry cask storage and the spent fuel pool). We would like to have these criteria developed by December 2014.

We are looking for the PWROG to lead each peer review, and therefore, provide the facilitator and produce the peer review report. For each peer review, the NRC will identify one or two experienced PRA analysts (e.g., Regional Senior Reactor Analysts) that will supplement the peer review team to be assembled by the PWROG. As part of documenting our request for each peer review, we will include the specific experience and capabilities of the NRC-proposed reviewers. Please see the enclosure (Table 1) for the official request for the first peer review. We will provide a similar table for the next peer reviews, as discussed above.

We greatly appreciate the PWROG's support in this effort. The peer review is a critical element in ensuring the technical quality and traceability of the work of the L3PRA project. We look forward to working with the PWROG on these peer reviews and, hopefully, others in the future, so that the entire scope of the NRC L3PRA project is fully peer reviewed. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Mary Drouin of my staff at (301) 251-7574.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard P. Correia, Director
Division of Risk Analysis
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

Enclosures:

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION:

DHelton, RES/DRA	PAppignani, RES/DRA	CHunter, RES/DRA
FGonzalez, RES/DRA	KCompton, RES/DRA	JWood, RES/DRA
SSancaktar, RES/DRA	AGilbertson, RES/DRA	RMartin, NRR
TZachariah Jr. (zachart@westinghouse.com)	RLinthicum (roy.linthicum@exeloncorp.com)	
MHigby (schwarmj@westinghouse.com)	CPierce (CRPIERCE@southernco.com)	
AAfzali (AAFZALI@southernco.com)	OScott (OMSCOTT@southernco.com)	

ADAMS Accession No.: ML14094A344

OFFICE	RES/DRA/PRB	RES/DRA/PRAB	BC: RES/DRA/PRAB	D: RES/DRA
NAME	M. Drouin	A. Kuritzky	K. Coyne	R. Correia
DATE	4/4/14	4/7/14	4/7/14	4/8/14

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY