March 7, 2003

Dr. Ronald L. Simard Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 1776 I Street, NW, Suite 400 Washington, DC 20006-3708

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION OF EARLY SITE PERMIT TOPIC 18a (ESP-18a), ALTERNATIVE

SITE REVIEWS FOR EARLY SITE PERMITS

Dear Dr. Simard:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of our understandings and expectations regarding alternative site reviews for early site permit (ESP) applications. This topic, which is identified as ESP-18a on the list of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) generic ESP issues, was discussed at public meetings between July 17 and December 5, 2002. Subsequently, NEI documented its position on this topic in a letter dated December 20, 2002. In addition, NEI submitted supplemental comments on petition for rulemaking (PRM) 52-2 on this same subject in a separate letter dated December 18, 2002. Both letters contained essentially the same information, but in the December 18, 2002, letter, NEI requested that the Commission address the issue generically because it has implications beyond ESP applications.

The staff wants to clarify that the understandings and expectations expressed in this letter apply to the three lead ESP applications and not necessarily to future ESP applications. As you are aware, the staff has initiated work to develop the technical bases for possible rulemaking to specifically define the requirements for consideration of alternative sites. This rulemaking activity is expected to account for industry deregulation and restructuring, consider the recent evolution of the siting process, and reduce uncertainty in the licensing process. The staff expects that this activity will reduce unnecessary regulatory burden and introduce more certainty in the alternative site review process. The staff held a January 28, 2003, public workshop as part of this effort to obtain public input in consideration of whether to undertake rulemaking to specifically define the criteria for review of candidate and alternative sites for nuclear power plants (see 67 FR 79165, December 27, 2002). NEI representatives were present at this meeting. Long-term resolution of the matters addressed in your December 20, 2002 letter on ESP-18a will be pursued in this generic effort.

The discussion below is our response to the relevant understandings and expectations identified in your December 20, 2002, letter and is intended to provide guidance to the three lead ESP applications.

NEI Position #1:

"As discussed with the staff on December 5, we conclude that both legal and policy reasons justify the NRC limiting its required NEPA analysis of alternatives to those that are pertinent in the context of the license application before it. For each of the three pilot ESP applicants, the

R. Simard - 2 -

objective is the approval of an existing site for new nuclear units. Thus, each applicant's NEPA evaluation of alternatives should be limited to consideration of other existing nuclear sites."

Staff Response:

At this point in time, the staff, in general terms, agrees with NEI that the current NEPA case law suggests that a federal agency, acting on a private entity's permitting request, may limit its review of alternatives with due regard for the proposal before it. Nevertheless, the objectives of the action may not be defined so artificially narrow that only one alternative would accomplish the stated goals. See Hydro Resources, Inc. (P.O. Box 15910, Rio Rancho, NM 87174), CLI-01-4, 53 NRC 31, 55 (2001). Therefore, it is the applicant's obligation to demonstrate, in its environmental report, that its bases for limiting its alternative site analysis are reasonable.

NEI Position #2:

"Consistent with a focus on alternatives that would satisfy the applicant's business purpose, only sites in the applicant's region of interest and under its control will be considered. The NEPA requirement for a 'hard look' at alternatives is satisfied by evaluation of the applicant's other existing nuclear sites in the region of interest.

This approach is consistent with existing guidance for review of alternative sites in NUREG-1555, Section 9.3 (III.8), which concerns the special case of existing sites.

Because this issue has implications beyond ESP, the industry requested that the Commission address this issue generically in supplemental comments provided on December 18 on petition for rulemaking PRM-52-2."

Staff Response:

The staff agrees that an ESP applicant need only consider the alternative sites within its region of interest. However, the applicant must demonstrate the reasonableness of confining the region of interest. In cases where the proposed facility would not have a determined service area, the ESP applicant would have to articulate a reasonable means of defining the region of interest.

NEI Position #3:

"Because of the obvious advantages of an existing nuclear site over non-nuclear sites for additional nuclear units, including the pre-existence of essential infrastructure, it is expected that no non-nuclear site would be found to be obviously superior. While not required by NEPA, lead ESP applications will also include a brief discussion that compares the selected site to generic green-field and generic industrial sites that will provide the analytical basis to confirm this presumption."

Staff Response:

The staff understands NEI's position. The superiority of alternative sites in comparison to the proposed site will be addressed on a case by case basis. NUREG-1555, Section 9.3, lays out the staff's methodology for identifying obviously superior alternative sites. The staff expects

R. Simard - 3 -

that an ESP applicant's environmental report will set forth the basis for its determination that none of the alternative sites is obviously superior in comparison to the proposed site.

Please contact Nanette Gilles of my staff at 301-415-1180 if you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,

/RA/

James E. Lyons, Director New Reactor Licensing Project Office Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 689

cc: See next page

R. Simard - 3 -

Please contact Nanette Gilles of my staff at 301-415-1180 if you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,

/RA/

James E. Lyons, Director New Reactor Licensing Project Office Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 689

cc: See next page

Distribution:

Hard Copy E-mail
NRLPO R/F AFernadez PUBLIC

NRLPO R/F AFernadez PUBLIC ACRS
NGilles GMizuno RidsNrrOD (SCollins) NRLPO Group

RJenkins TKenyon RidsNrrAdip (RBorchardt)

Mgamberoni BZalcman RidsOgcRp

JLyons

Accession No. ML030520434

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML030520434.wpd *See previous concurrence

OFFICE	NRR/NRLPO*	NRR/NRLPO*	NRR/DRIP/RLEP*	OGC/NLO	NRR/NRLPO
NAME	NGilles	MGamberoni	JTappert	AFR for JMoore	JLyons
DATE	2/21/03	2/21/03	2/27/03	3/4/03	3/5/03

CC:

Mr. David Lochbaum Union of Concerned Scientists 1707 H Street, NW Suite 600 Washington, DC 20006-3919

Mr. Paul Gunter Director of the Reactor Watchdog Project Nuclear Information & Resource Service 1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 404 Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Ron Simard Nuclear Energy Institute Suite 400 1776 I Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Russell Bell Nuclear Energy Institute Suite 400 1776 I Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Thomas P. Miller U.S. Department of Energy Headquarters - Germantown 19901 Germantown Road Germantown, MD 20874-1290

Mr. James Riccio Greenpeace 702 H Street, NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20001

Rod Krich Vice President, Licensing Projects Exelon Nuclear 4300 Winfield Road Warrenville, IL 60555

Patricia Campbell Winston & Strawn 1400 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20005 Mr. Eddie Grant Exelon Generation 200 Exelon Way, KSA3-E Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. James F. Mallay, Director Regulatory Affairs FRAMATOME, ANP 3315 Old Forest Road Lynchburg, VA 24501

Mr. Ernie H. Kennedy Vice President New Plants Nuclear Plant Projects Westinghouse Electric Company 2000 Day Hill Road Windsor, CT 06095-0500

Dr. Regis A. Matzie Senior Vice President and Chief Technology Officer Westinghouse Electric Company 2000 Day Hill Road Windsor, CT 06095-0500

Mr. Gary Wright, Manager Office of Nuclear Facility Safety Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety 1035 Outer Park Drive Springfield, IL 62704

Mr. Vince Langman Licensing Manager Atomic Energy of Canada Limited 2251 Speakman Drive Mississauga, Ontario Canada L5K 1B2

Mr. David Ritter
Research Associate on Nuclear Energy
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy
and Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Mr. Tom Clements 6703 Guide Avenue Takoma Park, MD 20912 Mr. Edwin Lyman Nuclear Control Institute 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 410 Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Jack W. Roe SCIENTECH, INC. 910 Clopper Road Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Dr. Gail H. Marcus U.S. Department of Energy Room 5A-143 1000 Independence Ave., SW Washington, DC 20585

Ms. Marilyn Kray Vice President, Special Projects Exelon Generation 200 Exelon Way, KSA3-E Kennett Square, PA 19348

Mr. Joseph D. Hegner Lead Engineer - Licensing Dominion Generation Early Site Permitting Project 5000 Dominion Boulevard Glen Allen, VA 23060

Mr. George Alan Zinke Project Manager Nuclear Business Development Entergy Nuclear M-ECH-683 1340 Echelon Parkway Jackson, MS 39213

Mr. Charles Brinkman Westinghouse Electric Co. Washington Operations 12300 Twinbrook Pkwy., Suite 330 Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. Ralph Beedle Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute Suite 400 1776 I Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-3708 Dr. Glenn R. George PA Consulting Group 130 Potter Street Haddonfield, NJ 08033

Arthur R. Woods Enercon Services, Inc. 500 TownPark Lane Kennesaw, GA 30144

Mr. Thomas Mundy Director, Project Development Exelon Generation 200 Exelon Way, KSA3-E Kennett Square, PA 19348