

**INSTITUTE FOR RESOURCE AND SECURITY STUDIES**  
**27 Ellsworth Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA**  
**Phone: 617-491-5177 Fax: 617-491-6904**  
**Email: [info@irss-usa.org](mailto:info@irss-usa.org)**

Risks and Risk-Reducing Options  
Associated with  
Pool Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel  
at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee  
Nuclear Power Plants

by  
Gordon R. Thompson

25 May 2006

A report for  
Office of the Attorney General  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

**Abstract**

This report addresses some of the risks associated with the future operation of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee nuclear power plants. The risks that are addressed here arise from the storage of spent nuclear fuel in a water-filled pool adjacent to the reactor at each plant. Both pools are now equipped with high-density, closed-form storage racks. Options are available to reduce spent-fuel-pool risks. The option that would achieve the largest risk reduction at each plant, during operation within a license extension period, would be to re-equip the pool with low-density, open-frame storage racks. That option would return the plant to its original design configuration. This report describes risks and risk-reducing options, and relevant analysis that is required from the licensee and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the context of license extension applications for the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants.

## **About the Institute for Resource and Security Studies**

The Institute for Resource and Security Studies (IRSS) is an independent, nonprofit, Massachusetts corporation, founded in 1984. Its objective is to promote sustainable use of natural resources and global human security. In pursuit of this mission, IRSS conducts technical and policy analysis, public education, and field programs. IRSS projects always reflect a concern for practical solutions to resource and security problems.

## **About the Author**

Gordon R. Thompson is the executive director of IRSS and a research professor at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts. He studied and practiced engineering in Australia, and received a doctorate in applied mathematics from Oxford University in 1973, for analyses of plasma undergoing thermonuclear fusion. Dr. Thompson has been based in the USA since 1979. His professional interests encompass a range of technical and policy issues related to international security and protection of natural resources. He has conducted numerous studies on the environmental and security impacts of nuclear facilities and options for reducing these impacts.

Dr. Thompson independently identified the potential for a spent-fuel-pool fire, and articulated alternative options for lower-risk storage of spent fuel, during his work for the German state government of Lower Saxony in 1978-1979. His findings were accepted by that government after a public hearing. Since that time, Thompson has conducted several other studies on spent-fuel-storage risk, alone and with colleagues. Findings of these studies have been confirmed by a 2005 report by the National Academy of Sciences, prepared at the request of the US Congress.

## **Acknowledgements**

This report was prepared by IRSS for the Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Gordon R. Thompson is solely responsible for the content of the report.

**Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Recognition of the Spent-Fuel Hazard
3. Characteristics of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants and their Spent Fuel
4. Trends in Management of Spent Fuel
5. Technical Understanding of Spent-Fuel-Pool Fires
6. Initiation of a Pool Fire by an Accident Not Involving Malice
7. Initiation of a Pool Fire by Malicious Action
8. Options to Reduce the Risks of Pool Fires
9. An Integrated View of Risks and Risk-Reducing Options
10. Analysis Required From Entergy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11. Conclusions
12. Bibliography

Tables  
(See next page)

**List of Tables**

(Tables are located at the end of the report.)

Table 3-1: Selected Characteristics of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants

Table 3-2: Selected Characteristics of the Spent-Fuel Pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants

Table 3-3: Estimation of Cesium-137 Inventory in a Spent-Fuel Assembly and the Reactor Core, for the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants

Table 3-4: Estimated Future Inventory and Selected Characteristics of Spent Fuel in Pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants

Table 3-5: Illustrative Inventories of Cesium-137

Table 4-1: Estimated Duration of Phases of Implementation of the Yucca Mountain Repository

Table 4-2: Potential Emplacement Area of the Yucca Mountain Repository for Differing Spent-Fuel Inventories and Operating Modes

Table 4-3: Estimated Number of Radioactive-Waste Shipments to the Yucca Mountain Site

Table 4-4: Characteristics of BWR-Spent-Fuel Storage Canisters or Disposal Packages Proposed for Use at the Monticello or Skull Valley ISFSIs, or at Yucca Mountain

Table 5-1: Estimated Source Term for Atmospheric Release from Spent-Fuel-Pool Fire at the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee Plant

Table 6-1: Licensee Estimates of Core Damage Frequency and Radioactive Release Frequency, Pilgrim Plant

Table 6-2: Licensee Estimates of Core Damage Frequency and Radioactive Release Frequency, Vermont Yankee Plant

Table 6-3: Categories of Release to Atmosphere by Core-Damage Accidents at Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Nuclear Plants

Table 7-1: Potential Sabotage Events at a Spent-Fuel-Storage Pool, as Postulated in the NRC's August 1979 GEIS on Handling and Storage of Spent LWR Fuel

Table 7-2: Potential Modes and Instruments of Attack on a Nuclear Power Plant

Table 8-1: Selected Options to Reduce Risks of Spent-Fuel-Pool Fires at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants

Table 8-2: Selected Approaches to Protecting US Critical Infrastructure From Attack by Sub-National Groups, and Some of the Strengths and Weaknesses of these Approaches

Table 8-3: Estimation of Cost to Offload Spent Fuel from Pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants After 5 Years of Decay

Table 9-1: Provisional Estimate of the Probability of a Spent-Fuel-Pool Fire at the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee Plant

Table 9-2: Present Value of Cumulative (20-year) Economic Risk of a Potential Release of Radioactive Material

## **1. Introduction**

Applications have been submitted for 20-year extensions of the operating licenses of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee nuclear power plants. These plants began operating in 1972, and their current operating licenses expire in 2012. The designs of the two plants are broadly similar, and both are operated by Entergy Nuclear Operations Inc. (Entergy). Each plant features a boiling-water reactor (BWR) with a Mark 1 containment. The US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has announced that interested persons can petition to intervene in the license extension proceedings for these plants. In that context, the Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has requested the preparation of this report.

This report addresses a particular set of risks associated with the future operation of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants. These risks arise from the storage of spent nuclear fuel in water-filled pools. Each plant's nuclear reactor periodically discharges fuel that is "spent" in the sense that the fuel is no longer suitable for power generation. The spent fuel contains a large amount of radioactive material, and is stored in a water-filled pool adjacent to the reactor. In this report, the word "risk" applies to the potential for a release of radioactive material from nuclear fuel to the atmosphere. Other risks arise from the operation of nuclear power plants, but are not addressed here. The concept of risk encompasses both the consequences and probability of an event. However, risk is not simply the arithmetic product of consequence and probability numbers, as is sometimes assumed.

Although this report focuses on the risks arising from pool storage of spent fuel, the report necessarily considers some aspects of the risks arising from operation of the reactor at each plant. Such consideration is necessary because the pool and the reactor are in close physical proximity within the same building, and some of their essential support systems are shared. Thus, an incident involving a release of radioactive material from the pool could be initiated or exacerbated by an incident at the reactor, or vice versa, or parallel incidents at the pool and the reactor could have a common cause.

### *Scope of this analysis*

This report does not purport to provide a comprehensive assessment of the risks arising from pool storage of spent fuel at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants. As discussed in Section 10, below, preparation of such an assessment is a duty of Entergy and the NRC. Neither party has performed this duty. In the absence of a comprehensive assessment, this report provides illustrative analysis of selected issues. Assumptions of the analysis are stated, and the author would be pleased to engage in open technical debate regarding his analysis. A companion report, prepared independently by Dr. Jan Beyea, examines the offsite consequences of releases of radioactive material. Findings in that report are consistent with scientific knowledge and experience in the field of

radiological consequence assessment. Questions about the analysis in that report should be directed to Dr. Beyea.

Five major purposes are pursued in this report. The focus throughout is on the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants and their license extension applications, but much of the report's discussion has wider application. First, the potential for a release of radioactive material from a spent-fuel pool is described. Second, options for reducing the probability and/or consequences of such a release are described. These descriptions provide a general picture of the risks and risk-reducing options associated with pool storage of spent fuel. Third, an integrated view of these risks and risk-reducing options is provided. Fourth, the state of knowledge about these risks and risk-reducing options is reviewed. Fifth, the technical analysis required from Entergy and the NRC to improve this state of knowledge is described.

Two classes of event could lead to a release of radioactive material from a spent-fuel pool. One class of events, typically described as "accidents", includes human error, equipment failure and/or natural forces such as earthquakes. A second class encompasses deliberate, malicious acts. Some events, which involve harmful acts by insane but cognitively functioning persons, fall into both classes. This report considers the full range of initiating events, including human error, equipment failure, natural forces, malice, and/or insanity.

#### *Protection of sensitive information*

Any responsible analyst who discusses potential acts of malice at nuclear power plants is careful about making statements in public settings. The author of this report exercises such care. The author has no access to classified information, and this report contains no such information. However, a higher standard of discretion is necessary. An analyst should not publish detailed information that will assist potential attackers, even if this information is publicly available from other sources. On the other hand, if a plant's design and operation leave the plant vulnerable to attack, and the vulnerability is not being addressed appropriately, then a responsible analyst is obliged to publicly describe the vulnerability in general terms.

This report exemplifies the balance of responsibility described in the preceding paragraph. Vulnerabilities of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants are described here in general terms. Detailed information relating to those vulnerabilities is withheld here, although that information has been published elsewhere or could be re-created by many persons with technical education and/or military experience. For example, this report does not provide cross-section drawings of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants, although such drawings have been published for many years and are archived around the world. NRC license proceedings provide potential forums at which sensitive information can be discussed without concern about disclosure to potential attackers. Rules and practices are available so that the parties to a license proceeding can discuss sensitive information in a protected setting.

*Structure of this report*

The remainder of this report has eleven sections. Section 2 outlines the hazard posed by storage of spent fuel in a high-density configuration in pools at nuclear power plants, and describes the history of attention to this issue. The hazard arises from the potential for a self-ignited fire in a spent-fuel pool if water is lost from the pool. Technical aspects of this hazard are discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of the report. Characteristics of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants and their spent fuel are described in Section 3. National trends in the management of spent nuclear fuel are described in Section 4, providing evidence that spent fuel is likely to remain at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee sites for at least several decades, and potentially for more than a century. The risks of spent-fuel storage will continue to accumulate over that period.

Section 5 reviews the state of technical knowledge about potential spent-fuel-pool fires. Scenarios for such a fire at the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee plants are discussed in the two following sections. Section 6 discusses scenarios initiated by accidents not involving malice, while Section 7 discusses scenarios initiated by malicious action. Options to reduce the risks of spent-fuel-pool fires at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants are described in Section 8. An integrated view of risks and risk-reducing options at these plants is set forth in Section 9.

In Section 5 and elsewhere, this report discusses the state of technical knowledge about risks and risk-reducing options associated with spent-fuel pools. There are substantial deficiencies in present knowledge. Section 10 describes the technical analysis required from Entergy and the NRC to correct these deficiencies in the context of license extension applications for Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee. Conclusions are set forth in Section 11, and a bibliography is provided in Section 12. All documents cited in the text of this report are listed in the bibliography.

## **2. Recognition of the Spent-Fuel Hazard**

From the earliest years of the nuclear-technology era, analysis and experience have shown that a nuclear reactor can undergo an accident in which the reactor's fuel is damaged. This damage can lead to a release of radioactive material within the reactor and, potentially, from the reactor to the external environment. An early illustration of this accident potential occurred in the UK in 1957, when an air-cooled reactor at Windscale caught fire and released radioactive material to the atmosphere. At that time, spent fuel was not perceived as a significant hazard.

When the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants began operating in 1972, there was limited technical understanding of the potential for severe accidents at commercial reactors. In this context, "severe" means that the reactor core is severely damaged, which typically involves melting of some fraction of the core materials. The environmental impact

statements (EISs) related to the operation of Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee did not consider severe reactor accidents.<sup>1</sup> Knowledge about the potential for such accidents was improved by completion of the Reactor Safety Study (WASH-1400) in 1975.<sup>2</sup> More knowledge has accumulated from analysis and experience since that time.<sup>3</sup>

Until 1979 it was widely assumed that stored spent fuel did not pose risks comparable to those associated with reactors. This assumption arose because a spent fuel assembly does not contain short-lived radioactivity, and therefore produces less radioactive decay heat than does a similar fuel assembly in an operating reactor. However, that factor was counteracted by the introduction of high-density, closed-form storage racks into spent-fuel pools, beginning in the 1970s. Initially, pools were designed so that each held only a small inventory of spent fuel, with the expectation that spent fuel would be stored briefly and then taken away for reprocessing. Low-density, open-frame storage racks were used. Cooling fluid can circulate freely through such a rack. When reprocessing was abandoned in the United States, spent fuel began to accumulate in the pools. Excess spent fuel could have been offloaded to other storage facilities, allowing continued use of low-density racks. Instead, as a cost-saving measure, high-density racks were introduced, allowing much larger amounts of spent fuel to be stored in the pools.

#### *The potential for a pool fire*

Unfortunately, the closed-form configuration of the high-density racks would create a major problem if water were lost from a spent-fuel pool. The flow of air through the racks would be highly constrained, and would be almost completely cut off if residual water or debris were present in the base of the pool. As a result, removal of radioactive decay heat would be ineffective. Over a broad range of water-loss scenarios, the temperature of the zirconium fuel cladding would rise to the point (approximately 1,000 degrees C) where a self-sustaining, exothermic reaction of zirconium with air or steam would begin. Fuel discharged from the reactor for 1 month could ignite in less than 2 hours, and fuel discharged for 3 months could ignite in about 3 hours.<sup>4</sup> Once initiated, the fire would spread to adjacent fuel assemblies, and could ultimately involve all fuel in the pool. A large, atmospheric release of radioactive material would occur. For simplicity, this potential disaster can be described as a "pool fire".

Water could be lost from a spent-fuel pool through leakage, boiling, siphoning, pumping, displacement by objects falling into the pool, or overturning of the pool. These modes of water loss could arise from events, alone or in combination, that include: (i) acts of malice by persons within or outside the plant boundary; (ii) an accidental aircraft impact; (iii) an earthquake; (iv) dropping of a fuel cask; (v) accidental fires or explosions; and (vi) a severe accident at an adjacent reactor that, through the spread of radioactive

---

<sup>1</sup> AEC, 1972a; AEC, 1972b.

<sup>2</sup> NRC, 1975.

<sup>3</sup> Relevant experience includes the Three Mile Island reactor accident of 1979 and the Chernobyl reactor accident of 1986.

<sup>4</sup> This sentence assumes adiabatic conditions.

material and other influences, precludes the ongoing provision of cooling and/or water makeup to the pool.

These events have differing probabilities of occurrence. None of them is an everyday event. Nevertheless, they are similar to events that are now routinely considered in planning and policy decisions related to commercial nuclear reactors. To date, however, such events have not been given the same attention in the context of spent-fuel pools.

Some people have found it counter-intuitive that spent fuel, given its comparatively low decay heat and its storage under water, could pose a fire hazard. This perception has slowed recognition of the hazard. In this context, a simple analogy may be helpful. We all understand that a wooden house can stand safely for many years but be turned into an inferno by a match applied in an appropriate location. A spent-fuel pool equipped with high-density racks is roughly analogous, but in this case ignition would be accomplished by draining water from the pool. In both cases, a triggering event would unleash a large amount of latent chemical energy.

#### *The sequence of studies related to pool fires*

Two studies completed in March 1979 independently identified the potential for a fire in a drained spent-fuel pool equipped with high-density racks. One study was by members of a scientific panel assembled by the German state government of Lower Saxony to review a proposal for a nuclear fuel cycle center at Gorleben.<sup>5</sup> After a public hearing, the Lower Saxony government ruled in May 1979, as part of a broader decision, that high-density pool storage of spent fuel would not be acceptable at Gorleben. The second study was done by Sandia Laboratories for the NRC.<sup>6</sup> In light of knowledge that has accumulated since 1979, the Sandia report generally stands up well, provided that one reads the report in its entirety. However, the report's introduction contains an erroneous statement that complete drainage of the pool is the most severe situation. The body of the report clearly shows that partial drainage can be a more severe case, as was recognized in the Gorleben context. Unfortunately, the NRC continued, until October 2000, to employ the erroneous assumption that complete drainage is the most severe case.

The NRC has published various documents that discuss aspects of the potential for a spent-fuel-pool fire. Several of these documents are discussed in Section 5, below. Only three of the various documents are products of processes that provided an opportunity for formally structured public comment and, potentially, for in-depth analysis of risks and alternatives. One such document is the August 1979 Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) on handling and storage of spent fuel (NUREG-0575).<sup>7</sup> The second document is the May 1996 GEIS on license renewal (NUREG-1437).<sup>8</sup> These two documents purported to provide systematic analysis of the risks and relative costs and

---

<sup>5</sup> Thompson et al, 1979.

<sup>6</sup> Benjamin et al, 1979.

<sup>7</sup> NRC, 1979.

<sup>8</sup> NRC, 1996.

benefits of alternative options. The third document is the NRC's September 1990 review (55 FR 38474) of its Waste Confidence Decision.<sup>9</sup> That document did not purport to provide an analysis of risks and alternatives.

NUREG-0575 addresses the potential for a spent-fuel-pool fire in a single sentence that cites the 1979 Sandia report. The sentence reads:<sup>10</sup>

Assuming that the spent fuel stored at an independent spent fuel storage installation is at least one year old, calculations have been performed to show that loss of water should not result in fuel failure due to high temperatures if proper rack design is employed.

Although this sentence refers to pool storage of spent fuel at an independent spent fuel storage installation, NUREG-0575 regards at-reactor pool storage as having the same properties. This sentence misrepresents the findings of the Sandia report. The sentence does not define "proper rack design". It does not disclose Sandia's findings that high-density racks promote overheating of exposed fuel, and that overheating can cause fuel to self-ignite and burn. The NRC has never corrected this deficiency in NUREG-0575.

NUREG-1437 also addresses the potential for a spent-fuel-pool fire in a single sentence, which in this instance states:<sup>11</sup>

NRC has also found that, even, under the worst probable cause of a loss of spent-fuel pool coolant (a severe seismic-generated accident causing a catastrophic failure of the pool), the likelihood of a fuel-cladding fire is highly remote (55 FR 38474).

The parenthetical citation is to the NRC's September 1990 review of its Waste Confidence Decision. Thus, NUREG-1437's examination of pool fires is totally dependent on the September 1990 review. In turn, that review bases its opinion about pool fires on the following four NRC documents:<sup>12</sup> (i) NUREG/CR-4982;<sup>13</sup> (ii) NUREG/CR-5176;<sup>14</sup> (iii) NUREG-1353;<sup>15</sup> and (iv) NUREG/CR-5281.<sup>16</sup> These documents are discussed in Section 5, below. That discussion reveals substantial deficiencies in the documents' analysis of the potential for a pool fire.

Thus, neither of the two GEISs (NUREG-0575 and NUREG-1437), nor the September 1990 review of the Waste Confidence Decision, provides a technically defensible

---

<sup>9</sup> NRC, 1990a.

<sup>10</sup> NRC, 1979, page 4-21.

<sup>11</sup> NRC, 1996, pp 6-72 to 6-75.

<sup>12</sup> NRC, 1990a, page 38481.

<sup>13</sup> Sailor et al, 1987.

<sup>14</sup> Prassinis et al, 1989.

<sup>15</sup> Throm, 1989.

<sup>16</sup> Jo et al, 1989.

examination of spent-fuel-pool fires and the associated risks and alternatives. The statements in each document regarding pool fires are inconsistent with the findings of subsequent, more credible studies discussed below.

The most recent published NRC technical study on the potential for a pool fire is an NRC Staff study, originally released in October 2000 but formally published in February 2001, that addresses the risk of a pool fire at a nuclear power plant undergoing decommissioning.<sup>17</sup> This author submitted comments on the study to the NRC Commissioners in February 2001.<sup>18</sup> The study was in several respects an improvement on previous NRC documents that addressed pool fires. It reversed the NRC's longstanding, erroneous position that total, instantaneous drainage of a pool is the most severe case of drainage. However, it did not consider acts of malice. Nor did it add significantly to the weak base of technical knowledge regarding the propagation of a fire from one fuel assembly to another. Its focus was on a plant undergoing decommissioning. Therefore, it did not address potential interactions between pools and operating reactors, such as the interactions discussed in Section 6, below.

In 2003, eight authors, including the present author, published a paper on the risks of spent-fuel-pool fires and the options for reducing these risks.<sup>19</sup> That paper aroused vigorous comment, and its findings were disputed by NRC officials and others. Critical comment was also directed to a related report by this author.<sup>20</sup> In an effort to resolve this controversy, the US Congress requested the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to conduct a study on the safety and security of spent-fuel storage. The NAS submitted a classified report to Congress in July 2004, and released an unclassified version in April 2005.<sup>21</sup> Press reports described considerable tension between the NAS and the NRC regarding the inclusion of material in the unclassified NAS report.<sup>22</sup>

Since September 2001, the NRC has not published any document that contains technical analysis related to the potential for a pool fire. The NRC claims that it is conducting further analysis in a classified setting. The scope of information treated as secret by the NRC is questionable. Much of the relevant analysis would address issues such as heat transfer and fire propagation. Calculations and experiments on such subjects should be performed and reviewed in the public domain. Classification is appropriate for other information, such as specific points of vulnerability of a spent-fuel pool to attack.

### **3. Characteristics of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants and their Spent Fuel**

Basic data about the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants are set forth in Table 3-1. Data and estimates about storage of spent fuel at these plants are set forth in Tables 3-2

---

<sup>17</sup> Collins and Hubbard, 2001

<sup>18</sup> Thompson, 2001a.

<sup>19</sup> Alvarez et al, 2003.

<sup>20</sup> Thompson, 2003.

<sup>21</sup> NAS, 2006.

<sup>22</sup> Wald, 2005.

through 3-5. In regard to the latter tables, publicly available information is incomplete and inconsistent. Therefore, assumptions are made at various points in the tables, as is readily evident. In addition, the estimates set forth in Tables 3-3 through 3-5 involve a number of simplifying assumptions, which are also evident from the tables.

The scope and accuracy of Tables 3-1 through 3-5 could be improved using information that is held by Entergy and the NRC. Given this information, a more sophisticated analysis could be conducted to estimate the inventories and other characteristics of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pools during the requested period of license extension. These improvements would not alter the basic findings of this report.

At the Pilgrim plant, the present configuration of the storage racks in the spent-fuel pool reflects a license amendment approved by the NRC in 1994. A report submitted by the licensee in support of that license amendment states that the existing racks in the pool and the proposed new racks had a center-to-center distance of about 6.3 inches in both directions. The new racks would, when fully installed, fill the pool tightly, wall-to-wall.<sup>23</sup> Equivalent detail is not available regarding the present configuration of racks in the Vermont Yankee pool. However, from the data provided in Table 3-2 regarding the capacities, inventories and dimensions of both pools, it is evident that the Vermont Yankee pool configuration is similar to that at Pilgrim.<sup>24</sup>

Entergy has announced its intention to establish an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) at the Vermont Yankee site, and for this purpose has requested a Certificate of Public Good from the Vermont Public Service Board. The ISFSI would store fuel in dry-storage modules. Entergy has described its planned schedule for transferring spent fuel from the pool to the ISFSI.<sup>25</sup> From this schedule, it is evident that Entergy plans to use the spent-fuel pool at nearly its full capacity, storing the overflow from that capacity in the ISFSI.

Extension of the Pilgrim operating license would imply the establishment of an ISFSI at the Pilgrim site. Entergy has not yet announced a plan to establish such an ISFSI. Given the continuing accumulation of spent fuel in the Pilgrim pool, and the time required to establish an ISFSI, it can reasonably be presumed that Entergy plans to use the Pilgrim spent-fuel pool at nearly its full capacity, storing the overflow from that capacity in a future ISFSI.

#### *Inventories of cesium-137*

The radioactive isotope cesium-137 provides a useful indicator of the hazard potential of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pools. This isotope, which has a half-life of

---

<sup>23</sup> Holtec, 1993.

<sup>24</sup> Hoffman, 2005, states that the present Vermont Yankee racks have a center-to-center distance of 6.2 inches.

<sup>25</sup> Hoffman, 2005.

30 years, is a volatile element that would be liberally released during a pool fire.<sup>26</sup> Table 3-4 shows the estimated inventory of cesium-137 in the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pools during the period of license extension. This table shows that the pools will hold about 1.6 million TBq (Pilgrim) and 1.4 million TBq (Vermont Yankee) of cesium-137. For comparison, Tables 3-3 and 3-5 provide licensee estimates showing that the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee reactor cores will hold 190,000 TBq and 179,000 TBq, respectively, of cesium-137. Thus, each pool will hold about 8 times as much cesium-137 as will be present in the adjacent reactor.

#### **4. Trends in Management of Spent Fuel**

Risks arising from storage of spent fuel will accumulate over time. Thus, it is important to estimate the time period during which spent fuel will be stored at the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee site, whether in a pool or an onsite ISFSI. In testimony before the Vermont Public Service Board, an Entergy witness has stated that the US Department of Energy (DOE) could begin accepting spent fuel from Vermont Yankee as early as 2015, for emplacement in the proposed repository in Yucca Mountain, Nevada.<sup>27</sup>

Some decision makers have advocated a revival of spent-fuel reprocessing as an alternative to placing intact spent fuel in a repository. Reprocessing was the national strategy for spent-fuel management when the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants were built, but was abandoned in the 1970s. If reprocessing were to resume, it would provide an option for removal of spent fuel from reactor sites.

This author has testified before the Vermont Public Service Board regarding the prospects for the Yucca Mountain repository, reprocessing, and other options for removal of spent fuel from the Vermont Yankee site. He concluded that spent fuel is likely to remain at the site for at least several decades, and potentially for more than a century.<sup>28</sup> The same arguments apply to the Pilgrim site. Here, selected arguments are summarized, to illustrate the factors that will hinder removal of spent fuel from each site.

Current national policy for long-term management of spent fuel is to establish a repository inside Yucca Mountain. Progress with this project has been slow, and many observers believe that it will be cancelled. Even if the repository does open, there will be a delay before fuel can be shipped to Yucca Mountain and emplaced in the repository. Table 4-1 shows a schedule projection by DOE, indicating that the emplacement process could occupy five decades.

---

<sup>26</sup> A study by the US Department of Energy (DOE, 1987) shows that cesium-137 accounts for most of the offsite radiation exposure that is attributable to the 1986 Chernobyl reactor accident, and for about half of the radiation exposure that is attributable to fallout from nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere. Note that the particular mechanisms of the Chernobyl accident could not occur in the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee pool.

<sup>27</sup> Hoffman, 2005.

<sup>28</sup> Thompson, 2006.

The US fleet of commercial reactors will probably produce more than 80,000 MgU of spent fuel if each reactor operates to the end of its initial 40-year license period. If each reactor received a 20-year license extension, the fleet could eventually produce a total of about 120,000 MgU of spent fuel. Yet, the capacity of Yucca Mountain is limited by federal statute to 63,000 MgU of spent fuel. DOE has investigated the option of placing 105,000 MgU of spent fuel in Yucca Mountain, which assumes a statute amendment. However, Table 4-2 shows that emplacement of 105,000 MgU of fuel could require an emplacement area of up to 3,800 acres if a lower-temperature operating mode is selected. Licensing considerations are likely to favor the selection of a lower-temperature operating mode, and there may not be enough space in the mountain to allow a total emplacement area of 3,800 acres. Thus, the physical capacity of Yucca Mountain could be less than 105,000 MgU of fuel.

As Table 4-3 shows, operation of the Yucca Mountain repository would involve a large number of spent-fuel shipments. This potential traffic poses a security concern, because there is evidence that shipping casks are more vulnerable to attack by sub-national groups than DOE has previously assumed.<sup>29</sup> Spent-fuel shipments could be comparatively attractive targets because they cannot be protected to the same extent as nuclear power plants.

A further impediment to shipping spent fuel to Yucca Mountain is that DOE has announced that it will receive fuel in standard canisters that are inserted, unopened, into waste packages prior to emplacement in the repository. Yet, as Table 4-4 shows, the concept of a standard canister is incompatible with the present configurations of dry-storage canisters and the proposed configurations of Yucca Mountain disposal packages. There is no clear path to resolution of this problem.

## **5. Technical Understanding of Spent-Fuel-Pool Fires**

Section 2, above, introduces the concept of a pool fire and describes the history of analysis of pool-fire risks. There is a body of technical literature on these risks, containing documents of varying degrees of completeness and accuracy. Current opinions about the risks vary widely, but the differences of opinion may be more about the probabilities of pool-fire scenarios than about the physical characteristics of these scenarios. In turn, differing opinions about probabilities lead to differing support for risk-reducing options. This situation is captured in a comment by Allan Benjamin on a paper (Alvarez et al, 2003) by this author and seven colleagues.<sup>30</sup> Benjamin's comment is quoted in the unclassified NAS report as follows:<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> The term "sub-national group" is used in security analysis to describe a human group that is larger and more capable than an isolated individual, but is not an arm of a national government. This distinction has strategic significance because deterrence, a potentially effective means of influencing a national government, may not influence a sub-national group.

<sup>30</sup> Allan Benjamin was one of the authors of: Benjamin et al, 1979.

<sup>31</sup> NAS, 2006, page 45.

In a nutshell, [Alvarez et al] correctly identify a problem that needs to be addressed, but they do not adequately demonstrate that the proposed solution is cost-effective or that it is optimal.

The "proposed solution" to which Benjamin refers is the re-equipment of spent-fuel pools with low-density, open-frame racks, transferring excess spent fuel to onsite dry storage. In fact, however, the [Alvarez et al] authors had not claimed to complete the level of analysis, especially site-specific analysis, that risk-reducing options should receive in an Environmental Report or EIS. These authors stated:<sup>32</sup>

Finally, all of our proposals require further detailed analysis and some would involve risk tradeoffs that also would have to be further analyzed. Ideally, these analyses could be embedded in an open process in which both analysts and policy makers can be held accountable.

The paper by Alvarez et al is consistent with current knowledge of pool-fire phenomena, including the findings set forth in the unclassified NAS report. The same cannot be said for all of the NRC documents that were cited in the NRC's September 1990 review of its Waste Confidence Decision. As discussed in Section 2, above, four NRC documents were cited to support that review's finding regarding the risks of pool fires.<sup>33</sup> In turn, the May 1996 GEIS on license renewal (NUREG-1437) relied on the September 1990 review for its position on the risks of pool fires. The four NRC documents are discussed in the following paragraphs.

NUREG/CR-4982 was prepared at Brookhaven National Laboratory to provide "an assessment of the likelihood and consequences of a severe accident in a spent fuel storage pool".<sup>34</sup> The postulated accident involved complete, instantaneous loss of water from the pool, thereby excluding important phenomena from consideration. The Brookhaven authors employed a simplistic model to examine propagation of a fire from one fuel assembly to another. That model neglected important phenomena including slumping and burn-through of racks, slumping of fuel assemblies, and the accumulation of a debris bed at the base of the pool. Each of these neglected phenomena would promote fire propagation. The study ignored the potential for interactions between a pool fire and a reactor accident. It did not consider acts of malice. Overall, this study did not approach the completeness and quality needed to support consideration of a pool fire in an EIS.

NUREG/CR-5176 was prepared at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.<sup>35</sup> It examined the potential for earthquake-induced failure of the spent-fuel pool and the pool's support systems at the Vermont Yankee and Robinson Unit 2 plants. It also considered the effect of dropping a spent-fuel shipping cask on a pool wall. Overall, this study appears to have been a competent exercise within its stated assumptions. With

---

<sup>32</sup> Alvarez et al, 2003, page 35.

<sup>33</sup> NRC, 1990a, page 38481.

<sup>34</sup> Sailor et al, 1987.

<sup>35</sup> Prassinis et al, 1989.

appropriate updating, NUREG/CR-5176 could contribute to the larger body of analysis that would be needed to support consideration of a pool fire in an EIS.

NUREG-1353 was prepared by a member of the NRC Staff to support resolution of NRC Generic Issue 82.<sup>36</sup> It postulated a pool accident involving complete, instantaneous loss of water from the pool, thereby excluding important phenomena from consideration. It relied on the fire-propagation analysis of NUREG/CR-4982. As discussed above, that analysis is inadequate. In considering heat transfer from BWR fuel after water loss, NUREG-1353 assumed that a high-density rack configuration would involve a 5-inch open space between each row of fuel assemblies. That assumption is inappropriate and non-conservative. Modern, high-density BWR racks have a center-to-center distance of about 6 inches in both directions. Thus, NUREG-1353 under-estimated the potential for ignition of BWR fuel. Overall, NUREG-1353 did not approach the completeness and quality needed to support consideration of a pool fire in an EIS.

NUREG/CR-5281 was prepared at Brookhaven National Laboratory to evaluate options for reducing the risks of pool fires.<sup>37</sup> It took NUREG/CR-4982 as its starting point, and therefore shared the deficiencies of that study.

Clearly, these four NRC documents do not provide an adequate technical basis for an EIS that addresses the risks of pool fires. The knowledge that they do provide could be supplemented from other documents, including the unclassified NAS report, the paper by Alvarez et al, and the NRC Staff study (NUREG-1738) on pool-fire risk at a plant undergoing decommissioning.<sup>38</sup> However, this combined body of information would be inadequate to support the preparation of an EIS. For that purpose, a comprehensive, integrated study would be required, involving analysis and experiment. The depth of investigation would be similar to that involved in preparing the NRC's December 1990 study on the risks of reactor accidents (NUREG-1150).<sup>39</sup>

*A pool-fire "source term"*

The incompleteness of the present knowledge base is evident when one needs a "source term" to estimate the radiological consequences of a pool fire. The concept of a source term encompasses the magnitude, timing and other characteristics of a release of radioactive material. Present knowledge does not allow theoretical or empirically-based prediction of the source term for a postulated pool-fire scenario. Instead, informed judgment must be used.

Table 5-1 provides two versions of a source term for a pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee. Each version assumes that a high-density pool would be almost full of spent

---

<sup>36</sup> Throm, 1989.

<sup>37</sup> Jo et al, 1989.

<sup>38</sup> Collins and Hubbard, 2001.

<sup>39</sup> NRC, 1990b.

fuel, which is the expected mode of operation of each plant during the period of license extension.

One version of the source term involves a release of 100 percent of the cesium-137 in a pool. That is an upper limit. In practice, the cesium-137 release fraction would be less than 100 percent, but there is no way to determine if the largest achievable release fraction would be 90 percent or 95 percent or some other number. In any event, this large source term implies that all or most of the zirconium in the pool would oxidize. Table 5-1 assumes that the oxidation occurs over a period of 5 hours. The second version of the source term involves a release of 10 percent of the cesium-137 in the pool, with oxidation of 10 percent of the zirconium over a period of 0.5 hours.

Given present knowledge, the approximately 100-percent release and the 10-percent release are equally probable for a typical pool fire. A prudent decision maker could, therefore, reasonably use the 100-percent release to assess risks and risk-reducing options.

## **6. Initiation of a Pool Fire by an Accident Not Involving Malice**

Section 2, above, provides a general description of the potential for a spent-fuel-pool fire. Such a fire could be caused by a variety of events. Here, accidental events not involving malice are considered, with a focus on the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants. Section 7, below, considers events that involve malicious action.

At Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee, non-malicious events at the plant that could lead to a pool fire include: (i) an accidental aircraft impact, with or without an accompanying fuel-air explosion or fire; (ii) an earthquake; (iii) dropping of a fuel transfer cask or shipping cask; (iv) a fire inside or outside the plant building; and (v) a severe accident at the adjacent reactor.

Given the major consequences of a pool fire, analysis should have been performed to examine pool-fire scenarios across a full range of initiating events. The NRC has devoted substantial attention and resources to the examination of reactor-core-melt scenarios, through studies such as NUREG-1150.<sup>40</sup> Neither the NRC nor the nuclear industry has conducted a comparable study of pool fires. In the absence of such a study, this report provides illustrative analysis.

---

<sup>40</sup> NRC, 1990b.

*A pool fire accompanied by a reactor accident*

As mentioned in Section 1, above, at Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee the pool and the reactor are in close physical proximity within the same building, and some of their essential support systems are shared. These plants are, therefore, comparatively likely to experience a pool fire that is accompanied by a reactor accident.

This combination of accidents is the focus of discussion here. The pool fire and the reactor accident might have a common cause. For example, a severe earthquake could cause leakage of water from the pool, while also damaging the reactor and its supporting systems to such an extent that a core-melt accident occurs. In some scenarios, the high radiation field produced by a pool fire could initiate or exacerbate an accident at the reactor by precluding the presence and functioning of operating personnel. In other scenarios, the high radiation field produced by a core-melt accident could initiate or exacerbate a pool-fire scenario, again by precluding the presence and functioning of operating personnel. Many core-melt scenarios would involve the interruption of cooling to the pool.

By focusing on a pool fire accompanied by a reactor accident, this report does not imply that other pool-fire scenarios make a smaller contribution to pool-fire risks at Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee. Such a conclusion could come only from a comprehensive assessment of pool-fire risks, and no such assessment has ever been performed.

Tables 6-1 and 6-2 provide licensee estimates of core-damage frequency (probability) and radioactive-release frequency for the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee reactors.<sup>41</sup> Some of these estimates are from the Independent Plant Examination (IPE) and the Independent Plant Examination for External Events (IPEEE) that have been performed for each plant.<sup>42</sup> The remaining estimates are from the Environmental Report (Appendix E of the license renewal application) for each plant. In this report, the IPE and IPEEE estimates are used instead of the ER estimates, because the studies underlying the latter are not available for review.<sup>43</sup>

Estimates shown in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 that are of particular relevance to this report are the estimates of the probability (frequency) of an early release of radioactive material from the reactor. Table 6-3 provides a definition of "early" and other terms that are used to categorize potential radioactive releases. "High" and "medium" release scenarios, as defined in Table 6-3, are often "early" and vice versa.

---

<sup>41</sup> For present purposes, core damage is equivalent to core melt.

<sup>42</sup> Boston Edison, 1992; Boston Edison, 1994; VYNPS, 1993; VYNPS, 1998.

<sup>43</sup> NRC Public Document Room staff informed Diane Curran that the recent reactor-accident studies referenced in the Environmental Reports for Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee could not be located within the NRC.

*Lessons from a license-amendment proceeding for the Harris plant*

This report assumes that the conditional probability of a spent-fuel-pool fire, given an early release from the adjacent reactor, is 50 percent. That assumption is reasonable – and not necessarily conservative – for the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee plant because the pool and the reactor are in close physical proximity within the same building, and some of their essential support systems are shared. Support for this assumption is provided by technical studies and opinions submitted to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB) in a license-amendment proceeding in regard to the expansion of spent-fuel-pool capacity at the Harris nuclear power plant. All three parties to the proceeding – the NRC Staff, Carolina Power and Light (CP&L), and Orange County – reached the same conclusion on an issue that is relevant to the above-stated conditional probability of 50 percent.

The Harris plant has one reactor and four pools. The reactor – a PWR – is in a cylindrical, domed containment building. The four pools are in a separate, adjacent building that was originally intended to serve four reactors. Only one reactor was built. Two pools were in use at high density prior to the proceeding, and the proceeding addressed the activation of the two remaining pools, also at high density.

During the proceeding, the ASLB determined that the potential for a pool fire should be considered, and ordered the three parties to analyze a single scenario for such a fire.<sup>44</sup> In the postulated scenario, a severe accident at the Harris reactor would contaminate the Harris site with radioactive material to an extent that would preclude actions needed to supply cooling and makeup to the Harris pools. Thereafter, the pools would boil and dry out, and fuel within the pools would burn. Following the ALSB's order, Orange County submitted a report by this author.<sup>45</sup> The NRC Staff submitted an affidavit by members of the Staff.<sup>46</sup> CP&L – the licensee – submitted a document prepared by ERIN Engineering.<sup>47</sup>

Orange County's analysis found that the minimum value for the best estimate of a pool fire, for the ASLB's postulated scenario, is 1.6 per 100 thousand reactor-years. This estimate did not account for acts of malice, degraded standards of plant operation, or gross errors in design, construction or operation. The NRC Staff estimated, for the same scenario, that the probability of a pool fire is on the order of 2 per 10 million reactor-years. The ASLB accepted the Staff's estimate, thereby concluding that, for the particular configuration of the Harris plant, the postulated scenario is "remote and speculative"; the

---

<sup>44</sup> ASLB, 2000.

<sup>45</sup> Thompson, 2000.

<sup>46</sup> Parry et al, 2000.

<sup>47</sup> ERIN, 2000.

ASLB then terminated the proceeding without conducting an evidentiary hearing.<sup>48</sup> Elsewhere, the author has described deficiencies in the ASLB's ruling.<sup>49</sup>

A major reason for the difference in the probability estimates proffered by Orange County and the NRC Staff was their differing assessments of the spread of radioactive material from the reactor containment building to the separate, adjacent pool building. However, the Staff agreed with Orange County on some other matters. For example, the Staff reversed its previous position that comparatively long-discharged fuel will not ignite in the event of water loss from a high-density pool. Staff members stated that loss of water from pools containing fuel aged less than 5 years "would almost certainly result in an exothermic reaction", and also stated: "Precisely how old the fuel has to be to prevent a fire is still not resolved."<sup>50</sup> Moreover, the Staff assumed that a fire would be inevitable if the water level fell to the top of the racks.

Most importantly for present purposes, the technical submissions of all three parties agreed that the onset of a pool fire in two of the pools in the Harris pool building would preclude the provision of cooling and water makeup to the other two pools. This effect would arise from the spread of hot gases and radioactive material throughout the pool building, which would preclude access by operating personnel. Thus, the pools not involved in the initial fire would boil and dry out, and their fuel would burn.

The Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants have a different configuration than the Harris plant, because at Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee the reactor and the pool are within the same building whereas at Harris they are in different buildings. Thus, the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants are analogous to the Harris pool building. Given an early release from the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee reactor as part of a core-melt accident, hot gases and radioactive material from the reactor would spread throughout the building that encloses both. Provision of cooling and water makeup to the pool would be precluded, the radiation field and the thermal environment being even more extreme than in the Harris situation. The pool would boil and dry out, and its fuel would burn.

Thus, the three parties' agreement in the Harris proceeding implies their agreement that a pool fire would inevitably follow an early release as part of a core-melt accident at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee. Against that background, this report's assumption of a conditional probability of 50 percent for a pool fire, given an early release, is reasonable.

## **7. Initiation of a Pool Fire by Malicious Action**

The NRC's August 1979 Generic Environmental Impact Statement on handling and storage of spent fuel (NUREG-0575) considered potential sabotage events at a spent-fuel pool.<sup>51</sup> Table 7-1 describes the postulated events, which encompassed the detonation of

---

<sup>48</sup> ASLB, 2001.

<sup>49</sup> Thompson, 2001b.

<sup>50</sup> Parry et al, 2000, paragraph 29.

<sup>51</sup> NRC, 1979, Section 5 and Appendix J.

explosive charges in the pool, breaching of the walls of the pool building and the pool floor by explosive charges or other means, and takeover of the central control room for one half-hour. Involvement of up to 80 adversaries was implied.

NUREG-0575 did not, however, recognize the potential for an attack with these attributes to cause a fire in the pool.<sup>52</sup> Technically-informed attackers operating within this envelope of attributes could cause a fire in a pool at Pilgrim, Vermont Yankee or other plants. Informed attackers could use explosives, and their command of the control room for one half-hour, to drain water from the pool and release radioactive material from the reactor.<sup>53</sup> The radiation field from the reactor release would preclude personnel access, thus precluding recovery actions if command of the plant were returned to the operators after one half-hour.

The potential for a maliciously-induced pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee is influenced by several factors. Here, the following factors are considered: (i) the present level of protection of nuclear power plants and spent fuel; (ii) options for providing greater protection; (iii) available means of attack; and (iv) motives for attack. In the context of an EIS, the first, third and fourth of these factors relate to the probability of a successful attack, and the second factor relates to alternatives.

*The present level of protection of nuclear power plants and spent fuel*

Site-security measures mandated by the NRC have made access to a nuclear power plant more difficult for attackers approaching on foot or by land vehicle than was the case in 1979.<sup>54</sup> Nevertheless, as discussed below, a successful attack could be mounted today using resources of the scale assumed in NUREG-0575 or employed to attack the United States on 11 September 2001. In light of information now available, the NRC could prepare a supplement to NUREG-0575 that updates its sabotage analysis. This supplement could employ a classified appendix to prevent public disclosure of sensitive information.

The consideration of sabotage events in NUREG-0575 is an exception. As a general rule, the NRC does not consider malicious acts in the context of license proceedings or environmental impact statements. The NRC's policy on this matter is illustrated by a September 1982 ruling by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the operating-license proceeding for the Harris nuclear power plant. An intervenor, Wells Eddleman, had proffered a contention alleging, in part, that the plant's safety analysis was deficient because it did not consider the "consequences of terrorists commandeering a very large airplane.....and diving it into the containment." In rejecting this contention the ASLB stated:<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> The sabotage events postulated in NUREG-0575 yielded comparatively small radioactive releases.

<sup>53</sup> In some areas of the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee reactor building, one explosive charge could potentially breach the pool wall, the reactor containment, and the reactor vessel.

<sup>54</sup> NRC, 2004; Thompson, 2004.

<sup>55</sup> ASLB, 1982.

This part of the contention is barred by 10 CFR 50.13. This rule must be read *in pari materia* with 10 CFR 73.1(a)(1), which describes the "design basis threat" against which commercial power reactors *are* required to be protected. Under that provision, a plant's security plan must be designed to cope with a violent external assault by "several persons," equipped with light, portable weapons, such as hand-held automatic weapons, explosives, incapacitating agents, and the like. Read in the light of section 73.1, the principal thrust of section 50.13 is that military style attacks with heavier weapons are not a part of the design basis threat for commercial reactors. Reactors could not be effectively protected against such attacks without turning them into virtually impregnable fortresses at much higher cost. Thus Applicants are not required to design against such things as artillery bombardments, missiles with nuclear warheads, or kamikaze dives by large airplanes, despite the fact that such attacks would damage and may well destroy a commercial reactor.

As indicated by the ASLB, the NRC's basic policy on protecting nuclear facilities from attack is laid down in the regulation 10 CFR 50.13. This regulation was promulgated in September 1967 by the US Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) – which preceded the NRC – and was upheld by the US Court of Appeals in August 1968. It states:<sup>56</sup>

An applicant for a license to construct and operate a production or utilization facility, or for an amendment to such license, is not required to provide for design features or other measures for the specific purpose of protection against the effects of (a) attacks and destructive acts, including sabotage, directed against the facility by an enemy of the United States, whether a foreign government or other person, or (b) use or deployment of weapons incident to US defense activities.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.13, licensees are not required to design or operate nuclear facilities to resist enemy attack. However, events have obliged the NRC to progressively modify this position, so as to require greater protection against malicious or insane acts by sub-national groups. A series of events, including the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center in New York, persuaded the NRC to introduce, in 1994, regulations requiring licensees to defend nuclear power plants against vehicle bombs. The attacks of 11 September 2001 led the NRC to require additional measures.

The NRC requires its licensees to defend against a design basis threat (DBT), a postulated attack that has become more severe over time. The present DBT was promulgated in April 2003. Prior to February 2002 the DBT was published, but not thereafter. The NRC has described the present DBT for nuclear power plants as follows:<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Federal Register, Vol. 32, 26 September 1967, page 13445.

<sup>57</sup> NRC Press Release No. 03-053, 29 April 2003.

The Order that imposes revisions to the Design Basis Threat requires power plants to implement additional protective actions to protect against sabotage by terrorists and other adversaries. The details of the design basis threat are safeguards information pursuant to Section 147 of the Atomic Energy Act and will not be released to the public. This Order builds on the changes made by the Commission's February 25, 2002 Order. The Commission believes that this DBT represents the largest reasonable threat against which a regulated private security force should be expected to defend under existing law. It was arrived at after extensive deliberation and interaction with cleared stakeholders from other Federal agencies, State governments and industry.

From this statement, and from other published information, it is evident that the NRC requires a comparatively light defense for nuclear power plants and their spent fuel. The scope of the defense does not reflect a full spectrum of threats. Instead, it reflects a consensus about the level of threat that licensees can "reasonably" be expected to resist.<sup>58</sup>

A rationale for the present level of protection of nuclear facilities was articulated by the NRC chair, Richard Meserve, in 2002:<sup>59</sup>

If we allow terrorist threats to determine what we build and what we operate, we will retreat into the past – back to an era without suspension bridges, harbor tunnels, stadiums, or hydroelectric dams, let alone skyscrapers, liquid-natural-gas terminals, chemical factories, or nuclear power plants. We cannot eliminate the terrorists' targets, but instead we must eliminate the terrorists themselves. A strategy of risk avoidance – the elimination of the threat by the elimination of potential targets – does not reflect a sound response.

*Options for providing greater protection*

Chairman Meserve's statement does not consider another approach – designing new infrastructure elements or modifying existing elements so that they are more robust against attack. It has been known for decades that nuclear power plants could be designed to be more robust against attack. For example, in the early 1980s the reactor vendor ASEA-Atom developed a preliminary design for an "intrinsically safe" commercial reactor known as the PIUS reactor. Passive-safety design principles were used. The design basis for the PIUS reactor included events such as equipment failures, operator errors and earthquakes, but also included: (i) takeover of the plant for one operating shift by knowledgeable saboteurs equipped with large amounts of explosives; (ii) aerial bombardment with 1,000-pound bombs; and (iii) abandonment of the plant by the operators for one week.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Fertel, 2006; Wells, 2006; Brian, 2006.

<sup>59</sup> Meserve, 2002, page 22.

<sup>60</sup> Hannerz, 1983.

As explained in Section 8, below, the spent-fuel pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants would be more robust against attack if they were re-equipped with low-density, open-frame storage racks. This step would restore the pools to their original design configuration.

*Available means of attack*

In considering the potential for a future attack on the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pool, it is necessary to consider both means and motives. Table 7-2 provides some general information about means. This table shows that nuclear power plants are vulnerable to attack by means available to sub-national groups. For example, one of the potential instruments of attack shown in Table 7-2 is an explosive-laden smaller aircraft. In this connection, note that the US General Accounting Office (GAO) expressed concern, in September 2003 testimony to Congress, about the potential for malicious use of general-aviation aircraft. The testimony stated:<sup>61</sup>

Since September 2001, TSA [the Transportation Security Administration] has taken limited action to improve general aviation security, leaving it far more open and potentially vulnerable than commercial aviation. General aviation is vulnerable because general aviation pilots are not screened before takeoff and the contents of general aviation planes are not screened at any point. General aviation includes more than 200,000 privately owned airplanes, which are located in every state at more than 19,000 airports. Over 550 of these airports also provide commercial service. In the last 5 years, about 70 aircraft have been stolen from general aviation airports, indicating a potential weakness that could be exploited by terrorists.

Sub-national groups could obtain explosive devices that would be effective instruments of attack on a nuclear power plant.<sup>62</sup> Assistance from a government or access to classified information would not be required. Designs for sophisticated explosive devices capable of exploiting the vulnerabilities of the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pools are publicly available from sources including the web. Means for delivery of such devices to the target are also readily available.<sup>63</sup>

*Motives for attack*

Understanding the factors that could motivate a sub-national group to attack a civilian nuclear facility in the USA is a difficult task. Multiple, competing factors will be in play, and will affect different groups in different ways. An attacking group might be foreign, as was the case in New York and Washington in September 2001, or domestic, as was the case in Oklahoma City in April 1995 and London in July 2005. As we try to understand

---

<sup>61</sup> Dillingham, 2003, page 14.

<sup>62</sup> Walters, 2003.

<sup>63</sup> For example: Raytheon, 2004; the website [www.aircraftdealer.com](http://www.aircraftdealer.com), accessed 6 November 2004.

the complex issue of motives, one requirement is clear. We must set aside our own perspectives, and attempt to understand the perspectives of those who might attack us. That understanding will help us to assess risks and prepare countermeasures.

One insight from experience is that an attack by a sub-national group could be part of an action-reaction cycle.<sup>64</sup> Former CIA Director Stansfield Turner has recounted how the October 1983 truck bombing of a US Marine barracks in Beirut was part of such a cycle.<sup>65</sup> A high-level task force convened by the Council on Foreign Relations recognized the potential for an action-reaction effect in the context of US military operations with counterterrorism objectives. They recommended that this effect be offset by greater protection of domestic targets. An October 2002 report of the task force stated:<sup>66</sup>

*Homeland security measures have deterrence value:*

US counterterrorism initiatives abroad can be reinforced by making the US homeland a less tempting target. We can transform the calculations of would-be terrorists by elevating the risk that (1) an attack on the United States will fail, and (2) the disruptive consequences of a successful attack will be minimal. It is especially critical that we bolster this deterrent now since an inevitable consequence of the US government's stepped-up military and diplomatic exertions will be to elevate the incentive to strike back before these efforts have their desired effect.

#### *Probability of attack*

For policy and planning purposes, it would be useful to have an estimate of the probability of an attack-induced spent-fuel-pool fire. The record of experience does not allow a statistically valid estimate of this probability. A decision maker or risk analyst must, therefore, rely on prudent judgment.<sup>67</sup> In the case of an attack-induced spent-fuel-pool fire in the USA, prudent judgment indicates that a probability of at least one per century is a reasonable assumption for policy purposes.

### **8. Options to Reduce the Risks of Pool Fires**

Various options are available to reduce the probability and/or magnitude of an atmospheric release from a spent-fuel-pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee. A useful option must achieve one or more of the following five effects: (i) reduce the probability of a loss of water; (ii) reduce the potential for ignition of fuel following a loss of water; (iii) reduce the potential for fire propagation following ignition of one or more fuel

---

<sup>64</sup> Davis, 2006.

<sup>65</sup> Turner, 1991.

<sup>66</sup> Hart et al, 2002, pp 14-15.

<sup>67</sup> The NRC has used qualitative judgment about the probability of attack as a basis for the 1994 vehicle-bomb rule and the present design basis threat.

assemblies; (iv) reduce the inventory of spent fuel in the pool; or (v) suppress a fire in the pool.

The fifth effect – fire suppression – would be extremely difficult to achieve. Spraying water on a fire could feed a zirconium-steam reaction. In principle, an air-zirconium reaction in the pool could be smothered, perhaps by spreading large amounts of a non-reactive powder. In practice, the high radiation field surrounding the pool would preclude the approach of firefighters. Here, the focus is on the first four effects.

Table 8-1 describes selected risk-reducing options that could, to some degree, achieve one or more of the first four effects. This table does not purport to identify a comprehensive set of risk-reducing options, or to provide a complete assessment of the listed options. Instead, this table illustrates the range of options and their properties.

The option that would achieve the largest risk reduction, during plant operation within a license extension period, would be to re-equip the pool with low-density, open-frame storage racks. Implementation of this option would return the plant to its original design configuration. Excess spent fuel would be placed in dry storage at the plant site. This option would not reduce the probability of a loss of water. Instead, it would allow the pool to survive a loss of water without damage to the fuel. It would prevent ignition of fuel in almost all scenarios of water loss. For the few, unlikely scenarios that would remain, it would inhibit fire propagation across the pool. By reducing the inventory of radioactive material in the pool, this option would limit the magnitude of the greatest possible release.

Re-equipping a spent-fuel pool with low-density, open-frame racks would be an entirely passive measure of risk reduction. Successful functioning of this option would not require electricity, a water supply, the presence of personnel, or any other active function. Passive risk-reduction measures of this type represent good practice in nuclear engineering design. Reactor vendors are seeking to use passive-safety principles in the design of new commercial reactors.

Nuclear power plants are important elements of the nation's critical infrastructure. Other elements of that infrastructure also offer opportunities to use passive measures of risk reduction. Passive measures can be highly reliable and predictable in their effectiveness. They can substitute for other measures to protect critical infrastructure, as shown in Table 8-2, yielding monetary and non-monetary benefits.

Table 8-3 provides an estimated cost for offloading spent fuel from the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee pool, to allow the pool to be re-equipped with low-density, open-frame racks. There would be an additional, smaller cost for replacing the racks, which is neglected here. Note that Table 8-3 does not purport to provide a definitive specification for re-equipment of the pools, or a final estimate of the cost of this option. The analysis presented in Table 8-3 is illustrative. A more sophisticated analysis would not alter the basic findings of this report.

From Table 8-3 one sees that the estimated cost of a transition to low-density, open-frame racks would be \$54-109 million at Pilgrim and \$43-87 million at Vermont Yankee. Approximately the same cost would otherwise be incurred during decommissioning of the plant, when spent fuel would be offloaded from the pool to dry storage. The net additional cost of the option would reflect the comparative present values of approximately equal expenditures now or two decades in the future.

## **9. An Integrated View of Risks and Risk-Reducing Options**

Preceding sections of this report have discussed particular aspects of the risks and risk-reducing options associated with pool storage of spent nuclear fuel. To produce useful policy findings, these separate discussions must be integrated.

Section 6 of this report provides, in Tables 6-1 and 6-2, licensee estimates of the probability of an early release as part of a severe reactor accident – of non-malicious origin – at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee. Also, Section 6 develops the reasonable assumption that the conditional probability of a spent-fuel-pool fire, given an early release from the reactor, is 50 percent. Section 7 sets forth a judgment that the probability of a successful, attack-induced spent-fuel-pool fire in the USA can be assumed, for policy purposes, to be at least one per century. Section 8 provides an estimate that the cost of a transition to low-density, open-frame racks in a spent-fuel pool would be \$54-109 million at Pilgrim and \$43-87 million at Vermont Yankee.

Table 9-1 combines the findings of Sections 6 and 7, yielding an estimate that the total probability of a pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee is 1.2 per 10,000 years at each plant. A number of simplifying assumptions are employed in Table 9-1, as is evident from the table. A more sophisticated analysis would not alter the general findings of this report.

Entergy's Environmental Reports for Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee present a cost-versus-benefit analysis as a means of evaluating Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives. Table 9-2 illustrates this type of analysis. The table shows that an investment of \$110-200 million (depending on discount rate) is justified to prevent a radioactive release with a probability of one per 10,000 years and a consequence cost of \$100 billion.

A companion report by Dr. Jan Beyea shows that the consequence cost attributable to a spent-fuel-pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee would exceed \$100 billion across a range of release scenarios.<sup>68</sup> This report estimates that the probability of a pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee is more than one per 10,000 years at each plant. Re-equipping the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee pool with low-density, open-frame racks would substantially reduce the probability of a pool fire and the magnitude of its

---

<sup>68</sup> The findings in Dr. Beyea's companion report are consistent with previous analysis provided in: Beyea et al, 2004.

consequences. To a first-order approximation, re-equipping a pool in this manner would eliminate the risk of a pool fire. The cost of re-equipping a pool would be less than \$110 million. Thus, a SAMA-type analysis shows that re-equipping both pools with low-density, open-frame racks is justified.

The analysis underlying this conclusion does not purport to be comprehensive. This analysis is, however, sufficient to show that Entergy and the NRC are obliged to perform new studies, as described in Section 10, below.

Probabilistic analysis, of the type that is used in Table 9-1 and in Entergy's Environmental Reports, should not be the only means of evaluating Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives. People who are unfamiliar with probabilistic risk assessment may place unwarranted faith in the numerical values that it generates. A closer look at probabilistic risk assessment for nuclear power plants shows that its findings are plagued by incompleteness and uncertainty.<sup>69</sup> These findings cannot substitute for prudent, informed judgment. In exercising that judgment, decision makers should be aware of strategic considerations, such as those addressed in Table 8-2.

## **10. Analysis Required From Entergy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission**

Entergy's Environmental Reports for the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants do not examine the potential for a radioactive release from a fire in a spent-fuel pool. Nor do they consider SAMA-type options that could reduce the probability and/or magnitude of such a release. Similarly, the NRC does not consider such options in its GEIS for re-licensing of nuclear power plants.

Yet, the NRC has determined that the potential for a reactor core-melt accident must be considered in a re-licensing EIS. Moreover, a spent-fuel-pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee has, according to this report, a probability comparable to the probability of a reactor core-melt accident. Finally, the offsite radiological impact of the pool fire could be substantially greater than the impact of the core-melt accident, because the pool has a larger inventory of cesium-137. Therefore, the potential for a pool fire should be considered in an Environmental Report or EIS for re-licensing. Such studies should use at least the depth of analysis that is employed to consider the potential for a core-melt accident.

Entergy should withdraw, revise and re-submit its Environmental Reports. In addressing the potential for pool fires, each revised ER should consider the full range of potential initiating events, including acts of malice. Options for reducing the risks of pool fires should be considered to at least the depth of analysis that is employed for SAMAs in the context of reactor accidents.

---

<sup>69</sup> Hirsch et al, 1989.

The NRC should prepare generic supplements to its August 1979 Generic Environmental Impact Statement on handling and storage of spent fuel (NUREG-0575), and its May 1996 GEIS on license renewal (NUREG-1437). These supplements should address the risks of spent-fuel-pool fires to at least the depth of analysis and experiment that was conducted to prepare the NRC's December 1990 study on the risks of reactor accidents (NUREG-1150).<sup>70</sup> In addition, the supplements should identify a range of options to reduce the risks of pool fires, and should comprehensively assess the benefits and costs of these options. An EIS prepared for re-licensing of Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee should incorporate the findings of the new, generic supplements to NUREG-0575 and NUREG-1437.

## **11. Conclusions**

Discussions in preceding sections of this report lead to the following major conclusions:

C1. At the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants, large amounts of spent nuclear fuel are stored in water-filled pools equipped with high-density, closed-form storage racks. Entergy plans to continue this practice during the period of license extension, operating the pools at near to full capacity.

C2. The radioactive isotope cesium-137 provides a useful indicator of the hazard potential of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pools. During the period of license extension, it is likely that these pools will hold about 1.6 million TBq (Pilgrim) and 1.4 million TBq (Vermont Yankee) of cesium-137. Each pool will hold about 8 times as much cesium-137 as will be present in the adjacent reactor.

C3. Various studies by the NRC and other bodies have shown that loss of water from a spent-fuel pool equipped with high-density, closed-form storage racks would, over a range of scenarios, lead to self-ignition of some of the fuel assemblies in the pool, leading to a fire that could propagate across the pool. Burning of fuel assemblies would lead to a large atmospheric release of cesium-137 and other radioactive isotopes. These findings have been confirmed by a 2005 report prepared by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the US Congress.

C4. Entergy has submitted an Environmental Report (ER) as part of each license extension application. Each ER examines potential reactor accidents involving damage to the reactor core and release of radioactive material to the atmosphere. That examination supports the ER's evaluation of Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMAs) – options that could reduce the probability and/or magnitude of a radioactive release from the reactor. Neither ER examines the potential for a radioactive release from a fire in a spent-fuel pool, or considers SAMA-type options that could reduce the probability and/or magnitude of such a release.

---

<sup>70</sup> NRC, 1990b.

C5. The NRC has published various documents that discuss aspects of the potential for a spent-fuel-pool fire. Only three of these documents are products of processes that provided an opportunity for formally structured public comment and, potentially, for in-depth analysis of risks and alternatives. One document is the August 1979 Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) on handling and storage of spent fuel (NUREG-0575). The second document is the May 1996 GEIS on license renewal (NUREG-1437). These two documents purported to provide systematic analysis of the risks and relative costs and benefits of alternative options. The third document is a September 1990 review (55 FR 38474) of the NRC's Waste Confidence Decision. That document did not purport to provide an analysis of risks and alternatives. None of the three documents provides a technically defensible examination of spent-fuel-pool fires and the associated risks and alternatives. The findings in each document are inconsistent with the more recent and more credible findings of the National Academy of Sciences, set forth in its 2005 report, and the findings of other studies conducted since 1996.

C6. The August 1979 GEIS (NUREG-0575) considered potential sabotage events at a spent-fuel pool. The GEIS did not recognize the potential for an attack with the postulated attributes to cause a fire in the pool. Technically-informed attackers operating within this envelope of attributes could, with high confidence, cause an unstoppable fire in a pool.

C7. Site-security measures mandated by the NRC have made access to a nuclear power plant more difficult for attackers approaching on foot or by land vehicle than was the case in 1979. Nevertheless, a successful attack could be mounted using resources of the scale assumed in NUREG-0575 or employed to attack the United States on 11 September 2001. The NRC has not prepared any environmental impact statement or comparable study that updates the sabotage analysis set forth in NUREG-0575.

C8. The record of experience does not allow a statistically valid estimate of the probability of an attack-induced spent-fuel-pool fire in the USA. Prudent judgment indicates that a probability of at least one per century is a reasonable assumption for policy purposes. This translates to a probability of one per 10,000 years at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee, which is comparable to the estimated probability of a reactor core-melt accident according to probabilistic risk studies done for these plants.

C9. Probabilistic risk studies done by licensees for the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee plants can support an estimate of the probability of a spent-fuel-pool fire that is caused by or accompanies a core-melt accident at the adjacent reactor. The connection between these events is particularly strong at these plants because the pool and the reactor are in close physical proximity within the same building, and some of their essential support systems are shared. A provisional estimate of the probability of a spent-fuel-pool fire associated with a core-melt accident, not involving malice, is about two per 100,000 years at each plant.

C10. Options are available to reduce the probability and/or magnitude of an atmospheric release from a spent-fuel-pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee. The option that would achieve the largest risk reduction, during plant operation within a license extension period, would be to re-equip the pool with low-density, open-frame racks. This step would return the plant to its original design configuration. Excess spent fuel would be placed in dry storage at the plant site. The estimated cost of this option would be \$54-109 million at Pilgrim and \$43-87 million at Vermont Yankee. Approximately the same cost would otherwise be incurred during decommissioning of the plant, when spent fuel would be offloaded from the pool to dry storage. The net additional cost of the option would reflect the comparative present values of approximately equal expenditures now or two decades in the future.

C11. Re-equipping a spent-fuel pool with low-density, open-frame racks would be a passive measure that would eliminate most scenarios for a pool fire and greatly reduce the atmospheric release for the few, unlikely scenarios that would remain. Passive risk-reduction measures of this type represent good practice in nuclear engineering design. Substantial benefits, both monetary and non-monetary, could arise from the deployment of passive risk-reduction measures at nuclear power plants and other elements of critical infrastructure.

C12. Entergy's Environmental Reports present a cost-versus-benefit analysis as a means of evaluating Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives. This type of analysis should not be the only basis for evaluating SAMAs, but can provide useful information. The analysis shows that an investment of \$110-200 million (depending on discount rate) is justified to prevent a radioactive release with a probability of one per 10,000 years and a consequence cost of \$100 billion. A companion report by Dr. Jan Beyea shows that the consequence cost attributable to a spent-fuel-pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee would exceed \$100 billion across a range of release scenarios. Given the pool-fire probability found in this report (at least one per 10,000 years), and the estimated cost of re-equipping the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee pool with low-density, open-frame racks (less than \$110 million), re-equipment of both pools in this manner is justified.

C13. The NRC has determined that the potential for a reactor core-melt accident must be considered in an environmental impact statement for the re-licensing of a nuclear power plant. Thus, the NRC has determined that such an accident is neither remote nor speculative. A spent-fuel-pool fire at Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee has, by estimation in this report, a probability comparable to the probability of a reactor core-melt accident. The offsite radiological impact of the pool fire could be substantially greater than the impact of the core-melt accident. Therefore, the potential for a pool fire should be considered in a re-licensing EIS to at least the depth accorded the consideration of a core-melt accident.

C14. Entergy should withdraw, revise and re-submit its Environmental Reports for Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee. The revised ERs should address the potential for pool fires to at least the depth of analysis that is employed for reactor accidents. The pool-fire

analysis should consider the full range of potential initiating events, including acts of malice. Options for reducing the risks of pool fires should be considered to at least the depth of analysis that is employed for SAMAs in the context of reactor accidents.

C15. The NRC should prepare supplements to its August 1979 Generic Environmental Impact Statement on handling and storage of spent fuel (NUREG-0575), and its May 1996 GEIS on license renewal (NUREG-1437). These supplements should address the risks of spent-fuel-pool fires to at least the depth of analysis and experiment that was conducted to prepare the NRC's December 1990 study on the risks of reactor accidents (NUREG-1150). Acts of malice should be considered. In addition, the supplements should identify a range of options to reduce the risks of pool fires, and should comprehensively assess the benefits and costs of these options.

## **12. Bibliography**

(AEC, 1972a)

US Atomic Energy Commission, *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station* (Washington, DC: AEC, May 1972).

(AEC, 1972b)

US Atomic Energy Commission, *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station* (Washington, DC: AEC, July 1972).

(Alvarez et al, 2003)

Robert Alvarez, Jan Beyea, Klaus Janberg, Jungmin Kang, Ed Lyman, Allison Macfarlane, Gordon Thompson and Frank N. von Hippel, "Reducing the Hazards from Stored Spent Power-Reactor Fuel in the United States", *Science and Global Security*, Volume 11, 2003, pp 1-51.

(ASLB, 2001)

ASLBP No. 99-762-02-LA, "Memorandum and Order (Denying Request for Evidentiary Hearing and Terminating Proceeding)", 1 March 2001.

(ASLB, 2000)

ASLBP No. 99-762-02-LA, "Memorandum and Order (Ruling on Late-Filed Environmental Contention)", 7 August 2000.

(ASLB, 1982)

*Carolina Power and Light Co.* (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069, 2098 (1982).

(Benjamin et al, 1979)

Allan S. Benjamin and 3 other authors, *Spent Fuel Heatup Following Loss of Water During Storage, NUREG/CR-0649* (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 1979).

(Beyea et al, 2004)

Jan Beyea, Ed Lyman and Frank von Hippel, "Damages from a Major Release of Cs-137 into the Atmosphere of the United States", *Science and Global Security*, Volume 12, 2004, pp 125-136.

(Boston Edison, 1994)

Boston Edison Co., *Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Individual Plant Examination for External Events*, July 1994.

(Boston Edison, 1992)

Boston Edison Co., *Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Individual Plant Examination*, September 1992.

(Brian, 2006)

Danielle Brian, Project on Government Oversight, letter to NRC chair Nils J. Diaz, 22 February 2006.

(Collins and Hubbard, 2001)

T. E. Collins and G. Hubbard, *Technical Study of Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk at Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG-1738* (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, February 2001). (This document was first released in October 2000.)

(Davis, 2006)

Mike Davis, "The Poor Man's Air Force: A History of the Car Bomb (Part 1)", TomDispatch.com, 12 April 2006.

(Dillingham, 2003)

Gerald L. Dillingham, US General Accounting Office, testimony before the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, US Senate, "Aviation Security: Progress Since September 11, 2001, and the Challenges Ahead", 9 September 2003.

(DOE, 1987)

US Department of Energy, *Health and Environmental Consequences of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant Accident, DOE/ER-0332* (Washington, DC: DOE. June 1987).

(ERIN, 2000)

ERIN Engineering and Research Inc., "Technical Input for Use in the Matter of Shearon Harris Spent Fuel Pool Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (Docket No. 50-400-LA)", November 2000.

(Fertel, 2006)

Marvin Fertel, Nuclear Energy Institute, testimony before the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, US House Committee on Government Reform, 4 April 2006.

(Hannerz, 1983)

K. Hannerz, *Towards Intrinsically Safe Light Water Reactors* (Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Institute for Energy Analysis, February 1983).

(Hart et al, 2002)

Gary Hart and Warren B. Rudman (Co-chairs), Stephen E. Flynn (project director) and Task Force members, *America Still Unprepared – America Still in Danger: Report of an*

*Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations* (New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relations, 25 October 2002).

(Hirsch et al, 1989)

H. Hirsch and 3 other authors, *IAEA Safety Targets and Probabilistic Risk Assessment* (Hannover, Germany: Gesellschaft für Ökologische Forschung und Beratung, August 1989).

(Hoffman, 2005)

John Hoffman, pre-filed testimony to Vermont Public Service Board on behalf of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, 16 June 2005.

(Holtec, 1993)

Holtec International, *Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Spent Fuel Storage Capacity Expansion* (Cherry Hill, New Jersey: Holtec, 5 January 1993).

(Jo et al, 1989)

J. H. Jo and 5 other authors, *Value/Impact Analyses of Accident Preventive and Mitigative Options for Spent Fuel Pools*, NUREG/CR-5281 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 1989).

(Meserve, 2002)

Richard A. Meserve, "Nuclear Security in a New World", *The Industrial Physicist*, October/November 2002, pp 20-23.

(NAS, 2006)

Committee on the Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage, Board on Radioactive Waste Management, National Research Council, *Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage: Public Report* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2006). (This document was first released in April 2005.)

(NRC, 2004)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Protecting Our Nation Since 9-11-01*, NUREG/BR-0314 (Washington, DC: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 2004).

(NRC, 1996)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants*, NUREG-1437 (Washington, DC: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, May 1996).

(NRC, 1990a)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "10 CFR Part 51: Waste Confidence Decision Review", Federal Register, Vol. 55, 18 September 1990, page 38474.

(NRC, 1990b)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Severe Accident Risks: An Assessment for Five US Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG-1150* (Washington, DC: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, December 1990).

(NRC, 1979)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel, NUREG-0575* (Washington, DC: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 1979).

(NRC, 1975)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, *Reactor Safety Study, WASH-1400 (NUREG-75/014)* (Washington, DC: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, October 1975).

(Parry et al, 2000)

ASLBP No. 99-762-02-LA, "Affidavit of Gareth W. Parry, Stephen F. LaVie, Robert L. Palla and Christopher Gratton in Support of NRC Staff Brief and Summary of Relevant Facts, Data and Arguments upon which the Staff Proposes to Rely at Oral Argument on Environmental Contention EC-6", 20 November 2000.

(Prassinis et al, 1989)

P. G. Prassinis and 8 other authors, *Seismic Failure and Cask Drop Analyses of the Spent Fuel Pools at Two Representative Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG/CR-5176* (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, January 1989).

(Raytheon, 2004)

Raytheon Aircraft Company, "Technical Data, Beechcraft King Air C90B", 16 June 2004.

(Sailor et al, 1987)

V. L. Sailor and 3 other authors, *Severe Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools in Support of Generic Safety Issue 82, NUREG/CR-4982* (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, July 1987).

(Thompson, 2006)

Gordon R. Thompson, pre-filed testimony before the Public Service Board, State of Vermont, 17 January 2006.

(Thompson, 2004)

Gordon Thompson, Institute for Resource and Security Studies, Cambridge, Massachusetts, testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California regarding Application No. 04-02-026, 13 December 2004. (This testimony, prepared for California Earth Corps, addressed the provision of an enhanced defense of Units 2 and 3 of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.)

(Thompson, 2003)

Gordon Thompson, *Robust Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel: A Neglected Issue of Homeland Security* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Resource and Security Studies, January 2003).

(Thompson, 2001a)

Gordon Thompson, *Comments on the NRC Staff's Technical Study of Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk at Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Resource and Security Studies, 19 February 2001).

(Thompson, 2001b)

US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 01-1246, "Declaration of 31 May 2001 by Dr Gordon Thompson in Support of Orange County's Stay Motion".

(Thompson, 2000)

Gordon Thompson, *The Potential for a Large, Atmospheric Release of Radioactive Material from Spent Fuel Pools at the Harris Nuclear Power Plant: The Case of a Pool Release Initiated by a Severe Reactor Accident* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Resource and Security Studies, 20 November 2000).

(Thompson et al, 1979)

Gordon Thompson (subgroup chair), Jan Beyea, Yves Lenoir and Gene Rochlin, "Potential Accidents and their Effects", Chapter 3 of the Report of the Gorleben International Review, submitted (in German) to the government of Lower Saxony, March 1979.

(Throm, 1989)

E. D. Throm, *Regulatory Analysis for the Resolution of Generic Issue 82, "Beyond Design Basis Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools"*, NUREG-1353 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, April 1989).

(Turner, 1991)

Stansfield Turner, *Terrorism and Democracy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1991).

(VYNPS, 1998)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, *Vermont Yankee Individual Plant Examination, External Events – IPEEE* (Vernon, Vermont: VYNPS, June 1998).

(VYNPS, 1993)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, *Vermont Yankee Individual Plant Examination – IPE* (Vernon, Vermont: VYNPS, December 1993).

(Wald, 2005)

Matthew L. Wald, "Agencies Fight Over Report on Sensitive Atomic Wastes", *The New York Times*, 30 March 2005.

(Walters, 2003)

William Walters, "An Overview of the Shaped Charge Concept", paper presented at the 11th Annual ARL/USMA Technical Symposium, 5 and 7 November 2003. (This symposium was sponsored by the Mathematical Sciences Center of Excellence at the US Military Academy (USMA) and hosted by the US Army Research Laboratory (ARL) and USMA.)

(Wells, 2006)

Jim Wells, US Government Accountability Office, testimony before the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, US House Committee on Government Reform, "Nuclear Power Plants Have Upgraded Security, but the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Needs to Improve Its Process for Revising the Design Basis Threat", 4 April 2006.

**Table 3-1**  
**Selected Characteristics of the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Pilgrim</b>	<b>Vermont Yankee</b>
Reactor type	BWR Mark 3	BWR Mark 4
Containment type	Mark 1: Drywell and free-standing torus	Mark 1: Drywell and free-standing torus
Rated power	2,028 MWt	1,593 MWt; application pending for 20% uprate to 1,912 MWt
Number of fuel assemblies in reactor core	580	368
Date of first commercial operation	December 1972	November 1972
Date of expiration of present operating license	June 2012	March 2012
Heat sink	Ocean	Connecticut River and/or cooling towers
Inventory of cesium-137 in reactor core	1.90E+17 Bq (Assumed power: 2,028 MWt)	1.79E+17 Bq (Assumed power: 1,912 MWt)

**Sources:**

- (a) Jay R. Larson, *System Analysis Handbook*, NUREG/CR-4041, USNRC, November 1985.
- (b) License renewal application, Appendix E (for each plant).

**Table 3-2**  
**Selected Characteristics of the Spent-Fuel Pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants**

Characteristic	Pilgrim	Vermont Yankee
Licensed capacity	3,859 fuel assemblies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 1988: 2,870 fuel assemblies; unused floor space could hold racks with potential additional capacity of about 360 assemblies</li> <li>• At present: 3,355 fuel assemblies, incl. temporary, 266-cell rack in cask position</li> </ul>
Inventory at end of 2002	2,274 fuel assemblies	2,671 fuel assemblies
Capacity needed for full-core discharge	580 fuel assemblies	368 fuel assemblies
Floor dimensions	40 ft 4 in by 30 ft 6 in; 5 ft 8 in thick	40 ft 0 in by 26 ft 0 in; 5 ft 0 in thick including 11 in of grout
Depth	38 ft 9 in	38 ft 9 in
Wall thicknesses	Reactor shield wall forms one face; thicknesses of other walls range from 4 ft 1 in to 6 ft 1 in.	Reactor shield wall forms one face; thicknesses of other walls range from 4 ft 6 in to 6 ft 0 in.
Typical spent fuel assembly	General Electric 8x8; 210 kgU per assembly	General Electric 8x8; 210 kgU per assembly

**Sources:**

- (a) USNRC documentation of Amendment No. 155, Pilgrim operating license.
- (b) USNRC documentation of Amendment No. 104, Vermont Yankee operating license.
- (c) P. G. Prassinis et al, *Seismic Failure and Cask Drop Analyses of the Spent Fuel Pools at Two Representative Nuclear Power Plants*, NUREG/CR-5176, USNRC, January 1989.
- (d) Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, *Vermont Yankee Spent Fuel Storage Rack Replacement Report*, April 1986.
- (e) Holtec International, *Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Spent Fuel Storage Capacity Expansion*, 5 January 1993.
- (f) USNRC, *Generic EIS on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel*, NUREG-0575, August 1979.
- (g) Anthony Andrews, *Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage Locations and Inventory*, CRS Report for Congress, 21 December 2004.
- (h) John Hoffman, pre-filed testimony to Vermont Public Service Board on behalf of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, 16 June 2005.

**Table 3-3**  
**Estimation of Cesium-137 Inventory in a Spent-Fuel Assembly and the Reactor Core, for the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants**

Estimation Step	Pilgrim	Vermont Yankee
Fuel burnup at discharge	B MWt-days per kgU	B MWt-days per kgU
Discharge burnup assuming each fuel assembly has a mass of 210 kgU	210xB MWt-days per assembly	210xB MWt-days per assembly
Reactor characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rated power: 2,028 MWt</li> <li>• 580 fuel assemblies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rated power: 1,912 MWt</li> <li>• 368 fuel assemblies</li> </ul>
Av. rated power per assembly	$2,028/580 = 3.50$ MWt	$1,912/368 = 5.20$ MWt
Av. full-power days per assembly	$210xB/3.50 = 60.0xB$ days	$210xB/5.20 = 40.4xB$ days
Av. full-power days per assembly, assuming B = 30	1,800 days = 4.93 yr	1,212 days = 3.32 yr
Av. actual days of exposure per assembly, assuming plant capacity factor = 0.90	2,000 days = 5.48 yr	1,347 days = 3.69 yr
Cesium-137 inventory in av. fuel assembly at completion of exposure	7.24E+14 Bq	7.39E+14 Bq
Approx. core inventory of cesium-137	$((7.24E+14)/2) \times 580 = 2.10E+17$ Bq	$((7.39E+14)/2) \times 368 = 1.36E+17$ Bq
Core inventory of cesium-137 as reported in Appendix E of license renewal application	1.90E+17 Bq	1.79E+17 Bq

**Notes:**

Here, calculation of the cesium-137 inventory in an average fuel assembly assumes steady-state fission of uranium-235 with an energy yield of 200 MeV per fission and a cesium-137 fission yield of 6.2 percent, over the actual days of exposure with a constant power level of 0.90 times the rated power level.

**Table 3-4**  
**Estimated Future Inventory and Selected Characteristics of Spent Fuel in Pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants**

Estimation Step	Pilgrim	Vermont Yankee
Licensed capacity	3,859 fuel assemblies	3,089 fuel assemblies (Not including temporary, 266-cell rack in cask position)
Capacity needed for full-core discharge	580 fuel assemblies	368 fuel assemblies
Assumed periodic offload of older fuel assemblies to onsite dry-storage modules	Offload to fill 3 modules, each of 68-assembly capacity: 204 assemblies	Offload to fill 3 modules, each of 68-assembly capacity: 204 assemblies
Average inventory of spent fuel, assuming pool used at near-full capacity	$3,859 - 580 - 204/2 = 3,177$ fuel assemblies	$3,089 - 368 - 204/2 = 2,619$ fuel assemblies
Av. period of exposure of assembly in core, assuming burnup of 30 MWt-days per kgU and plant capacity factor of 0.90	5.48 yr	3.69 yr
Av. age of fuel assemblies after discharge to pool	$(3,177 / (580 / 5.48)) / 2 = 15.0$ yr	$(2,619 / (368 / 3.69)) / 2 = 13.1$ yr
Cesium-137 in av. fuel assembly at discharge	7.24E+14 Bq	7.39E+14 Bq
Cesium-137 in pool, assuming all assemblies at average age	1.63E+18 Bq (44.1 MCi)	1.43E+18 Bq (38.6 MCi)
Mass of zirconium in pool, assuming 60 kg per fuel assembly	191,000 kg	157,000 kg

**Notes:**

Data on a General Electric 8x8 fuel assembly are provided in Table G.4 of: USNRC, *Generic EIS on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel*, NUREG-0575, August 1979. The total mass of an assembly is 275 kg and the mass of uranium is 210 kg. If all non-U mass were Zr, then the mass ratio of Zr to U would be 0.31. For comparison, masses of U and Zr in the core of the Peach Bottom BWR are provided in Table 4.7 of: M. Silberberg et al, *Reassessment of the Technical Bases for Estimating Source Terms*, NUREG-0956, USNRC, July 1986. The U mass is 138 Mg and the Zr mass is 64.1 Mg. Thus, the mass ratio of Zr to U in the core is 0.46. In the table above, it is assumed that each fuel assembly contains 60 kg of Zr, representing a Zr-to-U mass ratio of 0.29.

**Table 3-5**  
**Illustrative Inventories of Cesium-137**

Case	Inventory of Cesium-137 (TBq)
Produced during detonation of a 10-kilotonne fission weapon	67
Released to atmosphere during Chernobyl reactor accident of 1986	89,000
Released to atmosphere during nuclear-weapon tests, primarily in the 1950s and 1960s (Fallout was non-uniformly distributed across the planet, mostly in the Northern hemisphere.)	740,000
In Pilgrim spent-fuel pool during period of license extension	1,630,000
In Vermont Yankee spent-fuel pool during period of license extension	1,430,000
In Pilgrim reactor core	190,000
In Vermont Yankee reactor core	179,000

**Notes:**

(a) 1 Tbq = 1.0E+12 Bq = 27.0 Ci

(b) Inventories in the first three rows are from Table 3-2 of: Gordon Thompson, *Reasonably Foreseeable Security Events: Potential threats to options for long-term management of UK radioactive waste*, A report for the UK government's Committee on Radioactive Waste Management, IRSS, 2 November 2005.

(c) Inventories in the fourth and fifth rows are author's estimates set forth in this report.

(d) Inventories in the sixth and seventh rows are from Appendix E of the license renewal application for each plant.

**Table 4-1**  
**Estimated Duration of Phases of Implementation of the Yucca Mountain Repository**

Phase of Repository Implementation		Duration of Phase (years)	
		If Yucca Mountain Total Inventory of Commercial Spent Fuel = 63,000 MgU	If Yucca Mountain Total Inventory of Commercial Spent Fuel = 105,000 MgU
Construction phase		5	5
Operation and monitoring phases	Development	22	36
	Emplacement	24-50	38-51
	Monitoring	76-300	62-300
Closure phase		10-17	12-23

**Notes:**

- (a) These estimates are from the Final EIS for Yucca Mountain, DOE/EIS-0250F, Volume I, February 2002, pages 8-8 and 2-18.
- (b) The Development and Emplacement phases would begin on the same date. Other phases would be sequential.
- (c) The Construction phase would begin with issuance of construction authorization, and end with issuance of a license to receive and dispose of radioactive waste.

**Table 4-2  
Potential Emplacement Area of the Yucca Mountain Repository for Differing Spent-Fuel Inventories and Operating Modes**

Total Inventory of Commercial Spent Fuel in Repository (MgU)	Emplacement Area (acres)	
	Higher-Temperature Operating Mode	Lower-Temperature Operating Modes
63,000	1,150	1,600 to 2,570
105,000	1,790	2,480 to 3,810

**Source:** Final EIS for Yucca Mountain, DOE/EIS-0250F, Volume I, February 2002, page 8-9.

**Table 4-3  
Estimated Number of Radioactive-Waste Shipments to the Yucca Mountain Site**

Category of Radioactive Waste	Total Number of Shipments			
	If Yucca Mountain Total Inventory of Commercial Spent Fuel = 63,000 MgU		If Yucca Mountain Total Inventory of Commercial Spent Fuel = 105,000 MgU	
	By Truck	By Rail	By Truck	By Rail
<i>** If shipment mostly by truck **</i>				
Commercial spent fuel	41,000	0	80,000	0
All wastes	53,000	300	109,000 to 110,000	300 to 360
<i>** If shipment mostly by rail **</i>				
Commercial spent fuel	1,100	7,200	3,100	13,000
All wastes	1,100	9,700	3,100	18,000 to 19,000

**Source:** Final EIS for Yucca Mountain, DOE/EIS-0250F, Volume I, February 2002, page 8-8.

**Table 4-4  
Characteristics of BWR-Spent-Fuel Storage Canisters or Disposal Packages  
Proposed for Use at the Monticello or Skull Valley ISFSIs, or at Yucca Mountain**

Category	Characteristics of Storage Canister or Disposal Package		
	NUHOMS 61BT Storage Canister (proposed for Monticello ISFSI)	HI-STORM 100 MPC-68 Storage Canister (proposed for Skull Valley)	Proposed Disposal Package for Emplacement in Yucca Mountain
Vendor	Transnuclear West	Holtec	Unknown
Capacity (number of BWR fuel assemblies)	61	68	24 or 44
Wall thickness	0.5 in. (stainless steel)	0.5 in. (stainless steel)	2.0 in. (stainless steel) plus 0.8 in. outer layer (Alloy 22)
Length	196.0 in.	190.3 in.	201.0 in. (for 24 assemblies) or 203.3 in. (for 44 assemblies)
Diameter	67.2 in.	68.4 in.	51.9 in. (for 24 assemblies) or 65.9 in. (for 44 assemblies)
Neutron absorber material	Boral	Boral	Borated stainless steel
Fill gas	Helium	Helium	Helium
Presence of aluminum thermal shunts to transfer interior heat to wall of vessel ?	No	No	No for 24 assemblies, Yes for 44 assemblies

**Notes:**

(a) NUHOMS data are from: Xcel Energy's Application to the Minnesota PUC for a Certificate of Need to Establish an ISFSI at the Monticello Generating Plant, 18 January 2005, Section 3.7; and Transnuclear West's FSAR for the Standardized NUHOMS system, Revision 6, non-proprietary version, October 2001.

(b) HI-STORM data are from Holtec's FSAR for the HI-STORM 100 system, Holtec Report HI-2002444, Revision 1.

(c) Characteristics of the Yucca Mountain package are from the Yucca Mountain Science and Engineering Report, DOE/RW-0539, May 2001, Section 3.

**Table 5-1**  
**Estimated Source Term for Atmospheric Release from Spent-Fuel-Pool Fire at the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee Plant**

Indicator	Pilgrim	Vermont Yankee
<i>** Large Release **</i>		
Release to atmosphere of 100% of cesium-137 in pool	1.63E+18 Bq	1.43E+18 Bq
Thermal power of fire, assuming oxidation of 100% of Zr over 5 hrs	$191,000 \times 12.1 / (5 \times 60 \times 60) = 128 \text{ MW}$	$157,000 \times 12.1 / (5 \times 60 \times 60) = 106 \text{ MW}$
<i>** Smaller Release **</i>		
Release to atmosphere of 10% of cesium-137 in pool	1.63E+17 Bq	1.43E+17 Bq
Thermal power of fire, assuming oxidation of 10% of Zr over 0.5 hrs	$19,100 \times 12.1 / (0.5 \times 60 \times 60) = 128 \text{ MW}$	$15,700 \times 12.1 / (0.5 \times 60 \times 60) = 106 \text{ MW}$

**Notes:**

- (a) Pool inventories of cesium-137 and zirconium are from Table 3-4.
- (b) The heat of reaction of Zr with oxygen or water is provided in Table 3-1 of: Louis Baker Jr. and Robert C. Liimatainen, "Chemical Reactions", Chapter 17 in T. J. Thompson and J. G. Beckerley (editors), *The Technology of Nuclear Reactor Safety*, MIT Press, 1973. The heat of reaction with oxygen is 12.1 MJ/kg, and the heat of reaction with water (steam) is 6.53 MJ/kg. In the table above, it is assumed that Zr reacts with air (oxygen).

**Table 6-1  
Licensee Estimates of Core Damage Frequency and Radioactive Release Frequency,  
Pilgrim Plant**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Source of Estimate</b>	<b>Estimated Frequency</b>	<b>Est. Frequency Adjusted (by factor of 6) to Account for External Events &amp; Uncertainty</b>
Core damage freq. (internal events)	License renewal application, App. E	6.4E-06 per yr	3.8E-05 per yr
Core damage frequency (fires)	License renewal application, App. E	1.9E-05 per yr	Not relevant
Core damage freq. (earthquakes)	License renewal application, App. E	3.2E-05 per yr	Not relevant
Large, early release frequency (internal events)	License renewal application, App. E	1.1E-07 per yr	6.8E-07 per yr
Medium, early release frequency (internal events)	License renewal application, App. E	6.5E-08 per yr	3.9E-07 per yr
Core damage frequency (internal events)	IPE, September 1992	5.8E-05 per yr	This adjustment not used in this source
Core damage frequency (fires)	IPEEE, July 1994	2.2E-05 per yr	Not relevant
Core damage frequency (earthquakes)	IPEEE, July 1994	5.8E-05 per yr (EPRI) 9.4E-05 per yr (LLNL)	Not relevant
Early release frequency (internal events)	IPE, September 1992	1.3E-05 per yr	This adjustment not used in this source
Early release frequency (earthquakes)	IPEEE, July 1994	1.6E-05 per yr (EPRI) 3.2E-05 per yr (LLNL)	Not relevant

**Table 6-2  
Licensee Estimates of Core Damage Frequency and Radioactive Release Frequency,  
Vermont Yankee Plant**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Source of Estimate</b>	<b>Estimated Frequency</b>	<b>Est. Frequency Adjusted (by factor of 10) to Account for External Events &amp; Uncertainty</b>
Core damage frequency (internal events)	License renewal application, App. E	5.0E-06 per yr	5.0E-05 per yr
Core damage frequency (fires)	License renewal application, App. E	5.6E-05 per yr	Not relevant
Core damage frequency (earthquakes)	License renewal application, App. E	Not estimated in this source or in IPEEE of June 1998	Not relevant
Large, early release frequency (internal events)	License renewal application, App. E	1.6E-06 per yr	1.6E-05 per yr
Medium, early release frequency (internal events)	License renewal application, App. E	2.1E-06 per yr	2.1E-05 per yr
Core damage frequency (internal events except intl. floods)	IPE, December 1993	4.3E-06 per yr	This adjustment not used in this source
Core damage frequency (internal floods)	IPEEE, June 1998	9.0E-06 per yr	Not relevant
Core damage frequency (fires)	IPEEE, June 1998	3.8E-05 per yr	Not relevant
Large, early release frequency (internal events except intl. floods)	IPE, December 1993	9.4E-07 per yr	This adjustment not used in this source
Medium, early release frequency (internal events except intl. floods)	IPE, December 1993	8.0E-07 per yr	This adjustment not used in this source

**Table 6-3**  
**Categories of Release to Atmosphere by Core-Damage Accidents at Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Nuclear Plants**

Release Magnitude		Release Timing	
Category	Release of Cesium from Reactor Core to Atmosphere	Category	Timing of Release Initiation After Accident Begins
High	Greater than 10%	Early	Less than 6 hrs
Medium	1% to 10%		
Low	0.1% to 1%	Intermediate	6 hrs to 24 hrs
Low-Low	0.001% to 0.1%		
Negligible	Less than 0.001%	Late	Greater than 24 hrs

**Notes:**

These release categories are set forth in Appendix E of the license renewal application for Vermont Yankee. In the license renewal application for Pilgrim, the same categories are used except that: (i) the Early and Intermediate categories shown in the table above are combined into one category designated as 'Early'; and (ii) the Low and Low-Low categories are combined into one category designated as 'Low'.

**Table 7-1**  
**Potential Sabotage Events at a Spent-Fuel-Storage Pool, as Postulated in the NRC's August 1979 GEIS on Handling and Storage of Spent LWR Fuel**

<b>Event Designator</b>	<b>General Description of Event</b>	<b>Additional Details</b>
Mode 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Between 1 and 1,000 fuel assemblies undergo extensive damage by high-explosive charges detonated under water</li> <li>• Adversaries commandeer the central control room and hold it for approx. 0.5 hr to prevent the ventilation fans from being turned off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One adversary can carry 3 charges, each of which can damage 4 fuel assemblies</li> <li>• Damage to 1,000 assemblies (i.e., by 83 adversaries) is a "worst-case bounding estimate"</li> </ul>
Mode 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical to Mode 1 except that, in addition, an adversary enters the ventilation building and removes or ruptures the HEPA filters</li> </ul>	
Mode 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical to Mode 1 within the pool building except that, in addition, adversaries breach two opposite walls of the building by explosives or other means</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adversaries enter the central control room or ventilation building and turn off or disable the ventilation fans</li> </ul>
Mode 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical to Mode 1 except that, in addition, adversaries use an additional explosive charge or other means to breach the pool liner and 5-ft-thick concrete floor of the pool</li> </ul>	

**Notes:**

(a) Information in this table is from Appendix J of: USNRC, *Generic EIS on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel*, NUREG-0575, August 1979.

(b) The postulated fuel damage ruptures the cladding of each rod in an affected fuel assembly, releasing "contained gases" (gap activity) to the pool water, whereupon the released gases bubble to the water surface and enter the air volume above that surface.

**Table 7-2**  
**Potential Modes and Instruments of Attack on a Nuclear Power Plant**

<b>Mode of Attack</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Present Defense</b>
Commando-style attack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could involve heavy weapons and sophisticated tactics</li> <li>• Successful attack would require substantial planning and resources</li> </ul>	Alarms, fences and lightly-armed guards, with offsite backup
Land-vehicle bomb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readily obtainable</li> <li>• Highly destructive if detonated at target</li> </ul>	Vehicle barriers at entry points to Protected Area
Anti-tank missile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readily obtainable</li> <li>• Highly destructive at point of impact</li> </ul>	None if missile launched from offsite
Commercial aircraft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More difficult to obtain than pre-9/11</li> <li>• Can destroy larger, softer targets</li> </ul>	None
Explosive-laden smaller aircraft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readily obtainable</li> <li>• Can destroy smaller, harder targets</li> </ul>	None
10-kilotonne nuclear weapon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to obtain</li> <li>• Assured destruction if detonated at target</li> </ul>	None

**Notes:**

This table is adapted from a table, supported by analysis and citations, in: Gordon Thompson, *Robust Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel: A Neglected Issue of Homeland Security*, IRSS, January 2003. Later sources confirming this table include:

- (a) Gordon Thompson, testimony before the California Public Utilities Commission regarding Application No. 04-02-026, 13 December 2004.
- (b) Jim Wells, US Government Accountability Office, testimony before the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, US House Committee on Government Reform, 4 April 2006.
- (c) Marvin Fertel, Nuclear Energy Institute, testimony before the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, US House Committee on Government Reform, 4 April 2006.
- (d) Danielle Brian, Project on Government Oversight, letter to NRC chair Nils J. Diaz, 22 February 2006.
- (e) National Research Council, *Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage: Public Report*, National Academies Press, 2006.

**Table 8-1**  
**Selected Options to Reduce Risks of Spent-Fuel-Pool Fires at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants**

Option	Passive or Active?	Does Option Address Fire Scenarios Arising From:		Comments
		Malice?	Other Events?	
Re-equip pool with low-density, open-frame racks	Passive	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will substantially reduce pool inventory of radioactive material</li> <li>• Will prevent auto-ignition of fuel in almost all cases</li> </ul>
Install emergency water sprays above pool	Active	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spray system must be highly robust</li> <li>• Spraying water on overheated fuel can feed Zr-steam reaction</li> </ul>
Mix hotter (younger) and colder (older) fuel in pool	Passive	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can delay or prevent auto-ignition in some cases</li> <li>• Will be ineffective if debris or residual water block air flow</li> <li>• Can promote fire propagation to older fuel</li> </ul>
Minimize movement of spent-fuel cask over pool	Active	No (Most cases)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can conflict with adoption of low-density, open-frame racks</li> </ul>
Deploy air-defense system (e.g., Sentinel and Phalanx) at plant	Active	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation requires presence of US military at plant</li> </ul>
Develop enhanced onsite capability for damage control	Active	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires new equipment, staff and training</li> <li>• Personnel must function in extreme environments</li> </ul>

**Table 8-2**

**Selected Approaches to Protecting US Critical Infrastructure From Attack by Sub-National Groups, and Some of the Strengths and Weaknesses of these Approaches**

<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Offensive military operations internationally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can deter or prevent governments from supporting sub-national groups hostile to the USA</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can promote growth of sub-national groups hostile to the USA, and build sympathy for these groups in foreign populations</li><li>• Can be costly in terms of lives, money and national reputation</li></ul>
International police cooperation within a legal framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can identify and intercept potential attackers</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation can be slow and/or incomplete</li><li>• Requires ongoing international cooperation</li></ul>
Surveillance and control of the domestic population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can identify and intercept potential attackers</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can destroy civil liberties, leading to political, social and economic decline of the nation</li></ul>
Active defense of infrastructure elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can stop attackers before they reach the target</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can involve higher operating costs</li><li>• Requires ongoing vigilance</li></ul>
Passive defense of infrastructure elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can allow target to survive attack without damage</li><li>• Can substitute for other approaches, avoiding their costs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can involve higher capital costs</li></ul>

**Table 8-3**  
**Estimation of Cost to Offload Spent Fuel from Pools at the Pilgrim and Vermont Yankee Plants After 5 Years of Decay**

<b>Estimation Step</b>	<b>Pilgrim</b>	<b>Vermont Yankee</b>
Present licensed capacity of pool	3,859 fuel assemblies	3,089 fuel assemblies
Pool capacity needed for full-core discharge	580 fuel assemblies	368 fuel assemblies
Anticipated av. pool inventory of spent fuel during period of license extension	3,177 fuel assemblies	2,619 fuel assemblies
Av. period of exposure of fuel assembly in core	5.48 yr	3.69 yr
Av. annual discharge of fuel from reactor	$580/5.48 = 106$ fuel assemblies	$368/3.69 = 100$ fuel assemblies
Pool capacity needed to store fuel for 5-yr decay, incl. 10% buffer	$106 \times 5 \times 1.1 = 583$ fuel assemblies	$100 \times 5 \times 1.1 = 550$ fuel assemblies
Total pool capacity needed for full-core discharge and 5-yr decay	$580 + 583 = 1,163$ fuel assemblies	$368 + 550 = 918$ fuel assemblies
Fuel requiring offload if pool storage is limited to fuel undergoing 5-yr decay	$3,177 - 583 = 2,594$ fuel assemblies	$2,619 - 550 = 2,069$ fuel assemblies
Capital cost to offload fuel, assuming 210 kgU per assembly and capital cost of \$100-200 per kgU for dry storage	\$54-109 million	\$43-87 million

**Notes:**

A capital cost of \$100-200 per kgU for dry storage of spent fuel is used by Robert Alvarez et al in their paper in *Science and Global Security*, Volume 11, 2003, pp 1-51.

**Table 9-1**  
**Provisional Estimate of the Probability of a Spent-Fuel-Pool Fire at the Pilgrim or Vermont Yankee Plant**

Estimation Step	Pilgrim	Vermont Yankee
CDF (internal events)	2.8E-05 per yr	4.3E-06 + 9.0E-06 = 1.3E-05 per yr
CDF (fires + earthquakes)	2.2E-05 + (5.8E-05 + 9.4E-05)/2 = 9.8E-05 per yr	3.8E-05 + (5.8E-05 + 9.4E-05)/2 = 1.1E-04 per yr
CDF (internal events + fires + earthquakes)	1.3E-04 per yr	1.2E-04 per yr
Early release frequency (internal events + fires + earthquakes)	1.3E-05 + (1.3/5.8)x2.2E-05 + (1.6E-05 + 3.2E-05)/2 = 4.2E-05 per yr	1.7E-06 + (1.7/4.3)x(9.0E-06 + 3.8E-05) + (1.6E-05 + 3.2E-05)/2 = 4.4E-05 per yr
Conditional probability of a pool fire, given an early release from the reactor (internal events + fires + earthquakes)	0.5 (Author's assumption)	0.5 (Author's assumption)
Probability of a pool fire initiated by events not including malice	(4.2E-05)x0.5 = 2.1E-05 per yr	(4.4E-05)x0.5 = 2.2E-05 per yr
Probability of a maliciously-induced pool fire in the USA (99 pools)	1 per 100 yr (Author's assumption)	1 per 100 yr (Author's assumption)
Probability of a maliciously-induced pool fire at this plant	1.0E-04 per yr	1.0E-04 per yr
Total probability of a pool fire at this plant	2.1E-05 + 1.0E-04 = 1.2E-04 per yr	2.2E-05 + 1.0E-04 = 1.2E-04 per yr

**Notes:**

(a) CDF = core damage frequency

(b) Estimates in the first four rows are drawn from the IPEs and IPEEEs for each plant, except that the Pilgrim internal-events CDF is drawn from: Willard Thomas et al, *Pilgrim Technical Evaluation Report on the Individual Plant Examination Front End Analysis*, Science and Engineering Associates, prepared for the USNRC, 9 April 1996. Earthquake findings shown for Pilgrim are the average of the EPRI and LLNL values, and are used for both plants. The conditional probability of an early release, given core damage, is assumed to be the same for events initiated by fires and by internal events including internal flooding.

(c) The probability of a maliciously-induced pool fire in the USA is assumed to be uniformly distributed across all pools.

**Table 9-2**  
**Present Value of Cumulative (20-year) Economic Risk of a Potential Release of Radioactive Material**

Selected Characteristics of the Potential Release		Present (Initial) Value of Cumulative (20-year) Economic Risk, for various Discount Rates (D)		
Economic Cost of the Release	Probability of the Release	D = 7% per yr	D = 3% per yr	D = 0% per yr
\$100 billion	1.0E-03 per yr	\$1.1 billion	\$1.5 billion	\$2 billion
	1.0E-04 per yr	\$110 million	\$150 million	\$200 million
	1.0E-05 per yr	\$11 million	\$15 million	\$20 million
	1.0E-06 per yr	\$1.1 million	\$1.5 million	\$2 million

**Notes:**

- (a) The discounted cumulative-value function is:  $(1 - \exp(-DT))/D$ , where  $T = 20$ .
- (b) The present values shown in the table can be scaled linearly for alternative values of the economic cost or probability of the potential release.