

**American Nuclear Society
Nuclear Facilities Standards Committee
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 5, 2000 - LaGrange Park, Illinois**

Members Present:

Don Spellman, *NFSC Chair*, Oak Ridge National Lab
J. Thomas Luke, *NFSC Vice-Chair*, ComEd
Shawn M. Coyne-Nalbach, *NFSC Secretary*, American Nuclear Society
Rick A. Hill, GE Nuclear Energy
Neil Norman, Parsons Infrastructure and Technology Group
Susan Peccatiello, American Nuclear Society
J. Andrew Wehrenberg, Southern Company Services

Guests:

Neil W. Brown, Lawrence Livermore National Lab (alternate for Jean Savy)
John Dewes, Westinghouse (alternate for Joe Cohen)
Bill Reuland, Individual
Mike Ruby, Rochester Gas & Electric Corp (alternate for Mike Wright)

Members Absent:

Charles Brown, Southern Nuclear Operating Co.
Joe D. Cohen, Westinghouse Savannah River Co. (sent alternate)
Jean Savy, Lawrence Livermore National Lab (sent alternate)
Mike J. Wright, Entergy Operations (sent alternate)

1. Welcome and Introduction

Mr. Spellman called the meeting to order. Introductions were made. Special introduction was given to Sue Peccatiello who joined ANS staff in May and was meeting NFSC members for the first time.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was modified to show a discussion of the next meeting date and a discussion of a future NFSC ExC conference calls. This was scheduled for 3:45 p.m. on the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion was made and seconded to approve the June 4, 2000 NFSC minutes. The motion passed without dissent.

The committee discussed the purpose and benefit of the status chart for NFSC subcommittees. Headquarters e-mailed a template days prior to the meeting (a model copy can be found as **Attachment A**). Updates to this chart should be e-mailed to the Vice-Chair and Secretary two weeks prior to any NFSC ExC call or meeting. This will enable headquarters to send progress reports to the Executive Committee before each call/meeting. This led to the following:

Action Item 10/00-1:

Tom Luke and Headquarters shall revise the organizational chart (including the addition of the date of last approval). This shall be completed in 3 weeks.

Action Item 10/00-2:

Prior to each NFSC and NFSC ExC Meeting, Subcommittee Chairs shall provide an updated standards status chart to the NFSC Vice-Chair and Secretary.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the August 16, 2000 NFSC Executive Committee conference call minutes. The motion passed without dissent.

4. Discussion of NFSC Subcommittee Organization and Final Standards Tally

The issue of the correct placement of certain standards needed to be discussed. (**Attachment B** shows the organizational chart used by the committee for this meeting.) ANS-2.23 was used as an example because it is both siting and design related. Mr. Brown added that he felt 2.12 and 2.23 should be reviewed for placement because he felt they belonged with the siting committee. Mr. Wehrenberg cautioned that each standard or draft should be read to determine exactly what they cover, so as not to be misled by a title. This led to the following:

Action Item 10/00-3:

Each subcommittee Chair shall prepare a description of what he believes his committee should include (both scope and standards) for discussion at the next conference call.

There was a discussion of the need to define a need and purpose to reaffirmations and revisions. The point was made that if a new plant were to be built, old standards would not be used. However, utilities tend not to update to new revisions of standards due to cost concerns. This led to the following:

Action Item 10/00-4:

All NFSC liaison members shall canvass their other organizations to determine what and how other SDOs deal with historical standards.

Mr. Spellman reported that IEEE attempts to keep all standards and fights the ANSI administrative withdrawal process.

Another process whose need should be defined is the decision to ballot a standard for withdrawal. A flowchart of how to make this decision might be helpful to working groups. The committee needs to answer the following questions:

1. What standards do we have?
2. What's the criteria for "doing something with" these current standards?
3. What new standards do we need?

This led to the following:

Action Item 10/00-5:

Don Spellman and Chuck Moseley shall ask other SDOs what they do in order to determine how to maintain a standard. Don Spellman will review DOE documents to see their criteria and process. This information will be brought to the conference call in March.

Action Item 10/00-6:

Headquarters shall send a copy of each standard to its subcommittee Chair.

The committee also recommended maintaining liaisons from the various owners group. Rick Hill was named liaison to the BWR Owners Group and Mike Ruby was named liaison to the Westinghouse Owners Group.

5. Discussion of ANS Web Page

Ms. Coyne-Nalbach discussed the progress and direction of the changes to the ANS Standards web page. With significant discussion, the committee provided many suggestions for additions, improvements, and functions of the web page. These will be gradually implemented.

6. Workshop on NFSC Efficiency

Headquarters prepared and provided copies of the various NFSC reports. The ANS Standards Annual report was also discussed.

Action Item 10/00-7:

Headquarters shall develop a proposed distribution list for the Annual Report. This will then be e-mailed to the NFSC for their review and feedback.

The committee decided to table the activity on the Annual report until the June meeting, a time when the placement of all NFSC standards will by then be stabilized. The Subcommittee and liaison reports were also discussed:

Action Item 10/00-8:

Subcommittee Chairs and liaisons shall send their reports to headquarters in electronic form two weeks prior to the semi-annual meetings.

The committee reviewed the balloting process. Again the committee reiterated the need to define a clear process for when to develop new standards, ballot for revision, ballot for reaffirmation, or ballot for withdrawal. A discussion of concerns over the comments working groups receive from a ballot led the committee to plan to encourage working group Chairs to present their proposed standard to the NFSC prior to its ballot.

The committee planned the NFSC future meetings. The committee resolved to move to a Wednesday-Thursday meeting schedule during the ANS meetings. The Executive committee will meet for a half day on Wednesday, and the full committee will meet for an entire day on Thursday. The future meetings scheduled are as follows:

June 20 and 21, 2001	Milwaukee, WI
November 14 and 15, 2001	Reno, NV
June 12 and 13, 2002	Hollywood, FL
November 20 and 21, 2002	Washington, D.C.

Additionally, a conference call of the NFSC ExC was scheduled for Wednesday, March 14, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. Eastern time. This call will have a two-hour duration.

The committee discussed the possible need for other “subcommittees” whose purpose was something other than developing standards. Examples of these committee scopes include membership, policies and procedures, funding, outreach, web page, and future development. Mr. Norman proposed that Project Managers be created to handle and resolve action items.

The discussion returned to the issue of appropriate placement of standards. A discussion of ANS-2.26 led to its placement in the Design Criteria & Operations Subcommittee. The committee examined the issue of whether their standards are applicable to nuclear power plants only, non-reactor facilities, or both. This needs to be considered when issuing a revision or reaffirmation. This led to the following:

Action Item 10/00-9:

Mr. Spellman shall write to the Subcommittee Chairs asking them to be aware of the intended purpose of their standards and to plan to discuss if their standards for ballot are for facilities, non-reactors, or both.

The committee decided that the Design Criteria & Operations Subcommittee as well as the System Level Design Subcommittee should clearly indicate that they are for nuclear facilities rather than just power plants. This led to the following:

Action Item 10/00-10:

Headquarters shall change the titles of the first two NFSC subcommittees to “Nuclear Facility Design Criteria & Operations” and “Nuclear Facility System Level Design Standards.”

Action Item 10/00-11:

Mr. Wright and Mr. Hill shall discuss the standards in each of their respective subcommittees to make sure that between the two, each standard is appropriately placed.

The committee also discussed the issue of answering requests for interpretations and clarifications on historical standards. If we sell the standard (and ANS does sell historical standards), then we should be obligated to provide an interpretation or clarification. If there is no working group to whom the request can be given, it shall be given to the subcommittee. If the subcommittee lacks the appropriate expertise, it shall be given to the NFSC.

Lastly, the committee resolved to standardize on Microsoft Word 6.0.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Coyne-Nalbach
NFSC Secretary

List of Attachments
NFSC Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
October 5, 2000

Attachment A:	NFSC Standards Status Chart (Model)
Attachment B:	Nuclear Facilities Standards Committee - Proposed Organization (8/00)