

**AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY**  
**Risk-Informed Standards Consensus (RISC)**  
**Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**April 30, 2004, 9:00 am to 2:45 pm, Washington, DC**

**Members Present**

Bob Bari, *Brookhaven (RISC Chair)*  
Jim F. Mallay, *Framatome ANP*  
Jeff Julius, *Scientech*  
John Gaertner, *EPRI*  
Donnie Whitehead, *Sandia National Labs*  
Robert Budnitz, *LLNL*  
Jean Savy, *LLNL*  
Dave Finnicum, *Westinghouse*  
Biff Bradley, *NEI*  
Jeff Mittman, *ABE*  
Kenneth Kiper, *FPL Energy*  
Gene Hughes, *ERIN*  
Bill Bohlke, *Exelon*  
Mark Rubin, *U.S. NRC*  
Mary Drouin, *U.S. NRC*  
Andy Dykes, *ABS Consulting*  
Mary Beth Gardner, *American Nuclear Society*

**Guests**

Dan O'Neal, U.S. NRC

**1. After a brief introduction, the agenda was reviewed.** The minutes from the November 2003 meeting in New Orleans, LA were then approved with minor corrections (Amico affiliation corrected to SAIC).

**2. Chair Bari review the status of the RISC membership.** It was noted that since the November meeting, the following members had resigned:

Mark Cunningham, U.S. NRC  
Madeleine Feltus, U.S. DOE  
James Klapproth, GE Nuclear  
Don Miller, Ohio State Univ.  
Harold Brandes, Duke Energy  
William Parkinson, Data Systems & Solution (IEEE Liaison)

New members replacing the recent resignations include:

Mary Drouin, U.S. NRC  
Rick Hill, GE Nuclear  
Dennis Henneke, Duke Energy  
John Gaertner, EPRI

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved by the committee to accept the new committee members identified by Bari.

**ACTION:** The importance of maintaining a liaison relationship with the IEEE was addressed, and Bari agreed to contact William Parkinson to gain an IEEE liaison (replacement) to the committee.

The Balance of Interest was then confirmed with the group. It was noted that Selim Sancaktar was no longer with Westinghouse and was now with the U.S. NRC. After discussion, the following balance was confirmed: Government Agencies – 5 members; Manufacturers/Designers/Suppliers/Constructors – 4 members; National Labs/Academic Institutions – 5 members; Owner/Operators – 6 members; and Special Interest – 1 member, with the intent of gaining an IEEE liaison. Bari indicated that balance was present among the committee, and reminded everyone that despite the multiple organizational representations that existed within a few of the categories, only one vote per organization was permitted.

### **3. Status of Standards Writing Group Activities**

**A. External Hazards** – Budnitz for Ravindra - Budnitz addressed the anticipated revisions to the ASME standard as well as the issuance of App. C of Reg Guide 1.200 by the NRC, and explained how ANS-58.21 references the ASME standard, indicating that the ANS standard will need to be revised to reflect the upcoming related revisions. As a result, the External Hazards Working Group intends to begin a revision around the end of summer 2004, anticipating possible adoption in 2005. Budnitz indicated also that until a trial application is done, the revision will not be able to address all concerns. Discussion then ensued regarding the value of a revision prior to a trial. NRC committee members indicated that they would be looking to the standards to provide guidance during the trials. It would be of great help to them to get an application going.

The format of the revision was then discussed. Budnitz proposed issuing a redline version for review and comment; this format for review was acceptable to the RISC members. It was also noted that the NRC would begin having public meetings regarding Appendix C, and that the RISC committee should ensure committee representation at these meetings.

**B. Fire PRA** – Bari for Henneke – Bari reported that Henneke’s working group has made little progress since the last meeting (November ’03).

**ACTION:** The RISC committee addressed the lack of progress on this standard and urged Bari to acquire a real action plan from the working group. The committee would like to see the schedule accelerated due to the real need for this standard. Bari was requested to inform Henneke that if more support is needed at the writing group level, it should be requested and help will be provided.

**C. Low Power/Shutdown** – Kiper – Working Group Chair, Ken Kiper, provided an overview of the group’s activities since the November ’03 meeting. The draft (4A) was sent out in December ’03 to the RISC membership and selected reviewers. A good response with comments was received, and Kiper separated the comments into two types: Detailed Comments and High Level Comments which also addressed policy issues as well. Kiper then provided an overview of the detailed comments received as well as the high level comments. The High Level Comments were discussed in detail as follows:

- Immature Technology
- No Driving Force for the Standard
- Qualitative/Screening Approach

At this point in the discussion, Bari felt that each High Level Comment should be addressed by each RISC member present. With regard to the comments received involving LPSD as an immature technology and there being no driving force or need for the standard at this time, the committee members responded as follows:

Drouin: The NRC believes there is a need for the standard. This position will go forward to the Commission, and if no standards developing organization comes forward with a standard, the NRC will write its own.

Rubin: The standard is a benefit to the NRC. This standard and the other related standards allow for easier decision-making.

Bohlke: Believed the issue to be not a question of **do** we need a standard, but rather it's a question of **when** do we need such a standard. The issue for the utility is resource allocation with the adoption of such a standard.

Hughes: Believes that shutdown is dramatically difference from low power. Also disagrees with the sense that referenced studies in the standard are not needed. SECY-00-0007 Report, Section 5 lists many things that need to be addressed that still aren't in the draft standard. Recommended taking the work that been done on the standard to date and tabling it; encouraging the draft to be used as a guidance document.

Mitman: Felt we need a better understanding of shutdown; wants to continue with the standard.

Bradley: Believes that LPSD is currently not the highest priority, and agreed with Bohlke in terms of timing/need. He sees no major driving force to proceed with the standard right now. Suggested the work be used as a reference document rather than proceed to endorsement.

Dykes: Commented that if the standard enhances and clarifies communication and understanding, then the standards work effort should proceed.

Finnicum: Feels there is a need for the LPSD standard. As a designer, he needs to meet the requirements of EH, the ASME standard, as well as the LPSD.

Savy: Applauded the efforts of the working group to date and supported its continuation.

Budnitz: Believes this standard is the right thing to do. The fact that the industry currently doesn't know how to do the analysis shouldn't stand in the way of doing the standard. The standard should provide the structure. He urged the RISC members to not leave the standards writing effort to the NRC, because they will do the writing if ANS does not.

Whitehead: Endorsed proceeding with the standard.

Gaertner: Indicated that the qualitative methods should be part of the LPSD standard, and felt they should not become a separate standard. Felt the standard should be continued, yet agreed with all the negative feedback received on the draft. Felt the standard should be written at a higher level, and that currently as written was too detailed.

Julius: Commented that there is reference information available and out there, but believes it had been done more for internal management use. Commented that the standard is needed.

Mallay: Applauded the working group on its outstanding effort to date. Believes the effort should continue and that the standard does tell what to do. Noted that typically past standards have been very explicit, yet the PRA standards are different in that they provide more of a framework. The standard has considerable value to it today. Also believed it was important to support the NRC through this standards-writing effort.

Kiper then specifically asked the RISC for clear direction as to how to proceed. More discussion followed, with the following motion being made and seconded:

**MOTION: Advise the working group to proceed with the standard; the scope to include the qualitative approach and with guidance for HRA analysis, and expand the treatment of screening on a defined basis to include POS and operator errors of commission.**

**The motion was unanimously approved by the RISC members.** The working group was also advised to not constrain flexibility and innovation wherever it was believed necessary. Kiper indicated he hoped to come back to the RISC members in about three months with another draft. The working group will work through the detailed comments received as well and address those in the revised draft.

Bari then felt that the first two recommendations of the Working Group had been addressed and the RISC group now needed to address the remaining two recommendations from the Working Group. The remaining two recommendations were addressed as follows:

- A decision to consider changing the standard's title was tabled until a later date.
- Because it was determined that qualitative risk management methodology continue to be included in the LPSD standard, it was suggested that a subcommittee be formed to help review the Working Group's responses to specific qualitative concerns that were discussed.
- The following RISC members volunteered to serve on the qualitative review subcommittee: John Gaertner, Jeff Mitman, Bill Bohlke, and Andy Dykes.

**4. ANS/ASME Nuclear Risk Management Coordinating Committee (NRMCC)** – Mallay – Jim Mallay provided the RISC committee with a brief overview of this group's efforts to date, and indicated that it had drafted a committee scope and charter, a strategic plan, and has already issued a letter to the U.S. NRC in response to the December 19, 2003 NRC Memo regarding PRA standards activities and the NRC's proposed schedule. The RISC members also received copies of the ANS/ASME joint letter as well as the NRMCC's strategic plan. Currently, Ray Wiedler (ASME) and Jim Mallay (ANS) are serving as co-chairs of this new group. Its first meeting was held in Washington, DC on February 27, where the invited participants sketched out its purpose, and agreed

that this collaborative efforts between the two societies was worth formalizing with a charter and pursuing through the development of a strategic plan. The next meeting of the NRMCC will occur via conference call on May 20, 2004, with a follow-up meeting tentatively scheduled for the fall of this year.

Mallay indicated that the May 20 conference call's agenda is specifically defined to create a framework for all PRA standards, and to address "quality" as currently put forth by the NRC. The NRMCC will continue to invite organization/society participation to gain true industry participation in the risk management arena. However, each organization represented will only have one vote. The NRC members present emphasized that the first and biggest priority of this group should be the tie-in of all PRA standards.

**5. New Areas for RISC** – Bari – A RISC member suggested that transition risk be reconsidered as a subject for standards development, and indicated the NRC would like to see this incorporated into the LPSD standard. Kiper remarked that it is intended to be in the standard. However, the NRC would like to see it written more specifically into the standard.

After much discussion, the following motion was made and seconded:

**MOTION: For the LPSD working group to investigate the feasibility of incorporating into the LPSD standard the transition risks, and determine whether it be mandatory or non-mandatory.**

The motion passed with only two negative votes.

A RISC member reported also that the ASME reported that they felt the Level 2 PRA was a good item for the NRMCC, as well as transportation risk. The RISC members indicated an interest in developing a Level 2 Standard.

**6. Report from ASME-DHS Workshop** – Bari – Bari reported that ASME, in cooperation with ANS and other professional societies, is working with the Department of Homeland Security to develop "Guidance on Risk Analysis and Management for Critical Asset Protection" related to homeland security concerns. The committee speculated at how this subject could be addressed via the consensus process.

Bari also reported verbally on Paul Amico's written report regarding the three-day workshop. The ASME-DHS guidance document is not available for further distribution.

**7. Other Business** – A RISC member reported that Reg Guide 1.200, Appendix A goes outside the intent of consensus standards. It was recommended that the NRMCC address this item. Mallay reported that he would pass this along.

There being no other business for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Bari, Chair  
RISC

