

**AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY
Risk-Informed Standards Consensus (RISC)
Committee Meeting Minutes
November 17, 2004, 1:00 pm to 6:00 pm, Washington, DC**

Members Present

Robert Bari, *Brookhaven National Laboratory (RISC Chair)*
Richard Black, *U.S. DOE*
Biff Bradley, *NEI*
Robert Budnitz, *LLNL*
Allen Camp, *Sandia National Laboratory*
Mary Drouin, *U.S. NRC*
David Finnicum, *Westinghouse*
John Gaertner, *EPRI*
Dennis Henneke, *Duke Power Company*
Rick Hill, *GE Nuclear Energy*
Gene Hughes, *ERIN Engineering & Research, Inc.*
Stanley Levinson, *Framatome ANP*
Jeff Mittman, *ABE*
Mark Rubin, *U.S. NRC*
Patricia Schroeder, *American Nuclear Society*

Members Absent

Paul Amico, *SAIC*
Kendall Byrd, *FirstEnergy Corp.*
Andrew Dykes, *ABS Consulting*
Wayne Holmes, *HSB Professional Loss Control*
Yehia Khalil, *Dominion Nuclear Connecticut*
Kenneth Kiper, *FPL Energy*
James Mallay, *Framatome ANP*
Ravi Ravindra, *ABS Consulting, Inc.*
Steven Rosen, *Individual*
Selim Sancaktar, *U.S. NRC*
Jean Savy, *LLNL*

Others Present

Mary Beth Gardner, *American Nuclear Society, Staff Liaison*

Guests

Barbara Baron, *Westinghouse*
William Burchill, *Texas A&M University*

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Brief introductions were made and the agenda was approved with an additional discussion on the LPSD standard requested by John Gaertner.

2. Approval of April 30, 2004, Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the April 30, 2004, meeting in Washington DC were approved without dissent. It was also noted that a RISC conference call occurred in September. Although there was not a quorum on the call, the notes from the conference call were accepted as a matter of record.

3. Review of RISC Membership

While the membership has remained unchanged since the last meeting, it was noted that Kendall Byrd may have to withdraw from the committee due to a change in positions at FirstEnergy.

4. Status of Standards Writing Group Activities

A. External Hazards – Budnitz for Ravindra

Budnitz addressed the comments received from the NRC review of the standard. A total of 151 comments were received, and the working group has addressed all the comments, and has sorted responses into four categories. The working group agreed with 124 of the comments. Budnitz expressed his frustration with some of the comments made by NRC. He felt that many comments made were directed to a standard written specifically for regulatory issues, not the broader application as was intended. Mary Drouin reminded the committee that their comments were not a final position, but that the NRC wanted to get something out for use. A lively discussion ensued. Overall, the working group believes the bulk of comments received are reasonable and will help to make the standard less ambiguous. Many questions and comments were posed by RISC regarding the revisions:

- Does the standard need to be reissued?
- Before another revision, should the standard be tested?
- The working group intends to factor in NRC comments and then all ASME comments on Addendum B

Substantive Issues:

- NRC would remove App. D – the NRC felt it belonged elsewhere
- Appendix D does not fit the scope issue
- Rule 50.69 just came out and the Appendix is very useful
- All “shalls” in the standard were changed to action verbs; regarding the use of shall, should and may – the ANS standard has commentary and ASME has none. What will happen with this issue when the ANS standard and the ASME standard are combined?

Budnitz indicated he will provide the disposition of each comment received and will seek RISC endorsement. He indicated a redline version of the standard will be provided and hopes to have this accomplished by the end of February.

Action Item 11/04-01: Biff Bradley to send the RISC final report of check sheets.

B. Fire PRA -- Henneke

Working group chair, Dennis Henneke, reported that the working group has made tremendous strides over the last six months achieving a first draft. Several members were added to the team. The working group will be meeting on Thursday (November 18) to

perform a technical review on the first half of the draft. The working group will probably have another meeting in late January to review the complete draft. It expects to have a final draft ready for RISC review in March '05. Appendices may be delayed until May, and if possible, the draft could be released for public review in June or July of '05. Henneke does not expect much controversy.

C. Low Power/Shutdown – Burchill for Kiper

Comment resolutions from Draft 4a and its revision, Draft 5c, were distributed to the RISC a week prior to this meeting. Burchill provided an overview of how the comments were incorporated into Draft 5c and where the working group anticipates additional changes. Levinson and Camp both felt that the comment resolutions did not provide sufficient explanation. Another draft is planned to be sent out for ballot early in 2005. (See attachment A for greater detail.)

Burchill indicated the document still had the following open items:

1. Comparison with the ASME Addendum B – will not wait for internal floods before doing comparison
2. HRA and data sections still in draft form
3. Risk metric methodology
4. References – must be available at reasonable cost and w/o undue difficulty
5. End states – standard will acknowledge multiple end-states
6. Aggregation – standard does not currently say that you must aggregate
7. Screening process
8. Qualitative methods – are these a PRA? Working group intends to indicate this is outside the scope of the standard
9. Deletion of Section 3 – RISC recommended deletion; working group says it should be strengthened
10. Transitional risk – to include or not?

Action Item 11/04-02: Bill Burchill to address motion made at last meeting with working group. 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.

D. Low Power/Shutdown -- Gaertner

Gaertner provided the committee a handout of his presentation. He recommended that two new sections be added to the LPSD standards; 1.) Requirements for creating a useful Configuration Risk Management (CRM) version of LPSD PRA model and 2.) Requirements for creating a Qualitative Risk Assessment (QLRA) which addresses risk from all high-risk Plant Operating States (POSS). Additionally, Gaertner suggests that the screening and QLRA sections be expanded to support these new sections. (See attachment B for greater detail.)

The following motion was made:

Working group to consider the feasibility and value of inserting 1.) Requirements for creating a useful CRM version of LPSD PRA model, and 2.) Requirements for

creating a QLRA which addresses risk from all high-risk POSs and report back to the committee.

Friendly amendment: that this evaluation be commenced after revisions of Draft 5c.

A quorum was not met for this motion.

5. ANS/ASME Nuclear Risk Management Coordinating Committee (NRMCC) – Bari

Bari explained the outcome of the recently held NRMCC meeting on September 9, in Washington DC. ASME and ANS have reached agreement to consolidate all four Level 1 standards into one document. The intent of the NRMCC action is to put all the requirements into one document with the remaining information published as guidance documents. The Level 1 standard will be developed by ASME with representation from ANS. Level 2 and 3 standards will be developed by ANS. Balloting will be completed through the developing organization with a public review to all. Rick Grantom expects the team for the Level 1 standard to be identified in early December 2004.

6. Coordination with ASME on Level 1 Requirements -- Bari

Bari indicated that it is assumed that the working group chair for the revised Level 1 standard will call on others as needed to provide the technical expertise required to merge the Level 1 standards currently published. It was noted by RISC members that there was substantial ASME disagreement w/ the Level 1 merger process as some very important detail might get tossed or left out. The RISC requested more detail on the process planned for the merging. It was the sense of the group that it was probably premature to debate how the work should be divided; that until the “new” Level 1 standard is defined as to what it is going to look like, the division of work should not be defined also.

7. Initiation of Levels 2 & 3 Standards – Bari

Bari indicated that a special LERF team has been pulled together. Interested individuals' names should be provided to Bari for consideration on the team. He also noted that there is a brief list of potential names for the Level 3 standards as well. Bari indicated that he would like to have a subcommittee of RISC to develop a proposed slate of working group members for both Level 2 and Level 3, along with suggestions for working group chairs. The subcommittee will consist of Stanley Levinson (subcommittee chair), Bob Budnitz, with others to be added after this meeting.

8. Other Business

Grantom indicated that the next CNRM meeting will occur in New Orleans in April and it might be a good time to hold the next RISC meeting in cooperation with the CNRM. Bari will pursue this with ASME and determine if the RISC members will be available at that time.

9. Adjourn

There being no other business for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Bari, Chair
RISC