

RISC Telecom Minutes
August 11, 2008 • 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. (Eastern)

Participating Members: Allen Camp (RISC Chair), *Sandia National Lab*; Robert Budnitz (RISC Vice Chair), *Lawrence Berkeley National Lab*; Paul Amico, *SAIC*; Richard Black, *DOE*; Biff Bradley, *NEI*; Mary Drouin, *NRC*; Dennis Henneke, *General Electric*; John Gaertner, *EPRI*; Rick Hill, *ERIN*; Gene Hughes, *ETRANCO*; Kenneth Kiper, *FPL*; Stanley Levinson, *AREVA NP*; Jean Savy, *Risk Management Solutions*; Patricia Schroeder, *ANS*

Participating Alternates, Observers, Guests: Rick Grantom, *STPNOC*; Greg Krueger, *Exelon*; Gareth Parry, *NRC*; Doug True, *ERIN*

1. Roll Call

Roll call was taken and the teleconference was begun at 12:07 p.m. eastern.

2. Review of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented. Gene Hughes requested an update on the revision to the Fire PRA Standard. Camp suggested that the discussion be included under the CNRM update as the Fire PRA Standard was part of the Combined Standard under CNRM management.

3. NRMCC Update

Allen Camp stated that the NRMCC had held occasional conference calls with a few meetings between. He reported that the NRMCC appointed a strategic planning committee to develop a strategic plan. Camp stated that the last NRMCC conference call was devoted to a discussion on merging the RISC and CNRM committees.

4. Joint Committee Status

The committee was reminded that basic ideas of establishing a joint RISC/CNRM committee were already discussed at the June 2008 RISC Meeting. Camp explained that a small group of NRMCC members led by Ted Meyers had considered options for the joint committee. Bob Budnitz added that the NRMCC debated pros and cons for about 45 minutes. Mary Drouin stated that the NRMCC discussed the possibility of two consensus committees remaining but that membership on both would include all. Camp stated that it was important to make sure any change would reduce volunteer time.

Budnitz recommended that a position paper be prepared that included the recommended path for both standards boards. Camp questioned Drouin whether there was a current draft on the pros and cons to be shared with the RISC. Drouin said that she would email Ted Meyers with that request.

Action Item 8/08-01: Mary Drouin to request Ted Meyers to provide the RISC with the current proposal of cons and pros for a joint RISC/CNRM committee.
--

It was noted that the two relevant standards committees of the two societies (RISC and CNRM) would have to approve the proposal prior to requesting approval of the two standards boards anticipated in November 2008.

5. CNRM liaison update

Stanley Levinson reminded RISC that the Combined Standard was completed and was in the publication queue at ASME, and that the first revision was out for ballot by ASME-CNRM. Bob Budnitz stated that CNRM was developing two new standards. He reported that both writing groups were making good progress. Karl Flemming was chairing the Non-LWR Advanced Reactors PRA Group, and they optimistically anticipated a draft for distribution to CNRM prior to the CNRM September 2008 meeting. Jim Chapmans's New Advanced LWR PRA Group could possibly issue a draft within a year. Rick Grantom explained that a decision would have to be made whether the new LWR Advanced Reactor Standard would be a stand alone standard or be incorporated into the Combined Standard. Grantom added that the new LWR Advanced Reactor Standard may be an annex of the Combined Standard. Grantom requested recommendations for new writing group members for the LWR group from the vendor interest category.

Allen Camp questioned the committee if they had sufficient time to review the ASME ballots for the first addendum of the Combined Standard. It was noted that the RISC due date for comments on the two ballots was 9/5/08, a week before the CNRM due date to allow time to combine all comments and conduct a review prior to submission to CNRM. Camp asked members to let him know if additional time was needed. Grantom offered to provide until the end of the month if necessary.

Grantom reported that Dennis Henneke and his fire-PRA working group have incorporated lessons learned from the fire PRA pilots. The ballot for the revision to the fire PRA section of the Combined Standard has been issued separately. Grantom recognized a concern about conservatism within the standard. Dennis Henneke added that the working group made changes to the standard taking into account 1) feedback from pilot reviews, 2) RG 1.206 comments, and 3) previous comments from the Combined Standard ballot.

Gene Hughes expressed concerns that the industry was having difficulty with fire PRA methodology. He noted that it was unclear whether the difficulty was in the standard or in NUREG/CR 6850. Hughes asked if the update to the Fire PRA Standard would resolve some of this difficulty. Henneke stated that he did not feel the revision currently addressed this issue, but with the revision out for ballot, there was an opportunity to some extent for enhancements. Grantom suggested that a future revision of the Fire PRA Standard include items left out of NUREG/CR 6850 that could potential give relief for some of the conservatisms.

Hughes suggested to discuss what would be the lessons learned from the problems we were experiencing and what should be changed. Camp agreed that we should not repeat mistakes and welcomed emails from members with suggestions.

6. Meetings with NRC and NEI

Allen Camp informed the committee that he had meetings with the NRC and NEI. Basically the meeting with NRC was a good will visit but provided him the opportunity to discuss the ANS's grant proposal. Both NEI and NRC had similar pleas to mesh standards activity with the future regulatory needs and recommended coordination and long-term planning. They discussed different types of reactors, facilities, and needs.

A topic of discussion at the NEI meeting focused on the standards community especially including the PRA experts at the power plants being very busy. Additionally, a time line for development of standards was discussed. Rick Grantom reported that he took an action item to prepare a time line for development of a standard.

Biff Bradley noted that NEI's main focus was to have a stable platform for licensing and no confusion on what was needed. He stated that plants must have requirements soon. Bradley said that there was some discussion of the NRC practice of taking exception to segments of a standard. NEI felt that the practice of taking exception added uncertainty. Bradley reported that NEI formed an executive committee task force under Alex Marion to make sure the right people were on appropriate committees.

Grant Status

ANS applied to the NRC for a grant to support the Level 2 and Level 3 PRA standards writing groups. A few weeks ago, the NRC declined to fund that grant. Camp noted that many were concerned about the impact of this grant denial on the ability of the two writing groups to complete their PRA standards projects. He informed the committee that while visiting the NRC, he had an opportunity to meet with the Standards Board Chair Prasad Kadambi. Camp also talked with Mary Drouin, Gareth Parry, Christina Lui, and the NRC Standards Executive Jennifer Uhle. He noted that there had been significant changes of responsibilities within NRC that left the grant approval process without staff to process requests. The grant was resubmitted 7/29/08. Camp was told that there was not much money left in the 2008 grant budget and that there may not be additional funds for 2009 due to NRC increased staffing needs. He hoped that funds would be provided this year, but there was no guarantee. Drouin agreed with Camp's summary and suggested that ANS look to other sources for funding. Hughes questioned the amount of funds needed. Camp noted that the request was for just over \$100,000, although even \$30,000 would help initially.

Role of Standards

Camp stated that NRC's desire to endorse consensus standards was apparent during discussions with them. Camp pointed out to both the NRC and NEI that our committees had full plates and did not volunteer ANS to start a large number of new standards.

Members discussed the role of standards stating that historically they were written to establish best practices once lessons were learned. Some expressed concern with current standards getting ahead of the curve.

Future Standards Needs

Dick Black reported that DOE issued a survey on what standards needed to be updated and what new standards would be needed to support licensing. The results found that a broader range of standards were needed. Black noted that he represented DOE at the SDO meeting and that Standards Board Vice Chair Donald Spellman also attended. He and Spellman took an action item to form a high level steering group inclusive of the major SDOs to determine standards (non PRA related) that would be needed for new construction. Black mentioned that DOE had previously given ANS funds to develop a gas reactor standard which would be published in the near future. Black added that DOE may need to work with NRC to provide support to SDOs. Camp suggested a meeting with Black to discuss grant opportunities and to make sure there would be no over lap between the NRMCC and the proposed steering committee. Bob Budnitz

suggested that support was also needed on fast reactors. Black added that new standards on fuel cycle may also be needed.

7. LPSD Reballot

With the ballot on the Low Power Shutdown (LPSD) draft standard due at the end of September, Allen Camp encouraged members not to delay in returning comments. ANS-58.22 Working Group Chair Don Wakefield expressed his opinion that he felt it was possible certain parts of the draft would not be approved. Mary Drouin explained that she had not heard any more about an NRC representative for the LPSD Working Group.

Stanley Levinson informed the committee that he would be sending the LPSD draft to the PWR Owners Group for their Risk Management Subcommittee to review. However, he couldn't say if the draft would receive a thorough review. Greg Krueger added that he provided the draft to the BWR Owners Group with a request to review.

Pilots on the LPSD Standard were discussed but it was felt too early to see if there would be such interest. Camp asked Pat Schroeder to add time on the November 2008 RISC agenda to discuss LPSD ballot comments and potential interest in pilots.

Action Item 8/08-02: Pat Schroeder to include time on the November 2008 RISC agenda to discuss the LPSD ballot comments and potential interest in a pilot.
--

8. Level 2 Update

Allen Camp reported that ANS-58.24 (Level 2 PRA) Working Group Chair Mark Leonard had been contacted. He reported that there had not been much progress on the Level 2 project since the June 2008 RISC Meeting.

9. Level 3 Update

Pat Schroeder explained that she was unable to reach ANS-58.25 (Level 3 PRA) Working Group Chair Keith Woodard and thought that he might be out of the country.

10. Qualitative Standards – ad hoc committee

Allen Camp informed the committee that Rick Hill replaced Dave Finnicum as chair of the Qualitative Standards Ad Hoc Committee. Dave Finnicum was not able to chair due to other commitments. Camp noted that Bob Bari would assist Hill on the ad hoc committee. Hill reported that he was working on a charter to develop a position that would represent the consensus of the group or how we proposed to move forward. The intent of the charter would not affect the previous decision on the LPSD draft standard. Hill explained that the draft charter was with Bari for review. He hoped to have a working group resolution finalized for RISC review at the November 2008 meeting. Camp interjected that he felt the committee was not that fundamentally at odds among the members in the range of opinions.

11. Plan for next telecom

Pat Schroeder was requested to plan the next telecom for after the September 2008 CNRM meeting.

12. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 2:04 p.m. eastern.