Joint Meeting of the ANS RISC and the ASME CNRM
Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2006
8:30am – 12:00 pm, ASME International
New York, NY

Meeting Attendance: William E. Burchill, *Texas A& M Univ*. *(RISC Chair*); Rick Grantom, *STPNOC (CNRM Chair)*; Mark Allen, *Sandia National Labs*; Richard Anoba, *Anoba Consulting Services;* Ken Balkey, *Westinghouse*; Sid Bernsen, *Consultant*; Biff Bradley, *NEI*; Kevin Brook, *British Energy*; Allen Camp, *Sandia National Lab*; Mary Drouin, *US NRC*; Kevin Ennis, *ASME*; David Finnicum, *Westinghouse;* Mary Beth Gardner, *ANS;* Dennis Henneke, *Duke Power Co*.; Rick Hill, *ERIN;* Kenneth Kiper, *FPL Energy Co*.; Shigeo Kojima, *CSD – Japan*; Irina Kouzmina, *IAEA*; Gregory Krueger, *Exelon*; Teodor Lazar, *ASME*; Stanley Levinson, *AREVA NP;* Dave Miskiewicz, *Progress Energy;* Bijan Najafi, *SAIC*; Pamela Nelson, *UNAM – Mexico*; Gareth Parr*y, US NRC;* Ray Schneider, *WEC;* M. K. (Ravi) Ravindra, *ABS Consulting, Inc*.; Pat Schroeder, *ANS*; Barry Sloane, *Dominion Resources*; Ian Wall, *Consultant*; Gilbert Zigler, *Alion Science & Technology*

1. Roll Call and Approval of Agenda – Grantom/Burchill

Rick Grantom welcomed the joint group. The agenda was reviewed and introductions were made.

2. Objectives and Expectation of Joint Meeting – Burchill/Grantom

See Attachment A for slides presented during the discussion.

Bill Burchill explained that the joint meeting was focused primarily on the integrated standard and the issues and activities that must be considered by both RISC and CNRM in order to support the integration initiative.

3. Status of ANS Risk Standards – Burchill

See Attachment B for slides presented during the discussion.

Burchill stated that the slide for each standard provides a range of estimates for the time required to reach consensus, and hence, to enter the standard into the integration process. He explained that the details on the slides show how he determined these estimates. He stated that all draft standards have entered the consensus process.

<u>External Events Standard – ANS-58.21</u>

Burchill reminded the meeting attendees that Ravi Ravindra chaired the external hazards PRA standards Working Group (WG), which was currently working on consensus ballot comments from revision 1 of the current standard. Burchill informed the group that the ballot produced four negative votes out of 20. A RISC ad hoc committee was formed to develop recommendations for resolving the issues raised by the negative ballots. Primary issues included whether the bases for supporting

requirements were consistent with ASME PRA Standard ASME RA-S-2003, cost of complying with the standard, interpretation of requirements for updating seismic hazard results, and the need for pilot trial use study. In parallel, EPRI is formulating a potential trial use pilot project under John Gaertner's direction.

The committee noted that it might be longer than 18 months to conduct a pilot project and revise the standard if necessary.

Sid Bernsen questioned whether findings from the pilot study needed to be incorporated before the standard is turned over for the integration.

Burchill explained the decision was made that the information would be turned over after consensus has been reached. This decision was made by the ANS Standards Board and supported by the NRMCC. Burchill stated that if we are successful in reaching consensus without a pilot, we would be able to turn over the source standard earlier. If a pilot were found necessary, it would become part of the consensus process.

Mary Drouin reminded the group that pilots were done on the ASME full-power, internal events, Level 1 PRA standard after it was published, not as part of the consensus process. Results of these pilots provided input to later revisions.

Low Power Shut Down Standard – ANS-58.22

Burchill said the draft of this standard was submitted to consensus ballot last year and received 298 comments and seven negative votes. A RISC ad hoc committee was formed to make recommendations for resolution of the negative ballots; these recommendations were adopted by RISC at its 11/14/05 meeting. Significant changes are being made including deferring qualitative risk assessment requirements to a later revision of the standard. It is expected that the changes being made to the standard will be substantive and, hence, will require a re-ballot.

Burchill stated that he has not seen a movement to do a pilot on this standard, but with the problems of the external events standard, he cannot rule it out. If a pilot were needed, it would significantly impact the schedule as shown in Attachment B.

FIRE Standard – ANS-58.23

Burchill informed the group that the fire PRA standard was just sent to ballot April 4, 2006. He said that the WG did an excellent job. They not only formed a strong WG but also a strong external review group to use as a sounding board. In parallel with the ballot, the WG is analyzing input from the external review group. Burchill noted that 41 nuclear power plant units have committed to NFPA 805, which requires a standard to be appropriately implemented.

Burchill indicated that this standard might come in first to the integration process. This standard was recently re-structured to be complimentary with the ASME standard and should be easily incorporated into the integration process. Burchill noted that at this time the standard has just entered into the consensus process, and a pilot project has not been requested.

Level 2 PRA – ANS-58.24

Burchill stated that a PINS form for Level 2 was submitted to RISC in March and comments are being resolved. Additional scope may be added later. The WG has meet face-to-face once and has assigned writing responsibilities. CNRM has nominated two working group members to the group (Ray Schneider & Duncan Brewer). Burchill announced that the NRC would be nominating a staff representative.

Level 3 PRA – ANS-58.25

Burchill said that the RISC Committee has already approved a PINS form for work on the Level 3 standard, and it is currently being approved by the ANS Standards Board. The WG has met a couple times. Ray Schneider and Duncan Brewer will also serve on the Level 3 working group.

Ken Balkey explained to the group the agreements made through the NRMCC for leading the Level 1 (ASME), Level 2 (ANS), and Level 3 (ANS) integration efforts.

4. Plan for Integrated Standard – Grantom

See Attachment C for slides presented during the discussion.

Rick Grantom stated that a suggestion for an integrated standard was conceived at an NEI workshop in 2002. Utilities thought it would be easier to use one standard instead of four. Karl Fleming led a task team to provide elements of an integrated standard, which was presented at a joint meeting of RISC and CNRM in New Orleans, LA, on April 14, 2005. The response from the joint committees was not as well received as anticipated. The concern was that the integration process was too deep and too complicated.

Ken Balkey explained that in the last year or two it has become apparent that we have made it very difficult for other countries to use our PRA standards. It would be easier if they were all in one document. Balkey stated that we are working in a very global market place.

Grantom provided background information on the creation of the NRMCC, formal agreements between ASME and ANS, integration ground rules, and the integration process.

In response to questions Ken Balkey tried to explain the consensus process for the integrated standards. He said that either the ANS or the ASME standards board would be involved in the consensus process depending on which society is assigned the lead for the specific integrated standard. There would be no joint consensus committee. The integrated standard WG would report to the consensus committee responsible for the assignment. Kevin Ennis explained that two members would be added to each consensus committee to provide cross representation from the other society. He further elaborated that there are two agreements between the societies; business and consensus. Additionally five levels of integration were outlined: development, consensus, board approval process, business arrangement, and maintenance. Both Balkey and Ennis acknowledged that these consensus groundrules have not yet been written and submitted to the two societies' standards boards for approval.

Sid Bernsen opined that both standards boards would have to certify that their procedures were followed before using the joint logos. There would be opportunities for cross review of drafts by each society.

Barry Sloane stated that the integration team must have a core group that follows the entire scope for consistency. Stanley Levinson added the integration team must include the experts for each specialty area. Grantom explained that picking the integration team would be a consensus process to make sure the right people are involved. Ravi Ravindra suggested that each WG chair would be part of the integration team.

Burchill suggested that the CNRM integration team for the Level 1 standard should form a sub team, if necessary, comprised of an ASME CNRM lead person, the ANS WG Chair, one secretary/facilitator, and at least two other technical individuals. The team size should be no more than seven unless the team needed more help.

Najafi said that the representatives to the integration team must be empowered to make decisions without requiring approval from the consensus committees. Bernsen explained that we really don't want to make technical changes, as that is not the intent of the integration effort. Grantom reiterated that the integrated teams are under direction not to add/change technical requirements. Najafi expressed his believe that technical issues will inevitably arise.

Ken Balkey reminded the group of Burchill's previous statement that consensus needed to be reached before turning over the standards to the integration effort to reduce technical issues/changes.

Ray Weidler suggested a high level review of the standard for consistency may be beneficial.

Ken Balkey said that he expects that the respective consensus committees will have the authority to reach consensus on respective standards. He said that eventually all of the integrated standards will go through similar process to be combined into one jumbo standard. The work is expected to be divided amongst the two organizations. For example, ANS would be provided the draft of the Level 1 integrated standard for RISC to review concurrent with the CNRM consensus ballot. RISC comments would be considered, but the vote reported to ANSI would be from the CNRM.

Drouin stated that it is imperative if we are going to end up with one combined integrated standard the scopes of all the integrated standards must match up. Bernsen said if the Level 2 and 3 efforts can only handle a portion of the scope initially, it is at least a step in the right direction. Grantom explained we are only in the walking stage right now trying to pull this together.

ACTION ITEM CNRM/RISC 4/06-1: Rick Grantom asked the current integration group to review the balance of membership of the group and asked that Teodor Lazar email the electronic file of the current Level 1 integrated standard framework to both RISC and CNRM for both committees to offer comments.

Allen Camp recommended both consensus committees formally endorse the process for developing the integrated standards after it has been drafted by a joint effort of the two societies' standards staffs.

Balkey reminded the group that the NRMCC asked for the chairs of both consensus committees to work together and provided a detail plan/schedule for how the integration process will work. Burchill and Grantom stated that they are working on a letter with schedules to be submitted to the NRMCC to the NRC by end of the month.

ACTION ITEM CNRM/RISC 4/06-2: Bill Burchill and Rick Grantom work together to write a letter with schedules for the NRMCC submit to NRC by the end of the month.

Bernsen asked why we couldn't begin putting the integrated standards together now reasoning it would give us a head start if we used what is publicly available now. Burchill explained that as you get closer to consensus some of the more thorny issues arise and don't come to final resolution until forced to under the consensus process. Burchill stated it is highly risky to put the document into integration when dealing with the more difficult issues.

Bernsen informed the group that ASME spent a lot of money doing a study to expedite the process of developing standards, which concluded an inhibiting factor that the draft material was not put out soon enough. Bernsen felt it would not be hard to change requirements if changed after consensus.

Burchill agreed with Bernsen in regards to public comment, however, the decision on when to release information to the integrated team is not his decision alone. The ANS Standards Board must support it.

Balkey suggested reviewing the drafts to begin determining placement/formatting would be helpful. Drouin added that the majority of the pieces in each draft standard are not controversial and could be integrated at this time. Grantom suggested integrating one of the drafts to see how many changes/difficulty there would be to make changes after consensus. Since the fire PRA standard is expected to be available first, it would make sense to start with that one.

Bernsen asked Burchill what ANS plans to do with the standards once consensus is achieved. Burchill responded that it was his understanding that ANS would complete the development process through publication. Bernsen explained that when he was on ANSI's NSB, they frowned on two standards with duplicate information. Burchill acknowledged that he did not know what ANSI's policy would be on this situation, but stated we feel the integrated standards are no different then a revision to a standard. It's up to the user to decide what standard they want to use.

Balkey added that each society already has a standard out there. Utilities are saying they really need the fire standard out as soon as possible while the LPSD standard might be able to wait. We will have to work this out with the NRMCC

Bernsen said that we can make an arrangement to handle clarifications/interpretations, but we will have to find out what ANSI's policy is about two standards with similar requirements.

Drouin stated the NRC is not able to endorse two standards for the same application. ANS and RISC need to decide what is the right thing to do and make it happen. She feels ANS is putting up roadblocks. Burchill said that he could list many considerations why ANS has decided to publish, but the overriding reason is we need to be responsive to the user community and get the standards out to them as soon as possible. Bernsen recommended publishing the standards in draft form for the user community stating it is not necessary for it to go through the ANSI approval process. Burchill explained that users have told us they would not apply a draft standard.

Drouin reiterated Burchill's comment that we need to support the users and suggested the integrated standard be issued without all the parts to expedite its release.

Grantom recapped that we will all need to work together to bring this forward. Furthermore Grantom added that he shares Burchill's uncertainty about whether the integration process will be one month or one year behind. He would like to see if we could work together starting with integrating the fire PRA draft and seeing what changes result from the consensus process.

Burchill speculated that potential changes to technical requirements found during integration might add additional delays to the integration process.

Bernsen suggested using the fire PRA draft as a test to incorporate into the integrated standard.

Najafi urged Grantom to let experts from the fire PRA working group identify team members for the integration process.

Burchill suggested they needed to look at the feasibility of staff resources to take the external events and fire PRA drafts into the integration process now.

ACTION ITEM CNRM/RISC 04/06-3: Bill Burchill and Rick Grantom work on the feasibility of starting the integration at this point with the ASME full power, internal events standard and the fire PRA draft standard.

Grantom said he would like to get Dan McLaughlin started on charting the integration to see where we are.

5. Highlights and progress CNRM committee activities

This agenda item was not discussed because of limited time.

6. Other opportunities for CNRM/RISC Interaction – Grantom/Burchill

This agenda item was not discussed because of limited time.

7. Standards Training Plans – Balkey

Ken Balkey informed the group that a meeting was being held following the joint CNRM/RISC meeting today to discuss training users on the use of the integrated

standards. Bill Burchill has been asked to stay for the meeting. Balkey stated they don't expect to be able to complete this task with volunteers. Funding will be needed.

8. Plans/needs for future joint RISC/CNRM

Grantom stated that the next CNRM meeting was scheduled for Sept 21, 2006. CNRM members asked Grantom to see if there was any way to meet with the RISC Committee without overlapped meetings. Grantom said he would discuss with Burchill.

9. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned promptly at noon.

Respectfully submitted

Patricia Schroeder, RISC Secretary