

MEMORANDUM TO: Patrick W. Baranowsky, Chief
Operating Experience Risk Analysis Branch
Division of Risk Analysis & Applications
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Hossein G. Hamzehee
Operating Experience Risk Analysis Branch
Division of Risk Analysis & Applications
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 21, 2001 PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT
PHASE 1 RISK-BASED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

A public meeting was held on Wednesday, February 21, 2001 in Rockville, Maryland to brief external stakeholders on the results of Phase-1 Risk-Based Performance Indicator (RBPI) development. Representatives from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO), and the NRC attended the meeting. Another meeting is scheduled for April 24, 2001 to discuss comments from external stakeholders on the draft Phase-1 RBPI development report. The list of attendees is presented in Attachment 1, and the meeting agenda is provided in Attachment 2.

The presenters included the NRC staff from the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) and the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR). The presentation was focused on the following subjects:

- Perspective on relationship of RBPIs with the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP)
- Potential benefits of proposed RBPIs
- RBPI development process;
- Summary of RBPI development results
- Specific areas for review.

During the meeting, several issues were raised that were related to the implementation of RBPIs as summarized below:

- Industry representatives indicated that the data quality and reporting guidelines for the current set of Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) performance indicators under 10CFR50.9 requirements are excessive. Gathering additional data under 50.9 requirements to support RBPIs would result in additional burden. They indicated that the level of accuracy required by 50.9 for the existing ROP performance indicators and RBPIs are beyond what is necessary for risk-informed performance measures. The NRC staff stated that decisions regarding reporting data under 10CFR50.9, or other regimes, would be addressed under the ROP change process.

- Industry representatives indicated that the industry would not be likely to support the RBPI program at this time. There was a general sense that little progress has been made in risk-informing the regulations, and that another risk-informed initiative would be viewed as not likely to produce expected benefits either. They cited the lack of progress in granting utilities relief through Option 2 (special treatment requirements) and the long time frame expected for potential benefits from Option 3, as the reasons the RBPIs would be viewed as an add-on requirement with no likelihood of risk-informed relief. The NRC staff discussed the fact that the benefits and costs of implementing all or some of the RBPIs was independent of efforts related to Option 2 or Option 3 activities.
- Industry representatives indicated that there would be more support for implementing RBPIs in part to the extent they resolve difficulties experienced with the current ROP indicators (as indicated in the Frequently Asked Questions in the ROP Website). The NRC staff stated that partial, phased, or complete implementation of RBPIs would be addressed under the ROP change process.

Other issues or comments discussed at the meeting are:

- It was mentioned at the meeting that the quality of the draft RBPI report and the technical approach used seemed to be sound and consistent with the guidelines described in the RBPI development white paper.
- It was requested to extend the comment period to after the second public meeting on April 24, 2001. This would allow the industry to reflect insights from the public meeting in their written comments. We intend to extend the comment period via a Federal Register Notice.
- It was indicated that the accuracy of the SPAR models has not been verified by the industry yet. Therefore, the use of SPAR models versus licensee models in the RBPI development program needs to be addressed. The NRC staff agrees that model review issues will need to be resolved prior to RBPI implementation.
- The industry representatives indicated that equipment failures should be based on risk-significant functions rather than design-basis functions. The staff pointed out that RBPIs were developed based on risk-significant functions.

Attachments:

1. List of Attendees
2. Agenda

MEMORANDUM DATED: / /01

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 21, 2001 PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT PHASE 1 RISK-BASED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

Distribution:

OERAB RF	RBarrett, NRR	SFloyd, NEI
DRAA RF	PWilson, NRR	THoughton, NEI
File Center	DCoe, NRR	TWolf, RES
Public	MJohnson, NRR	BBrady, RES
MMarkley, ACRS	JZwolinski, NRR	ASpector, NRR
JLarkins, ACRS	TBoyce, NRR	SEide, INEEL
JFlack, RES	JChung, NRR	BYoungblood, ISL
TKing, RES	HMiller, RGN-I	EConnell, NRR
FEltawa, RES	JWiggins, RGN-I	GWelsh, INPO
MMayfield, RES	TShedlosky, RGN-I	PKadambi, RES
ARubin, RES	ABlough, RGN-I	RBeedle, NEI
MCunningham, RES	WLanning, RGN-I	DLochbaum, UCS
NSiu, RES	JTrapp, RGN-I	JRiccio, Public Citizen
MDrouin, RES	LReyes, RGN-II	JLiPoti, State of New Jersey
MWegner, RES	BMallett, RGN-II	
JJohnson, RES	LPlisco, RGN-II	
MFederline, RES	WRogers, RGN-II	
AThadani, RES	PBernard, RGN-II	
RZimmerman, NRR	JDyer, RGN-III	
BSheron, NRR	JCaldwell, RGN-III	
JRJohnson, NRR	GGrant, RGN-III	
DHickman, NRR	JGrobe, RGN-III	
GParry, NRR	MParker, RGN-III	
WDean, NRR	SBurgess, RGN-III	
FGillespie, NRR	EMerschhoff, RGN-IV	
LMarsh, NRR	TGwynn, RGN-IV	
MRubin, NRR	KBrockman, RGN-IV	
BBoger, NRR	AHowell, RGN-IV	
MReinhart, NRR	JShackelford, RGN-IV	
MFields, NRR	WJones, RGN-IV	
WTravers, DEDO	CPaperiello, DEDMRS	

DOCUMENT NAME: A:\RBPI-221MTGSUMMARY227.WPD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box "C" copy w/o attach/encl "E" copy w/attach/encl "N" no copy

OFFICE	OERAB		OERAB		OERAB	
NAME	HHamzehee		SMays		PBaranowsky	
DATE	/ /01		/ /01		/ /01	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

OAR in ADAMS? (Y or N)	Y	Publicly Available? (Y or N)	Y
-------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	----------

Attachment 1

<u>Name</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Steve Eide	INEEL	208-526-3797
Gary Welsh	INPO	770-644-8412
Bob Youngblood	ISL, Inc.	301-255-2270
Steve Floyd	NEI	202-739-8078
Tom Houghton	NEI	202-739-8107
Mike Markley	NRC/ACRS	301-415-6885
Bill Dean	NRC/NRR	301-415-1257
Mike Johnson	NRC/NRR	301-415-1241
August Spector	NRC/NRR	301-415-1241
Ed Connell	NRC/NRR	301-415-2838
Tom Boyce	NRC/NRR	301-415-1130
Tom Wolf	NRC/RES	301-415-7576
Pat Baranowsky	NRC/RES	301-415-7493
Bennett Brady	NRC/RES	301-415-6363
Hossein Hamzehee	NRC/RES	301-415-6228
Tom King	NRC/RES	301-415-5790
Steve Mays	NRC/RES	301-415-7496

PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT PHASE-1 RBPI DEVELOPMENT REPORT

MEETING AGENDA

8:30am - 8:35am:	Welcome	Steve Mays (RES)
8:35am - 8:45am:	Introduction	Tom King (RES)
8:45am - 9:00am:	Relationship of RBPIs to the Reactor Oversight Process	Bill Dean (NRR))
9:00am - 10:00am:	Presentation of Phase 1 Results and Review Process	Steve Mays (RES)
10:00am - 10:15am:	Break	
10:15am - 12:15pm:	Discussion/Questions	All
12:15pm - 12:30pm:	Wrap-up	Steve Mays (RES)

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP	Date 3/2/01
-------------------------------------	-------------

TO: (Name, office symbol, room #, building, agency/post)	Initials	Date
1. H. Hamzehee - Signature		
2. S. Mays - Concur		
3. P. Baranowsky - Concur		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

	Action		File		Note and Return
	Approval		For Clearance		Per Conversation
	As Requested		For Correction		Prepare Reply
	Circulate		For Your Information		See Me
	Comment		Investigate	X	Concurrence/Signature
	Coordination		Justify		

REMARKS

SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 21, 2001 PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT PHASE 1 RISK-BASED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room # - Bldg.
	Phone #