Wrap-up Session
July 16, 1999
①

Meisner: Preliminary
- ~~March~~ mtg: very high numbers - PRA
- after mtg sr. management
- industry willing to give commitments - came prepared for this mtg
- in return ~~wan~~ looked for reduction in risk in model
4 areas of commitments - hardware.
- seals - redundant
- anti-siphon devices - temp. equip also.
- pre-staging for FP diesel fire pump.
-

- Internal fires - part of SAR already
op. / security rounds for detection - not in SAR no.
- ~~ele~~ LOI
clear procedures; sources of water, power sources - ~~pred~~
~~training~~ procedures for long-term events.
procedures that does not allow ops. to focus on one path.
- training - NRC certified handling program
- willing to make additional commitments
- IN SAR is appropriate

- little feedback from NRC on industry suggestions - Q181

wrap-up.
(2)

Meisner:
- heavy loads / cask drop:
  (1) already resolved in NUREG-1353. for cask drops.
  (2) keeping 0612 commitments.

- HRA re-quantification:
  - would be real nice to better understand but not needed to deal with issues
  - just adjust #'s and requantify.
  - not necessary for new research project.

staff may say w/ this approach, may not re-quant. everything.

Industry did not get what they thought out of the workshop.
Looking for something early on to give them continued confidence.

GH: agrees - reasonable

(1) staff provide near-term plan (next 4 mo.)
  (1) HRA
  (2) credit for heavy loads.
  (3) seismic

BS: fine

(2) Sam/Brian/Mike Meisner mtg. periodic management meetings - track progress

GH: go forth w/ staff proposal

(3) HRA - model needs to be requantified but not make it a research project.
industry willing to participate if "early start" for HRA in short time period.

MM: ~~ind~~ indep. experts. industry

Wrap-up.

Meisner

(4) ~~focus to~~ mtg in next two weeks on HRA

GH: will decide ~~in credit~~

(5) heavy loads - actual, final decision. in couple ~~few~~ weeks.
(a) credit for 0612 → PRA requant. and (b) upper bounds concerns.

GH: agree

(6) seismic - industry will propose checklist - Bill Henries work~~s~~ w/ Gautam.
→ 3 weeks

GH: will provide to anyone

(7)(A) resource restraints. (PRA) - will offer: industry will requant if staff will give them the model.
(B) NEI to send in technical report.

GH: can identify contacts to meet on targeted areas. tech. working level - not management (MM: agrees)

(8) identify "tiger team" - NRC, industry, Stakeholders to meet on issues "right away".

- industry believes they provided stuff. suff. info. to modify model.
  - several orders of magnitude lower than today
  - model good, assumptions flaws.
- will support HRA work but really believes only requantification is needed.

Brian Sheron:
- agency does not make on-the-spot decisions
- this mtg was for informational gathering.
- don't share industry optimism on just sticking in the #s.
- learned alot.
- fact that resolved some GIs in past - does not mean that risk is zero. (heavy loads)
- *still need to consider it.
- don't believe that HRA will be RES. project. - assemble HRA experts.
- need to define other issues & convene to come to agreement or identify issues.
- identify mechanism to address issues.

Ray Shadis: (not at 3/17/99 mtg)
- have not seen Commissioner's expectations.
- regulations not written for decommissioning
- can this project.
- make new regulation for decommissioning plants.

Peter Atherton:
- over past mtgs brought up several issues - not obvious that the issues were being address.
- (1) seismic - aging requirements for racks, structures liner. - Concrete curing vs. temperature cures over several years.

GH: may be able to address in report.

wrap-up
5

Peter Atherton:

GH: already committed to meet

(2) criticality. - why is it not a concern for SFP. looking for written documentation.

(3) worst-case scenarios. - drain down
↳ consequences of public
- look at PRA
- what was the probability of TMI-2?
- use other accidents as basis for cutoff-point.
- why except $10^{-6}$ value.

GH: Rich to discuss

GH: Rich to discuss

(4) will NRC accept total blackout scenario? very concerned - at least lights in SFP area.

Action Items:

(1) include other public gps on mailings.
citizens awareness network

(2) safeguards & DBAs - explain how was it treated.

(3) a) NEI tech. rpt.
b) NRC to evaluate

(4) areas beyond TWG will be addressed by projects - WG. as part of rulemaking

(5) during whole process - will keep stakeholde informed - projects + Stu: already doing

wrap up.

(6)

(6) 3 New england plants - test results for SPP

(7) consideration of seismic - transfer tube

(8) seismic checklist - NEI to propose.

(9) heavy loads - consider
- 0612 & ~~upper bounds~~
- give early feedback.
- address in rpt. realistic values vs. upper bounds. (explain why choose #'s)

(10) T/H concerns decrease if plants continue to keep equip, procedures although staff will cont. to do generic calculations.

* Matrix of issues; how resolved; when.
* set up meetings.

staff needs to look at:
(11) What goes on when a plant is decommissioning?
MMeisner: look to your resident inspectors.