

October 20, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Victor M. McCree, Deputy Director (SDP Task Group Chairman)
Division of Reactor Projects
Region II

FROM: Darrell J. Roberts, Technical Assistant (SDPTG Member) */RA/*
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANCE
DETERMINATION PROCESS TASK GROUP MEETING HELD ON
OCTOBER 25, 2002

On October 25, 2002, a public meeting was held at One White Flint North, Room 14B6, to discuss questions and issues regarding the NRC's Reactor Safety Significance Determination Process (SDP) and related SDP Task Group (SDPTG) activities. Participants were asked to discuss concerns about the current SDP and provide any recommendations for programmatic or process improvements that might alleviate those concerns. Attachment 1 contains the agenda for the public meeting. Attachment 2 contains an outline of the discussion topics for the meeting.

Comments received during the meeting will be reflected in a final report to management from the SDPTG. That report is scheduled to be issued on December 13, 2002. A list of meeting participants is included as Attachment 3 to this memorandum.

Attachments:

1. Agenda
2. Discussion Topics
3. Attendance List

October 20, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Victor M. McCree, Deputy Director (SDP Task Group Chairman)
Division of Reactor Projects
Region II

FROM: Darrell J. Roberts, Technical Assistant (SDPTG Member) /RA/
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANCE
DETERMINATION PROCESS TASK GROUP MEETING HELD ON
OCTOBER 25, 2002

On October 25, 2002, a public meeting was held at One White Flint North, Room 14B6, to discuss questions and issues regarding the NRC's Reactor Safety Significance Determination Process (SDP) and related SDP Task Group (SDPTG) activities. Participants were asked to discuss concerns about the current SDP and provide any recommendations for programmatic or process improvements that might alleviate those concerns. Attachment 1 contains the agenda for the public meeting. Attachment 2 contains an outline of the discussion topics for the meeting.

Comments received during the meeting will be reflected in a final report to management from the SDPTG. That report is scheduled to be issued on December 13, 2002. A list of meeting participants is included as Attachment 3 to this memorandum.

Attachments:

1. Agenda
2. Discussion Topics
3. Attendance List

DISTRIBUTION:

NRC File Centers	PUBLIC	OGC	ACRS
S. Collins	J. Johnson	W. Borchardt	
NRR Communication Coordinator (DMcCCain)			

Accession Number: ML023240207

OFFICE	NRR/SDPTG		
NAME	D. Roberts		
DATE	11/ 20 /02		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

AGENDA
PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION PROCESS

Friday, October 25, 2002, OWFN O14B6

- Opening remarks by NRC (9:00 a.m. to 9:15 a.m)
 - Purpose of Meeting
 - Background
 - Objectives of SDP Task Group
 - Format of Discussion
- Discussion Topics (9:15 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.)
 - Contribution of SDP to ROP Objectives
 - Characterization of Significance of Inspection Findings using SDP
 - Staff Implementation of SDP
 - Recommendation on Use of SDP Phase 2 and/or Phase 3
 - Use of Uncertainty Analysis in the SDP
- Break (10:30 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.)
- Discussion Topics (10:45 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.)
 - Use of Other Inputs in Evaluating Licensee Performance
 - Public Confidence in NRC Significance Determinations
 - Other Recommendations to Improve ROP/SDP
- Summary



**PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE
SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION PROCESS**

OCTOBER 25, 2002

DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Contribution of SDP to ROP Objectives:

In developing the ROP, the NRC's goal was to develop a more objective, scrutable and risk-informed process. After nearly 3 years of implementation, what is your impression of:

- How well has the SDP worked to fulfill these objectives?
- What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the current process?
- What specific recommendations do you have to improve the process?

2. Characterizations of Significance of Findings using SDP

- Do you have any comments on how the NRC characterizes the significance of findings (colors) using the SDP?
- Do you have any recommendations or improvements on how we can better characterize the significance of findings?

3. **Staff Implementation of SDP**

- What are your views on how the NRC staff has implemented the SDP?
- Do you believe that the process has been implemented as intended?
- Do you believe the staff's implementation of the ROP/SDP reflects an adequate knowledge of risk insights?

4. **Use of SDP Phase 2 and/or Phase 3 Tool to Evaluate Inspection Findings**

The phase 2 SDP notebook was intended to be a simple tool, used by the inspectors to screen inspection findings for safety significance and facilitate agency decisions regarding resource allocation.

- Do you believe that the Phase 2 SDP is an effective tool for screening inspection findings?
- Should the current phase 2 SDP be replaced with a more comprehensive PRA tool such as the SPAR model or licensee PRA results?
- Do you have other ideas on how inspection findings should be evaluated for safety significance?

5. **Use of Uncertainty Analysis in the SDP**

- Should the SDP be used to quantify measures of uncertainty?

- Or, should we acknowledge the limitations (i.e., the degree of error) of the SDP, and any quantitative model, and include this the SDP Performance Expectations?

6. Use of Other Inputs in Evaluating Licensee Performance

There has been a concern among some NRC staff members and public stakeholders that the ROP should include an assessment of other potentially predictive performance indicators such as human performance error rate, quality of corrective action program, safety conscious work environment, and others.

- Do you believe there is merit in including these type of issues in the ROP?
- If so, what ROP/SDP process changes should be made to incorporate such inputs?

7. **Public Confidence in NRC Significance Determinations**

There have been some instances where the NRC has issued findings with preliminary significance determinations of higher significance and subsequently issued a final significance determination of lower significance (color), based on information provided by the licensee during the Regulatory Conference. For many of these issues, the significance was revised to more accurately reflect the equipment availability.

- Do you believe that this practice erodes public confidence?
- If so, what actions should NRC take to both enhance public confidence and ensure that final significance determinations are based on all available relevant information?

8. **Other Recommendations to Improve the ROP/SDP**

9. **Summary**

LIST OF ATTENDEES

NRC Staff Members (alphabetical order)

Brian Bonser, OEDO
James Caldwell, Region III (via telecon)
Cynthia Carpenter, NRR
Samuel J. Collins, NRR
Frank Congel, OE
John Craig, OEDO
Jennifer Dixon-Herrity, OE
Donald Dube, RES
Laura Dudes, NRR (SDPTG member)
Eliezer Goldfeiz, RES
Hossein Hamzehee, RES (SDPTG member)
Jon R. Johnson, NRR
Ian Jung, NRR (SDPTG member)
Peter Koltay, NRR
Victor M. McCree, Region II (SDPTG Team Leader)
Robert Moody, OIG
Dave Nelson, OE
Gareth Parry, NRR (SDPTG member)
Renee Pederson, OE
Darrell Roberts, NRR (SDPTG member)
James Trapp, Region I (SDPTG member)

External Stakeholders

Dennis Dyckman, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Steve Floyd, NEI
David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists
Deanne Raleigh, Scientec
Cecil Settles, Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition
Jenny Weil, McGraw Hill