

March 10, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: Christopher I. Grimes, Program Director  
Reactor Policy Rulemaking Program  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard Dudley, Senior Project Manager */RA/*  
Policy and Rulemaking Section A  
Reactor Policy Rulemaking Program  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS OPTION 3 GUIDANCE  
ON RISK-INFORMING REGULATIONS AND DRAFT PLAN FOR  
ACHIEVING RISK-INFORMED COHERENCE FOR REACTOR  
REGULATIONS

On December 5, 2002, staff of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation and the Office of Regulatory Research held a public meeting with stakeholders to discuss Option 3 guidance for risk-informing additional regulations and the draft Coherence Plan for risk-informing regulations in the reactor safety arena. The meeting agenda is provided in Attachment 1. A list of meeting attendees is provided in Attachment 2.

The staff first presented its planned activities on Option 3 guidance for risk-informing regulations and then solicited feedback from stakeholders. Slides used by the staff are provided in Attachment 3. The ensuing discussion on Option 3 focused on two issues: (1) the forthcoming revision to the Option 3 guidance document, and (2) identification of additional candidate regulations for risk-informing. The staff indicated that a draft revision to the guidance document would be made available for public comment in early 2003. The staff emphasized that the new version of the guidance document would not provide any new guidance or criteria but would involve better explanation and clarification of the concepts and quantitative guidelines contained in the original document. NRC staff also made available Appendix A of the Option 3 guidance, (Attachment 4) which provides the derivation of the Reg Guide 1.174 numerical objectives on core damage and large early release frequencies from the NRC Safety Goals. Industry representatives presented their concerns over the existing Option 3 guidance document. These concerns mainly focused on the complexity of the guidance document, and the partitioning and use of the quantitative guidelines. Slides used by EPRI are provided in Attachment 5. The EPRI representative also presented a summary of an alternative proposed framework for risk-informed changes to the technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50. These slides are included in Attachment 6.

The staff described a number of activities that were underway which support identification of additional candidate regulations for risk-informing under Option 3. These activities include evaluating Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) findings, evaluating licensing actions and exemptions, mapping regulations and technical requirements to the reactor safety

cornerstones, and evaluating special treatment requirements. Industry representatives indicated that they believed evaluation of the ROP findings is the activity with the most potential for identification of candidate regulations for change. NEI representatives indicated that they had previously attempted a similar exercise, but found that it was very complicated and resource intensive. NEI agreed to supply the staff with the results of their earlier trial effort on this activity. Subsequently, on December 10, 2002, NEI provided the NRC with information relating severity of inspection findings to the cornerstones. NEI also provided a table summarizing its review to determine which safety cornerstones are supported by the various NRC regulations. These documents are attached as Attachments 7 and 8, respectively.

Industry representatives stressed that they felt the staff should focus on the existing Option 3 activities, particularly, risk-informing of the LOCA-LOOP requirement from GDC 35 and redefinition of the spectrum of pipe breaks applicable to 10 CFR 50.46, and not pursue other candidate regulations until the ongoing efforts were complete, or much further along. The staff responded that the effort to identify and pursue additional candidate regulations for risk-informing would be in parallel with ongoing Option 3 efforts, and would not delay those efforts. Industry representatives identified the following regulations as potential candidates for risk-informing: 10 CFR 50.55a (Codes and Standards), 10 CFR 50.36 (Technical Specifications), Appendix I to Part 50 (Radiation Safety), 10 CFR 50.48/Appendix R to Part 50 (Fire Protection), and 10 CFR Part 54 (License Renewal).

Next, the staff presented its approach and draft plan for achieving risk-informed coherence in the reactor safety arena. Staff slides are provided in Attachment 9. The objective of the coherence program is to develop an approach in which the reactor regulations, staff programs, and processes are built on a unified safety concept and properly integrated so that they complement one another. Substantial stakeholder feedback was received on the staff's draft plan. One of the principal comments received from industry was that implementation of the coherence program could be an extremely large undertaking, and that it may be more efficient to attack the problem in smaller pieces; for example, focusing first on making the reactor regulations coherent with the risk-informed ROP. The staff stressed that the plan and approach were in the initial stages and that frequent interaction with stakeholders was essential for program success. NEI also discussed a proposal to develop a safety cornerstone for occupational and public radiation safety (Attachment 10).

The staff will discuss the Process for a Risk-Informed Coherence Effort in a public workshop in early 2003.

Attachments:

1. Meeting Agenda
2. List of Attendees
3. NRC Slides on Option 3 Guidance
4. Appendix A: Quantitative Guidelines
5. EPRI Slides on Option 3 Comments
6. EPRI Slides on Alternative Framework
7. Inspection Findings Summary
8. Table Relating Regulations to Cornerstones
9. NRC Slides on Coherence Plan
10. NEI Slide on Radiation Safety Cornerstone

cornerstones, and evaluating special treatment requirements. Industry representatives indicated that they believed evaluation of the ROP findings is the activity with the most potential for identification of candidate regulations for change. NEI representatives indicated that they had previously attempted a similar exercise, but found that it was very complicated and resource intensive. NEI agreed to supply the staff with the results of their earlier trial effort on this activity. Subsequently, on December 10, 2002, NEI provided the NRC with information relating severity of inspection findings to the cornerstones. NEI also provided a table summarizing its review to determine which safety cornerstones are supported by the various NRC regulations. These documents are attached as Attachments 7 and 8, respectively.

Industry representatives stressed that they felt the staff should focus on the existing Option 3 activities, particularly, risk-informing of the LOCA-LOOP requirement from GDC 35 and redefinition of the spectrum of pipe breaks applicable to 10 CFR 50.46, and not pursue other candidate regulations until the ongoing efforts were complete, or much further along. The staff responded that the effort to identify and pursue additional candidate regulations for risk-informing would be in parallel with ongoing Option 3 efforts, and would not delay those efforts. Industry representatives identified the following regulations as potential candidates for risk-informing: 10 CFR 50.55a (Codes and Standards), 10 CFR 50.36 (Technical Specifications), Appendix I to Part 50 (Radiation Safety), 10 CFR 50.48/Appendix R to Part 50 (Fire Protection), and 10 CFR Part 54 (License Renewal).

Next, the staff presented its approach and draft plan for achieving risk-informed coherence in the reactor safety arena. Staff slides are provided in Attachment 9. The objective of the coherence program is to develop an approach in which the reactor regulations, staff programs, and processes are built on a unified safety concept and properly integrated so that they complement one another. Substantial stakeholder feedback was received on the staff's draft plan. One of the principal comments received from industry was that implementation of the coherence program could be an extremely large undertaking, and that it may be more efficient to attack the problem in smaller pieces; for example, focusing first on making the reactor regulations coherent with the risk-informed ROP. The staff stressed that the plan and approach were in the initial stages and that frequent interaction with stakeholders was essential for program success. NEI also discussed a proposal to develop a safety cornerstone for occupational and public radiation safety (Attachment 10).

The staff will discuss the Process for a Risk-Informed Coherence Effort in a public workshop in early 2003.

**Attachments:**

- |                                               |                     |                    |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Meeting Agenda                             | <b>Package :</b>    | <b>ML023510497</b> |
| 2. List of Attendees                          | <b>Memo:</b>        | <b>ML023510284</b> |
| 3. NRC Slides on Option 3 Guidance            | <b>Attachments:</b> | <b>ML030100434</b> |
| 4. Appendix A: Quantitative Guidelines        |                     |                    |
| 5. EPRI Slides on Option 3 Comments           |                     |                    |
| 6. EPRI Slides on Alternative Framework       |                     |                    |
| 7. Inspection Findings Summary                |                     |                    |
| 8. Table Relating Regulations to Cornerstones |                     |                    |
| 9. NRC Slides on Coherence Plan               |                     |                    |
| 10. NEI Slide on Radiation Safety Cornerstone |                     |                    |

**Distributions:**

ADAMS Publicly available	DDiec	GHolahan/SBlack	MCunningham (RES)	LKokajko (NMSS)
RPRP r/f	SMagruder	MJohnson	MDrouin (RES)	BHardin (RES)
CIGrimes	EMcKenna	MRubin	RDennig	GParry
KSWest	WBeckner	MReinhart	GImbro	MSnodderly
RDudley	CCarpenter	MCaruso	PKadambi (RES)	TReed
AKuritzky	PRay	DDube (RES)		

\*See previous concurrence

\*Outside email distribution: See next page

OFFICE	RPRP:SPM	RPRP:SC	RES:BC	RPRP:PD
NAME	RDudley*	KSWest	MCunningham	CIGrimes
DATE	02/27/03	03/05/03	03/07/03	03/10/03



**Outside email Distribution:**

John Lehner

[lehner@bn0l.gov](mailto:lehner@bn0l.gov)

Steve Floyd

[sdf@nei.org](mailto:sdf@nei.org)

Tony Pietrangelo

[arp@nei.org](mailto:arp@nei.org)

Doug True

[detrue@erineng.com](mailto:detrue@erineng.com)

John Gaertner

[jgaertne@epri.com](mailto:jgaertne@epri.com)

Adrian Heymer

[aph@nei.org](mailto:aph@nei.org)

Sheldon Trubatch

[strubatch@starpower.net](mailto:strubatch@starpower.net)

David Finnicum

[david.j.finnicum@us.westinghouse.com](mailto:david.j.finnicum@us.westinghouse.com)

Ralph Anderson

[rla@nei.org](mailto:rla@nei.org)

Ted Ginsberg

[ginsberg@bnl.gov](mailto:ginsberg@bnl.gov)

## **Agenda**

9:00 - 9:15	Introduction - NRC
9:15 - 10:45	Status of Risk Informing 10CFR Part 50 - NRC
10:45 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 11:30	Overview of Draft Coherence Program - NRC
11:30 - 12:00	Discussion of Draft Coherence Program - all participants
12:00 - 1:00PM	Lunch
1:00 - 2:30	Discussion of Draft Coherence Program (cont.) - all participants
2:30 - 3:00	Conclusions and Next Steps - NRC

## Meeting Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Chris Grimes	NRC/NRR
Steven West	NRC/NRR
John Lehner	BNL
Steve Floyd	NEI
M. R. Snodderly	NRC/ACRS
Tony Pietrangelo	NEI
Doug True	ERIN
David Finnicum	Westinghouse
John Gaertener	EPRI
Adrian Heymer	NEI
Brad Hardin	NRC/RES
Stu Magruder	NRC/NRR
Richard Dudley	NRC/NRR
N. P. Kadambi	NRC/RES
Eileen McKenna	NRC/NRR
Alan Kuritzky	NRC/RES
Tim Reed	NRC/NRR
Phillip Ray	NRC/NRR
Ted Ginsberg	BNL
Don Dube	NRC/RES
Ralph Anderson	NEI
Sheldon Trubatch	Law Offices of Sheldon Trubatch