

February 09, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Andersen, Chief  
Performance Assessment Section  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: John W. Thompson, Senior Reactor Operations Engineer */RA/*  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY ON THE MITIGATING SYSTEMS  
PERFORMANCE INDEX AND THE REACTOR OVERSIGHT  
PROCESS MONTHLY MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 21-22, 2004

On January 21 and 22, 2004, a Mitigating Systems Performance Index (MSPI) and Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) public meeting was held at the One White Flint North Building, Room O6B4 and 07B4, respectively. Attachment 1 contains the attendance lists covering both meeting days. Attachment 2 contains the agenda topics for the two day meeting. Attachment 3 is the meeting notes from the MSPI public meeting and contains the main items of interest from the group discussion.

During the January 21, 2004 public meeting, meeting participants discussed updates on the MSPI technical issues involving proposed use of generic multipliers for accounting for common cause risk contributions, benchmarking results from comparison studies of SDP and MSPI data, and large early release frequency (LERF) and external event SDP analysis. Additionally, the staff gave a presentation of the merits of performing supplemental inspections and action matrix assessments relative to understanding performance deficiencies identified within the ROP program.

During the January 22, 2004 public meeting, items of interest included updates on the status of proposed changes to the draft significance determination process (SDP) appendices, brainstorming important ROP issues of interest to be address over the upcoming 12 months, update on the status of the industry trends initiating events performance indicator, and PI frequently asked questions (FAQs) (attachment). The next combined meeting of the MSPI and ROP Working Groups is scheduled for February 18 and 19, 2004, respectively.

Attachments:  
As stated

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Andersen, Chief  
Performance Assessment Section  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: John W. Thompson, Senior Reactor Operations Engineer  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY ON THE MITIGATING SYSTEMS  
PERFORMANCE INDEX AND THE REACTOR OVERSIGHT  
PROCESS MONTHLY MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 21-22, 2004

On January 21 and 22, 2004, a Mitigating Systems Performance Index (MSPI) and Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) public meeting was held at the One White Flint North Building, Room O6B4 and 07B4, respectively. Attachment 1 contains the attendance lists covering both meeting days. Attachment 2 contains the agenda topics for the two day meeting. Attachment 3 is the meeting notes from the MSPI public meeting and contains the main items of interest from the group discussion.

During the January 21, 2004 public meeting, meeting participants discussed updates on the MSPI technical issues involving proposed use of generic multipliers for accounting for common cause risk contributions, benchmarking results from comparison studies of SDP and MSPI data, and large early release frequency (LERF) and external event SDP analysis. Additionally, the staff gave a presentation of the merits of performing supplemental inspections and action matrix assessments relative to understanding performance deficiencies identified within the ROP program.

During the January 22, 2004 public meeting, items of interest included updates on the status of proposed changes to the draft significance determination process (SDP) appendices, brainstorming important ROP issues of interest to be address over the upcoming 12 months, update on the status of the industry trends initiating events performance indicator, and PI frequently asked questions (FAQs) (attachment). The next combined meeting of the MSPI and ROP Working Groups is scheduled for February 18 and 19, 2004, respectively.

Attachments:  
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:  
IIPB r/f          PUBLIC

**Accession Number: ML040410121 (Package)**

OFFICE	DIPM/IIPB
NAME	JWThompson
DATE	02/09/04

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

**ATTENDANCE LIST**  
**INDUSTRY/STAFF MSPI PUBLIC MEETING**  
January 21, 2004

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
1.	John Thompson	NRC
2.	Dave Wrona	NRC
3.	Stuart Richards	NRC
4.	Sonia Burgess	NRC
5.	Donald Dube	NRC
6.	Bennett Brady	NRC
7.	Donald Hickman	NRC
8.	Rick Thomas	Entergy
9.	Thomas C. Houghton	NEI
10.	Ken Heffner	Progress Energy
11.	Dale Ambler	Exelon
12.	Glen Masters	INPO
13.	Susan Ferrell	TVA
14.	Nirodh Shah	NRC
15.	Ann Marie Stone	NRC
16.	Kerry Landis	NRC
17.	Leonard Sueper	NMC
18.	Robin Ritzman	PSEG
19.	Lee Keller	Duke
20.	Victoria Warren	ERIN/Exelon
21.	Jennifer Dixon-Herrity	NRC
22.	Patrick Baranowsky	NRC
23.	Bill Mookhoek	STP/NOC
24.	Victoria Warren	Erin/Exelon
25.	Mark Caruso	NRC
26.	Duane Kanitz	APS
27.	Jerry Sours	APS
28.	Tony Pietrangelo	NEI

**ATTENDANCE LIST**  
**INDUSTRY/STAFF ROP PUBLIC MEETING**  
January 22, 2004

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
1.	John Thompson	NRC
2.	Dave Wrona	NRC
3.	Stuart Richards	NRC
4.	Greg Gibson	SoCalEdison
5.	Duane Kanitz	APZ
6.	Robert Kahler	NRC
7.	Donald Hickman	NRC
8.	Rick Thomas	Entergy
9.	Thomas C. Houghton	NEI
10.	Robin Ritzman	PS&G
11.	Jim Anderson	NRC
12.	Susan Ferrell	TVA
13.	W.E. Mookhoek	STP
14.	Lee Keller	Duke
15.	Doug Coe	NRC
16.	Roy Mathew	NRC
17.	Dale Rasmuson	NRC
18.	Joel Munday	NRC

## **MSPI WORKING GROUP PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA**

January 21, 2004  
OWFN 6B4

9:00-9:10 a.m.	Introductions	(NRC Staff/Industry)
9:10-9:20 a.m.	High Level Staff Overview	(All)
9:20-10:15 a.m.	Update of MSPI Technical Issues	(RES/Industry)
10:15-10:30 a.m.	Public Discussion & Break	
10:30-12:00 p.m.	Cont. Discussion of Technical Issues	(All)
12:00-1:00 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 - 2:00 p.m.	Implementation Issues	(All)
2:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Timeline Discussion	(All)
2:15 - 2:30 p.m.	Break and Public Discussion	
2:30 - 4:00 p.m.	Open Discussion on MSPI issues	(All)
4:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

## **ROP MONTHLY WORKING GROUP MEETING**

### **AGENDA**

January 22, 2004

OWFN 7B4

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| 9:00 a.m.  | Welcome and Introduction   |
| 9:15 a.m.  | General discussion on ROP inspection processes, improvements and initiatives |
| 9:30 a.m.  | Discussion on Proposed SDP changes   |
| 10:15 a.m. | Public Discussion & Break  |
| 10:30 a.m. | Update on the Industry Trends Initiating Events PI                           |
| 11:00 a.m. | Discussion of Generic Issues with Scrams w/LONHR PI                          |
| 12:00 p.m. | Break for Lunch  |
| 1:00 p.m.  | Discussion of PI FAQs  |
| 2:15 p.m.  | Public Discussion & Break  |
| 2:30 p.m.  | Discussion of other PI FAQs  |
| 4:00 p.m.  | Adjourn  |

### Public Meeting Summary on MSPI Pilot Program

The staff and industry met on January 21, 2004 in OWFN 6B4 to discuss status and open issues with the MSPI program. The public meeting was scheduled to last until 4 p.m., but discussion concluded at noon, given that the staff was not in a position to discuss the deliberations and internal discussion of regional and office level opinions and concerns for going forward with MSPI.

The Office of Research (RES) gave a two-hour presentation that included a discussion of their finishing effort reviews and studies for generic multipliers for accounting for common cause risk contributions. Essentially, industry will have an option to either: 1) calculate the site-specific common cause risk factor for each monitored component, or 2) use the generic values provided by RES. The generic values are categorized by system/component type (i.e., EDGs) and by success criteria (i.e., 2/3 EDGs needed for success) and will be multiplied with the FV/UR value for that component. Industry stated that this was an acceptable resolution to the common cause issue, where their main concern was the ability to have an option other than perform tedious site-specific calculations. NRC staff now considers this open technical issue resolved.

RES also gave updates to ongoing activities of comparison studies of MSPI, safety system unavailability (SSU) PI, and SDP results, and with sensitivity studies of the effect of PRA model differences and their effects on MSPI outcomes. The important conclusion from the effort is that there will be a mix of effects from the sensitivity studies with the impact being an important input and factor for developing the Temporary Instruction risk-informed checklists. The results indicated that there were a small number of pilot plants (3) that had modeling differences with a large sensitivity impact on MSPI results (large being a likely chance to cross a performance threshold), a few more pilot plants (5 plants) that had differences of a moderate impact on MSPI results (moderate being defined as a potential chance for crossing a performance threshold), and a small number of pilot plants (3) with only small modeling differences and little chance of crossing a performance threshold. The important conclusion from the MSPI, SSU, and SDP comparison studies is that the results present a mixed bag of agreements and differences that verify that the SDP and MSPI are two different assessment tools, that for their intended purpose, are valid measures of performance. Of the 77 failures evaluated, there was agreement for cases where MSPI equals SSU equals SDP for green performance determinations, and for non green performance determinations. There were also differences, and while those differences occurred less often, the data was more sparse due to the fact that there weren't that many non green findings. The MSPI meeting attendees acknowledged that MSPI, SSU, and SDP all measure different things, and any conclusions drawn from direct comparison between the three is complicated, at best. Nevertheless, the results were encouraging in that RES was confident that the MSPI is performing as it was designed to do; that is, MSPI is a risk measure of equipment performance averaged over a three year period. Others commented that SDP performs best for evaluating the risk contributions of performance deficiencies of single events/conditions.

The last topic of discussion was a tentative schedule of industry/staff activities that NEI put together along with a timeline for MSPI implementation. The initial impression by the staff attendees was that it was a very aggressive and optimistic schedule of milestones, with three national workshops for 2004 involving all four regions and SRAs, plus staff inspector training, all to be accomplished in 2004. Industry is still trying to meet their goal of MSPI implementation of January, 2005. However, they realize that all of this is predicated on if and when a go/nogo decision is made. The staff still has to find a way to allocate

significant resources if a decision is made to go forward, which will further complicate and likely push out industry's time line and schedule.

The next public MSPI meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 18, 2004, 9-4, in OWFN 13B4.