

April 9, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Cathy Haney, Program Director
Policy and Rulemaking Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, NRR

FROM: Peter C. Wen, Project Manager */RA/*
Policy and Rulemaking Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, NRR

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MARCH 24, 2004, PUBLIC MEETING REGARDING
PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT QUALITY ACTION PLAN

On March 24, 2004, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a public meeting to continue discussions with the industry and the public on the Staff's response to the staff requirements memorandum (SRM), COMNJD-03-0002, "Stabilizing the PRA Quality Expectations and Requirements." The meeting attendees are listed in Attachment 1. Handouts used by the staff during the meeting are included in Attachment 2 (ADAMS Accession Number ML040990268).

The staff presentation focused on the draft plan that was made publicly available before the meeting (ML040750462.) The attendees generally supported the staff's approach in the plan and expressed a desire to hold additional public meetings on this subject. However, several issues were raised concerning the implementation of the phased approach:

- Is the staff's definition of PRA quality (scope, level of detail, technical acceptability) consistent with the industry's? Should we focus on new terms?
- The staff should clarify (box 10 of the flowchart) that only the applicable portions of the base PRA will be evaluated against existing standards for Phase 2.
- The staff should better explain the difference between box 3 and box 10. In particular, an expanded discussion of how to determine which contributors are risk-significant would be helpful. The group reached a consensus that box 3 could be viewed as a generic evaluation and box 10 as plant-specific.
- There was a lengthy discussion of box 5 and the implications it has for encouraging or discouraging licensees to develop their PRAs. Industry representatives at the meeting were concerned that the staff's intention to give lower review priority to submittals that use broader scope PRAs for areas where standards have yet to be established is a major disincentive. The industry suggested that box 5 be split into several boxes to allow the staff to make more specific decisions.
- The industry and staff agreed that it would be beneficial for the standards development organizations to rethink the prioritization of the standards under development. The consensus seemed to be that the fire PRA standard should be the highest priority. The NRC staff clarified that the order of standards in the draft plan just reflects the current understanding and the NRC does not mean to influence the order of development.

- The NEI representatives noted that the industry has been devoting resources to resolving the issue of dealing with model uncertainty. Specifically, Westinghouse and EPRI have been working on reports. The group consensus was that a public meeting should be scheduled to discuss this topic and that the NRC should coordinate the efforts.

Having completed discussion of the agenda items, the group adjourned. Representatives of the NRC and the industry agreed that this meeting had been useful for the exchange of information on the discussion subject.

Project No. 689

Attachments: As stated

cc: w/atts: See list

- The NEI representatives noted that the industry has been devoting resources to resolving the issue of dealing with model uncertainty. Specifically, Westinghouse and EPRI have been working on reports. The group consensus was that a public meeting should be scheduled to discuss this topic and that the NRC should coordinate the efforts.

Having completed discussion of the agenda items, the group adjourned. Representatives of the NRC and the industry agreed that this meeting had been useful for the exchange of information on the discussion subject.

Project No. 689

Attachments: As stated

cc: w/atts: See list

ADAMS Accession No.: **ML041030349**

*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	PM:RPRP	SPSB	BC:SPSB	SC:RPRP
NAME	PWen*	SMagruder*	MTschiltz*	EMcKenna
DATE	04/08/2004	04/08/2004	04/08/2004	04/09/2004

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NRC/NEI/Stakeholders Meeting
Probabilistic Risk Assessment Quality Action Plan
March 24, 2004
List of Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Donnie Harrison	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Gareth Parry	NRC/NRR/DSSA
David Lew	NRC/RES/DRAA/PRAB
Mary Drouin	NRC/RES/DRAA/PRAB
Mike Tschiltz	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Mark Caruso	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Stu Magruder	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Lynn Mrowca	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Steve Long	NRC/NRR/DSSA/SPSB
Bob Tjader	NRC/NRR/DIPM/IROB
Bennett Brady	NRC/RES/DRAA/OERAB
Doug Coe	NRC/NRR/DIPM/IIPB
John Gaertner	EPRI
Ken Canavan	EPRI
Doug True	ERIN Engineering
Tony Pietrangelo	NEI
Biff Bradley	NEI
Gerald Sowers	APS
Gary Ament	Westinghouse
Jeff Stone	Constellation (CCNPP)
Tom O'Meara	Constellation (CCNPP)
David Finnicum	Westinghouse
Mats Sranberg	AB SKE
Stanley Levinson	Areva
Dave Bucheit	Dominion
Nancy Chapman	Bechtel/SERCH
Greg Krueger	Exelon
Craig Sellers	Alion
Daniel Stillwell	STPNOC
Rick Grantom	STPNOC
Ken Balkey	Westinghouse/ASME

cc: Via email (Use MS Word if available)

Tony Pietrangelo, NEI
arp@nei.org

Biff Bradley, NEI
reb@nei.org

Distribution: Mtg w/NEI PRA Quality Action Plan 03/24/04

ADAMS/PUBLIC

OGC

ACRS

EMail

J.Dyer/W. Borchardt

B.Sheron

D.Matthews/F.Gillespie

C.Haney

E. McKenna

S. Black/M.Johnson

M. Tschiltz

S. Magruder

M Reinhart

M. Rubin

G. Parry

M. Caruso

L. Mrowca

S. Long

D. Harrison

T. Boyce

R. Tjader

D. Coe

M. Snodderly, ACRS

D. Lew, RES

M. Drouin, RES

B. Brady, RES

T. Bergman, OEDO

OPA