

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM TO: Patricia G. Norry
Deputy Executive Director for Management Services

FROM: J.E. Dyer, NRR Office Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: DRAFT COMMUNICATION PLAN FOR RULEMAKING PLAN ON POST-FIRE MANUAL ACTIONS

The NRC staff developed a Communication Plan (check for other sentences from Passive to Active Tense) to enhance our ability to convey clearly and accurately the staff's plan to pursue rulemaking for resolution of manual operator actions. This communication plan serves as a guide for planning and conducting internal and external communication activities related to our rulemaking plan for post-fire manual actions.

Attachment: Draft Communication Plan for Rulemaking Plan On Post-Fire Manual Actions

N-1

DRAFT COMMUNICATION PLAN FOR RULEMAKING PLAN ON POST-FIRE MANUAL ACTIONS

GOALS

This document describes the methods and tools for communicating key messages related to rulemaking on post-fire manual actions.

The purpose of this communication plan is to provide timely, consistent and understandable information to our internal and external stakeholders. It identifies opportunities for meaningful involvement with the staff.

BACKGROUND

During recent inspections of licensee fire protection programs, concerns have arisen about licensee compliance when redundant trains are located in the same fire area. In particular, there are instances where licensees are relying on "operator manual actions" which have not been approved by the NRC.

An operator manual action is an action taken by an operator, to control equipment from outside the main control room in order to achieve and maintain post-fire safe shutdown. This action is typically performed by the operator at the equipment. An examples of manual action includes an operator going out in the plant to manually operate a valve or piece of equipment. In the past, the NRC has approved on a case-by-case basis, the use of manual operator actions. However, the staff did not envision that licensees would implement a broader use of operator manual actions without NRC approval.

The staff is concerned that many of these licensees have implemented operator manual actions without NRC approval of an exemption or in some cases depending on when the plant was licensed, a deviation to their fire protection program requirements. The staff is also concerned that where operator manual actions are relied upon, these operator manual actions may not be feasible when factors such as complexity, timing, environmental conditions, staffing, and training are considered.

Based upon review of the inspection results, the NRC does not have evidence that an immediate safety concern exists. However, licensee's who have implemented manual actions in certain areas of the plant without NRC approval, may not be in compliance with their licensing basis. To ensure that NRC resources which are focused on safety significant issues are not significantly diverted to this issue, the staff believes that it can develop generic acceptance criteria for manual operator actions. This criteria, when used in conjunction with a revised rule, would provide licensees a way to assess the acceptability of currently unapproved manual actions.

During the period of Rule Making, the staff plans to assure public health and safety by continuing its inspections using a set of Feasibility Criteria. The current Feasibility Criteria that ensures that the manual action which the licensees rely on are feasible are included in the Staff Inspection Procedure (get this from Ray Gallucci). The staff is in the process of making minor modifications to these feasibility criteria based on inputs received from the Office of

ReSearch and the Advisory Committee on Safeguard. While the Rule Making takes place, the licensees will be required to address any manual actions which are deemed infeasible.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Internal:

- Commission
- Office of the Executive Director of Operations
- Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards
- Committee for the Review of Generic Requirements
- Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
- Office of Public Affairs
- Executive Team
- Leadership Team
- NRR Divisions or Branches
 - Policy and Rulemaking Branch
 - Inspection Program Branch
 - Probabilistic Safety Assessment Branch
- Office of Enforcement
- Office of General Counsel
- Resident Inspectors

External:

- General Public
- Public Citizen Groups
- Interveners (Paul Gunther)
- Nuclear Industry Groups (i.e., NEI)
- Press
- Congress
- Fire Protection Code & Standard Groups (National Fire Protection Association, Society of Fire Protection Engineers)

KEY MESSAGES TO EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

- The NRC's mission is to ensure protection of the public health and safety.
- In the past, the NRC has approved on a case-by-case basis, the use of manual operator actions, when they are feasible and do not adversely affect the ability of the plant to shut down.
- Recent inspections show that licensee's have implemented some manual operator actions, which they believe are feasible and do not adversely affect safe shutdown of the plant. In many cases, these manual operator actions were not reviewed or approved by the NRC. Based upon review of the inspection results, the NRC does not consider this to be an immediate safety issue.

- To ensure that licensee's are in compliance with the regulation, the NRC is pursuing a change to the regulation, which would provide a way for licensee's to assess the acceptability of currently unapproved manual actions.
- NRC will continue its inspections using a set of Feasibility Criteria to identify any manual actions that are deemed infeasible while the rule making activities proceed.

COMMUNICATION TOOLS

The following table shows the various communication tools which will be used to deliver messages to each key stakeholder. For each tool, the communicator(s), as well as the target audience(s) are identified.

INTERNAL STAKEHOLDER TOOLS

Communication Tools/Activities	NRR Responsible Communicator	Internal Target Audience(s)			
		<u>Commission, EDO, ACRS, CRGR</u>	<u>ET/LT</u>	<u>OGC, OCA, RES, NRR Branches</u>	<u>Resident Inspector</u>
Internal fire protection web site	FP Section Chief	X	X	X	X
Expanded ET Meetings	FP Section Chief		X		
Office Newsletter (Have I Got News For You)	Executive Team	X	X	X	
ROP Quarterly Inspector Newsletter	FP Section Chief & Fiona Tobler				X
Briefings	FP Section Chief	X	X	X	
Regional Workshops/Training	FP Section Chief				X
Hot Topics	Plant Systems Branch Chief		X		

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER TOOLS

Communication Tools/Activities	NRR Responsible Communicator	External Target Audience(s)				
		<u>General Public</u>	<u>Industry Groups/FP Code Groups</u>	<u>Public Cit. Groups/Interveners</u>	<u>Press</u>	<u>Congress</u>
Press Releases	OPA (Scott Burnell) / FPSection Chief	X	X	X	X	X

External Fire Protection Website - Enhance quality of manual actions information on the public fire protection web page	FP Section Chief	X	X	X	X	X
Category 2 meetings with industry or Category 3 Workshops/Round Table Discussion	FP Section Chief	X	X	X	X	
Fire Protection Working Group Meetings	DSSA Division Direction	X	X	X		
Fire Protection Code Standard Group Meetings	Appointed Fire Protection Engineer		X			
Congressional Reports	FP Section Chief/ Laura Gerke of OCA					X

TIMELINE OF COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES (insert key activities associated w/ rulemaking and also show what you have completed already)

Communication Activities	Date
Prepare SECY on Rulemaking Plan On Post-Fire Manual Actions	June 17, 2003 (C)
Public Meeting with Industry to discuss Manual Actions	October 17, 2003 (C)
Work with Dan Frumkin to update manual action information on the public fire protection web page (Show meetings to date, and upcoming meetings. Also, list correspondence which a member of the public would want to access)	October 30, 2003
Work with Scott Burnell to prepare a press release for the November Manual Actions Category 3 Public Meeting	November 3, 2003
Submit a meeting notice to announce the Category 3 Public Meeting at least 10 days in advance	TBD
Brief the Executive Team On Manual Operator Action Status	TBD
Category 3 Public Meeting on Manual Actions	TBD

COMMUNICATION TEAM

Sunil Weerakkody,	Fire Protection Section Chief	301-415-2870
Ray Gallucci	Senior Fire Protection Engineer	301-415-
Phil Qualls	Reactor Engineer	301-415-1849
Tanya Mensah	Acting NRR Communications Analyst	301-415-3610
Scott Burnell	Office of Public Affairs	301-415-8200
Margie Kotzalas	Technical Assistant	301-415-2737
(Anybody else)		

EVALUATION OF SUCCESS

For internal stakeholders, the effectiveness of this communication plan will be evaluated on a periodic basis. Success in communicating our messages will be measured by both formal (e.g., staff interaction with the fire protection section chief), and informal (e.g., routine interfaces with internal management and staff). Appropriate modifications will be made to the ongoing and future communication strategy based on this assessment, to ensure that the staff understands the issue enough to accurately convey key messages, respond to questions and answers, and utilize the communication timeline.

For external stakeholders, the effectiveness of this communication plan will be evaluated on a periodic basis. Success in communicating our messages will be measured by formal feedback (e.g., participation of public during public meetings to discuss this issue). In addition, in the event that public criticism is high with regard to a manual operator actions rulemaking, success will be measured by our ability to utilize the communication plan to deliver consistent, accurate, key messages to the public and to the press. Success will also be measure by the staff's ability to proactively prepare a communication message which will be broad enough to cover all aspects of the issue related to manual operator actions..

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (add to this if you have any)

From the general public or news media perspective:

1. Why is the NRC revising the rule to allow manual actions in lieu of fire barrier separation without an NRC-approved exemption?
2. Is the NRC changing the rule to accommodate licensee's?
3. What are operator manual actions? (Definition on page 2 of SECY)
4. Instead of changing the rule, why doesn't the NRC issue a violation to the licensee for not being in compliance with the regulation?
5. How long have plants been implementing manual actions, which are unapproved by the NRC? In addition, if resident inspectors are in the plant everyday, why didn't the NRC know about it sooner?
6. What is the NRC doing now about plants who have implemented non-NRC approved manual operator action?