June 27, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: David C. Lew, Chief
Probabilistic Risk Analysis Branch
Division of Risk Analysis & Applications
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

FROM: Mary T. Drouin ***/RA/***
Probabilistic Risk Analysis Branch
Division of Risk Analysis & Applications
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF JUNE 16, 2005, PUBLIC MEETING WITH INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS REGARDING THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM PILOT APPLICATIONS OF REGULATORY GUIDE 1.200, "AN APPROACH FOR DETERMINING THE ADEQUACY OF PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR RISK-INFORMED ACTIVITIES"

The staff held a public meeting with interested stakeholders on June 16, 2005, to discuss and solicit comments on changes to Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.200, "An Approach for Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk -Informed Activities," and the associated draft Standard Review Plan Chapter 19.1 based on lessons learned from pilot applications. The meeting was well attended and included representatives from Exelon, Nuclear Energy Institute, Sandia National Laboratories, Information Systems Laboratories, South Texas Project, Dominion Generation, Energy Northwest, Southern California Edison Co., Bechtel, Framatome, Scientech, and other stakeholders.

The list of attendees, the meeting agenda, and the meeting handouts are provided in Attachments 1,2, and 3, respectively. The NRC staff led the discussion for the meeting, which addressed the following agenda items:

- Introduction and the purpose of the meeting
- Background/History
- Purpose of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.200
- Scope of RG
- Status
- Observations from the Pilots
- Proposed Schedule
- Staff Conclusions

There was a good interchange between the staff and attendees. There were two major issues raised during the discussion.

1. The five pilot licensees would like to send in their insights. The staff welcomed their input.

2. One finding from the pilots is that the ASME requirements for the peer review qualifications were not met. It was agreed that the requirements were too strict and not necessarily accomplishing the intent. It was further agreed that this issue needed to be raised to ASME and there would be future discussions.

The meeting concluded with the general agreement that the meeting was very productive and had provided for a good exchange of information. The staff agreed to hold another public meeting after RG 1.200 and Appendices A and B have been revised.

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees
2. Meeting agenda
3. Meeting handouts

There was a good interchange between the staff and attendees. There were two major issues raised during the discussion.

1. The five pilot licensees would like to send in their insights. The staff welcomed their input.

2. One finding from the pilots is that the ASME requirements for the peer review qualifications were not met. It was agreed that the requirements were too strict and not necessarily accomplishing the intent. It was further agreed that this issue needed to be raised to ASME and there would be future discussions.

The meeting concluded with the general agreement that the meeting was very productive and had provided for a good exchange of information. The staff agreed to hold another public meeting after RG 1.200 and Appendices A and B have been revised.

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees
2. Meeting agenda
3. Meeting handouts

DISTRIBUTION:
Central Files
DRAA r/f
PRAB r/f
ACRS (M. Snodderly)
OGC (G. Mizuno)

NRR:
J. Lyon
M. Johnson
D. Harrison
G. Parry
M. Rubin
M. TSchilitz
A. Pietrangelo, NEI
B. Bradley, NEI

RES:
D. Lew
M. Drouin
A. Singh
J. Lehner, BNL

E:\Filenet\ML051800478.WPD

OAR in ADAMS? (Y or N) Y ADAMS ACCESSION NO.: ML051800478 TEMPLATE NO. RES-__
Publicly Available? (Y or N) Y DATE OF RELEASE TO PUBLIC _____ SENSITIVE? N
**To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C"** = Copy without attachment/enclosure **"E"** = Copy with attachment/enclosure **"N"** = No copy * see previous concurrence

| OFFICE | *RES/PRAB | | *RES/PRAB | | *RES/PRAB | | *RES/PRAB | | *SISP REVIEW | | *SISP REVIEW | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NAME | DWatkins | | ASingh | | MDrouin | | DLew | | ASingh | | DLew | |
| DATE | 6/27/05 | | 6/27/05 | | 6/27/05 | | 6/27/05 | | 6/27/05 | | 6/27/05 | |

**(RES File Code) RES** _____

| LIST OF ATTENDEES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **NAME** | **ORG** | | **E-mail** |
| M. Drouin | NRC | | mtd@nrc.gov |
| M. Stutzke | NRC | | mas7@nrc.gov |
| D. Harrison | NRC | | dgh@nrc.gov |
| G. Parry | NRC | | gwp@nrc.gov |
| J. Lehner | BNL | | Lehner@bnl.gov |
| D. Vanover | Exelon-RMT | | DEVanover@erimeng.com |
| Biff Bradley | NEI | | reb@nei.org |
| Barry Sloane | Dominion | | barry_d_sloane@dom.com |
| Vesna B. Dimitrijevic | Areva-Framatome-ANP | | vesna.dimitrijevice@framatome.anp.com |
| JE “Dusty” Rhoads | Energy Nowrthwest | | jerhoads@energynorthwest.com |
| Tony Pietrangelo | NEI | | arp@nei.org |
| Gary Chung | SONGS/SCE | | gary.chung@songs.sce.com |
| Jeff LaChance | SNL | | jllacha@sandia.gov |
| Mark Rubin | NRC | | mpr@nrc.gov |
| Nancy Chapman | SERCH/Bechtel | | ngchapma@bechtel.com |
| Michael Phillips | Scientech | | mphillips@scientech.com |
| Sunil Weerakkody | NRC | | sdw1@nrc.gov |
| Bruce Mrowca | ISL | | bmrowca@islinc.com |
| Mike Snodderly | NRC/ACRS | | mrs1@nrc.gov |
| Inn Kim | ISL | | ikim@islinc.com |
| Steven Dolley | | | steven_dolley@platts.com |
| Deann Baleigh | LIS, Scientech | | draleigh@scientech.com |
| Jeff Brewer | SNL | | jdbrewe@sandia.gov |
| | | | |

THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM PILOT APPLICATIONS OF REGULATORY GUIDE 1.200, "AN APPROACH FOR DETERMINING THE ADEQUACY OF PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR RISK-INFORMED ACTIVITIES"

**June 16, 2005**

**AGENDA**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1:30pm-4:30pm | Introduction<br>• Welcome (M. Drouin)<br>• Overview/purpose of Meeting<br><br>Open Discussion Lessons learned from Pilot Applications On RG - 1,200, and SRP Chapter 19.1 (Includes times for a break)<br><br>Break<br><br>Open discussion on NEI/Industry Self -Assessment Process<br><br>Wrap-up, future activities etc. |

Attachment 2

**SUMMARY OF JUNE 16, 2005, PUBLIC MEETING WITH INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS REGARDING THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM PILOT APPLICATIONS OF REGULATORY GUIDE 1.200, "AN APPROACH FOR DETERMINING THE ADEQUACY OF PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR RISK-INFORMED ACTIVITIES"**
**NRC, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**
**June 16, 2005**

## Meeting Handouts

# SUMMARY OF JUNE 16, 2005, PUBLIC MEETING WITH INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS REGARDING THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM PILOT APPLICATIONS OF REGULATORY GUIDE 1.200, "AN APPROACH FOR DETERMINING THE ADEQUACY OF PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR RISK-INFORMED ACTIVITIES"

Attachment 3