

December 19, 2013

MEMORANDUM TO: Rani L. Franovich, Chief
Performance Assessment Branch
Division of Inspection and Regional Support
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Luis Cruz, Reactor Operations Engineer */RA/*
Performance Assessment Branch
Division of Inspection and Regional Support
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS WORKING
GROUP PUBLIC MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 20, 2013

On November 20, 2013, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff hosted the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) Working Group (WG) public meeting with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) ROP Task Force and other industry representatives. Enclosure 1 contains the meeting attendance list; Enclosure 2 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML13350A557) contains the white papers and handouts discussed during the meeting; Enclosure 3 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13350A570) contains the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Log and the FAQs discussed during the meeting; and Enclosure 4 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13350A597) contains an ROP WG action items log. Meeting attendees discussed topics related to probabilistic risk assessment (PRA), assessment, and performance indicators (PIs).

The PRA Operational Support Branch (APOB) staff mentioned that a public meeting was held on November 5, 2013, to discuss the use of event assessment conditional core damage probability (CCDP) in modeling the safety significance of a finding that causes an initiating event occurrence. The staff indicated that this topic will be vetted through separate public meetings and that the ROP WG will be updated on the results of these meetings. Industry representatives confirmed that the Pressurized Water Reactor Owners Group is developing a white paper on the use of event assessment CCDP in modeling the safety significance of a finding that causes an initiating event occurrence.

The Operating Experience Branch did not discuss operating experience topics during this public meeting.

The Reactor Inspection Branch (IRIB) discussed the status of the Mitigating Strategies Directorate activities. The staff mentioned that it is providing interim evaluations to licensees based on their draft overall integrated plans submitted in accordance with the mitigating strategies order, NRC Order EA-12-049. The staff will continue to provide these evaluations through February 2014. The staff indicated that the next step is to perform on-site audits.

IRIB staff discussed maintenance rule implications of Information Notice (IN) 2013-13, Deficiencies with Effluent Radiation Monitoring System Instrumentation. The staff mentioned that IN 2013-13 states, on Page 7, that “*Radiation Monitoring Systems (RMSs)* used in the emergency plan are within the scope of Section (b)(2)(i) of the Maintenance Rule, 10 CFR 50.65, ‘Requirements for monitoring the effectiveness of maintenance at nuclear power plants’.” IRIB staff indicated, however, that RMS use in an Emergency Plan is not a consideration for scoping into the Maintenance Rule under 10 CFR 50.65(b)(2)(i). The staff indicated that 10 CFR 50.65(b)(2)(i) actually states systems within scope of the Maintenance Rule also include “Non-safety related structures, systems, or components (SSCs) that are relied upon to mitigate accidents or transients or are used in plant emergency operating procedures (EOPs).” The staff noted that a RMS would be scoped into the Maintenance Rule under 10 CFR 50.65(b)(2)(i) only if it met these requirements. Industry representatives requested a revision to the IN. IRIB staff indicated that it would forward the request to the NRC authors.

IRIB staff discussed the review and expected endorsement of NEI 13-01, “Reportable Action Levels for Loss of Emergency Preparedness Capabilities.” The staff indicated that the NRC plans to endorse NEI 13-01 via a Supplement to NUREG-1022, Revision 3, “Event Reporting Guidelines: 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73”. The current schedule includes providing a Notice for Comment at the beginning of 2014 with a Notice of Availability towards the end of spring 2014. IRIB staff also indicated that NUREG-1022, Revision 3, contains staff guidance on how to meet 10 CFR 50.72 / 50.73, and that while the NRC currently has no issues with NEI 13-01, it is not yet officially endorsed.

IRIB staff discussed System Actuation Issues associated with Event Reporting. The staff indicated that a public meeting was held on June 26, 2013 (Meeting Summary Accession No. ML13182A334), to solicit comments on event reporting of system actuations. IRIB staff provided a handout containing comments received and NRC views on this matter, and requested that industry provide feedback on the handout. IRIB staff also requested that the industry provide input on issues in the planned NUREG-1022 Supplement by early December 2013. A white paper regarding consequences to the Safety Systems Functional Failure PI was distributed to several attendees; however, the content of the white paper was not discussed during the meeting (see Enclosure 2 for more details).

IRIB staff discussed the expiration of NRC Form 366, Licensee Event Report Form. The staff indicated that while the current NRC Form 366 expired on October 31, 2013, it may still be used. This is reflected on the public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/forms/>. The allowance is based on Public Law 104-13 – May 22, 1995, which states, “(3) If the [OMB] Director does not notify the agency of a denial or approval within the 60-day period described under paragraph (2) – (A) the approval may be inferred; (B) a control number shall be assigned without further delay; and (C) the agency may collect the information for not more than 1 year.” The NRC submitted the renewal request to OMB on 10/21/13. The staff expects approval to occur within the year because there were no changes to the Form.

For awareness, IRIB staff indicated that internal discussions were taking place in the following two areas of event reporting and that additional information would be provided in the future:

- Events or Conditions that Could Have Prevented Fulfillment of a Safety Function [50.72(b)(3)(v) / 50.73(a)(2)(v)]: The staff is discussing the role of Technical Specification inoperability on this reporting criterion and its impact on Event Reporting and the Performance Indicator program.

- News Release or Notification of Other Government Agency [50.72(b)(2)(xi)]: The staff is discussing the reportability of groundwater leaks when a state agency is notified.

The Performance Assessment Branch (IPAB) staff provided a status update on the assessment program portion of the ROP Enhancement project. The staff indicated its plans to hold a public meeting on November 21st, 2013, to discuss the scope of the assessment portion of the ROP Enhancements project and solicit feedback and input from external stakeholders. IPAB staff also provided an update on the status of the communications portion of the ROP Enhancement project. The staff indicated that it is currently working on a revision to NUREG-1649, "Reactor Oversight Process," and on improvements to the ROP public webpages. The staff plans to complete both initiatives in 2014. Industry representatives requested clarification on when plant movements across the ROP Action Matrix are reflected on the public website. The staff clarified that the ROP Action Matrix public website is updated on two instances: (1) on a quarterly basis after the PI data is processed, and (2) after a follow-up assessment letter is issued indicating that a plant will immediately transition to a different column in the ROP Action Matrix. The quarterly updates are performed about 6 weeks after the end of each calendar year quarter, and the updates resulting from assessment follow-up letters are typically performed within a few days after a letter is issued.

IPAB staff discussed the status of the ROP external stakeholder survey. The staff indicated that the survey did not receive approval by OMB in time to support the calendar year (CY) 2013 ROP self-assessment. Therefore, the staff will not issue the survey, and the associated metrics will not be applicable. The staff reiterated messages from prior ROP WG public meetings regarding the staff's intent to discontinue surveys in future ROP self-assessments in favor of more objective measures of ROP effectiveness. The staff also mentioned that it was considering alternative mechanisms for stakeholder feedback on the ROP.

IPAB staff indicated that the Commission paper, "Recommendations for Risk-Informing the Reactor Oversight Process for New Reactors," was with the Executive Director of Operations for concurrence. The staff mentioned that it also developed a response to the letter from the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) on the draft Commission paper. The staff expects the Commission paper and ACRS response to be issued and made publicly available in the coming weeks.

IPAB staff provided a status update on the initiative to implement safety culture common language into the ROP. The staff indicated that a public meeting was held on November 13, 2013, to discuss draft changes made to IMC 0310, "Components Within the Cross-Cutting Areas," and the staff's plans for implementing the revised guidance. The staff indicated that this guidance will be effective starting January 1, 2014, and that a communication plan would be developed to ensure clear and consistent communications.

IPAB staff solicited input from meeting participants on a draft technical basis for Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 0609, Appendix M, "Significance Determination Process Using Qualitative Criteria." Industry representatives agreed to provide comments on the IMC 0609 Appendix M technical basis document within in the coming weeks.

In the area of the PI program, staff and industry addressed the following items (Enclosure 2):

- (1) Industry provided a mark-up of NEI 99-02, Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guidance, including a revised definition of additional failures.
- (2) Industry provided a written response to the RCS Leakage White Paper, recommending that the basis of the RCS Leakage PI be modified to resolve the misalignment between the indicator's metric and basis.
- (3) Industry provided a revision to the white paper on the definition of concurrent failures, incorporating the resolution of FAQ 12-04.

Staff and industry discussed the following PI FAQs (see Enclosure 3):

- FAQ 13-03: This FAQ is final. This is a generic FAQ developed by Quad Cities. This FAQ involves a switchyard fault and resulting loss of the 13.8 kV bus that was caused by animal intrusion. The staff agrees with the licensee that the fence represents a reasonable measure to prevent animal intrusion. The staff considers the event a unique environmental condition and indicated that this event will serve as operating experience such that future occurrences of similar events would be anticipated.
- FAQ 13-04: This FAQ was discussed. This is a site-specific FAQ for Point Beach, Units 1 and 2. This FAQ indicates that Point Beach will not be reporting PI data for the eight sirens that overlap with Kewaunee, as they are still the responsibility of Kewaunee. The FAQ further asserts that once Kewaunee is no longer responsible for the eight sirens that overlap the Emergency Planning Zones, Point Beach will assume responsibility and will report the PI data. The NRC staff does not agree with this position because Kewaunee is no longer under the purview of the ROP and, as such, is no longer expected to submit ROP PI data. The staff indicated that Point Beach is responsible for reporting the PI data for these eight sirens under the ROP. The staff expects this FAQ to become tentative final during the next ROP WG public meeting.
- FAQ 13-05: This FAQ was discussed. This is a generic FAQ submitted by Oyster Creek. This FAQ involves a power reduction that occurred during the ascension of power following a planned down power. The staff indicated that this event should count as an unplanned down power. The staff expects this FAQ to become tentative final during the next ROP WG public meeting.
- FAQ 13-06: This FAQ is tentative final. This is a generic FAQ developed by Dresden, Units 2 and 3. This FAQ involves interpretation of PI guidance regarding unplanned versus planned unavailability for the mitigating system performance index. This FAQ seeks a revision to NEI guidance to clarify the distinction between unplanned and planned unavailable hours. The staff agreed that the hours the high-pressure coolant injection system was unavailable would be planned unavailability hours.
- FAQ 13-07: This FAQ was discussed. This is a generic FAQ developed by Diablo Canyon. This FAQ involves emergency preparedness exercise performance. Specifically, the licensee misidentified the emergency declaration prior to making the correct emergency declaration. There is a difference of opinion on how this scenario should be counted in the PI. Industry requested additional discussion on this FAQ.

R. Franovich

- 5 -

The next ROP working group public meeting will be held on January 15, 2014.

Enclosures:

Attendance List – November 20, 2013

White Papers Discussed in the November 20, 2013 ROP WG Public Meeting

Reactor Oversight Process Task Force FAQ Log – November 20, 2013

ROP Working Group Action Items Tracking Log – November 20, 2013

The next ROP working group public meeting will be held on January 15, 2014.

Enclosures:

1. Attendance List – November 20, 2013
2. White Papers Discussed in the November 20, 2013 ROP WG Public Meeting
3. Reactor Oversight Process Task Force FAQ Log – November 20, 2013
4. ROP Working Group Action Items Tracking Log – November 20, 2013

DISTRIBUTION:

RidsNrrDirspab	RidsNrrOd	NrrDistributionIpab	NrrDistributionIrib
RidsOgcMailCenter	RidsAcrs	AcnwMailCenter	RidsOPAMail
RidsRgn1MailCenter	RidsRgn2MailCenter	RidsRgn3MailCenter	RidsRgn4MailCenter
HNieh	AHowe	RFranovich	
CRegan	HChernoff	JMcHale	RAlbert
RLorson	JRogge	DRoberts	MScott
RCroteau	WJones	TReis	HChristensen
SReynolds	KObrien	GShear	PLouden
TBlount	JClark	KKennedy	TPruett
RPowell	SRose	DPassehl	RKellar
SWeerakkody	JWillis	ESchrader	FSullivan

ADAMS ACCESSION NO: ML13350A610 ADAMS Package No. ML13350A610 *concurrent via email

OFFICE	NRR/DIRS/IPAB	BC: NRR/DRA/APOB*	NRR/DIRS/IRIB*	BC:NRR/DIRS/IPAB
NAME	LCruz	SWeerakkody (SWong For)	CRegan	RFranovich
DATE	12/ 11 /13	12/17/13	12/17/13	12/19/13

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS PUBLIC MEETING
REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS
PUBLIC MEETING
ATTENDANCE LIST
November 20, 2013**

Luis Cruz	NRC
Ronald Frahm	NRC
Rani Franovich	NRC
Stephen Vaughn	NRC
Daniel Merzke	NRC
Andrew Waugh	NRC
Vic Cusumano	NRC
Aron Lewin	NRC
Sunil Weerakkody	NRC
Eric Schrader	NRC
Bob Kahler	NRC
Steve Lavie	NRC
Jim Slider	NEI
Roy Linthicum	PWROG/Exelon
Steve Catron	NextEra Energy
Larry Parker	STARS Alliance
Lenny Sueper	Xcel Energy
Tony Zimmerman	Duke Energy
Jana Bergman	Scientech
Robin Ritzman	FENOC
Tracy Honeycutt	SNC
Peter Wilson	TVA
Cindy Williams	FENOC
Kelli Roberts	SNC
Elijah DeVaughn	SNC
Tom Houghton	CERTREC
Gary Miller	Dominion
Bill Ketchum	Wolf Creek
Victoria Anderson	NEI
Steve Catron	NextEra Energy
Justin Wearne	PSEG
Dave Mannai	Entergy
Louis Dumont*	NRC
Marty Hug*	NEI
Chris Earls*	NEI
Ron Gaston*	Exelon
Jim Barstow*	Exelon
Thomas Griffith*	Exelon
Carlos Cisco*	Winston
John Snyder*	Nine Mile Point
Lori Tkaczyk*	Enercon
Bob Schwartz*	EPRI

*participated via teleconference and/or online meeting