



**UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
WASHINGTON, DC 20555 - 0001**

July 20, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: ACRS Members

FROM: Michael R. Snodderly, Senior Staff Engineer /RA/
 Technical Support Branch, ACRS

SUBJECT: CERTIFIED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
 FUKUSHIMA SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARCH 19, 2015

The minutes for the subject meeting were certified on July 10, 2015, as the official record of the proceedings of that meeting. Copies of the certification letter and minutes are attached.

Attachments: As stated

cc w/ Attachments: E. Hackett
 M. Banks

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
MINUTES OF THE ACRS FUKUSHIMA SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
MARCH 19, 2015

The ACRS Fukushima Subcommittee held a meeting on March 19, 2015 in TWFN 2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The meeting convened at 1:00 p.m. and adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

The entire meeting was open to the public.

We have received no written comments or specific requests for time to make oral statements from members of the public related to this meeting.

ATTENDEES

ACRS Members

Stephen P. Schultz, Chairman
Ron Ballinger, Member
Sanjoy Banerjee, Member
Dennis C. Bley, Member
Charles H. Brown, Jr., Member
Michael Corradini, Member
Dana A. Powers, Member
Joy Rempe, Member
Peter Riccardella, Member
Michael T. Ryan, Member
Gordon R. Skillman, Member
John W. Stetkar, Member

ACRS Consultant

William Shack

NRC Staff

Michael Snodderly, Designated Federal Official
Aby Mohseni, NRR
Tim Reed, NRR
Eric Bowman, NRR
George Tartal, NRO
Clinton Ashley, NRO
John McKirgan, NRO
Nanette Gilles, OCM
Robert Krsek, OCM
Amy Cabbage, OCM
Patrick Castleman, OCM
Lawrence Kokajko, NRR
John Monninger, NRO
Raul Hernandez, NRO
Mike Franovich, NRR
Mike Eudy, NRO

NRC Staff (Continued)

Angelo Stubbs, NRO
Fred Schofer, NRR
Marie Pohida, NRO
Jenny Tobin, NRR
John Lubinski, NRR
David Desaulniers, NRC

Other Attendees

David Young, NEI
Bryan Ford, Entergy
William Webster, Dominion
Phil Amway, Exelon
Jeff Capoler, ERW
Nick Pappas, NEI
Jim Riley, NEI
Steven Kraft, NEI
Andrew Maller, NEI
Jonathan Rund, NEI
Kyle Dittman, MPR
Greg Hatchett, AREVA
Bill Williamson, AGA
Ed Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists

SUMMARY

The purpose of the meeting was to review the Draft Proposed Rule for Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events and the associated supporting documents and guidance. The meeting transcripts are attached and contain an accurate description of each matter discussed during the meeting. The presentation slides and handouts used during the meeting are attached to these transcripts.

| SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Issue | Reference Pages in Transcript |
| 1. A. Mohseni, Deputy Director of Division of Policy and Rulemaking, provided an opening statement for the staff where he outlined the presentation, provided introductions and mentioned the key objective to demonstrate to the Subcommittee that the proposed rule is sufficient to support informed external feedback. | 7 |
| 2. T. Reed stated his intent to go over the proposed rule language and Statement of Considerations with an emphasis on new language since the Subcommittee's last briefing on this matter on November 20, 2014. | 10 |
| 3. Member Stetkar stated that the footnote on Page 28 of the Statement of Considerations regarding the technical analysis in support of the | 13-17 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Containment Protection and Release Reduction rulemaking regulatory is woefully misleading. Member Stetkar was concerned that a Member of the public could infer that the ACRS endorsed this analysis for the staff's stated purpose. He requested that the staff remove the footnote. See Action Item 1 below. T. Reed agreed to remove it. Member Stetkar also called out the rationale for not including firefighting procedures in the integration portion of the rule misleading. | |
| 4. Chairman Schultz asked about a discussion in the decommissioning section that related to a specific reactor. He asked if the intent was to incorporate into the rule provisions for that one particular reactor or whether the staff was using that as an example. | 20 |
| 5. Member Stetkar asked if the staff has looked at the effectiveness of SAMGs in a quantitative sense across different plant designs. | 28 |
| 6. Chairman Schultz added the inability of the staff not to be able to quantify the benefit at this time does not mean that all you have left is qualitative arguments. T. Reed and the Subcommittee then discussed backfitting and the idea of substantial safety benefit. | 31 |
| 7. Chairman Schultz pointed out that even if the Containment Performance Release Reduction evaluation demonstrates sufficient margin between the goals and the risk shown, one can buy into that only if one has an adequate integrated response capability. | 37 |
| 8. Members Corradini and Rempe asked for clarification of no additional equipment requirements for SAMGs, the reasonableness finding, and instrument survivability. | 41 |
| 9. Member Brown asked about the apparent discrepancy between the staff's statement, "we determined that conditions to which the instrumentation would be exposed, do not include the progression of sequence of events to damage the fuel," and the statement, "it would be necessary that the design and associated functional performance be sufficient to meet the demands of those strategies." | 48 |
| 10. E. Bowman discussed the instrumentation requirement being pre-core damage and the Tier 3 Item on instrumentation that will investigate further instrumentation requirements. | 57 |
| 11. Consultant Shack asked if an inspection under the Reactor Oversight Program would address the issue of adequate implementation and training of the SAMGs. | 63 |
| 12. E. Bowman and T. Reed stated that the staff recommends that the Commission require SAMGs based on a defense-in-depth argument that uses the cost justified substantial safety benefit exception to the Backfit Rule based on qualitative factors. | 67 |
| 13. T. Reed discussed draft proposed training requirements for the integrated response. Member Bley asked about training for non-licensed personnel in the Technical Support Center. Member Bley relayed his concerns with the delineation between advice from the TSC and transfer of plant control. | 71 |
| 14. G. Tartal discussed new reactor design requirements. Members Corradini and Rempe discussed differences in instrumentation requirements for next generation and advanced reactors. They discussed with the staff the example of the previously certified AP1000 and the yet to be certified APR1400. | 75 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 15. T. Reed discussed Paragraph (f) Drills and Exercises and Paragraph (g) Change Control. Member Powers asked about the basis for the eight year periodicity between drills. | 87 |
| 16. T. Reed discussed draft proposed changes to Appendix E, "Emergency Planning and Preparedness," application requirements for new reactors and implementation. | 94 |
| 17. Member Rempe asked about the Commission's motivation for increased expectations regarding severe accident instrumentation for new reactors versus the existing fleet as described in the Advanced Reactor Policy Statement. | 100 |
| 18. Member Skillman cautioned the staff about potential inconsistencies between containment integrity as it applies to the physical containment (a noun) versus human actions to preserve containment integrity (a verb). | 108 |
| 19. Chairman Schultz commented that the staff could better describe the credit given for the SAMGs already in place and improvements made already in response to lessons learned from Fukushima. | 112 |
| 20. Member Rempe asked the staff to describe the level of review performed on the revised PWROG and BWROG generic SAMGs. | 113 |
| 21. E. Bowman presents DG-1301, "Flexible Mitigation Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis Events," DG-1317, "Wide-Range Spent Fuel Pool Level Instrumentation, and DG-1319, "Integrated Response Capabilities for Beyond-Design-Basis Events." | 117 |
| 22. B. Ford of Entergy presented some industry high-level comments on the draft proposed rulemaking. He clarified that the industry's formal comments would be coordinated through NEI during the upcoming public comment period. B. Ford covered three main areas: (1) the reevaluated hazard requirement should be part of the rule's scope not the equipment portion, (2) no need for additional requirements for new reactors, (3) SAMGs should remain voluntary. | 132 |
| 23. Member Skillman challenged B. Ford's argument that the reevaluated hazard shouldn't have to address extended loss of AC power along with the loss of the heat sink if the licensee can demonstrate that the reevaluated hazard doesn't cause a loss of offsite power. B. Ford argued for that targeted hazard strategy the licensee shouldn't need to assess the extended loss of AC power. | 133 |
| 24. Member Rempe asked how the revised voluntary SAMG commitment would differ from the existing one that wasn't consistently maintained. | 140 |
| 25. Member Bley asked industry representatives if they had any objections to the staff's description of SAMG oversight. | 143 |
| 26. Chairman Schultz asked industry representatives if the staff's cost estimates for SAMG implementation were reasonable. Industry representatives said they would evaluate the cost estimates and provide comments during the public comment period. B. Ford acknowledged that industry has spent and plans to spend resources to implement the generic SAMGs on a plant-specific basis whether SAMGs are required or remain a voluntary commitment. | 144 |
| 27. Consultant Shack challenged industry representatives on the logic of removing seismic events from a rule to be put in place to deal with beyond-design-basis external events. | 154 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 28. Member Riccardella added that he didn't understand why new FLEX equipment wouldn't be designed to the new seismic ground response spectra. | 157 |
| 29. Chairman Schultz asked for comments from members of the public. | 170 |
| 30. E. Lyman of the Union of Concerned Scientists made two comments. He mentioned that UCS had proposed in July 2012 that licensees should propose a success path approach where you define the series of external event scenarios and you carry them through to their conclusion and you determine how the plant and the auxiliary or emergency equipment and personnel will respond. He also mentioned that qualitative factors can be used to justify SAMGs. | 170 |
| 31. B. Williamson of the Tennessee Valley Authority commented on ongoing activities of the PWROG and BWROG to validate their SAMGs. | 174 |
| 32. Chairman Schultz asked the subcommittee for final comments. | 176 |
| 33. Chairman Schultz adjourned the meeting. | 183 |

| ACTION ITEMS | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Action Item | Reference Pages in Transcript |
| 1. Member Rempe requested a copy of the letter from the PWROG and BWROG to the staff on their proposal for updating the revised generic SAMGs. | 167 |

Documents provided to the Subcommittee

1. Draft SECY-2015-XXXX, "Draft Proposed Rule for Mitigation of Beyond Design Basis Events," March 9, 2015 (ML15068A268)
2. Draft Proposed Federal Register Notice, "Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events," (ML15068A272)
3. Draft Proposed Environmental Assessment, "Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events," (ML15068A277)
4. Draft Proposed Office of Management and Budget Supporting Statement, "Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events," (ML15068A289)
5. Draft Proposed Paperwork Reduction Act Statement, "Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events," (ML15068A301)
6. Draft Regulatory Guide – 1301, "Flexible Mitigation Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis Events," (To be Provided)
7. Draft Regulatory Guide – 1317, "Wide-Range Spent Fuel Pool Level Instrumentation," (ML15068A325)
8. Draft Regulatory Guide – 1319, "Integrated Response Capabilities for Beyond-Design-Basis Events," (ML15068A328)

9. Draft Regulatory Analysis Proposed Rulemaking to Address Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events, February 24, 2015 (ML15068A284)

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
 Fukushima Subcommittee

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Thursday, March 19, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1453

Pages 1-188

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS

(ACRS)

+ + + + +

FUKUSHIMA SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MARCH 19, 2015

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met at the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, Room
T2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, at 1:00 p.m., Stephen
Schultz, Chairman, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMITTEE MEMBERS :

- STEPHEN P. SCHULTZ, Chairman
- RON BALLINGER, Member
- SANJOY BANERJEE, Member
- DENNIS C. BLEY, Member
- CHARLES H. BROWN, JR. Member
- MICHAEL CORRADINI, Member *
- DANA A. POWERS, Member
- JOY REMPE, Member
- PETER RICCARDELLA, Member *
- MICHAEL T. RYAN, Member
- GORDON R. SKILLMAN, Member
- JOHN W. STETKAR, Member

ACRS CONSULTANT :

WILLIAM SHACK

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL :

MICHAEL SNODDERLY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

ALSO PRESENT:

CLINTON ASHLEY, NRC

ERIC BOWMAN, NRC

DAVID DESAULNIERS, NRC

BRYAN FORD, NEI

ED LYMAN, Union of Concerned Scientists *

ANDREW MALLER, NEI*

JOHN MCKIRGAN, NRC

JOHN MONNINGER, NRC

ABI MOHSENI, NRC

TIM REED, NRC

GEORGE TARTAL, NRC

WILLIAM WEBSTER, Dominion

BILL WILLIAMSON, AGA* *

DAVID YOUNG, NEI

*Present via telephone

A G E N D A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Opening Remarks and Objectives.....5

Introductory Statement.....7

Draft Proposed Rule for Mitigation of
 Beyond-Design-Basis Events.....10

Break.....116

Draft Proposed Rule for Mitigation of
 Beyond-Design-Basis Events.....120

Industry Comments on Proposed Rule
 Language and Bases.....135

NGO Comments on Proposed Rule
 Language and Bases.....

Discussion.....181

Adjourn.....188

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:00 p.m.

CHAIR SCHULTZ: Good afternoon. This meeting will now come to order. This is a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee on Fukushima.

I'm Stephen Schultz, Chairman of the Subcommittee. Members in attendance today are Dick Skillman, Dennis Bley, John Stetkar, Mike Ryan, Ron Ballinger, Charlie Brown, and Joy Rempe. Pete Riccardella is attending on the telephone today, and there may be other Members that will join us later. We also have former ACRS Chairman, Dr. Bill Shack in attendance today participating as our consultant on this matter.

The purpose of today's meeting is to review the Draft Proposed Rule for Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events and the associated supporting documents and guidance prepared by the Staff. We have had several meetings with the Staff on this topic and look forward to discussions on their progress and the results and products that they're going to present today.

This meeting is open to the public. It's being conducted in accordance with the provisions of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Federal Advisory Committee Act. Rules for the conduct
2 of and participation in this meeting have been published
3 in the Federal Register as part of the notice for this
4 meeting.

5 The Subcommittee intends to gather
6 information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and
7 formulate proposed positions and actions, as
8 appropriate, for deliberation by the Full Committee.

9 Mr. Michael Snodderly is the Designated
10 Federal Official for this meeting.

11 A transcript of the meeting is being kept
12 and will be made available, as stated in the Federal
13 Register Notice. Therefore, we request that
14 participants in this meeting use the microphones
15 located throughout the meeting room when addressing the
16 Subcommittee. All participants should first identify
17 themselves and speak with sufficient clarity and volume
18 so that they may be readily heard.

19 We have received no written comments or
20 specific requests for time to make oral statements from
21 members of the public regarding today's meeting. I
22 understand that there are individuals on the bridge line
23 today who are listening in on today's proceedings. To
24 effectively coordinate their participation in this
25 meeting we will be placing the incoming bridge line on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mute so that those individuals may listen in. At the
2 appropriate time later in the meeting we will provide
3 the opportunity for public comments from the bridge line
4 and for members of the public in attendance.

5 I'd like to remind us all to turn off our
6 cell phones and communication devices so there's no
7 interruption during the meeting.

8 We'll now proceed with the meeting, and I'd
9 like to call upon Aby Mohseni of the Office of NRR to
10 open the presentations today. Aby.

11 MR. MOHSENI: Thank you very much, Dr.
12 Schultz, and good afternoon. My name is Aby Mohseni, and
13 I am the Deputy Director of the Division of Policy and
14 Rulemaking in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

15 Today we will discuss the Proposed
16 Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Rulemaking. We are
17 here today to engage with the ACRS Fukushima
18 Subcommittee in support of your review of the Proposed
19 MBDBE Rulemaking package. We are seeking ACRS
20 endorsement for issuance of the proposed rule package
21 for public comment. The ACRS Full Committee will meet
22 on April 9th on this same topic.

23 In terms of ACRS support for issuance of the
24 proposed MBDBE rulemaking, our view is that the proposed
25 rule needs to be sufficient to support informed external

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 feedback such that the NRC using that feedback can
2 produce a good final product.

3 Accordingly, you will find that this
4 proposed rule package seeks external feedback on a
5 number of issues for which the NRC expects such a
6 feedback to be key in reaching a final decision. And,
7 of course, we will always find that external
8 stakeholder's feedback improves our rulemaking, and we
9 certainly expect that to occur again for the proposed
10 MBDBE rulemaking.

11 To support this presentation, I have
12 several members of NRR and from NRO. Tim Reed from our
13 Staff will be leading the discussion of the proposed
14 rulemaking. Tim will focus on the proposed rule
15 language. Supporting Tim as the Lead Technical Expert
16 in mitigation strategies is Eric Bowman from the
17 Japanese Lessons Learned Division. Eric will focus on
18 the supporting draft regulatory guidance. From NRO we
19 have Clint Ashley who will also support the discussion
20 of the draft regulatory guidance; the portions of 13-01
21 that would be applicable to new reactors.

22 We also NRO support at the side table.
23 George Tartal will support Tim with regards to the
24 aspects of the proposed rule language that apply to new
25 reactors. There are other members from the Mitigation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of Beyond-Design-Basis Events Rulemaking Working Group
2 in attendance to support questions from the Committee.

3 We last met with the Subcommittee on
4 November 21, 2014, followed by a Full Committee meeting
5 in December 2014. And since that time, there have been
6 a few changes to the rule language, but in large measure
7 the language has not changed substantially. Our plan
8 today is to walk through the proposed language
9 reasonably quickly and note where the language has
10 changed. Our intent is to provide the maximum time to
11 the ACRS Subcommittee to discuss the parts of this
12 package that ACRS has not seen to date with the focus
13 being on the draft guidance.

14 We want to thank the ACRS for its
15 flexibility and patience in supporting the Staff with
16 our efforts to provide the materials for the Committee.
17 As the ACRS knows, we are on an aggressive schedule, and
18 we are doing quite a bit in parallel that would normally
19 occur in series.

20 This rulemaking has been a collaborative
21 effort with several offices, as rulemakings always are,
22 but in this case the Japanese Lessons Learned Division
23 in NRR has been a major player as this rulemaking is
24 addressing many post-Fukushima regulatory actions the
25 JLLD is currently addressing. I will now turn it over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to Tim.

2 MR. REED: Thanks, Aby. I'm Tim Reed. As Aby
3 just mentioned, I'm the Lead Project Manager for the
4 Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events Proposed
5 Rulemaking, and I'll walk through the language and give
6 the ACRS an opportunity to walk through to feel free to
7 question, provide questions, comments, whatever you
8 want; and, of course, any time you want.

9 My intent was to focus on the areas that I
10 think are substantively new but you, of course, can stop
11 me wherever you want. You have at your disposal a lot
12 more information than we previously provided; namely,
13 the Statement of Considerations that supports this
14 language, as well as all the supporting analyses, Draft
15 Reg Guides, what have you. So, with that information it
16 may, in fact, generate a lot more comments and
17 interactions regardless of whether you've seen that
18 language before.

19 So with that, I'll go to the background
20 slide. There's really nothing new in terms of the
21 background that you haven't heard before, but I think
22 it always goes B- it's a good thing to let stakeholders
23 who are listening into this, maybe haven't heard this
24 before; what this rulemaking is about, how it came to
25 be. It's quite a large rulemaking in terms of its scope,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and it has effectively the consolidation of two
2 rulemakings, as this Committee is certainly well aware,
3 the Station Blackout Mitigation Strategies rulemaking,
4 and the Onsite Emergency Response Capabilities
5 rulemaking. Those were combined into what we're calling
6 the Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events
7 rulemaking, and it goes to addressing a fairly large
8 number of Near-Term Task Force recommendations, and you
9 see the list there. Essentially, all of 4, 7, and 8, as
10 well as 9.1, 9.2., 9.3.

11 You've seen this list before. Basically,
12 these are elements that have been implemented as part
13 of the Mitigation Strategies Order, collectively with
14 that order. In addition, we're also cleaning up the ERDS
15 language to effectively align with what is in place now,
16 so it doesn't refer to any technology.

17 And before I go a whole lot further again,
18 this is for folks who may not have been involved with
19 this to date. It's always important to mention that in
20 terms of safety, the orders B- most importantly, the
21 Mitigation Strategies order issued on March 12th of 2012
22 has been out there for quite a long time, and it's being
23 implemented right now. I think if folks didn't know that
24 they would say what is this? You know, here we are in
25 March of 2015; this event is from four years ago, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the fact is the Agency, the industry has been working
2 very hard, obviously; a huge amount of changes going on,
3 and Lessons Learned from Fukushima, mitigation
4 strategies, and other post-Fukushima regulatory
5 activities that you see there.

6 And as Aby mentioned, many of these are
7 coming into this rulemaking. We're making those
8 generically applicable; although, we plan to, or we
9 proposed to make those generically applicable in the
10 Code of Federal Regulations.

11 So, in addition to this, I would also
12 mention that because of B- there's actually six
13 potentially for rulemakings that also did address it as
14 part of this rulemaking effort, and that's because those
15 six petitions relied solely on the Near-Term Task Force
16 report, and in each case those Near-Term Task Force
17 recommendations are being addressed in this rulemaking,
18 so it logically follows that this rulemaking will also
19 address those petitions. So, it's quite a large effort
20 that's scoped in, and I think it's important just to
21 remind everybody of the scope of the rulemaking.

22 MEMBER STETKAR: Before you get to the
23 B- into the language of the rule, I've got a few issues
24 with the Statements of Considerations, because I hadn't
25 read through those before. I'm not even sure we had them

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 before.

2 First comment is that there is a woefully
3 misleading statement regarding ACRS, and it's in the
4 Scope of Proposed SAMG Requirements. It happens to be
5 on page B- it's in a footnote. It happens to be on page
6 28, at least in my copy. Just to read it on the record,
7 the discussion says, "As part of the NRC's efforts to
8 develop the backfitting justification for imposition of
9 SAMG requirements, it sought to make use of any
10 applicable quantified risk information that might help
11 to inform the justification.

12 In this regarding, the NRC looked at its
13 recent technical analysis work performed in support of
14 the containment protection and release reduction CPRR
15 Rulemaking Regulatory Basis." And there's a footnote,
16 and the footnote says, "The technical" B- there's a word
17 missing, "was presented to the ACRS Subcommittee on
18 August 22nd, 2014," and there's an ADAMS reference, "And
19 November 19th, 2014," and an ADAMS reference.

20 If I'm a member of the public reading this,
21 the implication I get is that the ACRS endorsed that.
22 (A) The ACRS did not endorse it. It was presented to a
23 Subcommittee. And (B) the Subcommittee had tremendous
24 problems with that technical analysis. Please remove
25 that footnote, period. I'm now speaking as the Chairman

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the ACRS, not a member. That is a completely
2 misleading reference to ACRS.

3 MR. REED: Okay.

4 MEMBER STETKAR: I've got real problems
5 with the way you refer to those technical analyses for
6 the CPRR as evidence that SAMGs don't improve risk. You
7 explicitly make those statements. Now, those analyses
8 were done to look at the net risk-benefit to public
9 health and safety of installing a filter on a hardened
10 vent for boiling water reactors with Mark 1 and Mark 2
11 containments. They did not evaluate the effectiveness
12 of SAMG actions. They only looked at the effectiveness
13 of that filter; and, yet, you draw a conclusion that says
14 based on that analysis, it looks like, you know, SAMGs
15 won't really affect plant safety. But then you go on and
16 say well, we have other qualitative reasons of doing
17 this, and things like that.

18 I have no problems with the qualitative
19 stuff, but to point to that limited, and in my opinion
20 very flawed technical analysis to say that that B- the
21 NRC can draw a conclusion that SAMGs in total for any
22 plant in the country, for any set of accidents do not
23 improve risk, is B- this is now my personal opinion, not
24 as Chairman of the ACRS, misleading at best. Okay?

25 And the third place where you're misleading

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is when you discuss the rationale for not including what
2 you call firefighting procedures or firefighting
3 strategies and procedures under the scope of the
4 procedures that's included in this integration. And
5 you're very careful to talk about these as firefighting
6 strategies and procedures, and the rationale looks at
7 fire brigade actions and things like that.

8 You say that this was discussed with the
9 ACRS during the regulatory basis development. Indeed,
10 it was discussed with us. We recommended that the fire
11 response procedures, which are not firefighting
12 procedures, they don't tell you how to put a fire out.
13 They do tell you about things like oh, disconnecting
14 power supplies to a large fraction of your plant,
15 sending operators out to do local things in the plant
16 that they wouldn't normally do, abandoning the main
17 control room. Those operational aspects of those
18 procedures are what our concerns were, not how one might
19 go mobilize the fire brigade to go put water or gas on
20 a fire.

21 Indeed, we have actual operating
22 experience that shows people can get confused when
23 they're in both the EOPs and the fire response
24 procedures simultaneously. And, indeed, that confusion
25 can cause them to overlook things that are important to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant safety because they're focusing, perhaps, more on
2 the fire response procedure rather than on other
3 indications. So, I'd suggest that you may want to look
4 at the way that those procedures are characterized as
5 fire fighting procedures, and develop a better
6 rationale for why this procedure integration ought not
7 to include the fire response procedures, which are
8 different. I'm done. I don't know if you want to respond.
9 Those are the three things that I B-

10 MR. REED: Well, we'll certainly touched
11 upon the SAMG B-

12 MEMBER STETKAR: B- had reading through B-

13 MR. REED: B- stuff some more later. And we
14 can B- I'm sure we'll revisit that. I can give you the
15 thoughts, anyway.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: Yes.

17 MR. REED: And then we can talk about that,
18 and I don't know if you want to talk B- if anyone B-

19 MEMBER STETKAR: That's strictly from the
20 Statement of Discussions because, you know, you never
21 said that reflected B-

22 MR. REED: Yes, and that's B-

23 MEMBER STETKAR: B- the rule language.
24 That's why I wanted to B-

25 MR. REED: Well, we can address that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 throughout, or however you want to do it.

2 CHAIR SCHULTZ: No, I think we should wait
3 on that B-

4 MR. REED: Okay.

5 CHAIR SCHULTZ: B- because I think it's
6 worthy of further discussion B-

7 MR. REED: Absolutely.

8 CHAIR SCHULTZ: B- a broader discussion
9 than this.

10 MR. REED: Absolutely. Appreciate that. So,
11 can we go to the next slide where we actually get into
12 the substance of this?

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Yes.

14 MR. REED: All right, sir. Okay. So, the way
15 the rule is structured is first, in Paragraph A we have
16 an applicability paragraph there. Again, as the
17 Committee should be aware, this applies to power
18 reactors both operating, as well as new applications.
19 And, in fact, we actually have decommissioning
20 provisions in here, so we've built in that so it applies
21 to whether you're in decommissioning or at power, as
22 well as a new applicant. So, again, that's no change.
23 You'll see that we have, in fact, updated our
24 decommissioning provisions to reflect exactly what
25 we've been doing here recently, as you'll see in a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 second.

2 This Committee was B- we were provided B- I
3 think November 21st is the right date for the
4 Subcommittee meeting. We did discuss new design
5 features requirements at that Committee. Those have
6 changed slightly. We have a slide on that, on Slide 7.
7 And at that point, I think we'll wait B- we can wait,
8 if you will. George Tartal in NRO can address that slide
9 B- that issue on Slide 7, but I just simply note that
10 in November we had an assessment feature, if you will,
11 in those design feature requirements, and now it's
12 simply, basically, about design features and building
13 that into the design of your facility for new reactor
14 designs such that you enhance scoping capability and
15 lessen reliance on human action. So, again, that will
16 be addressed. We have a slide on that, on Slide 7.

17 The decommissioning provisions actually
18 just reflect what we've recently done for Oconee and
19 San Onofre 2 and 3, Vermont Yankee, and Crystal River,
20 so it looks like a lot, but it's actually completely
21 status quo there, is what we've done. It reflects how
22 we've been treating mitigation strategies when the
23 licensee goes into decommissioning, how we're relieving
24 those requirements. So, the idea here is simply B- it's
25 good rulemaking practice. I'm trying to build into the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rule decommissioning provisions to helpfully
2 facilitate that process of decommissioning. I'm sure
3 this Committee is well aware, this is a issue of pretty
4 high importance right now to the Commission, so this is
5 really building that in. So, again, it's fairly similar,
6 you know.

7 Once the fuel is removed from the reactor
8 and goes to the spent fuel pool, obviously, it doesn't
9 make sense to apply the mitigation strategies and
10 guidelines that apply to the reactor source term, so
11 what you do is remove anything doing with core cooling
12 for the reactor, of course, or primary reactor
13 containment. And your focus goes to the spent fuel pool.
14 And then whatever period of time is needed to basically
15 conclude that your decay heat in your spent fuel pool
16 is low enough that your boil off happened long enough
17 giving you plenty of time to take out action. Then you
18 can basically now remove the remaining
19 Beyond-Design-Basis External-type mitigation
20 strategies and it leaves you with the so called B5B or
21 50.54(hh)(2) mitigation strategies. And those are now,
22 as you'll recall, they are now what would be proposed
23 155(b)(2). And that's because the nature of those events
24 involve kinetic energy being added to the spent fuel
25 pool, and that's why those stay in place until the fuel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is completely removed from the spent fuel pool.

2 Again, if you look through the SAMG
3 considerations you'll see that discussion there. This
4 is in alignment with what we've been recently doing.
5 We're not carving any new territory here. This is trying
6 to reflect that and do basically good rulemaking in
7 terms of decommissioning.

8 CHAIR SCHULTZ: In that regard, Tim, in
9 terms of the decay heat once it's sufficiently low in
10 the spent fuel pool, in the section there's discussion
11 related to one reactor, a specific reactor that has been
12 shut down for a very long time. And it wasn't clear to
13 me whether you were trying to incorporate into the rule
14 provisions for that one particular reactor, or whether
15 you were using that as an example.

16 MR. BOWMAN: What we're doing, Dr. Schultz,
17 with that one B- this is Eric Bowman. I'm the Staff Lead
18 for the B5B requirements, as well as the Special Advisor
19 for Japan Lessons Learned Division. That particular
20 facility is a decommissioned reactor. It's the only one
21 with fuel remaining in the spent fuel pool.

22 In 2005, we looked at the risk that was
23 presented by the spent fuel that's remaining in that
24 pool and concluded that it was sufficiently low
25 remaining decay heat that the B5B requirements would not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need to be imposed on that particular facility.

2 CHAIR SCHULTZ: That particular reactor.

3 MR. BOWMAN: Well, spent fuel pool to be
4 precise.

5 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Okay.

6 MR. BOWMAN: Not the reactor, but the pool.

7 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Right.

8 MR. BOWMAN: The reactor would have been out
9 of the question, anyway, because it had already
10 decommissioned. We haven't got any information to show
11 any change, any substantial safety benefit that would
12 be accrued by imposing requirements on that licensee.

13 The counter is true for the remaining
14 reactors that have entered decommissioning. They had as
15 operating licensees the requirements imposed upon them
16 to develop and implement the strategies for their spent
17 fuel pools, and we concluded in the Power Reactor
18 Security Rulemaking in 2009 that those requirements
19 should remain in place until the fuel is removed from
20 the pools. So, we've constructed the wording of the
21 decommissioning provisions to carry that forward as we
22 move the B5B provisions, if you will, the 50.54(hh)(2)
23 provisions from Section 50.54 to Section 50.155.

24 CHAIR SCHULTZ: That clarifies the
25 distinction for me. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REED: Is there any other questions
2 before we move on with this? Okay. Then we come to
3 Paragraph B which I kind of view as the central piece
4 to this entire proposed rulemaking. And this goes to the
5 integrated response capability that we would require,
6 develop and implement, maintain integrated response
7 capability. It's this and the next slide run through
8 this paragraph the way it's structured in the proposed
9 requirements therein.

10 They're again substantially the same. It
11 starts off with, of course, the mitigation strategies
12 for Beyond-Design-Basis external events, what's known
13 in the industry as FLEX. That's the first set of
14 guidelines there. The second set of guidelines as we
15 just mentioned are the extensive B- what are most
16 commonly called the Extensive Damage Mitigation
17 Guidelines. Those would be there, obviously, as we move
18 50.54(hh)(2) in those rule. Again, this is a loss large
19 area due to explosions and fires. Then we have the only
20 set in this paragraph that are not currently
21 requirements. These are the Severe Accident Management
22 Guidelines. Those, of course, go into place when you
23 have the onset of core damage.

24 Those, as the Committee is well aware, are
25 currently voluntary industry initiatives. This

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposed requirement, we are proposing to the
2 Commission that those would be requirements. They would
3 be restricted to the guidelines. It's intentionally
4 designed to be the least amount of requirements for this
5 set of guidelines that we think is necessary.

6 So, those are three guideline sets. That
7 would be integrated with the currently existing
8 symptom-based EOPs. We've structured the rule B- that's
9 on the next slide. Before I go to it, I'll hold for a
10 second, but we've structured it intentionally such that
11 we don't go back and revisit the work from the 1980s,
12 so we say these are structured with the EOPs. The
13 intention is to leave the EOP work in place and not touch
14 that. So, what we're trying to do is take these
15 strategies and guidelines that were developed over
16 different times and different places for different
17 events and basically work those into something that
18 becomes a lot more seamless in terms of an integrated
19 capability. And it looks B- really, I think it's going
20 in place largely in place, I mean, so this is really
21 B- if you think about it, the FLEX strategies are being
22 implemented right now connected into the EOPs, the
23 Station Blackout EOP. The Extensive Damage Mitigation
24 Guidelines are in place.

25 The SAMGs are voluntary B- are in place,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but voluntary, but there are links, and so this would
2 really formalize that and make sure it's done, and a
3 complete and thorough job. So, that's the idea of this
4 integrated response capability.

5 This is basically the same as we presented
6 back in 2014. We haven't made any substantive changes
7 here since that B-

8 CHAIR SCHULTZ: I wanted to just clarify
9 that for the record, Tim, that what you have on the
10 slide, revised or unchanged B-

11 MR. REED: Yes.

12 CHAIR SCHULTZ: B- that you're talking
13 about what the Committee has heard previously.

14 MR. REED: That's correct.

15 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Not what this rule is doing.

16 MR. REED: Yes, right.

17 CHAIR SCHULTZ: The proposed rule is doing.
18 So, as you've described here in detail these are, in
19 fact, all changes that are being proposed with the rule.

20 MR. REED: Oh, absolutely. Sorry, it's
21 B- yes, this is entirely focused on the Committee and
22 trying to get you B- hopefully, help you focus attention
23 on the new stuff.

24 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Right.

25 MR. REED: That was the intent.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BOWMAN: The one thing I would suggest
2 clarifying B- this is Eric Bowman, again. The
3 50.54(hh)(2) movement from its current location to this
4 particular section isn't going to be a change in the
5 strategies, the B5B strategies that have already been
6 in place, licensed, and reviewed. So, that will not be
7 a substantive change. Otherwise, the statement you made
8 about what the meaning of the unchanged is exactly
9 correct.

10 CHAIR SCHULTZ: The statement at the
11 bottom, "No additional equipment requirements for
12 SAMGs."

13 MR. REED: Yes. The structures, as we get
14 into it we can talk about this, and I'm sure we will based
15 on the comments so far. The way we've structured the SAMG
16 requirement is in light of what I think are B- I think
17 our Work Group thinks are very informative risk
18 information. And based on, in light of that what we tried
19 to do is address what we've B- with a problem that was
20 identified.

21 The problem that was identified
22 post-Fukushima from the TI that showed that there was
23 a range of conditions out there. When we went out and
24 looked at what licensees had in place for the SAMGs,
25 between people who have updated and kept those SAMGs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 basically up to date and were in great shape, to folks
2 that put something in place in say 1998 and just
3 basically did not do a whole heck of a lot with them since
4 then, so there's a range there. So, the concern was hey,
5 these things aren't necessarily being maintained. They
6 don't necessarily reflect the generic work by the
7 industry and updating SAMGs over time, certainly
8 couldn't reflect the most recent work here. And wouldn't
9 necessarily be in alignment with the configuration of
10 the facility and wouldn't reflect the new capabilities
11 going in place under the Mitigation Strategies Order.
12 So, that's the problem, if you will, and so putting
13 requirements on SAMGs, the way we've structured it would
14 certainly solve that problem. And that was what we were
15 going after.

16 Now, in terms of going further than that,
17 you know, in terms of saying should the Staff review and
18 approve SAMGs on a generic basis or on a plant-specific
19 basis, we backed off of that. And I'm sure you've read
20 that. And the idea is that we don't think that's
21 necessary, and level of regulatory assurance for this
22 thing B- for this area. We think we can do this with
23 inspection. And it basically would be a high-level
24 inspection to make sure licensees have SAMGs, that
25 they're in place, they're in Configuration Management,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they reflect new equipment, they're updated in
2 accordance with the generic Owners Groups program, and
3 new EPRI basis documents, the great work that's been
4 done here in the last couple of years, and so that's the
5 intent.

6 Of course, when I talked about SAMG
7 requirements, I think it's in the backfit analysis.
8 You'll see there's a footnote, and what I'm really
9 saying there is that all the regulatory assurance, that
10 in fact goes to that. And that includes drills that
11 extend into core damage, that includes the change
12 control that would apply to SAMGs, that includes
13 training for SAMGs, so it's not B- it is the guideline
14 set, but it's all the assurance requirements that
15 support the guideline set so that you have sufficient
16 assurance that, in fact, SAMGs are in place, and there's
17 reasonable expectation that they can be implemented.
18 But that's what we thought B- our view was B- our view
19 is what is appropriate given what we understand to be
20 the risk benefit from that.

21 Now, obviously, we think they're
22 beneficial from a qualitative standpoint. I think there
23 are very strong defense-in-depth arguments. Okay? But
24 in terms of what I've extracted, I know Dr. Stetkar
25 disagrees on this, but B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER STETKAR: What I would ask is, has
2 the Staff B- I mean, the thing you refer to B-

3 MR. REED: Yes.

4 MEMBER STETKAR: B- is not a valid study of
5 the effectiveness of SAMGs.

6 MR. REED: Yes, it wasn't B- that's
7 correct.

8 MEMBER STETKAR: Has the Staff actually
9 tried to look at the effectiveness of SAMGs B-

10 MR. REED: Yes, I think B-

11 MEMBER STETKAR: B- in a quantitative sense
12 across pressurized water reactors, different plant
13 designs?

14 MR. REED: Yes, I think B- I tried to B-

15 MEMBER STETKAR: Not, you know, early
16 fatalities and cancer risk just because you can't
17 quantify anything else?

18 MR. REED: Yes, I fully understand that
19 wasn't directed to SAMGs. That's absolutely the truth.
20 What I tried to do is be risk-informed by that
21 information, okay, the best I can. And what I'm trying
22 to B- what we're trying to do with that information is
23 understand what could be the benefit for SAMGs using
24 that, so it's certainly a stretch.

25 MEMBER STETKAR: Give you a different

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perspective from B- and I've been cautioned about not
2 doing this, but I'll try to do it once. I've worked on
3 risk assessments in Europe that are full scope Level 2
4 risk assessments that, indeed, have shown substantial
5 risk benefit from severe accident management guidance
6 to save the containment. Can't tell you about them
7 because they're, you know, proprietary work that I
8 worked on, so I know there's quantifiable benefit.

9 I doubt that the NRC has looked at that
10 because the NRC does not have models or quantitative
11 ability to look at those deltas. You typically don't
12 have SPAR models that have detailed Level 2, and you
13 certainly have not quantified Level 2-type human
14 reliability. You didn't even do it in the thing you
15 referred to. I won't call it a risk assessment. So,
16 developing a blanket B- saying I looked at that thing
17 B- in Europe when we looked at, for example, the
18 benefits of filters versus non-filtered vents on a
19 boiling water reactor 30 years ago, it was clear that
20 the filter didn't buy you any improvement in terms of
21 offsite health benefit, and people have known that for
22 a long time. But that's not SAMGs, that's not an
23 inference that I can say having SAMGs or not having SAMGs
24 will have an effect on reducing risk to the health and
25 safety of the public. And that's my real problem with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 referring to that particular study and saying well, we
2 gained all of these tremendous insights from that thing
3 to say well, SAMGs are likely not to have much benefit,
4 because I can show you a study B- I can't.
5 Unfortunately, I can't show you the studies, but studies
6 have been done to show that they do.

7 MR. REED: Well, I'm certainly not aware of
8 that.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: It leaves people the wrong
10 B- the problem is it leaves people the wrong impression
11 because it says well, the NRC did some sort of risk
12 assessment work, and the conclusion B- and it's recent.
13 It's not stuff that's 30 years old. And the conclusion
14 from that is oh, there's likely not much quantitative
15 benefit, but we can develop a lot of qualitative
16 arguments which, by the way, are all very good.

17 MR. REED: Appreciate, at least B-

18 MEMBER STETKAR: The qualitative arguments
19 are all very good, but to explicitly say that we don't
20 have any B- you may not have any quantitative evidence.

21 MR. REED: I mean, I was trying to
22 extrapolate that, and you can B- I stand accused.

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Well, let me pile on a
24 little bit.

25 MR. REED: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Because I do believe that
2 the discussions associated with the reasons why the
3 SAMGs are of safety benefit, those discussion B- that
4 discussion is very good. I do get stuck when I see that
5 the rationale for moving forward with this portion of
6 the proposed rule is that B- the rationale is that we're
7 using qualitative factors, or qualitative rationale.

8 I think it should be quantifiable. I think
9 it's clear that if you have a facility of these types,
10 and you have the need for Severe Accident Management
11 Guidelines, and you instill them into the operation of
12 the facility, that there is a quantitative benefit.

13 Let me say it differently. The inability,
14 perhaps, for us not to be able to quantify at this time
15 does not mean that all you have left is qualitative.

16 MR. REED: I guess B-

17 CHAIR SCHULTZ: It's just a matter of
18 expression, but it de-emphasizes the advantage and the
19 benefit of the SAMGs, and all of this integrated
20 response capability, and its benefit and need to move
21 forward with the rule. Otherwise, you begin to lose the
22 argument B-

23 MR. REED: I think B-

24 CHAIR SCHULTZ: B- that this is an
25 important B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REED: Part of the problem is I think in
2 backfit space, and not necessarily in showing a change
3 in benefit. I'm showing either adequate protection,
4 which is a very large change, or a substantial B- you
5 know, so I think in purely backfit, so that may be part
6 of the problem.

7 MEMBER STETKAR: No. Yes, I understand.

8 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: I understand that
10 constraint. And quantitatively in the context of U.S.
11 backfit numerics, it's been a while since I looked at
12 the study. I honestly don't know B-

13 MR. REED: Yes, and I B-

14 MEMBER STETKAR: B- whether you trip over
15 B- on the other hand, I am absolutely confident that you
16 can show more benefit than was shown from that CPRR
17 little study.

18 MR. REED: Yes, I would agree with that,
19 too. I think you could show more if you did something
20 explicitly for SAMGs. Okay? But I'm thinking in my mind,
21 and I didn't provide it in this one, but in the last
22 presentation B- and I didn't want to provide it here.
23 I didn't want to get into a lot B- because I knew B- I
24 think is some sensitivity some of this information
25 because I was at that briefing, Dr. Stetkar, but I was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thinking about the more bounding number there, that was
2 a full magnitude below the QHOs, if you recall. And, to
3 me, that's B- you know, when you're 10 times below at
4 a bounding level for a very B- for a type design that
5 is amenable to actions after core damage, and there's
6 lots you can do with the Mark 1 and Mark 2 there. To me,
7 that is pretty good information that tells me that what
8 I believe is B- everybody kind of expects that B- severe
9 accident risk is very low. It's low as a function of all
10 our regulations that drive core damage down, and it's
11 low as a result of EP moving people out of harm's way.
12 I mean, that shouldn't be surprising, but what was
13 surprising to me was it was that low. And that's why in
14 the backfit space I'm thinking I don't B- even if you
15 spent the time and money to do it, I don't think we can
16 make the level, if you will, show we can impose by
17 quantitative measures.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: Don't hang up, though, on
19 that one particular plant design, and the one particular
20 issue for that one particular plant design. How much
21 benefit do you get from piping an alternate cooling
22 water supply to the containment fan coolers from a
23 non-safety grade source of water to save the
24 containment? That's a SAMG. I've seen it done. How much
25 do you get from piping fire water into the containment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 spray system? That's a SAMG. I know plants that have
2 hooked it up, and I've seen the credit that you can get
3 for that.

4 They have it in pressurized water reactors
5 and they are not focused on this particular one issue
6 for a boiling water reactor with a Mark 1 or Mark 2
7 containment. And that's the broader context of SAMGs.

8 MR. REED: Yes, I hear you. I mean, I'm not
9 sure if I'm communicating well, but in each case if I'm
10 going to get a lot of benefit for the circumstances, I
11 think you're going to find that there's a power reactor
12 there with a lot of risk there. For whatever reason,
13 internal, external, probably external risk that there's
14 substantial risk such that when I do that SAMG, I get
15 a big benefit. So, yes, there would be a range across
16 the board of different B- every plant is going to have
17 a different risk, but for there to be a substantial
18 change in severe accident risk, I think, you know,
19 there's got to be some risk there.

20 And the first thing I would ask the people
21 is if, in fact, you get to the point where you show SAMGs,
22 let's say whatever plant it is, you show SAMGs get a very
23 big return, I'm going to say let's come to a full stop.
24 How did you get to that sequence? Is it better to stop
25 upstream and address the issue before it goes to core

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 damage, if you follow what I'm saying.

2 MEMBER STETKAR: It's a difference in
3 perspective. Will it drop below some magic absolute
4 number, or will it drop the risk by a factor of 100?

5 MR. REED: Yes.

6 MEMBER STETKAR: A factor of 100, not
7 necessarily less than, you know, 1E to the minus 5 large
8 release frequency.

9 MR. REED: Exactly.

10 MEMBER STETKAR: But gain a factor of 100 on
11 perhaps a lower value than that.

12 MR. REED: Yes.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: But a factor of 100, to me,
14 is kind of important from a risk perspective.

15 MEMBER BLEY: And the point you just made,
16 Tim, if we put B- for any given defined scenario, you
17 can prevent it. You can come up with something. I agree
18 with you. But putting all your eggs in the prevention
19 basket doesn't cover you for the case where you didn't
20 think of the scenario.

21 MR. REED: Yes, that's defense-in-depth,
22 and I like that argument B-

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: And that's the qualitative
24 stuff brings out that point.

25 MR. REED: Yes, I agree 100 percent. There's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 value to that, and if the Committee has ever looked
2 through the SAMGs and looked at EPRI Technical Basis
3 document, if you glance through that, there's an
4 enormous amount of great information in there. I think
5 it's very valuable, so I do think there's a lot of value
6 in it. Absolutely.

7 MEMBER BLEY: And to that issue of what
8 we've forgotten, when we had the floods a couple of years
9 ago and started looking hard at the risk from floods,
10 I think nobody had calculated it at the levels that you
11 probably calculate it now.

12 MR. REED: Yes, I agree with that, too. I
13 think sometimes we think we know more than we really do.
14 There's more uncertainty, perhaps. Yes, I agree with
15 that, also. I think I had those thoughts in there, too,
16 so I'm aligned with it qualitatively. I'm just trying
17 to address Dr. Stetkar's issues on how I was informed,
18 or our team was informed by the risk. We think we really
19 were informed enough.

20 MEMBER BLEY: Your argument about where the
21 level of risk is compared to B- is one thing, but I
22 really agree with John on the idea of extrapolating
23 anything from that one study to apply across B-

24 MR. REED: Yes, I know B-

25 MEMBER BLEY: B- the range of the SAMGs,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just doesn't work.

2 MR. REED: I know. I was B- you know, I think
3 it was Dr. Corradini, one of our previous meetings B-

4 MEMBER BLEY: He came up with it?

5 MR. REED: Well, he was the one, hey, how
6 come you aren't doing risk B- I haven't heard B- and
7 he's beating on me. And I said well, you know, I'm going
8 to try to find risk information everywhere I can find
9 it. And I thought the B- I think the folks in Research
10 did a great job in that technical basis for CPRR. I'm
11 sorry, I really do think they did a great job, and that's
12 why I was looking at it. I think it is informative, and
13 there's a lot B- it tells you a lot about doing things
14 after core damage, and whether there's any risk benefit
15 to be gained. Certainly, there's benefits, but are they
16 at the level that you can backfit and impose it? I don't
17 believe you're going to get there personally as a
18 backfit B- from a backfit standard in the U.S. I do
19 understand there would be benefits, I agree, but it's
20 a tough standard to hit the backfit mark, in my personal
21 opinion. Anyway.

22 CHAIR SCHULTZ: But here's another
23 perspective. If you look at that evaluation and you see
24 the difference between the goals and the risk shown, one
25 way one might look at that would be to say I can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 B- there's plenty of margin, and I can buy into that.
2 But I can buy into that only if I have an integrated
3 response capability that falls along these lines,
4 because those are the elements that, in fact, are being
5 brought forward to the Mark 1s, Mark 2s with that overall
6 evaluation and approach. There's a lot of work that's
7 being done, we'll hear about it tomorrow morning B-

8 MR. REED: Yes.

9 CHAIR SCHULTZ: B- with regard to B-

10 MR. REED: Absolutely.

11 CHAIR SCHULTZ: B- response to events.

12 MR. REED: Yes.

13 CHAIR SCHULTZ: And the need for that in
14 order for the argument to hold, perhaps. And I don't mean
15 you B- everyone wouldn't need that for the argument, but
16 I would propose that this is extremely helpful to
17 demonstrate that were this in place, I can buy into it.
18 I can see that the delta is there, and it's very, very
19 beneficial to move in this direction.

20 MR. REED: Also, I would be remiss if I
21 didn't mention that B- I do tend to forget this because
22 I think of it as no SAMGs and SAMGs, and that's the delta;
23 where, in fact, there are SAMGs. And the delta about this
24 requirement is simply updating those SAMGs. As I
25 mentioned, some folks they really update, others that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 may be a switch, and so the delta in terms of that impact
2 is fairly small, I believe. I think you could probably
3 take somebody who has a 1998 SAMG that's been sitting
4 on the shelf, and you probably wouldn't be too bad given
5 their most recent experience with mitigation strategies
6 and their understanding of how to do that. They have a
7 much more mitigation strategy mind set, clearly, and if
8 you take even something that was out of date, I believe
9 they'd have a really good chance.

10 Now, I think it's much better the work the
11 industry has recently done, it's great stuff, and I
12 would like to see it updated, no doubt. And they're
13 working that way, so I do think there's benefits. But
14 we've got to keep in mind that these things are in place
15 at every facility. They're just voluntary, and what
16 we're trying to do is make them mandatory. So, that goes
17 to this backfit again.

18 I'm a backfit mind set in rulemaking.
19 That's the way I'm thinking, so that's why I thought
20 B- I'm trying to inform the Commission. I'm trying to
21 be as honest and objective across the board. I mean, the
22 fact is, is that it's the Commission's decision here on
23 how much weight you're going to give to qualitative
24 factors. I mean, that's a recent SRM, and I understand
25 that. For them to make that informed decision, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they have to have all the best information, again.
2 That's the spirit I'm trying to provide, so B-

3 MEMBER STETKAR: Tim, my point is that the
4 information that you throw in their face as quantitative
5 information is rather, in my opinion, bad information.
6 It's misleading.

7 MR. REED: I should probably characterize
8 it a little better. I think I B-

9 MEMBER STETKAR: And that's the danger of
10 spending B-

11 MR. REED: Yes.

12 MEMBER STETKAR: B- kind of a page focusing
13 them on this recent study that's been done, and look at
14 the insights that we can from it, and from quantitative
15 B-

16 MR. REED: Yes, I B-

17 MEMBER STETKAR: B- we can't make the case,
18 because it's not true.

19 MR. REED: It B-

20 MEMBER STETKAR: It's true that you can't
21 make the case B-

22 MR. REED: That's what I meant.

23 MEMBER STETKAR: B- but using that study as
24 evidence B-

25 (Simultaneous speech)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER STETKAR: B- you can't
2 quantitatively justify it.

3 MR. REED: Certainly want to characterize
4 that information correctly, but I want to be informed
5 by it. So, I mean, to the extent you can help with that,
6 I do appreciate it. I mean, so B- because I think it's
7 great information to try to use, but I understand we've
8 got to be careful how we do that.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: Right. I think very
10 careful with sensitivity.

11 MR. REED: Yes, okay.

12 MEMBER STETKAR: Just to try to demonstrate
13 that there is quantitative evidence and that you've
14 relied on it to some extent.

15 MR. REED: Yes.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: And I think B-

17 MEMBER CORRADINI: Can I ask a question?

18 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes. I was just informed
19 that you wanted to ask a question. Go right ahead.

20 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, Tim said I was
21 beating him up, so here's my chance. So, Tim, I don't
22 understand the last phrase in your viewgraph where no
23 additional equipment requirement. And that B- and I
24 want you to explain that, and also from the context that
25 the way you described the process, NRC Staff is going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to make sure there are SAMGs, that they're up to date,
2 that they're being trained on, but it's going to make
3 no comment on the technical content of them, and review
4 them for, I don't know, the evolution of the technical
5 content. Am I misunderstanding?

6 MEMBER REMPE: Could I even ask a little bit
7 differently, because you said they were going to review
8 them for the reasonableness, or adequacy for reasonable
9 implementation successfully. At least you said
10 something like that a few minutes ago. Right? And so how
11 would a Staffer do that without some sort of
12 quantitative analysis? I mean, what's your vision on how
13 you're going to implement this?

14 MR. REED: Well, first let me talk a little
15 bit to Dr. Corradini's, and I'll try to get to you both
16 at one time.

17 MEMBER BALLINGER: I've got one after that.

18 MR. REED: Okay, fine.

19 (Simultaneous speech)

20 MR. REED: Well, no, this is the central
21 question I think in this rulemaking, so this makes a lot
22 of sense. But, you know, if I B- if you follow where I'm
23 going with this, if I don't think there's a lot of
24 quantitative risk benefit, okay, there is benefit, but
25 not a lot. I do want the requirements in place to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 basically make sure there things are in the
2 Configuration Management Program, and maintained up to
3 date. That was the problem.

4 What I don't want to do is sink a lot of
5 attention and resources from the NRC into reviewing at
6 any level and then getting into exchanges back and
7 forth, and industry taking their resources and sinking
8 it at a generic level, or even a plant-specific level
9 because those resources would not be doing something
10 else that, in my view, would be much B-

11 MEMBER BALLINGER: Looking at equipment?

12 MR. REED: No, I mean in terms of reviewing,
13 looking at strategies, looking at equipment for the
14 strategies, looking at the B- basically going through
15 and reviewing the SAMG information. I think that would
16 take an awful lot of focus and resources away from
17 activities that I think would be vastly more important
18 for plant safety. That's my concern.

19 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, let me ask it more
20 bluntly. So, you're saying that there's going to be a
21 frequency of a box check, but not any frequency of a
22 content check.

23 MR. REED: I don't think that B- I think
24 that's not too far off. I mean, basically, what B- I
25 mean, I wouldn't, obviously, put it that way, but what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're suggesting here, you could see the inspection
2 ideas that we have here, is to make sure that the
3 guideline set is in place, is within Configuration
4 Management, reflects the new set of equipment and quite
5 a bit of additional capability for mitigation that's
6 going in place because of the Mitigation Strategies
7 Order, and reflects the new generic industry efforts to
8 update the SAMGs. That's an awful lot of good stuff, and
9 if that happens, I think we have addressed the issues
10 that were identified in the TI. So, that's B- if that's
11 the box check, Dr. Corradini, that's what we are
12 intending to do. But not delve into the individual
13 strategies and reviewing them, or looking at whether the
14 primary means, alternate means, or uncertainties of
15 instruments, the range of instruments, or everything
16 else as you walk through all the different phenomenology
17 you could see in these different core damage sequences
18 are the appropriate way to do it. That's a large, giant
19 effort that you could go on for years, and that's B- I
20 don't want to take our resources, the licensee's
21 resources and go down that rabbit hole.

22 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. All right.

23 MR. REED: Is that B-

24 MEMBER CORRADINI: You've clarified it. I
25 may not agree with it, but you clarified it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REED: Okay, that's B- understand.

2 MEMBER REMPE: Then is it worthwhile having
3 that if they have these SAMGs, and they're trained to
4 rely on certain instruments, as you brought up, and the
5 instrument is not good for those conditions. I mean,
6 what's the benefit?

7 MR. REED: I probably don't have my SAMG
8 person here yet in the room. They'll be here shortly,
9 but basically, the SAMGs have that philosophy built into
10 them, you know, in terms of primary means to B- you know,
11 if you've looked at them B-

12 MEMBER REMPE: They're working on that to
13 even improve it at this time, too.

14 MR. REED: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely.

15 MEMBER REMPE: But if there's not any
16 regulatory exchange or review B-

17 MR. REED: That's right.

18 MEMBER REMPE: B- I'm not sure if it's going
19 to be a worthwhile endeavor.

20 MR. REED: No doubt I'm trusting the
21 industry experts, and I'm not going to B- and the NRC
22 is not going in and basically checking that work, at
23 least not officially.

24 MEMBER REMPE: Well, I B-

25 MR. REED: I would say I'm probably not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 being fully fair to the efforts of the NRC because, you
2 know, back in the '90s, some of you folks might have been
3 around when the Staff did look at the SAMGs, and I had
4 quite a bit of interaction with the industry up until
5 1998 in establishing the voluntary initiative. And we
6 have, in fact B- we've had a public meeting, a two-day
7 public meeting back B- I'm thinking it was in March,
8 somewhere in 2014, maybe it was a little later month
9 where we've interacted with them. And, in fact, we've
10 got access through the e-Portal. We have been looking
11 at the SAMGs, so if it sounds like we don't have any idea,
12 that wouldn't be proper. But what I'm saying is, when
13 I say review, an official review where somebody sends
14 and ends in official review. And that's a different
15 animal, you know. What we've done, I wouldn't
16 characterize that as review. I think we've used words
17 like "look," and, you know, that's a soft word, but I
18 won't want to over sell what we've done, but we have
19 B- we're definitely familiar with it. We have
20 interacted with industry, we've interacted recently, so
21 that's the level at this point of what we've done.

22 MEMBER REMPE: Historically, you did at the
23 beginning and it was deemed a voluntary effort, and then
24 after B-

25 MR. REED: That's right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REMPE: B- Fukushima you went back
2 and said well, the voluntary effort didn't work so well,
3 and here we are again. Well, we'll do a checkbox review
4 to keep it from being something that's not really going
5 to be useful in the end-run if you don't have more of
6 an exchange, and an ongoing exchange at some level. I
7 realize it's a severe accident and not deemed to be that
8 frequent of an event, but it's just B- I'm wondering if
9 something more concrete needs to be established.

10 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, can I try a different
11 way of saying it, Tim? I understand where NRC can only
12 interact with the owner-operators, the licensees in a
13 formal manner, but I think in this regard, if you have
14 a no- good, very bad day, you want to be ready for it
15 by having the regulator in conversation with the
16 licensee so that they're on the same page as to what the
17 content is of these. So, to the extent that the Agency
18 has people in conversation with the licensees on this
19 on an ongoing basis, I think it can only be beneficial.
20 And I think these B- as John started off the
21 conversation, on a relative basis, these are quite
22 beneficial.

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you, Mike. Charlie,
24 you're next in queue.

25 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Equipment. On B- I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guess at an ANS meeting recently, one of your staff
2 presented a B- some conclusions where it demonstrated
3 for accidents monitoring instrumentation, that that was
4 needed to further hardened reactor and containment, and
5 spent fuel pool monitoring to better withstand severe
6 accident conditions. That was presented B- one of your
7 staff members did that.

8 So, I said okay, that's consistent with
9 some of our past discussions and the meetings relative
10 to severe accident monitoring. Then I looked at the FRN
11 and said, okay, the NRC proposes to have requirements
12 for licensee B- this is on page 67, for licensee
13 equipment, including instrumentation that is relied
14 upon for use in the proposed mitigation strategies and
15 guidelines.

16 You page down to page 69, when you finish
17 all your discussion, it says, "As a result, we
18 determined that conditions to which the instrumentation
19 would be relied on would be exposed, do not include the
20 progression of sequence of events to damage the fuel."
21 You've determined that it should not be necessary for
22 the instrumentation to be designed for use in the
23 mitigating strategies and guidelines conditions, in the
24 first paragraph. But, instead, it would be necessary
25 that the design and associated function requirements

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 B- functional performance be sufficient to meet the
2 demands of those strategies. Well, that was a little
3 loose, couldn't figure out what that said.

4 Then I looked at your other document that
5 you provided us that said -- that's the being supported
6 -- to support the meeting with ACRS today and not to
7 solicit external feedback, where said, "The proposed
8 SAMGs would not include new instrumentation
9 requirements." You go through a discussion and then you
10 conclude that, "The Staff concludes the NRC and licensee
11 requirements efforts and resources are focusing on
12 designing severe accident instrumentation. Attention
13 could be significantly diverted from more important
14 safety issues."

15 I'm trying to figure out where you're going
16 with this. Is it the conclusion -- there have been a
17 number of past meetings where we've discussed and it has
18 been kind of understood that you would look at or assess
19 it, and it seems to me what you've said is no, there's
20 no severe B- other than the fuel pool B- the spent fuel
21 pool level instrumentation, that looks like everything
22 else is off the board and everybody would just be relying
23 on the standard built in equipment, so I'm not quite sure
24 where you're going with these statements from one to the
25 other. First a little bit of an endorsement, then the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 presentation to the ANS, then diverting attention from
2 other more important safety issues is such that no
3 instrumentation is required.

4 MR. REED: I guess all I can B- and, Eric,
5 I think some levels on mitigation strategy stuff, but
6 I can give you the perspective on SAMGs. The SAMGs
7 approach is basically in terms of equipment and
8 instrumentation. It's going to be, I'll tell you, the
9 status quo. In other words, you make use of everything
10 you have in the facility, wherever the pedigree of that
11 is. It's Reg Guide 1.197.

12 (Off microphone comment)

13 MR. REED: Yes, I probably did. And what you
14 do is, given that you're basically looking, and you
15 recognize that's going to only last for so long, and then
16 no matter what it is you do, whether you get the super
17 duper instrument or whatever, depending on where that
18 is, it's going to fail. And what you're really looking
19 at now is hey, what's my primary means, what's my backup
20 means, what my alternative means are, what are my
21 calculational methods for determining it, and that's
22 what the SAMGs do.

23 So, the question I would have is, given
24 that's the philosophy the SAMGs are built on, what would
25 be the difference if you changed out an instrument to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make it more capable of say severe accident conditions
2 beyond what it would be for Reg Guide 197, whatever, I
3 think Rev. 3, whatever it is that people have actually
4 monitoring instrumentation for. How much better would
5 it be? And would it extend you look into a severe
6 accident by minutes, hours, anything at all? Would that,
7 in fact, then end up changing any of the actions that
8 are taken in terms of mitigation? Would it still be add
9 water, add water, add water, or would it, in fact, be
10 a real change in what can we do in mitigation?

11 And then you roll that back up to finally
12 why I started. How important are SAMGs in their entirety
13 for public health and safety? I don't think in terms of
14 backfit space and absolute change they're a very large
15 change. They are beneficial. You know, obviously,
16 you've seen my arguments. Okay? And when I look at how
17 the overall changes in terms of safety, and then I drive
18 it down and I look at okay, I'm going to start thinking
19 about equipment, enrichments, and different
20 strategies, and maybe making it better, how much better
21 am I making it? And how much does that matter B-

22 MEMBER BROWN: How do I know if I'm adding
23 water that I'm doing any good? I mean, not if you're
24 going out a hole that you're not aware of, it's never
25 getting to where you want it to go, and the temperatures

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just keep going up.

2 MR. REED: How will you know with better
3 instruments?

4 MEMBER BROWN: You'll know the temperature
5 keeps going up until you've exceeded B-

6 (Simultaneous speech)

7 MEMBER BROWN: B- up to 2,000 degrees.
8 Well, then you know you've got a bigger problem.

9 MEMBER REMPE: And it's real important to
10 know where it fails.

11 MR. REED: So, you extended the time in a
12 sequence.

13 MEMBER BROWN: Well, no, you've extended
14 the information you have relative to how severe the
15 problem is now because you know the water is not getting
16 there. I mean, I just have a little bit of qualms with
17 that thought B- pressure B- let me see, temperature,
18 pretty important. Okay? And you can put pretty hardened
19 sensors in place, and you can get that information out,
20 okay, under pretty nasty getting them out of the plant
21 where you can read them. You can also get some types of
22 level out if you work out B-depending on the reactor type
23 we're talking about that is pretty blacksmith
24 technology approach to doing business, and maybe the
25 temperature is the best one. But if you don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whether the water is doing anything or not, what the hell
2 good is it to put the water in? You pump the whole
3 Atlantic Ocean or the Pacific, whatever it is, it's not
4 cooling anything, doesn't do any good.

5 MR. REED: You're going to B- the Committee
6 is going to hear this a lot because I do this B- I always
7 say bring your backfit justification. I'm thinking in
8 backfit space, so when you say you want to do something
9 different with equipment or instrumentation, then I say
10 okay, show me the benefit for that, and let's see if you
11 could show substantial additional protection or
12 adequate protection. I don't think you can. And if you
13 can, then we'll talk about the costs both direct and
14 indirect that justify B-

15 MEMBER BROWN: I would argue that it brings
16 in the thought or the concept of alternate B- if you know
17 your water is not doing any good, I better do something
18 else.

19 MR. REED: Okay.

20 MEMBER BROWN: You know you have to go do
21 something else.

22 MR. REED: Right.

23 MEMBER BROWN: You may not exactly know, but
24 what's the knowledge worth?

25 MR. REED: That's B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BROWN: Do you want to continue to
2 have the whole thing melting down like a little volcano
3 and lava flowing out the side B-

4 MEMBER BLEY: Not much today, but today you
5 have an accident it'll be really B-

6 MEMBER BROWN: Right. I've got a
7 fundamental disagreement on some very basic. And I'm not
8 talking about extensive B-

9 MR. REED: I understand what you're saying.

10 MEMBER BROWN: B- high-level digital, you
11 have flat screen displays, you know, the hardened
12 B- that's baloney.

13 MR. REED: I understand the spirit of what
14 you're saying.

15 MEMBER BROWN: Look at a temperature sensor
16 with hard wire coming out and a guy reads with a meter
17 somewhere 200 feet away.

18 MEMBER POWERS: The trouble, Charlie, is
19 that if you've got conditions that will damage a ceramic
20 fuel then you've got conditions that will destroy any
21 thermocouple known to man.

22 MEMBER BROWN: I don't B- once you B- I
23 don't know. If your fuel is already broken and stuff is
24 coming out of it, you've got heat. It can get pretty hot.

25 MEMBER REMPE: So put your thermocouple on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the bottom of the vessel and you'll know it's heating
2 up, and that something real hot is on the inner surface
3 of the vessel, and you might think of an alternate
4 strategy.

5 MEMBER BROWN: I just think it B-

6 MEMBER REMPE: It's where you put that
7 thermocouple.

8 MEMBER POWERS: If you're going to talk
9 about thermocouples located away from the fuel, we've
10 got lots of them.

11 MEMBER REMPE: But what's their operating
12 envelope, 350 C?

13 MEMBER POWERS: You can make them anything
14 you want to.

15 MEMBER REMPE: Well, that's the issue, is
16 think about where you B-

17 MEMBER BROWN: The ones today are using
18 conventional B- getting the information out to B-

19 (Simultaneous speech)

20 MEMBER POWERS: B- things like that.

21 MEMBER BROWN: I mean, nobody is putting any
22 thought into the way you would do this in order to have
23 a better idea of what the temperatures are on the inside
24 of the reactor vessel.

25 MEMBER POWERS: And you're simply never

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to get there. If you're talking about temperatures
2 that are away from the reactor, the inverse calculation
3 is ill-posed, and it's more likely to mislead you than
4 anything I can think of. The answer is always water,
5 water, and water.

6 MEMBER BROWN: If you don't know whether the
7 water is doing you any good, then what good is it?

8 MEMBER POWERS: It is extremely difficult
9 to come up with a way that the water isn't any good.

10 MEMBER BROWN: I don't know, but there seem
11 to be a lot of questions floating around at the beginning
12 B-

13 MEMBER POWERS: Yes, you could hypothesize
14 all kinds of strange conditions B-

15 MEMBER BROWN: That doesn't seem like it's
16 an unknown unknown type of operation B-

17 MEMBER POWERS: The answer at Fukushima was
18 add water.

19 MEMBER BROWN: And we still don't know
20 whether any good initially.

21 MEMBER POWERS: The answer was B- yes, we
22 know that not adding water was really bad. We know that
23 one for an absolute for sure fact.

24 MEMBER BROWN: Well, this back and forth is
25 not going to resolve this particular issue, but I did

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to bring it out that this B- I personally do not
2 agree, even though my compatriot B-

3 MR. BOWMAN: To answer the first part of
4 your question, though, the discussion in the Statement
5 of Considerations on the limitations of the equipment,
6 including instrumentation is limited to the discussion
7 in the proposed Section 50.155(b)(1) for equipment
8 supporting the mitigating strategies portion. I'm
9 sorry, (c)(1) for the equipment supporting the
10 mitigating strategies portion of (b)(1) which is
11 limited to pre-core damage. So, for its use to meet the
12 functional requirements before core damage there is no
13 need for the equipment or the instrumentation to be
14 capable of surviving post-core damage.

15 MEMBER BROWN: Where does the severe
16 accident monitoring thought process get factored? I
17 guess I missed that when I was reading this.

18 MR. BOWMAN: There's an exclusion of a
19 separate equipment requirement for post-core damage,
20 and that's discussed, in part, in the draft SECY paper
21 where we made the statement. That's that separate page.

22 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, can I ask a question?

23 MEMBER BROWN: To the Commission B- for the
24 Commission.

25 MEMBER BROWN: Hold on, Mike.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: Sorry, Charlie.

2 MEMBER BROWN: Well, that's where you do
3 state B- you do talk about severe accident monitoring.

4 MR. BOWMAN: Yes. There was B-

5 (Simultaneous speech)

6 MEMBER BROWN: B- not going to do anything.

7 MR. BOWMAN: We are not doing anything in
8 this context in this rulemaking. There remains a Tier
9 3 action item post-Fukushima to look at the value that
10 post-severe accident monitoring equipment would
11 provide and come to a conclusion as to whether or not
12 that would provide a substantial safety benefit. I think
13 part of B-

14 MEMBER BROWN: The patient could be dead by
15 the time we get to that one.

16 MR. BOWMAN: B- the problem that we've got,
17 and we may not have communicated it well enough, it's
18 not that we are pointing to the quantified results of
19 the CPRR information and saying it doesn't meet it. What
20 we're saying is we don't have quantified information
21 that meets the substantial safety benefit criteria at
22 this point.

23 MEMBER BROWN: I guess B- I understand what
24 you're saying. I just B- I have a little bit of
25 difficulty because I can't stick a quantitative, highly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 quantitative in this very unknown type situation that
2 I'm just effectively going to B- I don't want to use the
3 word "ignore," reject, not consider it at this time,
4 maybe forever.

5 MR. BOWMAN: We have to consider the value
6 it would add to have the severe accident capable
7 instrumentation in the context of the existence of other
8 things like computational aids that can give us
9 information that would influence our decisions on what
10 courses of actions we've got to be taking.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, you really don't
12 want to rely on a computer when I could measure
13 something. You're not saying that, are you?

14 MEMBER BROWN: That is exactly what he said.

15 MR. BOWMAN: You would measure it. If you
16 can't measure something, you would use whatever means
17 you have available to aid you in B-

18 MEMBER REMPE: I'm aware that industry has
19 these calculational aids, but what I was B- I haven't
20 B- I thought heard you say is we're just going to check
21 the box, but now it almost sounds like well, yes, we are
22 going to look at what they are proposing. And if the
23 first sensor goes and we B- you know, they should define
24 boundaries for when that sensor goes and what the
25 alternative methods are at that time. Are you going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have some interaction with the regulator reviewing what
2 industry is proposing? Are you just going to say yes,
3 they've got B- they say they have calculational aids,
4 they have alternate sensors, and we check the box and
5 go on. How much B- that's what I'm wondering, are you
6 going to get into the details, or are you just going to
7 let them do whatever?

8 MR. REED: Well, first of all, presuming the
9 Commission does agree with the qualitative arguments
10 and thinks that SAMGs should be imposed. I don't know
11 if that's a given at all.

12 MEMBER REMPE: Right.

13 MR. REED: Then I think then it depends on,
14 of course, their direction to us. Now, we are
15 B- obviously, we're familiar with the SAMGs, and that's
16 different than being reviewed, as I mentioned, so we are
17 familiar. You do understand that, but I don't think we
18 would B- if it's me, I'm speculating now, but those
19 special requirements are pretty high-level, and unless
20 I saw something that was egregious, I mean, in terms of
21 some licensee's SAMGs were, you know, on the face of it
22 not even potentially executable. Okay? I mean, it would
23 have to be something where it doesn't make the
24 black-letter of the B- you know, what our rule says, you
25 know, in terms of what SAMGs do. It's a pretty tough B- a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pretty high standard. So, I wouldn't be going B- at
2 least the way I see it right now, I wouldn't be going
3 into individual sequences and looking at the different
4 means of instruments and what have you. I wouldn't be
5 going down to that level.

6 I think to go down to that level, in other
7 words, to check the work that industry has done over the
8 last 20 plus years would, obviously, have a lot of NRC
9 resources and back and forth. So, right now it's saying
10 yes, we've looked at it. We know it's there, but we're
11 not reviewing and approving.

12 MR. BOWMAN: I think one potential example
13 is something that would be plainly wrong with an
14 implementation of a severe accident management
15 guideline set for a licensee if their SAMGs did not
16 reflect the plant as built, and as maintained, or the
17 equipment that was available and that they should be
18 proposing to rely on. Then we would say there is a
19 problem, an issue of concern, and we would process it
20 through our normal inspection processes in the Reactor
21 Oversight Process for dispositioning.

22 MR. REED: Because I think if you read
23 through that, one of the things I think it B- I think
24 it was in this package, could have been in a previous
25 version about the qualitative arguments, SAMGs, I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think, are very valuable and they became a lot more
2 valuable because of the much increased mitigation
3 capabilities that are going into place now.

4 Now, those are designed to be pre-core
5 damage, but let's face it, this stuff would B- you use
6 everything and anything you can post-core damage, and
7 it's likely they would be very useful post-core damage.
8 So, for example, if a licensee didn't reflect that in
9 their SAMGs, that to me would be a clear case where no,
10 this is not making it.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: May I ask a question at
12 this point, Steve?

13 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes, go ahead, Mike.

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, maybe we should wait
15 until industry comes up and ask them the question of
16 content, and the questions might be what is the minimum
17 set of instrumentation although outside of their EQ
18 range, that they look at so that they get a feeling for
19 how, God forbid, an event like this occurs, how it's
20 progressing in terms of water addition, or where I might
21 retreat to put the water?

22 Also, the next question for industry is,
23 what is the frequency in which they do training so they
24 do it appropriately, but not overwhelm the operators
25 with training that is of low probability compared to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 other things need to train? I assume the industry has
2 answers to these things.

3 CHAIR SCHULTZ: I agree, Mike. That would be
4 a good approach to take, especially with regard to this
5 afternoon, and we'll give the industry some time to
6 think about that before they come up. But that is a way
7 in which what we've just discussed, I think what Eric
8 was getting to with regard to measurement versus
9 calculation. Those are the elements that had gone into
10 the development of the SAMGs.

11 DR. SHACK: Just thinking about it, I mean,
12 it seems to me one of the problems with the SAMGs has
13 not been so much that the guidelines have been poor o
14 badly thought out. The question is whether they've
15 really been implemented, people have been trained on
16 them.

17 In your view, would the inspection under
18 the ROP go some ways towards solving that problem that
19 we're sure that people B- are they being implemented and
20 people are being trained?

21 MR. BOWMAN: Well, the things we saw in the
22 temporary instruction inspection, I think it was 184,
23 I don't remember exactly what the number was, that was
24 done post-Fukushima, was some licensees did not include
25 the SAMGs in their Configuration Management Programs,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so there were some issues that were found with the
2 currently B- the then existing SAMGs reflecting B-

3 DR. SHACK: No, I realize there were
4 problems found. The question is, is your proposal going
5 to fix that? It should.

6 MR. REED: That's exactly what it's going
7 towards. In other words, it would B- sure, you update
8 them, you maintain them updated over time, that you've
9 done the sufficient training that, you know, you can
10 expect that they could actually implement them. Those
11 are the kind of issues that were found in the TI, and
12 so that's what we're trying to do. That would address
13 that. That's the level we're going to to solve the
14 problem. That's how we tried to construct it.

15 CHAIR SCHULTZ: I would hope so, otherwise,
16 there's no reason to move forward and make them
17 mandatory, not voluntary.

18 MR. BOWMAN: Absolutely.

19 CHAIR SCHULTZ: That, in fact, this
20 approach would fix the problems that have been
21 identified from 1998 until now, whenever they occur.

22 MR. BOWMAN: The other B-

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: I'm not saying there are
24 lots of problems out there, but there are certainly
25 some.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BOWMAN: The other thing I would point
2 out to be completely open is that the content of the
3 SAMGs has changed since they were first implemented. One
4 of the major changes was the inclusion of damage to fuel
5 in a spent fuel pool. That wasn't covered under the prior
6 version of the SAMGs before the Fukushima event.

7 MR. REED: In fact, I think there are five
8 candidate high-level accidents. I don't see Ed in the
9 room, Ed Fuller did look at the Technical Basis Document
10 in detail and those are all lessons learned from
11 Fukushima, like hydrogen build-up mitigation, the use
12 of raw water. There's a few others, too.

13 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Well, this is something we
14 can hear in the industry presentation later today.

15 MR. REED: Any more questions on this slide?

16 DR. SHACK: One further comment. I mean, in
17 terms of the fence B- I agree that you probably can't
18 do this under a backfit. You know, that B- I haven't done
19 the calc but I'd be very surprised. But as a
20 defense-in-depth measure, I certainly don't see the
21 difference between the EDMGs and the SAMGs. And the
22 defense-in-depth capability I get from one to the other,
23 seems to me an inconsistent treatment. I would, you know
24 B-

25 MR. BOWMAN: All I can say in response to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that is that the requirement for the EDMGs was proposed
2 B-

3 DR. SHACK: Was under a different B-

4 MR. BOWMAN: B- as the adequate protection
5 exemption for exception from the Backfit Rule. So, it
6 did go through the backfit process. It was a policy
7 decision that was made. It's been carried forward B-

8 DR. SHACK: It seemed to me on a qualitative
9 basis if you're looking for defense-in-depth, I can at
10 least make a strong case for SAMGs as a contribution to
11 the defense-in-depth as I can EDMGs.

12 MR. REED: I would personally agree with
13 you, Dr. Shack. I think there's a stronger case for
14 SAMGs, but that's just my personal opinion. So, I do
15 think there's a lot of value, too, but Eric is absolutely
16 right that the EDMGs stem from B5B B-

17 DR. SHACK: It's a different world, yes, I
18 agree. But, again, I do want to think that B- you know,
19 it's important to solve the problem that we're really
20 seeing with the SAMGs, which is implementation and
21 training, not so much the proposing things that are
22 technically unsatisfactory.

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: But you're proposing to
24 move it forward in that way.

25 MR. REED: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR SCHULTZ: The defense-in-depth
2 argument.

3 MR. REED: Yes, absolutely.

4 MR. BOWMAN: Well, a defense-in-depth
5 argument that uses the cost justified substantial
6 safety benefit exception to the Backfit Rule based on
7 qualitative factors, presenting the qualitative
8 factors to the Commission so that they can make the
9 decision on whether or not they believe it is, indeed,
10 cost justified substantial safety benefit.

11 MR. REED: And I do B- and when I say that,
12 I do say I understand that the work does not reflect
13 specific all the benefits for SAMGs in risk space, so
14 I understand that. I know that's not exactly what
15 B- scratch Dr. Stetkar's itch here, but I do understand
16 that, that there's more benefit. And I'm suggesting that
17 there's enough that we could make the substantial list
18 from that standpoint. So, yes, sir, we are proposing to
19 the Commission to B- for them to go forth with this as
20 a requirement.

21 MR. BOWMAN: At least as a proposed B-

22 MR. REED: Yes, a proposed requirement.

23 MR. BOWMAN: So we can fully inform and
24 develop a final recommendation.

25 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes, it's a Commission

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decision.

2 MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

3 MR. REED: Is there anything else on Slide
4 4? We won't have to do the later slide on SAMGs by the
5 time I get there.

6 (Off the record comments)

7 MR. REED: So, Slide 5 is just a
8 continuation of Paragraph B. And I had mentioned that
9 the three different guideline says they're integrated
10 with EOPs and it's structured intentionally that way to
11 leave in place the work from the 1980s that put in place
12 the symptom-based EOPs after TMI. We're not going to
13 revisit that. That work is fully acceptable.

14 And then given you have this integrated
15 capability. Of course, you need to support that with
16 sufficient command and control, and staffing. And this
17 stems from the fact that, you know, at least one of these
18 guideline sets the mitigation strategies for
19 Beyond-Design-Basis External Events, FLEX is, in fact,
20 for a site-wide Beyond-Design-Basis Event. That's a
21 severe challenge to the site. Obviously, it's a command
22 and control challenge. It also involves all site
23 assistance, so for an indefinite capability maintaining
24 core cooling, spent fuel pool cooling and containment
25 capability, so that's the demand, ultimate demand

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's placed on this integrated capability. And,
2 obviously, that places demands on your command and
3 control, your staffing, and your communications. You'll
4 see the Paragraph B-4 and 5 there, I believe is the
5 references. Again, that hasn't changed. That's been
6 substantially the same as it was in November.

7 Slide 6. I was thinking that we were going
8 to get to Slide 6 before we got into any real
9 interaction, so that shows how much I know. But Slide
10 6 are the equipment requirements, and these have
11 changed. And, namely B- and I have the exact
12 requirements up there on the slide. The part of it that
13 changed, of course, was the reasonable protection of the
14 mitigation strategies equipment under proposed
15 155(c)(2).

16 Of course, just before we get to that, these
17 are the parts of the rule, the equipment requirements
18 we're calling them, that would make generically
19 applicable the equipment requirements from EA-12-049,
20 and that's in (c)(1), (2), and (3). And then the
21 requirements for the level instrumentation from the
22 spent fuel pool in Order EA-12-051 as 155(c)(4).

23 And there you see basic B- this was,
24 obviously, you will recall back in November a lot of
25 discussion. It was on COMSECY 14-0037, and we are still

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 awaiting the Commission's direction on this. And, of
2 course, we'll be aligned with that direction. It goes
3 without saying.

4 We think this is B- what we've seen so far,
5 this is in alignment. I'll be very frank, there's some
6 B- I mean, as we're going through this concurrence
7 process, I think we've mentioned it in the beginning.
8 This is a lot happening in parallel, and you're getting
9 B- you're becoming part of the rulemaking concurrence
10 process. Welcome to the party. But, you know, in this
11 case we're getting feedback, and the concern is, is that
12 can we actually implement that provision by the
13 effective date of the rule? There's a lot of moving parts
14 there on what the licensee can do. They may, in fact,
15 be getting information from another entity, and then
16 giving it to us, us doing our assessment, so we're
17 looking at that, and maybe we'll probably ask for some
18 stakeholder feedback on that. We're thinking about any
19 question to that, and maybe building in flexibility as
20 part of our CR process to make sure that the
21 implementation can be done appropriately.

22 Again, we've got to B- we inform that by
23 the Commission direction, so the Commission direction
24 in the SRM will rule the day, and we need to comply with
25 that. But, nonetheless, that's an ongoing issue. That

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is different. You see that provision up there. I'll come
2 to a full stop if the Committee wants to comment on that
3 aspect of the change in the language. Okay. So, I that's
4 where I thought the discussion was, and there's none.

5 (Off the record comment)

6 MR. REED: The training requirements, those
7 are unchanged. In fact, it's actually B- Dr. Corradini
8 kind of mentioned a little bit earlier, kind of our
9 concept here. What we're trying to do is salvage
10 training requirements that enable a licensee to make use
11 of everything they have available to them right now
12 that's usable, and there's quite a bit of training
13 that's in place that would work for this integrated
14 response capability. Training that goes to from the
15 EOPs, from mitigation strategies order, any EP
16 training. There's a lot of B- even fire protection
17 training could be applicable. All that training can be
18 used. We're trying to B- you've read the Statement of
19 Considerations there. We're trying to enable licensees
20 to make maximal use of what they have. But to the extent
21 they don't have any training, then we're talking about,
22 you know, a systems approach to training there. So,
23 we've written the Statement of Considerations to try to
24 get that thought across. Hopefully, that makes sense.

25 It's clearly designed to, basically,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 establish a minimum training requirement to not focus
2 too much attention on SAMGs to the exclusion of say EOPs
3 or other training, for example, so it's with that kind
4 of mind set.

5 Again, that is basically the same training
6 requirements that were in place. There's no change.
7 You've got the Statement of Considerations there with
8 you so, hopefully, that makes sense of that requirement.
9 Yes, sir?

10 MEMBER BLEY: For the plants that have
11 chosen, should they enter the SAMGs to transfer control
12 of the plant to the TSC, will there be anything
13 specifically addressing any kind of training that would
14 apply to whoever is in charge of the TSC?

15 MR. REED: I think exact B- that would be,
16 I think, the most substantive part of the training. In
17 other words, the TSC personnel, their understanding of
18 the content of the SAMGs, that switch over from the
19 control room to the TSC. I think that is where most of
20 the training would be focused. Certainly, they're
21 probably very B- in some cases, very familiar, perhaps
22 not. We mentioned the TI results, so that's where I think
23 most of the training would go.

24 Now, you should also understand, although
25 we have drills, in my view, drills and training are very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 similar, there's a lot of overlap, so we have also drills
2 in this rule that would be a test, you know, a
3 demonstration of whether you can do these transitions,
4 so that's another check on it. But, yes, I do think
5 that's where the SAMGs training would be focused, at
6 least in my view. I don't know if I B-

7 MR. BOWMAN: What I would add is that the
8 training requirement is written as a broad high-level
9 requirement. It's in 155, Subparagraph E, and in the
10 draft guidance, I believe it's in NEI 13-06 that we're
11 looking at B- we're considering endorsing, is sets of
12 guidance for training for the ultimate decision maker
13 or the Emergency Director, whatever the chosen name for
14 that person is, whether or not that person is within the
15 control room or in the TSC, or wherever they'd be
16 located.

17 MEMBER BLEY: I guess that always B- I hang
18 up on this idea of transferring the control, it's
19 B- even if you're very senior and experienced, if you're
20 not licensed and refreshing routinely, you don't know
21 the guts of the plant on the way B- in the way that
22 licensed folks do. And I guess we'll have to wait and
23 see how this would be implemented to make sure that we're
24 covered in that regard.

25 MR. BOWMAN: Well, in any case, if you view

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 command and control as a bundle of rights and functions,
2 in order to implement direction on what would be going
3 on in the plant, if they transfer command and control
4 to the TSC, what would happen is the TSC would provide
5 direction to the main control room, and from there the
6 licensed operators would direct what happens in the
7 plant.

8 MEMBER BLEY: I guess that's kind of B-

9 MR. BOWMAN: So, there is a real functionC-

10 MEMBER BLEY: B- of the model I've always
11 thought of, and that it would be advice. We hear more
12 and more that no, in fact, they'll be driving the plant
13 from the TSC, at some plants. And it's another venue,
14 not commercial nuclear plants, I recall reading many
15 incident reports in facilities that have a similar
16 structure, and quite often you'd see the senior guy come
17 in and say this is going bad, I'm taking over, without
18 being fully informed of the details of what was going
19 on right now in the plant. And the first couple of
20 decisions would if not wreck the plant, put it in a lot
21 worse situation than it was in. And that's the thing I
22 keep worrying about with this concept.

23 The way you described it, I have no worry,
24 send them recommendations and the guys who really are
25 aware would say wait a minute, you might not want us to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do that for these reasons. Keep it at that and just watch
2 how this progresses.

3 MR. REED: Okay, so we're on Slide 7. George
4 Tartal from NRO will present Slide 7.

5 MR. TARTAL: Good afternoon. Thanks, Tim.
6 I'm George Tartal with the Office of New Reactors. I'm
7 going to talk to Slide 7 here on the new reactor design
8 requirements.

9 CHAIR SCHULTZ: George, just move up to the
10 microphone a little more. Thank you.

11 MR. TARTAL: Is that better?

12 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes.

13 MR. TARTAL: Okay, good. Again, this is
14 talking about Slide 7, the new reactor design
15 requirements. We briefed the Committee on this in
16 November. The concept is not substantially changed from
17 what we briefed the Committee on last time.

18 Again, the applicability statements that
19 this feature, or sorry, this provision would apply to
20 applicants for new reactors and the key here is
21 applicants, that this being a forward fit requirement.
22 That's the way that we discussed with the Committee last
23 time, it being forward fit. It applies when the key
24 safety functions, that is core cooling, containment,
25 and spent fuel pool cooling capabilities are being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposed to the NRC for review and approval, and we want
2 this requirement to apply as early as possible in the
3 design process.

4 It still applies to applicants for designs
5 for construction permits, operating licenses, design
6 certifications, standard design approvals, combined
7 licenses, and manufacturing licenses. That concept
8 hasn't changed.

9 What has changed on this particular
10 provisions is, as we went through the backfit analysis,
11 we found two situations that would either be a backfit
12 or inconsistent with issue finality provisions in Part
13 52. The first of those is the requirement used to say
14 that it applied to applicants that referenced a design
15 with a previous approval. For example, a combined
16 license applicant referencing a certified design. We
17 removed that applicability statement from Paragraph A.4
18 because that would essentially be inconsistent with the
19 issue finality given to the design certification.

20 And then the other situation that we
21 revised in A.4 is applying to applicants for design
22 certification renewals. Again, under the issue finality
23 provisions of Part 52 that would have been a violation
24 of the issue finality afforded to the design
25 certification once it's certified, so we had to remove

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that provision from A.4, as well.

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, can you give me an
3 example of each so it's clear?

4 MR. TARTAL: I did give you B-

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Or clearer?

6 MR. TARTAL: Right, okay. So, let's give you
7 an example of a combined license applicant such as Levy
8 that's referenced in the AP1000 design. All right? This
9 rule provision would not apply to a plant like Levy
10 because they already have B- sorry, they're referencing
11 a certified design in their applications, so they would
12 not need to comply with the requirements of Paragraph
13 D in that situation.

14 Another example would be B- you wanted
15 another example on DC, so let's say the AP1000 design
16 that Westinghouse came in for a renewal. We would not
17 be able to impose this provision on Westinghouse in that
18 case because they're already afforded issue finality in
19 this area.

20 MEMBER CORRADINI: But they still conform
21 to the current plant rules.

22 MR. TARTAL: Yes. They're still subject to
23 the rules and regulations that were in effect at the time
24 the design was originally certified.

25 MEMBER CORRADINI: And all the associated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rules that we just spoke about.

2 MR. TARTAL: You're talking about the other
3 provisions that the other Staff are talking about now
4 in this meeting?

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes.

6 MR. TARTAL: No, those provisions apply to
7 B- oh, I'm sorry, yes, for the combined license
8 applicant in the first situation, yes, those provisions
9 would apply to the combined license applicant, not to
10 the design certification renewal applicant.

11 MR. BOWMAN: As far as the applicability
12 goes for the remainder of the requirements in Paragraphs
13 B, C, E, F, and G, those are all applicable; being
14 subject to Paragraph D as an applicant for a new reactor
15 plant design would not result in an exemption from any
16 of the other requirements of the section as a whole.

17 MEMBER CORRADINI: The reason I'm asking
18 the question, just so I B- maybe I'm misunderstanding.
19 So, just you can tell me to wait, but you're about to
20 go to the second part of that slide where the bullet is,
21 "Longer time constant, sufficient instrumentation."
22 I'm trying to understand what sufficient
23 instrumentation means for a new plant that it isn't
24 meant for in a current B- do you understand where I'm
25 going?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. TARTAL: I'm not sure what that has to
2 do with the applicability. Can you help me with that?

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: Well, I B- so, is there
4 going to be an additional requirement of
5 instrumentation on a new plant that is being required
6 on a current plant? That's where I'm going.

7 MR. TARTAL: Yes, this is a forward fit
8 requirement, so the idea of having the longer time
9 constant, sufficient instrumentation; actually, you're
10 reading from the Commission's Advanced Reactor Policy
11 Statement, but specifically to the requirement in
12 Paragraph D, that's the second sub-bullet under new
13 reactor design requirements.

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: Right. So, my question
15 is going B- I now am going to require additional
16 instrumentation for these advanced plants under adverse
17 conditions. So, what's the design basis for the adverse
18 conditions? I'm struggling. On one hand, we're arguing
19 that we don't know what they are, or there's not
20 risk-significance to them. On the other hand, we're
21 asking the new plants to design to something, and I don't
22 understand what they're designing to.

23 MEMBER BROWN: I don't think that's B- I'm
24 not sure I understand that question, but I thought I just
25 heard that no B- there's no advanced instrumentation in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 severe accident for anything, new reactors, old
2 reactors B-

3 MEMBER REMPE: Well, actually B-

4 MEMBER BROWN: B- backfit reactors.

5 MEMBER REMPE: For the AP1000 there's not a
6 good B- maybe I'm misunderstanding, but I don't think
7 that there's a firm process in place. But for these new
8 plants that B- the AP1000 B-

9 MEMBER BROWN: Do you mean the SMRs, or are
10 you B-

11 MEMBER REMPE: No, the AP1000. They
12 actually did an analysis that considered some
13 scenarios, identified some sensors and said they had to
14 be surviving that for a certain time, and the staff, and
15 it was an agreement type of thing. It wasn't a fixed
16 process that they had to follow, but they said yes,
17 that's good. Is my B- am I correctly interpreting what
18 I read from it's like FSAR or something.

19 MR. McKIRGAN: So, if I could B- this is
20 John McKirgan from the New Reactor Staff. Under Part 52,
21 I think the analysis you're talking about is the severe
22 accident analysis where they look at the most likely
23 severe accident scenarios and describe features that
24 would address those scenarios, so that is part of a
25 certified design.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REMPE: Right. So, that's part
2 B- and the reason they do that is because of the
3 Commission's Advanced Reactor Policy Statement that
4 said they had to do that. The existing plants just look
5 at design basis events.

6 MR. McKIRGAN: At a very high level, I'll
7 agree with that.

8 MEMBER REMPE: Okay.

9 (Simultaneous speech)

10 MR. McKIRGAN: But I think in concept,
11 that's a fair statement. Dr. Corradini, could I ask you
12 to rephrase your question for me a little bit?

13 MEMBER CORRADINI: Well, I'm listening
14 because I'm probably misinterpreting, so your
15 explanation is helping me. So, I'm trying to understand
16 the nuances of an AP1000 versus an APR1400.

17 MR. McKIRGAN: Okay.

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, let's say the
19 APR1400 which is going to come in under certification,
20 you're going to look at it, and somebody wants to build
21 one in the States. How is their B- since they're not
22 certified yet, how are they going to be treated, and any
23 different than the AP1000?

24 MR. McKIRGAN: So, let me see if I can say
25 that simply. We're looking for B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: Please do.

2 MR. McKIRGAN: We're looking for design
3 features so we want to address this rule to those
4 applicants who have not yet finalized their designs. So,
5 in the case of the AP1000 where there is a certified
6 design and construction is going on, we feel those
7 design B- that has achieved a level of design finality
8 that we want to not become a backfit issue, so we're
9 looking to forward fit these. So, we're only looking for
10 those applicants that have not yet achieved
11 certification. So, if the Commission were to proceed
12 with this, then these provisions would apply to the
13 APR1400 which was accepted for review.

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay, and now that
15 B- okay, so I B- then I did interpret it correctly. So,
16 my next question is, what is the basis of the adverse
17 conditions you would add instrumentation or improve the
18 design of the instrumentation? I'm struggling with the
19 words.

20 MR. BOWMAN: Right. If I could interject,
21 this is Eric Bowman, Dr. Corradini. On the slide what
22 you see at the bottom is a quote of two portions of the
23 Advanced Reactor Policy Statement, and the first one
24 includes the phrase "sufficient instrumentation," and
25 goes on further about the instrumentation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could also remind you, so there are no additional
2 instrumentation requirements in this provision under
3 this rule, but I would not want you to forget the other
4 provisions in Part 52 and the severe accident analysis
5 that goes into design certifications where they do
6 consider the most likely severe accidents and talk about
7 the features to mitigate those. So, the instrumentation
8 B- there is a greater level of consideration in that
9 area, and we can talk more about that perhaps at another
10 meeting. But I think that's what Dr. Rempe had read, and
11 that does apply to the design certification applicants
12 independent of the rulemaking package that is before the
13 Committee right now.

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay, thank you very
15 much. That helps. Thank you.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: Let me try something else
17 to get away from the instruments and focus on the second
18 sub-bullet under the intent there. "Simplified safety
19 systems that where possible reduce required operator
20 actions." And I won't mention any existing designs, but
21 let's presume that we have a design, been certified
22 where under a loss of all AC power the operators must
23 de-energize everything in the control room and relocate
24 to a remote shutdown area that has much less
25 instrumentation and indications available. And that's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a certified design, that's already been accepted. And
2 we have a new design that comes in, Design X for
3 certification, that proposes that same strategy. Would
4 that new design be held to a different standard because
5 the determination could be made that that's not
6 simplified and it doesn't reduce the need for operator
7 actions? Is that part of this intent?

8 MR. MCKIRGAN: You said a lot there, and I
9 don't know that I caught it all.

10 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

11 MR. MCKIRGAN: I mean, certainly the intent
12 here is to B- for the new applicants to come in with
13 these enhancements. Obviously, this provision does not
14 apply to the certified designs.

15 MEMBER STETKAR: Right.

16 MR. MCKIRGAN: So, I missed when you B-

17 MEMBER STETKAR: Well, but what I was
18 asking, given the fact that we've accepted a design
19 where it employs that strategy, de-energize everything
20 in the control room to preserve battery life and
21 relocate to some other place in the plant where you do
22 things from that location. But if a new applicant came
23 in now that proposed that same strategy for an extended
24 loss of AC power, would that applicant be held to higher
25 scrutiny because it could be judged that they are not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 minimizing, in fact, they're increasing the need for
2 operator actions?

3 MR. McKIRGAN: And this B- so, yes, this is
4 where the guidance comes in, because as you can see, this
5 is a very high-level language in the requirement, in the
6 regulation. And then the guidance is what's providing
7 one acceptable means to meet that requirement. It's very
8 difficult when you start to get into speculation about
9 what B-

10 MEMBER STETKAR: I'm just trying to
11 understand, you know, what different philosophical
12 criteria are going to B- I tend to provide specific
13 examples, but to try to understand the different
14 philosophy that might be applied to a new design
15 certification applicant coming in tomorrow compared to
16 one that's already been accepted.

17 MR. McKIRGAN: And I think that is captured
18 in Appendix A to the Draft Guide.

19 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

20 MR. McKIRGAN: And I think if you haven't
21 had an opportunity B-

22 MEMBER STETKAR: I have not had an
23 opportunity to read that, so I will.

24 MR. McKIRGAN: So, that B- and, again,
25 that's a Reg Guide, that's not the requirement, but it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is one acceptable means. And, again, as Tim started the
2 discussion, the major focus here is to get this out for
3 stakeholder feedback, to have the dialogue.

4 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay, thanks.

5 MR. REED: Any further questions for George
6 on Slide 7? All right.

7 Slide 8, then we'll go to Paragraph F and
8 G of the proposed rule. And as I note there at the top,
9 this is basic B- it is the same as what was presented
10 back in November, so just to remind folks, those are
11 provide the drills and/or exercise requirements and
12 change control is Paragraph G. The drills, of course,
13 include an initial drill that would show use and
14 transitions between the various guideline sets. Then
15 there's a follow-on periodicity of every eight years to
16 show continued capability of that B- those transitions
17 and use of the integrated capability of these multiple
18 sets of guidelines.

19 It is rather complex. It's B- you know, in
20 fact, you'll find if you go back into the questions, we
21 actually have a question focusing on this issue in terms
22 of the structure of the periodicity, if you will, of the
23 drills, and to ask for stakeholder feedback as to
24 whether that aligns well with the EP drills. They also
25 have, essentially, an eight-year period type of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 periodicity to them because the intent here is to enable
2 flexibility to licensees to most efficiently address
3 these kinds of drills and exercise requirements. And if
4 necessary B- if they can in one fell swoop in terms of
5 combining drills and exercises, so that was the intent.

6 So, this has been B- is basically
7 unchanged. It is, in fact, entirely unchanged since
8 November, but again we have an additional question there
9 to understand from external stakeholders whether
10 there's any need to change this, or improve it, and to
11 align it better with other EP exercises.

12 MEMBER POWERS: Is the eight-year
13 periodicity of the drill the product of deep thought?

14 MR. BOWMAN: The deep thought that went into
15 it was an attempt to align with the existing periodicity
16 for the EP exercise program, and the Appendix E
17 inclusion of the drilling on the B5B strategies. One of
18 the other things we're doing is removing the B5B
19 strategy demonstration from the EP exercise program and
20 moving it over to the requirements here for the
21 Paragraph F drills or exercises in order to provide more
22 flexibility to licensees on whether to do a separate
23 drill for that, or include it in the emergency
24 preparedness exercise.

25 MEMBER POWERS: It did not include anything

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the ability of human beings to retain experience?
2 I can think of nothing that happened eight years ago that
3 I can even recall, so B-

4 MR. BOWMAN: I have nights like that, too.

5 MEMBER POWERS: My entire life is like that.

6 MR. REED: Actually, Dave Desaulniers is
7 C-I think he's got perhaps something to say.

8 MR. DESAULNIERS: Okay. As a member of the
9 working group, just to add B-

10 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Go ahead.

11 MR. DESAULNIERS: B- that you raise a good
12 question.

13 CHAIR SCHULTZ: For the record, just please
14 announce yourself.

15 MR. DESAULNIERS: David Desaulniers.

16 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you.

17 MR. DESAULNIERS: Just keep in mind that the
18 eight-year periodicity is for drills, and while you can
19 look at those as training opportunities, you heard
20 earlier training is implemented in accordance with a
21 systems approach to training. Part of that system is to
22 look at the periodicity of the training, insuring that
23 it's sufficient. So, there shouldn't be training
24 ongoing outside the drill periodicity.

25 MEMBER BLEY: Are these drills that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Staff would track closely, or is this just that they need
2 to do these drills, and perhaps could meet this
3 requirement by other drill requirements that they
4 already have in place for other organizations that
5 observe them?

6 MR. BOWMAN: The drills would be subject to
7 the Reactor Oversight process, viewing an ordinary
8 drill, as is done for the fire response drills, and all
9 other drills.

10 MEMBER BLEY: The resident might submit B-

11 MR. BOWMAN: Exactly. That's the level of
12 oversight we would see for that.

13 CHAIR SCHULTZ: It's not a graded exercise.

14 MR. BOWMAN: Unless they incorporate it
15 into doing it at the same time as an emergency
16 preparedness exercise. And then we wouldn't be strictly
17 looking at these aspects of it as parts of the graded
18 portion. The EP exercise is graded for meeting
19 requirements as an EP exercise. We wouldn't extend the
20 grading to the SAMGs, for instance.

21 MR. REED: Okay. Let's go to the change
22 control portion on the bottom of this slide. That is
23 unchanged, too, and this is a B- as I think I spoke to
24 back in November, it's a very basic, nominal I'll call
25 it change control provision for Beyond-Design-Basis. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recognize that the current change control provisions
2 that are in place, whether it's 50.59, 50.54(g), or
3 50.54(p) fire protection, whatever it is, those each are
4 B- I'll call these design-basis type change controls,
5 they focus on a certain regulatory area, and we are fully
6 B- we understood that in large measure I'll say those
7 were "blind" to a Beyond-Design-Basis type situation,
8 so the idea here is to have a change control that looks
9 at the Beyond-Design-Basis aspects of this regulation
10 and its implementation, and that a licensee would
11 nominally have to look at changes to the facility,
12 understand those changes, include that they continue to
13 comply with the requirements and document that and
14 maintain it, so that's the idea.

15 Then, of course, if you look in the
16 regulation you'll find that we also indicate that you
17 need to apply your currently existing change control
18 provisions because as I think the Committee is probably
19 fully aware just from the discussions of the
20 modifications went in place from the Mitigation
21 Strategies Order, it's very easy for these
22 modifications to touch on multiple areas. Touch and, in
23 fact, impact safety-related systems, structures, and
24 components, that clearly brings in 50.59. Brought fire
25 protection equipment that will bring into play fire

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 protection change control. It can go into EP, it can go
2 into security, so depending on what the change to the
3 facility is, it can affect multiple different
4 regulatory areas, which each have their own change
5 control provision. So, it is B- now, this is a very
6 complex situation, and what we're trying to do is
7 address the Beyond-Design-Basis, insure people
8 continue to do what they have to in the other change
9 control provisions so they don't offset anything to do
10 with the licensing basis there. So, that's the intent.

11 I do understand that in a previous life
12 having to do change control and doing this kind of thing,
13 there are lots of opportunities going back and forth
14 where this can be very complex, and one change control
15 provision could stop another or create some interface
16 issues, and we probably need to sort that out. And,
17 hopefully, we'll get great stakeholder input on any kind
18 of disconnects like that. For example, if you're in
19 Beyond-Design-Basis space and you want to go and take
20 a B- say open a security door because that makes sense
21 for mitigation, maybe your security 50.54(p) or
22 something else stops you from doing that, or it may
23 appear to stop you from doing that. So, those are the
24 kind of interface issues we want to sort through and make
25 sure that they're not stopping us from doing what we need

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to do, and that we can implement these
2 Beyond-Design-Basis requirements.

3 So, all that's kind of built into this, and
4 I look forward to getting a good set of feedback on this.
5 It does not, unlike any other change control provision
6 in place, have a threshold criteria, and I'm talking
7 about, if you're familiar with 50.59, there are eight
8 such criteria. And, typically, the other ones have I'll
9 call it a reduction of effectiveness criteria. There's
10 no such criteria that says hey, if you cross this line,
11 you come to NRC for prior review and approval. It simply
12 indicates hey, you must continue to comply with the
13 regulations. You must reach that conclusion, and you
14 must basically maintain that documentation there so we
15 can come and look at that later.

16 That's not a great deal of flexibility on
17 the part to the licensee, and I understand that, so it's
18 an area where we're seeking external stakeholder input.
19 You can see that in one of our stakeholder questions to
20 say whether there's a better way of doing it, or there's
21 been an improved way to do it under what we're suggesting
22 here. That's all exactly the same as it was previously.

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Tim, did you ask for
24 stakeholder feedback on the frequency of the drills?

25 MR. REED: Yes, we did. We, actually B- we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just added B- I think we might have added it. I don't
2 know if you have it, if we added it after it went to you
3 or not. I can't keep track of the changes going on but,
4 yes, it was looking at the frequency of these drills
5 versus the frequency of your EP exercises. (A) How does
6 that match up? Is there B- you know, does that work
7 together, is there a way of doing it better? That's the
8 kind of question that we're looking at, so we do have
9 one on that, also.

10 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you.

11 MR. REED: Any other questions on this
12 slide? Appendix E, these also remain unchanged. As
13 you'll recall, these are the B- what I refer to as the
14 onsite B- enhanced onsite emergency response
15 capability type requirements. They are located in
16 Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50 either directly in the
17 current part, existing parts of Appendix E, or as a new
18 Section 7 which contains the staffing and
19 communications capability requirements.

20 Then in addition, of course, we also have
21 made basically what I view as a cleanup to the ERDS
22 requirements in Appendix E that reflect what is already
23 in place in terms of not referring to any kind of
24 technology there. So, we're fixing that part of the
25 regulation as part of this, also. But this goes to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 B- what I call the multi-source-term requirements, and
2 also the equipment to support those B- doing those
3 assessments.

4 Right now, it would be B- if you go and look
5 at this, would require licensees to be able to do
6 multiple source-terms, even a single unit would have to
7 be able to handle releases from the reactor and the spent
8 fuel pool at the same time, and through multiple points.
9 Of course, multiple units, multi-units it's a more
10 complex situation, so that's building this capability
11 into Appendix E.

12 This is something that was being done
13 post-Fukushima by the industry. We expect that as a
14 result, though it is a backfit, is in fact done and
15 should be of very little or no impact, so that's going
16 into Appendix E. And the staffing and communications
17 requirements here reflect the 50.54(f) request for
18 information of March 12th, 2012 where we requested
19 licensees to basically do an analysis of their staffing
20 for a Beyond-Design-Basis type event that affects the
21 entire site. They, in fact, are responding to that, so
22 that's ongoing. Again, this would simply reflect that
23 staff requirement, and also those communications
24 capability part of that response or that RFI. And that,
25 again, this reflects that request for information, so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's building that into Appendix E.

2 So, that's Appendix E. That is unchanged.
3 The application requirements saying those are basically
4 unchanged. I think there is some B- and this is what I
5 call the content of applications. There's a lot of
6 regulation if you go and look in there in Part 50 and
7 Part 52 about if you want to come in with a new reactor
8 application under either process, Part 50 and Part 52.
9 So, there have been some changes George Tartal was
10 mentioning before, we made some changes now about
11 forward fitting basically design requirements. So, for
12 example, 52.59 was a certification of a current
13 B- renewal of a certification for a current certified
14 design. That's not there, but that's now been changed
15 to reflect what George just said earlier in terms of the
16 new design requirements on new designs forward fitted.
17 So, otherwise, those application B- content of
18 application requirements reflect exactly, I believe,
19 unchanged from what was in what you saw in November.

20 The implementation now, if you go back to
21 November and you look at that, we basically gave you kind
22 of a high-level list of items that in our view would kind
23 of drive the issue in terms of how much time do we have
24 to give licensees to implement this once this regulation
25 goes final, and you hit you effective date. How much time

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are folks going to need? And we tried to list a couple
2 of items, areas there where we think there would be kind
3 of pacing, what would be the implementation period.

4 Now you'll see in there it's essentially a
5 B- it's marked to two refueling outages, and we actually
6 have a question on this because we recognize that it may
7 not make sense to tie implementation of this rule to
8 refueling outages, but the proposed rule as written
9 right now would basically say you'd have to implement
10 it two refueling outages following the effective date
11 of the rule; basically, when you're coming from startup
12 and withdrawing rods. So, it made sense to make that four
13 years or something else, and we have the question,
14 stakeholder question on that. And, of course, we'll
15 pursue that as part of our CER process as we get to the
16 final rule, we see where we are, we see what licensees
17 have on their plates. We'll revisit this and see if we've
18 got it right.

19 And I'll just reflect back to an earlier
20 slide where I mention we may have some challenges with
21 implementing 155(c)(2), that would be another aspect of
22 this we have to be mindful of to see whether that
23 implementation is appropriate. We may need to build some
24 flexibility or some criteria into the implementation of
25 that provision, again, mindful of the fact that we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to get a Draft SRM from the Commission on
2 COMSECY-14-0037. And we're obviously going to comply
3 with that regardless, so that's a driver on that. So,
4 implementation now you do see the language there as
5 opposed to a high-level set of bullets that you saw in
6 November. So, I'll come to full stop and see if folks
7 have any questions on this.

8 Okay, backfit considerations. This will be
9 the first time we've had a discussion on backfit today.
10 Huh? That was supposed to be a joke. So, this is B- this
11 slide was I think identical to what I provided before.
12 And I don't think it's really worthwhile going through
13 it with basically all the backfit discussion we've had
14 today.

15 We've developed the proposed rule such that
16 if the Commission, in fact, does not agree with the Staff
17 and our qualitative basis for imposing SAMGs, that we
18 can, in fact, adjust the regulation. And we definitely
19 can do, and so we're ready to do that if that's the
20 direction we get. So, that's the first thing. I've
21 committed to the Commission back in B- was in SECY paper
22 B- one of the updates to Fukushima from 2014, I think,
23 that I would do that, so we can do that. And, if
24 necessary, we will do that.

25 But in large measure, most of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirements in this rulemaking are going into place
2 right now. In large measure, they're being imposed under
3 orders, most of them. The vast majority are being
4 imposed as a result of implementation of EA 12-049, the
5 Mitigation Strategies Order. But we also reflect the
6 spent fuel pool level, as EA-12-051 said. That's already
7 in, those are in place, those are not backfits as a
8 result because they've already been imposed.

9 The rest of this, you'll see some
10 discussion of other areas where technically they would
11 be backfits. I mentioned just now recently the
12 multi-source-term requirement. That would be a backfit.
13 It's a new requirement, but in fact licensees are
14 implementing it voluntary, so that's a new requirement
15 without impact, as far as we understand at this point.

16 SAMGs and everything that support SAMGs, as
17 I mentioned earlier, are backfits. And, of course, we've
18 had quite a bit of discussion on whether we have a good
19 valid basis on that. And I have a next slide on that
20 coming up, and we can B- if you want hold it, or we can
21 have some more discussion this slide.

22 And we mentioned earlier that we have new
23 reactor requirements, and that's in, of course, 155(d).
24 And those are forward fitting, and that's why they're
25 not an issue for us in backfit, you know, since it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really about implementing a new reactor policy and
2 trying to implement the Commission's ideas there, what
3 the Staff believes those are, so we've got that
4 discussion.

5 And, in fact, additionally, what I view as
6 simply cleaning up the ERDS requirements to reflect what
7 is in place now, and remove references. There's a
8 reference right now in there about NRC replacing a
9 modem. Nobody uses that any more, so it's an opportunity
10 to clean up the requirements for ERDS. I'll come to a
11 stop, and if you want to we can talk about backfit here,
12 or we can go to the next slide and talk about the backfit
13 again, if you want.

14 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Let's stop for a moment and
15 ask if there's questions on this slide.

16 MR. REED: Okay.

17 MEMBER REMPE: A long time ago when they did
18 the Advanced Reactor Policy Statement, what was C-- it
19 was before I was on ACRS, and what was the Commission's
20 motivation for imposing more requirements for severe
21 accident instrumentation on the new reactors versus the
22 existing fleet?

23 MR. McKIRGAN: If I could begin, this is
24 John McKirgan. The Policy Statement does not impose any
25 requirements, so it was intended to provide an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 opportunity for the vendors to voluntarily provide
2 these features, but it does not impose requirements.

3 MEMBER REMPE: Westinghouse did not have to
4 do that analysis, and that's why it's a fuzzy thing with
5 the Staff interacting with them on it.

6 MR. McKIRGAN: Let me see if I can say it
7 correctly, and someone from the audience can correct me
8 if I'm wrong. But I believe it's a concept of application
9 requirement, so there's a requirement that they have to
10 provide information in the application on those things.
11 And there is, of course, the Policy Statement from the
12 Commission, so the Staff in conducting our reviews looks
13 at those things and considers them. Of course, the
14 vendors first have been mindful of the Policy Statement
15 and the content of application requirements, and have
16 provided these features. So, it's a combination of the
17 voluntary input provided by the vendors and then the
18 guidance that's used by the Staff during the review that
19 gets us B-

20 MEMBER REMPE: Never any discussion well,
21 the Commission decided, you know, we think this is just
22 needed for adequate protection, for example?

23 MR. McKIRGAN: I don't have that
24 background. I could not answer that.

25 MEMBER POWERS: I'm not sure what your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question is, Joy?

2 MEMBER REMPE: Well, it seems to be the new
3 reactors have gone ahead and looked at severe accidents
4 and the instrumentation survivability for whatever
5 reason, and I'm just wondering B-

6 MEMBER POWERS: Required to because they're
7 required to have a PRA. They're required B-

8 MEMBER REMPE: They have a PRA, yes. But
9 they look at instrumentation, too.

10 MR. MONNINGER: So, if you may allow, this
11 is John Monninger of the Staff. I'm the Director of
12 Division of Safety Systems and Risk Analysis from the
13 Office of New Reactors. You know, the first question was
14 with regard to the Advanced Reactor Policy Statement,
15 and the original timing of that was very closely aligned
16 also with the Severe Accident Policy Statement, which
17 came post-TMI, and the Commission's expectations for
18 new reactors, or advanced reactors to have high levels
19 of safety, and particularly higher levels of severe
20 accident safety performance.

21 We can talk about the AP1000, the AP600, the
22 ABWR, the System 80+. Back in 1990, the Staff proposed
23 various policy positions to the Commission. One of those
24 policy positions was something called Equipment
25 Survivability, and out of that policy position the Staff

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 did impose those requirements on applicants for both
2 equipment and for instrumentation, for instrumentation
3 post-severe accident, prior to severe accident and
4 post, so we looked at various profiles. The Staff did
5 MELCOR calculations, the applicants did a series of MAPP
6 calculations to come up with quasi bounding profiles for
7 the equipment, and we spec'd out, or the applicant
8 spec'd out equipment within the design certifications
9 for both the prevention and mitigation of severe
10 accident, and also the instrumentation necessary for
11 that. So, that's B-

12 MEMBER REMPE: Okay, that helps a whole lot.
13 And what I'm not hearing you say is why, was it deemed
14 that's needed for adequate protection?

15 MR. MONNINGER: So, in those days we B- for
16 the good or for the bad, we developed what we called
17 Policy Positions. We didn't say whether they were for
18 adequate protection, they weren't necessarily
19 substantial safety enhancements. There was, you know,
20 a lot of qualitative discussions in there, but there was
21 no type of backfit discussion done at that time. It was
22 the positions, there as probably, you know, 10, 15, 25
23 of them that were generated over five years or so, and
24 they were intended to meet the Commission's
25 expectations for the Severe Accident Policy Statement

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for closure of severe accidents, and also the
2 Commission's expectations within the Advanced Reactor
3 Policy Statement, but wasn't an explicit analysis
4 against the Backfit Rule in those times.

5 Subsequently, many of those provisions
6 were codified within Part 52. You know, I don't have the
7 exact accounting for which ones did roll up into Part
8 52, and which ones didn't, there were issues with direct
9 containment heating, steam explosions, the equipment
10 survivability, hydrogen control, all those types of
11 issues. And that's where the instrumentation for new
12 reactors or advanced reactors comes in.

13 MEMBER REMPE: Thank you very much.

14 MR. REED: I was just add, too B- you
15 mentioned the Severe Accident Policy Statement. If you
16 go to Appendix A of the Draft Reg Analysis you'll see
17 I walk through a little bit of the history on SAMGs, and
18 I do have some quotes out of the Severe Accident Policy
19 Statement from 1985. And you'll see the Commission at
20 that time concluded that severe accident risk was not
21 an undue risk to public health and safety. Of course,
22 then they hedged and said, of course, if you identify
23 any kind of vulnerabilities we would address those under
24 backfit, and as you folks probably are well aware, along
25 later in the decade came 88-20 that was looking exactly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at those IP and IPEEE, those vulnerabilities. But,
2 nonetheless, at that time they had to conclude no undue
3 risk to health and safety of the public on the Severe
4 Accident Policy Statement itself. So, these would be
5 causing future reactors go beyond that and to be much
6 safer. I think the risk results that they are, in fact,
7 submitting would show that they have achieved
8 significant levels of safety improvement for new
9 reactors. So, just adding to what John just said.

10 MEMBER REMPE: Thanks.

11 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Go ahead.

12 MR. REED: All right. So, let's go to SAMGs
13 where I sense there's -- the Committee is not in full
14 agreement with the justification. We started this thing
15 off talking about the quantitative analysis that I B- or
16 it was informed by quantitative information, and also
17 the qualitative basis I provided. It sounds like folks
18 have B- do like the qualitative arguments that I
19 provided there. I do B- you know, I boil this down to
20 it's a very simple argument because I think it's very
21 easy to relate SAMGs to the qualitative arguments in
22 terms of defense-in-depth. They are, in fact, the
23 B- I'll call it the command and control guideline set,
24 if you will, once you go past core damage. They're
25 informing the decisions that you make with containment,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or how you try to maintain containment under human
2 control, and containment is clearly one of the most
3 important defense-in-depth features in the facility in
4 terms of fission product barriers. And they also do
5 inform or can inform any decisions made by the onsite
6 emergency response organization for protective actions
7 either on site or off site, so that goes to EP. And that's
8 another one of our fundamental foundational
9 defense-in-depth parts of our regulations.

10 So, you saw those arguments. I think
11 they're very good arguments from a qualitative
12 standpoint, but I'm mindful of the Commission's SRM here
13 recently, and unfortunately it came just a couple of
14 weeks B- about a week and a half ago, the early part of
15 this month on qualitative factors. So, I think, as I
16 mentioned earlier, it's up to the Commission to decide
17 the weight that they want to put on the qualitative
18 factors given what I think is B- I personally think, I
19 think the Working Group believes is really good risk
20 information to inform our decision, recognizing B- and
21 I think I've got to be a little more careful on how I
22 characterize it, as Dr. Stetkar discussed, and we
23 discussed earlier with the Committee. But I do think
24 there's a lot of value in looking at the information
25 coming out of the containment protection and release

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reduction.

2 Again, as I mentioned earlier, I think that
3 analysis demonstrates what I think what you should
4 expect, and which I think is a great story for safety,
5 that the 50 plus years of regulation and infrastructure
6 the AC and the NRC have put in place, have in fact driven
7 down severe accident risk to a very low level such that
8 when you do look at it and you try to quantify it, and
9 you try to show B- and you do show benefits. I mean, even
10 that work shows benefits, too. Whether that meets our
11 backfit criteria. I don't think it does, and I think it
12 strongly enough to suggest you won't get there.

13 Now, we can disagree on that, whether we
14 could go off and do a detailed look with a PRA or some
15 sort of risk analysis that looks at SAMGs more fully and
16 tries to get at their benefits quantitatively. I think
17 B- I bet that that would come out pretty much around the
18 same answer, and that's what I'm suggesting. So, again,
19 that was an effort to provide a full complete story to
20 the Commission, as I said, both sides of the equation,
21 everything I know about risk, everything I know about
22 the qualitative arguments that are very strong for
23 defense-in-depth, and let the Commission make that
24 decision.

25 I think personally, it's worth the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission to put that out for stakeholder feedback and
2 get the feedback from industry and external
3 stakeholders, but if the Commission wants to decide that
4 no, it's B- you know, based on the recent decision on
5 qualitative factors they want to B- of course, I can,
6 in fact, adjust this regulation. It might take B- it
7 actually would probably take a little bit of time, a
8 couple of weeks, but we definitely can do that and adjust
9 to remove SAMG requirements, if that's the direction.
10 But this was B- I did have last time if you recall a
11 little bit more detail about the CPRR work. I'm
12 sensitive, I was sensitive to some of the issues here
13 already. I tried to remove that. In fact, I removed the
14 figure. You won't see that in here. That was in the last
15 presentation that came right from the CPRR with the
16 bounding number, if you guys recall. So, that's B- I'll
17 come to full stop. Let me just stop talking and allow
18 you guys to start talking, so how's that?

19 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Tim, second carat under
20 the first bullet, "Decisions Concerning Containment."
21 In that context is containment a noun or a verb?

22 MR. REED: I'm thinking of it as a noun. In
23 other words, I'm thinking B- I'm trying to make any
24 decision to keep that barrier under human control. I
25 don't want to lose the physical integrity of that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 boundary because then I'm done. Right? So, that's
2 exactly how I think about it.

3 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay, so in that context
4 it's containment integrity.

5 MR. REED: Yes, I think you could think of
6 that as B- and we B-

7 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay, let's B-

8 MR. REED: We've had that discussion.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: We're going to get into it
10 in 13-01 in a minute B-

11 MR. REED: Yes.

12 MEMBER SKILLMAN: B- because I want to
13 point out the inconsistencies throughout 13-01. So,
14 what I want to suggestion here is words matter, and
15 written words matter more.

16 MR. REED: Absolutely.

17 MEMBER SKILLMAN: And here, this is
18 containment integrity. I think somewhere in this
19 discussion you need to weave in containment integrity
20 and containment cooling, because while they are
21 considered one and the same, they are, in fact,
22 different. For example, containment integrity gets to
23 the liner, or the vessel, any vessel, whatever might be
24 used in the valve seals, what your last leak rate test
25 confirmed; whereas, containment cooling can get into

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 spray, boxcar fans, other activities that you would
2 B- or other functions that you would use to cool. So,
3 I think there needs to be clarity around this term. And,
4 more importantly, as you did in 13-01, there are 12 or
5 13 different places where you used this term, and
6 sometimes you used the term containment integrity,
7 other times it's containment cooling, and it isn't
8 consistent. So, I want to just lob that now and we'll
9 talk about it a little more in 13-01.

10 MR. REED: We can certainly wait until
11 13-01, if you wish.

12 MEMBER SKILLMAN: 13-01 is fine. I think
13 that's the better place to talk about it.

14 MR. REED: Okay.

15 MEMBER SKILLMAN: But I think when you talk
16 about it, you better be specific as to containment
17 integrity, or containment cooling.

18 MR. REED: The good news is Eric is going to
19 present 13-01.

20 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay.

21 MR. BOWMAN: Well, I'm going to present that
22 we aren't really ready with 13-01 completely yet, as we
23 don't have a complete version of the underlying proposed
24 industry guidance. And we are also awaiting the decision
25 on the COMSECY-14-0037. I think we can talk about the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 containment portions. The one thing I would suggest,
2 though, it's not just integrity or cooling, the words
3 that we used in the original Mitigating Strategies Order
4 and the words that we're using in the proposed rule are
5 containment capabilities. And that also encompasses for
6 Mark 3, and estimates of containments, the backup power
7 for the hydrogen igniters.

8 MR. REED: I think mass and energy. Yes,
9 there's a lot to it.

10 (Simultaneous speech)

11 MEMBER SKILLMAN: And there's one incident
12 in 13-01 where it is containment capabilities, so it
13 seems that there is an opportunity here for
14 clarification.

15 MR. REED: Oh, yes.

16 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

17 MR. REED: No other problems with the SAMG
18 backfit?

19 CHAIR SCHULTZ: No. I guess, Tim, the only
20 comment I'd have is that going back and forth between
21 qualitative and quantitative, I would precede each of
22 the four bullets that you have there with the value of,
23 the way you did it at the bottom. I mean, each of those
24 has significant value.

25 MR. REED: Oh, yes. Sure.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR SCHULTZ: And the other piece of this,
2 although there's a great amount of detail associated
3 with costs associated with performing this, imposing
4 the requirements, much has already been done. And I
5 didn't go through carefully and dissect that, but things
6 are moving B- things have moved forward, things are
7 moving forward, and so it's certainly B- well, I think
8 we're talking about codifying what is in place and
9 assuring that it stays in place, and it doesn't drift
10 the way some, only some have drifted in the past.

11 MR. REED: That's exactly what we're trying
12 to do. And when we did the analysis of cost, we tried
13 to B- the costs have been, I'll call sunk costs to date
14 were not costing that's going forward, which I think is
15 a fair way of doing it, too.

16 CHAIR SCHULTZ: It is the right way of doing
17 it, certainly.

18 MR. REED: And I do agree there's value in
19 them. And I personally think the value is largely in
20 maintaining the containment under human control. And I
21 think I made those arguments pretty clear, because the
22 containment is there for one reason, it's to contain
23 fission products, and fission products, when you have
24 fission products, you got core damage, and where are
25 you? You're in SAMG space, and so that to me is a direct

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 link, and I've said that many times before. So, it's a
2 pretty strong argument from the defense-in-depth
3 standpoint.

4 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Any other comments before
5 we break? We have reached the time for a break, and after
6 the break we'll go into the discussions related to the
7 Draft Regulatory Guides. So that we go into that with
8 sufficient energy, I'll call a break until 3:35.

9 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
10 off the record at 3:15 p.m., and resumed at 3:34 p.m.)

11 CHAIR SCHULTZ: I would like to bring the
12 meeting back in session and on the record. And we'll
13 proceed then with the discussion on the Draft Regulatory
14 Guidance. Eric Bowman, welcome.

15 MEMBER REMPE: Can I ask a question that's
16 kind of a holdover from earlier discussions this
17 afternoon?

18 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Go ahead, Joy.

19 MEMBER REMPE: We talked about the Severe
20 Accident Management Guidelines, and I know at one point,
21 Tim, you mentioned well, even if they use the old one
22 and properly trained on it, and implemented it, it would
23 be there. It's pretty good, but I read the Draft SECY.
24 It discusses that the BWR Owners Group and the PWR Owners
25 Group have new SAMGs, and it says the Staff will not be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reviewing them. And I guess I'd like to know have you
2 looked at them, what's your thoughts, are they
3 sufficient or deficient? I mean, this is kind of
4 important. Again, why do this if you're not to have some
5 sort of oversight?

6 MR. REED: Sure. I can tell you what we have
7 done. And I tried B- I mentioned a little earlier we had
8 I think it was a one or two-day public meeting where we
9 interacted with the SAMG experts, some of which are
10 here. We also were granted access to an e-Portal which
11 we've looked at the SAMGs that are in existence in the
12 e-Portal, so we're familiar with that. We actually had
13 a member of our research staff, Ed Fuller, who is a SAMG
14 expert from back in the day also, he also looked at the
15 Technical Basis Document. I think I mentioned that the
16 Technical Basis Document from EPRI, if not 2012 version
17 update the 1992, added five candidate high-level
18 actions of lessons learned. I believe it's five. I might
19 be wrong, but I believe so. I'm checking my memory here.
20 Lessons learned from Fukushima, so we've done all that
21 work.

22 But that's different, and I want to make
23 sure, I don't want to over B- but that's different than
24 reviewing it. You know, that's having a lot of
25 familiarity with it. I think we used looking at it, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know. I'm not even sure we can say audit, you know. Each
2 of these words mean something to us, and if I'm going
3 to review that, then I need to have that submitted to
4 me. Then I need, I think, to have some sort of criteria
5 of what I would look and find acceptable. That works us
6 into a pretty structured format, and that's what I was,
7 you know, saying what we have not done to date, and
8 that's why we structured it admittedly with a light
9 regulatory footprint not to do that. You know, basically
10 that B- going back to this idea about hey, do you have
11 them? Are they in place? Are you keeping them up to date?
12 Not getting into the licensing up front review and
13 approval type process, so is that helpful?

14 MEMBER REMPE: Not totally, because B-

15 MR. REED: Okay.

16 MEMBER REMPE: B- you've B- I believe you
17 mentioned in your discussion, or someone did that well,
18 if it doesn't reflect the plant, we'll clearly say
19 that's not working. But what if you just don't think it
20 B- I mean, do you think they're adequate with what you
21 reviewed? I mean, the B-

22 MR. BOWMAN: What we're standing from is in
23 the 1990s we had a significant amount of interaction
24 with the EPRI and the parties that were developing the
25 basis for the Severe Accident Management Guidelines,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Technical Basis Report, and looked at the Owners
2 Groups guidelines, including modifications to it, and
3 concluded that they were good enough for us to forego
4 further regulatory action on the subject of the SAMGs,
5 and leave them as a voluntary industry initiative. We
6 would be building on that view of the Severe Accident
7 Management Guidelines, and we also have an outstanding
8 offer from the Owners Groups as a joint submittal from
9 the BWR Owners Groups and the Pressurized Water Owners
10 Group B- Pressurized Reactor Water B- Pressurized
11 Water Reactor Owners Group to submit any changes on a
12 future ongoing basis to the Severe Accident Guidelines
13 so that we could keep up to date on them and maintain
14 currency, and the assessment that they were adequate to
15 meet the needs. It would not be a licensing-type review.
16 That's where we are with it.

17 MEMBER REMPE: So, you do review them for
18 adequacy? And you B-

19 MR. BOWMAN: We have not taken that offer up
20 to date. It really depends on what happens with the
21 rulemaking, the treatment. We haven't completely
22 settled that. That will be further settled when we get
23 feedback from stakeholders, and it'll depend on, of
24 course, whether or not Severe Accident Management
25 Guidelines, in fact, become requirements, or what the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 final disposition is.

2 MEMBER REMPE: Okay, so depending on the
3 outcome, you have an offer from industry that you can
4 B- I don't know B- review is a bad word, maybe, I don't
5 know, but review them for adequacy, and if there's some
6 point of contention there can be follow-on discussions?

7 MR. BOWMAN: Yes. We have to remain mindful
8 that we cannot delegate to the Owners Groups the
9 authority to set what is acceptable legally to meet a
10 requirement. We can look at a public document such as
11 the Technical Basis Report, and judge whether or not we
12 think that it provides sufficient basis to develop the
13 Severe Accident Management Guidelines on a
14 licensee-specific basis. Those are some hurdles that we
15 haven't crossed yet.

16 MEMBER REMPE: Okay, thank you. And that
17 you, Steve.

18 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you. Okay, Eric.

19 MR. BOWMAN: Okay. Draft Regulatory
20 Guidance. We've provided as part of the Draft Proposed
21 Rule package three Draft Regulatory Guides that would
22 propose to endorse a number of documents that were
23 developed by industry to provide guidance.

24 Rather than going in the order that they are
25 listed on the slide here, I'll just start out with Draft

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Guide 1317, which is on the wide range spent fuel pool
2 level instrumentation, because I think that'll be the
3 easiest one to cover with the Committee.

4 The proposed requirement in 155(c)(2) is to
5 make the orders, EA-12-051 generically applicable. The
6 way we've drafted that portion of the proposed rule is
7 a high-level requirement that lacks a lot of the
8 specificity that was in the order, itself. But we are
9 carrying forward the guidance that was provided by
10 industry for the order as endorsed by JLDISG 2012-02
11 with no changes. So, what you got for Draft Guide 1317
12 is really just that Interim Staff Guidance put into
13 regulatory guide format.

14 The second one to discuss, Draft Guide
15 1301, is the guide on the mitigating strategies portion,
16 the portion that would EA-12-049 generically
17 applicable. It also includes an Appendix A that provides
18 the guidance for new reactor designers to meet the
19 Paragraph D portion of 50.155. And then the third one
20 would be Draft Guide 1319, which deals with the other
21 aspects of the proposed rule.

22 The state of development for Draft Guide
23 1301, it's a very preliminary draft right now. We've had
24 several public meetings with industry and public
25 stakeholders on the subject of the revision to NEI

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 12-06. Currently, we have Draft Version C of Revision
2 1. It's taking some feedback that we've provided and
3 it's B- the intention of the revision to NEI 12-06 is
4 to address lessons learned in the implementation of the
5 requirements of the Mitigating Strategies Order.

6 The other thing that is going to ultimately
7 be dealt with in Revision 1 to NEI 12-06 is the
8 reevaluated hazards under the 50.54(f) letter of March
9 12th, 2012. We're still awaiting the Commission's
10 guidance in the SRM on COMSECY 14-0037 in order to
11 proceed further on the development of guidance for how
12 that should be dealt with.

13 You've seen in the presentation earlier and
14 in the proposed rule language that we have proposed at
15 least as a starting point for seeking stakeholder input
16 on how the mitigating strategies should deal with the
17 reevaluated hazards. Once we get the SRM on that
18 COMSECY, we'll get further along with the discussions
19 with stakeholders, including the Industry Working
20 Group, on how to address the reevaluated hazards.

21 My understanding is that the Industry
22 Working Group is going to propose an Appendix G to add
23 to NEI 12-06 that will address the reevaluated flood
24 hazards, and potentially an Appendix H for reevaluated
25 seismic hazard.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, what you've got is a B- you can think
2 of it as a rough draft of what we would put out in Draft
3 Guide 1301 to seek public comment on the regulatory
4 guidance as it's developed to date. We intend to
5 finalize the Draft Guide to include guidance on the
6 reevaluated hazards, and clear up some of the
7 typographic errors, if you will, that Dr. Skillman
8 pointed out, so that we have a more complete product when
9 the proposed rule package is published. Right now we're
10 shooting for this summer as B- insuring that we get the
11 Draft Guide more fully developed. And we are, of course,
12 happy to come and interact with the Committee again when
13 we're further along in that development process.

14 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Eric and I were off the
15 record when we sat and spoke for several minutes during
16 the break. I went through this Draft Guide very
17 thoroughly and there are about 13 instances where the
18 term core cooling containment and spent fuel cooling is
19 used, but not all 13 instances are the same. Sometimes
20 it's containment, sometimes it's containment
21 integrity, sometimes it's containment function,
22 sometimes it's containment cooling, so I pointed that
23 to Eric that that phrase should be used consistently
24 each time it's used in this guide for the record. Thank
25 you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BOWMAN: Thank you for that. Are there
2 any other questions on the main body portion of Draft
3 Guide 1301?

4 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I do. I have one. It is on
5 page 3 of the Draft Guide. It is the second paragraph
6 from the bottom of the page, and this paragraph
7 communicates that the Commission-issued memorandum
8 which included requirements for mitigation strategies
9 as a license condition for Virgil Summer Stations 3 and
10 3. And my question is about what Vogtle 3 and 4?

11 MR. BOWMAN: Vogtle 3 and 4 were subject to
12 the Mitigating Strategies Order EA-12-049 because it
13 was issued contemporaneous with the issuance of their
14 combined license.

15 MEMBER SKILLMAN: So, it's a chronology
16 issue.

17 MR. BOWMAN: Yes. It's just Summer's Units
18 2 and 3 didn't receive their combined licenses prior to
19 the issuance of the Mitigating Strategies Order, and
20 they were issued license conditions along with a
21 combined license.

22 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

23 MR. BOWMAN: If there are no other
24 questions, I'll have Clint Ashley from the Office of New
25 Reactors to discuss the content of Appendix A for Draft

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Guide 1301.

2 MR. ASHLEY: Thank you, Eric. Good
3 afternoon. I'm Clint Ashley. I'm from the Office of New
4 Reactors. I was a member of a team that was put together
5 to put this preliminary Draft Guidance for Applicants
6 for New Nuclear Power Plants, and there's other members
7 in the audience that if your questions get more
8 detailed, we can certainly draw on their expertise.

9 Draft Guide 1301, Appendix A contains
10 guidance that provides applicants for new nuclear power
11 plants with an acceptable method to meet the proposed
12 rule. This slide highlights guidance related to coping
13 duration and human actions, which are areas that are not
14 covered in NEI 12-06 for meeting the proposed rule, as
15 Eric just summarized.

16 So, to enhance coping durations, the design
17 features should increase the amount of time that safety
18 functions can be maintained early in an event before
19 there's a need to augment the plant with onsite portable
20 equipment, or possibly even transition from plant
21 equipment to onsite portable equipment. And we believe
22 that enhancing coping durations provides the operators
23 with the time to plan and implement the onsite portable
24 mitigation strategy for the longer term coping. So, with
25 respect to the initial coping phase, enhanced coping

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 durations means coping with installed plant equipment
2 for at least 24 hours.

3 And we looked at this, we looked at the
4 existing designs, the AP1000, the ESBWR, and they had
5 coping durations, initial coping durations out to 72
6 hours. We looked at the Advanced Boiling Water Reactor,
7 it had initial coping duration out to 36 hours. We looked
8 at operating plants in general, and we saw some initial
9 coping durations that were on the order of five to eight
10 hours. Eric, please correct me if that's B- it's a rough
11 general idea about coping durations.

12 So, we also spoke with the Staff that had
13 been involved with the Fukushima activities, read the
14 Near-Term Task Force reports, and we came up with a
15 judgment that we felt that 24 hours would provide an
16 operator with ample time to implement the mitigation
17 strategy, keeping in line with this rule requirement
18 that says we need to have enhanced coping durations.
19 That's for the initial response phase.

20 Now, as far as the concept of enhanced
21 coping durations, we also applied that to the transition
22 phase, which is where you would B- at the end of that
23 transition phase you would bring in your offsite
24 equipment. So, we viewed that B- again, we looked at the
25 current certified designs and their capabilities, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so we came up with a judgment that the coping for that
2 transition phase if we want to bring in that offsite
3 equipment, we expect that to be at 72 hours. And that's
4 consistent with the current fleet of advanced reactor
5 designs. Are there any questions on the B- how we came
6 up with the 24 hours and 72 hours?

7 Now, additionally, we also have this
8 feature for B- in the initial response phase, we permit
9 use of an installed AC power engineered alternative, and
10 we refer to that as supplemental AC. Again, that has to
11 be protected from external hazards such as the flood and
12 the seismic. The basis for the eight hours was to be
13 consistent with the recommendations in the Near-Term
14 Task Force report. And we believe that this coping
15 duration will, again, provide ample time for operators
16 to start in line the supplemental AC source. It would
17 be permanently installed, normally disconnected from
18 the electrical bus, designed such that only minimal
19 operator action would be needed to put the system in
20 service, and we would expect that it would be diverse
21 and independent source from the emergency AC source.

22 With respect to human actions, you know,
23 the requirement to minimize reliance on human actions
24 we felt was consistent with the Advanced Reactor Policy
25 Statement, and we modeled this after the Aircraft Impact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Assessment Rule. We believe that the benefit of being
2 able to cope with an extended loss of AC power would
3 reduce reliance on operator actions, was also
4 recognized by the Near-Term Task Force report based on
5 the results of insights from the Fukushima Daiichi
6 accident.

7 So, greater reliance on design features
8 that would include well thought out human-machine
9 interfaces, would reduce reliance on and simplify
10 manual actions necessary to restore key safety
11 functions. So further reducing reliance on human
12 actions would also reduce the potential for human
13 failures during stressful adverse conditions.

14 So, for the initial response phase which is
15 our focus with respect to design features, the guidance
16 is we would expect minimal operator actions at limited
17 and protected locations, and that all necessary actions
18 to monitor and coordinate the control of the nuclear
19 facility can be performed in the main control room.
20 However, we also recognize that if there's an alternate
21 station that contains equipment specifically designed
22 for that purposes, that it could be also conducted from
23 outside the control room.

24 MEMBER STETKAR: So, a design that requires
25 that the operators completely de-energize the main

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 control room and shuffle off to another place that has
2 barely enough instrumentation available for them to
3 make sure they're adding some water is perfectly fine,
4 because that minimizes operator actions during a very
5 confusing situation.

6 MR. ASHLEY: The guidance doesn't preclude
7 geographically where the operators do command and
8 control, but I recognize that certainly if you were to
9 have to de-energize the control room to extend battery
10 life, that would be a more complicated action, and an
11 applicant would have to do sufficient technical
12 justification and provide that to the Staff in order for
13 them to make a judgment on that.

14 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

15 MR. ASHLEY: That's all I had for Appendix
16 A.

17 MR. BOWMAN: Okay, thanks, Clint. Draft
18 Guide 1319 is the final Draft Guide. In this guide we
19 consider three industry-developed guidance documents
20 to address the vast majority of the remaining
21 requirements that would be in place for 50.155.

22 The first of the industry documents, NEI
23 1201 should be familiar. It was the guidance document
24 that was endorsed for meeting the B- providing
25 information in response to the RFI of March 12th, 2012

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the staffing assessment for response to a multi-unit
2 event on site, and also providing the information for
3 the communications assessments.

4 The other two guidance documents that we're
5 looking at, the industry ones, NEI 1306 and NEI 1401,
6 NEI 1306 deals with the multi-unit dose assessment, the
7 types of training, drills, and exercises, and the
8 necessary facilities for emergency preparedness for a
9 multi-unit event.

10 NEI 1401 covers the command and control,
11 the integration of the different procedure sets, what
12 would be necessary to create an integrated response
13 capability of all the elements that are in 50.155. And
14 finally to provide some guidance on the development of
15 Severe Accident Management Guidelines.

16 It points back to the EPRI Technical Basis
17 Report for the Severe Accident Management Guidelines,
18 and does make mention of the Owners Groups guidelines.
19 We do include the we aren't endorsing secondary
20 references within the NEI document, so this is not
21 intended to be an endorsement of the Owners Group Severe
22 Accident Management Guidelines.

23 I'm not sure if you've had enough time to
24 look through the guidance documents, so we would, of
25 course, be happy to come back and discuss them further

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with you, as we'll have to do with Draft Guide 1301 once
2 that's finalized.

3 MR. REED: And, again, we mentioned a little
4 earlier the timing for the draft guidance is to try to
5 get it B- our process is to issue with the proposed rule,
6 so our estimate on that, of course, is that have to
7 reflect the Commission's deliberation on this proposed
8 rule. We have to take some guess at that, get the SRM,
9 fix the package and get it to the Federal Register. And
10 if you start working those numbers and you be reasonable
11 about it, I think something like maybe July of next year,
12 or this year, I guess, whatever year we're in, 2015,
13 would be about the estimated time that the rule would
14 probably be published, maybe even August. So, with
15 regard to the Draft Guidance and filling in the holes,
16 that would be the kind of time frame I think that we have
17 to finish what we have, have complete Draft Guidance
18 sufficient to get the stakeholder feedback on the Draft
19 Guidance to get to the final guidance.

20 And then it's up to the Committee. I mean,
21 you guys B- this is, obviously, a very important issue.
22 You guys have engaged with us quite a bit but, you know,
23 in other rules, as you well know, you don't engage on
24 Reg Guides until the Final Rule, so it's up to the
25 Committee whether you want to interact more with us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 before that goes out, during the public comment period,
2 wait until the Final Rule. Your call. We're here to do
3 whatever it is that you wish in that regard, so that's
4 basically what Eric was suggesting. I think I actually
5 have that on the last slide, too.

6 MR. BOWMAN: I already switched to the last
7 slide.

8 MR. REED: You did, so recognize that that's
9 there. That's a hole right now, if you will, in the Draft
10 Guidance, and industry I think is probably waiting for
11 the Final SRM on COMSECY 14-0037. I know that some work
12 on some of these appendices are going on, so we'll have
13 to see how that sorts out.

14 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Are there any other pieces
15 with regard to 1301 where you're anticipating further
16 appendices, other elements that would, perhaps, be
17 included?

18 MR. BOWMAN: Those are the two major items.
19 The current version, the current draft version of NEI
20 12-06 includes an appendix on AP1000 design and how it
21 can meet the Mitigating Strategies requirements. There
22 had been an effort earlier to generalize that to new
23 reactor designs.

24 And the other caution I would have is that
25 we don't have a final clean version of NEI 12-06, so I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can't tell you with certainty exactly what it's going
2 to look like, or whether or not we will have any further
3 clarifications or exceptions that we need to add to
4 13-01 until I see a final version. The version that this
5 was based on, this Version DG-1301 was based on was a
6 version that included redline strikeouts and comments
7 that still needed some cleaning up.

8 CHAIR SCHULTZ: That's helpful, thank you.

9 MR. BOWMAN: But I did want to give you a
10 sense of where we are currently with what we view as
11 appropriate guidance, what the state of affairs is right
12 now.

13 MR. REED: And that's part of my last slide,
14 the Staff's last slide here on status and path forward.
15 As I mentioned earlier, we are in office concurrence
16 right now. It's ongoing. I'm getting feedback from
17 offices. I'll certainly try to incorporate some of the
18 feedback that we've heard today, too. We need to get this
19 package after office concurrence up to the EDO on the
20 16th of April, and it needs to go and it will go to the
21 Commission on April 30th. So, that's the schedule. We're
22 on that schedule right now. We intend to meet it. As I
23 mentioned, the Draft Guidance will go out with the
24 Proposed Rule, and that I'm estimating in the summer.
25 And we're certainly here to, if you so wish, we'll try

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to interact with you, the Committee, as you wish on the
2 Draft Guidance.

3 As you're well aware, the Full Committee
4 meeting is on April 9th on the proposed rule. That a much
5 shorter, one or two-hour meeting, but a lot of the
6 Committee Members, of course, are participating. And
7 then, of course, we'll meet with the Full Committee and
8 the Subcommittee, of course, during the final rule
9 process, so that's the path forward and the status.

10 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Other questions for the
11 Staff from members of the Subcommittee? Hearing none,
12 I'll thank you now for the work that you've done in
13 preparation, and stay in the room in case there are more
14 questions. We're going to turn to the industry
15 presentation, and for the audience it's just going to
16 be a short break while we change chairs. We're not
17 leaving the record.

18 (Off the record comments)

19 CHAIR SCHULTZ: At this point, I'd like to
20 recognize David Young from NEI.

21 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Good afternoon. My
22 name is David Young, and I'm the Senior Project Manager
23 in the Emergency Preparedness Department at NEI. With
24 me are Bryan Ford from Entergy, and Bill Webster from
25 Dominion. We appreciate the opportunity to provide

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 industry comments and observations on the draft
2 proposed Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events Rule
3 to this ACRS Subcommittee.

4 At this time, I'm going to turn it over now,
5 and I'll turn it over to Bryan to go ahead and get started
6 on delivering our comments in the presentation.

7 MR. FORD: Well, as David said, my name is
8 Bryan Ford with Entergy, and I'm going to provide you
9 some industry high-level comments on the rulemaking. We
10 look forward to providing more during the rest of the
11 process.

12 To start off with some overall positives,
13 we think the right topics in general are in the
14 rulemaking, and the rulemaking reflects the significant
15 amount of work that has been done between the NRC and
16 the industry since Fukushima. You know, it does work to
17 codify the existing order requirements and commitments,
18 and the responses to the 50.54(f) letter.

19 We appreciate the fact that the Staff
20 intends to support the use of the previously developed
21 and the still developing industry guidance. There is
22 still additional work needed on that. Specifically, if
23 the seismic moves into the rulemaking, we don't have
24 guidance yet that supports that. And we do appreciate
25 the changes that have been made based upon previous

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 industry comments in the process.

2 Some areas that we think could use some
3 improvement. You know, the mitigation of
4 Beyond-Design-Basis Event capabilities needs to
5 address a spectrum of plant conditions that may be
6 caused by the different initiating events and the
7 resulting damage states. One thing that the current
8 proposed does is it basically requires that you assume
9 the ELAP condition and the loss of the heat sink even
10 when you're assessing the revised hazard response. We
11 think that in many of those cases you should be able to
12 use a alternate or targeted hazard mitigation strategy
13 that takes into account the actual state of the plant.
14 If the flood or whatever the event is doesn't cause a
15 loss of offsite power, then for that targeted hazard
16 strategy you shouldn't need to assess the extended loss
17 of AC power.

18 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Bryan, doesn't that take
19 the teeth out of the tiger?

20 MR. FORD: Well, we're really thinking
21 that, as we said before, that the current FLEX or 12-06
22 strategies were basically developed for an unknown set
23 of events, so instead of a known damage state, you're
24 basically taking I'm going to assume a damage state and
25 develop strategies to address that damage state.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Once we move to the revised hazards, we
2 think that we have a better understanding of what the
3 effect has been on the plant of that event, and we think
4 taking that into account for building the strategy
5 specific for that event is the appropriate thing to do.

6 MR. YOUNG: For that reevaluated hazard.

7 MR. FORD: For that reevaluated hazard.
8 You'll see in a second, we still think we need to keep
9 the overall FLEX capabilities, whether it's for flood
10 or for whatever the hazards are, but when we're going
11 in and building a specific strategy for the reevaluated
12 hazard we think we should be able to consider what the
13 effects of that reevaluated hazard has been on the
14 plant.

15 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Well, supposing I say
16 okay, well, I really haven't lost all of the ultimate
17 heat sink, I've only lost 20 percent of it?

18 MR. FORD: You know, you would have to
19 evaluate how you can say that, and whether or not the
20 equipment is still available. You'd have to go through
21 the whole process to assure that the necessary equipment
22 is available for the hazard that you just evaluated.

23 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I didn't lose all my AC,
24 I only lost two of my three lines.

25 MR. YOUNG: But I think when you would look

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at the strategies for that particular condition, then
2 you'd factor that into how you would build your
3 strategies.

4 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Now I have a custom
5 strategy.

6 MR. FORD: Yes, and we think in many cases
7 or in some cases for the reevaluated hazards plants are
8 going to need to build a specific strategy to deal with
9 the reevaluated hazard.

10 MR. YOUNG: There'll be information that we
11 will have now on the reevaluated hazard that would not
12 have been B- as Bryan said B- right, in this nebulous
13 damage state where everything is gone, that's the
14 underlying assumption, from the reevaluated hazards
15 you're going to have additional information that may
16 indicate that certain things are going to be available,
17 so you would have to have strategy sets that reflect the
18 availability of that equipment. In fact, an installed
19 power source, why wouldn't I use it?

20 MR. FORD: And on the other hand, it may also
21 say that other equipment isn't available that in your
22 primary FLEX strategy is, so you would need to take that
23 into account and deal with it for the targeted hazard.

24 MEMBER SKILLMAN: On the other hand, if I
25 just choose to not go through these permutations and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 combinations and simply say I'm in ELAP, and I've lost
2 access to my normal heat sink, doesn't the path forward
3 become very, very clear; even though it's complicated,
4 it's very clear?

5 MR. FORD: I'm not sure about that depending
6 upon what the reevaluated hazard has done at your plant.
7 You know, depending upon how you got into that ELAP state
8 and, you know, we make certain assumptions under the
9 12-06 current strategies on the availability of
10 equipment and what equipment is available and what
11 equipment isn't, and in the reevaluated hazard that
12 evaluated hazard may exceed those assumptions. And as
13 a result, you know, the plant can be in a greatly
14 different state potentially than we assumed for the base
15 FLEX flood or whatever it may be event.

16 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I understand your
17 explanation. It just seems to me that by asserting this
18 might be the better way to go you have created what can
19 be an unending series of evaluations to try to figure
20 out where you should be. And it seems to me that that's
21 not simplifying, that's complicating this issue.

22 MR. FORD: Well, hopefully, when we get to
23 the next slide B- I don't see that it complicates it
24 right yet, but we'll show you what our proposal is, and
25 we'll see.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

2 MR. FORD: One thing we do think, though, is
3 that the current proposal of including seismic into this
4 is inconsistent with the current seismic path forward
5 that we've been working on. Currently, the seismic path
6 forward that's being used is a risk-based path where
7 we're doing reviews of IPEEE information, we're doing
8 SPRAs. The flooding path in FLEX is of a deterministic
9 path forward. You know, you go and you build a specific
10 strategy for that. So, we currently don't have any
11 guidance that really goes towards incorporating the
12 reevaluated seismic hazard into FLEX, and how you would
13 do that. And we haven't started developing that yet.

14 MEMBER STETKAR: Why haven't you?

15 MR. FORD: Because right now the industry
16 path is that we are doing this risk-based path of doing
17 SPRAs, and using the IPEEEs for the plants that could.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: I guess I didn't
19 understand that answer, but that's okay.

20 MEMBER POWERS: I mean, is the difficulty or
21 the conundrum we have here that for seismic we have some
22 sort of probabilistic record that goes back a few
23 thousand years, but for floods, you know, maybe 100
24 years is all we have. Is that the conundrum?

25 MR. FORD: I think that is part of it. You

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, the stated current NRC position that I understand
2 is that they can't really assign probability numbers to
3 many of these flood events because of the amount of
4 information we have available. On the other hand, there
5 is numbers that are accepted for probability to seismic
6 events, and we're right now consistent with the industry
7 commitments for resolving the 50.54(f) letter. We're
8 off with the Tier 1 plants doing SPRAs currently.

9 So, our suggestion is twofold. One, where
10 in the proposed rulemaking the reevaluated hazard was
11 added back in the equipment section, we don't think
12 that's necessarily the right place to add it because
13 where it was put really only applies to the portable FLEX
14 equipment, and there's a lot to these strategies and
15 making one of these strategies for one of the hazards
16 than just the qualification of the portable equipment.
17 So, we think the appropriate place would be to bring it
18 up into the (b)(1) section where it says you have to
19 build a strategy or guideline that supports that
20 reevaluated hazard. And our view is that it doesn't
21 necessarily have to be directly connected to the
22 concurrent ELAP, but you need to do the current FLEX,
23 and then if you have a hazard that exceeds your current
24 FLEX, you also need to go evaluate that hazard for what
25 the appropriate strategy would be. And our current view

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is that you would limit that to the reevaluated flood
2 hazard consistent with the industry commitments.

3 So along with that, we wouldn't put it back
4 in the equipment section. We're not really sure the
5 equipment section as a whole is really necessary for the
6 rule. It's more stuff that should be controlled by
7 guidance. There's always chances that when you try to
8 take a large body of guidance and sum it up in a couple
9 of sentences that you lose the subtleties of what makes
10 that work. But as a minimum, we think that this would
11 B- this section on incorporating the revised hazard
12 would be best up in the "You must build your strategy
13 to address it," and leaving up what is reasonable
14 protection and how you decide that reasonable
15 protection robustness into the guidance.

16 On the new plant requirement that was
17 discussed earlier, we don't necessarily think that
18 those requirements are necessary to be added in for new
19 plants. That, one, the new plants are designed to the
20 higher review standards and design standards that are
21 identifying the revised hazards, so we're not sure that
22 those are necessary to be included in the rule.

23 Also, on SAMGs, we don't think using the
24 qualitative factors is in accordance with the
25 Commission direction given in the SECY, and so we think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that it would be more appropriate to achieve the
2 regulatory footprint that the Commission would like in
3 a different way. The industry has developed and is
4 committed to SAMGs, and we understand the goal is to have
5 a regulatory footprint to make sure we keep them in the
6 future, but we don't think that it seems that the current
7 method of justification is correct for including them
8 in the regulations.

9 MR. YOUNG: So, for example, if the basis
10 here of qualitative factors wasn't sufficient to get it
11 in the rules, then perhaps some sort of voluntary
12 industry docketed commitment might be a way of
13 establishing a footprint on it in the future. That
14 doesn't exist today. That may be one approach.

15 MEMBER REMPE: So, we have a voluntary
16 commitment. Isn't that what they had years ago, and then
17 they inspected after Fukushima and the voluntary
18 commitment wasn't kept up? So, what are you suggesting
19 at this time?

20 MR. YOUNG: Well, it would be a B- kind of
21 the word we used yesterday in some of the discussions,
22 a more reinvigorated and more vigorous kind of
23 commitment that carries more B-

24 MEMBER REMPE: Unless it's a regulatory
25 commitment, I don't B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Simultaneous speech)

2 MR. YOUNG: If it was a licensing basis
3 commitment of that nature, and I don't want to go into
4 a whole lot of specifics here because we'd have to talk
5 it through with a lot of folks, but certainly more than
6 just sort of the voluntary initiative that was
7 characterized back when it was rolled out in the '90s.

8 MR. FORD: So, I guess our main point is that
9 we don't think that the current justification in the
10 rulemaking package using the qualitative factors is
11 sufficient to justify the imposition of the
12 requirements as a regulation. We do understand the
13 desire and need to have, you know, appropriately
14 maintained and controlled SAMGs, and we support that,
15 and we're willing to work on how the appropriate way is
16 to include it, but we don't think B-

17 MEMBER STETKAR: Bryan, let me ask, does the
18 industry have that broad-based quantitative
19 justification to show that there isn't any benefit from
20 the SAMGs? Do you have all of those Level 2 PRAs that
21 you can show me how much B- how little benefit you get
22 from the SAMGs?

23 MR. FORD: No.

24 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. FORD: But to be clear, and this is as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a licensee for a long time, it's the NRC B- you know,
2 as the NRC has said in the past, there's a job for the
3 NRC, and a job for licensee.

4 MEMBER STETKAR: So, you can't quant B- you
5 can't tell me quantitatively that they're not
6 justified. The NRC can't tell me quantitatively that
7 they're not justified. You're telling me qualitatively
8 that you don't think they're justified.

9 MR. YOUNG: Well, no, I don't think that's
10 what we're saying.

11 MEMBER STETKAR: That's all I hear.

12 MR. YOUNG: You know, what we're saying is,
13 is the basis as currently written in the FRN doesn't get
14 you there. We don't think it gets you there, so there
15 was B-

16 MEMBER STETKAR: I'm asking do you have a
17 basis to disprove that?

18 MR. YOUNG: The Staff B-

19 MEMBER STETKAR: Quantitative, we want the
20 quantitative basis B-

21 MR. YOUNG: The Staff itself said that
22 quantitatively they can't get there, so we're going to
23 use qualitative approach to make it over the hump, and
24 we're saying when you look at the SECY, it's like
25 B- we're not seeing the sufficient rationale there for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 using qualitative factors. So, the solution is either
2 come up with more B- better quantitative rationale,
3 take some kind of administrative exception to backfit,
4 get a docketed commitment. I mean, there's other
5 approaches, so B-

6 MEMBER BLEY: Can I ask a B- you were here
7 for the Staff's presentation, and you've talked with
8 them on it. The way they're proposing to have oversight
9 of the SAMGs, at least to me seems a not very intrusive
10 way to do it. Do you have objections to the way they've
11 described how they would have that oversight, or are you
12 just objecting to the basis that they provided for
13 getting to that?

14 MR. FORD: The basis.

15 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

16 MR. FORD: The basis is the B-

17 MR. YOUNG: As I said, I don't think the
18 industry is objecting to maintaining and, you know, we
19 just put out documents to upgrade the SAMGs.

20 MEMBER BLEY: Anything inspections?

21 MR. YOUNG: Yes, I mean, yes, I always
22 expected B-

23 MEMBER BLEY: So, on the practical level you
24 are not objecting to how they want to pursue the SAMGs.

25 MR. YOUNG: It is the process that they're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 using to get there.

2 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Has the industry evaluated
3 the costs that are provided for the implementation, the
4 SAMG implementation, the costs that are in the
5 evaluation? Are they reasonable?

6 MR. YOUNG: Yes. We've looked at some of the
7 numbers in the Reg analysis and, quite frankly, aren't
8 prepared to discuss those here today, but I think we want
9 to go back and take a very good look at the numbers that
10 are in the Reg analysis and maybe just do some
11 independent scrubbing to see if we come up with
12 something in the same ballpark. I just had some recent
13 experience in the EP Rule back in 2011, and I think some
14 of the numbers that were in that Reg analysis weren't
15 borne out in the subsequent cost of implementation, so
16 I would want to go back and take a pretty hard look this
17 time around going in on the front end and see if we can
18 look at those estimated costs, and do they really
19 reflect all the B-

20 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Well, let me ask it
21 differently. The scope of what's described and costed
22 out, the scope of what is described there seems to be
23 what you say the industry would commit to with respect
24 to SAMGs, that portion of it, and then also an upgrade,
25 and making sure the Owners Groups and making the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 improvements that we've discussed, as well as assuring
2 that everyone is committed to, and performing, and
3 doing, and sustaining, and exercising, excuse me,
4 demonstrating through drills. All of that is to be done,
5 is what you're saying, the industry sees value in that.

6 MR. YOUNG: We don't see any B- we don't
7 have any objection to the current proposed requirements
8 that are in the FRN.

9 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Okay.

10 MR. YOUNG: So, having SAMGs, configuration
11 control, maintaining them up to date, drilling on them
12 periodically, that's all B-

13 MEMBER BLEY: You want to not have it a rule?
14 I'm having a little trouble seeing what you're
15 presenting to us.

16 MR. YOUNG: I think B- again, in our
17 discussions, I guess, you know, the message B- you know,
18 the point here in this presentation is to B- we're not
19 objecting to the requirements. We just think the Staff
20 needs to go back and take a look at the basis provided
21 in the FRN, and look at its consistency with this SRM,
22 and if they can't get through it through anything other
23 than qualitative measures, we ask that they go back and
24 think about another approach for providing a basis for
25 imposing the requirement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BALLINGER: So, what you're
2 objecting to is basically the administrative process?

3 MR. YOUNG: The imposition B- how the
4 requirement is imposed.

5 MEMBER BALLINGER: What is the downside?

6 MR. YOUNG: Well, because if you start to
7 use qualitative factors and defense-in-depth, that
8 becomes a slippery slope very quickly for everybody's
9 great idea.

10 MEMBER BALLINGER: Okay, so there's your
11 objection.

12 MR. YOUNG: You know, so everybody's got
13 great ideas, and I'm sure they all add defense-in-depth
14 at some point but, you know, the Commission said yes,
15 we want some kind of quantitative analysis. Right? I
16 mean, that's the expectation, so that's the concern.

17 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Do you have a way in which
18 you would characterize the safety benefit of SAMGs, not
19 only the SAMGs, but what has been proposed, which is that
20 B- and the industry is doing, assuring that there's
21 integration, operating procedures on up to response to
22 severe accidents.

23 MR. YOUNG: I think in our conversations,
24 you know, we've all along in our conversations,
25 interactions with the Staff, and the last time we were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in front of the Subcommittee, the industry has
2 acknowledged that, you know, we are prepared to support
3 having some kind of regulatory oversight of severe
4 accident management because they certainly do add some
5 additional level of mitigation capabilities, you know,
6 for accidents and protection of the public. So, you
7 know, quantifying the B- and I'm hedging a little bit
8 because of the way you kind of phrased it, which almost
9 goes more to, you know, have I looked at some of rigorous
10 analysis? No, I haven't. But, I mean, qualitatively,
11 that's kind of what we said, is we support it, we think
12 there's value to having it, and we think some kind of
13 oversight of it is appropriate. And we're just proposing
14 here, not to make light of what you said, but yes, it
15 is more of an administrative kind of thing because there
16 some other precedent issues that could come up.

17 CHAIR SCHULTZ: It's a policy matter.

18 MR. YOUNG: As a policy matter.

19 MEMBER REMPE: So what regulatory oversight
20 process could be invoked that gives assurance that the
21 voluntary effort wouldn't dissipate? I mean, you're
22 saying I don't mind doing it, I don't want it to be
23 imposed this way, so give me an example of what you'd
24 suggest.

25 MR. YOUNG: Well, I'm certainly nowhere

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 near as knowledgeable as Mr. Reed but, you know, I don't
2 know what the ultimate mechanism might be to fit this.
3 All we're saying is that the basis currently in there
4 now just needs to be looked at, just go back and rethink
5 that. Is there some other basis that gets you there
6 without having to invoke qualitative requirements in
7 this instance because of the precedent issue, and how
8 this could get B-

9 MEMBER BLEY: And especially
10 defense-in-depth.

11 MR. YOUNG: And particularly B- I mean, is
12 there anything isn't defense-in-depth at some point. I
13 mean, you could almost make that argument for just many,
14 many things, so B-

15 MEMBER BALLINGER: So, your issue is the use
16 of qualitative arguments period, and that's to start the
17 slippery slope, is what you're saying.

18 MR. YOUNG: Yes. In so many words, yes.

19 MEMBER BLEY: So if they say, went back and
20 looked at say some of the PRAs and then addressed some
21 of the events that we've heard, maybe not just
22 Fukushima, and said gee, there's uncertainty in how
23 likely some of these are, and attacked that uncertainty
24 basis, and from that showed there was a possibility of
25 a higher risk that might meet the Backfit Rule, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be more palatable.

2 MR. YOUNG: Well, clearly then you're in
3 accordance with the SECY. Right? Now, you've done a
4 quantitative set of analysis, and here's your results,
5 and this is what it shows, and you compare this B-

6 MEMBER BLEY: Maybe substantial judgment
7 involved in it, but it's a quantitative B-

8 MR. YOUNG: Well, it's a quantitative
9 assessment. Now, again, that's not to say that, you
10 know, we might have comments on that in public comment
11 period, and we could certainly talk about those at that
12 point, but certainly something like that would be more
13 of a path for getting a quantitative rationale.

14 MEMBER BLEY: From the way you've talked it
15 seems there's not an easy mechanism, or a previously
16 adopted mechanism to get these kind of requirements in
17 place other than a rule. Is that right? You suggested
18 something but it had no stuff there, no substance there.

19 MR. FORD: We would have to sit down and talk
20 to the Staff over what the appropriate mechanism is. The
21 previous voluntary industry initiative that put SAMGs
22 in, I mean, as the Site Licensing Manager, that is not
23 as near and dear to my heart as I wrote a letter that
24 had a regulatory commitment in it that I track to make
25 sure that it's done. So, there may be other mechanisms

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we could use that raises the B- at least the perceived
2 B-

3 MR. YOUNG: So, we could have some public
4 engagement that hopefully we come up with the right, you
5 know, the right form letter, for lack of a better term,
6 that has the right words in it, and that's the commitment
7 letters everybody sends in.

8 MEMBER BALLINGER: Well, let be clear
9 again. The objection is the qualitative factors, the use
10 of qualitative factors because you're concerned C-now
11 maybe I'm putting words in your mouth, of the
12 subjectivity that can creep into using qualitative
13 factors, the definition of qualitative factors.

14 MR. YOUNG: It's the use of qualitative
15 factors to B- as a substitute for not getting there
16 quantitatively, because if you look at what the SECY
17 said, right, it's quantitative factors, and you can
18 inform the decision making with qualitative. But, you
19 know, we expect some sort of quantitative basis for this
20 information, and it's like well, they did the
21 quantitative measure, it's like no, we didn't get there.
22 Okay, so now we go over the hump by using qualitative
23 measures, and that just doesn't seem to be the right B- I
24 mean, so where does that stop? So, every time I don't
25 get them from quantitative measures, I'm going to invoke

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 qualitative measures? I mean B-

2 MEMBER BLEY: If you look at Reg Guide 1.174

3 B-

4 MR. YOUNG: Which I haven't.

5 MEMBER BLEY: B- which is used in a
6 different way, but that has you do risk calculations,
7 but also has you go through an integrated decision
8 process where you can bring things that may be
9 responsible for extensive uncertainty, or lacks of
10 knowledge into that decision process to jointly come up
11 with a basis for considering the impact of changes. It's
12 not quite what's written into the Backfit Rule or that
13 sort of thing, but it is a kind of process that
14 integrates strictly quantitative with a consideration
15 of factors that are difficult to quantify. That sort of
16 approach would smell better, or maybe not.

17 MR. YOUNG: You know, I'm going to have to
18 plead ignorance. I have not read that.

19 MEMBER BLEY: Well, the other gentlemen
20 probably are not ignorant of B-

21 MR. WEBSTER: 1.174 is where we risk-inform
22 tech spec submittals.

23 MEMBER BLEY: Yes.

24 MR. WEBSTER: Again, as risk-informed the
25 quantitative numbers are B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BLEY: Are part of it, but also
2 there's an integrated B-

3 MR. WEBSTER: Right.

4 MEMBER BLEY: B- process to consider things
5 that you haven't yet figured out how to quantify
6 properly.

7 MR. FORD: And I don't know how well that
8 comports with the legal requirements, you know, in the
9 Backfit Rule for significant safety benefits. I haven't
10 thought of how that would connect to B-

11 MR. YOUNG: Yes. So, I mean, I don't think
12 necessarily we were going to solve the thing here, but
13 it was just to make this comment, and if we had to have
14 some subsequent engagement with the Staff to find out,
15 you know, hey, what is the best path forward for this,
16 happy to have that engagement and figure out what that
17 right solution is.

18 MEMBER BLEY: I assume this conversation
19 has been going on with the Staff.

20 MR. YOUNG: We've had some recent
21 conversations.

22 MEMBER BLEY: So, it's fairly recent.

23 MR. YOUNG: Well, we just saw this last
24 week. Right?

25 MEMBER BLEY: Yes, but you kind of knew what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was coming, but go ahead.

2 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes, as this is the
3 Fukushima Subcommittee, I throw out some B- another
4 thought for a B- a thought exercise, and that is at least
5 to me when Fukushima happened, and the response in the
6 days just thereafter by the NRC, and by the industry,
7 and the United States seemed to at least rely partly on
8 the fact that our reactors were safe, and some of that
9 depended upon, I believe, the fact that we have Severe
10 Accident Management Guidelines, we have things in
11 place. We had a lot of work that we had done in terms
12 of safety, operator performance beyond just operating
13 the facilities, but going into elements associated with
14 severe accident response, and leading up to there. So,
15 that just tells me that, as you've said, this is an
16 important feature, and it does concern me that we can't
17 quantifiably demonstrate that this is an important part
18 of what we do. We want to do it, and with some reasonable
19 oversight by the Staff, we're willing to proceed. I hope
20 we can find a way soon to make this happen.

21 I understand your point in terms of policy,
22 the slippery slope discussion.

23 (Simultaneous speech)

24 MR. YOUNG: Yes, I just want to stress
25 again, this isn't a question of pushing back on the right

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulatory footprint. That's not what B-

2 CHAIR SCHULTZ: In terms of decision
3 making, it seems as if we ought to be there but we're
4 not, decision making to move forward and figure a way
5 to set up the process.

6 MEMBER BLEY: I mean, the reason we all
7 think it's important, I think, is because despite what
8 we calculate events crop up every once in a while, maybe
9 every 20 years or further than that, that puts us into
10 a spot, but these would be really good to have. Then we
11 say well, our calculations are still okay because we've
12 done a better job on some of this than somebody else has.
13 But there are a few areas of uncertainty that could
14 affect this.

15 MR. YOUNG: Take the flip side though, too,
16 is that now we have FLEX in place, right, which we didn't
17 have before, so there's that whole other barrier that's
18 in place now. I think that's obviously something to
19 reflect on when you start thinking about SAMGs.

20 MEMBER BLEY: Absolutely. And the
21 procedures for FLEX need to get integrated with all this
22 stuff.

23 MR. YOUNG: That's right.

24 DR. SHACK: Just going back for a second to
25 your reevaluated hazards, I mean, the orders were put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in place to deal with Beyond-Design-Basis accidents and
2 external events, and you've just stripped seismic out
3 of it. It just seems a little peculiar.

4 MR. FORD: Well, the orders had you build a
5 set of capabilities for Beyond-Design-Basis Events, and
6 within those there was constraints put upon how you made
7 the assumptions for designing those systems. You know,
8 in most cases something that was robust for your current
9 hazard was considered robust sufficiently to use for the
10 FLEX hazard. So, it was just one of those constraints;
11 otherwise, what would you have picked, you know,
12 something X, Y, or Z? So our current FLEX designs have
13 been built there.

14 Now, we did a B- I always forget the
15 acronym, ESEP evaluation for plants whose GRMS was
16 exceeding it in certain requirements to provide a level
17 of confidence that FLEX could perform it beyond the
18 current design basis. You know, what we are really
19 pointing out is not that in the long run whether we make
20 FLEX support a reevaluated seismic hazard or not, at
21 least my way of looking at it, my real point was, one,
22 that's not what we're doing right now. We're off
23 spending millions of dollars doing SPRAs because that
24 was the path decided, and if you B- if we want to change
25 track, so far the industry has not committed to do this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 other track for the revised seismic hazard, and you can
2 impose it, but then you need to evaluate that revised
3 track under the Backfit analysis.

4 MR. YOUNG: And have the guidance.

5 MR. FORD: And have the documents, and we
6 haven't yet put together the guidance on how to do that.
7 You know, as we found with flooding, it's not as simple
8 as, you know, just saying go use these new numbers and
9 make it work. So, what we're really pointing out is that
10 right now what's in this B- what's in the proposed
11 rulemaking for the area of the seismic reevaluated
12 hazard is not consistent with the current industry
13 commitments for resolving the 50.54(f) letter. And if
14 it's going to stay inconsistent with our commitments,
15 then it needs to be appropriately evaluated under
16 Backfit and the appropriate guidance put together.

17 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: This is Pete
18 Riccardella. Could I make a comment?

19 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes, Pete, go ahead.

20 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yes. You know, I think
21 regarding the seismic assessment, I mean, it's one thing
22 when you have a bunch of existing equipment out there
23 that's been there for years and years, and now you've
24 got a new ground motion response spectra, and the
25 appropriate road to go is a seismic risk assessment, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're talking about new equipment that we're putting in,
2 or that's been put in very recently when you had a pretty
3 good idea what the new seismic criteria were going to
4 be. I can't understand why it wouldn't be designed to
5 the new seismic ground response spectra.

6 MR. WEBSTER: Well, one thing just B- you
7 know, the FLEX order was implemented before the GMRS
8 data was available to all sites, so it was B- we did it.
9 We started implementing the FLEX before that
10 information was available.

11 MR. YOUNG: Well, one thing, too B- let me
12 just throw out a lifeline here. So, we've got Andrew
13 Maller here from NEI who is heading up our interface on
14 the seismic stuff, so let Andrew speak here for a minute
15 on what he can share with this.

16 MR. MALLER: Thanks, David. So, I did just
17 want to mention that we do have a number of activities
18 going on in response to the 50.54(f) letter. In large
19 part, a number of the plants are doing SPRAs that take
20 out to 2020 under the current schedule, so that's the
21 first phase of the 50.54(f) response. Phase 2 is where
22 the NRC will look at any potential design-basis changes
23 after that. So, what's unclear right now is where this
24 rulemaking fits into the overall schedule for closure
25 there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We're trying to work that out. We don't have
2 the answers right now. It's not been at the top of our
3 list. We've had a number of Near-Term actions that we've
4 been working on that are also a part of the 50.54(f)
5 response, including figuring out the scope for
6 high-frequency limit evaluations, about fuel pool
7 evaluations, finishing up the expedited approach that
8 Bryan mentioned, so there's a number of things going on.
9 We're trying to figure out how the overall strategy for
10 closure on 2.1 seismic relates to this rulemaking, so
11 the idea is, like we said, we're not trying to say we
12 don't think this ought to be a part of this rulemaking.
13 What we're saying is that it needs to be a part of this
14 rulemaking once we get the guidance put together to
15 support this, and we're not there yet. So, one
16 B- obviously, one possibility is to just put a pause on
17 the rulemaking and wait for us to come up with the
18 guidance for seismic. Or the other concept would be to
19 pull out this part for now until we come up with that
20 working with the Staff, and then find the time to work
21 that in.

22 MR. YOUNG: So, your second option, you're
23 talking about like a placeholder, move forward with this
24 and then fill it in later. Is that B-

25 MR. MALLER: Yes, I think there's different

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulatory options in order to do that. Our point was
2 not that the rulemaking should not include seismic as
3 an external hazard, but the way it's set up right now,
4 it doesn't quite reflect the path that we're on, and we
5 don't have the guidance yet to support where we're going
6 to end up relative to mitigation strategies in terms of
7 seismic.

8 MEMBER STETKAR: Well, I thought the order
9 was a way to proceed ahead on the seismic event in a
10 restricted sense where you looked at the consequences
11 as being an ELAP and a loss of ultimate heat sink. I would
12 look at the seismic PRA as something above that, that
13 if we get new insights out of that, it could lead to
14 regulatory action above and beyond that. But this was
15 already considered as an adequate protection event for
16 the seismic in a broad kind of sense that you really
17 weren't quite sure what the consequences were, but you
18 took a base case. And I don't see that that has to in
19 any way conflict with what's going on under 2.1. To me,
20 they're separate tracks, and you can proceed ahead with
21 this rule, which essentially just embodies the orders.
22 It's not really from that point of view, as the Staff
23 made the argument before, it's not imposing any new
24 requirements beyond what the orders did.

25 MR. FORD: And from our point of view, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 orders did have us build mitigating capabilities for a
2 seismic event, and instead of developing a new seismic
3 spectrum or GRMS to evaluate against, you use the
4 current design base B-

5 MEMBER STETKAR: Here's the problem, and
6 this will help Pete also. There are plants out there who
7 are taking installed equipment and taking credit for it
8 as part of their FLEX strategy and enhancing, because
9 it's not qualified right now to the existing seismic
10 earthquake, enhancing that equipment so it meets the
11 current seismic design basis. Those plants know fully
12 well that their reevaluated seismic hazard will be far
13 above their existing design basis. The strategy is you
14 build it, you enhance it to the existing design basis,
15 and then you say you can't justify further enhancing it
16 under a Backfit Rule. That's why we're having this
17 discussion.

18 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: It seems to me that the
19 worst case would be that you've got this equipment put
20 into your original SSE, you've got the new GRMS. The
21 minimum you should have to do is a seismic risk
22 assessment, or seismic margins analysis of that new
23 equipment at least to show, you know, that it can
24 withstand the new hazard. Maybe you didn't design it,
25 just like you didn't design the original stuff, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's what your seismic risk assessment is doing, is
2 showing that you have sufficient margin.

3 MR. FORD: And we have done the ESEP that
4 evaluated installed equipment. It was a subset of
5 equipment to a higher seismic standard for those plants
6 it was applicable to show that they were robust beyond
7 their current design basis. But just one point of
8 clarification, every plant is using for their FLEX
9 strategies a fair amount of installed equipment. I mean,
10 if you're going to have a portable pump and inject, you
11 have to inject it into something, or you have to have
12 tank that it's getting water out of, so everybody is
13 using a fair amount of installed equipment in these
14 strategies, and you have to.

15 So, our point was right now for the 50.54(f)
16 letter is out path for resolving, you know, any safety
17 concerns associated with the revised spectra has been
18 depending upon your spectra, and whether you had IPEEE
19 that covered it, and all these other things, has been
20 a probabilistic approach in many cases. We have not B-

21 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: So, as a minimum you
22 would do that on the newly installed FLEX equipment, as
23 well. Right?

24 MR. FORD: On the newly installed B- you
25 know, the B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER STETKAR: Pete, it's not newly
2 installed equipment. It's stuff that is there B-

3 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Well, somebody B-

4 MEMBER STETKAR: No, wait. The stuff of
5 concern is the existing pumps, and valves, and piping,
6 and tanks, and you know, that's already there in the
7 plant.

8 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: I understand that, and
9 the plan is to do a seismic risk assessment or a margins
10 assessment of that. But then there's additional new
11 stuff that they're putting in, and if they didn't do that
12 to the new ground motion, I'm assuming that they will
13 do a sort of risk assessment on that.

14 MR. FORD: Well, it would be included, as
15 necessary, into the SPRA risk assessment. I mean, if you
16 ended up needing to credit that equipment to
17 appropriately characterize the risk for your plant,
18 then you would, but if it wasn't, you know, part of what
19 you needed to look at to appropriately bound the risk,
20 then you may not.

21 MR. YOUNG: Andrew, is there any other
22 clarity you can offer on that?

23 MR. MALLER: Well, I was just going to say,
24 I mean, obviously we did the expedited seismic
25 evaluation process where we looked at a subset of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 equipment related to FLEX for an increased seismic
2 hazard beyond the design-basis and, you know, across the
3 fleet the results of that have been very positive with
4 very B- with the number of plants without any
5 modifications identified as a result of that. So, we've
6 demonstrated the seismic margin within the fleet.

7 There are some questions here popping up,
8 and I think that really gets to the point of why we don't
9 think we're ready to move forward with this in the
10 rulemaking, and we need to figure out what the guidance
11 looks like. So, I think it's this sort of dialogue that
12 really contributes to that point. We're just not there
13 yet. That's all the message is, is we're just not there
14 yet, and we need to work with the Staff to put it
15 together.

16 MR. WEBSTER: Yes. And we definitely are not
17 saying that we don't think seismic should be considered.
18 We just think it's, like you said, we've just go some
19 more evaluations to do to determine what the right
20 safety improvement is, and what right evaluations need
21 to be done.

22 MEMBER REMPE: Before you leave this B- I'm
23 back on the Severe Accident Management Guidance, and I
24 think I heard you say we aren't opposed to regulatory
25 footprint, just the way that you've B- or the basis for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it. And there were specific items mentioned about having
2 configuration control, drilling them, et cetera. For
3 the et cetera, during the earlier discussion, the Staff
4 mentioned that industry had offered that we B- they
5 could do some sort of collaborative review or something
6 and, you know, to say well, did you think of this, and
7 you need to include this, and is that your perception,
8 too, that you don't mind having B- they're not going to
9 do a detailed review. We heard the Staff say that, and
10 also put it in several documents, but what about
11 interactions and some sort of not a detailed official
12 review, but some sort of interchange and oversight that
13 way?

14 MR. YOUNG: Right. So, what you're asking
15 that really involves the Owners Groups, and so I'm not
16 an Owners Group representative, but let me if I can,
17 again, reach out to my lifeline here. So, Jack
18 Stringfellow, are you on?

19 CHAIR SCHULTZ: No, he would not be able to
20 talk. We can open the line.

21 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Just give me one moment
22 here. I just want to see if he's able to hop on. Jack
23 is the Chairman of the PWR OG, and was instrumental in
24 coming up with the proposal that Tim referred to earlier
25 with respect to how this material could be looked at by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Staff on a periodic basis.

2 MEMBER REMPE: Oh, so there's some sort of
3 written proposal that has B-

4 MR. YOUNG: There is a joint letter that the
5 Owners Group sent in, the PWR/BWR Owners Group sent a
6 joint letter offering a process by which the Staff could
7 periodically look at updates to SAMG material. There
8 was, I want to call a comment period in line with what
9 Tim said earlier about it's not really a review, but
10 there's a period in which the Staff can review this,
11 provide some comments and feedback back if there's open
12 questions, have some dialogue, make sure there's a clear
13 understanding before it would go out to the industry.

14 MEMBER REMPE: That would be actually good
15 if we could see that letter, and then if he has some
16 comments about it.

17 CHAIR SCHULTZ: The line is open, we
18 believe, so just ask and see if he's available.

19 MR. YOUNG: Okay, thank you. Hey, Jack
20 Stringfellow, are you on the line? Anybody from the
21 PWROG?

22 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Not hearing any, we'll
23 close the line. He may be out there, we just don't know.

24 MR. YOUNG: That's right. Okay. I do feel,
25 again, I'm not B- I can't speak B-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR SCHULTZ: But B-

2 MR. YOUNG: I'm sorry, go ahead.

3 CHAIR SCHULTZ: But let's see what
4 information you might be able to provide to us.

5 MR. YOUNG: Well, again, that was a summary.
6 I don't want to get too much more into that because I
7 think that starts to get directly into their business.
8 But I have seen the letter, I do know the letter was sent
9 it, and again was jointly signed by both the
10 Chairpersons of their organizations, and it did offer
11 B- I believe that the term that was used in the letter,
12 in the offer letter was audit, is what they called it.

13 CHAIR SCHULTZ: If it happens to be
14 internal, we'll get it here.

15 MEMBER STETKAR: It was sent to the Staff?

16 MR. YOUNG: Absolutely, yes, yes. Yes, they
17 have it. And, in fact, the Owners Groups were attempting
18 to be responsive to a request that came up in the meeting
19 that Tim referred to back in May when we had that two-day
20 workshop on SAMGs. This was one of the questions that
21 the Staff asked for, and the Owners Groups were
22 responsive to it. So, it is a process where, you know,
23 I think the term they used in the letter was an audit.
24 But, again, providing this material in advance on an
25 electronic portal because it is, of course, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proprietary information, but giving B- I believe from
2 memory, I think it was a 60-day review period to give
3 the Staff plenty of time to review it and take a look
4 at it, provide some comments or suggestions, or
5 questions, and then get those resolved before it was
6 sent out.

7 MEMBER REMPE: But getting those resolved
8 sounds like a nice phrase that I'd like to see that
9 letter.

10 MR. YOUNG: Yes, and I believe that's
11 clearly the intent. I mean, obviously, now if we thought
12 something was going to B- and here I am speaking for
13 them. I believe their intent was if it was something that
14 was going to drag on for quite a period of time, there
15 was all kinds of other goods in the update package, then
16 what they would probably do is maybe take that one
17 element out, let's get all the other good stuff out
18 there, and then we would B-

19 MEMBER REMPE: That's a good letter to see,
20 so thank you.

21 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

22 CHAIR SCHULTZ: All right. We're ready for
23 Slide 7.

24 MR. FORD: Okay. Just a few other comments.
25 The new staffing and communication requirements that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 were put into Appendix E, we don't think that they should
2 go in Appendix E. We think they should come up into this
3 new Part 50.155. We're concerned that putting these back
4 into Appendix E will cause some confusion of the
5 appropriate change controls, whether or not they're
6 part of the e-plans, and you apply the e-plan change
7 controls to them versus the change controls of the
8 section.

9 MR. YOUNG: And we appreciate the fact that
10 there's some language in there now to that extent, but
11 we just think that just the cleaner approach is just to
12 keep it with the rest of the rule. So, we just suggest
13 that everything be in 50.155. We think it's where it
14 belongs.

15 MR. FORD: We also think on the change
16 control that there needs to be some more discussion,
17 maybe potentially some changes in the other sections.
18 We're concerned about the going forward interaction
19 between the normal design-base change controls and the
20 change controls in this section. You know, we agree that
21 you have to evaluate that in the appropriate areas it's
22 just making sure that the lines are clear for when you
23 just evaluate it against these Beyond-Design-Base
24 requirements versus you evaluate it against your fire
25 protection program requirements, or your security plan,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or whatever those normal design-base requirements are.

2 MR. YOUNG: So, this was Tim's example
3 earlier in his presentation. So, if clearly in
4 design-basis space, you know, propping open security
5 doors, you know, not a thing you can do, but if I'm
6 evaluating a BDBE event, and it's clearly a BDBE event,
7 and that's the only time it's ever going to get used,
8 and the change control processes just somehow recognize
9 the acceptability of that propping that security door
10 open is okay in these conditions.

11 A couple of comments on the implementation
12 period. We would suggest using four years versus the two
13 outage item. You know, what happens with the two outage
14 item all depending upon timing, some plants end up
15 getting a very short window, potentially, and if four
16 years is acceptable, then we think it would be
17 appropriate just to put that in so they'd have time to
18 implement.

19 And the last one is that we would request
20 that we be given a fair amount of time to comment on this
21 when it does come out. If we can get 120 days or that
22 time frame, we think that would make it much easier for
23 us to provide good comments, and would keep down the need
24 for us to submit a request for an extension. And I think
25 that is the end of the industry comments.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR SCHULTZ: All right. Any further
2 questions from the Committee to the industry with regard
3 to the presentation? Hearing none, the next segment of
4 the agenda is to ask for public comments, so we'll go
5 ahead and open the phone line. And while the phone line
6 is being opened, I'll ask if there are any comments from
7 individuals in the room, comments that would be like to
8 be made to the Committee? We're seeing none here, so I'll
9 wait for a moment to get the signal that the line is open.
10 The line is open as far as we know, but for us to assure
11 that we need someone to say hello.

12 MR. LYMAN: Hello, this is Ed Lyman from
13 UCS. Can you hear me?

14 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes, we can hear you, Ed.

15 MR. LYMAN: Okay, great.

16 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Please make a comment, if
17 you'd like to.

18 MR. LYMAN: Yes, I would. Thank you. I'm
19 sorry I can't be there in person today.

20 I have two comments. One is in response to
21 what we just heard from the industry. And I was actually
22 quite surprised to hear that they have a proposal which
23 is very similar to what UCS proposed back in 2012 when
24 the first Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for a Prolonged
25 SBO rule was put out.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Ed, just a moment. You're
2 breaking up on this end, and it may be the system.

3 MR. LYMAN: Okay.

4 CHAIR SCHULTZ: But are you on a speaker
5 phone?

6 MR. LYMAN: Yes. Well, I'll try the handset.

7 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you very much.

8 MR. LYMAN: Is that better?

9 CHAIR SCHULTZ: We'll find out in a moment.
10 Thank you. Go ahead.

11 MR. LYMAN: Okay. So, we submitted comments
12 back in July 2012 where we proposed that the success path
13 approach should be taken where you define the series of
14 external event scenarios and you carry them through to
15 their conclusion, and you determine how the plant and
16 the auxiliary or emergency equipment and the personnel
17 will respond. And then you carry that through
18 consistently. So that sounds like it's not too far from
19 the approach that the industry was just proposing, which
20 is a lot different from B- their argument was always we
21 just want to consider this artificial boundary
22 condition, some mysterious event causing an ELAP and a
23 loss of access to the ultimate heat sink, and we don't
24 know how that happened, and we're not going to think
25 about the ways in which it happened. We're just going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to focus on that. And we always thought that seemed to
2 be an artificial and unrealistic approach. So, to the
3 extent that approach can be integrated again into this
4 process, we'd welcome it, but we also point out, as the
5 industry did, that the B- what's sauce for the goose
6 might be sauce for the gander, and the implications of
7 that may go in a different direction for some scenarios
8 than what the industry was anticipating, which was that
9 things might be worse than that artificial ELAP
10 scenario. So, I think that's encouraging.

11 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Ed, was that a letter from
12 UCS to the Commission?

13 MR. LYMAN: Yes, it was a comment on the
14 Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

15 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes.

16 MR. LYMAN: It was May 7th, 2012.

17 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you.

18 MR. LYMAN: Now, on the question of SAMGs
19 and qualitative factors, first of all, I think there
20 B- I think the industry is misreading the SRM, because
21 the way I read it B- well, the way it B- what it says
22 is that you use quantitative methods to the extent
23 possible, but where they're not appropriate or
24 possible, then you can use qualitative measures. It's
25 not saying you can throw anything at the problem and say

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's defense-in-depth. I think in the case of SAMGs
2 there seems to be a large consensus from the Near-Term
3 Task Force to what I heard from the members of the
4 Committee that increasing the regulatory rigor of the
5 SAMGs would be a positive development, and a significant
6 increase in defense-in-depth, and that it's not just,
7 you know, throwing some arbitrary measure at it and
8 saying this is going to give us more defense-in-depth.
9 That seems to be singled out as a very significant policy
10 shift, and to the extent we think that should give
11 considerable weight to going forward with what the Task
12 Force recommended, and that's making SAMGs a rigorous,
13 regulatory requirement that would entail significant
14 review of not just checking the boxes, but insuring that
15 it's actually a meaningful and workable plan.

16 So, if you're not going to review the
17 details of the plan that thoroughly, then that's a more
18 performance-based approach, and then you need to
19 reflect that in enhanced exercises. And I don't know if
20 the exercise, the drill and exercise provisions in this
21 draft would be adequate to fully demonstrate that. So,
22 I don't think you can have B- you need one or the other.
23 Either you do a comprehensive sanity check on the SAMGs,
24 or you require the licensees to demonstrate through
25 performance testing that they'll work. So, I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is going to need to be beefed up. So, I think that's all
2 I have.

3 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Ed, this is Steve.

4 MR. LYMAN: Yes.

5 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you very much for your
6 comments, and they did come through very clearly, so
7 thank you very much.

8 MR. LYMAN: I appreciate it.

9 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Are there others on the
10 phone line that would like to make a comment? If so,
11 please identify yourself, and make your comment.

12 MR. WILLIAMSON: This is Bill Williamson
13 from TVA. I'm representing the BWROG and the PWROG.

14 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes, Bill.

15 MR. WILLIAMSON: Can you hear me?

16 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Yes. Please go ahead with a
17 comment. Thank you.

18 MR. WILLIAMSON: My only comment is that
19 both the Boiling Water Reactor Owners Group and the PWR
20 Owners Group are validating their SAMGs. We're doing it
21 with every means we have possible right now. For
22 example, the PWRs has scheduled a time to go to the three
23 different vendor's simulators and try them out and see
24 how they work. The BWROG is going through the actual
25 events that occurred at Fukushima Daiichi Units 1, 2,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and 3 and looking to see how the SAMGs and supporting
2 documents, TSGs would work through this. The Boilers and
3 the PWRs are communicating with each other on what our
4 findings are, and we expect to share this information
5 with one another. And I think we will find some way to
6 share it with the Staff, also.

7 MR. YOUNG: Bill, this is David Young. I
8 mean, clearly, you guys have already done a significant
9 amount of work already, the stuff that Tim referred to
10 earlier. Right? So, these are just ongoing work
11 activities to further enhance or improve the SAMG
12 guidance. Is that a fair characterization?

13 MR. WILLIAMSON: David, that is a fair
14 characterization. That is correct.

15 MEMBER BLEY: Any other comments, Bill?

16 MR. WILLIAMSON: I guess I would just add
17 that one of the main focuses of what we're doing is to
18 look at instrument readings and figure out how to
19 validate them whether they're giving us a true
20 indication, or where they're indicating error. And
21 that's where a lot of our efforts have gone on, and are
22 going on currently, also.

23 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you. Are there other
24 members of the public who like to make a comment for the
25 record? Please state your name and make a comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Hearing none, we'll B-

2 MEMBER REMPE: Before you do that, if Bill
3 is B-

4 CHAIR SCHULTZ: No. It is a public comment
5 period at this point. That's how we've announced it.
6 We'll go ahead and close the phone line.

7 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Bill.

8 MR. WILLIAMSON: You're welcome.

9 CHAIR SCHULTZ: All right. At this point
10 then, like to have comments by members of the Committee,
11 the Subcommittee. Joy, any closing comments?

12 MEMBER REMPE: Okay. I appreciated the
13 presentations from the Staff and their efforts, as well
14 as from industry today. The Staff during their
15 presentation did mention about the B- their willingness
16 to come back and communicate with us about the Draft
17 Guides in upcoming months, and I would like to have put
18 my vote in that I'd like to see that interaction occur.

19 With respect to what industry presented,
20 definitely as I mentioned during the discussion, I'd
21 like to see this letter from the BWR and PWR Owners
22 Group. And then with respect to what Bill Williamson
23 said on the line, I would like to, again B- and I've
24 mentioned this to the Staff about B- or with the
25 industry about the interactions with the Staff and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 results of his audits. And he said well, we'd like to
2 find a way to communicate to the regulator. And, again,
3 those kind of details would I think provide more
4 confidence with respect to me on what was occurring.

5 Also, I really had wanted to ask but we're
6 not allowed to interact with the public commentors about
7 what B- I mean, I think Bill mentioned that they were
8 just doing the Fukushima Daiichi event, but what events
9 in the PWR Owners Group evaluating just one event for
10 the instrumentation B-

11 MR. YOUNG: No, the Ownerships look at a
12 range of different events. I think Bill was just trying
13 to B- what he thought was the interest of this crowd
14 because of the nature of the mitigating design-basis
15 events rule of Fukushima, but I mean they regularly look
16 at OEs from a variety of different B-

17 MEMBER REMPE: But for the Severe Accident
18 Management Guidelines, and to validate the
19 instrumentation performance, are they looking at a
20 range of events?

21 MR. YOUNG: They look at a range of
22 conditions in the guidance for which alternate
23 indications, confirming indications, calculation aids,
24 trends. If you don't get an accurate reading, what's the
25 trend? Those kinds of tools are all talked about in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Severe Accident Management Guidance from both Owners
2 Groups.

3 MEMBER REMPE: They are talked about but to
4 validate that they would survive, that's not in what
5 I've seen for Severe Accident Management Guidance. And
6 when they B- and feeling, knowing exactly when you can
7 and can't trust. And I believe there are some activities
8 to do that. I wasn't sure of the B- I wanted it on the
9 record, so I'm glad you said although they're looking
10 at a range of events.

11 MR. YOUNG: Am I on the record?

12 MEMBER REMPE: Right, I'm glad to hear that,
13 but I'd like, again, if there were that exchange in
14 having that with some sort of discussion with the
15 regulator, it would make me feel better.

16 MR. YOUNG: So, let me say this, and maybe
17 this will help. What Tim referred to a little while back
18 was in May we had a two-day workshop, and I think
19 everybody B- it seemed like everybody and their mother
20 from the Staff was in this workshop. And day one was the
21 PWRs, and day two was the BWRs. And it was a full day
22 of going through soup to nuts, everything, all the
23 guidance, the calc aids, the tech support guidelines,
24 some of the basis information, and answering all those
25 questions. And the idea of this two-day workshop was,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if you will, try to baseline the Staff's knowledge on
2 where are we right now? What are all the improvements
3 that we've made since Fukushima, I should say the Owners
4 Groups, the Owners Groups have made there. And try to
5 get that information out there, and that understanding
6 out there. And then with the idea being that kind of once
7 we've baselined that, I believe their intent then is
8 B- with this letter is to provide this ongoing look
9 periodically as other changes are made so that the Staff
10 is kept up to speed over time as to what the SAMGs are
11 doing, what they're trying to solve, you know, that kind
12 of thing. So, I believe that's the philosophy.

13 MEMBER REMPE: Okay. I think B- that's all
14 I have. Thank you.

15 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Okay. Charlie?

16 MEMBER BROWN: Nothing more.

17 MEMBER BALLINGER: Nothing more.

18 MEMBER RYAN: Thank you for the
19 presentations today. They were very informative. Thank
20 you very much.

21 MEMBER BLEY: Nothing more, thanks.

22 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Dana?

23 MEMBER POWERS: I continue to feel like we
24 are abandoning or degrading, at least, a drive to use
25 risk-information to structure the regulatory system.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I'm getting the impression that we're doing things
2 in a fairly chaotic fashion through running the risk of
3 imposing inconsistent and divergent burdens on industry
4 here. And I think that's something we've got to make sure
5 does not happen. I think we have to work scrupulously
6 to make sure that does not happen, that in a rush to show
7 that we've done something, we don't end up with
8 something that is burdensome and, ultimately, degrades
9 safety by the introduction of complexity on the site,
10 congestion on the site. And I get very concerned about
11 our operating force being diverted into a focus, an
12 unmerited focus on low- probability events at the
13 expense of things that will happen on the plant. And the
14 current set of presentations just reinforced my
15 concerns in this area.

16 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Dick?

17 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you for the
18 information you've provided today. And I, too, as Dr.
19 Rempe mentioned, I would like to see these Draft Guides
20 another time. I think they will contain some meat that
21 is important to us. Thank you.

22 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Bill?

23 DR. SHACK: No, I think I've commented
24 enough.

25 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Members on the phone line,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Pete?

2 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yes, this is Pete. I
3 think personally the Committee needs to understand
4 better how the updated seismic hazards are going to be
5 addressed just by either through time or through a
6 risk-based B-

7 (Telephonic interference)

8 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: That either would
9 work, we just need to understand it a little better. I
10 think it doesn't make any sense to put in a requirement
11 that would be highly vulnerable to theseC-

12 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Pete, you're breaking up,
13 if you're on a speaker. Are you?

14 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Just hang on, I'll get
15 off it.

16 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you.

17 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Hello, is that better?

18 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Much better.

19 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Okay.

20 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Lesson learned.

21 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yes. I think the
22 Committee needs to understand how these updated seismic
23 hazards are going to be addressed with the FLEX
24 equipment.

25 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Okay. Is Mike Corradini on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the line, by any chance?

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes, sir.

3 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Okay, Mike, would you like
4 to make a comment in closing?

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Well, I think most
6 things have been said by the other members. To the
7 extent, Steve, you've kind of captured all of this, I'
8 guess I'll just thank the Staff for bearing with us for
9 a long day of questions. I do think we should look at
10 the guidance so that it's very clear. I understand
11 Dana's concerns, so it strikes me that without looking
12 at the guidance to make sure it's consistent, and it's
13 understandable, some of Dana's concerns could occur.

14 And beyond the guidance, I think Pete's
15 point, and I think John made it, also, is how an upgraded
16 seismic hazard is going to be figured into dealing with
17 the equipment that has to be used either partially or
18 totally within the FLEX implementation. But that's it,
19 thank you.

20 CHAIR SCHULTZ: Thank you, Mike. I'd also
21 like to express my appreciation to the industry for the
22 presentation this afternoon for having brought a lot to
23 the table. And also to the Staff for their discussions
24 earlier. It was very helpful to the Subcommittee to hear
25 all of the presentations and hear responses to our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions. It's been a very fruitful afternoon.

2 So, I would close the formal meeting with
3 that. I do have an informal announcement because the
4 Fukushima Subcommittee does have a meeting tomorrow
5 morning. Yes, let me close the record.

6 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
7 off the record at 5:09 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Mitigation of Beyond-Design-Basis Events (MBDBE) Proposed Rulemaking

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
Fukushima Subcommittee

March 19, 2015

Background

- Efficiency gains through consolidation
- Scope of proposed rulemaking as it relates to originating Near-Term Task Force (NTTF) recommendations:
 - All of recommendations 4, 7, and 8
 - All of 9.1, 9.2. and 9.3 – except long term Emergency Response Data System (ERDS)
 - 10.2 (command and control/decision maker qualifications) and 11.1 (delivery of equipment to site - phase 3 portion of Order EA-12-049)
 - Includes NTTF 9.4 (ERDS modernization)
- In terms of post-Fukushima regulatory actions already underway:
 - Makes generically-applicable Order EA-12-049 and Order EA-12-051
 - Addresses staffing and communications from NTTF 9.3 (10 CFR 50.54(f) request)
 - Addresses re-evaluated hazards from NTTF 2.1 (10 CFR 50.54(f) request)

Proposed Rule Language

Paragraph (a) - Applicability

- Applicability
 - Current operating reactors
 - New reactors
 - Decommissioning reactors
- Requirements apply to both current and new reactor licensees and applicants
 - Design features requirements in proposed § 50.155(d) are for new reactor plant designs, and are in addition to the remainder of the requirements (revised)
- Decommissioning provisions: (revised)
 - Once fuel is permanently removed from the reactor - no reactor or primary containment requirements
 - Once decay heat is sufficiently low versus SFP heat up/boil off to provide ample time: then only remaining mitigation is § 50.155(b)(2)
 - Once irradiated fuel is removed from the spent fuel pool - all requirements cease

Proposed Rule Language

Paragraph (b) – Integrated Response

- Integrated Response Capability (unchanged)
 - Beyond-design-basis external event mitigation
 - Would make Order EA-12-049 generically applicable
 - Formerly referred to as SBOMS (industry’s “FLEX” program)
 - Extensive Damage Mitigation Guidelines (EDMGs)
 - Would move § 50.54(hh)(2) requirements to this rule
 - No substantive changes to requirements
 - Severe Accident Management Guidelines (SAMGs)
 - Currently voluntary industry initiative
 - Regulation would require SAMGs
 - Inspection under ROP only - no licensing review.
 - No additional equipment requirements

Proposed Rule Language

Paragraph (b) – Integrated Response



- Integrate with Emergency Operating Procedures (EOPs)
 - Structured to not impact previous regulatory efforts on EOPs
- Supporting staffing and command and control
 - Both staffing and command and control should be in place after Order EA-12-049 implementation
 - Recognizes challenge of a site-wide event that could lead to core damage and involve offsite assistance

Proposed Rule Language

Paragraph (c) – Equipment Requirements

Paragraph (e) – Training Requirements

- Equipment Requirements (**revised**)
 - Would make Order EA-12-049 equipment requirements generically applicable
 - Would make Order EA-12-051 spent fuel pool level instrumentation requirements generically applicable
 - § 50.155 (c)(2) revised to reflect COMSECY-14-0037:
 - Mitigation strategies equipment required by paragraph (b)(1) must be reasonably protected from the effects of natural phenomena that are the more severe of: (1) the design basis of the facility; or (2) the licensee's reevaluated hazards, stemming from the March 12, 2012, NRC letter issued under § 50.54(f), as verified by the NRC's assessment issued by [EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE RULE].
- Training (**unchanged**)
 - Training of personnel for activities not already addressed
 - Systems approach to training
 - Expect most training already addressed as part of EOPs and Order EA-12-049 implementation
 - New training should be in the SAMG area

Proposed Rule Language

Paragraph (d) – New Reactor Requirements

- New reactor design requirements (**revised**):
 - Only applies to applicants listed in paragraph § 50.155(a)(4)
 - Would require that design features be incorporated into new reactor plant designs that enhance coping durations and minimize reliance on human actions for an extended loss of all ac power concurrent with a loss of normal access to the ultimate heat sink
- Intent:
 - Require certain elements of the Commission’s advanced reactor policy statement for new reactor designs during ELAP/LUHS
 - “...longer time constants and sufficient instrumentation to allow for more diagnosis and management before reaching safety systems challenge or exposure of vital equipment to adverse conditions.”
 - “simplified safety systems that, where possible, reduce required operator actions”
 - Applicants would consider the effects of an ELAP/LUHS early in the design process and incorporate design features that provide enhanced capabilities to address these events

Proposed Rule Language

Paragraph (f) Drills and Exercises (Unchanged)

Paragraph (g) – Change Control (Unchanged)

- Drills provide assurance that guideline sets are integrated and can be used
 - Initial drill(s) to show use and transitions
 - Follow-on drill(s) to provide assurance of continuing capability
 - Complex drill schedule: Initial drill within 2 refueling outages (RFs) and follow-on in 8 calendar years
 - Current operating licensees/holder of combined license (COL) after 52.103(g) finding:
 - 1st drill within 2 RFs – after that 8 year period
 - Applicants for a part 50 operating license (OL) or holder of COL before 52.103(g) finding:
 - Demonstrate use and transitions – initial drill(s)
 - Subsequent drills - 8 year period
- MBDBE Change Control
 - Facility changes can impact multiple regulatory areas; all change controls must be applied
 - No threshold criterion; must comply with requirements

Proposed Rule Language

Appendix E, Application, Implementation

- New Appendix E requirements (**Unchanged**)
 - Multi-source term requirements are incorporated directly into current Appendix E
 - New Section VII requirement for staffing and communications
 - Technology-neutral ERDS
- Application requirements (**Unchanged**)
 - Applications for new reactors
- Implementation: Will use the Cumulative Effects of Regulation (CER) process (**Unchanged**)

Backfit Considerations

(Unchanged)

- The MBDBE rule has different supporting backfit bases:
 - Proposed rule requirements are severable
 - Order EA-12-049 and Order EA-12-051 requirements are not backfits (i.e., already imposed by orders)
 - All other requirements need justification under Part 50 backfitting provisions (operating reactors) and Part 52 issue finality provisions (new reactors) :
 - Items supporting Order EA-12-049 are technically backfits without impact
 - SAMGs and supporting requirements (drills and training that involve SAMGs)
 - Multi-source dose assessment (voluntarily implemented): Is a backfit but should not cause additional impact
 - New reactors requirements are designed to be “forward fitted”
 - Technology-neutral Emergency Response Data System (ERDS) remove technology reference, aligns with current practice, not a backfit

SAMGs Backfit (Unchanged)

- Qualitative basis for imposing SAMG requirements
 - Guideline set used by operators and decision-makers following onset of core damage
 - SAMGs support making optimal decisions concerning containment
 - SAMGs support informing the emergency response organization with regard to protective actions (e.g., fission product barrier integrity)
 - The value of SAMGs, pre-planned guidelines for best use of all available resources to mitigate the accident
- Quantitative basis informed by Containment Protection and Release Reduction effort

Draft Regulatory Guidance

- **DG-1301 “Flexible Mitigation Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis Events”**
 - Current draft guidance would endorse NEI 12-06 rev. 1 with clarifications
 - NEI is revising NEI 12-06 rev. 0 (to produce rev. 1):
 - To reflect lessons-learned from implementation of Order EA-12-049
 - To address re-evaluated hazards
 - Includes guidance for new reactor designs to meet proposed § 50.155(d)
- **DG-1317 “Wide-Range Spent Fuel Pool Level Instrumentation”**
 - Would endorse NEI 12-02 (Previously endorsed for Order EA-12-051)
- **DG-1319 “Integrated Response Capabilities for Beyond-Design-Basis Events”**
 - Would endorse NEI 12-01 (Previously endorsed for RFI), NEI 13-06, and NEI 14-01

DG-1301

- Preliminary Draft
- NEI 12-06, Diverse and Flexible Coping Strategies (FLEX) Implementation Guide, Revision 1, Draft C, is basis
- Incorporates lessons learned in Order EA-12-049 implementation (alternative approaches, generic items, etc.)
- Work remaining includes:
 - Receipt of SRM-COMSECY-14-0037 to support development of NEI 12-06 Appendices for Seismic and Flooding Re-evaluations

DG-1301 Appendix A

(For New Reactor Designs)

- *Enhance coping durations*
 - Initially cope with installed SSCs at least 24 hours
 - After 8 hours, use of supplemental ac permissible
 - Then, cope at least 72 hours, using on-site equipment, before off-site resources are obtained

- *Minimize reliance on human actions*
 - Initially, minimal actions at limited and protected locations; monitoring, control, and coordination from the MCR or designed in location
 - Following the early phase, actions should be reasonable considering anticipated site conditions following the event

DG-1319

- NEI 12-01, “Guidelines for Assessing Beyond Design Basis Accident Response Staffing and Communications Capabilities”
 - Accident response staffing
 - Communications systems
- NEI 13-06, “Enhancement to Emergency Response Capabilities for Beyond Design Basis Events and Severe Accidents”
 - Multi-unit dose assessment
 - Training
 - Drills and exercises
 - EP facilities and equipment
- NEI 14-01, “Emergency Response Procedures and Guidelines for Beyond Design Basis Events and Severe Accidents”
 - SAMGs - No detailed review of Owners Group or plant-specific SAMGs
 - Command and control
 - Procedure integration

Status and Path Forward

- Proposed rule package is in concurrence:
 - Due to EDO on April 16, 2015 and Commission on April 30, 2015
 - Draft guidance should be issued with proposed rule in summer 2015
 - Recognize the ongoing work on DG-1301 and can meet with the ACRS prior to July or during public comment period if the Committee desires.
- Future ACRS interactions
 - Full committee – April 9, 2015 (proposed rule)
 - Full committee – TBD (final rule)

Industry Perspective on Draft Mitigating Beyond Design Basis (BDB) Events Rule

Bryan Ford

Senior Manager - Regulatory Assurance

Entergy Nuclear

March 19, 2015 • ACRS Meeting

MBDBE Rule - Positives

- Right topics addressed with “high-level” language
- Reflects the significant amount of industry work since Fukushima
 - Existing Order requirements and commitments
 - Responses to 50.54(f) letter of 3/12/12
- Staff intends to support use of industry-developed guidance – additional work needed
- Changes have been made based on previous industry comments

MBDBE Rule – Areas for Improvement

- Reevaluated Hazards
 - MBDBE capabilities need to address a spectrum of plant conditions caused by different initiating events (hazards) and resulting damage states
 - In some reevaluated hazard cases, AC power and/or ultimate heat sink may be available
 - Rule wording should accommodate Alternate/Targeted Hazard mitigation strategies
 - Affects “reasonable protection” and “containment”
 - Inconsistent with current seismic path forward

Reevaluated Hazards – (b)(1)

- Strategies and guidelines to mitigate beyond-design-basis external events from:
 - Natural phenomena that result in an extended loss of all ac power concurrent with a loss of normal access to the ultimate heat sink
 - The licensee's reevaluated flood hazards, stemming from the March 12, 2012, NRC letter issued under § 50.54(f), as verified by the NRC's assessment issued by [EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE RULE].

Reevaluated Hazards – (c)(2)

- The equipment relied on for the mitigation strategies required by paragraph (b)(1) of this section must be reasonably protected from the effects of natural phenomena. ~~that are the more severe of: (1) the design basis of the facility; or (2) the licensee's reevaluated hazards, stemming from the March 12, 2012, NRC letter issued under § 50.54(f), as verified by the NRC's assessment issued by [EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE RULE].~~

MBDBE Rule – Areas for Improvement

- Proposed § 52.79 and § 52.80
 - We do not believe that these requirements are necessary for new plants
 - Adequately addressed in current design review requirements (designed to higher standards)
- Use of qualitative factors to justify imposing SAMG requirements is not in accordance with Commission direction (SRM-SECY-14-0087)

MBDBE Rule – Areas for Improvement

- Emergency Response
 - Relocate the new staffing and communications requirements from Appendix E to new Part 50.155
- Change control
 - Other change processes should recognize the differences between design/licensing basis and BDB external events
 - What is not acceptable in one instance (design basis) may be acceptable in the other (BDB)

Other Comments

- Implementation should be specified in “years,” not 2nd outage restart
 - Recommend 4 years to minimize CER
- Given the scope and complexity of the proposed rule, the industry requests that the public comment period be initially established at the maximum possible duration
 - Obviate the need to request/process an extension