

March 11, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
Operating Experience Branch
Division of Inspection and Regional Support
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Eric M. Thomas, Senior Reactor Systems Engineer */RA/*
Operating Experience Branch
Division of Inspection and Regional Support
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM TO FILE: REVISED TRANSCRIPT FOR PUBLIC
MEETING WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND THE U.S. NUCLEAR
REGULATORY COMMISSION TO DISCUSS DISPOSITION OF
INFORMATION RELATED TO THE TIME PERIOD THAT SAFETY
RELATED STRUCTURES, SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS ARE
INSTALLED

This memorandum provides documentation of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff edits to the subject public meeting transcript of January 20, 2016. During this meeting, NRC staff, licensees, utility groups, and other stakeholders discussed a proposed draft Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) concerning the disposition of information related to the time period that safety-related structures, system or components are installed.

NRC staff made several edits to the transcript produced by Neal R. Gross and Co. Inc. and submitted to NRC staff on January 21, 2016. The edited transcript is included as Enclosure 1. Enclosure 2 is a summary of the staff's edits with page and line number references. Three of the edits were not made in the revised transcript. These omissions are noted in Enclosure 2. Of note, Enclosure 1 contains a statement by a meeting participant that questions the cause of an emergency diesel generator (EDG) failure to start event that is discussed in the draft RIS. Subsequent to the meeting, this participant corrected his statement and confirmed that the draft RIS accurately describes the cause of the EDG failure to start (see Agencywide Document Access and Management System Accession No. ML16034A326).

Enclosures:

1. Edited Public Meeting Transcript
2. Summary of NRC staff edits to Public Meeting Transcript

CONTACT: Eric Thomas, NRR/DIRS/IOEB
301-415-6772

MEMORANDUM TO: Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
 Operating Experience Branch
 Division of Inspection and Regional Support
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Eric M. Thomas, Senior Reactor Systems Engineer
 Operating Experience Branch
 Division of Inspection and Regional Support
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM TO FILE: REVISED TRANSCRIPT FOR PUBLIC MEETING WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION TO DISCUSS DISPOSITION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO THE TIME PERIOD THAT SAFETY RELATED STRUCTURES, SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS ARE INSTALLED

This memorandum provides documentation of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff edits to the subject public meeting transcript of January 20, 2016. During this meeting, NRC staff, licensees, utility groups, and other stakeholders discussed a proposed draft Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) concerning the disposition of information related to the time period that safety-related structures, system or components are installed.

NRC staff made several edits to the transcript produced by Neal R. Gross and Co. Inc. and submitted to NRC staff on January 21, 2016. The edited transcript is included as Enclosure 1. Enclosure 2 is a summary of the staff's edits with page and line number references. Three of the edits were not made in the revised transcript. These omissions are noted in Enclosure 2. Of note, Enclosure 1 contains a statement by a meeting participant that questions the cause of an emergency diesel generator (EDG) failure to start event that is discussed in the draft RIS. Subsequent to the meeting, this participant corrected his statement and confirmed that the draft RIS accurately describes the cause of the EDG failure to start (see Agencywide Document Access and Management System Accession No. ML16034A326).

Enclosures:

1. Edited Public Meeting Transcript
2. Summary of NRC staff edits to Public Meeting Transcript

CONTACT: Eric Thomas, NRR/DIRS/IOEB
 301-415-6772

DISTRIBUTION:

RidsNrrMailCenter Resource

ADAMS Accession No.: ML16070A078 (memo and transcript); ML16050A489 (Pkg)

OFFICE	NRR/DIRS/IOEB	NRR/DIRS/IOEB
NAME	EThomas	HChernoff
DATE	3/10/2016	3/10/2016

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**Official Transcript of Proceedings
Nuclear Regulatory Commission**

**Public Meeting on Draft RIS Disposition of
Information Related to the Time Period that
Safety-Related SSCS Are Installed**

(101 pages)

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting on Draft RIS Disposition of Information Related to the Time Period that Safety-Related SSCS Are Installed

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2016

Work Order No.: NRC-2143

Pages 1-101

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

OFFICE OF NEW REACTORS

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFETY AND SAFEGUARDS

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT RIS

DISPOSITION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO THE TIME

PERIOD THAT SAFETY-RELATED SSCs ARE INSTALLED

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JANUARY 20, 2016

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting convened at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, Room T3B45, 11545 Rockville Pike, at 1:30 p.m., Harold Chernoff, facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

HAROLD CHERNOFF, NRR/DIRS

DENNIS MOREY, NRR/DLR

SCOTT MORRIS, NRR/DIRS

CATY NOLAN, NRR/DIRS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

KEN O'BRIEN, Region III

ALEXANDRA POPOVA, NRR/DPR, Facilitator

JESSE ROBLES, NRR/DIRS

SHELDON STUCHELL, NRR/DPR

ERIC THOMAS, NRR/DIRS

JOHN THOMPSON, NRR/DIRS

ALSO PRESENT:

DAVID LOCHBAUM, Union of Concerned Scientists

VINCENT BACANSKAS, Entergy*

KELLY BAKER, DC Cook*

STEVE FRANTZ, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius*

SAM HARVEY, EPRI

FRED MASHBURN, TVA

STEPHEN MEYERS, STARS/Ameren

BRUCE MONTGOMERY, NEI

MARTY MURPHY, Xcel Energy

JOHN PFABE

JOHN SAMS, Ontario Power Generation*

RICK WEINACHT, Curtiss-Wright Corporation*

*Present via telephone

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

1:34 p.m.

MS. POPOVA: Okay, good afternoon.

First, I'd like to thank everybody for attending this meeting.

My name is Alexandra Popova and I am the Lead Project Manager for this issue in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

So, we're here today to discuss the disposition of information related to the time period that safety-related structure systems and components are installed.

Before we start the meeting, I'm going to cover a couple of administrative topics.

For security purposes, NRC policy dictates that visitors to the Agency are required to wear and display their badges as well as be escorted at all times while within NRC controlled space.

If you are not an NRC employee, you must be escorted at all times once you enter the elevator lobby on the first floor.

Therefore, if you need to leave the room for any reason, please ensure that an NRC employee is with you.

So, there's a couple of NRC employees who

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are raising their hands right now and, if you need to
2 leave the room for any reason, just grab one of them.

3 We'll make arrangements at the end of the
4 meeting to have NRC employees escort you back to the
5 elevator lobby on the first floor or to the bathrooms
6 on this floor.

7 We also plan to take a break about an into
8 the meeting.

9 Please turn off or silence all your cell
10 phones during the meeting as a courtesy.

11 Also, for people that are at the round, so
12 that's these tables here, the mics are always on, so
13 if you want to mute them, you have to push the button
14 that says push. Yes, so you have to hold it and that's
15 how it's muted otherwise, it's always on.

16 So, there is an attendants list that is in
17 the middle before the pews as well as one that should
18 be circulating the round. Please fill out the
19 information and pass the list along.

20 Once the lists are completed, please pass
21 them back to me. Or just leave them in front of the
22 pews.

23 For those who are participating on the
24 phone, please send an email to axpl6, so that's A-X as
25 in x-ray, P as in Papa, 16 at nrc.gov. My email is also

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 listed on the Public Meeting Notice.

2 I will reply to your email with the meeting
3 summary and the slides.

4 The list of the attendees and the phone
5 participants will become part of the meeting summary
6 and that will be made publically available.

7 Okay, so the purpose of this meeting is to
8 allow for open discussion between external
9 stakeholders and the NRC regarding components that are
10 installed past their time period.

11 NRC staff is developing a RIS to reiterate
12 existing requirements related to dispositioning
13 information pertaining to the capability of
14 safety-related structure systems and components to
15 perform the safety-related functions in nuclear power
16 plants.

17 Once developed and aligned internally, the
18 draft RIS will be posted in the Federal Register and
19 open for comments. Please submit all formal comments
20 through the Federal Register.

21 Once the public comment period closes, the
22 NRC staff will review and disposition all formal
23 comments received through the Federal Register.

24 Submitting comments can be done by
25 searching for the draft RIS on www.regulations.gov.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This is a Category 3 Public Meeting which
2 allows the public to participate in the meeting by
3 providing comments and asking questions throughout.

4 Please state your name and company before
5 speaking since this meeting is being recorded.

6 This meeting will not decide any Agency or
7 staff positions and it will not interpret regulations
8 other than what is current established by guidance or
9 staff position.

10 No decisions regarding this draft RIS will
11 be made at the meeting.

12 During the question portion of the
13 meeting, I will first take questions here at
14 Headquarters and then go to the phones.

15 So, if you are on the GoTo Meeting and have
16 a question or would like to discuss, please send me a
17 message and that way, I can queue you.

18 This is a two hour meeting scheduled from
19 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

20 For those who desire to provide feedback
21 about the public meeting process, please email me.
22 Again, my email address is axp16@nrc.gov.

23 I welcome the participants on the phone and
24 ask that they keep their phones on mute except to
25 discuss issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 To place the phone on mute, press star six
2 and star six again to unmute.

3 We understand difficulties encountered
4 when listening by phone. By muting the phones, it will
5 minimize the noise heard by all.

6 I'd like to open the meeting with
7 introductions. We will first do introductions here at
8 Headquarters and then move to the phones.

9 Actually, no, correction, due to the large
10 number of participants on the phones, we are only going
11 to do introductions here at Headquarters. And, we will
12 be doing introductions just in the round.

13 As we go around the room, please be sure
14 to clearly state your name, your position, your company
15 and, for NRC staff, the office that you work for in the
16 NRC.

17 So, I'll start off. Once again, I'm
18 Alexandra Popova, Lead Project Manager for this issue.
19 I'm in the General Communications Branch in the Office
20 of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

21 MR. O'BRIEN: I'm Ken O'Brien. I'm the
22 Director of the Division of Reactor Safety for Region
23 III.

24 MR. MORRIS: I'm Scott Morris. I'm the
25 Director of the Division of Inspection and Regional

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Support in NRC Headquarters.

2 MR. CHERNOFF: Harold Chernoff, I'm the
3 Chief Operating Experience Branch in NRR. And, I would
4 just add, the microphones at the tables are
5 directional, so you need to be within about 6 to 12
6 inches or the people on the phone won't be able to pick
7 it up.

8 MR. THOMPSON: John Thompson, Lead
9 Technical Contact for this RIS, Operating Experience
10 Branch, NRC.

11 MR. MASHBURN: I'm Fred Mashburn,
12 Corporate Licensing, TVA.

13 MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum, Director of
14 the Nuclear Safety Project for the Union of Concerned
15 Scientists.

16 MR. MEYERS: Steve Meyers, STARS
17 Alliance.

18 MR. MURPHY: Marty Murphy, Director of
19 Regulatory Affairs for Xcel Energy.

20 MR. MONTGOMERY: Bruce Montgomery,
21 Nuclear Energy Institute.

22 MR. HARVEY: Sam Harvey, Principle
23 Technical Leader for Electric Power Research
24 Institute.

25 MR. MOREY: Dennis Morey, I'm Chief of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Reactor Systems Branch in Division of License Renewal
2 at the NRC.

3 MR. STUCHELL: Sheldon Stuchell, Chief of
4 the Generic Communications Branch.

5 MS. POPOVA: Okay. Scott, would you like
6 to provide some opening remarks?

7 MR. MORRIS: Yes, I'll just make a few --
8 a couple of opening remarks and we'll turn it over to
9 Harold and we'll just right in.

10 So, obviously, welcome everybody here.
11 I'm, I guess, a little surprised at the quantity of
12 folks who have come to the meeting and are on the phone.
13 But, I guess that's a good thing. There's an interest
14 in what we do and why we do it. So, we're looking
15 forward to a good exchange here today.

16 Clearly, our goal, our main goal here is
17 to listen to your feedback, comments, concerns or other
18 thoughts on the draft Regulatory Information Summary
19 that we attached to the Meeting Notice for this
20 particular meeting.

21 There's a fairly substantial history
22 associated with the rationale for developing this RIS.
23 Some of you know what that is. Some of you know that
24 history, some of you don't. I think Harold's going to
25 touch on a little bit of that just to make sure everybody

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 has a common understanding of the real reason we're here
2 today, what brought us to this point today.

3 But, yes, I'm looking forward to a good
4 exchange. It is a Category 3 Meeting, as Alex
5 mentioned. So, we look forward to comments, not just
6 from the industry, but also from members of the public,
7 including UCS and any others.

8 So, if you feel like at some point you want
9 to make a comment, you know, please alert us and we'll
10 give you the opportunity to express that.

11 So, with that, I'm going to shut up and hand
12 it off to Harold and let's move this forward.

13 MR. CHERNOFF: Again, the thanks for the
14 opportunity to talk. We often don't get enough time
15 to sit across the table in a room and listen. And,
16 that's what we're going to be doing mostly as far as
17 NRC staff. Our intent here is to listen and make sure
18 we understand what your comments, what feedback various
19 people have. That's our purpose.

20 We're not here to debate or espouse our
21 beliefs. We want to hear from the people in the room
22 that we don't work with on a day to day basis.

23 With regard to background, we have just a
24 half dozen overview slides that we'll go through and
25 then we'll open it up into the real purpose, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to get some information from the folks in the room.

2 In the Operating Experience Branch, one of
3 the things we're tasked with is to look at large and
4 small trends and activities in both events and
5 regulatory actions, findings, enforcement, et cetera.

6 And, we launched into a couple of years
7 ago, almost three years ago now, we produced a study
8 that actually was a follow on to some other activities
9 we had done related to implementation and vendor
10 recommendations at the plants.

11 And, in this case, we were looking and
12 found what we saw as a small increasing trend in
13 findings and Licensee Event Reports involving
14 age-related issues and failures of equipment in the
15 field, safety-related SSCs.

16 And, the data actually shows a break over
17 point of things that had been in the field more than
18 15 years. And, just simply, there were about 17 of
19 these type of events in 2009 and, by 2012 we'd seen an
20 increase to about 32. And, it's a mixed set of data.
21 It's not all Licensee Event Reports, it's not all
22 findings.

23 Overall, the percentage of findings
24 attributed to these kind of things was pretty small.
25 It was about two percent of overall findings.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Most of the examples that we saw related
2 to, as you might suspect, to electrical subcomponents,
3 be that cards, relays, breakers, power supplies, et
4 cetera.

5 MR. MORRIS: Are you on a different slide?

6 MR. CHERNOFF: No.

7 MR. MORRIS: Just checking.

8 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes, you want to advance --
9 let's go two slides I think will get us -- thank you,
10 guys.

11 MR. MORRIS: Just trying to help you out.

12 MR. CHERNOFF: I know. This is preamble
13 to this.

14 So, in looking at that and we also saw that
15 the cause was varied. There were a number of -- there
16 was no single smoking causal factor that we saw. There
17 were some issues regarding keeping abreast of operating
18 experience. There were issues regarding
19 performance-based monitoring. And there were some
20 event issues where maybe a maintenance rule
21 miscategorization had led to the finding or the
22 incident.

23 There were also a variety of, for the ones
24 that were findings, a regulatory basis for those
25 findings.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This led us, as one of our actions, we had
2 a number of actions out of the study that, internally,
3 we were taking including ones focused on staff and how
4 staff was doing oversight focus in this area.

5 But, one of the other ones that we felt was
6 important was to take the opportunity to communicate
7 out what we saw.

8 The study was made publically available
9 back in 2012 or 2013, so it's in public ADAMS and I
10 believe it was attached to the Meeting Notice for this
11 meeting.

12 But, in looking at, is there a need to
13 communicate something a little broader? We felt there
14 was and that is the purpose of the draft RIS which is
15 to discuss disposition, as the slide shows, of
16 information related to how long safety-relates SSCs are
17 installed.

18 And, there's a careful wording there, it's
19 to discuss the disposition of the information, okay,
20 how you go about doing it, what the processes are.

21 And, to reiterate responsibility of
22 licensee's to maintain SSC structure systems
23 components ability to perform their safety-related
24 functions. And, I'm going to emphasize safety-related
25 functions here.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So, can we go to the next slide, please?

2 So, these are the main points that I hit.

3 We had the study. We saw a slight trend. We're not
4 talking about, you know, stoke your mattress,
5 statistics breakdowns, we're talking about judgment
6 calls regarding small sets of data. Okay?

7 And, we felt there was additional focus
8 needed both within the staff and from industry
9 perspectives.

10 Next slide, please?

11 This is a very short list of what would
12 likely be a fairly long list if we tried to list out
13 all the regulatory requirements that have some kind of
14 a juncture or intersection with this activity.

15 But, these are probably the more
16 significant ones. The NRC Approved Quality Assurance
17 Program that each operating reactor has. Their
18 technical specifications, and particularly within
19 their technical specification their administrative
20 section regarding procedures and establishment of
21 procedures in accordance with Reg Guide 133.

22 And also, of course, the maintenance rule
23 which is the performance-based aspect to the
24 regulations for equipment monitoring and control.

25 Next slide, please?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Okay, I spoke a little bit about
2 enforcement history. And, to be very straightforward,
3 we have a number of examples of findings and they vary.
4 And, how they are written up, the action that we took,
5 also varies.

6 And, this is very typical of our ROP
7 Program. We try to write findings close to the nexus
8 of what we feel that the main issue is.

9 So, in one case, a problem might be written
10 up as a failure to follow or failure to comply with Tech
11 Spec 5.4.1 Procedures where there this procedure that's
12 been established but it wasn't followed.

13 On the contrary, at some case, a finding
14 might have been written up under design criteria
15 because there was not an application of either design
16 criteria or maybe establishment of procedures. There
17 were no procedures written.

18 And, one of the complexities is, I don't
19 think we have -- we've come to the consensus that there
20 is no single formulaic way to address this issue because
21 it's about how you disposition information that you get
22 and that you see at the plant.

23 So, from an enforcement point of view, we
24 have a number of findings. There were, John, how many
25 in the overall study roughly?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. THOMPSON: Hundred and five.

2 MR. CHERNOFF: A 105 within the scope of
3 the study that were cited and there's a pretty good
4 variability about what specific findings were tied to
5 from a regulatory perspective.

6 Well, I think that's -- okay, that's the
7 very brief introductory remarks.

8 Now, a couple of other items. Really
9 appreciate everybody staying within the spirit of the
10 meeting and speaking to the draft document in front of
11 us.

12 There are a lot of ancillary related
13 things. We're really not here to get into those in
14 detail. So, what we're focused on is any comments,
15 thoughts, perspectives on the draft document that was
16 sent out. That's our primary purpose and appreciate
17 it if we can help do that. And, the focus is on external
18 stakeholders.

19 So, with that --

20 MR. MORRIS: Well, if I could just add to
21 that?

22 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes.

23 MR. MORRIS: It's not -- just to echo a
24 little bit and maybe clarify a little bit what Harold
25 just said.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 It's -- we're interested in feedback on
2 what we've provided in the draft Regulatory Information
3 Summary, both what is in there and what may not be in
4 there that you think should be in there. So, it's both
5 of those things.

6 MR. CHERNOFF: Thank you. Good point,
7 good point.

8 With that, if there are any questions about
9 logistics before we get started and open it up for
10 comment? Yes, Dave? Dave Lochbaum, please?

11 Just to reemphasize, when you speak,
12 please identify yourself and affiliation so that people
13 on the phone --

14 MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum, Union of
15 Concerned Scientists.

16 I have a request. The TIA that's
17 mentioned is not publically available. I'm not sure
18 exactly how NEI spoke so eloquently about a nonpublic
19 document. But, could that document, ML-15127A569, be
20 made publically available?

21 MR. O'BRIEN: This is Ken O'Brien with
22 Region III.

23 We originally did that TIA and I don't
24 recall if we made that publically available when we
25 finished it. We subsequently withdrew that TIA in the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 guise of finishing this issue from a generic
2 standpoint.

3 I'm not sure there's anything that
4 precludes us from putting it out there. It could
5 confuse us a little bit because that same sort of
6 information's in the RIS right now and it was focused
7 on a single issue at a plant, specific plant, so it's
8 more localized than I think we're trying to talk here.

9 MR. CHERNOFF: Is it okay to say that we'll
10 take a look and make it publically available?

11 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, yes, I think that's
12 what I said but maybe not as clearly.

13 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes.

14 MR. MORRIS: It's nothing magic, it was
15 like a process issue -- this is Scott Morris -- process
16 issue. We withdrew the TIA, so we took it off the
17 website.

18 We withdrew the TIA in lieu of -- the TIA,
19 as Ken pointed out, are done a retail site by site basis
20 whereas RIS is a wholesale generic basis. So, we
21 pulled the TIA in lieu of a RIS.

22 Yes, there's nothing we can --

23 MR. CHERNOFF: We'll look at making that
24 happen. Thank you.

25 MR. O'BRIEN: I don't see anything to stop

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 us from that.

2 MR. MURPHY: This is Marty Murphy.

3 If -- Xcel Energy -- if you do make that
4 publically available again, will you make it clear it
5 has been withdrawn?

6 MR. O'BRIEN: Oh, yes.

7 MR. MORRIS: Sure.

8 MR. O'BRIEN: Withdrawn, by the way,
9 doesn't change the aspect of it. As I said, we withdrew
10 it, not because there was anything in there we thought
11 was wrong, but instead, because we were looking it more
12 holistically.

13 MR. LOCHBAUM: Understood.

14 MR. MONTGOMERY: Yes, this is Bruce
15 Montgomery, Nuclear Energy Institute.

16 I'll open by just saying, I appreciate the
17 opportunity to discuss this draft RIS.

18 We have a number of questions and probably
19 some comments that we'd like to make. And, in a process
20 of doing that, we're really just seeking to clarify our
21 understanding of what this RIS is communicating to us.

22 We do note a significant difference
23 between that TIA we were just discussing in terms of
24 the level of detail of information and positions taken
25 and this draft RIS.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So, in our minds, we're trying to make sure
2 we understand that we, you know, what's the difference
3 between the two documents? And, exactly what is the
4 staff trying to communicate to the industry?

5 So, from our perspective, we have Steve
6 Meyers from Ameren, a STARS organization who's going
7 to be our spokesperson. He was the primary author of
8 the industry paper that was submitted October 20th.

9 So, we'll start the questioning, just in
10 terms of trying to understand the staff's position
11 relative to what you were talking about, Harold, which
12 is the different citations and the bases for the
13 citations, they do vary.

14 We have some specific concerns or
15 questions about some of those citations that we'd like
16 to talk about today. So, I'll turn it over to Steve.

17 MR. MEYERS: Okay, thanks. Steve Meyers,
18 STARS Alliance again.

19 Harold, I wanted to ask you, and I
20 appreciate your introductory comments, and we note that
21 there's a number of CFRs cited.

22 But, I didn't hear you discuss the
23 regulatory gap. You talked about the performance
24 issues and some trends that you noticed. But, when we
25 look at the paper, we're not seeing what the specific

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 regulatory gap is, whether, for example, it would be
2 against the implementation of the quality assurance
3 programs or actual regulations.

4 And, if there's some weakness in the
5 implementation of those programs versus the findings
6 on the specific components? Or if there's some more
7 important theme in public health and safety with the
8 findings that you've seen?

9 MR. CHERNOFF: Harold Chernoff.

10 What we are trying to get across, quite
11 simply, in the RIS is, again, not statistically
12 significant, however, we saw a small trend and we think
13 additional focus and attention is warranted.

14 And, to be very clear, in the RIS, we tried
15 to be very clear in the RIS that we were not saying,
16 of course, it would be inappropriate in a RIS to say
17 that you needed to establish any kind of new program
18 or process. We are not doing that.

19 What we are trying to say is, in some cases
20 as evidenced by the findings and the dockets, the
21 individual dockets, there have been deficiencies
22 identified in the implementation of plants existing
23 programs.

24 And, those things have manifested
25 themselves in some preventable equipment failures or

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 actual, you know, failures in process.

2 So, we don't have a specific regulatory
3 gap, per se. We have, I would characterize more of a
4 noted unlevelness in implementation in some cases.

5 And, what we want to make sure is that more
6 than just the plants that may have been affected by an
7 individual finding or made aware of this and they can
8 share it and inculcate it in their activities through
9 their -- through the plant's operating experience
10 program which will be the way most of the people would
11 bring in the RIS and get with the RIS.

12 Did I answer your question?

13 MR. MEYERS: Yes, I think so.

14 I have a follow on question with that.

15 MR. CHERNOFF: Sure.

16 MR. MEYERS: The examples you gave there
17 of the credible, or what I believe is the credible
18 information that you used in the RIS to describe these
19 findings, the failures of equipment, the items that you
20 just discussed, is that what you really intend the
21 credible information to the scope to include or it
22 broader than that?

23 MR. CHERNOFF: Well, we don't have a -- we
24 can't give you a perfect definition of what credible
25 means. I think you know that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 What we mean is apply reasonable judgment
2 as professionals to the information source and the
3 information content and act in a responsible manner
4 with that information.

5 And, I know that's a lot of generalities,
6 but it's very difficult to be more specific because you
7 may get information from a fellow licensee, a fellow
8 license member of your fleet. You might get
9 information from a manufacturer. You might get
10 information from industry organizations like INPO or
11 WANO.

12 Some people, you know, might even take
13 internal actions based on things from trade
14 information, industry trade information.

15 All of those could be -- we are not going
16 to try to judge credible. It's really the licensee's
17 responsibility.

18 You know, if you want to go back into the
19 history, this is really kind of the root of operating
20 experience was to not inundate the staff with
21 everything but to sort out the chaff from the more
22 meaningful information and take appropriate action on
23 the more meaningful information.

24 MR. MEYERS: I'm going to ask -- I'll turn
25 this over to somebody else, but I could just follow on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with that.

2 Generic Letter 83-78 is referenced which,
3 I think, we typically think of in terms of establishing
4 communications with your suppliers and receiving that
5 information and evaluating it.

6 But, it sounds like your scope of what you
7 just discussed is broader, quite a bit broader than that
8 to include OE, things from INPO and so forth to be
9 informed.

10 MR. CHERNOFF: As possible sources of what
11 we would call credible information.

12 And, please, feel free, maybe there's a
13 better use of terminology than credible information.
14 That's what we came up with.

15 Yes?

16 MR. MEYERS: Yes, when I read the paper,
17 what stood out to me as credible information, to me,
18 was discernable as information that was received from
19 a supplier subsequent to your initial procurement
20 documentation that, for example, provided your vendor
21 maintenance instructions and so forth, that would
22 provide some type of a technical condition that was
23 previously unknown.

24 I didn't really read this to include the
25 other broad terms of OE you discussed because we have

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 other programs for those.

2 So, all right, I'll let somebody else go.

3 MR. CHERNOFF: Understood.

4 MR. MONTGOMERY: Harold, Bruce
5 Montgomery.

6 Back on the discussion of the performance
7 gap where you indicated a slight increase in trend and
8 findings, you know, I would just observe, as you do,
9 I'm sure, that there's a difference between the number
10 of findings that are cited in the actual safety
11 performance of systems.

12 MR. CHERNOFF: Sure.

13 MR. MONTGOMERY: So, could you talk a
14 little bit about what information you have that
15 specifically to the failure rates that you -- or trend
16 in failure rates in safety-related equipment over the
17 past several years?

18 MR. CHERNOFF: I'm not sure we're prepared
19 to talk about that beyond what's in the study. We could
20 recount a little bit of what was in the study. Is that
21 what you're asking for?

22 MR. MONTGOMERY: It is.

23 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. John, do you want to
24 try to address that a little bit?

25 MR. THOMPSON: Well, we're talking with a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 small data set. I mean, over the five years that the
2 study looked at information, we had 77 inspection
3 findings.

4 Approximately a third to a half of those
5 involved failures. The other half did not involve
6 failures. We weren't really focused on the failure
7 rate in the study.

8 What we were focused on was time. How long
9 a component, safety-related component, had been
10 installed and, specifically, beyond what some
11 analysis, whether that is vendor information, plant
12 information or information from elsewhere.

13 We were interested in age, how long it had
14 been installed. Sometimes that age length resulted
15 directly in the failure. Sometimes it was the
16 realization that it had been installed longer than
17 desired by plant documentation.

18 So, that's the data set. We weren't
19 looking for a failure trend.

20 MR. MONTGOMERY: Thank you for that.

21 A couple of points that I'd like to make
22 is it's before we came to this meeting, we pulled some
23 information from the Institute of Nuclear Power
24 Operations with regard to the trends of failures and
25 key safety systems for pressurized and boiling water

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 reactors over the past several years and found that the
2 failure rates in all of those key systems was very flat,
3 for all causes, if not evidencing a slight improvement
4 in performance.

5 The past key factors hit a record 2015 for
6 the plants to 91.8 percent capacity factor reflecting
7 the plants were running very well, doesn't directly
8 correlate to safety system performance, but that's a
9 piece of it.

10 I'd also like to comment that one of the
11 examples, in fact, I think the key example provided on
12 page two of the RIS which talks about that diesel
13 failure at one of my former plants.

14 This is Dual Unit failure where there's a
15 failure of a diesel to start and run is attributed to
16 a failure of Agastat relay.

17 Now, I would admit that the first root
18 cause analysis that we performed did attribute failure
19 of that Agastat relay to a performance function. Upon
20 further research and evidence, though, after we got the
21 word back from the forensic review, it was not the
22 Agastat relay that was the cause, it was the sensing
23 line to that Agastat relay that was -- had debris in
24 it that basically caused that Agastat relay not to see
25 the pressure impulse that it needed to see to do its

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 job. The Agastat relay was working fine as far as we
2 could tell.

3 So, we would not think that that example
4 is appropriate for this RIS and that that Agastat relay
5 did not fail, as far as we could tell, from age-related
6 degradation or service life.

7 Even though it was in service longer than
8 the ten years that the -- we often refer to as a vendor
9 recommendation for service life.

10 MR. CHERNOFF: Thank you.

11 Let me just make a couple of general
12 comments.

13 One is, that kind of information is exactly
14 the kind of feedback we are looking for. So we can --
15 we'll take this information from this discussion and
16 I can say without much qualms or reservations, there
17 will be changes in the document before it's published.

18 That being said, though, I want to make
19 sure everybody understands, when it is published in the
20 Federal Register in that form, we do need everybody who
21 has issues they want to bring to the table to make sure
22 and put in formal comments.

23 Because this is an informal discussion and
24 doesn't substitute for the formal comments.

25 MR. MONTGOMERY: Yes, I think a point --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CHERNOFF: I meant to mention that at
2 the outset but I forgot.

3 MR. MONTGOMERY: I think, you know, it
4 would add to the RIS if there were examples. I think
5 one of the things we would like to see are several
6 examples of not only failures that could be attributed
7 to this issue, the time the equipment is installed in
8 the plant and the area within our -- or the program,
9 if you will, program element whether it be design,
10 maintenance programs or whatnot that didn't prevent
11 that failure or where there was a weakness in one of
12 our programs that would have addressed the issues.

13 So, we have a number of citations we're
14 looking at right now that you've written up over the
15 past several -- that the Regions have over the past
16 several months and we're very interested in the nexus
17 between --

18 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. Those are things
19 that will have to be address on a plant specific basis.
20 And, that's part of the difference in this document by
21 some of the things you've seen previously.

22 This is a higher level perspective and, you
23 know, we are not trying to say that there is an imminent
24 safety issue, that there's a, you know, you talked about
25 a performance issues regarding past key factors.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This is to try to draw a focus on things
2 that are out there and could be done better. That's
3 really where we're headed.

4 And, if I could at this point maybe, and
5 we can circle back, but are there people outside of the
6 NEI STARS that maybe want to -- Dave, do you want to
7 provide -- Dave Lochbaum, provide some comments?

8 MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum, Union of
9 Concerned Scientists.

10 I have one question to try to understand
11 what the RIS is going towards.

12 And, several times it talks about if a
13 system structure or component has been installed in a
14 nuclear plant for longer than the amount of time
15 described, yet, in some of the support documents that
16 led up to it, there was a talk about somewhat of
17 shelf-life and an in-service life.

18 Is the RIS mainly focused on how long a
19 widget is installed or is it also looking at the
20 shelf-life that may -- precedes that installation time?

21 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes, that's an excellent
22 question and I think as we refine our discussion, what
23 we saw is, there are a number of different terms used
24 throughout the industry and in different standards and
25 regulatory documents.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And, one of the points of, at least within
2 the staff, debate and discussion related to, I'll just
3 call them special terms or defined terms.

4 So, we tried in the document to get away
5 from using any of the defined terms because we did not
6 want to exclude or, you know, intentionally exclude
7 anything because we wanted to be fairly general.

8 What we're really talking about are a
9 couple of situations where, one, in some limited sets,
10 there actually is information in the FSAR. There are
11 not a lot of them, but FSAR level information that talks
12 about how long something is expected to be in the plant.
13 Okay?

14 There's the more common situation, much,
15 much more common situation where either through the
16 plant's own experience or one of these other sources
17 we talked about previously, information comes in to the
18 licensee that might have a negative impact on something
19 that's in the plant, be it a Part 21 from vendors or
20 others, et cetera.

21 And, our emphasis in the RIS is both of
22 those situations need to be looked at and
23 dispositioned.

24 The program's already out there in the
25 facilities to do those dispositions. That's -- and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 when you start to go to a lower level of detail, more
2 detail, it becomes quite complex unless you're talking
3 about one situation.

4 So, if you were to talk about a maintenance
5 rule criteria situation, that's fairly easy to talk
6 about in that realm.

7 When you're trying to talk about it more
8 broadly, it very quickly can become confusing with
9 regard to the terminology and the limitations of the
10 individual programs that are out there.

11 There's overlap on these to a fair extent
12 which is good. And, again, what we're trying to do is
13 draw people's attention to the need for continued focus
14 and, for example, not assuming things beyond what you
15 can evaluate and justify.

16 MR. LOCHBAUM: I do have one follow up.

17 I appreciate that answer. It's helpful.

18 I think the RIS is a good step of balancing
19 what needs to be done in safety. So, think it's a --
20 we support the RIS.

21 I think one of the reasons we think the RIS
22 is important or for the NRC to clarify its expectations
23 in this area, there are many reasons.

24 I think one of them includes the license
25 renewal rule that was revised in May 8, 1995, Federal

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Register 22461. Reading from the Statements of
2 Consideration for the rule change, part of that rule
3 change excluded active components from consideration
4 under aging management.

5 And, it said, quote, however, the
6 Commission does not believe that it can generically
7 exclude structures and components that, and paragraph
8 two is, are not subject to periodic plant maintenance
9 or replacement, end quote.

10 You know, conceivably, waiting until
11 something breaks or run to failure is a scheduled
12 replacement. You know, that's probably not what was
13 meant by that.

14 So, if there's a decision that run to
15 failure is an option, it looks like the license renewal
16 rule, subsequent license renewal rule, needs to go back
17 and throw active components back in, if the game plan
18 is to run to failure as your scheduled replacements
19 theme.

20 Thanks.

21 MR. CHERNOFF: Thanks, Mr. Lochbaum.

22 I think, in some circumstances, we have
23 Agency documents that acknowledge that given proper
24 consideration and evaluation, there are some
25 components that have a level of significance that would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 make run to failure appropriate.

2 However, you know, that's not a default
3 condition, that's a reasoned end point after review and
4 is part of the program that the licensees have for
5 administrative maintenance.

6 So, like many things, it's not a situation
7 where we can say it's never appropriate or it's always
8 appropriate. It depends. It depends, obviously, on
9 the applications and the components involved.

10 MR. LOCHBAUM: I appreciate that
11 clarification. I think that speaks to -- well, I think
12 the RIS, the draft RIS, or the proposed draft RIS,
13 whatever, is so valuable in that it doesn't prescribe
14 that the service life is the be all and end all.

15 It says if you have an evaluation whether
16 it's run to failure or whatever, to ensure that that
17 component doesn't have an unusually high or unduly high
18 chance of failure, then it's okay.

19 So, I think you spoke to the aspect rule,
20 we think is a proposed rule, is so good is that it
21 doesn't assume that this verily you will abide by the
22 service-life. You just have to have something that
23 shows that what you are relying on is thoughtful,
24 considerate and make sure you cover all those bases.

25 MR. CHERNOFF: And the just one more -- the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 other aspect of this is, just to be -- maybe anticipate
2 a couple of questions is, we also very clearly
3 understand that manufacturers have a multitude of
4 complex reasons for how they speak to service-life of
5 something they're selling.

6 They have warranty issues. They have
7 production issues. They have cost issues. We
8 understand that.

9 So, there is no automatic because a vendor
10 says something that that automatically applies to a
11 plant specific installation. It may not be installed
12 in the same environment or the reasonable evaluation
13 might determine that, in the in situ installation, a
14 longer period of time might be warranted.

15 Again, it depends on the specifics very
16 much so.

17 MR. HARVEY: Yes, Sam Harvey, Electric
18 Power Resource Institute.

19 I just want to reinforce that because, in
20 our preventive maintenance basis database, when we go
21 through all that process, we find that the vendor
22 recommendations aren't always technically based.

23 So, that those intervals are not
24 necessarily always valid on a technical basis.

25 MR. CHERNOFF: Can I ask, in both

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 directions?

2 MR. HARVEY: With both directions. I
3 have examples, we just did a service-life evaluation
4 study for Agastat relays, EGP. And, we took all of them
5 out of service-life from various utilities that were
6 in safety-related applications at the ten year interval
7 recommended by the vendor.

8 Found nothing wrong with them, subject to
9 accelerated thermal degradation tests, since that's
10 the primary degradation means, and found that they
11 would run 20 to 30 years before we had approached the
12 end of life of those.

13 Contrary to that, electrolytic
14 capacitors, for example, most vendors are 10 to 12
15 years. Our evaluation says seven's probably a good
16 year for replacement.

17 So, it goes both ways.

18 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. Good point, thank
19 you.

20 Steve, I interrupted you.

21 MR. MEYERS: That's all right. I have
22 several things I'd like to comment on.

23 But, I just want to talk a little bit about
24 use of the EPRI PM Basis Database and as it relates,
25 John, to some of the findings that you discussed in your

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 report that half had failures and half had not.

2 I wanted to ask and you can answer, did you
3 review how licensees had or had not applied that EPRI
4 PM Basis Database in evaluating the life that they had
5 when you looked at those findings?

6 And, you can answer that in a minute, but
7 my point on what Sam mentioned with use of this tool
8 is that, you know, this is a living database that has
9 experts participating on development of the
10 recommended templates for nearly 40 different
11 component types, with 300 templates.

12 And, there has been a couple mentions in
13 the NRC -- and some of the NRC inspection findings
14 reports were licensees that applied this. It was, you
15 know, not really a decision on it, it's just that they
16 have or have not applied it.

17 But, when I look at the RIS, it certainly
18 seems like that the RIS is silent on this, which I
19 understand. But, this is a very important tool that
20 incorporates, I think, all the things that you've
21 brought up that we need to -- the OE from the site, the
22 OE from the industry, the vendor feedback, the vendor
23 recommendations.

24 Because, frankly, when -- you know,
25 there's two things in this RIS it seems to me like you've

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 got going, the concern with the ongoing new developing
2 credible information and then you also discussed the
3 licensing basis and the documentation that has likely
4 was developed 30 to 40 years or more ago and may not
5 even be updated.

6 But, use of this EPRI PM Basis Database
7 keeps this living and alive for licensees to use as one
8 of the best tools that would be available to evaluate
9 any deviations from that.

10 Would NRC consider accepting that as a
11 technical -- as a tool to do the technical
12 determinations or be interested in learning more about
13 it from EPRI?

14 MR. CHERNOFF: Let me ask John to answer
15 the first part of that question first. Then, let me
16 speak to the second part of it.

17 So, with regard to what the -- the
18 question, as I recall, was with regard to whether the
19 study looked at the EPRI data implementation document?

20 MR. MEYERS: Yes, if you found in your
21 concerns in those findings, the half where there were
22 failures and half that were not, had you looked at all
23 use of that database by licensees?

24 MR. THOMPSON: The short answer, no.

25 MR. MEYERS: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. THOMPSON: We are aware of use of
2 templates on -- through the reading of inspection
3 reports during the INPO database searches and stuff.

4 We're also aware that the templates are
5 specific to a component type, so you don't have general
6 template.

7 So, when we look at a performance issue and
8 a cause of failure and it's a relay, then you would have
9 a specific template or maybe two templates or updated
10 revised template.

11 We looked at some of those templates but
12 we are also aware that the NRC doesn't endorse many of
13 these EPRI templates. Many of these templates are new,
14 2011, 2012 date.

15 The one you talked about on Agastat relays
16 and some of the other more general relays is new
17 information. So, that has --

18 And, I know in Ken's case and some of the
19 plants involved in the TIA, that came up as the center
20 of discussion. And, you know, we just don't have a lot
21 of inside research into the templates.

22 MR. CHERNOFF: Sam, if I could also ask,
23 my reading of the document, it also looked for licensees
24 to look at their own operating experience and
25 incorporate their own operating experience into the use

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and appropriateness of the use of those templates.

2 And, my recollection, again, I don't want
3 to get into a debate about all the field issues, but
4 my recollection is, in some cases, that may not have
5 been done as thoroughly as maybe EPRI guidance desired
6 it to be done.

7 MR. HARVEY: I can't speak for the
8 individual utilities, of course, but, yes, the
9 templates, and they're all living and they're always
10 constantly evolving.

11 And, to the point where they're even
12 getting into subcomponents for some of these
13 components.

14 So, that data is very specific. It still
15 has to be evaluated for the conditions and use at that
16 plant.

17 MR. CHERNOFF: And, this is a good example
18 of why we try to stay at a higher level because we want
19 to try to draw attention to what needs to be done in
20 this case, disposition of information, not the varied
21 tools that are out there to do it.

22 Because there's a number of different ways
23 to approach it that could be fine. And, we're not --
24 you know, you're not hearing us precluding things,
25 you're hearing us make sure that it gets looked at.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 That's trying to be our emphasis.

2 MR. MEYERS: Yes, the exception to that,
3 though, is that the findings and the way the RIS, the
4 undertone in the RIS, is that it's compliance-based
5 with a mild environment program that, you know, you
6 replace per the manual at X, where that's 30 -- can be
7 30 and 40 year old information that we've moved beyond
8 and evaluated that.

9 I'm just saying, that's kind of the read,
10 the gist. But, without that background information in
11 the RIS, the other point you were talking to, you were
12 leaving it kind of vague.

13 MR. CHERNOFF: I just want to be clear, you
14 mentioned earlier about licensing basis information
15 that hasn't been updated, and I know that was probably,
16 you know, mixing two thoughts.

17 Because there is a requirement to keep that
18 licensing basis information, you know, current and up
19 to date. I know you guys are aware of that.

20 MR. MEYERS: Right.

21 MR. CHERNOFF: And, it's a mix of
22 licensing basis information and more detailed design
23 basis, design basis supporting information that's out
24 there.

25 MR. MEYERS: But, you can't update it if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the vendor hasn't updated it. I mean if they don't --

2 MR. CHERNOFF: I would challenge that you
3 could update it. It's up to your engineering
4 organization to make those decisions and to, in fact,
5 what --

6 MR. MEYERS: And, that's where we use the
7 tool.

8 But, I wanted -- you talked about the
9 licensing basis in general. And, I think the general
10 approach, while we understand that, the lack of some
11 background information in the draft RIS on how
12 licensees did or did not implement commitments to the
13 IEEE standards for the qualification program of
14 components in mild environments and ongoing
15 prescriptive maintenance-type programs.

16 I think that lack of discussion in there
17 leads you to a little bit narrow focus when you read
18 it and go down the path of what's really required by
19 a licensee.

20 Because, they could be in complete
21 compliance with their quality assurance program and
22 licensing basis by use of these EPRI tools and other
23 things versus a strict time-based replacement.

24 So, additional discussion on possibly Reg
25 Guide 1.89, IEEE 323 and how licensees did or did not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 commit to those standards, I think, would be helpful
2 in explaining how this relates and doesn't relate to
3 time-based requirement replacement.

4 MR. CHERNOFF: I do understand the
5 comment. I would ask if you would think about the
6 counterpoint to that is when we talk about something
7 and not everything, it also is subject to criticism.

8 So, for us to talk about all the potential
9 things that might come into play in these kind of
10 situations would be a Sisyphean task.

11 However -- and so, our decision in this,
12 as Dave Lochbaum put it, the proposed draft RIS was to
13 be at a higher level where we could be more certain of
14 not leaving something out or inferring something that
15 we didn't intend.

16 And, it is a -- we found it a difficult
17 balance to discuss and work with. And that is part of
18 why we're soliciting this input.

19 MR. MORRIS: Scott Morris here.

20 I think the reason it's taken us as long
21 as it has to move from withdrawing the TIA and producing
22 a proposed draft RIS is precisely that issue, is what's
23 the right level of detail to be in here to convey the
24 message we're trying to convey?

25 And, I will tell, internally, there are a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 lot of different opinions about that. I mean this was
2 the lowest common denominator, I guess, perhaps.

3 MR. CHERNOFF: Or, you know, the camel,
4 you know the horse designed by a committee at this
5 point.

6 MR. MORRIS: Right. So --

7 MR. CHERNOFF: And, hopefully, it'll be
8 refined by this dialogue we're having today.

9 Let's do -- Dave had --

10 MR. O'BRIEN: One more comment.

11 I want to FYI a little on -- this is Ken
12 O'Brien.

13 I want to FYI a little bit on Harold and
14 Scott and something I heard both from Steve and, I'm
15 sorry, but I apologize, I forgot your name.

16 MR. HARVEY: Sam.

17 MR. O'BRIEN: Sam, thank you. I knew it
18 was another S in there, I lost it for a second.

19 A piece that I heard here was a dialogue
20 was the idea of using the EPRI methodology as another
21 informing source of information as licensees try to
22 discern for themselves what the appropriate frequency
23 as replacement, modification, repair, whatever.

24 And, what I heard from Sam was a discussion
25 not of gathering PM data, but instead, taking a whole

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 -- in this case, the Agastats or maybe some other relay,
2 taking a whole group of information from a lot of
3 different utilities and figuring out -- taking them out
4 of service and looking at them, saying are these still
5 able to perform? Are these still in good shape? So
6 on.

7 And so, there's almost an evaluative
8 process there as opposed to looking at a preventive
9 maintenance program which says I haven't had three
10 failures in the last year, so therefore, I'm good.

11 That's a new piece of knowledge of putting
12 those two together. I just want to highlight to you
13 that that's different than I've heard it described by
14 many licensees to me in the past as it relates to this
15 particular issue.

16 So, it's a little different than
17 preventative maintenance template program and a little
18 bit more, going back to what you said earlier or the
19 dialogue, where a vendor gives me an answer. It's
20 service-life is X amount of time and we're beyond X
21 amount of time. Am I using preventative maintenance?
22 Am I using some other evaluative process? How do I go
23 about that?

24 There's a struggle there and so, I just
25 want to highlight that there's a nuance there that I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 don't know if everybody appreciates that was a little
2 different than on just using PM data.

3 MR. HARVEY: Yes, and this is Sam Harvey
4 again.

5 And, there's a lot that goes into this
6 creation of those templates including OEM, vendor
7 recommendations and other things including some of
8 these studies that we have conducted independently.

9 So, there's a lot that goes into and a lot
10 of different information sources and that's what I
11 wanted to make clear. It's just not -- there hadn't
12 been a failure in the last three years.

13 MR. O'BRIEN: Well, I'd offer, I've never
14 heard the program described with this aspect to it and
15 the detail as I've talked with the licensees.

16 MR. MONTGOMERY: Well, by its nature, a
17 preventative maintenance program is preventative, it's
18 not reactive. And, I think I hear language often times
19 that says that, hey, you know, like what you said, if
20 you don't have to the past three years, you know, we
21 don't have to do anything.

22 It's this preventative program, as Steve
23 points out, takes into account many different sources
24 of information. The idea is to prevent failures and
25 maximize reliability for the type of equipment for the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 service it's in.

2 So, I think that we ought to be asking
3 ourselves is, is the preventive maintenance program and
4 the staff's oversight process for the maintenance rule
5 working for us or not? If it's not, what is the
6 specific gap and what do we need to do to close that
7 gap is there is one?

8 And, I think that information or that
9 discussion, so far, I think, has been lacking. The
10 slight uptick in findings, I can explain that probably
11 in a couple of different ways.

12 So, again, we have data that indicates our
13 performance trends are either flat or improving and at
14 very high levels of reliability rates. So, I'd like
15 to get into that sort of a discussion at some point in
16 time because we struggle with, what's the problem we're
17 trying to solve?

18 MR. O'BRIEN: I'll offer a history, that
19 way I don't have to go outside the bounds of what's
20 already on the docket. This is Ken O'Brien.

21 So, we've issued unresolved items, to at
22 least three utilities in Region III. And, the issues
23 that are associated with components in service beyond
24 the vendor recommended service-lives and asking the
25 question, so why is that okay?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And, I think that's a question that
2 reasonable to ask as an inspector, why is that okay?

3 And, I think often, we're not getting a --
4 we've looked at, here's an engineering evaluation. We
5 often we're an answer that's documented in the
6 inspection report, so I'm not going outside -- that says
7 well, we haven't had a failure.

8 For components where you're relying upon
9 them to perform a safety function, I think we all would
10 agree that there's probably a higher level of
11 expectation that we all have in terms of the knowledge
12 as to why we're taking specific actions.

13 And so, that's what we're trying to get at
14 and that's where I think the gap that you're talking
15 about comes to. Is it a 50.65 issue? Is it a
16 preventative maintenance program issue?

17 Is it a Criterion 3, the program isn't
18 there? Is it a Criterion 5, the program's there but
19 we're not following the procedures? Or, is it a
20 Criterion 5, the procedures are there, but they're not
21 comprehensive enough?

22 Or, is it I forgot it completely and it's
23 not covered or it's a subcomponent so far down that I
24 hadn't thought about it? Or, is it OEM not aware of?
25 Or, is it a case where I don't have the vendor's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information? And, to be very frank with you, it's not
2 something that was on our list and we don't have
3 information to demonstrate it's good, bad or otherwise.

4 Usually, when we're coming at something of
5 this nature, you find the vendor information is an easy
6 one to go at. But then, you also find, as Harold and
7 John have pointed out, we have OE that we look at, both
8 your OE internally and our OE.

9 And then, you also have events that we look
10 and we say, well, gee, this brings to light a new issue
11 and we try and go out and look at that.

12 So, I think that's a little bit of where,
13 Bruce, the gap is. We're trying to figure out how these
14 different pieces fit together and that's why I see --
15 I think you see, and I've heard it before, you know,
16 the citations are different.

17 And, part of the reason, as Harold
18 articulated, the citations are different is, often,
19 we're trying to get at different answers. Because some
20 licensees have phenomenal programs but didn't do a real
21 good job of implementing it in a procedure.

22 Or, they have phenomenal programs that are
23 implemented well in a procedure but somebody didn't
24 follow the procedure.

25 Or, they're thinking they're covering it

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 under X and really, it needs to be covered under Y.

2 And so, that's why I think you see a little
3 bit of the difference and that's why I think we struggle
4 a little bit here, as Harold pointed out earlier, that
5 to define a very specific, singular regulatory
6 requirement, because I think it's a host of
7 requirements. It's a host of issues and we're trying
8 to --

9 There's so many that it's very difficult
10 to get them all -- all the horses in the barn at the
11 same time, but I think that's where the regulatory gap
12 is when we're trying to figure out the overarching
13 answer without prescribing the absolute answer to the
14 industry.

15 Because, if you look at the NRC's
16 regulations, they're intended and focusing on you come
17 up with the answer. Here's the performance that's
18 expected. And that's part of where the problem is
19 here, I think.

20 MR. CHERNOFF: And, that's also
21 perspective. This is a RIS, it's not a Bulletin and
22 it's not a generic letter. There's no inference of a
23 significant imminent safety issue that needs, you know,
24 immediate attention of those levels.

25 MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks for the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 clarification. You're absolutely correct.

2 MR. CHERNOFF: It's an improvement area
3 that we're focused on.

4 Let me do two things because I want to make
5 sure we give everybody an opportunity to participate.

6 Mr. Lochbaum, I think you had one comment
7 and then let's go to the phones and see anybody on the
8 phones has anything after that, then we'll circle back.

9 MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum with the
10 Union of Concerned Scientists.

11 It was an interesting discussion on
12 time-based replacements. My understanding of the
13 NRC's position in the draft RIS, is if a component's
14 within its vendor recommended service-life, you've got
15 to meet tech specs and all of the other things, if it's
16 beyond that, there needs to be some explanation of why
17 that's still okay.

18 And, that could take any number of forms
19 but, you can't just have that it hasn't failed yet as
20 the reason why it's still -- those components are still
21 operating.

22 Is that my -- do I have a correct understand
23 of what the RIS is seeking to accomplish?

24 MR. CHERNOFF: I think that's a
25 generalization that's fairly accurate that you -- if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and there are a lot of ifs here, but if the information,
2 the vendor information that you were citing, is
3 specific to your component in your plant, that you have
4 multiple programs that would tell you, you need to
5 assess that.

6 And, it's not okay to say, that was a plant
7 in a different part of the country or it was a BWR
8 instead of a PWR.

9 It doesn't mean that that assessment needs
10 to be complex. It doesn't preclude, for example, avail
11 you of EPRI's activities properly used. And, I'm
12 emphasizing the properly used because there's a long
13 discussion about using plant-based OE and informing
14 those templates with plant-based operating experience.

15 And, I just wanted to, you know, add
16 emphasis. I think that's a good -- that information
17 is good. It's very similar to what we do a lot of time
18 when we're looking at topical reports. We approve a
19 general concept in a topical report, but we always
20 almost exclusively have implementation conditions.
21 And, that's often where the rub comes in in following
22 those implementation conditions.

23 So, I think, you know, in a broad sense,
24 Dave, your comment is correct. What we're trying to
25 say is those situations where that information comes

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 through need to be addressed.

2 And, it could be the obvious choice is
3 corrective action program, operating experience
4 programs, another aspect of your quality assurance
5 program to disposition those besides those.

6 All those are okay, engineering
7 dispositions, there's a plethora of ways it could be
8 appropriately addressed.

9 MR. LOCHBAUM: Could I ask that question
10 in a slightly different way?

11 MR. CHERNOFF: Sure.

12 MR. LOCHBAUM: The examples that the NRC
13 provided up to this date, but led into this, the
14 findings or violations or however, weren't that the
15 licensees evaluations were inadequate, is that they
16 were just not there and the component was beyond its
17 vendor service-life. Is that a fair statement?

18 MR. CHERNOFF: Is that accurate, John?
19 Within the study, is that accurate?

20 MR. THOMPSON: In some cases.

21 MR. LOCHBAUM: Partial credit.

22 That's fine. There were a lot of examples
23 in that study, so that's a fair question. I withdraw
24 the clarifying question.

25 MR. CHERNOFF: Fred, if you could hold for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just a second and we could pulse the phone bridge and
2 see if anybody's --

3 MR. MEYERS: Can I just comment on that
4 last point before we move off of it? I think it's
5 important to recognize, however, I appreciate what
6 you're saying, but under a licensee's quality assurance
7 program, the requirement to develop maintenance
8 schedules does not require the licensee to formally
9 document a deviation from a vendor recommendation.

10 You have to consider many factors under
11 your quality assurance program and vendor
12 recommendations are one of them.

13 But, a deviation from a vendor manual,
14 unless you've committed to it in your licensing basis,
15 does not require a formal evaluation.

16 It's sound engineering practices and it's
17 a determination of a maintenance schedule, but it's not
18 a documented evaluation of why you're not doing
19 something.

20 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay.

21 MR. MEYERS: It's an evaluation of --

22 MR. CHERNOFF: So, help me understand,
23 every plant out there either is under a Confirmatory
24 Order or part of their licensing basis under IC5, TMI
25 Action Item, they have an operating experience program.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Okay?

2 Now, my question is, when you get operating
3 experience that comes in from whatever source that says
4 this widget is only good for six years, tell me, what
5 do you do with that?

6 MR. MEYERS: New information would be
7 processed. If it was from a vendor, it would go through
8 your V-TIP and then it gets ultimately entered into your
9 CAP program, if it's applicable, just like your site
10 OE or industry OE that we read about.

11 If it's vendor information that was
12 already in the manual, that type of information is the
13 type of documentation that I'm talking about that you
14 considered in the development of your maintenance
15 schedules, but you don't have to evaluate a deviation
16 from it.

17 MR. CHERNOFF: When the information comes
18 in and you put it in -- your next step was you put it
19 in your vendor or your --

20 MR. MEYERS: If it was from a vendor, it
21 would probably start with the V-TIP Program.

22 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. If it was not from
23 a vendor, it would go into your broader operating
24 experience program? Okay.

25 And, you look at that for -- your next step

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 was applicability? Okay. And then, what's your next
2 step?

3 MR. MEYERS: If you determine it's
4 applicable, it would wind its way into the CAP Program.

5 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. And then, what do
6 you do in the CAP Program?

7 MR. MEYERS: It would be evaluated to
8 determine what potential impact that would have.

9 MR. CHERNOFF: That's exactly what our
10 point is. That's simply, that's our point. It's the
11 processes, process the information, make a decision
12 based on processing the information.

13 MR. MEYERS: Well, but what I'm hearing,
14 though, is you're expecting to see documented
15 evaluations of where you have deviated from something
16 that you got long time ago.

17 MR. CHERNOFF: What you describe is
18 producing documentation of your consideration and your
19 determination.

20 MR. MEYERS: On a current time going
21 forward basis, not historical, not past.

22 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes, no one has mentioned
23 going back and trying to look at all the equipment in
24 the plant and producing extemporaneous contemporary
25 documents for all the equipment that's already out

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there.

2 MR. MEYERS: But, right now, that's what
3 the RIS would, I think, lead most people to conclude
4 is necessary.

5 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay, we'll look at. I
6 mean that certainly was not our intend. There is, of
7 course, a RIS cannot create a new requirement or
8 process. So, that was certainly not our intent.
9 We'll look at the wording.

10 But, what you described is the point we're
11 trying to get at.

12 MR. O'BRIEN: So, Steve, I guess I'd ask
13 you the question as part of this purpose for us to
14 understand. So, if you are trying to get at the point
15 that Harold was making, and I'll avoid using the word
16 maintenance because I'm not sure I'm necessarily in
17 alignment with that dialogue, but if you were trying
18 to get to the point of dispositioning information that
19 comes available to you from whatever venue to determine
20 whether it has an impact and whether or not you want
21 to continue to use a component in service in the plant.

22 How would you propose we word that to
23 ensure that's what's occurring? That's what I don't
24 -- I don't need an answer now, but that's what I'd offer
25 you. And, that's part of what we're trying to get at.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'd offer you -- I used to inspect at one
2 point in time, but I'll tell you that I'm not qualified
3 to do that anymore -- but I'd offer you Criterion 3,
4 Criterion 5, Criterion 16, 50.65. I can quote a bunch
5 of them off the top of my head, all of which have
6 probably some aspect to it.

7 And, Criterion 17, I think is the one, if
8 I'm not mistaken, would tell me I need to document
9 things that are important to safety.

10 When I make a decision that I'm going to
11 do something different than somebody that sold me a
12 component or somebody that's used a component a long
13 period of time or something else, it would seem that
14 it would be necessary for me to document why that's okay
15 because, otherwise, it would be difficult.

16 What we're asking here is a part of this
17 and that's why we're looking for your insight and your
18 feedback is, if there's a better way of describing what
19 you just described, by the way, being led by the quiz
20 guru over here, we've both decided he was leading the
21 witness.

22 If there's a better way of describing that,
23 I think that's what we're trying to look for. We're
24 not looking to create a new requirement. We're not
25 looking to create a different requirement. We're

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 looking to make sure that we both have a similar
2 understanding of how best to ensure the components that
3 you rely upon in the plant are able to perform their
4 intended function when called upon.

5 And, any time we get information that
6 potentially call that into question, and that can come
7 from a lot of different means and a lot of different
8 measures, we want to make sure that you're properly
9 evaluated.

10 And, any time you properly evaluate
11 something, since it's important to safety, I think
12 Criterion 17, if I'm correct, it's been a long time
13 since I was allowed to inspect, but I think that's one
14 that requires you to document activities important to
15 safety.

16 MR. CHERNOFF: Let's go to the phones.
17 And then, after we do that, let's take a short break.

18 MS. POPOVA: Okay. So, anyone that's on
19 the phones that has a question or a comment, just please
20 state your name and your company.

21 MR. FRANTZ: This is Steve Frantz from
22 Morgan Lewis.

23 And, the RIS seems to suggest that you have
24 to use the Corrective Action Program and you have to
25 do operability determinations any time you receive

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information, for example, from a vendor.

2 I think as we've been discussing, there are
3 other programs out there besides the Corrective Action
4 Program and the operability determination program that
5 can be used, such as the operating experience program,
6 the engineering program, the maintenance program.

7 And, if you go forward with this RIS, I
8 suggest you identify that these other programs are also
9 available to be used to evaluate vendor information,
10 that you don't necessarily have to use the Corrective
11 Action Program, although that may be an option.

12 MR. CHERNOFF: Thank you.

13 I think we do not disagree that there are
14 other programs than, I'll just say, the three that are
15 the majority of the discussion in the RIS. So, I
16 appreciate that comment.

17 MS. POPOVA: Are there any other questions
18 on the line?

19 MR. BACANSKAS: Yes, this is Vincent
20 Bacanskas. I'm Chief Engineer with Entergy Nuclear.

21 And, I wanted to offer something for Harold
22 to take a look at. Mr. Lochbaum referred back to the
23 active components in the license renewal rule.

24 And, I'd like to remind you that, in the
25 early '80s through the early '90s, the NRC conducted

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a research program resulting in numerous NUREG
2 documents being issues regarding nuclear plants aging
3 research program where both accident passive
4 components were studied with respect to failure rate,
5 failure modes and what the operating history had been
6 to date.

7 My understanding at the time, I authored
8 probably five or six of those documents was that this
9 was in support of license renewal rule for these
10 components.

11 So, I think it would be most interesting
12 to look at the current study and compare it to the
13 failure rates that the NRC staff, through publication
14 of the NUREGs already identified 30 years ago. Just
15 a thought.

16 MR. CHERNOFF: If I could just ask a
17 question with regard to looking at that and it being
18 interesting, can you help me relate that to the draft
19 document in what regard? Because we're really
20 structured around failure rates.

21 MR. BACANSKAS: I understand. But, what
22 you're saying is, that is the result of the operating
23 experience study that you saw an uptick or a slight
24 increase.

25 MR. CHERNOFF: In findings.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. BACANSKAS: In findings, okay, as well
2 as failures. And this kind of goes back to what Bruce
3 Montgomery was saying as well. Have we changed the
4 capability of the equipment to protect the health and
5 safety of the public? Which is a thought of mine.

6 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes, just --

7 MR. BACANSKAS: And, that goes back to the
8 failure rates. And, there's also numerous AEOD
9 studies in the past that looked at failure rates of
10 equipment and I think this could be correlated to vendor
11 recommendations at the time, this hopefully addresses
12 it.

13 So, my premise is, maybe in the small area
14 that we're looking, there's an increase in findings,
15 but not necessarily in any real material effect when
16 operating the unit.

17 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay, thank you for that
18 clarification.

19 And, just to reiterate, you know, the study
20 did not look at failure rates of equipment or tried to
21 ascribe any kind of a trend positive or negative to
22 actual equipment failure rates.

23 But, I have a better understanding of what
24 your point is. Thank you.

25 MS. POPOVA: Are there other -- any other

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 questions online?

2 MR. WEINACHT: This is Rick Weinacht.
3 I'm with Curtiss-Wright. I'm the Manager of the
4 Equipment Qualification Data Bank.

5 I have three points that I'd like to make.

6 One is that, in these discussions of
7 service-life, we seem to be omitting the corresponding
8 service condition. A service-life cannot be assessed
9 unless the service condition is known.

10 And so, when we find, for example, a
11 service-life statement in a vendor document that says,
12 an Agastat relay can only be used for 20 years. And,
13 a 1968 document, that has no context for the operating
14 plant because the service conditions are not the stated
15 with that service-life.

16 The other two points I'd like to make are
17 with regard to the draft RIS and the lack of clarity
18 about the regulatory issues that it contends that can
19 be summarized.

20 I think there are two areas we have the
21 opportunity to provide some clarity. And, one is when
22 does vendor information become part of the plant's
23 current licensing basis or design basis documentation?

24 I think the RIS does a very poor job to
25 provide any clarification on that issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The second is, there seems to be a jump that
2 when a vendor service-life exceeds it, that constitutes
3 a nonconforming condition. And, the Commission paper
4 pointed this out and I think that's a technical error
5 that still exists in the draft RIS.

6 We need to recognize that exceeding a
7 vendor recommended service-life does not in and of
8 itself constitute a nonconforming condition.

9 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. Could you, on that
10 last point, I think our language actually in the draft
11 RIS talks about the potential to be a nonconforming
12 condition. And, if you would help us, if we've got
13 other language in there some place, can you point us
14 to that?

15 MR. WEINACHT: I think I could. I could
16 provide that in formal comment.

17 MR. CHERNOFF: Or you could email it in
18 would be fine.

19 MR. WEINACHT: Okay.

20 MR. CHERNOFF: But, our intent in the
21 language and, I'm looking at page two of five, I happen
22 to have it open to that, where we talk about documenting
23 a potential nonconforming condition.

24 So, again, it depends. We are one --
25 you're right, we don't speak directly to when things

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 become part of the licensing basis. That was really
2 not our intent to try to define that. And, in and of
3 itself, you could write a long document about that.

4 But, certainly, on your last point, we
5 wanted to be sure that our language indicates that
6 something like that might be a nonconformance rather
7 than try to be predictive that, in all cases, it would
8 be.

9 So, this is that balancing act we're
10 talking about because, depending on what it is, what's
11 it's relied on for, where it is in the documentation,
12 all those things matter.

13 So, if you wouldn't mind, we'd certainly
14 appreciate -- you could use Alex's email address, but
15 also certainly, if there's some language that similar
16 to what you described in the item that gets published,
17 please ensure that you follow up with some formal
18 comments on that, too.

19 MR. WEINACHT: I'd be glad to.

20 And, just to point out one other thing
21 regarding this whole balance. I am aware of a finding
22 that occurred during one inspection where the licensee
23 had a documented evaluation that demonstrated the life
24 of a component was 27 years.

25 And, the NRC inspector provided a document

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that was not in the licensee's current licensing basis
2 or even the possession of this licensee that said the
3 item was only installed like for 20 years.

4 And, the licensee did not have an
5 evaluation that showed why that document presented to
6 him was invalid because they had never seen the document
7 before.

8 But, they did have a documented
9 engineering evaluation that demonstrated a life longer
10 than that and they still received a fine.

11 Those are the kinds of balances where the
12 NRC is overplaying its hand in terms of saying vendor
13 recommended service-life takes precedent.

14 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. And, just in the
15 interest of time, if we can -- we've got a couple more
16 -- at least a couple more comments on the bridge, we'll
17 try to get those in and then take a very short break.

18 MS. POPOVA: Yes, I'm seeing a couple of
19 comments coming through the GoTo Meeting. So, if you'd
20 like to ask those, now would be a good time.

21 MR. BAKER: This is Kelly Baker. I'm from
22 DC Cook. I'm the Design Engineering Manager.

23 And, I kind of inherited one of the
24 unresolved items from the NRC design inspection. We
25 were one of the three recipients of the TIA that has

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 turned into this RIS draft.

2 And, our position has been approaching
3 this has been a very difficult one because guidance that
4 was provided in the TIA that we received seems to
5 suggest that, what I believe someone said earlier, that
6 since we have no basis for not performing time-based
7 replacements on any of our relays that are installed,
8 that we have to evaluate each one of those as a
9 nonconformance.

10 So, basically, looking at the vendor
11 service-life as a design requirement that we're not
12 meeting.

13 And so, we'd have a huge evaluation
14 required to go through the number of components we're
15 talking about which is on the order of thousands of
16 relays with hundreds of different individual model
17 numbers that might be in different service conditions
18 to evaluate whether even the nonconformance exists.

19 And, this was just basically not the way
20 the plant was licensed. And, not a consideration at
21 the time, even finding a service-life for many of these
22 components is going to be extremely difficult.

23 So, that's kind of the position I'd like
24 to present to those who are drafting this guidance.

25 My understanding from what's intended is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that we only need to look at new information received
2 on vendor service-life that would call into question
3 any evaluations or time-based replacements we have if
4 new information is provided that changes -- that would
5 change our evaluation.

6 But, that's not the way it reads to us
7 currently.

8 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. And, obviously,
9 Kelly, I know you appreciate that we're, you know, we're
10 not in this forum going to go into details of the
11 incidents that you're talking about. But, I think I
12 understand your comment and appreciate it.

13 MR. MURPHY: Harold?

14 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes?

15 MR. MURPHY: Marty Murphy from Xcel
16 Energy.

17 I think, and maybe this is something we can
18 talk about when we come back and I think you've touched
19 on it already, that the RIS is being written at a high
20 level.

21 However, I think, you know, industry can
22 read this as very much still aligned with what's in the
23 TIA. And, I think we just heard that from DC Cook and
24 I think the rest of us have that concern that this,
25 essentially, just continues to espouse the position

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that's in the TIA.

2 MR. CHERNOFF: And, Marty, what I've asked
3 is, help -- not necessarily right now in this room, but
4 help us with some specifics of what are the points that
5 you're seeing that are particularly problematic and,
6 you know, make some suggestions. That's what would be
7 most helpful.

8 MR. MEYERS: And, you know, I think the
9 reason you have so much participation and concern in
10 understanding this because of, you know, the potential
11 impact with all the evaluations that was just discussed
12 on the phone is that, in one plant that was looking at
13 this while they had over 3,000 components under 50.49
14 for a harsh environment, they had over 27,000
15 components that were in a mild environment and over 200
16 million estimated to do evaluations and replacements.

17 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes.

18 MR. MEYERS: So, there's a lot of concern
19 and I know your message is different than what we read
20 and it's different that what's in the TIA, but as Marty
21 says, it's like the precedence, at least out there, that
22 this is getting back to where you're evaluating 27,000
23 components.

24 MR. CHERNOFF: I mean, the messages can be
25 difficult at times, but if there is information that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 brings into question a broad category of equipment
2 installed in the plants, it needs to be dealt with in
3 disposition still. And, that could, at times, be, you
4 know, very large.

5 I can't speak to the specifics. I wasn't
6 involved in any of those and probably wouldn't be
7 appropriate in this forum anyway.

8 But, we are focusing in this document on
9 things that you become aware of, not trying to impose
10 additional documentation on things that are already out
11 there.

12 MR. MASHBURN: So, let me make that --

13 MR. CHERNOFF: You go ahead, absolutely,
14 yes.

15 MR. MASHBURN: -- very clear since I've
16 been sitting on my hands here for a moment. This is
17 Fred Mashburn, TVA.

18 That plant that he was mentioning is rather
19 near and dear to my heart. And, it may not be one of
20 the cats that you were intending to herd in this TIA,
21 but we've been talking in terms of becoming aware of
22 information from a vendor or credible information that
23 calls into question the capability of the components
24 that do their safety-related function.

25 The other side of this that's near and dear

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to my heart is the question of, is this intended to imply
2 that, when we go out and purchase new components, shall
3 we say, let's say a multi--case circuit breaker is going
4 into a safety-related component that is not in a harsh
5 environment that we have to request the vendor to
6 provide us with service-life information.

7 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay, very direct answer to
8 that, it depends. It's your decision, it's your
9 obligation to ensure the suitability of the purchased
10 item for its intended purpose. So, you guys have to
11 make decisions in your engineering process as to how
12 much information you need to ensure that it can perform
13 its function.

14 MR. MORRIS: Yes, there's an EPRI PM
15 template that's already factored in a lot of stuff.
16 And, you take that and you adapt it to your particular
17 application at your particular site that, in my mind,
18 ought to be good enough.

19 MR. MASHBURN: So, I've heard --

20 MR. CHERNOFF: And, I've heard it also
21 before, no one at this table is saying you need to have
22 akin to a Q-listing out the service-life of every
23 component in the plant. That's not what we're --

24 MR. MASHBURN: Well, especially for
25 equipment that we are purchasing or intending to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 purchase at that point in time.

2 MR. CHERNOFF: Right. But, your
3 obligation is that you do enough engineering work to
4 assure that it will function suitably for its mission.

5 MR. MASHBURN: Okay, I heard it depends,
6 but my definition was no, not necessarily.

7 MR. CHERNOFF: I'm an old licensing guy,
8 so it depends is like --

9 MR. MASHBURN: It sounds more like a --

10 MR. CHERNOFF: -- you get every paragraph
11 with that. Right?

12 MR. MASHBURN: Thank you.

13 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. We probably need to
14 take a break shortly.

15 Okay, let's take -- I've got 2:54 on my
16 clock and let's come back in ten minutes, 2:55, so in
17 ten minutes, let's come back.

18 Let me remind everybody, you need escorts
19 if you are not an NRC employee, badged employee, you
20 need escorts to leave the room and we will come back
21 to the people on the phone when we come back.

22 Thank you.

23 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
24 went off the record at 2:55 p.m. and resumed at 3:06
25 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CHERNOFF: I appreciate everybody
2 wrapping up the side conversations and taking seats so
3 we can get back under way.

4 All right, so our IT assistant is going to
5 be unmuting the bridge. Assistant is probably not an
6 adequate term to describe his help for us today.

7 Just a couple of -- before we get back into
8 the comments on the phone, I think it's pretty clear
9 we've gotten a lot of good feedback and good info so
10 far from a variety of people. This is what we wanted
11 to do.

12 I want to remind people the focus of the
13 document is on raising awareness and focus and
14 attention on dispositioning of information that comes
15 in. I think it's clear we probably won't have time to
16 get everybody that wants to speak today the
17 opportunity.

18 And, what I'd like to do is make sure that
19 people please, if you don't get the opportunity or you
20 think of something you didn't add to the dialogue, email
21 it to Alexandra ax16 -- no?

22 MS. POPOVA: It's axp16@nrc.gov, but it's
23 also on the Public Meeting Notice.

24 MR. CHERNOFF: So, please email any
25 additional thoughts you have to her reasonably

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 promptly, within a week or so would be great so that
2 we can take those under consideration.

3 We will also add those to publically
4 available ADAMS so that everybody can take a look at
5 it and we'll figure out a way to do that so it's
6 identifiable as associated with this document.

7 With that, if we can go back to the phone
8 bridge?

9 MS. POPOVA: Any questions still on the
10 phone?

11 MR. SAMS: This is John Sams with Ontario
12 Power Generation.

13 MR. CHERNOFF: John --

14 MS. POPOVA: Can you speak up?

15 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes, we're having trouble
16 hearing you, if you could speak up or move closer.

17 MR. SAMS: I'm on a headset, so hopefully
18 it actually picks up.

19 As far as the safety-related systems, I
20 guess the main question about the RIS here, we looked
21 at as part of our AP-913 INPO document for equipment
22 reliability.

23 We're looking -- some of the
24 safety-related equipment that, you know, it's in the
25 safety-related system but its failure really doesn't

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 result in an, you know, really much of an impact on the
2 safety related system.

3 And, not the special safety systems like
4 containment, but on some of the safety support systems.

5 And, basically, the toss to, say, do the
6 Agastat relay replacement is significant if we do it
7 as a PM. But, if we're looking for, you know, when is
8 the right time and we've looked through the EPRI
9 templates and, you know, that gives the basic guideline
10 around where we believe, you know, from an industry,
11 we may -- are seeing failures but, you know, we now have
12 a new tool within that that actually looks at what the
13 risk of, you know, not doing certain time-based
14 maintenance.

15 And, if we have an evaluation like that in
16 our system, would that be adequate for what the
17 inspectors would be looking for?

18 MR. CHERNOFF: Thank you.

19 I don't know that we're in a situation
20 where we could answer that. It's a very specific
21 question and I think you understand the components of
22 the application, the installation and whether or not
23 you follow through on the implementing requirements of
24 the EPRI templates for plant specific information as
25 well. All those things factor into that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So, I don't think we can give you, you know,
2 it's not our purpose here to try to give specific
3 answers.

4 But, if it runs through your processes and,
5 like everything else you do at the plants, it's
6 incumbent upon the licensees to follow their processes,
7 provide sufficient documentation.

8 And, that first standard is your own
9 self-assessment and self-scrutiny as to the adequacy
10 of that documentation.

11 And, I know that's a lot of generalisms,
12 but I think that's all we could do in this forum on that.

13 MS. POPOVA: Are there other questions on
14 the line?

15 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay.

16 MR. PFABE: Can you hear me?

17 MR. CHERNOFF: Yes, go ahead.

18 MR. PFABE: I have a question along
19 similar lines about the violation and challenges.

20 A few findings in the field and practical
21 experience, the --

22 MS. POPOVA: Could you please state your
23 name and the organization you work for?

24 MR. PFABE: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, let
25 me just pull over.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This is John Pfabe, the Licensee Engineer
2 Consultant.

3 A few times in the past, I've noticed an
4 inspector may be particularly knowledgeable or have a
5 particular focus in an area and he may not necessarily
6 accept the licensee's position on an item.

7 It may be reasonable and we go back to the
8 old discussions of engineering judgment and it depends
9 who the engineer is, that type of thing.

10 Is there a way of minimizing impacts or
11 going off on another science project or even, you know,
12 minimize the chance of receiving a violation on another
13 process because when difference of opinion, whether or
14 not something's strict enough or there's enough
15 scrutiny's been done to the studies or documentation.

16 MR. CHERNOFF: Let me -- this is Harold
17 Chernoff, let me address just a piece of that and then
18 I think Ken O'Brien would like to address part of it.

19 One aspect we mentioned at the very
20 beginning of this was, some of our findings, poor choice
21 of words.

22 Some of our observations in our study were
23 internally focused on things that we can do better.
24 So, we have some actions, you can go to the study and
25 you can see generally what some of those are. They are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 directed at improving our guidance documents to our
2 inspectors and providing some orientation and training
3 to try to improve that activity which you're speaking
4 of.

5 But, Ken, if you want to speak beyond that?

6 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, I'll just kind of
7 articulate, as in any inspection activity, our
8 inspectors, as they go through the evolution, they have
9 a nice open dialogue, hopefully, with the licensees and
10 the individuals they're interacting with.

11 And then, from there, they'll propose at
12 an exit meeting their potential findings which, as a
13 standard statement as a part of that dialogue, are
14 always open to management review.

15 And, that's one of the things that occurs
16 to make sure that there's a clarity and an
17 understanding, hopefully, a consistency between all
18 the inspectors throughout the Agency and we act as a
19 single voice and those things will come back to the
20 Region for review and evaluation by management.

21 And, if there's a disagreement, we'll
22 raise it up even higher to make sure that there's an
23 understanding of what the particular issues are and
24 that we're being consistent across the Agency.

25 Another reason that you're seeing this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 dialogue here today is to try and make sure we're doing
2 things in a singular voice with a consistent manner in
3 seeking input from those that we regulate.

4 MR. MORRIS: Well, and in truth -- this is
5 Scott Morris -- this is exactly what happened in this
6 case and it went to the next level which was the Region,
7 who was considering these issues, reached back to
8 Headquarters and said, hey, help us. What's the right
9 answer here? What else -- have we got it right or was
10 there something we're missing?

11 And, so that's why Headquarters is having
12 as part of this and why ultimately we're having this
13 meeting.

14 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
15 went off the record at 3:14 p.m.)

16 MR. PFABE: Right. And I understand that
17 it's a great challenge, but sometimes you get differing
18 professional opinions and then the item just drags out
19 for a year or so. Whether it's a study or additional
20 data has to be gathered or developed. You know, so,
21 we're going into a new area where vendors may be going
22 out of business that make these elite components.
23 Similar to others in the commercial field, but the data
24 may not be available. Sometimes the level of review
25 may vary across different licensees or it's very costly

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for programs. You just -- you have a pretty good
2 challenge ahead of you.

3 MR. MORRIS: Thank you.

4 MR. PFABE: Trying to focus this correctly
5 going forward the next 20/40 years.

6 MR. CHERNOFF: Thanks. I think we
7 understand this is not an easy, simple fix or
8 necessarily a major significant problem either. It's
9 something that we want to --

10 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I mean I think --

11 MR. CHERNOFF: -- tune and focus attention
12 on.

13 MR. MORRIS: I think at some level maybe
14 at its foundational level this is really operating
15 experience 101 discussion. Is really what this is.
16 Right. I mean it's not a whole lot more than that and
17 we have an operating experience organization internal
18 to the Agency who's charged with among other things to
19 assess, you know, equipment issues, performance issue,
20 all kinds of things and look for -- as Harold pointed
21 out, separate the wheat from the chaff and if there's
22 wheat, you know, what does it mean and how can we use
23 that information to modify our inspection programs, to
24 communicate observations to the industry, et cetera,
25 et cetera, et cetera. So.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CHERNOFF: And just to emphasize, the
2 most important part of what we're trying to do is
3 communicate out information. Okay. And that -- I
4 purposely am not talking about enforcement. I'm
5 talking about getting messages out in a broad sense so
6 people are aware. That's the most important thing we
7 do. The operating experience.

8 MR. PFABE: Yes, I understand. Thank
9 you.

10 MS. POPOVA: Okay. So, let's go back to
11 the room for any more questions or discussions.

12 MR. MEYERS: This is Steve Meyers, STARS
13 Alliance back to -- this is really operating experience
14 and recapping that, Harold, you discussed, you know,
15 this is really time zero going forward with credible
16 information.

17 And the draft RIS is silent on the 50.2
18 discussion, design basis information that was in the
19 TIA. So, I still just find it confusing.

20 Is this really like time zero going forward
21 with new credible information that's coming in or can
22 you just discuss why this is silent on 50.2 and, you
23 know, this old documentation that may or may not even
24 be in your CLB? The change there.

25 Because, again, you know, I think, the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 industry and the inspectors have started down this path
2 and it sounds like you've made an adjustment here.

3 MR. CHERNOFF: Well, the -- okay.
4 We -- 50.2 design, it's a regulatory definition. Okay.
5 You can go in. You can look if there's additional
6 guidance on what it means. It's a very specific subset
7 of information within a licensing basis.

8 The important part of that is it has some
9 additional requirements on it beyond the more broad
10 general information. You've got the general licensing
11 basis information which was really defined in the
12 regulations for the first succinct definition with
13 respect to license real rules. It being a term of art
14 for the beginning to that point, but in license rule
15 regulations, it was -- there's an actual definition.

16 And so, these things are all important and
17 they classify the level of significance of particular
18 pieces of equipment, but at the end of the day, you know,
19 when the sun starts to set on the power plant, the
20 important thing is that the information that came in
21 or you found -- in other words, I don't want to
22 overemphasize this time zero concept because a lot of
23 times as you're doing self-assessment activities and
24 other things, information that maybe people weren't
25 really cognizant of but had been on site is revealed

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and so, you know, we're not trying to exclude that kind
2 of a situation either.

3 But, it does not necessarily matter
4 whether it's 50.2 or other licensing basis information
5 or support and design basis information because your
6 programs are designed to deal with it in a graded
7 approach based on what it is.

8 So, that's why we felt it was more
9 effective to talk about the main programs and as one
10 of the previous commenters said these -- you know, the
11 three that we focus on are not the only ones, but they're
12 kind of the biggest ones, the broadest ones.

13 That's why we shifted that discussion a
14 little bit. Because the recognition is within those
15 things there's a tiered emphasis and tiered
16 requirements already embedded into those activities.

17 MR. MEYERS: Well, do you consider the
18 vendor maintenance owner's manual type information is
19 50.2?

20 MR. CHERNOFF: Well, no, I can't give you
21 that answer because it depends on the site. It depends
22 on the equipment. It depends on -- some people have
23 taken and made design basis documents and
24 they've -- some people actually have
25 incorporated -- referenced those directly into their

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 FSARs which raises them to a licensing-based
2 information where they may have only previously been
3 supporting information.

4 It varies quite a bit and so, I'm just not
5 going to try to put an exclamation point or a dot on
6 something that's really very broad and varied across
7 the fleets that are out there.

8 MR. O'BRIEN: So, Steve, I want to take
9 your question and comment in a slightly different
10 manner. So, I'm going to lead the witness here for a
11 moment if you don't mind.

12 What I think you're asking -- no. What I
13 think you're asking is you think it would be valuable
14 for the Agency as a part of any RIS to articulate a
15 perspective generically, broadly, however we might be
16 able to as it relates to how this information you come
17 about and how it may relate to design basis 50.2 or
18 supporting information or the associated NEI guidance.

19 Is that a statement that you're looking
20 for?

21 MR. MONTGOMERY: Yes. Yes, that would be
22 very helpful. This is Bruce Montgomery.

23 I think that given where you were with
24 the -- you're trying to communicate at a fairly high
25 level. You said that several times.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So, when you're in that mode, I think it's
2 best to help supplement communication with examples and
3 I think examples that would indicate where you would
4 believe that certain types of information relating to
5 installed time period rose to the level of design-basis
6 information and you saw those instances where we
7 deficient in that area of the industry. Those types
8 of examples whether it be CLB, design basis or Appendix
9 B type information that should have found its way into
10 a repair and replacement program, but didn't that would
11 go a long ways to help us understand your position and
12 the basis for your position.

13 The other piece that our colleague was
14 talking about from Sequoyah were there was a finding
15 that they failed to establish an installed time period
16 in equipment that was procured where one didn't
17 previously exist. That's a concern to us because the
18 implications of that would mean that we would take all
19 of our safety-related equipment and then somehow
20 establish an installed time period and retrofit it to
21 our plans.

22 That's not what I think you intend.

23 MR. CHERNOFF: And you don't see anything
24 in the RIS I don't think that infers that.

25 MR. MONTGOMERY: So, our question would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be -- and this would be really for the regions. I would
2 presume that those specific findings would be rewritten
3 in some fashion or even pulled.

4 MR. O'BRIEN: So, it's an interesting
5 question. Let me move on beyond that and I'll come back
6 to it if you don't mind. This is Ken O'Brien again.

7 I guess I'd offer that in addition to the
8 question that I think you're posing, your perspective
9 would be helpful for us to understand. So, not just
10 asking for us to help do that, but your perspective
11 would be helpful for us to understand as it relates to
12 50.2 design-basis information, supporting
13 design-basis information and the application of any,
14 I think, it's 9704.

15 A number of other things of that nature
16 would help in that regard.

17 Generally, licensees take corrective
18 actions to violations that we put out here. So, now,
19 I'm going to go on to the second part.

20 So, if we issued a violation and the
21 licensee didn't contest it, we assume that you put it
22 in your corrective program and took actions associated
23 with it.

24 I think the RIS here is trying to get at
25 the broader question, the broad guidance to the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 industry and the agency as a whole to make sure we're
2 all clear on what we're trying to accomplish. I think
3 an outcome of that would be a process moving forward
4 that's more consistent and more clear to everybody.
5 I'm not sure of the additional value we might gain for
6 something that was previously cited for which the
7 licensee took corrective actions.

8 But, again, this RIS may be able to address
9 it if you provide the information from your perspective
10 as how those pieces apply.

11 MR. CHERNOFF: Can I ask a follow-up
12 question, Bruce.

13 It's always problematic when you start to
14 present examples from real data sets that are out there
15 and we've heard several people talk about their
16 specific issues.

17 Do you think we could accomplish a similar
18 objective that you're asking for by using, if you would,
19 developed examples? In other words, not from a
20 citation or a finding, but just a here are the
21 circumstances and this is what we think based on these
22 circumstances.

23 Would that still be helpful or would that
24 defeat what you're trying to get at?

25 MR. MONTGOMERY: Well, I think examples

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that are hypothetical, if you will, will be just as
2 useful of examples that were from --

3 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. Thank you for
4 stating it much more clearly than I did.

5 MR. MONTGOMERY: But, I think the
6 gentleman who called in who indicated -- and, of course,
7 Sam Harvey's discussion around the EPRI databases and
8 how those evolve into PM templates on our AP913
9 processes.

10 The gentleman who called in to talk about
11 how we put those together, if you really looked at those
12 programs, our position is that is the synthesis of all
13 the information that we get. Whether it be a vendor
14 recommendation, testing and analysis, information from
15 OE. They're internal or external as an industry.
16 That's the synthesis of our conclusion and our
17 engineering evaluation of how long something should be
18 installed and how often we should do a replacement or
19 refurbishment.

20 And the answer that you should have got at
21 these stations when asked hey, it's 22 and the vendor
22 said 20, why is that okay? It's really not the right
23 question to ask or at least the right answer should have
24 been our PM template -- our PM template basis indicate
25 here's the appropriate frequency for this equipment in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this environment for our plant and if we want to have
2 a discussion around that, I think that's where the
3 discussion should occur. That will be the industry
4 position.

5 MR. CHERNOFF: Okay. And just to repeat
6 that, hypothetical examples would likely help as well.
7 Okay.

8 MR. MONTGOMERY: We can with that.

9 MR. CHERNOFF: Because it avoids a lot of
10 issues that we get into when we start dealing with a
11 specific example from a plant. So.

12 MR. MONTGOMERY: I think that where we can
13 help and where I think the RIS would provide value is
14 examples of what we consider credible and what's the
15 opposite of credible. Maybe we can come up with better
16 terminology and I think you're asking for that and I
17 think also instances where we think something falls
18 into our Criterion 5 Maintenance Programs, drawings,
19 procedures and whatnot and those things which I think
20 are fairly limited would put this type of information
21 at the level of design basis for CLB information. I
22 think you provided some examples. I think what I'm
23 hearing is that it -- you would agree that most of this
24 information is in our Appendix B Program that govern
25 our maintenance programs.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CHERNOFF: Well, our scope of
2 discussion is safety-related equipment. So, all of
3 that is -- falls under Appendix B even if a small part
4 of it might be graded approach.

5 But, and, Sam, if I could ask Sam a
6 question. With regard to your organization's -- the
7 template document and the frequency of updates to those
8 documents, how are they managed?

9 MR. HARVEY: Well, let's -- we can talk
10 about the formation of the templates because those are
11 various things.

12 MR. CHERNOFF: And we have staff that was
13 involved in that as well. Yes.

14 MR. HARVEY: We can -- we'd be happy to
15 share that with you. But, the template updates are
16 when something comes in that is credible information
17 that says the basis for this is no longer valid.

18 So, if we got operating experience, we got
19 a vendor service life instruction or any other type of
20 information that says what's in our template is wrong
21 or no longer valid, needs to be reassessed by the panel
22 of experts from the industry, from vendors, from OEMs
23 and et cetera, we would go back and do it.

24 Every time one of those templates is
25 reviewed, it's got a date stamp on it and it's also got

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the basis of what was in that review. So, what was
2 evaluated, what input went into it and everything else.

3 So, most of that is as we get credible
4 information and not set on any periodicity unless the
5 industry requests let's go back and revisit this. The
6 new ones are all based on requests to go back and
7 establish it. So, we may have valves. Well, now,
8 we've got check valves and we've got some components
9 and check valves in that template.

10 So, it's ongoing and living continuously.
11 That's why it's on our website because it's
12 continuously updated.

13 MR. MURPHY: Harold, a question. So,
14 Marty Murphy, Xcel Energy.

15 With the risks and the intent to keep it
16 at a relatively high level, how do you intend to
17 promulgate some kind of consistent inspector guidance
18 for us?

19 MR. CHERNOFF: That's -- I spoke to that
20 a minute ago. We have other recommendations from our
21 study that are focused on our internal procedures and
22 training and that's how that'll move forward after we
23 sort out exactly what we want our message to be.

24 MR. MURPHY: And will you share that with
25 us so that we have a common understanding of what that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is?

2 MR. MORRIS: Yes, to the extent it's in
3 inspection procedures or manual chapters, absolutely.

4 MR. CHERNOFF: Not necessarily -- I can't
5 speak to the -- where we end up on training, informal
6 or formal training, I can't speak to that, but the
7 manual chapters are out there.

8 So, as we edit and change those, it'll
9 become publicly available.

10 MR. MORRIS: Scott Morris. I just had a
11 question quickly for Sam.

12 This is a question just seeking
13 understanding. Are the templates for -- your PM
14 templates, preventive maintenance templates
15 presumably have -- without going into a lot of minutia
16 and telling you things you probably already know, I mean
17 there's performance-based maintenance and then there's
18 time-based maintenance. Right?

19 It captures both concepts? Because,
20 you're they're both important and they're both
21 relevant. Some things are not -- don't avail
22 themselves to performance monitoring. Right. So,
23 you have to have time-based maintenance. So, they were
24 both factored in there?

25 MR. HARVEY: They're both factored in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there. Absolutely.

2 MR. O'BRIEN: And this is Ken O'Brien.
3 Time-based maintenance includes replacement?

4 MR. MORRIS: Right. That's what I meant.
5 I'm sorry. I meant -- that's what I meant to say.
6 Right. Right.

7 MR. O'BRIEN: This is Ken O'Brien again.
8 I guess the reason I raised that is a lot of people when
9 you say preventive maintenance don't necessarily think
10 that preventive maintenance also includes replacement.

11 MR. HARVEY: It does. It absolutely
12 does.

13 MR. O'BRIEN: Because it's not the -- it's
14 not the components. The system you're looking at.

15 MR. MORRIS: The simplest example I like
16 to use and it's really -- it's simple to the point of
17 absurdity, but, you know, a light bulb, the
18 manufacturer says it'll burn for X amount of hours.
19 Right. And there's really no way to performance
20 monitor it. It's always going to draw the same amount
21 of current. It's always going to have the same amount
22 of lumens until one day you flip a switch and it doesn't
23 work. Right. So.

24 MR. CHERNOFF: It'll draw a different
25 amount of current.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Yes, but in the last
2 microsecond, you get the point.

3 MR. CHERNOFF: But, that's a good
4 illustration of the issues.

5 MR. MORRIS: You get the point. So, I'm
6 just trying to make sure and you've answered my
7 question. So, I'll shut up.

8 MR. CHERNOFF: Now, that I've gotten in
9 trouble with my boss --

10 MR. HARVEY: Well, like I said, it does and
11 it absolutely includes -- and it includes the
12 environmental conditions. Like is it critical
13 high-duty cycles? No, the environment as well. So,
14 all of those factor into it as well.

15 So, that's why the template gives you that
16 generic and you have to evaluate it for those
17 conditions.

18 MR. CHERNOFF: For your plant and your
19 situation.

20 MR. HARVEY: That is correct.

21 MR. CHERNOFF: I mean you're saying the
22 exact same thing I was saying and I know we had some
23 discussions where it's not clear that that was done by
24 the plant necessarily. So, it's important that they
25 do that implementation part.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. MEYERS: The EPRI template is more
2 than just a sheet of paper you're looking at, you know,
3 with some Xs in a column. It's -- I mean it provides
4 failure modes and locations and other things that you
5 consider. It's not just a check the box kind of
6 application when it's correctly.

7 MR. HARVEY: It also have a vulnerability
8 assessment tool built in it. It says if I don't do
9 this, what does it do for my probabilities?

10 MR. CHERNOFF: And to reiterate something
11 that was said earlier, we understand that we -- I'm in
12 trouble with my -- yes, my boss here and my other boss.

13 But, you know, we are reasonably
14 cognizant. We have people on staff that were also
15 involved in development of it that we can use the
16 resource to get into more detail as well.

17 But, it's also -- it takes application and
18 correct application. It's not a pull it off the shelf
19 and apply it type tool.

20 With that, we are at the end of our time
21 and just a couple of comments. One is I really
22 appreciate both the tone and the interaction that
23 people have engaged with today. It's all been very
24 pleasant. Which is the way it ought to be when we're
25 talking about something which encourages everybody to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 take more of these kinds of opportunities to do this
2 stuff.

3 That being said, I know we haven't probably
4 gotten an opportunity to address everybody's comments
5 and questions.

6 So, again, please if you would, thoughts
7 you have now, thoughts you develop over the next few
8 days in reflecting upon things that were said, please
9 email those in to Alexandra. We'll get them into ADAMS
10 so that everybody can see them and we will think about
11 them in -- as we go forward in looking at this document.

12 MR. MORRIS: So, just on that note, so
13 maybe, Alex, you could give us just quick synopsis of
14 path forward to get us from today to the point where
15 we think we'll have something in the Federal Register
16 for formal comment. I know it's a prognostication
17 that's based in guess work, but --

18 MS. POPOVA: That's a good question.

19 MR. CHERNOFF: I'm not sure that's a
20 completely fair question.

21 MS. POPOVA: So, I assume that we're going
22 to have something in the public register this year, but
23 it's going to be -- that'll be based on -- so, this
24 meeting is over, I anticipate that we're going to go
25 back to get drafting our draft and once we have internal

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 resolution there and alignment and we have OGC, our
2 General Counsel, approval, that will be posted in the
3 Federal Register.

4 MR. CHERNOFF: Can I suggest a licensing
5 answer? When we do the meeting minutes from this
6 meeting, we'll try to get some information in the
7 meeting minutes about general framework of time that
8 we're going to move forward and I think that's about
9 the best we can do.

10 MS. POPOVA: Yes, that's about the best we
11 can do. But --

12 MR. CHERNOFF: There are a lot of internal
13 things that have to be worked on and we've gotten a lot
14 of good input and we need to take some time to look at
15 that. So.

16 MS. POPOVA: Okay. Is there anything
17 else? You guys good?

18 MR. CHERNOFF: Any --

19 MS. POPOVA: Okay.

20 MR. CHERNOFF: If I could maybe ask Dave
21 or Bruce if you -- you guys were kind of principal
22 commenters. If you had anything you wanted to add at
23 closing here.

24 MR. MONTGOMERY: Well, certainly, we
25 appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 advance of issuing a RIS for comments. So, it provides
2 an extra opportunity to -- the level of interest in the
3 room here belies how significant we think this is.

4 Of course, I think a lot of the reason why
5 we're here is because of what we read in the original
6 TIA and the level of detail that was in that.

7 But, there was a little discussion we just
8 had over here that maybe as we approach this draft RIS
9 either before or after there might be an opportunity
10 to continue this dialogue maybe in a public forum with
11 a workshop.

12 MS. POPOVA: So, just as a reminder, the
13 comments that are received through the Federal Register
14 those will be the formal comments which we will take
15 in disposition and then formally answer.

16 During that -- after we notice the draft
17 RIS, we will have another public meeting to discuss
18 that.

19 MR. MONTGOMERY: Okay. Good.

20 MS. POPOVA: So, and that typically
21 happens a couple of weeks after it's noticed in the
22 Federal Register.

23 MR. MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

24 MS. POPOVA: Okay. Okay. So, I would
25 like to thank everyone again.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. LOCHBAUM: I just wanted -- Dave
2 Lochbaum of the Union of Concerned Scientists. I just
3 want -- I appreciate this meeting. It was very
4 helpful.

5 I also wanted to not reiterate because I
6 didn't say it yet, but I wanted to point out that I
7 think -- one of the reasons I think this RIS is a
8 good -- draft RIS is a good thing is it -- rather than
9 waiting for the safety event, the really bad thing from
10 happening, there is a performance trend that you're
11 trying to address and I think it's commendable that the
12 NRC's not waiting for the bad thing and then taking a
13 step back. But, is trying to avoid that bad thing.
14 So, I think that's very valuable.

15 I don't like proactive or reactive. I
16 think it's at least lagging. There was some signs.
17 The NRC's acting responsibly to those signs. I think
18 that's a good thing and I appreciate your doing it.

19 MR. CHERNOFF: Thank you.

20 MS. POPOVA: Okay. All right. Thank you
21 for that.

22 So, I would like to thank everyone for
23 their participation today and just as you saw my message
24 up on the screen, submit anything that hasn't been
25 answered to my email and that will be public and yes,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 make sure you signed in on the sheet that went around.
2 If you signed in, you don't need to send me an email.
3 You will get an email from me with the meeting notes
4 and summary and the slides which I know you're -- you
5 know, there's not too much to them and that should
6 happen in the next couple of weeks.

7 So, no further remarks? Okay. The
8 meetings adjourned.

9 MR. CHERNOFF: Thank you all. Thank you
10 on the phone.

11 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12 went off the record at 3:37 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Summary of NRC Staff Edits to the January 20, 2016 Public Meeting Transcript

Page #	Comment	Line #
10	ECS (changed to "UCS")	7
12	find (changed to "event")	20
12	incident (changed to "finding")	21
13	dismission (changed to "disposition")	15
15	541 (changed to 5.4.1)	11
18	went though (changed to "withdrew")	16
24	GL 83-78 (change to "83-28") <i>[Note: change not made in edited transcript]</i>	2
24	EO (changed to "OE")	8
24	board terms of EO (changed to "broad terms of OE")	25
28	location of statement later corrected by meeting participant via email (see ADAMS ML16034A326 <i>[Note: no changes or references in edited transcript]</i>)	9
31	though (changed to "through")	15
31	into (changed to "in to")	17
41	mile (changed to "mild")	5
43	reg. guide (changed to "RIS")	12
47	so (changed to "to")	21
50	that's also perspective (change to "also that perspective") <i>[Note: change not made in edited transcript]</i>	20
50	bolt (changed to "bulletin")	21
50	it (deleted)	23
58	at in time (changed to "at one point in time")	2
58	a better of (changed to "a better way of")	22
62	numerous AOEP studies (changed to "numerous AEOD studies")	8
66	fault (changed to "installed")	3
71	queue listing (changed to "Q-listing")	22
83	bender (changed to "vendor")	18
84	leave (changed to "lead")	10
86	or ever pulled (changed to "or even pulled")	3
94	is (changed to "as")	14