

June 1, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Stacey L. Rosenberg, Chief
Probabilistic Risk Assessment Licensing Branch
Division of Risk Assessment
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Leslie C. Fields, Senior Project Manager */RA/*
Probabilistic Risk Assessment Licensing Branch
Division of Risk Assessment
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MAY 2, 2016, PUBLIC MEETING TO
CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN NUCLEAR
REGULATORY COMMISSION AND INDUSTRY ON
PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL ADEQUACY
WORKING GROUP TOPICS

On May 2, 2016, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a Category 2 public meeting with the nuclear industry to continue discussions pertaining to Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Technical Adequacy Working Groups. The meeting participants discussed: 1) Proposed process for closure of peer review facts and observations (F&O); 2) Staff plan for revision 3 to Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.200; and 3) Staff plan for revision 3 to RG 1.174. The public meeting notice was made available at Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession Number ML16111A172.

Proposed Process for Closure of Peer Review Facts and Observations (F&O)

NRC provided an update on staff's position by giving a presentation entitled, "Staff Position on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Guidance for Resolution of Peer Review F&Os, NEI guidance on Approach for Acceptability of New PRA Methods" available at ML16148A813. There was specific discussion on the close out process of peer review F&Os and acceptance of new PRA methods. NRC stated that industry guidance will be reviewed and, if accepted, endorsed in the upcoming Revision 3 to RG 1.200. Industry representatives mentioned that the proposed wording in RG 1.200 on team qualifications with regards to independence of the peer reviewers seems to be more restrictive than the current requirements in "Appendix B to Part 50—Quality Assurance Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants" (Appendix B). NRC clarified that the intent was to add more clarification on the topic, and not be more restrictive. NRC suggested that industry provide specific feedback on the proposed draft wording. Industry agreed to provide the requested written feedback in the following weeks.

Industry asked about documenting the closure of F&Os and whether the closed F&Os would need to be submitted in the License Amendment Request (LAR) applications. The industry questioned the additional costs associated with submitting closed F&Os in LAR applications for

CONTACT: Leslie Fields, NRR/DRA
(301) 415-1186

NRC review, since these closed F&Os would have already been subject to a peer review in the new proposed F&O closure process. NRC stated that more details need to be provided regarding how the F&Os closure process will work. NRC requested that Industry provide a brief high-level summary of how they envision the process to work.

Industry invited NRC staff to participate in the upcoming pilot independent assessment as observers for F&O closure, scheduled to take place in July of this year. NRC mentioned that the review of this process including the review of the licensee's self-closed F&Os would be helpful.

Industry stated that they are concerned with the wording used to define a new method, but stated they do not have any newly proposed language at this time. NRC mentioned that suggestions are welcomed. There was discussion about the vetting panel approach and guidelines, specifically, what is the vetting panel completion time schedule and what is procedure is available to formally accept/deny a new method and closeout the review. There was an inquiry about how to handle an expedited review. NRC stated that the expedited review process needs to be clarified and explicitly defined. There was discussion regarding the most efficient way to handle the vetting process for new methods identified in NRC publications and brochures. NRC mentioned that funding and resources for vetting panels still needs to be developed. NRC stated that it will investigate the possibility of fee-waivers for this process. NRC reiterated that, if accepted, the vetting panel procedure will be endorsed in RG 1.200.

NEI stated that they plan to provide comments on the NRC draft guidance by May 31, 2016.

Staff plan for Revision 3 to RG 1.200

NRC provided an update on Revision 3 to RG 1.200 by giving a presentation entitled, "Staff Plan on Next Revision to RG 1.200" available at ML16148A871. NRC stated that it is not efficient and too resource intensive to issue a new revision to RG 1.200 each time new or updated PRA standards or guidance are issued. The proposed approach is to endorse a series of draft guides at one time, but issue a series of draft guides along the way which allows for trial use standards to be piloted before finalizing the RG. NRC stated that there are no plans to review the Non-Advanced Light Water Reactor (ALWR) standard. There was discussion about how seismic PRAs will be handled.

Staff plan for Revision 3 to RG 1.174

NRC provided an update on Revision 3 to RG 1.174 by giving a presentation on the "Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.174, Revision 3 Development Plan and Schedule" available at ML16148A885. NRC mentioned that a working group has been formed to ensure that relevant data is received from stakeholders. NRC mentioned that there will be three opportunities for public interaction while guidance is being revised. Industry questioned the changes for defense-in-depth definitions and the impact on applications. NRC mentioned that a public workshop is planned for August of 2016.

Closing Remarks and Public Comments

At the conclusion of the meeting it was decided that next public meeting will be scheduled after receipt of the Industry's comments on Staff's position to NEI guidance for resolution of peer review F&Os.

An opportunity for public comment was provided near the end of the meeting. Public comments were received unrelated to the topics discussed. NRC is not planning to take any actions.

An agenda and list of meeting attendees is enclosed with this memorandum.

Enclosures:

1. Agenda
2. List of Attendees

Closing Remarks and Public Comments

At the conclusion of the meeting it was decided that next public meeting will be scheduled after receipt of the Industry's comments on Staff's position to NEI guidance for resolution of peer review F&Os.

An opportunity for public comment was provided near the end of the meeting. Public comments were received unrelated to the topics discussed. NRC is not planning to take any actions.

An agenda and list of meeting attendees is enclosed with this memorandum.

Enclosures:

1. Agenda
2. List of Attendees

DISTRIBUTION:

RidsNrrDraAfpb
DHarrison, NRO
JHyslop, APLA
JRogge, RI
GMiller, RIV

RidsNrrDraApla
Nrr_Dra_Apla
MDrouin, RES
MKing, RII
vka@nei.org

RidsNrrDra
RidsOpaMail
ADriver, APLA
RDaley, RIII
Nrr_Dra_Afpb

RidsRgn1MailCenter
RidsRgn2MailCenter
RidsRgn3MailCenter
RidsRgn4MailCenter
PMNS

ADAMS Package Accession No.: ML16152A020

ADAMS Memo Accession No.: ML16148A758

ADAMS Enclosure 1Accession No.: ML16148A813

ADAMS Enclosure Accession No.: ML16148A871

ADAMS Enclosure Accession No.: ML16148A885

OFFICE	NRR/DRA/APLA	NRR/DRA/APLA: BC
NAME	LFields	SRosenberg
DATE	06 /01/ 16	06/01/ 16

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND INDUSTRY TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS WITH PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL ADEQUACY WORKING GROUPS

DATE & TIME: May, 2, 2016
10:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

LOCATION: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Conference Room, OWFN-6-B04
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

PURPOSE: To discuss staff's position on NEI guidance for resolution of peer review F&Os, NEI guidance on approach for acceptability of new PRA methods, and staff plans for Revision 3 to RG 1.200 and Revision 3 to RG 1.174.

AGENDA:	10:00 AM – 10:15 AM	Introduction
	10:15 AM – 11:45 AM	Discussion on Facts & Observations resolution approach
	11:45 AM – 12:45 PM	Break
	12:45 PM – 2:15 PM	Discussion on acceptability of new PRA methods approach
	2:15 PM – 3:00 PM	Discussion on staff plan for Revision 3 to RG 1.200
	3:15 PM – 3:30 PM	Discussion staff plan for Revision 3 to RG 1.174
	4:00 PM – 4:30 PM	Public Comments
	4:30 PM	Adjourn

ENCLOSURE 1

PUBLIC MEETING BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND
INDUSTRY TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS WITH PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT
TECHNICAL ADEQUACY WORKING GROUPS

NRC

S. Rosenberg
M. Drouin
D. Harrison
J.S. Hyslop
M. Biro
L. Fields
A. Driver
S. Laur
D. Stroup
J. Nakoski
A. Gilbertson

NRC Contractors

Robert Fosdick

Stakeholders

V. Anderson, NEI
M. Schiltz, NEI
J. Stone, Exelon
B. Dolan, TVA
A. Lindeman, EPRI
D. Rao, Entergy
L. Mangan, FirstEnergy
T. Morgan, Enercon
S. Levinson, AREVA
J. Reinert, AREVA
S. Bristol, Nuscale Power
D. Henneke, GE
D. Passehl, JensenHughes
R. Linthicum, GenCo-Nuc
J. Bergman, Curtiss-Wright