

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File (50-10/50-29/50-206/50-155/50-409/50-244  
50-219/50-213/50-237/50-245/50-255)

NRC PDR

Local PDR

SEP Reading

NRR Reading

E. G. Case

V. Stello

K. R. Goller

D. Eisenhut

T. J. Carter

R. Baer

W. Butler

B. Grimes

L. Shao

A. Schwencer

D. Davis

G. Lear

R. Reid

W. Russell

T. Wambach

G. Zech

A. Burger

E. Reeves

R. Bevan

D. Jaffe

S. Nowicki

G. Vissing

OELD

OI&E (3)

NRC Participants

R. Fraley, ACRS (16)

T. B. Abernathy

J. R. Buchanan

Memo  
4

NOV 22 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: D. Eisenhut, Assistant Director for Operational Technology

FROM: R. D. Silver, Systematic Evaluation Program Review Group

THRU: D. L. Ziemann, Leader, Systematic Evaluation Program Review Group

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING ON NOVEMBER 17, 1977 TO DISCUSS THE SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION PROGRAM (SEP)

On November 17, 1977 the NRR staff met with representatives of the licensees involved in Phase II of the SEP to inform them about the program and answer questions.

A list of attendees is presented in Enclosure 1.

The meeting was opened by E. Case, Acting Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation who summarized the bases for and the highlights of the program. Mr. Case emphasized several points including:

1. NRC believes the program is important and must be accomplished.
2. The need for the program evolved because of changes in the licensing review process and changes in licensing criteria. He noted that in the early days, licensing was done on an ad hoc basis and the rationale on bases for safety was not always documented in a manner which is clear today. He emphasized that the need for the review does not mean that there is a safety problem at any operating facility; a major concern is a lack of readily available information which hinders efficient and effective staff evaluations.
3. The review approach selected should provide the appropriate documentation and result in a minimum impact on the licensees and NRC resources.
4. Operating experience, use of non-safety systems and WASH-1400 insights will be considered in the staff evaluations.
5. The staff manpower for the SEP program has been approved by Office of Management and Budget and by Congress and the program has been approved by the Commission.

OFFICE >

SURNAME >

DATE >

D. Eisenhut, Assistant Director for Operational Technology, Division of Operating Reactors, then discussed the program background, objectives and review process and emphasized the following:

1. The review will be based on the evaluation of design basis events as outlined in Enclosure 2.
2. The plants to be reviewed and the expected sequence for initiation of reviews is shown in Enclosure 3.
3. Each facility review is expected to take two years and it is anticipated that all eleven reviews will be completed within three years. The staff will issue its evaluation reports within about 2 years after each plant review is initiated, based on the information available and received during that period. If sufficient information is not available at the end of the review period to clearly document the basis of acceptability in review, the evaluation will so indicate.
4. The first steps of the review are for the staff to prepare the plant specific topic lists, construct the matrices and study information presently available in the docket.
5. The review process will place greater emphasis on plant visits and less on first rounds of questions and answers than is typical.
6. The staff evaluations for the SEP is expected to provide more than an adequate safety basis for acting upon conversion of POLs to FTLs. The use of SEP evaluations as input to the FTL evaluations, as appropriate will result in more efficient use of NRC and licensee manpower.

Following the presentations by Messrs Case and Eisenhut, several questions from licensees were discussed. Significant points resulting from these discussions are:

1. Information from Inspection and Enforcement records will be utilized in the SEP reviews.
2. The SEP is not a licensing review. However, the outcome of the SEP review would be factored into subsequent licensing actions, e.g., full term operating licensee reviews.
3. It is anticipated that the SEP reviews will satisfy the ACRS request for a review of operating experience after 10 years of facility operation.
4. The SEP scope does not include environmental reviews.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

D. Eisenhut

- 5. The implementation of positions developed for generic issues will be coordinated with the SEP.
- 6. Phase II of SEP will include review of eleven facilities. After Phase II is completed a decision will be made regarding an SEP review of additional facilities.
- 7. The question of the relationship of this program to licensing fees is still being studied.
- 8. The staff intends to meet with the ACRS and with the AIF to inform them of the program.

After the meeting, the meeting attendees were provided copies of the generic Topic List which will be the basis for plant specific lists.

151

R. D. Silver  
Systematic Evaluation Program  
Review Group  
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:  
List of Attendees

OFFICE	SEP/DOR	SEP/DOR	AD/DT/DOR		
SURNAME	RSilver	DZiemann	DEisenhut		
DATE	11/21/77	11/24/77	11/17/77		

*as changed written RDS*

ENCLOSURE 1

LIST OF ATTENDEES  
SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION PROGRAM  
MEETING NOVEMBER 17, 1977

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
R. W. Klecker	NRC/DOR
W. S. Hazelton	NRC/DOR
C. H. Berlinger	NRC/DOR
N. Anderson	NRC/DOR
D. Fitzgerald	NUS Corp.
T. Crimmins	JCP&L
T. Tipton	JCP&L
H. Schierling	NRC/DOR
M. Turbak	Commonwealth Edison Co.
G. P. Wagner	Commonwealth Edison Co.
D. E. Nunn	Southern California Edison
K. P. Baskin	Southern California Edison
L. S. Gifford	General Electric Co.
R. L. Gridley	General Electric Co.
E. A. Reeves	NRC/DOR
J. Parkyn	Dairyland Power Coop.
E. B. Tremmel	Dairyland Power Coop.
R. E. Shimshak	Dairyland Power Coop.
A. Burger	NRC/DOR
A. Schwencer	NRC/DOR
A. Mitchell	NRC
C. J. DeBevec	NRC/I&E
P. A. DiBenedetto	NRC/DOR
G. T. Rahner	EDS Nuclear
W. A. Paulson	NRC
T. J. Carter	NRC/DOR
R. W. Reid	NRC/DOR
E. G. Adensam	NRC/DOR
R. L. Wright	ACRS
R. D. Silver	NRC/DOR
D. Jaffe	NRC/DOR
R. Mecredy	Rochester Gas & Electric
L. D. White, Jr.	Rochester Gas & Electric
J. Arthur	Rochester Gas & Electric
J. J. Shea	NRC/DOR
R. B. Hoffman	NRC/DSE
R. L. McGuinness	Northeast Utilities Serv. Co.
D. Ziemann	NRC/DOR
D. K. Davis	NRC/DOR

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
J. Reece	NRC/DOR
J. Guibert	NRC/DOR
E. Case	NRC/NRR
D. Eisenhut	NRC/DOR
K. R. Goller	NRC/DOR
G. A. Blanc	Pacific Gas & Electric
P. A. Morris	Scand Power, Inc.
A. A. Johnson	NRC
D. A. Bixel	Consumers Power
R. B. DeWitt	Consumers Power
W. J. Beckius	Consumers Power
L. M. Hausler	Consumers Power
R. H. Groce	Yankee Atomic
R. A. Szalay	AIF
D. W. Edwards	Yankee Atomic Electric Co.
F. E. Greenman	Yankee Atomic Electric Co.
S. E. Bryan	NRC/DOR

EVALUATION OF DESIGN BASIS EVENTS (DBE)

- COMPARE WITH CURRENT CRITERIA
  - o SRP CRITERIA
  - o REGULATORY GUIDES
  - o BRANCH AND STAFF POSITIONS
  - o 10 CFR REQUIREMENTS
- WHERE CRITERIA ARE MET, DOCUMENT ACCEPTABILITY
- WHERE CRITERIA ARE NOT MET, CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES
  - o JUSTIFICATION FOR OPERATION WITH DEVIATION
    - DEVIATION DOES NOT SIGNIFICANTLY DECREASE LEVEL OF SAFETY
    - PROBABILITY OF EVENT IS SUFFICIENTLY LOW
    - CONSEQUENCES (MORE REALISTIC) ARE SUFFICIENTLY LOW
  - o USE OF NON-SAFETY SYSTEMS TO PERFORM SAFETY FUNCTION
  - o ADMINISTRATIVE OR PROCEDURAL CHANGES
  - o AUGMENTED SURVEILLANCE
  - o SELECTED BACKFITTING
- DOCUMENT RESULTS

## SEQUENCE OF FACILITY REVIEWS

FACILITY	DATE OF POL	TYPE OF LICENSE	TYPE OF REACTOR
DRESDEN 1	1959	FTL	BWR
YANKEE ROWE	1960	FTL	PWR
SAN ONOFRE 1	1967	POL	PWR
BIG ROCK POINT	1962	FTL	BWR
LA CROSSE	1967	POL	BWR
R. E. GINNA	1959	POL	PWR
OYSTER CREEK	1959	POL	BWR
CONN YANKEE	1967	FTL	PWR
DRESDEN 2	1969	POL	BWR
MILLSTONE 1	1970	POL	BWR
PALISADES	1971	POL	PWR

AGE OF PLANT, TYPE OF LICENSE, BALANCE OF WORKLOAD, AND THE TYPE OF REACTOR WERE CONSIDERATIONS IN ESTABLISHING SEQUENCE OF REVIEWS.