Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Advisory Committee on Reactor

Safeguards

US-APWR Subcommittee: Open

Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2521 Pages 1-6

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS US-APWR SUBCOMMITTEE OPEN SESSION 8 WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2008 The subcommittee came to order in closed session 10 at 11:55 a.m. in room T2B3 of White Flint Two, Otto L. 11 12 Maynard, Chairman, presiding. PRESENT: 13 OTTO L. MAYNARD CHAIRMAN 14 DENNIS C. BLEY MEMBER 15 16 CHARLES H. BROWN JR. MEMBER WILLIAM J. SHACK MEMBER 17 18 JOHN D. SIEBER MEMBER 19 JOHN W. STETKAR MEMBER NEIL COLEMAN DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL 20 21 22 23 24

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	11:55 a.m.
3	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Is there anybody outside
4	that's from the public?
5	DFO COLEMAN: Neither outside nor
6	downstairs.
7	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay. We're in open
8	session now and I would like to just go around the
9	room and see if the members have any final comments or
10	anything. I'll start with Jack.
11	MEMBER SIEBER: I have no additional
12	comments.
13	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay, John?
14	MEMBER STETKAR: Nothing.
15	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay. Bill?
16	MEMBER SHACK: No.
17	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Dennis?
18	MR. BLEY: I think I've said everything I
19	wanted to, thanks.
20	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay, Charlie?
21	MEMBER BROWN: No.
22	CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay. I'd just like to
23	express my appreciation to both the staff and to MHI
24	for the presentations and the interaction. I think

that helps give us a much better overview of the

1 topical reports and these issues and I think it will be beneficial to our review later on. 2 As I've said before, this really is not 3 4 something that constitutes any agreement, 5 disagreement, approval, disapproval, or anything. informational briefing, still 6 is interaction between you and the staff. We'll have to 8 talk internally, as to what our next actions are or 9 what we need to -- on any of these for the future and that we'll be discussing that with the staff and 10 provide that. But again, informational for us at this 11 12 time. I will ask if MHI or anybody has any 13 comments before we closed? 14 MR. BURKHART: This is Larry Burkhart. 15 is possible to answer two questions that Mr. Stetkar 16 up yesterday, about the 17 brought human factors engineering topical report, concerning the third 18 19 methodology and the other methodology that came up? CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Sure. 20 BURKHART: Mike and John were real 21 quick to answer. So, Mike and --22 CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: We'll take any answer. 23

Just don't ask us a question, but we'll accept answers.

NEAL R. GROSS

24

MR. BURKHART: Just to re-cap, the question was, from what I recall, is are we approving the specific methodology as part of the HFE topical report, i.e., the third methodology and another methodology that is used to validate some numbers or come up with some numbers in the topical report?

MR. JUNGE: Yes, I guess my understanding was it's whether we were accepting third methodology.

MR. JUNGE: Yes, I guess my understanding was it's whether we were accepting third methodology.

It's an accepted method. It's one that's been out there for a while.

We're not accepting it. I mean, we're not endorsing it as part of the topical. What we'll do is look at how they used it and make sure that's okay.

But I'm speaking from FHEM, probably stepping outside my bounds a little bit because that's the PRA/HRA people that should be answering it.

MEMBER STETKAR: Yes, my biggest concern, to clarify it, was not -- was if the third methodology is accepted within the context of this topical report, however it's used for, verifying the HSI, because the topical report seems to be inter-woven quite closely with human reliability analysis in the PRA. But was there, by implication approval of that methodology --

MR. JUNGE: For the PRA?

MEMBER STETKAR: In other words, your

NEAL R. GROSS

evaluation of the topical report could say, well, we believe that this methodology is okay for verifying certain aspects of the human system interface design. However, you're not making any decision applicability of that particular methodology for the human reliability analysis within the context of the PRA. MR. JUNGE: Yes, used for Chapter 19 of the was outside my bounds a little bit, because that is --

MEMBER STETKAR: Right, that's why I said I

MR. JUNGE: The other question I had was, the two issues, both using a because specific methodology to essentially verify some sort of task analysis, let's say, for the human system interface design, that particular methodology might have some use in that context and yet, there might questions of its usefulness or applicability in the PRA, example, and by accepting it for this context, is there by implication, an acceptance that it's also applied for the HRA within the PRA --

MEMBER STETKAR: No.

MR. JUNGE: Okay, that's. That was my concern.

CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay, is there another

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

one or is that it? Okay. I'm going to keep the record open until 12:00 p.m. in case some member of the public does walk in at 12:00 p.m. But I will say, do you have any closing comments or anything?

MR. SCAROLA: I just wanted to thank

everyone for such an interactive discussion. I think you gave us very good feedback. We certainly have issues that we will then, now go back and address, based on your feedback. Thank you for the opportunity to get your wisdom. It was very helpful.

CHAIRMAN MAYNARD: Okay, again, I'm going to leave the record open here for a minute, but thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter concluded at approximately 12:00 p.m.)