

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

INFORMATION BRIEFING ON INSPECTIONS, TESTS,  
ANALYSES, AND ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA (ITAAC) -  
RELATED ACTIVITIES

AUGUST 30, 2011

9:00 A.M.

Public Meeting

Before the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Gregory B. Jaczko, Chairman

Kristine L. Svinicki, Commissioner

George Apostolakis, Commissioner

William D. Magwood, IV, Commissioner

William C. Ostendorff, Commissioner

## APPEARANCES

## ACRS Members:

Alan Torres  
General Manager of Nuclear Construction,  
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company

Charles Pierce  
AP1000 Licensing Manager,  
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc.

Rolf Ziesing  
Director, U.S. Licensing, Nuclear Power Plants,  
Westinghouse Electric Co., LLC.

## NRC Staff:

Bill Borchardt  
Executive Director for Operations

Michael Johnson  
Director, Office of New Reactors  
Laura Dudes, Director, Construction Inspection and  
Operational Programs, NRO

James Beardsley  
Branch Chief, Construction Inspection Branch, NRO

Alan Blamey  
Chief, Construction Projects Branch 2, RII

Mark Kowal  
Branch Chief, Technical Specifications & ITAAC Branch,  
NRO

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Good morning. The Commission meets  
3 today to discuss the Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria for  
4 potential new reactor construction, or what we refer to as ITAAC. And this is, like  
5 many of our activities related to construction or oversight, this issue has taken on  
6 added importance given the significant progress on the safety and environmental  
7 reviews for new reactor design and license applications. As one of our key  
8 construction-oversight programs, the ITAAC process is the heart of our efforts to  
9 ensure that potential new reactors are constructed in accordance with their  
10 designs and in a manner that ensures that they can operate safely. Under this  
11 process, the licensee bears the primary responsibility for developing and  
12 conducting the ITAAC, while the NRC has a more limited oversight role in  
13 reviewing the licensee's proposed ITAAC and verifying their completion through  
14 selective inspections. In order for this new process to move forward effectively  
15 and efficiently, it is critical that licensees be thorough, timely, and comprehensive  
16 in meeting their responsibilities.

17 In looking back in the history of the current generation of reactors,  
18 it's clear that many of the safety issues that they experienced during their early  
19 years of operation are rooted in construction and quality-assurance issues.  
20 Although operating reactors later achieved a much stronger safety performance,  
21 we can all agree that we need to avoid these types of early problems with new  
22 reactors that may be built in the future. Rigorous construction oversight through  
23 ITAAC, the Construction Reactor Oversight Program, and other inspection  
24 activities is essential to ensuring that. I would note, I read in preparation for this

1 meeting the Lessons Learned from the ITAAC development. And I was actually  
2 somewhat surprised by some of the lessons that are in there. And there's a  
3 couple of samples, and I think it was in there or somewhere else of the ITAAC,  
4 and I was actually -- to be honest, I think it's probably the first time I really looked  
5 at an ITAAC before, and they were surprisingly vague, which I don't think bodes  
6 well for our ability to actually work through these issues. And so hopefully today  
7 we'll be able to hear from all of you about how these are really going to work in  
8 practice, and if it's going to really achieve what we want it to achieve, and  
9 obviously the time is now to get it fixed. So it will be very interesting in what you  
10 have to say. And with that, I'll offer my colleagues any comments that they'd like  
11 to make? Okay. Alan, we'll begin with you.

12 ALAN TORRES: All right.

13 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Alan Torres is the general manager of  
14 nuclear construction at South Carolina Electric and Gas.

15 ALAN TORRES: Yes, for those of you that don't know which unit  
16 that is, that's V.C. Summer nuclear station, and I'd like to start out with thanking  
17 the Commission for the opportunity for my colleagues and myself to sit here and  
18 discuss ITAAC this morning. We're going to cover a couple of items, and we  
19 hope to go on somewhat of a logical link to one another. I'm going to cover our  
20 utility's role and view perspective, if you will, of ITAAC.

21 From a topic standpoint, requirements for ITAAC performance,  
22 utility's role, the complete ITAAC completion process, the transition to operations  
23 which is very critical, and of course then an equally critical component is the CIP  
24 Task Force initiative that goes on.

1           First of all, to start the basic discussion we'll talk about  
2 requirements for ITAAC performance, and of course the literal rule of 10.CFR.52,  
3 that the ITAAC provide reasonable insurance that the facility has been  
4 constructed and will operate in conformance with the license. And this  
5 assurance is to not only the staff, but to the public that we've constructed the  
6 facility in accordance with the requirements. ITAAC originates from the COLA,  
7 including those from the referenced DCD and ESP if applicable, and for our site  
8 specifically there are approximately 900 ITAACs. Some sites will be different,  
9 depending upon the site-specific ITAACs that would apply.

10           Going on to requirements for ITAAC performance and I think  
11 sometimes this gets missed to a degree when we discuss ITAAC. And the  
12 technical work for ITAAC completion is performed in several manners, the first of  
13 which leads off, which is one of the basic foundation parts of building the nuclear  
14 power plant, and that's 10.CFR.50, Appendix B. That is the cornerstone of all our  
15 inspections. Of course, then we have Reg Guides, ASME code, the ANSI  
16 standards, the IEEE, AWS code, the American Concrete Institute code,  
17 numerous other standards, along with our licensee programs and procedures  
18 that we would use to implement the ITAAC process and/or any other safety-  
19 related activity that were to occur onsite.

20           It goes without saying in the utility's role that the licensee is  
21 ultimately responsible for all activities, not just ITAAC activities, but we  
22 understand that the ultimate responsibility lies with the licensee on the site. Self-  
23 performance of some ITAACs, we'll do from an emergency-planning, a physical  
24 security program. Those will be the site-specific type of ITAACs that I had

1 mentioned earlier. Those will be performed by the utility. We provide direct  
2 oversight for ITAAC performance by our vendors at Westinghouse and Shaw, our  
3 consortium partners in building this plant. And then the utility will be the primary  
4 interface for the NRC inspection of ITAAC activities under IMC-2503.

5           The next slide is just a brief animation of what we would expect the  
6 process to look like and does look like, specifically highlighting the fact that our  
7 goal would be to complete all ITAACs to the point where we could get a  
8 52.103(g) finding to allow us to load fuel.

9           The ITAAC completion process, the inspection, test, and analysis  
10 are performed in accordance with the normal work process, and to me this is a  
11 very important statement because, again, I go back to my comment about  
12 10.CFR.50, because inspections are performed using the 18 criteria. And that's  
13 a very important foundation for all of our inspections. Not all ITAAC are safety-  
14 related, but all ITAAC are performed under the licensee's QA program. Extra  
15 visibility is provided on ITAAC activities due to their regulatory significance. They  
16 are uniquely identified on project schedules, they're highlighted within our  
17 construction documents and our pre-operational testing procedures, and that's an  
18 important point also. As we do our readiness reviews, that is one of the things  
19 that we highlight, that this is an ITAAC activity, and specifically if it happens to be  
20 a targeted ITAAC activity that we need to emphasize. We emphasize in our  
21 procurement documents so that our vendors are aware that they have a  
22 responsibility to complete certain inspections that are required.

23           Continuing on with the ITAAC completion process, the closure  
24 notifications being prepared in accordance with our NEI Document 08-01 and

1 Reg Guide 1.215, and the task force and the staff have done, in my opinion, an  
2 excellent job of working together to craft those documents such that we  
3 understand and can continue to utilize that as a learning tool going forward and  
4 enhance it as necessary. Work continues with the CIP task force to refine our  
5 ITAAC Closure process and develop additional examples. I think that's a very  
6 key point, the additional examples ultimately will help in the next bullet, which is  
7 planning to mitigate the expected surge of ITAAC closure near the end, right  
8 before 103(g) point, which I think everybody's aware that that is the predicted  
9 bow wave period as most of the ITAACs close toward the tail end of that period.  
10 So by having additional closure notices, using resource planning to the best of  
11 our ability, we can help try to mitigate some of that bow wave.

12 Continuing on with the closure process, staff has proposed -- and  
13 this is a work in progress -- new requirements for post-closure ITAAC  
14 notifications, the supplemental ITAAC closure notifications -- and this is  
15 commonly referred to as ITAAC maintenance -- after we've submitted a closure  
16 letter, and we must maintain the validity of the ITAAC to the point until we have  
17 received our 103(g), and we're consistent with the 08-01 document, and this  
18 happens to refer to the July 10 publication. And we've also provided, as a task  
19 force, provided comments to DG-1250 as it goes forward.

20 Some of the elements that will be used to maintain the ITAAC --  
21 going back again, if you look at these items, problem identification and resolution,  
22 construction and maintenance, configuration, control, and quality assurance.  
23 Those come directly out of Appendix B. Those are critical attributes that we  
24 would be doing, problem identification and resolution being commonly referred to

1 as corrective action or non-conformance programs. Construction and  
2 maintenance, utilization of approved procedures, configuration control,  
3 maintaining the design basis is critical to us, and then of course quality  
4 assurance roll in the function of onsite quality control and quality assurance.

5 NRC notification -- we list here several of the current times we  
6 would have to notify the staff: material error or omission in an ITAAC closure  
7 notification, a design change being implemented that would cause the ITAAC  
8 acceptance criteria not to be met any longer, and licensee activities materially  
9 affecting the ITAAC determination basis.

10 A critical element to us is the transition to operations on or about  
11 that time period where we receive the 103(g) -- of course, all ITAAC being met,  
12 the as-built configuration of the plant being verified to meet the license, and then  
13 the Commission can make the finding under 52.103(g) to allow fuel load and  
14 operation, and then there's a series of tests that of course do occur once we  
15 begin that fuel-loading process. We're working with the staff on additional  
16 guidance for requirements with respect to potential interim, and a 103(c)  
17 configuration in the event that there was some problem with a specific ITAAC or  
18 element of an ITAAC that required that justification.

19 The CIP Task Force efforts -- and again, I commend both the staff  
20 and the industry in working together on this task force. They've accomplished  
21 quite a bit since the time that it's been put together. Preparation of additional  
22 ITAAC closure notifications to reduce uncertainty in the closure process. I think  
23 that's a critical element for us going forward. Streamlining the process and  
24 clarifying expectations to assist with the surge in ITAAC closure notifications late



1 in construction, and then working to clarify the path of operation under 103(g)  
2 and/or 103(c). And to your point about vagueness on ITAACs, I think as we  
3 develop closure notices and as the task force and staff work together, we can  
4 help eliminate some of that vagueness.

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay, thank you. I guess now we'll turn to  
6 Rolf -- can you say your last name?

7 ROLF ZIESING: Ziesing.

8 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Ziesing, who is the director of U.S. licensing  
9 for Westinghouse Electric. Thank you.

10 ROLF ZIESING: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. Good  
11 morning and thank you for the opportunity to share industry views on this critical  
12 new-plant topic. My name is Rolf Ziesing, and I'm the director of U.S. licensing in  
13 the new power plant division of Westinghouse Electric. I'm responsible for all  
14 aspects of the AP-1000 certification and licensing-related activities, including the  
15 DCD, Design Certification Amendment, and the COL support and ITAAC  
16 limitation.

17 Today I'm going to address the Westinghouse role in the ITAAC  
18 process, industry progress addressing and resolving generic ITAAC issues,  
19 examples of Lessons Learned from the demo project we talked about, and briefly  
20 touch on the subject of standardization of the process.

21 At the regulatory level, the ITAAC process is defined, including the  
22 overall responsibilities of the license holder. However, at the implementation  
23 level, one could imagine there are different models for assigning roles and  
24 responsibilities of the various aspects of an ITAAC process, and the need to

1 create a detailed implementation process. What I'm going to explain as the  
2 Westinghouse role in the ITAAC process reflects formal agreements between  
3 Westinghouse-Shaw Consortium as the engineering procurement construction  
4 contractor of the standard AP-1000 plant, and our clients.

5           For AP-1000, the total number of ITAAC associated with one  
6 combined license is approximately 900. Of these, approximately 834 are  
7 considered quote-unquote "standard plant" ITAAC, and the balance are site-  
8 specific ITAAC. Site-specific ITAAC numbers vary based on site due to unique  
9 aspects of each site. For standard-plant ITAAC, the consortium will conduct  
10 ITAAC planning. In other words, the development of performance and  
11 documentation plans, and this is a key step we'll touch on later, to help provide  
12 certainty in the outcome of the execution of an ITAAC, because it's at the  
13 planning stage that we identify the details that need to be captured in the ITAAC.  
14 We will manage status tracking, performance documentation, completion of  
15 package preparation, and ITAAC maintenance up to the point of system turnover,  
16 and we'll provide our clients with this product. Where appropriate, Westinghouse  
17 coordinates with the Design Center Working Group to encourage standardization  
18 of the planning and documentation.

19           For a specific ITAAC such as programmatic ITAAC like security and  
20 emergency plans, a license holder will be more directly involved in performing  
21 and documenting the ITAAC, but it's envisioned that the project management of  
22 all ITAAC will be captured in the same process work flow and tracking tools used  
23 to develop standard ITAAC. The consortium responsibility for ITAAC  
24 maintenance will be transferred to the licensee as the systems are formally

1 turned over to the licensee. We understand the licensee has the overarching  
2 responsibility to satisfy ITAAC, but obviously there's a role that we as the EPC  
3 provide in supporting their implementation of ITAAC.

4           As you know, there's a long history of industry working with staff  
5 and Commission to understand each successive phase of the new ITAAC  
6 process under Part 52, first in the early '90s to define design certification ITAAC,  
7 including design acceptance criteria known as DAC. Then early this decade to  
8 define plant-specific ITAAC on emergency-planning ITAAC, and more recently,  
9 physical security ITAAC. This early work led to the creation and guidance of  
10 ITAAC closure, in accordance with new requirements codified in 2007. There  
11 have been numerous and frequent engaging interactions between industry and  
12 the NRC staff over the years, and I'd like to acknowledge NEI and their efforts to  
13 lead the industry stakeholders in this area by effectively leading the ITAAC task  
14 force and engaging the involvement of design-center working groups. As a  
15 guidance for closing ITAAC has matured, we're now appropriately shifting our  
16 focus on validating the guidance and demonstrating the ability to execute ITAAC  
17 closure via demonstration project. I'll speak to the demonstration project on the  
18 next slide.

19           Lessons Learned from the latest activity are being used to refine an  
20 ITAAC closure process and are being factored into industry and NRC guidance.  
21 I believe that excellent progress has been made in developing robust policies,  
22 processes, and procedures. We're now shifting our focus on execution of the  
23 ITAAC program, and are sensitive to identifying Lesson Learned early in the  
24 implementation phase so we can further improve the ITAAC closure process.

1           On the ITAAC demonstration projects, the project was sponsored  
2 by DOE under MP 2010 that involved extensive tabletop exercise to walk down  
3 all aspects of the process and explore the organizational interfaces. Participating  
4 organizations including NEI, Southern Company, Westinghouse, and NRC. The  
5 project started in approximately July, August 2010 timeframe and involved  
6 simulated inspections at Vogtle and Westinghouse of six selected simulated  
7 ITAAC closure notifications, and the project is now complete. This is a very  
8 valuable exercise and involved a lot of great interactions among the participants.  
9 For your information, the ITAAC that were selected included a pre-op test for  
10 passive core cooling systems, functional arrangement walk-down of PCS,  
11 electrical system analysis, equipment qualification-type testing -- in other words,  
12 harsh-environment testing for reactor cooling system components -- DRAP and  
13 containment-vessel materials property testing, so it represented the range of the  
14 type of ITAAC that we see.

15           Getting into Lessons Learned, as I said, this demonstration project  
16 provided early insights into the execution of ITAAC closure process. I believe the  
17 staff is going to discuss several of the first Lessons Learned, and I'm going to  
18 focus on the last two Lessons Learned, identifying their -- related to ensuring  
19 sufficient information in ITAAC closure letters and mitigating the impact of ITAAC  
20 surge.

21           First lesson I'm going to discuss, relating to closure letter  
22 information. The lesson there is that there were different expectations on closure  
23 letter content for ITAAC, where no similar NEI 08-01 example existed. That  
24 resulted in re-submittal of the closure letters until we converged on an expected

1 standard for what's needed in a closure letter. The goal going forward, obviously,  
2 is to provide additional confidence and certainty in the content of ITAAC closure  
3 letters. The activities we have planned going forward to continue working on this  
4 include expanding the ITAAC closure notification efforts, specifically  
5 Westinghouse and NEI, and we'll be working with DCWG industry group to  
6 prepare approximately 30 additional example letters that will be incorporated into  
7 NEI 08-01. That will reflect approximately 80 percent of the AP-1000 ITAAC that  
8 exist. The balance of the ITAAC that won't be represented by example letters  
9 are the one-offs in ITAAC that basically, there's not many of them. So it wouldn't  
10 really make sense to invest in the effort of the sample closure letter. So we think  
11 that having a more extensive library, if you will, and working through, in advance,  
12 the necessary details for the content basis for determination of the closure letters  
13 for the various types of ITAAC, will help improve the certainty in the outcome  
14 when we get to that point in the process.

15           The next lesson I'll discuss relates to the ITAAC surge. You saw in  
16 Alan's presentation, the graph of the expected completion or notification of  
17 ITAAC. The graph shown here is for one AP-1000 unit. I won't dwell on this as  
18 we're going to talk about it a little more in the next slide.

19           The lesson that came out of the demo project, and I think it was  
20 realized before the demo project, is that by the nature of the ITAAC program,  
21 many ITAAC come late in the process. You can't validate a system is complete  
22 until the system is complete, so by the nature of the ITAAC program itself, it will  
23 result in more ITAAC near the end. This obviously poses challenges with respect  
24 to work flow and resources and dealing with the surge, while at the forefront we

1 need to ensure that it's done properly with a needed level of detail and the quality  
2 that needs to exist. So there was discussions on how we can mitigate the  
3 challenges that will be associated with this surge, and there's various activities in  
4 place that will proceed, that will work to mitigate the challenge of the surge. We  
5 can't really do a lot to change the surge, but we can do activities to mitigate the  
6 impact of the surge.

7           For example, many of the ITAAC are pre-operational tests, and  
8 these involve well-understood processes with significant NRC inspector  
9 involvement throughout. Many of them are go/no-go type tests, where the test  
10 was either acceptable or not and you don't proceed until it's acceptable. That's  
11 done under NRC resident oversight and documented, so there's approximately  
12 274 pre-operational ITAAC, and some of them will be more involved than others  
13 but that's a healthy number of ITAAC that should be fairly straightforward, and  
14 those ITAAC come late in the process. So that's a mitigating factor.

15           Also, the effort I mentioned previously with regard to working now  
16 to define templates for ITAAC notification closure letters, to help ensure we flesh  
17 out expected level of detail and content, will help to mitigate the review question  
18 cycle that could come with submittal of a closure letter. I still expect we'll get  
19 that, but I think that working now to flesh out expectations will be helpful. And let  
20 me just add, it's not fleshing out NRC expectation per se. We need to flesh out  
21 our own expectations, and we have a consortium of different companies as well  
22 as our clients, and that's what we're focusing on first is to do it right for ourselves,  
23 and certainly we need to do it right in a manner that will be accepted by the NRC  
24 at the end.

1 I'm going to finish up by talking a little bit about standardization and  
2 the fleet approach. I've got a graphic here and I'm going to speak to some  
3 concepts. The vision is to identify and apply common activities to the entire AP-  
4 1000 fleet within Westinghouse and consortium. Like I said earlier, there's  
5 different models for how you could implement ITAAC. We think that the model  
6 that's working within the current consortium is going to prove to be an effective  
7 and efficient model, in that with Westinghouse and Shaw working to establish  
8 common central processes that support all of our customer needs, there will be  
9 efficiencies gained in the process, rather than the contrary where each client to  
10 Westinghouse would establish their own process that could look different and  
11 you could have different versions of the processes that we need to support,  
12 which could complicate things a little bit and make it more difficult for oversight as  
13 well.

14 So per an agreement with our clients and future license holders, we  
15 have the lead for managing ITAAC work flow, and we're taking an approach to  
16 standardize process regardless of project. For example, I mentioned the work  
17 we're doing with performance and documentation plans that we tend to reuse on  
18 follow-up projects, and I'll elaborate just a little bit. Each PDP that's being  
19 developed now is provided to, essentially, a design center working group, all of  
20 the AP-1000 customers for review and comment prior to finalizing the PDP, so  
21 we get the early license holder and future license holder buy in to the content of  
22 the PDP's, and then those are formalized and issued to each license holder for  
23 use. Currently today, there's about 350 standard-plant PDP's that had been  
24 finalized in the process, and we get all of the cognizant expertise, both

1 technically as well as licensing in developing those PDP's, so that's another key  
2 part in the ITAAC is to demonstrate that the ITAAC satisfies a licensing basis,  
3 and so we need to bake that into the PDP planning. And we're moving to  
4 modernize our IT infrastructure to manage the ITAAC work flow. You can  
5 imagine with many projects going on in different phases and 900 ITAAC on each  
6 project, there's a task to just manage the status of each ITAAC in different  
7 phases, share the Lesson Learned across projects, and improve the process as  
8 we go. And so we're building the infrastructure to facilitate the ready  
9 incorporation of Lessons Learned as we proceed. So I think this will not only  
10 improve the quality of the ITAAC closure process, but improve the efficiency in  
11 managing the work flow and maintaining information, and this also helps the  
12 surge. That's all. So I'll finish -- yes sir?

13 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Do those colors on that thing mean  
14 anything?

15 ROLF ZIESING: No.

16 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Trying to figure out if there was a pattern  
17 there.

18 ROLF ZIESING: Okay. To finish up, the standardization concept --  
19 other examples of standardization include equipment qualification where we  
20 intend to qualify equipment on a type basis, standard equipment-qualification  
21 packages use cross-projects, and also testing and first of the kind, first three of  
22 the kind testing. And this is an area that we're paying close attention to as China  
23 is leading the AP-1000 activities. We're just certainly -- in construction we're  
24 capturing Lessons Learned, but looking forward with testing, which is going to be



1 very similar between the different projects, we'll be capturing Lessons Learned  
2 from those testing and that will benefit the ITAAC program, because many ITAAC  
3 are essentially tests. So while China doesn't have a formal ITAAC program, what  
4 we will learn from the testing in China will greatly benefit us here. That  
5 concludes my remarks.

6 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: I will now turn to Charles Pierce, who is the  
7 AP-1000 licensing manager at Southern.

8 CHARLES PIERCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Chuck  
9 Pierce, Charles Pierce, and I'm the licensing manager for the Vogtle 3 & 4  
10 Program. It is a privilege to be here today to speak to you on this important  
11 subject, and managing ITAAC is one of the large regulatory challenges of the  
12 construction process. You heard SCE&G mention that they have about 900  
13 ITAAC, so the nuclear has approximately 875 ITAAC per unit that must be closed  
14 during this construction cycle. We have a two-unit plant, so it's a total of 1750  
15 ITAAC. On a per-unit basis, there were 841 design-controlled document ITAAC  
16 covering such areas as ASME code, as-built verification, construction  
17 inspections, pre-operational tests, engineering analysis, and environmental  
18 qualification. There are also 34 site-specific ITAAC for Vogtle covering such  
19 areas as backfill, emergency planning, security, and offsite power. Southern  
20 Nuclear is putting a significant amount of attention on the processes and  
21 resources for the results for this effort to be successful. My presentation today is  
22 designed to summarize the progress we've made and the challenges ahead.  
23 Next slide.

24 Okay, as you've heard from my colleagues, there's been a

1 significant amount of progress made between the NRC and the industry in  
2 understanding today how to manage, close, and maintain ITAAC until a 103(g)  
3 finding has been made. Both NRC Region II and NRC/NRO Division of  
4 Construction Inspection and Operational Programs have been very helpful in  
5 working with the industry to define this process. We participated, Vogtle  
6 participated in the DOE ITAAC project, which you've heard about earlier, and that  
7 was helpful for the NRC but not only for the NRC but for Southern Nuclear as  
8 well. As you've heard earlier, this project has helped define such areas as level  
9 of detail in close-out letters. It has also helped Southern Nuclear to refine its own  
10 internal ITAAC procedures. Through the experience gained from these DOE  
11 project activities, Southern Nuclear has also worked to improve its own internal  
12 level of contractor oversight. Thus, there's been an ongoing level of refinement  
13 in the processes since the last ITAAC briefing here on September 22, 2009 on  
14 ITAAC. Next slide.

15           But in truth, there's nothing like actual experience, and so for the  
16 next few slides I'm going to be talking to you about some of the experiences at  
17 Vogtle. In this regard, the early fabrication and limited work authorization have  
18 been invaluable to Southern Nuclear, and to the industry and the NRC staff in  
19 working through these areas and to identify areas that required additional  
20 discussion emphasis. In particular, the licensee oversight of the entire ITAAC  
21 process is essential to ensure confidence, or to provide confidence to both the  
22 licensee and the NRC staff that ITAAC are ready for closure. As you are aware,  
23 Southern Nuclear has contracted with Westinghouse and Shaw to build Vogtle 3  
24 and 4. However, let me emphasize: Southern Nuclear is accountable and

1 responsible to the NRC for the acceptability of this construction project with  
2 respect to the NRC regulations. Thus, in the area of ITAAC, Southern Nuclear's  
3 responsibility involves audit and oversight of suppliers and sub-suppliers, and the  
4 audit and oversight of testing activities of vendors in addition to the onsite  
5 oversight of in-place installation and maintenance of systems, structures, and  
6 components. Partially as a result of these insights, Southern Nuclear has  
7 recently reorganized to provide more emphasis on onsite and offsite licensee  
8 oversight activities. This reorganization specifically established a new onsite vice  
9 president position that focuses on this quality aspect. Also as an enhancement  
10 to licensee oversight, Southern Nuclear now performs readiness reviews that  
11 covered many of the ITAAC prior to the work being performed onsite. Next slide.

12           During the last two years, several ITAAC have gotten under way,  
13 even while the COL application is under NRC review. Southern Nuclear has  
14 closely worked with NRC Region II to keep the region informed of these  
15 activities, initially on a quarterly basis and then moving to a monthly basis, and  
16 more recently we're having discussions on providing more complete information  
17 on a weekly basis. NRC Region II has access to the Vogtle 3 and 4 construction  
18 schedule on a monthly basis, currently. The first ITAAC to have been performed  
19 was the reactor pressure-vessel charpy test at Japan Steelworks in 2010. Since  
20 then, there have been several ITAAC-type tests that have been performed on  
21 such as the squib valves, safety related batteries, and main steam line valves.  
22 There have also been ITAAC initiated during fabrications such as the non-  
23 destructive examination of the ASME code welds of the pressurizer being  
24 manufactured in Italy.

1           There's an ITAAC onsite for in-place applications such as the sheer  
2 weight velocity test to establish adequacy of the backfill, and most recently, the  
3 waterproof membrane ITAAC was performed to establish that the membrane  
4 meets the Vogtle seismic design requirements. The NRC has either observed or  
5 performed inspections on many of these activities at some point during the  
6 performance of these various ITAAC. Southern Nuclear does expect to be in a  
7 position to submit a closure letter for the waterproof membrane ITAAC for the  
8 NRC sometime in the next three to four months. This activity will allow Southern  
9 Nuclear and NRC to continue to formally exercise the closure processes and  
10 procedures. I feel confident there will be additional Lessons Learned from the  
11 execution of these early activities as well. Next slide.

12           I wanted to at least spend a few moments to talk to you about  
13 surges. I think all of us have now talked about the surge, but it is worthwhile to  
14 spend a little time to emphasize this challenge that's before Vogtle and the NRC.  
15 We have two units being built over about one year apart, and so we have 1750  
16 individual ITAAC that must be complete before the 103(g) findings can be made.  
17 This means that in 2012, we may be closing up to 100 ITAACs. We'll be starting  
18 the ITAAC closures next year. In 2015, we'll be closing approximately 650  
19 ITAAC, which does represent if you think about it about three ITAAC per day  
20 being closed, which is a business day, which is a lot of ITAAC each day.

21           I'd also like to draw your attention to the timing of the 225-day letter  
22 on the graph. In early 2015, Southern Nuclear would expect to submit this 225-  
23 day letter for Vogtle Unit 3. This letter notifies the NRC which ITAAC are still  
24 open, and how Southern Nuclear intends to close those ITAAC to allow the

1 opportunity for the hearing process to begin. But we would expect that letter to --  
2 at that point in time -- to have open about 400 ITAAC, and that letter for Unit 3  
3 alone to contain about 400 ITAAC.

4           It's also important to note in assessing the impact of the graph, that  
5 several of the activities really take place over many years that culminate in the  
6 closure of the ITAAC. And so the resources being applied take place over those  
7 same years. For example, the recent ASME code welding of the pressurizer  
8 ITAAC probably will not be closed until after the pressurizer system is in-  
9 stamped.

10           Southern Nuclear is predicting that the closure of these 650 ITAAC  
11 in the year 2015, along with ongoing oversight of the management of  
12 maintenance and the development of the 225 letter, could require 20 to 25 full-  
13 time equivalent personnel in that time frame for us, so it would be quite an effort.  
14 Next slide.

15           This was mentioned earlier, and there are different ways of  
16 counting what are pre-operational ITAAC, but we get a lot of questions of why  
17 don't we close the ITAAC out earlier. And you've heard this from Rolf earlier, but  
18 I'd mention it again. The reason why many ITAAC are closed late is that simply  
19 put, they come late in the process. Pre-operational ITAAC are done in the last  
20 year or two, and it makes sense since ITAAC confirmed that the as-built  
21 configuration of the plant meets the licensing basis. The ITAAC concept by its  
22 nature drives many ITAAC closures toward the end of this process. Okay, next  
23 slide.

24           I want to spend a few moments talking about specific ITAAC, and

1 I'm going to start by just presenting an ITAAC and to get an expanded sense of  
2 the challenge. Many ITAAC are fairly simple, such as the reactor pressure  
3 charpy ITAAC. However, about 20 percent of the ITAAC are more complex in  
4 that these ITAAC may involve many components or may involve the combination  
5 of NRC Region II and NRC/NRO resources. These ITAAC may have multiple  
6 facets, such as type test, and conforming the type test to the as-built  
7 configuration, and resolving non-conformances for multiple components.

8 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: What is a type test?

9 CHARLES PIERCE: A type test is a test of a -- typically a lab test  
10 of a field component like you do when you're basically testing a valve that is a  
11 type of what you're installing in the field. An AQ test is typically considered a  
12 type test.

13 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay.

14 CHARLES PIERCE: In that type, in that major. In many cases,  
15 these ITAAC are called report ITAAC as the example above is a report ITAAC,  
16 which means a report must be created to make the demonstration. And the  
17 industry and NRC are currently working through what attributes these report  
18 ITAACs should contain.

19 Another example of a report ITAAC on the next slide is the  
20 waterproof membrane ITAAC, which is currently underway. The NRC staff has  
21 recently performed their second inspection of the waterproof membrane ITAAC  
22 at the Vogtle 3 and 4 facility. These inspections have been invaluable in helping  
23 Southern Nuclear more fully understand NRC expectations and attributes to  
24 report ITAAC. These expectations and Lessons Learned primarily center around

1 the level of rigor the reports should contain to ensure that the testing conforms to  
2 the site conditions and the overall quality elements of the test, and these Lessons  
3 Learned will be integrated into the industry activities as we go forward. Next  
4 slide.

5 I wanted to show you briefly a picture of the waterproof membrane,  
6 and in terms of construction aspect, you note that the waterproof membrane is  
7 actually sandwiched between two layers of concrete, what's called a mud mat.  
8 This membrane is actually sprayed on the lower mud mat and then covered with  
9 a second mud mat, so it actually is a liquid applied to a elastomeric compound. It  
10 cures very rapidly. You see around the perimeter of the mud mat, the  
11 mechanically stabilized earthen wall is being installed as well as part of the  
12 limited work authorization. It is important to note that we need to address any  
13 issues with the staff at this stage regarding this ITAAC since this construction  
14 part progresses, the membrane itself will be inaccessible.

15 Finally, in closing I just want to reemphasize that a significant  
16 amount of progress has been made in the last two years toward understanding  
17 ITAAC with the NRC. Just due to the very nature and number, ITAAC has been  
18 and will continue to be a major focus area with the industry as we go forward,  
19 and as the NRC staff as well. Most recently in the last couple of weeks, the NRC  
20 staff has used the Vogtle site for applying inspections and for assessing certain  
21 standard ITAAC that may affect multiple AP-1000s. Southern Nuclear does  
22 support continued lead planned approach concepts in this and other areas to  
23 efficiently apply NRC and industry resources. In this regard, Southern Nuclear  
24 will be working with the NRC to more fully understand this concept of the use of

1 Vogtle as a lead plant for this type of activity. This concludes my remarks, and  
2 we're ready to take any questions you might have.

3 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Thank you. Commissioner Svinicki?

4 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Welcome here today. I want to thank  
5 each of you for your presentations. I'll begin with Mr. Torres and Mr. Pierce, if  
6 both of you would respond to this. You talked about the unique role of the utility,  
7 the applicant in this case, and the obligation that you have in the ITAAC process.  
8 What were the key learnings -- I've also read the report about the ITAAC  
9 demonstration project findings, but what were the learnings that each of you had  
10 for the unique role that you will have the ITAAC process, and if there were to be  
11 support for future demonstration projects, how do you think those should be  
12 oriented? What should we be trying to do in any future demonstration projects in  
13 the time that we have between now and potentially positive licensing decisions at  
14 your sites?

15 ALAN TORRES: Well, from our aspect, one of the initial keys was  
16 determining which template to utilize to begin the closure process itself. I think  
17 that was a critical aspect that both the staff and the industry learned as we began  
18 to prepare those documents to go as sample closures, so that was a tremendous  
19 learning activity for both groups, I believe.

20 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, and do you have any  
21 comments on future demonstration project work?

22 ALAN TORRES: Well, I think the opportunity to continue to learn  
23 through the demonstration process is invaluable. The proximity to COLA  
24 issuance and the actual ITAAC evolution probably makes that somewhat



1 improbable for our two units, but I think it would benefit the industry to continue  
2 that philosophy.

3 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay. Perhaps to take some real-  
4 world experiences for the future. Okay, thank you.

5 CHARLES PIERCE: I think for us, one of the key aspects that we  
6 learned was as we interacted with the NRC was the level of information that  
7 needed to be in the closure letters. I mean, we want to get those right when we  
8 submit them, and I think that was something that requires an interaction on the  
9 DOE demonstration for us to come to an understanding of what needed to be in  
10 the letters. So I think that was quite helpful.

11 As far as demonstration projects, there are some areas that I think  
12 that we're continuing to work on, such as this issue of finding report attributes,  
13 there's some ITAAC that could yield some more discussion regarding-- to make  
14 sure that we're in agreement of what -- on the acceptance criteria and what it  
15 means in a couple of cases. So I think there are some areas where we could  
16 have -- continue to dialogue with the staff. Whether that would go under  
17 demonstration or not, I think, should come up from that dialogue. I don't really  
18 have any specific recommendations at this time but I do believe this is something  
19 we ought to keep open.

20 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Is there planned engagements, in  
21 your case, between your staff and the NRC staff on something like the issue you  
22 just mentioned, which, it seems to me, in other words, you might have been  
23 describing kind of, when is an ITAAC satisfied. It seems to me if I lay that  
24 against, you know, the possibility for a surge in the very near term-- if we are at

1 the time that we're trying to process three ITAAC or close three ITAAC a day, if  
2 we're arguing about what satisfies an ITAAC that'll be, you know, pretty much--  
3 the system might collapse on itself if we're trying to resolve that at that point. So,  
4 is there a planned engagement to try to remove any remaining ambiguities  
5 between now and those days?

6 CHARLES PIERCE: We are certainly continuing to work on  
7 closure letters with the staff. In terms of with NEI 08-02, we intend to expand NEI  
8 08-02, I agree with you. We need to – when we get to the surge in particular, in  
9 the 2014-15 time-frame, we need to have very, very clear understandings of what  
10 the closer letters and what the material is needed by the staff to move on those  
11 closers at that point. And we do intend to have further dialogue with the staff on  
12 those elements to make sure there's some clarity there.

13 ALAN TORRES: Some clarification in that also in the last two  
14 weeks we had an ASME, a subcommittee meeting that the staff participated in  
15 discussion of the ASME ITAACs and what would detail necessary for the N5 data  
16 package to support what would be used as the closure process for ASME code  
17 ITAACs and there was good agreement on that level of detail.

18 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, thank you. And I think the  
19 NRC staff will discuss a little bit of some of the software tools that will be used by  
20 the NRC to manage the orchestration of a lot of these activities and the tracking  
21 of the various ITAAC. Do you have systems that we've looked at any  
22 compatibility between if there's reporting or scheduling of ITAAC that you want to  
23 notify the NRC of, so that we need to have representatives on site? Our we -- do  
24 you have remaining concerns about compatibility between what you're going to  
25 try to communicate to us and any of our software systems? Has that been

1 explored?

2 ALAN TORRES: We have explored the scheduling piece,  
3 specifically early on in the ITAAC process to ensure that we were able to submit  
4 our version of our schedule, which happens to be a software called "Primavera,"  
5 and the staff has aligned itself with the necessary tools to access that  
6 information.

7 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, thank you. And Mr. Ziesing, I  
8 would ask you -- it's interesting obviously, the AP-1000 is a reference technology  
9 in many applications, and so you said in a unique situation, where your  
10 consortium may, depending on NRC licensing decisions, have multiple units that  
11 they have a role in ITAAC and that are going on at different locations across the  
12 country. And also you have -- as a designer -- you have other vendors and  
13 things inputting into the system. Could you comment on how are you planning  
14 for the unique challenges that your consortium might face in terms of the overall  
15 orchestration of these activities?

16 ROLF ZIESING: Okay, so, just to restate your question, you want  
17 to understand the challenges with just managing the scheduling and workflow of  
18 multiple projects, multiple phases --

19 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Yes.

20 ROLF ZIESING: Yeah, it is a challenge, and it needs to start with a  
21 good schedule, a baseline construction schedule, so that we know when in  
22 construction ITAAC need to be completed so that we can back out of that -- you  
23 know, the work activities associated with planning and preparing for that. A key  
24 aspect is the generation of standard performance and documentation plans.  
25 Those will be standard regardless of project. They'll be on the shelf. We're

1 developing them now. As we execute from project to project I'm sure that we'll  
2 learn. For example, the waterproof membrane, you know, there's a performance  
3 documentation plan associated with that. We're going to do a cause evaluation  
4 to understand what we can do better on that and then we'll update that PDP,  
5 performance documentation plan, on the shelf for the next time it's used. So  
6 that's a way to roll those lessons forward.

7           In terms of just managing the complexity of multiple PDPs in  
8 various phases, we are using the Primavera scheduling, and we're using a  
9 software application that we're actually -- have used for design configuration  
10 control, with AP-1000. It happens to be called Smart Plant, and that software is  
11 specifically designed to maintain configuration control of design type information  
12 and so, we will have the ability to link any ITAAC at any phase, and then also link  
13 in the relevant design information that goes with that particular project for that  
14 phase because you could imagine that, as projects proceed -- the licensing basis  
15 for example, could change from FSAR to FSAR. Okay, and so, we're really  
16 investing in the IT tools to build linkages to manage that workflow.

17           COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: All right, thank you. And just as a  
18 closing thought, all of you I think commented that a lot of interaction has been  
19 held and it was productive and that progress has been made. If you were to  
20 identify one remaining area where you think that good focus between now and  
21 perhaps a substantially heightened activity, where would you identify that we  
22 should try to spend a little bit of additional time on the disclosing of any  
23 ambiguities. Is there anything you would highlight? Mr. Torres?

24           ALAN TORRES: Well, my focus would most definitely be on what  
25 we can do to reduce the bow wave, the impact --

1 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay

2 ALAN TORRES: -- because it has both an impact on your  
3 resources and also, it would be the key element for the units driving toward fuel  
4 load, which is the, you know, ultimately, where we want to get to at the end of the  
5 day so, anything we can do to help reduce both the amount of work in that area  
6 and to smooth the process would be of benefit to both sides.

7 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, Mr. Pierce --

8 CHARLES PIERCE: I think my focus would be a better  
9 understanding -- I think we've come to a good understanding with regard to the  
10 maintenance ITAAC rule, but actually, looking at some situations of where that  
11 would apply in a broader level to make sure we understand how to apply the  
12 ITAAC processes in the maintenance programs so that we get those right  
13 because we really -- when we're in this bow wave, we're also going to be in the  
14 wave where we have a lot of these ITAAC equipment already installed, so we're  
15 going to need to be dealing with, at the same time, with when does maintenance  
16 requires us to readdress an ITAAC and so forth. So, we'll need to -- those  
17 aspects will need to be very well established by that point as well.

18 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, thank you, Mr. Ziesing.

19 ROLF ZIESING: Yes, I'm going to answer more from a process  
20 standpoint. It's difficult to predict any one specific problem, but I'd like to see the  
21 continued level of interaction. I don't think it's something we need to do  
22 differently we just need to focus on maintaining the right forms to interact so that  
23 we stay aligned on what the issues are, and that we're looking down the road to  
24 see what the pending issues are. If we let issues creep up on us, you know, and  
25 try to deal with them at the end, that's I think where we're going to run into

1 problems. I think just maintaining the form for healthy interaction to ensure that  
2 we're aligned on what the issues are we need to be working on.

3 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, Thank you. Thank you, Mr.  
4 Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Commissioner Apostolakis.

6 COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm  
7 wondering, have we learned anything from the international construction  
8 experience? Do other countries have something similar like ITAAC, or, how do  
9 they handle that issue? Are there any Lessons Learned from there or are we just  
10 focusing on what we're doing here?

11 ALAN TORRES: Well, I can address from the construction  
12 operating experience and I think Rolf can probably talk about the AP-1000 fleet  
13 standardization but, from a construction operating experience we've actively  
14 been involved with the Chinese project since they're building four AP-1000's  
15 currently. And we are getting on a regular basis through Westinghouse, and our  
16 constructor Shaw, the operating Lessons Learned from the specific activity such  
17 as module construction, containment construction, equipment installation,  
18 modular equipment installation and also, eventually, start-up testing, which is a  
19 critical phase in some of the ITAACs that we'll be involved in so we are actively  
20 involved in that program right now.

21 COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: But do they have something  
22 similar like ITAAC or --

23 ALAN TORRES: I'll let Rolf address that.

24 ROLF ZIESING: No, sir. They don't have -- they're not working to  
25 a Part 52 program in China, it's more like a Part 50. Although, there is, I believe,

1 an effort to build in an ITAAC-like process, you know, to help them validate the  
2 construction and system operation. But the aspect of the public hearing process  
3 and what not that the ITAAC program also brings as part of the one step  
4 licensing process if you will, is not - - doesn't exist in China. So -- but we are  
5 sensitive to those learning opportunities in this area and for example, in the  
6 construction and testing to come, the design authority if you will, is Westinghouse  
7 in China as well, so they're about two years ahead of where we are here and  
8 issues that occur over there are identified and resolved with the assistance of our  
9 engineering organization in Cranberry. Each issue that comes up goes through a  
10 formal evaluation for applicability to U.S. application. We have a Lessons  
11 Learned program, and we go through applicability determination so there's a  
12 formality to the process to determine what lessons in China do need to -- or  
13 should be considered for application in the U.S.

14 In terms of ITAAC specifically though, I think the opportunity is still  
15 in front of us with the testing program because the tests that will be run in China  
16 for all practical purposes will be the identical test that will be running in the U.S.  
17 And, many ITAAC are simply documenting that the tests were run. Okay, so as  
18 we learn test execution, you know, from tests execution in China, that'll improve  
19 the procedure -- should improve the procedures and execution here, which  
20 should benefit then the ability to complete the ITAAC in a quality and timely  
21 manner.

22 COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: You don't have any specific  
23 cases where you have benefitted from the experience there -- or the U.S.  
24 program has benefitted there?

25 ROLF ZIESING: I'm not sure if your question is directed

1 specifically toward ITAAC. That's why I'm hesitating a little bit because I can't  
2 point to a specific lesson today where the ITAAC program has benefited. There  
3 are benefits that we have learned in the construction engineering and module  
4 fabrication and that type of thing that are outside the scope of ITAAC.

5 COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: And, on your slide you had a  
6 sentence -- maybe you could explain it a little better to me: the vision is to  
7 identify and apply common activities to the entire AP-1000 fleet; I mean, how  
8 would that work? I mean the regulatory systems are different aren't they?  
9 Internationally, that's what you mean.

10 ROLF ZIESING: For example, equipment qualification testing; our  
11 approach to type testing equipment qualification testing would be to perform it in  
12 a manner that would be acceptable, you know, in any regulatory region.

13 COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Commissioner Magwood?

16 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Thank you, Chairman. Good  
17 morning and welcome. I appreciate your presentations today. As I sit here and  
18 listen to the extreme level of detail that I see all of you are going through at this  
19 program, it's actually encouraging in a way because I always like to put things in  
20 a broader perspective and I remember back when the acronym ITAAC first  
21 appeared. I remember the reaction I heard from some people in the industry  
22 was, "This is where Part 52 becomes Part 50," and I don't get the sense from you  
23 that you feel that way about it. I get the sense that you think this is a process  
24 that's working; that has a lot of definition to it, that you're working through it and  
25 will be able to be successful at the end.



1           That said, there do seem to be some issues that are at there and  
2 some uncertainties and I wanted to -- and there were a couple that you  
3 mentioned that you didn't get into much detail about. One that I've actually  
4 become interested in more recently are the report ITAACs, and I think Mr. Pierce,  
5 you mentioned that as an area -- How much discussion has there been about the  
6 report ITAACs in terms of exactly what is required to achieve closure? How  
7 much of that is still under discussion? I worry that when a report is the product,  
8 there is a lot of subjectivity that can get into a large technical report about -- in  
9 regard to whether it's the quality you're looking for versus the content and it  
10 would be interesting to hear your thoughts about that.

11           CHARLES PIERCE: Well, with regard to report ITAAC, there has  
12 been some initial discussions between the NEI, Nuclear Energy Institute, and the  
13 NRC regarding report ITAAC. There's further discussion that's actually being  
14 planned this week as I understand it to address that, or to more further address  
15 those attributes that need to be in the report. As that information is developed  
16 and as the NRC and the industry come to grips with that we will be modifying NEI  
17 08-01 to address those attributes of what a report ITAAC requires in that  
18 document to memorialize that information for the industry.

19           Now, I will say that the waterproof membrane ITAAC is a report  
20 ITAAC and we've had some -- Southern Nuclear has had some initial challenges  
21 and with that waterproof membrane ITAAC in terms of working through those  
22 issues with the NRC. We've gotten those, I think -- we're working to modify the  
23 report to address some of the NRC expectations and we've learned a lot from  
24 that, from those experiences, in terms of the rigor that needs to be in the report  
25 and addressing environmental conditions for example and so forth between the

1 lab test and the field installation is an area that -- and those Lessons Learned will  
2 be fed back to the industry.

3 ALAN TORRES: I think one of the -- when we talk about  
4 subjectivity of a report ITAAC and I go back to the example I was using earlier  
5 about the ASME ITAAC -- several parts of that state a report exists -- an example  
6 the design report exists for the piping system, that type stuff. But I think what's  
7 important from an industry standpoint as well as a staff standpoint is getting  
8 some level of agreement on the critical attributes of what that report needs to tell  
9 you. That way you can begin to eliminate some of the subjectivity in that report,  
10 and as long as we sit down and discuss what are those critical attributes as they  
11 did with the ASME one in the recent subcommittee meeting, I think the industry  
12 and staff will continue to move forward, and thereby be able to continue to revise  
13 the 01 document and make it a very useful tool for the industry.

14 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Do you have a sense of -- or  
15 maybe you know specifically how many report ITAACs are in the surge territory?  
16 Do you know how many show up late at the end of the process?

17 ALAN TORRES: I don't have that breakdown, Rolf, do you know  
18 offhand?

19 ROLF ZIESING: There's more than 200 engineering reports, or  
20 engineering ITAAC, which I think most of them are report ITAACs but I don't  
21 know when they are in the surge. I'll take that as a lookup and get back to you  
22 on that.

23 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Appreciate that. Since we were  
24 talking about the surge -- I -- since all of you mentioned that in some detail, I  
25 thought I'd explore that a little bit further. I think it was Mr. Torres' presentation,

1 he noted that the ITAAC closure process is integrated with the normal work  
2 process of the project. I've always seen ITAAC that way, that it's not necessarily  
3 -- while it's certainly a lot of documentation and a lot of interaction with the  
4 regulator that's beyond what you would've done anyway, a lot of it are project  
5 activities that probably would have been done in the course of accepting work  
6 from your contractors. So, when I think about -- when you talk about the surge,  
7 how much of the surge is a surge in work activity? How much of it is really a  
8 surge in communications with NRC and a surge in documentation? How should  
9 we really think about this? And so, in that respect, exactly where is -- I'll give you  
10 a chance to be very specific about this -- where do you think the surge becomes  
11 a problem in the process? Where is the possible weak spot in the process where  
12 the surge becomes an issue?

13 CHARLES PIERCE: Well, I think there's two questions there. The  
14 first, in almost all of the -- I would say -- almost all the ITAAC, is work that would  
15 be done under Part 50 process anyway. I mean, for example, the environmental  
16 qualification testing would need to be done regardless of whether you were  
17 building a construction plant, constructing a plant under Part 50 or 52. But, under  
18 52, you validate that, you have to a validation process to verify the plant is built  
19 as designed, so that becomes an ITAAC as a validation.

20 NRC inspections would have been performed in either situation, I  
21 think, in most cases. The ITAAC process is a more formal process, in my  
22 estimation, for that. And so, and, it does result in a higher, somewhat of a higher  
23 degree of documentation, and, of course, the NRC closure letters NRC  
24 processes with the NRC, I think it starts becoming an issue and probably in the  
25 2000, for Vogtle, in the 2014 timeframe as we start seeing several hundred

1 ITAAC in that year that we would be starting to close with the staff in terms of the  
2 processes would need to be, you know, would need to be well in place by that  
3 time. And, it's going to take, you know, a good bit of resources to deal with that  
4 specific, it'd take a good bit of additional resources to deal with that specific  
5 closure processes that are associated with ITAAC itself.

6 ALAN TORRES: From my perspective, some of the challenge  
7 resides in insuring that we have enough focus on the targeted ITAAC because  
8 without the completion of targeted ITAAC's, then we have to hold open the  
9 ITAAC family, which could lengthen the process. So, provided we put the  
10 appropriate level of emphasis, both from a scheduling and resource standpoint  
11 on the targeted ITAAC, then we've set ourselves up for the next stage, which  
12 would be the normal closure process of the entire ITAAC family as those events  
13 occur more sequentially.

14 So, one of the things that we try to do is look at how and where  
15 those specific elements fall in our schedule so we can assure ourselves that, you  
16 know, we haven't done all of the family, but, yet, the ITAAC target hadn't been  
17 completed yet, and we're sitting here waiting for all those. And, so, you know, I  
18 think it's very important to have a very logical process in our schedule to help  
19 both the staff and the utility through that process.

20 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Rolf, if you have anything else.

21 ROLF ZIESING: I'll just, I'll agree with your observation that the  
22 graph we show is, it's simply closure notifications, okay? And I think if we graph  
23 the -- the effort we're going to feel, we're going to see a graph that shows a peak  
24 in effort much sooner than what the peak is, you know, for closure letters. So, I  
25 think that we need to anticipate that it's going to take a lot of work and planning,

1 and, especially, where we have targeted ITAAC and NRC interaction. That will  
2 certainly result in significant effort much sooner to the left of that peak curve than  
3 what you see.

4 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Just one last, I'll try and make, I'll  
5 make the question quick. We'll see how quick your answers are. What's your  
6 current comfort level with design acceptance criteria? Do you think that this is an  
7 issue that's been wrestled to some clarity, or do you still have some questions  
8 about how that's going to be closed?

9 ALAN TORRES: Right now, I think we're comfortable with the  
10 clarity level that we have. But, again, until you get to the application point, then  
11 you ferret out more additional questions. So, at this point, I believe we are.

12 CHARLES PIERCE: I would agree with that.

13 ROLF ZIESING: I agree.

14 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Excellent. Thank you very much.  
15 Thank you, Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Commissioner Ostendorff?

17 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 Thank you all for your presentations. I want to start out maybe with Mr. Pierce.  
19 On one of your slides, I think this is your slide that talked about 20 percent of the  
20 ITAAC have higher levels of complexity. I believe that was yours.

21 CHARLES PIERCE: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: And I want -- can you give us  
23 some more concrete examples of which, I'm trying to visualize what some of the  
24 difficult areas are, either for inspection or for coming to agreement with an  
25 industry or between industry and NRC on appropriate criteria for bringing to

1 closure these issues. So, is it bench valve testing versus installed testing of  
2 pneumatic valves, or -- excuse me -- you know, you know, you have the example  
3 of the waterproof membrane --

4 CHARLES PIERCE: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORF: I know, in my experience, being  
6 part of crews on two new construction submarines before robotic radiography  
7 was around. Radiography for welding was always a real tough issue. Now, that  
8 was many years ago. Advances have been made. I was trying to understand  
9 what were some of the specific examples of where you see challenges?

10 CHARLES PIERCE: Well, the, in terms of these more complex  
11 ITAAC, there's a number of ITAAC that deal with seismic qualifications of  
12 systems, environmental qualification of a system. Of course, the system  
13 contains multiple valves, multiple components. Each one of them has their own  
14 environmental qualification test that may be a collection of a component of  
15 multiple tests as an example. Because, one valve, you may have limit switches,  
16 solenoid valves, you may have heat shrinks to protect the valve from the  
17 environment and other things. So, those have to be combined on a component.  
18 And then, you have multiple components. So, you're building for one ITAAC a  
19 fairly complex series of reports that go against multiple components for one  
20 ITAAC. NRO would be conducting inspections for those items that are being  
21 tested, you know, lab tested for environmental or seismic qualifications.

22 So, the end result would be an ITAAC with a lot of reports that  
23 would, each one of them demonstrating each component for a system, for  
24 example. Does that make, I don't know if that answers your question.

25 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Well, okay, and on that point,

1 and maybe Mr. Ziesing wants to chime in here, or, Mr. Torres as well. Let's say  
2 that you have an AP-1000, you know, component that, you know -- I'm trying to  
3 get -- understand the demarcation between what's acceptable for a bench test  
4 versus what needs to be inspected in situ once it's been, you know, physically  
5 installed in the piping system, for instance. And is there, are there pretty clear  
6 lines of demarcation there as far as what point things get inspected and tested?

7           ALAN TORRES: Well, initially, you know, we would do any type  
8 testing that would be required. Let's use, let's use EQ testing for example, on a  
9 valve. So, we've done the electrical components and/or the INC type  
10 components for that valve. And then, we take that valve, and then we install it in  
11 an ASME piping system. Well, when we have a criteria that says, "Okay, this  
12 valve has got to go in in this orientation in order to keep it within your design  
13 basis analysis." This valve may have had its center of gravity in a vertical  
14 direction or horizontal direction. Whatever the case may be, provided you follow  
15 the design isometric for that, then you will have kept that component within that  
16 envelope that it was tested to. So, you role that into, okay, I've completed that  
17 element of the ITAAC, I've got my type testing done. I've installed that  
18 component properly. So, that component ITAAC may be complete, then I  
19 complete the entire piping assembly. And then, I've completed that ITAAC  
20 evolution. So, each distinct area would have a -- not necessarily a complete  
21 closure, but a fairly clear line of where one evolution had started and stopped,  
22 and the next one took over.

23           CHARLES PIERCE: As a couple of other points to that, many of  
24 these ITAAC, like EQ ITAAC, actually are separated into two parts. One of them  
25 is a report of the -- is an ITAAC of the report of the component, and others are

1 verifying the as-built configuration. So, they're actually, it's actually a two part  
2 ITAAC. The other point that I'll make is that many of these activities, such as EQ,  
3 have been exercised for years by the industry already and going all the way into  
4 how you verify it in the field. So, how you verify installation in the field matches  
5 the lab conditions, and how you build that information between the two. So,  
6 there's already a lot of experience in how you build those types of reports for  
7 environmental and seismic qualification.

8 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Okay. Mr. Ziesing, anything to  
9 add?

10 ROLF ZIESING: I was just going to echo what was said in terms of  
11 the key is really to establish the linkage between the lab type testing and the as-  
12 installed conditions. So, that's a clear delineation, I think, in terms of being able  
13 to tie the type testing to the as-installed condition. And there's bounds and  
14 whatnot that need to be established to maintain the validity of any qualification  
15 testing on the as-installed. So, I think that's a good example of how the two  
16 relate. I was going to mention one other example to your initial question in terms  
17 of ITAAC that may be more complex. An example would be related to electrical  
18 analysis. Okay. So, there's requirements, and then you have the as-built. And  
19 there's an ITAAC to basically analyze the as-built DC electrical distribution  
20 system, for example, to ensure that the as-built capacities exceed their  
21 nameplate ratings. And, so, that could be fairly involved with all the different  
22 electrical components, the documentation to show what got installed, link it to its  
23 design basis in any testing, deficiencies that may exist, and then, just the  
24 analysis may be subject to review and comment in terms of assumptions and  
25 whatnot that went in to an analysis. So, I think that type of ITAAC could result in



1 fairly involved interactions as we work to close it.

2 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Thank you. The second  
3 question I want to ask you, and Commissioner Magwood introduced this topic  
4 with respect to ITAAC being part of the normal procedures and processes,  
5 whether it be Westinghouse or with the two licensees here, and I want to maybe  
6 just neck that question down to the quality assurance area. Are there any new  
7 lessons in quality assurance, whether it be proper documentation or any of the  
8 really the paperwork side of the house that have been, that have surfaced as a  
9 result of the ITAAC demonstration process?

10 ALAN TORRES: I wouldn't necessarily just lean on the ITAAC  
11 demonstration process for learnings and quality assurance areas. I think one of  
12 the things we've learned from our operating fleet in the quality assurance arena is  
13 a very valuable tool force, and that is to depend more so on performance-based  
14 attributes of inspection as opposed to strictly compliance-based attributes of  
15 inspection, to perform an audit by simply doing a review of the regulations and  
16 verifying a procedure complies with that is one way to verify compliance. But, to  
17 take it the next level and do a performance-based observation and/or  
18 surveillance or audit gives you a great deal more assurance of the product you're  
19 getting, and ITAAC lends itself to that by its nature, because it is a performance-  
20 based activity you're out there doing. So, I think, you know, we have  
21 incorporated a lot of those type lessons into our quality environment.

22 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Okay. Thank you. Thank you,  
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: As I've said, this is probably the first time  
25 I've ever really looked into ITAAC, and I was surprised. I would note that in the

1 Lessons Learned document the staff said use of the conjunction and/or is never  
2 appropriate. I'm not sure that was, who did that, if that was a grammatical  
3 preference, or if there was a substantive preference, because, of course, one of  
4 the ITAAC I picked up has an and/or construction in it, not written out, but in the  
5 same thing, of the same. But, like I said, I'm not sure if that was grammatical or it  
6 was substantive. If it was substantive, then one of the ITAAC that I'm looking at  
7 doesn't satisfy that condition, because the thing that struck me, in all honesty,  
8 which is why it's not surprising that we're having trouble with the report ITAAC is  
9 that there doesn't appear to be anything in the inspections test or analysis piece,  
10 at least in the ones that I saw. And, it's probably true with some of the more  
11 specific pieces of equipment for which there is a, you know, if it's a, you know, a  
12 valve or, a certain valve has to open, close, whatever it may be.

13 I'll focus on two. Well, I'll focus on the first one, on the waterproof  
14 membrane ITAAC. The design commitment says the friction coefficient to resist  
15 sliding is 0.7 or higher. Okay. So, that's clear. So, the design commitment and  
16 the acceptance criteria are pretty much probably the same, right? The report  
17 exists in documents that the as-built waterproof system has a minimum  
18 coefficient of friction of 0.7, as demonstrated through material qualification  
19 testing. Okay, that seems like a reasonable acceptance criteria.

20 And then, if I go to the inspections test and analysis piece, first of  
21 all, there's no mention of material qualification testing. Now, maybe this gets to  
22 your point, Mr. Torres, about there's lots and lots of backup and understanding  
23 and discussion for what we mean by testing. But, all it says in the testing is that  
24 testing will be performed to confirm that the mud-mat waterproof mud-mat  
25 interface beneath the nuclear island base mat has a minimum coefficient of

1 friction to resist sliding of 0.7. That sounds more like an acceptance criteria to  
2 me than a test. So, where do we specify the actual test?

3 CHARLES PIERCE: Well, there are more details when you go to  
4 the underlying section in the COL or the ESP.

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay. SO, it'll be in the SER, or in the  
6 application itself?

7 CHARLES PIERCE: It'll be in the application itself. There will be  
8 more details about, of the expectations.

9 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay. So, that will specify, then, what type  
10 of test exactly?

11 CHARLES PIERCE: Not necessarily what type of test. In some  
12 cases, it would. But, it would certainly have more detail than what's here in terms  
13 of establishing the expectations of the test.

14 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So, is that, then, and maybe the staff -- to  
15 what extent, I mean, what are the requirements, I mean, when the Commission is  
16 making the 103(g) finding, what are we finding relative to? Because, again, keep  
17 in mind that the whole point here is that you don't want to hear them. So, if I get  
18 an intervener that comes in and says, Well, okay, you did three tests. The first  
19 three tests did not show that the minimum coefficient of friction to resist sliding  
20 gave you 0.7. And then you did a fourth test and the fourth test showed that. So,  
21 have you satisfied the ITAAC? Have you done the inspections? Where would it  
22 tell me that that was true or not?

23 ALAN TORRES: Well, you start a little bit more fundamental from  
24 once you have the general description of the ITAAC that you're reading there.  
25 You have a performance demonstration plan that you're going to utilize, which is

1 basically the procedure --

2 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: And that's in the license?

3 ALAN TORRES: That's not in the license. We developed that as  
4 part of our ITAAC process. And, what we do is we developed this plan --

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Do you submit that to us? Do we review it?

6 ALAN TORRES: The PDP's can be reviewed on-site.

7 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: I mean, and, are they, I mean, that's part of  
8 licensing. Because the whole idea here is to have certainty. So, that, when I'm  
9 at day, you know, you want your plant to start. And I'm sitting here, and I've got  
10 in front of me interveners who have said, "You haven't met the ITAAC." Where  
11 do I go to demonstrate that, I mean, if I look at this, this doesn't tell me anything.

12 ALAN TORRES: Right. What I was going to finish with was that  
13 the PDP is part of our closure package that --

14 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: I'm not talking about, I'm talking about the  
15 license. Because, unless I'm --

16 ALAN TORRES: Well, the staff gets to review the closure  
17 documentation and anything that consists of that package, and the PDP's would  
18 be part of that package.

19 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Right. But, what would, and, again, maybe  
20 this is just my complete misunderstanding, but the whole purpose here was early  
21 licensing, right? And, I think, as Commissioner Magwood said, we don't want  
22 Part 52 to become Part 50. It's supposed to be different.

23 ALAN TORRES: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So, the whole point was to specify all of this  
25 at licensing so that when I get to this stage, I don't have an argument about what

1 this means. Because, if I have an argument about what this means, I've got a  
2 hearing, because then I don't know how this has been met. Testing will be  
3 performed. And I don't know what that means. I mean, that's, the ITAAC was  
4 supposed to specify, what, three tests, four tests, five tests. I mean, you take a  
5 freshman physics class. The first thing you learn is, you know, you probably do  
6 parabolic motion. It's an easy one. You roll things off a table, and you measure  
7 how far. And the first thing you teach people is how you do testing, right? And  
8 you can't just do it once. You got to do it multiple times. And then you got to  
9 come up with an average. And, I mean, you know, presumably, all that comes  
10 from Appendix B, that level of detail. But, if we don't know now what the answers  
11 to these questions are, then we're not going to know then because they'll be  
12 open for debate and discussion.

13 ALAN TORRES: Let us take that back as an action and respond  
14 back to you specifically, because there are numerous ITAAC that are more  
15 specific in detail.

16 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay. Right. And, I suspected there are.  
17 And there are some that I glanced through. But, they may reference a specific  
18 ASME test or something like that.

19 ALAN TORRES: Right.

20 CHARLES PIERCE: And I think it'd be helpful if we could -- if you  
21 take an ITAAC such as this one and then you'd lay out the information that's in  
22 the licensing documentation that supports how that ITAAC is to be performed. I  
23 think if you laid those two together, you'd --

24 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: I mean, if there's more specificity there,  
25 that's good.

1 CHARLES PIERCE: It would give you a greater sense of, I think  
2 you'd feel better about it. Let me put it that way.

3 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yeah. No. I think that would help. And I  
4 think, and, you know, and, this is probably a question for the staff, and, maybe  
5 Marv, I know you're getting better information than I am. But, you know, and  
6 again, the idea is to make sure we lock it down. If it's in the license, if this is  
7 what's in the license, this is vague, and, in my mind, subject to interpretation.  
8 Now, if there is documentation then reviewed by the staff as part, I mean, I don't  
9 know if it goes in the SER or where it goes. Kind of people are nodding behind  
10 you. But, where that specificity happens so that we know, because, based on  
11 this, there's nothing. I mean, this is nothing different than the acceptance criteria.  
12 It's exactly the same. And, to me, they should be different. And, it's not all that  
13 much different, you know, in the one on the Class E equipment, the acceptance  
14 criteria's or report exists and concludes that the Class 1E equipment identified in  
15 Table 2.12-1 as being qualified for harsh environments is not all there. That's  
16 what's in the acceptance criteria. And, the inspection technology, the type  
17 technologies or combination of type test analysis will be performed on Class 1E  
18 equipment located in a harsh environment.

19 Now, you do a type test, and you do analysis. And, if they're  
20 inconsistent and you get different answers, and I'm an intervener, I'm going to go  
21 with the you need to do a combination of these. So, you need to use them both.  
22 And, if you get one that's okay, and one that's not, you're going to go with type  
23 test. Let's say the type tests show you and the analysis doesn't, and then we've  
24 got a hearing. Because, then, you've got an argument. I mean, I would think. I  
25 mean, that would be a prima facie showing. I mean, but, it comes back to the

1 fact that ITAAC's not clear.

2 ALAN TORRES: And I understand your emphasis on specifics for  
3 those particular ITAAC's because of their subjectivity that's written in there. So, I  
4 think we can --

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: But, I mean, how many are subjective like  
6 this? Because, I mean, the whole point for ITAAC was they're supposed to be  
7 objective, not subjective. If they're subjective, they're not satisfying the function.

8 CHARLES PIERCE: And, again, I think that if you go and you look  
9 at the underlying material for, let's say, the environmental qualification program,  
10 those are fairly specific requirements that are in the DCD and in the --

11 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So, why does the ITAAC say type test  
12 analysis or a combination of type test and analyses?

13 CHARLES PIERCE: Because you can do a combination of both.

14 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So, when I've got an intervener in front of  
15 me, saying that we like the analysis, we don't like the type test, and you're going  
16 to say, well, it's type test analysis or a combination, who chooses which one you  
17 use? How -- what's the -- I mean, the ITAAC aren't technical; they're legal. It's a  
18 legal way to demonstrate that the plant was built the way it was built. So, if you  
19 fail one of these, you fail the ITAAC. But, you'll, or, if you -- you'll argue, no, it's  
20 an or; I've got type test analysis or a combination. So, I can do one of the three.  
21 Which one is it? I don't know. I mean, and, again, I'm -- this isn't something that  
22 I think the Commission should be doing, quite frankly, but these --that's what I  
23 meant by vague. These are not to me clear. And, if I'm in the position to have to  
24 make a 103(g) finding, I don't know how I can argue if some intervener comes in,  
25 as I've said. So, I hope that more of them are more straight-forward than this.

1 But, if they're not, I don't -- and maybe the staff has a better explanation, or,  
2 maybe Marv does because, there's a lot of discussion over there. Am I missing  
3 something?

4 MARVIN ISKOWITCZ: No. I think, Chairman, I think you raised a  
5 legitimate point. I mean, the licensee proposes the ITAAC, the staff approves it.  
6 One would think that the staff would be on the lookout for the kind of, you know,  
7 vagueness or open to interpretation type issues that may create, you know,  
8 hearing opportunities or problems in hearings. Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Well, anyway, I, you know, I don't know  
10 what we do with this at this point. And, clearly, I don't think I have the time to  
11 look at all the ITAAC. But, these are just two that you showed, and they don't  
12 seem to be particularly clear. So, you know, maybe there's more there. But, it's  
13 in your best interest to have it clear. You know, I sound like a broken record, but  
14 that's the point. This is how we don't have a second hearing is with this. This is  
15 how we went from a Part 50 process where you had a license you had to get.  
16 You get the license up front. It's got to be clear. The inspections were to make it  
17 clear so we don't have arguments, so that the acceptance criteria is obvious, you  
18 know, in these, 0.7 coefficient of friction. But, I've got interveners who would  
19 come in and say, well, yeah, you know, you were supposed to measure it this  
20 way, and you didn't measure it this way. If it doesn't say in the ITAAC exactly  
21 what the inspection was, exactly what the test was, exactly what the  
22 measurement was, then we have an argument because there's no clear answer.  
23 And, so, you know, I'm not sure, you know, that we're this far down the road and  
24 it's like this. I'm not sure what this means. But, and, again, maybe it's all in the  
25 subsequent documentation, and the staff's going to explain that it's in their write-



1 up, and then that's clear. Or, you'll bring it forward and show it to me and Marv  
2 will agree that it's what's legally kind of binding on us as we go forward if we've  
3 got hearings. So, that's kind of the question that I'm looking at. Sorry. I've taken  
4 too much time.

5 ROLF ZIESING: Mr. Chairman, if I could make one comment or  
6 two on that. To your point, I think that's why we have the ongoing industry efforts  
7 to work on standard notification closure letters to work on the content needed to  
8 flush out any ambiguity that may exist. But, I do want to say that what is clear is  
9 the licensing basis is clear. And, at the heart of it, we need to demonstrate for  
10 those ITAAC that are identified that the underlying objective is to show that the  
11 licensing basis has been demonstrated, and it's incumbent upon us and the  
12 licensees to prepare the documentation to show without a doubt how the  
13 licensing basis has been satisfied.

14 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: And, I mean, and that's the ITAAC. And  
15 that's the only way we do that. I mean, that's by law what we do. It's not -- the  
16 Commission's finding is that the ITAAC have been met, not that the licensing  
17 basis has been satisfied. It's a different, I mean, I think it's a different legal  
18 finding. The 52.103(g) is specifically that the ITAAC have been met. And, the  
19 hearing opportunity is an a priori finding that there's, that the ITAAC have been  
20 met. So, it is a high threshold that maybe these issues would never meet that.  
21 But, the point, what I'm trying to emphasize to you, and, again, maybe I have this  
22 confused and the staff will straighten it out to me. The issue isn't closure, all  
23 right? Closure is three or four years from now. The issue is COL issuance. This  
24 has to be locked down at COL issuance, because that's when we lock in the  
25 ITAAC. If we're still dealing with this in three or four years and trying to fix it in

1 the closure letters, it's too late because the legal commitment is at the COL. And  
2 that's what, it seems to me is everybody wants to fix it at the closure. That's just  
3 too late, because we've made a licensing commitment now and a licensing  
4 decision to say how this will be done. And, if it's not clear now, we cannot clarify  
5 it later. That's a hearing in and of itself right there. I mean, there you've a priori  
6 demonstrated the ITAAC can't be met if you've got to clarify it later. So, then,  
7 you've got a hearing. And it doesn't have to -- the contention doesn't necessarily  
8 have to be successful. But, once you get yourself into a hearing, you're three,  
9 four, five months, maybe you go forward even with the hearing. The Commission  
10 will have to determine that. But, the whole point is not to have a hearing.

11 And, so, I don't know. Maybe I'm misinterpreting this. But, I was  
12 very surprised when I actually saw these. So, but, again, appreciate you being  
13 here. And, I think we hopefully have, I'll hear from the staff, and maybe I'll get  
14 better educated on this and understand it better. And, again, I'm not getting the  
15 full picture, just a slide or two. Well, thank you. Appreciate it.

16 ALAN TORRES: Thank you.

17 [break]

18 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay. Bill, we're going to start.

19 BILL BORCHARDT: Okay. Good morning. Well, Part 52 is  
20 certainly a very innovative idea and approach. We remind ourselves that it  
21 started in the 1980s as a result of the Lessons Learned from over 30 years of  
22 construction and licensing experience in the U.S. There's no area of Part 52  
23 that's more innovative than ITAAC, and there is no other system anywhere else  
24 in the world that has anything close to Part 52 or to the use of ITAAC, which lay  
25 out provisions and details of how the regulator is going to verify proper

1 construction.

2 I'd like to congratulate the staff and the industry and all the  
3 stakeholders for taking a proactive approach and working through some of the  
4 details well ahead of time in an effort to minimize surprises later on down the  
5 process. While there might be more work to be done as we've been discussing, I  
6 think they've made very good progress.

7 I'd also like to recognize that, from the staff today, you have  
8 representatives from headquarters, the Office of New Reactors, but also the  
9 Region II Center for Construction Inspection. And, I'd like to especially  
10 congratulate and acknowledge them, because they are implementing on a day-  
11 to-day basis many of the management and organizational approaches that we're  
12 trying to implement across the agency. The fact that we have a Center of  
13 Excellence in Region II, that will be the Construction Center of Excellence for the  
14 entire country, is an idea that we've been moving towards in areas outside of the  
15 reactor program but throughout the agency.

16 I'd also like to acknowledge that they are actually living the NRC  
17 values that we stress so much, the ideas about having cooperation and  
18 interdependence. These are -- this program is a prime example of how that has  
19 been successful. They are working very closely together right now as we  
20 develop the program, but, you'll see that, as we go into the construction process,  
21 that it's not like Part 50 where there was this separate licensing process, and  
22 then it got turned over to the regions, and there was inspection. The people at  
23 this table represent the two organizations that will be working very closely  
24 throughout the entire process. It's ongoing, very strong relationship between the  
25 licensing function and the inspection activities. So, I'd just like to personally

1 thank them for their ongoing efforts, and Mike will begin the briefing.

2           MICHAEL JOHSON: Thanks, Bill. Good morning, Chairman and  
3 Commissioners. As Bill indicated, we've exercised most of the parts, aspects of  
4 the Part 52 licensing process. That is, we've issued early site permits, we've  
5 issued design certifications. We are in the final stages of the process for issuing  
6 combined licenses. And, today's presentation, both the previous panel and our  
7 presentation, really is focused on the last remaining aspect, which is the  
8 oversight of construction and transition from its -- transition from construction to  
9 operations.

10           As you've heard, there are really three points that will resonate, I  
11 think, throughout the presentation. First, we have been spending a lot of time on  
12 preparation. We're now transitioning to implementation. I think that's clear.

13           Secondly, we have, as Bill indicated, proactively sought out  
14 potential speed bumps. We've continued to do that and made adjustments to our  
15 implementation. Our process is to ensure our implementation is smooth.

16           And then, last but not least, as you'll hear again and again as you  
17 heard in our previous panel, we've had extensive dialogue with external  
18 stakeholders. And I think we benefitted as a result of that dialogue because we  
19 have a better understanding, an increasingly better understanding of potential  
20 challenges and alignment regarding the actions that are going to be needed to  
21 address those challenges.

22           Turning to the agenda slide, Laura Dudes, who is the director of the  
23 Division of Construction Inspection and Operational Programs in the Office of  
24 New Reactors will provide an overview of the construction inspection program.  
25 Jim Beardsley, who was the chief of the Inspection Branch in NRO will discuss

1 construction inspection program and the role of ITAAC. Allan Blamey, how is the  
2 chief of Construction Projects, Branch 2 in our Region II Center for Construction  
3 Inspection will discuss planning and scheduling and execution of the construction  
4 inspection program at the various sites where we have construction ongoing in  
5 the country.

6 And, finally, Mark Kowal is going to discuss -- I'm sorry -- who is  
7 chief of the Technical Specifications and the ITAAC branch will discuss the  
8 ITAAC closure verification process and many of the issues that we've raised,  
9 have raised in the previous panel. With that, I'll turn to Laura to begin.

10 LAURA DUDES: Thank you, Michael. May I have the next slide,  
11 please? And may I have the next slide, please. Okay. Well, I was going to  
12 begin. It's been several months since we briefed you on anything associated  
13 with the oversight program. And, so, as this is my first time as the director in this  
14 new role, I was beginning with how pleased I am that this is good news story. I  
15 think you heard from the industry panel that we've completed policy  
16 development. We have our program as developed, and we're transitioning to  
17 execution. But, as the Chairman raised towards the end of the last panel, we still  
18 need to be leaning forward to work out other issues and implementation issues  
19 for the final frontier of the Part 52 process. Mike said we've learned lessons from  
20 many of the other products. And, so, we expect to learn lessons as we move  
21 forward.

22 Mike, or Jim, Allan, and Mark will talk in detail about the program  
23 structure and procedures that are ready for use or, in some cases, are being  
24 used by the inspectors at the Vogtle and Summer sites. Before I turn it over to  
25 them though, I do want to talk about a few other highlights of the oversight

1 program. We've made tremendous progress in responding to the March 2011  
2 SRM on the construction reactor oversight process. We have established a  
3 framework, a significance determination process and a construction assessment  
4 matrix for that program and I think that's responsive to the Commission's request  
5 for us to look at the good practices from the operating reactor oversight process,  
6 and namely transparency and predictability as we process construction  
7 inspection findings. So we plan to train the inspectors on that program in  
8 October of this year and implement on January 1 of 2012, and that is to coincide  
9 with the annual cycle for the operating reactor oversight process. That allows us  
10 to make use of the existing management structures for them.

11 Let's see, moving on to vendor inspection. Our vendor inspection  
12 program continues to provide us good insights on the quality of components and  
13 services that are being supplied for the new reactor program. We have  
14 completed over 18 domestic and international inspections in this area and we  
15 continue to be engaged with our international partners. This October, we're  
16 going to conduct the first ever joint vendor inspection with our regulatory partners  
17 in Korea. This is being done under the auspices of the Multinational Design  
18 Evaluation Program. It is a unique activity in that this is the first time that two  
19 regulators will fully participate in a vendor inspection using just the host  
20 regulator's procedure. So lessons learned from that activity will obviously feed  
21 back into the MDEP program and of course this helps us to continue to enhance  
22 coordination and cooperation in the international arena.

23 In addition to that, we also plan to assign a vendor inspector to  
24 work with our regulatory partners in China this fall and this inspector will help  
25 oversee, and observe some of the vendor activities in China as it relates to the

1 AP-1000 Project in that country. So we hope to get some lessons learned from  
2 that. May I have the next slide, please?

3           So, the earlier panel and I believe several Commissioners had teed  
4 up some of the issues associated with our ITAAC demonstration project. So, as  
5 you heard from the industry this morning and you'll hear from us today, we did  
6 learn quite a few lessons from that and we're continuing to focus on that. I  
7 probably won't belabor the first two bullets in this particular item, except to assure  
8 you that we know that we need to continue to work with stakeholders to assure  
9 that we have a common understanding of the information that's necessary and  
10 sufficient for ITAAC closure. There's been a significant amount of effort, as you  
11 heard, to identify examples and create closure letter examples, and get common  
12 understanding of both what's expected in those letters and what would be  
13 expected in the packages on site for which we would perform inspections on, and  
14 the guys will talk a little bit more about that this morning.

15           In addition, I believe Commissioner Svinicki raised the issue of our  
16 information technology tools. One of the lessons we did learn was that they will  
17 be -- they will help us be more effective in dealing with the ITAAC surge in terms  
18 of processing numerous inspection inputs that are gathered over several years of  
19 the construction process, and again, those inspection inputs will help us support  
20 the ITAAC determination recommendations that we make to the Commission.  
21 Moving beyond the construction inspection on site activities, I just want to  
22 highlight a few other focus areas within the overall construction oversight  
23 program. We've had several Inspector General audits over the past few years,  
24 focused on the vendor inspection program. They have identified areas for  
25 improvement and actually I think they've helped us enhance the overall goals,

1 objectives, communication, and selection criteria of the vendor inspection  
2 program.

3           Two issues that were raised as a result of the IG audit include the  
4 agency's ability to deal with counterfeit, fraudulent, and suspect items in a supply  
5 chain and the second issue was the clarity of the Part 21 regulation, and the  
6 supporting guidance documents. Now, both of those issues are broader than just  
7 the NRO vendor inspection program, and so we created working groups that had  
8 participants from all program offices that are affected by these issues. These  
9 working groups examine the regulations, guidance documents, communication  
10 protocols, also interacting with external stakeholders to understand what's being  
11 done in industry for these issues and get some perspectives from many different  
12 stakeholders. The working groups are wrapping up this effort and we will issue  
13 papers on each of these items to the Commission, which talks about the scope  
14 and breath of what the working groups have done, as well as our next steps in  
15 that area.

16           Albeit a smaller level of effort, we also are engaged with the  
17 advance reactor licensing folks in the Office of New Reactors, and that's really to  
18 begin the dialogue with the small modular reactor community. We need to do so,  
19 because their manufacturing models or deployment models may be different than  
20 what we are used to for the large light water reactors, so we are looking early to  
21 see if there's any changes to the construction inspection program. And last, but  
22 certainly not least, you issued the Safety Culture Policy Statement in July of this  
23 year and so we are actively working to communicate and educate that Safety  
24 Culture Policy Statement to a large and very diverse group of vendors through  
25 inspection activities, conferences, and workshops. In addition to that, we are



1 also incorporating portions of the Safety Culture Policy Statement into the  
2 construction reactor oversight process in a manner very similar to what's being  
3 done with the operating reactor oversight process, so there will be some  
4 consistency across those two programs. So, with that brief overview, I will now  
5 turn it over to Jim Beardsley, who will begin the detailed discussion on the  
6 construction inspection program.

7           JAMES BEARDSLEY: Thank you, Laura. Chairman and  
8 Commissioners, my name is Jim Beardsley and I'm the chief of the Construction  
9 Inspection Program Branch. This morning, I will provide you with a brief  
10 overview of the Part 52 Construction Inspection Program and provide the context  
11 in where ITACC fits into that program. In addition, I'll discuss the infrastructure  
12 that we're developing to facilitate both the inspection program and the ITAAC  
13 closure verification process. Next slide, please.

14           The construction inspection program is ready right now for  
15 transition from development to full scale operation. We have in place all of the  
16 manual chapters and inspection procedures necessary to support the inspection  
17 effort following the issuance of a combined license. We expect over time to  
18 routinely refine the program, to optimize efficiency and effectiveness as we learn  
19 lessons and to support the ITAAC closure and transition to plant operations. This  
20 slide shows the phases of the Part 52 licensing process and the relationship  
21 between licensing actions and inspection activity. There are documented  
22 processes across the Part 52 licensing and construction phases where  
23 requirements and design changes can be inserted. In all cases, the processes  
24 include structured change management to ensure the timeliness and  
25 transparency.

1           Although we're in the final phases of the COL issuance, the  
2 construction inspection program is in operation today. Under the Vogtle limited  
3 work authorization and our pre-COL Quality Assurance Inspection Program, the  
4 staff is actively inspecting construction and fabrication activities at this time. The  
5 inspections focus on work that has a direct bearing on ITAAC closure, on the  
6 ITAAC closure -- on the ITAAC systems, structures, and components, and their  
7 closure to be completed in accordance with acceptance criteria.

8           Over the course of the inspection program, the CCI inspectors will  
9 continue the majority of the inspection activity. For those inspections that require  
10 more detailed technical analysis, resources from the headquarters technical staff  
11 will be drawn upon and will be scheduled as appropriate. We will also work  
12 closely with the host region inspectors for scheduling and execution of a selected  
13 number of programmatic inspections to ensure the resources are efficiently  
14 managed. Fire protection, security, emergency preparedness, and health  
15 physics are examples of those inspections where we will draw upon host regions  
16 to help indoctrinate those host regions into the technologies and designs of the  
17 plants, to facilitate not only construction inspection, but the transition to  
18 operations. For the past two years we've been working with the Vogtle 3 and 4,  
19 and V.C. Summer 2 and 3 applicants to gain a thorough understanding of their  
20 construction schedules. Results of that analysis, the development of a detailed  
21 construction schedule -- excuse me -- it focuses on the earliest possible  
22 opportunities to view ITAAC related activity.

23           Our goal is to develop insight into procurement, and development,  
24 and construction of ITAAC related SSCs. In addition, we're scheduling our  
25 programmatic inspections to gain assurance that the programs required to

1 conduct quality construction are implemented in accordance with the regulations.  
2 Alan Blamey will provide further discussion on the processes and tools used to  
3 plan and schedule our construction inspections during his brief. Next slide,  
4 please.

5           We have three significant initiatives in place to improve the  
6 efficiency and effectiveness of our construction inspection and ITAAC closure  
7 process. In an effort to maximize communications in support of construction  
8 inspection and provide a record of that communication, we have established a  
9 formal system to manage technical assistance requests between the inspection  
10 and technical staffs. The TARs, as we call them, are used to coordinate  
11 clarification of technical questions, in particular, ITAAC related questions. The  
12 resolution of TARs is coordinated through the appropriate technical branches to  
13 ensure that inspectors receive comprehensive support. When necessary, the  
14 TARs may be reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel, to ensure there is  
15 clarity in ITAAC requirements and acceptance criteria.

16           The TAR process will be used by the headquarters staff. It will also  
17 be used by the headquarters staff to request additional inspection activity where  
18 necessary, in order to answer questions on ITAAC or other technical areas.  
19 Once the technical assessments have been completed, the responses will be  
20 entered into ADAMS and the TARs will also be maintained in a SharePoint  
21 system to provide other inspectors and technical staff with a historical record of  
22 the issues. We are using the TAR process today to assist the inspection staff in  
23 the LWA, and pre-COL inspection activity. We will use a tool known as the  
24 Construction Inspection Program Information Management System, or CIPIMS to  
25 effectively track and control the inspection program. The system brings together

1 ITAAC requirements, inspection procedures, and licensee construction plans in  
2 an integrated fashion.

3           The current CIPIMS upgrade is based on the oversight  
4 infrastructure plan assessment that was completed in 2010. That assessment  
5 provided us with a holistic interoffice view of the processes used to manage our  
6 inspection program. The development of an improved system requirement  
7 specification for CIPIMS incorporated a significant input from the inspectors at  
8 CCI, including the development of a pilot database for requirements validation.  
9 The upgrade is in development today and is on schedule for release to the  
10 inspection staff in early 2012. It will provide a series of dashboards that  
11 management will use to track the overall status of programmatic and ITAAC  
12 inspections. All ITAAC inspections and any associated findings will be recorded  
13 in CIPIMS and the database will be a focal point in our ITAAC closure verification  
14 process.

15           With the goal of maximizing efficiency and effectiveness of ITAAC  
16 closure verification, we're developing a tool known as VOICES. That stands for a  
17 Verification of ITAAC Closure and Evaluation Status. The system is a workflow  
18 tool that facilitates ITAAC closure verification process. When a closure letter is  
19 received from the licensee, it will be entered into VOICES and automatically  
20 routed to the engineers responsible for ITAAC closure. The tool manages the  
21 digital routing of the letters through all the steps identified in our NRO office  
22 instruction on ITAAC closure verification, finally resulting in the development and  
23 release of a Federal Register Notice on the ITAAC closure verification. In  
24 addition, VOICES provides both the staff and the public with a status on the  
25 closure letter adjudication, enhancing our transparency. VOICES is currently in a

1 detailed requirements development stage and is scheduled for release to the  
2 staff in mid-2012. Next slide, please.

3           Our construction inspection program is ready for transition to  
4 execution. We've developed all the inspection manuals and chapters, and  
5 inspection procedures necessary for the initial phases of the ITAAC and  
6 programmatic inspections. We recently awarded a contract for construction  
7 inspection support. That contract will provide the team with flexibility to request  
8 specific technical areas, support in specific technical areas, such as non-  
9 instructive testing, at times when we may not have the necessary experience  
10 available. The contract will also support the general inspection expertise in the  
11 event that the scope and timing of plant inspections exceed our available  
12 inspection resources. The construction inspection team is actively developing  
13 processes and procedures necessary to support ITAAC closure verification. The  
14 ITAAC related construction inspection is ongoing in order to assure that we have  
15 the necessary breadth and depth of ITAAC related information available to  
16 adequately review the licensee's closure verification letter -- the closure letters,  
17 for verification. The CIPIMS tool for planning, scheduling, and recording the  
18 results of inspections will be fielded in time to support full scale inspection activity  
19 as well as the ITAAC closure verification. We're developing procedures for both  
20 ITAAC closure verification and the preparation of the Part 52.103(g) finding  
21 recommendation.

22           The VOICES workflow tool will be a key element in those  
23 processes. We will have tools and processes in place well before the ITAAC  
24 bow wave you heard about this morning and will focus on ITAAC closure analysis  
25 and preparation. Alan Blamey will now discuss the status of our ITAAC

1 Inspection Program.

2           ALAN BLAMEY: Thank you, Jim, and good morning, Chairman  
3 and Commissioners. My name is Alan Blamey and I'm the chief of the  
4 Infrastructure Development Branch in the Center for Construction Inspection.  
5 This morning I would like to provide to you an overview of the work that's been  
6 accomplished in preparing for conducting inspections at new reactors as well as  
7 briefly discuss the lessons learned from international exchanges at the AP1000  
8 site in China and also the opportunities that lay before us as we transition into the  
9 execution of the Construction Inspection Program. Next slide, please.

10           Over the past several years we've worked with stakeholders and  
11 software vendors to develop the Construction Inspection Program and the  
12 infrastructure that's needed to plan, schedule, and execute construction  
13 inspections at multiple construction sites simultaneously. Based on this work,  
14 today we're using CIPIMS for inspection planning and we're using Primavera for  
15 inspection scheduling. The platforms are scalable and they will support our  
16 future needs for managing the Construction Inspection Program. Next slide,  
17 please.

18           Over the past several years we've developed inspection plans for  
19 conducting AP-1000 ITAAC inspections. The development of the ITAAC  
20 inspection plans provide valuable insights for the inspectors as they prepare to  
21 inspect the new reactors. The first step of the inspection planning process is to  
22 review and understand specific ITAAC and the structure, systems, and  
23 components that are contained in that ITAAC. The inspectors then select a  
24 sample of the structure, systems, and components within that ITAAC and also  
25 identify the inspection procedure subsections that would be used to inspect these

1 particular structure systems and components. The inspectors then identify a  
2 representative number of inspections. The estimated hours per sample, the  
3 engineering discipline that would be needed to do the inspection, and also they  
4 look at specific activities that we would like to directly observe during the  
5 construction process. The ITAAC inspections were typically planned using a  
6 senior inspector as well as civil, electrical or mechanical inspector.

7           The team also reviewed the completed inspection plans to  
8 determine if the plan provided sufficient inspection activities that would provide  
9 reasonable assurance that an ITAAC was met. If the existing procedures do not  
10 contain sufficient guidance, additional guidance was included in the inspection  
11 plan and procedures -- revisions were submitted. This was an important  
12 consideration, because the ITAAC inspection procedures were not previously  
13 validated during construction. Therefore the ITAAC planning process better  
14 prepared the inspectors to conduct ITAAC inspections, verify the inspection plans  
15 were sufficient and provided additional validation of the ITAAC inspection  
16 procedures. Once the planning was completed, these plans were then used to  
17 schedule the inspections. During the last three years we've worked with  
18 stakeholders in the industry to understand the construction scheduling tools that  
19 are being used. Based on these interactions, we determined that Primavera is  
20 the industry standard program that's used to manage and schedule these large  
21 construction projects.

22           Adoption of this software allows us to preserve all aspects of the  
23 applicant's proprietary construction schedule and allows our inspection schedule  
24 to be aligned with the construction activities. Therefore, we believe that  
25 Primavera will result in a stable and scalable platform to support inspection

1 scheduling. In June of 2011 we received approval to deploy Primavera on the  
2 NRC network and we've already transitioned the Region II data for testing to this  
3 network, and we plan to fully transition to the network, the NRC network at the  
4 end of this year.

5           Preparing to perform inspections on a specific design is a time  
6 consuming process. Once the design control document, the DCD, is nearing  
7 NRC approval, the ITAAC must be grouped in the ITAAC families and then  
8 ranked so that we identify those specific ITAAC that will be targeted for  
9 inspection. Inspection plans are then developed for the targeted ITAACs and the  
10 inspection activities are scheduled. Because of the time consuming process, we  
11 began the inspection planning process using previous versions of the AP-1000  
12 DCD. Currently 80 percent of the targeted ITAAC inspections have been  
13 planned and 15 percent of them scheduled using the previous versions of the  
14 AP-1000 DCD. This effort has resulted in vendor inspections and pre-COL  
15 inspections that focus specifically on ITAAC related work activities which will be  
16 used in our review and verification of ITAAC closure.

17           The early planning and scheduling was needed to ensure that we  
18 could identify early ITAAC inspection opportunities. However, we now need to  
19 go back and reconcile the plans that were put together with the current version of  
20 the AP-1000 DCD. We began the reconciling -- the reconciliation process in late  
21 August of this year and currently we've completed the reconciliation process of  
22 the targeted ITAAC and we're in the process of reconciling the plans and the  
23 inspection schedules. Next slide, please.

24           Previously, Jim discussed the CIPIMS upgrade, which will be used  
25 to manage the construction inspection program. We're planning inspections



1 using the current version of CIPIMS that I believe many of you have seen during  
2 your tours of the Region II Planning Center, however through development of the  
3 infrastructure oversight program, stakeholder interactions and inspector  
4 feedback, our vision of CIPIMS has matured. The current CIPIMS upgrade that  
5 is being developed contains specific improvements. Examples of the  
6 improvements include a look and feel that's intuitive to the inspectors as well as  
7 the inspection program. Inspection planning views that provide information on  
8 previously inspected components within an ITAAC and a more robust reporting  
9 capability. Therefore, we believe that this upgrade, once deployed, will allow the  
10 inspectors to remain focused on critical inspection activities in the field and not  
11 have to manually track the work that's been done in preparing for the upcoming  
12 inspections. This improved reporting feature will also support the ITAAC closure  
13 process and management of the inspection program. Next slide, please.

14           We continue to look for opportunities to improve the efficiency and  
15 mature the construction inspection process. Our inspectors have gained  
16 valuable AP-1000 construction insights through exchanges with the AP-1000  
17 instruction project in China. The inspectors gained insights in the construction  
18 process that were used to assemble large modules and use these insights to  
19 validate applicable plans and construction inspection procedures. They  
20 concluded that the inspection procedures and plans that were developed were  
21 adequate for conducting ITAAC inspection of these activities. The inspectors  
22 also identified a significant number of module and structural fabrication activities  
23 that were occurring offsite. These activities presented inspection opportunities  
24 that could be used in the closure of ITAAC. Therefore, it was recommended to  
25 allow regional inspectors the opportunity to observe this fabrication process at

1 locations other than the construction site.

2           This resulted in NRC manual chapter changes to allow the  
3 inspection of these activities as well as other activities that can be used to close  
4 an ITAAC. These procedures are being used today and we're currently  
5 scheduling inspections of ITAAC related activities that are occurring offsite.  
6 Based on the Sanmen and domestic construction experience, we noted that the  
7 construction schedules are frequently changing. This changes -- this challenges  
8 our ability to manage the inspection program and the inspection resources.  
9 We're continuing to work with various stakeholders to improve the timeliness of  
10 the construction schedule submittals and developing other project controls that  
11 can be used to more effectively manage the construction inspection program and  
12 management of the resources. For example, the resident inspectors have more  
13 schedule flexibility than the regional inspectors. Therefore, we're carefully  
14 increasing the inspections that the residents will do, which should improve our  
15 ability to respond to scheduled changes that are occurring onsite. Next slide,  
16 please.

17           Currently, from a new reactor perspective, we're transitioning from  
18 a period of heavy program development into execution of the construction  
19 inspection program. We have established resident offices and stationed  
20 residents at the Vogtle and V.C. Summer site. We are also receiving  
21 construction schedules from these sites and using the schedules to align our  
22 inspection activities. We've also conducted inspections related to the limited  
23 work authorization as well as program inspections at Vogtle. Establishing the  
24 office and infrastructure before significant construction inspection begins allows  
25 us to gain experience in executing the construction inspection program, as well

1 as establishing lines of communication with stakeholders prior to significant  
2 inspection activities occurring.

3           Based on our experience to date, we believe that the Part 52  
4 Construction Program will be a data intensive program. The inspectors will need  
5 to identify and inspect construction of targeted ITAAC structure systems and  
6 components out of thousands of work activities that will be ongoing at the site on  
7 a daily basis. We'll need to manage the inspection program for multiple Part 52  
8 construction projects as well as Part 50 and Part 70 construction projects.  
9 Therefore, leveraging the appropriate scalable technology such as Primavera  
10 and CIPIMS, as well as continuing to gain operational experience with these  
11 platforms will have a direct impact on our ability to efficiently manage multiple  
12 construction inspection programs simultaneously and that concludes my  
13 presentation, and I'll turn it over to Mark Kowal.

14           MARK KOWAL: Good morning. My name is Mark Kowal. I'm the  
15 chief of the technical specifications in ITAAC branch in NRO. Building on Jim's  
16 and Alan's presentations, I'll be discussing our efforts to improve ITAAC quality  
17 and inspectability, and to verify ITAAC closure notifications, which I'll also  
18 referred to as ICNs. Since our last ITAAC Commission meeting in September  
19 2009, we've made substantial progress in these areas, overall based on our  
20 efforts, we are ready for the level of ITAAC closure verification activities we  
21 expect in the near term and have made significant strides in planning and  
22 preparations for the long term. Next slide, please.

23           As a result of our ITAAC related activities, we found that some of  
24 the ITAAC were not written as clearly and objectively as they could have been.  
25 This could result in different interpretations of an ITAAC's intent. Each ITAAC

1 should be written so a common understanding of the meaning of the ITAAC's  
2 wording exists between licensees, vendors, public stakeholders, and the NRC  
3 staff. Uncertainty in the meaning of an ITAAC could result in delays in verifying  
4 the ITAAC is closed. We've completed several actions since our last  
5 Commission meeting to address this issue. Since early 2010, we've held eleven  
6 category three public workshops, engaging industry and participants, and  
7 interested stakeholders on emerging topics related to new reactor construction.  
8 These public meetings have been a valuable forum to discuss, understand, and  
9 resolve ITAAC related issues. Specific to ITAAC quality and inspectability, we  
10 held two public meetings, which focused on Revision 1 to RIS 2008-05, entitled  
11 "Lessons Learned to Improve ITAAC Submittals." The September 2010 revision  
12 to this RIS captured key insights and best practices to improve ITAAC quality.

13           Additionally, to improve efficiency or to introduce efficiency and  
14 synergies into our review process, we developed various training materials on  
15 ITAAC quality and inspectability, and in the past year provided three training  
16 sessions to NRO technical reviewers. These training sessions focused on key  
17 points identified in the RIS and provided specific examples to further aid technical  
18 reviewers with their ITAAC reviews. These efforts have resulted in more focused  
19 licensing reviews of ITAAC for design certifications and combined license  
20 applications. For example, we recently conducted quality and inspectability  
21 reviews of the proposed changes to ITAAC for the US-APWR design. The  
22 APWR design center proactively formed a working group with specific intents to  
23 improve the ITAAC based upon our guidance. The working group met with us on  
24 several occasions to discuss the ITAAC improvements. Additionally,  
25 Westinghouse reviewed the AP-1000 ITAAC and notified us of some wording

1 changes to address quality and inspectability issues. These reviews  
2 demonstrate industry's alignment with the need for high quality ITAAC. Next  
3 slide, please.

4           As I've discussed, ITAAC quality plays an important role in efficient  
5 ITAAC closure. Once a licensee has completed an ITAAC and submitted an  
6 ICN, we will verify that that ICN sufficiently details the licensee's basis for  
7 determining that the ITAAC was successfully completed. A draft office instruction  
8 for ITAAC closure verification has been developed and tested on several  
9 occasions. This process was first exercised during a March 2010 NRC internal  
10 technical counterparts meeting where several simulated ICNs of varying levels of  
11 complexity were taken through the verification process. The draft verification  
12 process was subsequently presented and discussed during the ITAAC public  
13 workshop series, allowing the industry and public stakeholders to comment. The  
14 process was also a key element in the ITAAC closure demonstration project,  
15 which I'll speak about in the coming slides. Following each of these exercises,  
16 the closure verification process was refined to reflect lessons learned. Next  
17 slide, please.

18           Now we'll get to the ITAAC demonstration project. This has already  
19 been discussed to some extent by the industry panel, but I want to focus on our  
20 perspective of the project. Over the past year, we conducted a highly beneficial  
21 ITAAC closure verification demonstration project. NRC participants included the  
22 Office of New Reactors, Region II, Center for Construction Inspection, the Office  
23 of Administration, and the Office of the General Counsel. The purpose of the  
24 demonstration was to gain insights on the readiness of industry's ITAAC closure  
25 process and the NRC's closure verification process. Additionally, we tested

1 aspects of the construction assessment and enforcement programs, as well as  
2 evaluating the surge in the ITAAC closure notifications.

3           The licensee submitted the performance -- simulated the  
4 performance of the ITAAC, prepared ITAAC completion packages, and submitted  
5 ITAAC closure notification letters to the staff. We simulated inspection of the  
6 ITAAC completion packages at Vogtle and at the Westinghouse headquarters,  
7 issued two simulated notices of violation, reviewed the ITAAC closure  
8 notifications, and drafted Federal Register notices, documenting the successful  
9 completion of the ITAAC. Participants in the exercise demonstrated most  
10 aspects of ITAAC closure, including adequacy of the guidance provided in Reg  
11 Guide 1.215 and the draft office instruction on ITAAC closure verification.  
12 Progress throughout the exercise was shared with industry and stakeholders  
13 through eight public meetings. Next slide, please.

14           I'll briefly touch on this since it's been shown a couple of times.  
15 The expected surge in ITAAC closure activities in the last stages of construction  
16 will be resource intensive and may challenge our ability to verify successful  
17 ITAAC completion on a licensee's desired timeframe. This surge of submittals  
18 could account for 50 percent or more of a combined license ITAAC population.  
19 To gain a better understanding of what to expect in terms of ITAAC closure  
20 submittals the staff proposed that Westinghouse as part of the demonstration,  
21 perform an evaluation of the surge and identify potential mitigation strategies.  
22 The results of this evaluation indicated that scheduling improvements may help  
23 reduce the surge, however the majority of the final wave of ITAAC submittals  
24 cannot be accelerated. Participants in the demonstration did identify potential  
25 mitigating strategies. The additional ICN examples have already been

1 mentioned and we also discussed that we will evaluate any synergies that can be  
2 gained from the required 225 day notification letters. We're continuing to pursue  
3 these mitigating strategies and manage this expected ITAAC closure surge  
4 through industry and public stakeholders, through public workshops. Next slide,  
5 please.

6           The ITAAC closure demonstration identified needed clarifications  
7 and refinements in areas involving communication, information, technology  
8 infrastructure inspection, and closure verification. For example, NRC and  
9 industry identified that further clarification regarding the ITAAC closure  
10 notification examples and industry's guidance is needed. Another lesson from  
11 the closure demonstration project is that ITAAC quality, clarity, and inspectability  
12 can continue to be improved. Through the demonstration, two ITAAC  
13 interpretation issues were identified. In the first, the scope of inspection required  
14 by licensee to close the functional arrangement ITAAC and submit ITAAC  
15 closure notifications was questioned. The second example involved a number of  
16 the ITAAC that generate reports and require interpretation of what the level of  
17 detail in those reports is. More recently, interpretations issues were identified  
18 with one of the Vogtle limited work authorization ITAAC, which resulted in the use  
19 of the TAR process by the staff. Chuck had talked about that in the previous  
20 session. These examples reinforce the importance of ITAAC quality, as I  
21 previously discussed, and demonstrate that the staff and stakeholders will need  
22 to be flexible, agile, and demonstrate a learning attitude as the first Part 52  
23 construction efforts are executed.

24           Additionally, we continue to refine the ITAAC closure verification  
25 process by incorporating lessons learned from the demonstration exercise and

1 public workshops with stakeholders. Effective utilization of available resources  
2 will be needed to ensure infrastructure and trained staff are in place to fully  
3 implement the ITAAC closure verification activities consistent with expectations.  
4 In addition, the development and use of VOICES to facilitate closure verification  
5 is essential. As Jim mentioned earlier, the system is being developed in  
6 conjunction with CIPIMS to ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness.  
7 We've prepared a final report which details the demonstration, lessons learned,  
8 and proposed next steps. The report also includes action items that are being  
9 tracked and will be included, and implemented to enhance infrastructure in the  
10 ITAAC closure verification process. We also recently began to -- have begun to  
11 develop the process by which a recommendation will be made to the  
12 Commission for its 52.103(g) finding, which authorizes operations. The staff's  
13 recommendation will include references to all ITAAC closure notifications as well  
14 as the documentation for the staff's determination that each ITAAC was  
15 successfully completed. Through these proactive efforts, we should be well  
16 prepared for future ITAAC closure verification activities. And that completes my  
17 presentation.

18 LAURA DUDES: Thank you, Mark. Thank you, Alan. Thank you,  
19 Jim, very nice job. So, I will conclude and summarize as I started. I believe you  
20 heard from the industry and as you heard from these presentations today, we are  
21 -- we completed our program development. We are transitioning to execution as  
22 we have sites that have limited work authorization and preconstruction activities,  
23 and expect to start construction within the next few months, so we will be in full  
24 execution of this final, first of a kind Part 52 process and so we know that we  
25 need to continue and look forward. We need to focus on achieving a common



1 understanding of what's necessary and sufficient for ITAAC closure and we are  
2 poised to do so. So, unless you have other comments, that concludes the staff's  
3 remarks.

4 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Thanks. Commissioner Svinicki.

5 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Thank you all for your presentations  
6 and yes, I have had an opportunity as others have, to go through the center of  
7 excellence that we have down in Region II on construction inspection, and  
8 sounds like they've even been sharpening a lot of their tools since I visited. That  
9 was over a year ago. There are some software upgrades and revisions that I  
10 was a little surprised how late they're coming in the process. I think some will be  
11 upgraded and revised next year or so. That's getting maybe a little  
12 uncomfortably close to when you will actually be needing to use these systems at  
13 100 percent capacity, but I know also, but correct me if my understanding is  
14 incorrect, that some of the tweaks that you're making are an outgrowth of other  
15 lessons learned that you've had, so it's natural that you can only of course  
16 implement a lessons learned after you've learned that lesson.

17 So, I know and I suspect that over time, as quickly as software  
18 modifies and transitions, that you'll have to make upgrades over time on those  
19 very systems, but I appreciate it also that you've looked at interfaces between,  
20 because you're going to get deluged with scheduling information. So, I think that  
21 having a good interface with applicants and vendors, that will be really important.  
22 It may sound like a minor thing, but if you had to hard enter a lot of that  
23 information, that would be a huge staff resource that we'd have to commit to that.

24 I think we've heard about a lot of the pieces of this process and I  
25 think as you prepared for this meeting, maybe you were thinking about a more

1 general overview, but I have a really basic question, because when we look at  
2 ITAAC as needing to have a certain legal sufficiency and I think, Laura, you  
3 concluded, saying you know, it's a complete and effective, and efficient, sufficient  
4 process for, what it has to be able to support at the end of the day and you know,  
5 the staff ultimately will be reviewing a lot of information and making its  
6 determination based on the totality of what it looks at, that an ITAAC is closed  
7 and that's the closure process that we've heard about, but can you talk to me  
8 about, since there does need to be ultimately legal sufficiency to support the  
9 103(g) finding, which a lot of you made reference to, how have you worked with  
10 the Office of General Counsel to be certain that your process at the end of the  
11 day can support what it needs to support legally? I don't know who would like to  
12 address that interaction, Laura.

13 LAURA DUDES: Well, I'll try it at a high level. Of course the Office  
14 of General Counsel has -- they were an active participant in our ITAAC  
15 demonstration process and as we continue to tabletop the processes, they give  
16 us advice as they would through implementation downstream. So, they have  
17 been actively engaged. They may want to talk about what types of advice they  
18 would give, but as we also prepare the documents associated with making a  
19 recommendation to the 103 -- for the 103(g) finding and those are things that are  
20 in draft and being prepared. We will have Office of General Counsel look at them  
21 and advise us on that. Now, I don't know if somebody wants to --

22 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: And I don't know, Marv, because  
23 you talked about inspectability and clarity of the ITAAC themselves, is that in  
24 terms of setting the standard there and the threshold has there been work with  
25 anyone in the General Counsel's office about you know, the clarity of ITAAC?

1           MARK KOWAL: Yes, we -- they, they've been involved and Mike  
2 Spencer is sitting over there, but they've been involved in pretty much everything  
3 that we've been doing as far as the verification, ITAAC verification closure  
4 process development goes, they attend our public meetings. They, they're  
5 always there. We've talked to them about interpretation issues, most recently the  
6 functional arrangement ITAAC. We've been having discussions with them in that  
7 area. We do regularly interact with them on our guidance, probably almost  
8 everything we've been doing in the verification area.

9           COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: So, is this for when you -- as the staff  
10 approached ITAAC closure and what is a demonstration or an adequate  
11 demonstration of a closed ITAAC, is it fair that it was looked at somewhat like  
12 findings that need to be made to issue a COL, which is that overall there has to  
13 be a defensibility and sufficiency, and adequacy of staff's review, and for  
14 instance in a mandatory hearing, one of the findings that the Commission is  
15 looking at, we're looking at whether or not the staff has demonstrated the  
16 adequacy and sufficiency of that review. The regulations themselves of course  
17 don't say you know, do a sampling of this many, rerun this many of the  
18 applicants' calculations or things like that, that's not defined in the regulation, but  
19 at the end of the day, for legal defensibility, you have to be able to defend the  
20 adequacy and sufficiency of what you've done. Is there a parallelism with  
21 demonstration of ITAAC closure meaning that the applicant develops things like  
22 there -- what they're going to demonstrate to you for sufficiency? You receive  
23 various packages of information for review and then you convince yourself that  
24 they have sufficiently done the right tests and adequately demonstrated, is there  
25 a parallelism? I see Mike Johnson nodding his head a little bit.

1 LAURA DUDES: Well, I'm going to take a stab at this and I'm --  
2 whenever I get -- act like a lawyer, I hope that they pull me back, but --

3 MARVIN HSKOWITCZ: Go ahead, we'll let you know.

4 LAURA DUDES: All right. Well, in terms of a parallel, the licensing  
5 is complete and so our overall approach to ITAAC closure -- and I'll go back to  
6 where the Chairman had read that the licensees are responsible for providing us  
7 those closure notifications. And then we have a process to determine and  
8 recommend to the Commission, which is based on a sample of inspections. So,  
9 we're going to put all of that together, and that's what we would recommend  
10 closure, but I don't think it has a legal parallel, because it's not a licensing  
11 activity, it's -- and, here's where I'll get a crossways as a lawyer, it's an  
12 authorization to load fuel, so -- and I mean they would help us out with the legal  
13 determinations there, but this is not a process where there's a one for one  
14 verification on each ITAAC. And I would look to Marv to clarify.

15 MARVIN HSKOWITCZ: I don't have anything to add to this point.

16 [laughter]

17 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: That's certainty for you.

18 LAURA DUDES: Yeah, I mean, our inspection is our support, or  
19 how we will provide our best recommendation to the Commission at the ITAAC  
20 have been met, and this will occur over five years of the construction inspection  
21 program, or the length, duration of the construction, but, I mean, it's a pretty  
22 extensive set of information linking back to specific ITAAC, but we will not inspect  
23 every ITAAC as a part of the closure process.

24 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: But then the staff has a paper  
25 discussing some of its processes for making that recommendation on the 103(g)

1 finding, did you say that's a paper yet under development?

2 LAURA DUDES: Yeah, we're developing the final  
3 recommendation, the paper for the recommendation for the 103 finding, and that  
4 will be done well in advance of that time, probably this year sometime, and I think  
5 that's was in our ITAAC paper that we issued in August, so, that deliverable is  
6 coming, and we can begin to discuss and weigh in on how 103(g) will be made.

7 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, but this is sounding like, and  
8 correct me if I'm wrong, this paper isn't the first you're thinking about how your  
9 entire ITAAC process needs to support that ultimate finding. This isn't the first  
10 you're thinking about that.

11 LAURA DUDES: Oh, no, that was -- that precedes my role here,  
12 but I know that process has been thought out thoroughly and documented in our  
13 manual chapters, and then that's how we table talked in the demonstration  
14 program is using the program structure that was developed using the specific  
15 procedures, invoking the manual chapters, working with our council. We had  
16 inspectors who would -- we actually issued mock violations in the tabletop, so I  
17 think the process has been documented, and that -- and we use that to step  
18 through the demonstration program.

19 MARK KOWAL: Just to add to that, what we've just begun working  
20 on that's referred to in our Commission paper is how we're going to implement --  
21 how we're actually going to make the 103(g) recommendation to you. Is it going  
22 to look like what kind of information will be in there?

23 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, this is mechanics?

24 MARK KOWAL: This is, it's implementation. Right, that's the way I  
25 view it. We envision at this point -- and this is -- we're beginning this, we're going

1 to talk with a public stakeholders about this, they may have interest in the interim  
2 operations in 103(c), but how -- what we envision is a Commission paper will go  
3 up with -- and attached to that paper will be our determination basis, which will  
4 describe, you know, what we recommend, you know, making the finding based  
5 on the ICNs, the OI-tech complete letter our inspection program, and there'll be  
6 a description we envision of our inspection program that we've done these  
7 inspections throughout all of construction, and that type of information is what  
8 we're working on now.

9 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Do any of the findings coming out of  
10 the construction assessment program have any connection to the 103(g) finding,  
11 and what do you do with that, and Laura was mentioning that that will begin and  
12 get on a cycle with the ROP, and so, if there are findings and the construction  
13 assessment program is much broader, obviously, than ITAAC, it could just be,  
14 you know, things you're encountering as they go through the construction  
15 process on site. What -- I guess most basically -- what do we do with those?

16 JAMES BEARDSLEY: I think the key to understand is as we  
17 conduct our assessments, just in accordance with the ROP, we envision the  
18 exact same process, the result of that will be -- could be an increase in inspection  
19 activity.

20 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay.

21 JAMES BEARDSLEY: As we do inspections -- programmatic  
22 inspections or ITAAC inspections -- we'll link those to the appropriate areas. So  
23 if it's ITAAC inspection, that inspection will be recorded in the CIPIMS, and when  
24 the ITAAC closure verification comes in, whatever time later it happens, we will  
25 go through the database and search all inspection activity associated with that

1 ITAAC or ITAAC family if necessary, and if that increased inspection resulted in  
2 something that was related to that ITAAC, that will be included in our criteria for  
3 evaluating closure verification.

4 COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Okay, okay, thank you. Thank you,  
5 Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Commissioner Apostolakis?

7 COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: No questions.

8 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Commissioner Magwood?

9 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Thank you, Chairman, Bill, so I'm  
10 guessing here, but my guess is you're probably the senior person at the panel  
11 when it comes to thinking about ITAAC, is that fair?

12 BILL BORCHARDT: On the panel, not in the room, but on panel.

13 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Just -- I'm always interested in  
14 these historical reflections. When this first got started, does this look like  
15 anything like what you thought it was going to be when it first got off the ground?

16 BILL BORCHARDT: Oh, exactly.

17 [laughter]

18 No, I think in reality, when we began, we probably thought there  
19 would be fewer ITAAC and that they would be simpler. When we began the  
20 ITAAC discussion, we had no idea there would be a thing called "DAC" which is  
21 closely related, so it's a little bit more complex and a little more complicated than  
22 we originally envisioned.

23 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Yeah, I think they would -- I think  
24 that's how I'd put it, more complicated. Certainly more -- a larger program, I  
25 think, than anyone was really thinking 10 years ago or whatever it was, it may be

1 longer than that now; lose track of time. When was it?

2 BILL BORCHARDT: The first ITAAC papers were really early '90s.

3 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Oh, that far back. Okay. I'm really  
4 losing track of time. How many target ITAACs are there in these programs? Is  
5 there a definitive number?

6 MARK KOWAL: For AP-1000, for example, it's about -- and  
7 ABWR, those are the two that we've prioritized at this point -- the two design  
8 center ITAACs, and they're about roughly 40 percent of the ITAAC are targeted.

9 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Okay, so that's .4 and comes out  
10 to be about 40 percent, is that -- okay. One of the things that I was reading some  
11 of the staff papers, and there's some indication the staff papers seem to suggest  
12 that not all of the ITAACs' closures will be noted in the Federal Register. Am I  
13 reading that incorrectly, or are there some that will not or should all 100 percent  
14 of them be --

15 MARK KOWAL: I think that the regulations require us to publish  
16 Federal Register notices up until a certain time. And I think that time is the last  
17 day for hearings -- for hearing requests, so we will publish them up until that  
18 point. After that point, we plan to make them publicly available on our website,  
19 so they will be available publicly, but there's no requirement, at that point after  
20 that, to publish them in the Federal Register.

21 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: I see, so after a certain point,  
22 some just -- there won't be a Federal Register notice, just simply put on the  
23 website, or --

24 MARK KOWAL: Right, we intend to make them publicly available.

25 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: One of the industry participants



1 this morning talked a bit about -- and I think you mentioned it, Mark, the 103(c)  
2 process, with interim operation. Can you give us the sketches to what the  
3 current thought process is about that and where you are in defining that process?

4 MARK KOWAL: Well, it gets to the implementation, and what  
5 we've just begun working on, I know we need some more discussion on that.  
6 You know, I'm hoping everything goes well and we won't need to, you know,  
7 everything goes smoothly and we'll make our 103(g) recommendation, but, you  
8 know, if there are -- if there is a hearing, if there are issues with ITAAC, that's  
9 something we still need to work through. I don't know that I have a definitive  
10 answer. If it's one, if there is one ITAAC that may need a hearing, then maybe  
11 the staff could make a recommendation and then give a recommendation on  
12 interim operations for that one. If there is more than one, you know, that's  
13 something we haven't fully thought through yet. That's what we said in our  
14 Commission paper. We're beginning this exercise now, and industry just  
15 recently, in talking with NEI, this was something they brought up that they want to  
16 begin discussing in our public workshops.

17 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Just one last question. Save the  
18 best for last. I'll aim this at Bill and you can go from there. Obviously, Bill, we're  
19 in the process of going through the recommendations from the near-term task  
20 force on the post Fukushima review of our regulatory framework, and there are  
21 clearly some things that could come out of this process, if you project forward like  
22 a year or so, that could impact, certainly, the new plants. But, I haven't heard  
23 anyone explain whether that would impact ITAAC, and I wonder if you have any  
24 thoughts about that -- what could potentially happen in ITAAC space?

25 BILL BORCHARDT: The near-term task force report does a brief

1 discussion of that. I think that -- from my perspective, the point to keep in mind is  
2 that Part 52 has some change provisions in it. There's a rather high threshold,  
3 but it does have change provisions. If there are new regulations or new  
4 requirements that come out of the Fukushima review, that we, the Commission,  
5 decides to apply to either to operating reactors or to future reactors, there are  
6 provisions. If there are design changes, I could see, personally, that there might  
7 be follow-on ITAAC relating to those new design aspects, but I don't see  
8 personally, now, I'm not in complete alignment that's in the near-term taskforce  
9 report, in that it seemed to me to imply a very strong connection to ITAAC. I  
10 don't think that's the first place you go. I think you go first to changing the design  
11 certification rule, if required, or the combined license or imposing by order some  
12 design requirement and then there might be then, following from that, some  
13 additional ITAAC implications.

14 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Well, one thing, because one that  
15 comes to mind for me, when you look at things we could change post-  
16 Fukushima, I mean, one example that I think about is when if you look at multi-  
17 reactor emergency planning. Emergency planning is clearly one of the ITAAC's  
18 we look at, so the question then comes to me, why would that not change as a  
19 result of this?

20 BILL BORCHARDT: Yeah, and it very well could, but I think the --  
21 when we issue the combined license, that's an operating license. We have all of  
22 the enforcement tools, including orders and the ability to revise Tech Specs if we  
23 needed to make changes to accommodate changes in regulations relating to  
24 multi-unit sites. And so, it's somewhat a question of timing. We don't need to  
25 rely on ITAAC for many of those things. We have many other regulatory tools

1 available to make sure it's adequately addressed.

2 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Okay, and in recognizing everyone  
3 is in speculation space here because we haven't gone through this process, I  
4 guess what I see it across the table here, is that you're not expecting that  
5 anything flowing from our Fukushima related activities would impact ITAAC,  
6 you're not seeing that right now based on what we know so far.

7 MICHAEL JOHNSON: I agree. No, we're not seeing anything yet,  
8 but I think Bill's -- the other part of Bill's answer that I resonate with is, we'll figure  
9 it out, and there's a process to deal with it wherever it falls out of the process for  
10 recommendations.

11 COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Commissioner Ostendorff.

13 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
14 Thank you all for your presentations. I wanted to maybe talk about inspections.  
15 I'm going to direct my first question, I guess, to Mark and maybe Alan -- you need  
16 a sample frequency. Earlier this year I bought a Ford Fusion hybrid. This is not  
17 an advertisement but it's a relatively new car, it's a 2010 motor trend car of the  
18 year, and Commissioner Svinicki drives a Ford, and so we're the two Ford drivers  
19 from this group here on the Commission. And when I look at -- I'm not an  
20 industrial engineer, but I've seen some factory production and some industrial  
21 engineering practices, look at sample frequencies and have some experience  
22 with quality assurance sampling for nuclear components in prior jobs.

23 When Ford builds these cars, there's, you know, certainly the first  
24 prototype off the line, you have a very rigorous inspection, from the first small  
25 production prototypes, then I'd imagine at some point in time, there's a ramp-off

1 of sampling, particularly let's say wheel bearings or circularity of engine pistons,  
2 those kinds of things, as you get more comfortable that your manufacturing  
3 processes are robust and are seeing very few defects. So, I wanted to get to --  
4 how is the ITAAC inspection -- I realize that the staff is going to look at every  
5 single package to make sure that things are closed out, but as far as onsite  
6 inspections by resident inspectors or other people from the region, I wanted to  
7 get a feel for it, is there -- I heard 40 percent targeted, I assume that's a sample  
8 frequency --

9           MARK KOWAL: Forty percent of the ITAAC would be targeted for  
10 inspection. That's what that number is.

11           COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Okay, so talk to me a little bit  
12 more about how was arrived at, what was the methodology or algorithm to get to  
13 that number.

14           MARK KOWAL: I can talk a little bit about what I know that was  
15 done before I arrived here, but yeah, I think there was -- I know that this  
16 methodology was discussed with ACRS, and it also is discussed in at least one  
17 Commission paper from 2007 timeframe, but it's a formal, structured, decision-  
18 making approach that considers a few specific attributes for each ITAAC, and it  
19 uses what's called an analytic hierarchy process, and I know safety significance  
20 is one of those attributes, it's one of the higher weighted and ranked attributes,  
21 so what we'll do first is we'll take each of the ITAAC and we'll put it into an ITAAC  
22 matrix, and we'll group them by family, and by family, I mean they have similar  
23 characteristics -- very similar characteristics -- and then we'll rank, using this  
24 analytic hierarchy process, using each of the ITAAC within that family, and get a  
25 rank order for those.

1                   And what we'll do is we'll -- we selected a threshold of, I think, of .4,  
2 which gave us a reasonable number of ITAAC to inspect. So, we will inspect  
3 those ITAAC within a family and assuming everything turns out fine with those  
4 ITAAC, that gives us confidence that the other ITAAC within that family that  
5 weren't targeted for inspection should be okay as well. So what the process  
6 does is it optimizes our inspection resources while at the same time ensures that  
7 there aren't any significant flaws that would go undetected. And that's the intent  
8 of that process and what was done. Now there -- now, we also will -- if there's  
9 certain families where ITAAC don't make the threshold, we ensure that we will  
10 inspect and target at least one ITAAC within each of those families -- within each  
11 family, and then we'll also have, with EP and security ITAAC, we will inspect all --  
12 those are all targeted, those will all be targeted based on the number that there  
13 aren't an overabundance of those so, that's how it's done. That's how it was  
14 done for the targeting of the ITAAC.

15                   COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Alan, you want to add  
16 anything?

17                   ALAN BLAMEY: Sure, and once the region receives the targeted  
18 ITAAC listing, then we start the preparation for the inspection. We do that by  
19 getting the technical experts together and we review, for example -- if you look at  
20 the matrix in row one and row two, that's really activities that are focused very  
21 heavily in the civil area. So, we pull the experts together, and we go through and  
22 we develop plans based on the targeted ITAAC, and once again, we take a look  
23 at -- and this is spelled out as well in manual chapter 2503, we'll go through and  
24 we'll take a look at the ITAAC, the SSC's structure systems and components,  
25 that are in that ITAAC, and then we take a look at the inspection procedures, and

1 we view that taking a look at what inspections do we want to do, when do we  
2 want to do the inspections. With biasing our inspections early in the process,  
3 and if, for example, we look at it early and we find out that the licensee is doing  
4 an adequate job, it's a simple task, and they'll continue, we have confidence that  
5 they'll continue to do that correctly, then we will spread the inspections out if it's  
6 going to occur over a two year period, we're probably back off, for example, for  
7 doing quarterly inspections, we may back off to once every six months to ensure  
8 that the licensee continues to perform that activity correctly.

9           Converse to that, if we look at the process, it's a complex process,  
10 and it's the first time it's being done, and we noted that the licensee has some  
11 challenges in that area, we'll go through and we'll probably have more frequent  
12 inspections, and that's typically, at this point in time, controlled by the region, and  
13 we do the periodic assessments to look at the licensee performance, so we'll  
14 actually increase or decrease the inspection activities based on the licensee  
15 performance, but we will do a sample of all targeted ITAAC and we'll also ensure  
16 that by the time we're finished, the inspection procedures are laid out by row and  
17 column, and we'll also make sure that by the time we're finished with the  
18 inspection activities that we will have also inspected all the high-level steps in the  
19 inspection procedures to make sure that we don't focus in any one area, but the  
20 licensee receives a broad based inspection based on the inspection procedure.

21           COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Okay, and one -- that's very  
22 helpful, and I appreciate that explanation, and maybe -- let's just assume for the  
23 sake of this question that we have -- end up having the COL's issued for both  
24 Vogtle and Summer -- so you have four AP-1000 design cert based plants, am I  
25 hearing that there's some dynamic nature that, let's say, for the first unit at

1 Vogtle, that you learn lessons X through Z here on certain targeted inspections  
2 and you'd have the flexibility to adjust or make a course correction for the second  
3 unit of Vogtle, is that --

4 ALAN BLAMEY: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: -- the case. Thank you.

6 MARK KOWAL: Can I just add too -- and this was mentioned in the  
7 industry panel this morning -- you know, we -- we're going to get ICNs for every  
8 ITAAC, ITAAC Closure Notifications, for every ITAAC, even those that are non-  
9 targeted, and we don't intend to necessarily publish those non-targeted ITAACs  
10 in the Federal Register Notice until a percentage of the targeted ITAAC are  
11 completed and inspected and completed as well, and that also uses confidence  
12 that, you know, that -- the ITAAC, and within that family, are being done correctly.

13 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Okay. Jim, I want to ask you a  
14 question, with respect of the headquarters operations, and then, maybe, Laura,  
15 you may want to add to this, as you desire. I assume you're going to have some  
16 kind of a rotation, some of your headquarters staff, or some visiting, out in the  
17 field visits to see how these inspections are going to give the headquarters nexus  
18 a complete understanding of the onsite resident inspector, regional inspector  
19 program activities?

20 JAMES BEARDSLEY: We do. One of the things that we have  
21 been working very closely with the CCI on is developing an ITAAC strategy for  
22 each ITAAC family. And as part of that strategy, we work with the technical staff  
23 here at headquarters to identify those inspection areas where a generalist  
24 inspector, or even a specific inspector, may not have the expertise. We would  
25 then draw on the technical reviewer staff here at headquarters to draw out -- and

1 report ITAAC are a great example. I mean, some of those are very complex.  
2 And we would then schedule inspection activity either in the field or back here at  
3 headquarters, drawing on those resources as necessary.

4 We're also -- we have an effort in place right now to try and  
5 document Lessons Learned from the licensing process, so the technical  
6 reviewers are putting their Lessons Learned down in writing, and then we're  
7 going to use that to inform the inspectors and improve our inspection procedures  
8 as we go, to try and get as much of that information in the field.

9 But to specifically answer your question, we are working on getting  
10 our headquarters staff -- getting their initial qualification as construction  
11 inspectors. And so we will use that staff to augment the inspection staff in the  
12 field, so that the headquarters staff not only has an understanding, can see how  
13 the technical staff -- can see how the inspection procedures are working, and  
14 then take that in to improve our processes and procedures, but also bring back  
15 those Lessons Learned to headquarters and help educate the staff here. So  
16 we're -- we have a good feel for what's going on in the field.

17 COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Okay.

18 Thank you. Thank you, all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Sure. The -- one of the issues that the ARS  
20 had raised with regard to DAC, and Commissioner Magwood touched on this  
21 earlier, was where we would put in guidance, how we'll close DAC. Has the staff  
22 resolved that issue?

23 LAURA DUDES: We continue to work with the ACRS. We've  
24 provided our inspection procedures in terms of how we approach that, and we  
25 will be meeting with them in November. One challenge that we had was we were



1 planning on conducting a DAC inspection pilot program this spring, in association  
2 with another vendor who's no longer necessarily able to complete that.

3 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Right.

4 LAURA DUDES: And that's --

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: South Texas.

6 LAURA DUDES: We do have some -- we're continuing to work on  
7 the DAC inspection procedures. We will interact with ACRS. But that was the  
8 vendor who had the majority of DACs, so it was going to be a good testing of  
9 that. Right now, we only have a few DAC that we think we will be inspecting over  
10 the next couple of years, which is why I think the industry panel said, I think,  
11 we've got sufficient information on that as we move forward, for implementing  
12 what's before us today.

13 MICHAEL JOHNSON: I do think the ACRS was dependent on our  
14 interaction in addition to seeing our procedures, and we haven't forgotten that  
15 commitment. We continue to talk -- we'll continue to talk with them.

16 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Well, I mean, and specifically, I think they  
17 talked about including something in Reg Guide 1.215. That DAC closure would  
18 be described there, is that --

19 MARK KOWAL: Currently, NEI-08-01 includes the options for  
20 closing DAC.

21 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yeah.

22 MARK KOWAL: That's about all it says, just design, during the  
23 design phase, during COL or after COL issuance. But I think that when we  
24 replied to the ACRS a couple years ago, we did say, "We are considering where  
25 to put -- best put that guidance, once it's developed." And I think we said, NEI-

1 08-01, which would be endorsed by the Reg Guide 1.215, there's one option I  
2 think we're also considering Standard Review Plan, as another, and --

3 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay. So --

4 MARK KOWAL: -- a section of the Manual Chapter --

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: -- that decision has not been made

6 MARK KOWAL: It hasn't been made because of -- we're not yet  
7 finished with the pilot, and that.

8 MICHAEL JOHNSON: And we'll verify completion of that  
9 commitment.

10 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yeah, okay. Back to the earlier discussion  
11 of the ITAAC. So, you know, as I look at these ITAAC, and as I read the Lessons  
12 Learned, I mean, clearly there were examples in there of ITAAC that were not  
13 really sufficient. So what happened -- I mean, there are examples in there; were  
14 the examples in there actual ITAAC, or were they made up? I mean, were they  
15 scenarios the staff developed to give examples of what not to do, or were they  
16 actually pulled from actual ITAAC --

17 MARK KOWAL: The training -- are you referring to the training  
18 manual that was --

19 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: No, the Lessons Learned.

20 MARK KOWAL: Oh, the Lessons Learned, those were the actual  
21 ITAAC that were used in the demonstration project. They're real ITAAC.

22 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So the ones that, you know, were -- maybe  
23 it's the training manual that I'm thinking of, then.

24 MARK KOWAL: Yeah, your comment earlier -- the "and/or"  
25 comment --

1 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yeah.

2 MARK KOWAL: That comes out of the RIS. That was --

3 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Oh, it was a RIS, okay.

4 MARK KOWAL: It was in the RIS.

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yeah.

6 MARK KOWAL: And, because it introduces -- we wanted to be as  
7 objective and clear as possible.

8 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Right.

9 MARK KOWAL: The training manual is mostly real ITAAC as well.  
10 You know, we --

11 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So what happened to those? Did they get  
12 fixed? I guess that it was in the RIS, so there -- here's an example of one, says  
13 this is -- applicant should ensure that the ITA matches the acceptance criteria.  
14 So, you know, here the -- it says example one. This one, I'm assuming, is not an  
15 actual -- because it says --

16 MARK KOWAL: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: -- the X-Y-Z systems --

18 MARK KOWAL: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: -- it's not a real one. But if you encounter  
20 these -- did the staff, I mean, did the staff --

21 MARK KOWAL: No, we encountered those, and that -- it was  
22 probably, X-Y-Z was put in there so that we didn't single out a --

23 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay.

24 MARK KOWAL: -- particular design or something. But --

25 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Because, I mean, the inspection in that

1 case says, the ITA piece says, inspections of the as built system will be  
2 conducted -- I mean, yeah, and it's one of these kind of meaningless statements.  
3 So did those get corrected --

4 MARK KOWAL: Well --

5 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: -- in the COL, or how was that addressed,  
6 then?

7 MARK KOWAL: Those -- I'm not sure that those specific ones have  
8 been corrected. We have throughout the review process, we've asked RAIs in  
9 this area. You know, historically, I think the ITAAC have been -- haven't been  
10 reviewed for inspectability and, you know, clarity as -- you know, the original AP-  
11 1000 ITAAC, and as we've learned and progressed, we've recognized this, that's  
12 what we're trying to do is educate everyone. We're taking these lessons, we're  
13 incorporating them into the EPR, the APWR designs, and the COLs.

14 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: If we look at the AP-1000, which is the most  
15 relevant one right now, I mean, are there ITAAC like this in the AP-1000?

16 MARK KOWAL: Yeah, I believe there are. I'd have to confirm that.

17 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So when, I mean, how -- when do we  
18 change them? I mean, when do they get fixed? I mean, don't they have to be  
19 fixed before COL issuance?

20 MICHAEL JOHNSON: It is true, Chairman, that, as we have -- as  
21 we've done these exercises like the training, for example --

22 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Oh, good.

23 MICHAEL JOHNSON: As we've done these exercises --

24 MALE SPEAKER: Nobody knows what they're talking about.

25 [laughter]

1           MARK KOWAL: These training exercises, for example, we have  
2 learned that -- and then been able to improve our ability to create ITAAC. That's  
3 one of the values of this exercise. Of course, there are certified designs that  
4 have ITAAC that have already been approved. We're sort of form fitting lessons.  
5 We've improved -- made improvements in the AP-1000 ITAAC, based on this  
6 training. We've made improvements in the other ITAAC going forward, APWR,  
7 EPR, as we talked.

8           CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So, again, and I appreciate that, and I keep  
9 forgetting, I mean, some of these are incorporated in the design cert. So can you  
10 give -- can you just give us all the ITAAC, the ITAAC -- I mean, I'd be curious as  
11 to how many have ITA pieces that say something along the lines of, "We will do  
12 inspections and know more." I mean, I'd be very interested in that, because I'm  
13 not sure that that's really what the ITAAC are intended to do.

14           RICH LAURA: Chairman, Rich Laura, and I work on the ITAAC  
15 team for Mark Kowal, and just to add a little more background on that training,  
16 that occurred over several years, and Mark gave a high level discussion on it.  
17 And essentially, yes, all those problems more or less got addressed.

18           CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay, okay.

19           RICH LAURA: A lot of them were through RAIs --

20           CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay.

21           RICH LAURA: And specifically, we're doing reviews on the SRP  
22 14.3.

23           CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yes.

24           RICH LAURA: We used hundreds of hours of inspection or  
25 auditing, we used contractors, we worked very closely with our licensing staff.

1 Now, as far as --

2 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So you don't think -- you don't think that  
3 there's anymore ITAAC like this that are still there? They all got addressed?

4 RICH LAURA: For ITAAC that are certified already, you know, we  
5 have to use judgment of which ones are significant that are broken, totally  
6 broken, and they would not work as written. And in those cases, I think we've  
7 only found one or two, we work closely with the vendor and the workshops, and  
8 those got either added or corrected.

9 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay. So that it doesn't -- so your view is,  
10 there aren't any more problematic ones?

11 RICH LAURA: No significant ones. Now, you know, when you look  
12 at ITAAC that were developed, I don't know, 10 years ago, and you look at where  
13 we are today, where we're much -- we know better what we're looking for, you  
14 know, they might be worded a little better today. So that --

15 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: I don't mean to be overly critical here, but I  
16 read this in five minutes and realized --

17 RICH LAURA: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: -- this wasn't acceptable.

19 RICH LAURA: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: I find it very hard to see that, with all the  
21 reviews that we did, that it took RAIs and it took a difficult path to determine that  
22 that was not an acceptable ITAAC. I mean, that's what I'm a little bit frustrated  
23 here by. This is not rocket science we're talking about. It says nothing. It says,  
24 "Inspections of the as-built system will be conducted." That doesn't tell me a  
25 single thing, so I appreciate what you're saying and I don't mean to be very

1 critical, but -- and it's -- you know, and I've approved these design certifications. I  
2 mean, in theory I've signed off on these things, but if this stuff is in there, you  
3 know, and if this is limited work authorization that's been approved. It says testing  
4 will be performed to confirm -- I mean, that doesn't tell me anything.

5 RICHARD LAURA: Well, if you look at little higher level, those are  
6 probably all the specific issues we found over several years of looking at maybe  
7 4,000 or 5,000 ITAAC. So you know, what we found is yeah, there were some  
8 problems. We got that word out through the RIS. We trained our own staff  
9 better, and we had a number of interactions and we continue focusing, but we've  
10 only found really one or two that were highly significant that were broken.

11 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay.

12 RICHARD LAURA: Now the one --

13 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Would you want to -- let me ask you this  
14 question. Would you consider this one to be highly significant and/or broken? I  
15 shouldn't say --

16 RICHARD LAURA: Which one is that?

17 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: This is the mud mat for -- this is in the LWA,  
18 I think, right?

19 LAURA DUDES: Yes, correct.

20 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: That testing will be performed to confirm  
21 that the mud mat, waterproof mud mat interface beneath the nuclear island base  
22 mat has a minimum coefficient of friction to resist sliding of 0.7. Do you think --  
23 does that ITAAC meet the quality standards and expectations that you have?

24 MARK KOWAL: I would say it probably could have been a little  
25 cleaner, and --

1 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: All right, so this one got through, okay.

2 LAURA DUDES: Yeah, I think the case with that, and the reason  
3 that that was raised in the panel -- it's not necessarily going back to the quality of  
4 that ITAAC, and I need to continue to remind people as we go through this that  
5 the ITAAC tables that are pulled out are really a shortened version of a  
6 systematic, significant review. There's an enormous amount of licensing basis in  
7 Tier 2 information --

8 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Okay, that would support that.

9 LAURA DUDES: For which we would always expect, today with  
10 the operating reactors --

11 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: This is from an LWA, which is there --

12 LAURA DUDES: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: And that doesn't have the Tier 2.

14 LAURA DUDES: Well, there is a document that supports -- there is  
15 a safety evaluation and a submittal that is on the docket that supports the  
16 technical basis under the limited work authorization.

17 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: So this isn't itself the ITAAC, then. There is  
18 something else which is actually the ITAAC.

19 LAURA DUDES: Well, you have an ITAAC but you also have to  
20 inspect against the licensing basis, so I mean, we would literally be cutting and  
21 pasting a large amount of information from Tier 2, which is the engineering  
22 behind these nuclear power plants, into these ITAAC tables. So the ITAAC are  
23 the Inspections, Tests, Analyses, Acceptance Criteria, but as we expect our  
24 inspectors today of the operating reactors, when they're inspecting compliance,  
25 to be aware of what the existing licensing basis is and do their inspection against



1 that and the regulations, it's very similar that the ITAAC will point you back to the  
2 design basis and licensing basis. So there's more information than what is  
3 actually contained in there, and we would expect that because an as-built  
4 verification, I think someone said there's numerous ITAAC that are very clear,  
5 which says a grip around the fuel pool bridge will open and close. Very clear.  
6 But as Rolf had indicated earlier, there is some engineering that is going to be  
7 associated with this, so we do inspect that.

8 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Well no, and that's fine. I mean, I would just  
9 take Mark at his word that he didn't -- this is probably not one that he thinks  
10 would have gotten -- I mean, this doesn't really meet what we wanted it to do, so  
11 again, maybe I don't honestly know whether this is a particularly significant  
12 ITAAC from a structural safety perspective from the -- nor do I know whether this  
13 is a difficult thing to meet or whether this is kind of no-brainer stuff in terms of the  
14 structural integrity of the container. But as I said, I just -- you know, obviously  
15 you've worked hard on this and you've tried to capture these things. We have a  
16 COL issuance or decisions about COLs coming up. I just want to make sure we  
17 don't miss an opportunity to fix something if we can fix it, because five years  
18 down the road it will be too late. And it is a very different mindset, because we  
19 have to get things right. Now obviously we missed it at the design cert in some  
20 cases. We let ITAAC go through that were less than ideal, so let's not miss it  
21 again at the COL, and if there are things we need to fix, we have time to do it.  
22 Let's do it and get it right. So Bill, you want to say something?

23 BILL BORCHARDT: I think just listening to the discussion, there's  
24 an operating reactor parallel situation which I think of as tech specs.

25 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yes.

1 BILL BORCHARDT: Tech specs might say you have to do a  
2 functional test, that's all it says. So how do you figure out what a functional test  
3 is? Well, you go to the licensing basis, you go to the industry codes and  
4 standards, and they develop a test protocol and a procedure which we would  
5 review. And I think ITAAC discussion is similar. You do a certain test in the  
6 licensing basis, and all the things we reviewed -- there's the details. To have an  
7 ITAAC that included all of those would one, be very voluminous; number two,  
8 would lock you into an old technology, right? An old methodology. Maybe  
9 there's a more enhanced methodology that the licensing basis got updated to, so  
10 I think we were trying not to make it too burdensome and duplicative.

11 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: No, I appreciate that, and that's maybe  
12 where there's a disconnect -- because I have a very different view of ITAAC,  
13 which is that the ITAAC is supposed to be -- it's supposed to avoid problems.  
14 And to do that, it has to be specific. In my mind, that was the intent of the  
15 program all along was to avoid subjectivity and to avoid the process whereby we  
16 have a discussion about what it really means. Did you meet the criteria or not?  
17 If what we were really just interested in was the criteria, then these kinds of  
18 things would be accepted, and that's just my view and I think that's maybe where  
19 we're having a disconnect, because I think it's as you said -- that's where I think I  
20 disagree with that, is that it wasn't intended to be flexible. Because with flexibility  
21 comes the opportunity for uncertainty, and so anyway, as I said, I've approved  
22 many of these things in design certifications, and like I said, it's the first time I've  
23 ever looked at one, but --

24 MICHAEL JOHNSON: Chairman, can I just say, we -- I understand  
25 the question and I think you're right on with respect to how important it is that

1 there's clarity in the meaning, that in fact when we get through and reach a  
2 decision regarding the fact that the ITAAC has been closed, that that can  
3 withstand scrutiny.

4 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Yeah.

5 MICHAEL JOHNSON: I think we have a great opportunity in terms  
6 of this LWA ITAAC that we're actually finishing up on. We'll take a look at that  
7 actually from the perspective of the question that you've asked to make sure that  
8 we understand with OGC on where we are and where we need to be with respect  
9 to ITAAC, so we'll take that.

10 CHAIRMAN JACZKO: Great, thank you. Any other comments or  
11 questions? Okay, thanks everybody. Good meeting.

12 [Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded]