

Official Transcript of Proceedings  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 561st Meeting Advisory Committee  
on Reactor Safeguards

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Thursday, April 2, 2009

Work Order No.: NRC-2757


Pages 1-275

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

# Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

License Renewal ACRS  
Committee Presentation

Mark Ajluni  
April 2, 2009



# Agenda

---

- ◆ Introductions
- ◆ VEGP Site Description
- ◆ Project Key Points
- ◆ Open Items
- ◆ Subcommittee Follow-Up Items
- ◆ Summation and Questions

# VEGP Representatives

---



- ◆ Tom Tynan, Site Vice President
- ◆ Lee Mansfield, Engineering Support Manager
- ◆ Mark Ajluni, Licensing Manager

# VEGP Site Description

---



- ◆ Westinghouse (NSSS), Bechtel (AE)
- ◆ Two 4 Loop PWR Units
  - 3625 MWt
  - 1250 MWe
- ◆ Ultimate Heat Sink – NSCW Forced Draft Cooling Towers and Basins
- ◆ Turbine Cycle Cooling Provided By Natural Draft Towers

# VEGP License Renewal Project Key Points

---



## ◆ 10 CFR 54.17(c) Exemption

- NRC granted VEGP an exemption to 10 CFR 54.17(c) to submit Vogtle Unit 2 License Renewal Application prior to reaching 20 years remaining on the operating license
  - ◆ Basis: Unit 2 is the same design and construction as Unit 1

# VEGP License Renewal Project Key Points

---



- ◆ As a result of the aging management reviews, VEGP credited the following:
  - 38 Aging Management Programs
    - ◆ 9 existing programs with no change
    - ◆ 15 existing programs with enhancements
    - ◆ 14 new programs
  - 27 of the 38 are GALL Programs
    - ◆ Only minor exceptions
    - ◆ 11 plant specific programs incorporated GALL attributes where possible

# Open Item Resolution

---



- ◆ The VEGP Final SER for License Renewal has no Open or Confirmatory Items



# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## Containment Residue

---



- Region II Site Inspection performed walkdown of Boric Acid Corrosion Control Program during 1R14 (April 2008)
- Inspection concluded BACC Program would adequately manage boric acid corrosion
- However inspector noted non-boric acid deposits from NSCW leakage that could mask boric acid corrosion

# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## Containment Residue

---



# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## CNMT Residue Corrective Actions

---



- BACC Program procedure changes, training, and enhanced communication have been implemented to heighten awareness.
- Aggressive inspection, cleaning and repainting program is in progress – at power and during refueling outages.
- Tools developed to promptly identify and address leakage in containment.

# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## Containment Residue

---



1-1206-114  
016  
NSCW  
CHMT CLR 140  
OUTLET  
TEST CONN  
A



# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## Containment Residue

---



- ◆ The valve on the preceding slide was discussed at the Subcommittee meeting
- ◆ The corrosion visible in the picture had been evaluated as minor surface corrosion that did not require remediation
- ◆ VEGP inspected and cleaned the valve. The initial evaluation was confirmed as correct.



# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## Water in Pullboxes

---



### ◆ Medium Voltage Cables

- In scope medium voltage cables at VEGP are located in tunnels and not subject to submergence, with one exception
  - ◆ Non-safety related 4kV feeders to high voltage switchyard switch house
- Region Inspection found water in pull box near switch house
- Corrective action – accelerated implementation of the license renewal aging management program inspections
  - ◆ Quarterly inspection (later increased to monthly based on first two inspections)
  - ◆ Trending of results
- Design changes initiated to add sump pumps to two boxes. Planned for installation in 2010.



# Subcommittee Follow-Up Items

## Aging Management of Boral

---



- ◆ VEGP Unit 1 spent fuel racks contain Boral™ neutron-absorbing panels. Unit 2 racks do not use Boral™.
- ◆ Our strategy monitors spent fuel pool aluminum concentration and monitors industry operating experience.
- ◆ To date, industry operating experience has not shown evidence of loss of neutron absorption in Boral™.
- ◆ SNC has committed to perform a baseline and a follow-up inspection to confirm the neutron-absorbing capacity of the Boral™ panels.

# Summary

---

- ◆ Experienced team created a high quality application
- ◆ Extensive use made of GALL
- ◆ Thorough audits and inspection of the application and programs
- ◆ VEGP responsive to NRC throughout review
- ◆ No Open or Confirmatory Items
- ◆ VEGP is confident that we are prepared to manage aging and continue to operate safely beyond 40 years

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS (ACRS)

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

APRIL 2, 2009

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee convened in Room T2B3 in the Headquarters of the Nuclear Safety Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, at 8:30 a.m., Dr. Mario Bonaca, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARIO BONACA Chair

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

SAID ABDEL-KHALIK Vice Chair  
J. SAM ARMIJO Member-at-Large  
JOHN D. SIEBER Member  
MICHAEL T. RYAN Member

MEMBERS PRESENT (CONTINUED):

SANJOY BANERJEE Member  
DENNIS C. BLEY Member  
JOHN W. STETKAR Member  
WILLIAM J. SHACK Member  
OTTO L. MAYNARD Member  
CHARLES H. BROWN, JR. Member  
HAROLD B. RAY Member  
MICHAEL CORRADINI Member  
GEORGE E. APOSTOLAKIS Member

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

Brian Holian  
Donnie Ashley  
Louis Lake (via telephone)  
Emma Wong

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

David Pelton  
Jay Collins  
Jim Medoff  
Steven Arndt  
David DeSaulniers  
G. Edward Miller  
Ian Jung  
Bill Kemper  
Ted Quay

NRC STAFF PRESENT (CONTINUED):

William Kennedy  
Tom Koshy  
Stu Richards  
George Russell

ALSO PRESENT:

Mark Ajluni  
Lee Mansfield  
Tom Tynan  
Wade Richards

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

Mike Rowe  
Paul Brand  
Dave Brown  
Robert Williams  
Dan Flynn  
William Horin  
Philip Holzman

I N D E X

AGENDA ITEMS	PAGE
Call to Order	5
Review of License Renewal of Vogtle (VEGP)	
Opening Remarks	7
VEGP Introduction	11

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1	SNC License Renewal Application	12
2	Staff Introduction	28
3	NRC Staff Review Summary	29
4	NRC Onsite Inspection Results	31
5	Committee Discussion	36
6	Digital Instrumentation and Control (I&C)	
7	Interim Staff Guidances (ISGs)	46
8	Afternoon Session	133
9	Adjourn	275

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

P R O C E E D I N G S

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(8:29 a.m.)

1  
2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Good morning. The  
3 meeting will now come to order.

4 This is the first day of the 561st  
5 meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor  
6 Safeguards. During today's meeting, the Committee  
7 will pursue the following: license renewal  
8 application and final Safety Evaluation Report for  
9 the Vogtle Nuclear Plant, digital instrumentation  
10 and control Interim Staff Guidances, license renewal  
11 application and Final Safety Evaluation Report for  
12 the National Institute of Standards and Technology  
13 reactor, draft final Regulatory Guide 1.211,  
14 Qualification of Safety-Related Cables and Field  
15 Splices for Nuclear Power Plants, preparation of  
16 ACRS reports.

17 This meeting is being conducted in  
18 accordance with the provisions of the Federal  
19 Advisory Committee Act. Mr. Sam Duraiswamy is the  
20 Designated Federal Official for the initial portion  
21 of the meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

Mr. Louis Lake of Region II is on the phone bridge line to listen to the discussion regarding the Vogtle license renewal application.

We will have some members representing the Nuclear Utility Group on Equipment Qualification which is NUGEQ on the phone bridge line to listen to the discussion regarding draft Final Regulatory Guideline 1.211.

To preclude interruption of the meeting, the phone will be placed in a listening mode for the presentation and committee discussion.

We have received no written comments from -- no, we have received written comments from NUGEQ regarding new Regulatory Guide 1.211. We have not received any requests for time to make oral statements from members of the public regarding today's sessions.

A transcript of portions of the meeting is being kept. And it is requested that speakers use one of the microphones, identify themselves, and speak with sufficient clarity and volume so that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 they can be readily heard.

2 We'll move on to the first item on the  
3 agenda, which is the Vogtle License Renewal  
4 Application. But before that, I would like to --  
5 Dr. Abdel-Khalik would like to make a statement.

6 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: Thank you, Mr.  
7 Chairman.

8 I have a conflict. Therefore, I will  
9 not participate in the discussions regarding to the  
10 Vogtle license renewal application.

11 CHAIR BONACA: Okay.

12 With that, I'll go to Mr. Sieber who  
13 will take us through the presentation.

14 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. Thank you, Mr.  
15 Chairman.

16 Our first session this morning is the  
17 license renewal for two units at the Vogtle Nuclear  
18 Plant. The Vogtle plant consists of two units,  
19 four-loop Westinghouse-type PWRs with dry ambient  
20 containments. And it is located about 26 miles  
21 southeast of Augusta, Georgia, which was my hometown

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 for a while. And Michael lived in Aiken so we're  
2 familiar with the territory.

3 We had our subcommittee meeting on  
4 November 5th, which was clear there were some issues  
5 that came out of that. And I'll just briefly touch  
6 on what those issues were.

7 The first was the number of exception to  
8 GALL, of which there were 14, which is -- we have  
9 spoken to the issues of exceptions to GALL in  
10 previous reports on license renewals. I would just  
11 point out at this time that when there are a lot of  
12 exceptions, it indicates that GALL could possibly be  
13 updated to lower the number of exceptions taken.

14 Some applicants have taken an effort an  
15 to change their AMPs, Aging Management Programs, to  
16 better match GALL. And so that's another approach  
17 to that. But since we have discussed it in so many  
18 previous letters, I've concluded we need not discuss  
19 it again.

20 The second issue that came up during the  
21 subcommittee was medium-voltage cables that appeared

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to be submerged at least part of the time. This is  
2 an issue that is generic to many plants in the  
3 United States that use medium-voltage cables that  
4 are underground or underground duct work.

5 And we consider this a current licensing  
6 issue and not a license renewal issue. So there is  
7 a generic letter out on that which the licensee must  
8 respond and come up with a program to solve that  
9 problem.

10 The third issue to come up during the  
11 subcommittee was the fatigue analysis. There is no  
12 open item here. The licensee has committed but has  
13 not yet done, to my knowledge, the fatigue analysis  
14 the way that is so suggested by the ASME Code.

15 And lastly there were some material  
16 condition issues, for example the boric acid  
17 program, there was some evidence of  
18 corrosion/deterioration based on photographs and the  
19 reports from the region.

20 In addition, there were photographs of  
21 anti-corrosive material that apparently came from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the containment air coolers when those coolers were  
2 repiped to use to cool containment during outages to  
3 provide a better working condition for the workers  
4 in containment during outages.

5 That does not appear to be a condition  
6 that would effect the safety of the plant. On the  
7 other hand, boric acid condition, to the extent they  
8 exist, is a current licensing issue. And needs to  
9 be remediated and not wait until license renewal  
10 occurs.

11 So those are the four issues. I would  
12 bring them out here just to put on the record the  
13 fact that we looked at these items and made some  
14 preliminary determinations about them. And you may  
15 not see them in our final letter or perhaps you  
16 will, depending on what the issue is.

17 So with that, I would like to introduce  
18 Brian Holian, Director of License Renewal, to  
19 introduce the staff speakers and the licensee for  
20 this session.

21 Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MR. HOLIAN: Thank you, Dr. Sieber.

I'm Brian Holian, Director of License Renewal. In accordance with the agenda, I will just introduce NRC staff and turn it over to Southern Nuclear for their presentation. The NRC presentation will follow the licensee's presentation.

One item before introductions, as Dr. Sieber mentioned, on the GALL update, I remind the Committee that the GALL has served, you know, very usefully in license renewal reviews. And we are in the process this year of updating the GALL.

The Nuclear Energy Institute, on behalf of a lot of licensees, has already sent us some comments that we get from the public and we'll be working through a GALL update to minimize exemptions and, you know, increase the efficiency of reviews really.

For introductions, to my right is Mr. Dave Pelton, the Branch Chief that also has the Vogtle review.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 To his right and presenting later will  
2 be Donnie Ashley, the Senior Project Manager in  
3 License Renewal.

4 Already on the phone, the Chairman  
5 introduced Mr. Lou Lake, the reactor inspector from  
6 Region II. And he presented at the subcommittee  
7 back in November. And he's on the phone.

8 Also on the phone is his Branch Chief  
9 from the Division of Reactor Safety, Mr. George  
10 Hopper.

11 With that, I'll turn it over to Mark  
12 Ajluni, the Licensing Manager for Southern Nuclear  
13 Company.

14 MR. AJLUNI: Thank you.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and  
16 distinguished members of the ACRS staff.

17 I'd like to start off today by  
18 introducing myself. I'm Mark Ajluni. I'm the  
19 Licensing Manager for the Southern Nuclear Fleet.  
20 And I'd like to introduce the members of our team.

21 Mr. Todd Youngblood in back. Todd is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 our Engineering Director at the site.

2 Mr. Jack Stringfellow, Jack is Licensing  
3 Supervisor for Vogtle.

4 Mr. Cary Martin, Project Engineer,  
5 electrical, for the license renewal project.

6 Jon Hornbuckle, Project Engineer, time-  
7 limited aging analysis -- I'll get that straight.

8 And I'd like to introduce Mr. Lou Bohn.

9 And Lou is Project Engineer, electrical -- no, I'm  
10 sorry, mechanical.

11 And also with us today is Tom Tynan,  
12 Site Vice President.

13 And Lee Mansfield, Site Engineering  
14 Support Manager.

15 Next slide. Okay, I'd like to start off  
16 really talking about the site. And then I'll cover  
17 some key points, open items, and subcommittee  
18 follow-up items.

19 The Vogtle site is a Westinghouse, four-  
20 loop plant. Bechtel is the architect engineer. It  
21 went commercial in the late '80s. The megawatt

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 rating is 3625 and producing about 450 megawatts  
2 electric. It has been uprated and the latest uprate  
3 was a feedwater flow measurement uncertainty uprate.

4 Ultimate heat sink for the plant is the  
5 NSCW system forced draft cooling towers and basins,  
6 right there. And these are concrete structures,  
7 Category One seismic. And then for the power  
8 producing segment of the plant, there is a turbine  
9 cycle cool provided by natural draft cooling towers,  
10 the hyperbolic towers here.

11 And our latest core damage frequency is  
12 1.5 E to the minus 5 for those of you that are  
13 interested.

14 Some of the key project points, when we  
15 applied for license renewal, we applied for Unit One  
16 and Unit Two even though Unit Two had not completed  
17 its 20-year requirement. And the NRC did review  
18 that and grant us an exemption pursuant to 10 CFR  
19 54.17(c). Currently, both units are within the 20-  
20 year cycle.

21 Other key points, I'll talk about the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 aging management reviews in a minute. We credited  
2 38 aging management programs. Twenty-four of the 38  
3 were existing programs and 15 of those required  
4 enhancements, nine there were no changes to the  
5 programs.

6 Twenty-seven of the 38 programs are  
7 GALL. Only minor exception were taken to GALL. And  
8 since we talked about it, some example of the  
9 exceptions would be different versions of a code or  
10 a standard, perhaps a different surveillance  
11 interval, and material environmental issues. And  
12 then other differences. Overall though we were  
13 greater than 85 percent match to the GALL program.

14 And one thing we are very proud of is  
15 the fact that there are no open or confirmatory  
16 items for the final SCR for license renewal. So  
17 that was -- we were pleased with that.

18 And now I'd like to turn it over to Lee  
19 Mansfield and Lee will talk about some of the  
20 subcommittee follow-up issues.

21 MR. MANSFIELD: Good morning.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1                   The reason Region II did a site  
2                   inspection and a walk-down of our Boric Acid  
3                   Corrosion Control Program in the spring of 2008.  
4                   They concluded that the program would adequately  
5                   manage boric acid but pointed out that we had a non-  
6                   boric acid residue in our containment. It is a  
7                   white residue that could potentially mask boric acid  
8                   leaks.

9                   So we have taken a number of actions  
10                  there and I'll describe those. Next slide please.  
11                  I did want to show you an example of what this  
12                  residue looks like. This is an area looking up  
13                  under one of our containment coolers that has  
14                  nuclear service cooling water passing through it.

15                  The white residue and the staining is  
16                  from past leakage out of the cooler that is above  
17                  this area. And as you can see, it dries white and  
18                  could potentially mask boric acid.

19                  Next slide please. Our corrective  
20                  actions have included procedure changes. We went  
21                  and revised every procedure that has anything to do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 with a walk-down or inspection or housekeeping at  
2 Plant Vogtle to make sure there is no confusion  
3 between this material and a boric acid leak.

4 We've actually done training which  
5 involves recurring training coming into outages as a  
6 reminder. We've done enhanced communication through  
7 our electronic means. And in general have made sure  
8 that while we're recovering our containments from  
9 this issue, that there is no confusion.

10 And we've told our plant staff whenever  
11 there is a question about this, you know, default to  
12 a condition report in our corrective action program,  
13 come ask the boric acid corrosion control engineer,  
14 and we'll get to the bottom of it.

15 We have put in place a very, very  
16 aggressive inspection, cleaning, and repainting  
17 program. We're making at-power entries as we speak.

18 We've been doing that for a couple of months now.  
19 Actually for the last month, we've been doing that  
20 weekly.

21 The bulk -- those efforts are fairly

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 short in duration again because we're at power.  
2 They are really valuable because they are helping us  
3 plan for our outage cleaning efforts, which is where  
4 the bulk of our work is going to be.

5 So we have -- we currently have a  
6 significant commitment by Tom of people and budgets  
7 going forward to make sure that we come to grips  
8 with this residue issue and clean it up. We will be  
9 doing, as a minimum, these large clean-up efforts in  
10 the next two refueling outages on each unit.

11 We've also developed work controls tools  
12 to help us identify -- promptly identify leaks from  
13 cooling water systems and containment so that while  
14 we're cleaning and recovering, we don't have new  
15 leaks that go too long and create more of a problem  
16 for us.

17 Next slide please. This is the same  
18 photo I showed you before of the underside of one of  
19 our containment coolers. I just show this as an  
20 example of how we are able to recover these areas,  
21 clean and repaint and recoat and get back to our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 original condition.

2 MR. TYNAN: Before we move further, I  
3 just want to make sure the Board understands that  
4 I've given this, you know, a lot of my personal  
5 attention. I've walked down all these areas in both  
6 containments. And make sure, as Lee mentioned, that  
7 we have resources and whatever we needed to clean up  
8 the containment and address these issues.

9 And to make sure that the station, my  
10 station has the proper focus on this item, we have  
11 made it number five on our major issues list which  
12 gets attention from the entire plant staff.

13 So we are going to make sure that, you  
14 know, we're not taking this lightly. We've taken  
15 this very seriously and intend to have this  
16 addressed in short order in the short term as well  
17 as making sure we have long-term actions so it  
18 doesn't occur again.

19 MR. MANSFIELD: Next slide please. This  
20 is a photograph that was shown at the subcommittee  
21 meeting on November 5th. And it was shown as an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 example of the white residue. There was some  
2 discussion about the material condition of the  
3 valve, particularly the carbon steel packing  
4 follower and gland studs had minor corrosion on  
5 them.

6 We wanted to follow up with that issue  
7 and tell the Committee what we've done. Next slide  
8 please. We had originally evaluated this as minor  
9 corrosion in our corrective action program and had  
10 not planned a near-term remediation of that valve.

11 We have since gone back out to that  
12 valve -- I've gone personally and looked at it. And  
13 we've cleaned the valve and confirmed our initial  
14 belief that it was minor corrosion and we didn't  
15 have to replace any components.

16 Next slide please, Lou. This is an  
17 after photograph of the same valve. And this was --  
18 we did this without liquid cleaning methods. So  
19 this was the after condition. And I really just  
20 wanted to show that this was, indeed, what we  
21 thought it was.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER RAY: How do you deal with ALARA  
2 considerations when you elect to do something like  
3 that? I mean is it worth it?

4                   MR. MANSFIELD: At-power cooling?

5                   MEMBER RAY: No, just the manner and  
6 exposure --

7                   MR. MANSFIELD: Okay.

8                   MEMBER RAY: -- that's involved in the  
9 housekeeping.

10                  MR. MANSFIELD: Well, we took that into  
11 account in doing this. And actually these are all  
12 of the work that we're doing inside containment now  
13 is outside the bioshield and in low-dose areas. The  
14 dose rates are very low and we're picking up very  
15 little dose doing this.

16                  We looked at all of the impacts of doing  
17 that and see a real benefit in the head start in  
18 helping us prepare for the outages to refine our  
19 cleaning methods and make sure that when we get into  
20 the outages we can do the most, you know, the most  
21 cleaning and the best effort we can do.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1                   MEMBER RAY: Well, I guess I conclude  
2 from that that if significant exposure would have  
3 been incurred, you wouldn't have done it.

4                   MR. MANSFIELD: I certainly would say  
5 that there would be a point where it wouldn't make  
6 sense to go in and do this kind of work at power  
7 because of the dose.

8                   MEMBER RAY: I'm not talking about at  
9 power necessarily.

10                  MR. AJLUNI: I would say we always  
11 consider radiological consequences and dose when we  
12 do work. And that's a factor. For these valves in  
13 this area, you know, the Vogtle containment is a  
14 very large containment. Things are spread out.  
15 There's lots of shielding. And for this work, it is  
16 low dose.

17                  MEMBER RAY: Well, low but some dose, I  
18 would guess. It may be negligible, I don't know  
19 what the field is in there. It just -- it didn't  
20 sound to me like you were taking that into  
21 consideration when you were talking about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 progressing.

2 MR. TYNAN: We are top quartile in the  
3 industry for four-loop Westinghouse PWR in terms of  
4 overall dose. And looking at both non-outage and  
5 outage dose. And this particular project, you know,  
6 always gets a lot of attention when we go into  
7 containment. And we assess dose relative to our  
8 goals. And so --

9 MEMBER RAY: I just wouldn't want you to  
10 take away some message here that wasn't intended  
11 when it comes to incurring dose for housekeeping  
12 purposes.

13 MR. MANSFIELD: And we didn't. To be  
14 honest with you, we didn't. We see -- you know  
15 taking the dose into account, we really do see a  
16 great value in -- for our planning, to be able to  
17 get in there in these low-dose areas, do what  
18 cleaning we can, scope out what we're going to do  
19 during outages to make that the most effective.

20 MEMBER SIEBER: I think that goes two  
21 ways. And generally I leave it to the licensee's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 judgment as to whether housekeeping is worth the  
2 dose that it takes. But we do have examples in the  
3 industry where housekeeping -- poor housekeeping has  
4 masked major problems, for example, in Ohio.

5 And so I think that the management of  
6 Vogtle and every other plant has to decide the  
7 extent to which they will expend dose to find out  
8 what the condition of their plant is. And I think  
9 in the examples that the applicant has shown here  
10 that it is reasonable.

11 And I agree with you --

12 MEMBER RAY: Well, Jack, I would just  
13 like to hear it mentioned.

14 MEMBER SIEBER: Right. It's on the  
15 record. But it is a judgment call.

16 MR. MANSFIELD: Next slide please. The  
17 second follow-up item is water in pullboxes. Now at  
18 Vogtle, the end scope medium voltage cables are all  
19 located in tunnels and not subjected to submergence  
20 with one exception. We have two non (1)(e), 4kV  
21 cable cables that run from the turbine building out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to our high-voltage switch yard to support switching  
2 operations for offsite sources.

3           During a region inspection, water was  
4 found in one of the pullboxes, the pullbox nearest  
5 the high-voltage switch yard. And our corrective  
6 action for that has been to go ahead and accelerate  
7 the implementation of the license renewal aging  
8 management program inspections.

9           So we were doing quarterly inspections  
10 of those boxes, those three boxes. We've now moved  
11 those inspections to monthly based on our findings.  
12 We'll continue to trend the results.

13           When we inspect and find water, we pump  
14 it out. We'll continue to trend those results. In  
15 the mean time, we are developing a design change.  
16 We have on our work list for 2010 to add automatic  
17 sump pumps to two of the three boxes that don't have  
18 sump pumps in them now.

19           And I will tell you that, you know,  
20 we're -- if we need to change the frequency again,  
21 if there are other actions we need to take in an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 interim method before we get the sump pumps in,  
2 we'll do that.

3 MEMBER STETKAR: Remind me, I look at  
4 too many plants. Are the main safety-related pumps  
5 at Vogtle 4kV? Or are the 480 volt?

6 MR. MANSFIELD: The main safety-related  
7 pumps are 4kV.

8 MEMBER SIEBER: This issue is also a  
9 generic issue. In November of -- excuse me, March  
10 21st, 2002, there was an information notice issued  
11 by the staff on this matter of submerged safety-  
12 related electrical cables. There is a Generic  
13 Letter issued in 2007, which Vogtle and other  
14 licensees are required to respond to that talks  
15 about inaccessible or underground power cable  
16 failures that disable accident mitigation systems or  
17 cause plant transients.

18 These are current licensing issues that  
19 would be handled under the reactor oversight  
20 process. I presume you have received the Generic  
21 Letter and have responded to it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MR. MANSFIELD: Yes, we have.

MEMBER SIEBER: And so that would be the manner of disposition of this item with regard to license renewal is through your Generic Letter response.

MR. MANSFIELD: Okay. Next slide please. Mark Ajluni will cover the aging management of Boral.

MR. AJLUNI: Thank you.

Since the last ACRS meeting related to this issue, we got basically notified by the staff that they had expressed a concern concerning Unit One Boral spent fuel pool racks. And on Unit One, Boral is the material that is used for the spent fuel pool racks.

Unit Two uses a different material called Boroflex. And Unit Two does not credit the Boroflex in their licensing basis.

And the concern was that the Boral perhaps could experience similar degradation effects as Boroflex related with aging.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1                   And we had proposed -- we currently  
2 monitor the spent fuel pool chemistry and one of the  
3 elements we look for is aluminum. And the presence  
4 of aluminum would indicate that there was some  
5 degradation going on potentially with the Boroflex.

6                   And we also monitor industry operating which, to  
7 date, has not shown any problems with the use of  
8 Boral as the material.

9                   We had a lot of discussion with the  
10 staff about where do we go with this and there's  
11 really not any evidence of the degradation. The  
12 driving factor for us was, as pointed out the staff,  
13 was that the Unit One racks are, they're not  
14 original Vogtle racks. They were purchased from  
15 Maine Yankee. And so they actually are rather older  
16 racks. In fact, they are one of the older set of  
17 racks currently in use.

18                   So if there was an aging impact or  
19 effect due to Boral degradation, one might expect  
20 them to show up on the Vogtle racks first. And  
21 given that and thinking about what the right thing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to do was, we made a commitment to go forth and  
2 conduct testing on the racks.

3 We'll do a baseline inspection in 2017.

4 And then within ten years after that, we'll do --  
5 but prior to the license renewal period starting,  
6 we'll do another neutron attenuation test or some  
7 other test and measuring absorber effectiveness and  
8 we'll look to see if there has been any degradation  
9 of that.

10 If we see degradation, we'll report it  
11 as OE and we will take appropriate measures to deal  
12 with it. And to address that, we made a commitment  
13 to do that. It is a one-time commitment.

14 MEMBER SIEBER: Let me ask you a  
15 question --

16 MR. AJLUNI: Yes.

17 MEMBER SIEBER: -- about your racks. Do  
18 you use flux trap design-type racks? That's the  
19 ones where you have the space between them.

20 MR. AJLUNI: Yes, the high density.

21 MEMBER SIEBER: And the idea is to put

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com



1 the Boral where the flux peaks so you get the  
2 greatest capture?

3 MR. AJLUNI: That's correct.

4 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. Those racks came  
5 out shortly after the Executive Order that banned  
6 recycling and a lot of plants backfit with those  
7 kind of racks. One of the issues, besides the loss  
8 of boron as an absorber material, is the change in  
9 geometry that occurs when the Boral blisters.

10 And so when you inspect and you do a  
11 determination as to whether the Boral is still  
12 there, you have to look at whether the geometry has  
13 changed because of blistering or other effects that  
14 would change the neutronic characteristics of the  
15 rack itself.

16 Are you aware that that could be a  
17 factor?

18 MR. AJLUNI: We are aware of the  
19 blistering.

20 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay.

21 MR. AJLUNI: And the issue. There's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 industry OE out on it. And our testing would factor  
2 that into it.

3 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. AJLUNI: Okay. And that's all I  
5 have on that issue if there are no further  
6 questions.

7 In summary, we created an experienced,  
8 high-quality team and a high-quality application.  
9 The team -- the members of the team worked on all  
10 three Southern nuclear plants license renewals.  
11 This is the last one so they have had a lot of  
12 experience.

13 They've made extensive use of GALL.  
14 There were thorough audits and inspections of the  
15 program. We've been very responsive to the NRC  
16 throughout the review. We're proud of the fact that  
17 there's no open or confirmatory actions.

18 And finally, we're confident that Vogtle  
19 Electric Generating Plant is prepared to manage  
20 aging and continue to operate the plant safety  
21 beyond its 40-year regular life.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

Thank you very much.

MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions of the applicant at this time?

MEMBER RYAN: Just one. You mentioned the residue several times. And it is interesting to see the change. Did you ever figure out what the residue is?

MR. MANSFIELD: Yes. The residue is principally from our nuclear service cooling water system. That system is made up to by well water. And the minerals in the well water, when they come out into the air and dry, they turn white.

There is a corrosion inhibitor in that system as well called tolytriazole. That dries white so between the two, when that system has had leakage over the years, it has caused this staining.

MEMBER RYAN: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER SIEBER: Any other questions?

(No response.)

MEMBER SIEBER: If not, I would ask the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 staff.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. HOLIAN: This is Brian Holian. I'm  
4 Director of License Renewal. We'll transition to  
5 the staff's presentation.

6 Presenting is Donnie Ashley, the Senior  
7 Project Manager. Also joining us at the side table  
8 is Dr. Sam Lee, Deputy Director of License Renewal.

9 And a reminder, primarily for questions,  
10 but the region is on the phone. That's Lou Lake,  
11 Reactor Inspector. Go ahead, Donnie.

12 MR. ASHLEY: Thanks, Brian.

13 Good morning to you all. As Brian said,  
14 I'm Donnie Ashley. I'm Project Manager for the  
15 Vogtle Electric Generating Plant License Renewal  
16 Project. I, along with the tech staff members here  
17 in the room, are here to provide you with the status  
18 of our review of the Vogtle application and to  
19 answer questions that you might have.

20 And Mr. Lou Lake, as has been been  
21 mentioned several times, is on the phone with us.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

I'll begin with a brief overview of the license renewal effort on this particular project. And the audits and inspections, we're going to cover those in a little different path this time. Usually we do those after we do Section 2 but we'll do those first and then we'll talk about the individual sections of the Safety Evaluation Report.

The Safety Evaluation Report itself, the staff was aided with the audit reviews. In additional requests for information provided by the applicant, in response to 87 of those RAIs, there were 173 audit questions which appeared and ended up in the Q&A database, which is on the docket.

The information collected from the audit and the RAI responses, in addition to the information given to us from the inspection, was used to develop the final Safety Evaluation Report.

There are 40 commitments in the Appendix A of the Safety Evaluation Report.

The applicant did not use two number so what we did is we went back to the SER Appendix and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 changed that commitment list to show that Commitment  
2 No. 10 and Commitment No. 22 were not used at  
3 Vogtle. As has been mentioned, the SER contains no  
4 open items or confirmatory items. And we have three  
5 license conditions that normally -- they are in the  
6 back, the last page of your handout -- these are the  
7 standardized conditions that appear in all license  
8 renewal SERs.

9 And continuing the recap of the November  
10 2008 subcommittee meeting, the three major issues  
11 that were discussed by the applicant are repeated  
12 here. Subsequent to the subcommittee meeting, the  
13 staff asked seven additional RAIs based on the  
14 discussions with the staff and on your questions  
15 from the subcommittee.

16 And this resulted in a revised  
17 commitment to provide for the inspection of the  
18 panels in addition to the Water Chemistry Program.  
19 That raised the total number of RAIs to 94.

20 The applicant also provided an update on  
21 the commitments that were in effect at the time the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 subcommittee met. And we added one new commitment,  
2 which was involved in -- the emergency diesel  
3 generator fuel oil day tank vent line was added to  
4 the commitment list.

5 During the review, the NRC teams  
6 conducted three onsite audits and one inspection  
7 during the periods listed on this slide. The staff  
8 started the review with the scoping and screening  
9 methodology audits in September of 2007 at the  
10 corporate offices of the Southern Company.

11 This was followed with a series of  
12 onsite audits and inspections from October 2007  
13 through June 2008. Region II conducted that  
14 inspection in May and June to review the scoping and  
15 screening and aging management programs.

16 CHAIR BONACA: On page three, you  
17 mention that additional components are broke into  
18 scope. Could you comment on that?

19 MR. ASHLEY: Yes, sir, I have a slide on  
20 that later.

21 CHAIR BONACA: All right.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MR. ASHLEY: The specific audit information was combined into the audit summary and used as input into the SER. And it was issued in September 2008.

The original inspection was completed during 2008 and the results were published in a July 18, 2008 Inspection Report that was provided to the subcommittee and Mr. Lake was the author of that Inspection Report.

As has been discussed by the applicant, the inspectors identified enhancements involved in the manhole flooding and the conditions inside the containment. Region II will follow up on these issues during a future 71003 inspections.

The inspection team concluded that the scoping and screening of the non-safety-related systems, structures, and components was implemented as required by the rule and the aging management portions of the license renewal activities were conducted as described in the application.

Mr. Lake, do you have any comments from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.



1 Region II?

2 MR. LAKE: No, we do not.

3 MR. ASHLEY: Any questions from the  
4 Board for Mr. Lake?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. ASHLEY: Section 2 discusses the  
7 scoping and screening methodology of those  
8 structures and components subject to aging  
9 management review. The methodology, plant level  
10 scoping reviews of the relevant systems and  
11 structures, mechanical systems, structures and  
12 electrical I&C systems are in those sections, too.

13 The staff found the results by the  
14 applicant also meet the review criteria in the  
15 standard review plan and in accordance with the  
16 rules.

17 Three components -- and this should  
18 answer your question, Dr. Bonaca -- three components  
19 were added to the scope of the review. And that was  
20 the non-ESF exhaust fan housing and unit heaters  
21 were added as a missile barrier function.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   The makeup air duct for the electrical  
2 ventilation system was added as A2 on the scope.  
3 The chiller compressor components, including the  
4 housings, filters, and dryers, were added to the  
5 scope as a result of the RAIs that were asked.

6                   Does that answer your question?

7                   CHAIR BONACA: Yes.

8                   MR. ASHLEY: Consistent with 10 CFR  
9 54.4(a), the staff concludes that there were no  
10 omissions of mechanical components and structures  
11 within the scope of license renewal. The staff  
12 believes that the available guidance in identifying  
13 such components by the applicant is adequate.

14                   The review of the aging management  
15 programs was performed, as I said, by a combination  
16 of license renewal audit teams, onsite teams, and  
17 headquarter's personnel, as documented in the SER.  
18 The summary of those reviews are listed on this  
19 slide.

20                   Our counting is a little different than  
21 the applicant counts. But we did review 38 aging

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 management programs. Fourteen of those were new  
2 programs and 24 were existing programs. Twenty of  
3 the programs had exceptions and/or enhancements made  
4 to them. Eleven of the programs were plant-specific  
5 and seven were 100 percent consistent with GALL.

6 When considering the individual elements  
7 of the programs and looking at the individual line  
8 items that were evaluated, we agree with the  
9 applicant that approximately 85 percent of their  
10 programs were consistent with GALL.

11 In Section 3, the staff concluded that  
12 the aging management effects will be managed so that  
13 the intended functions will be maintained and that  
14 the activities authorized by the renewed license  
15 would continue in accordance with the current  
16 licensing basis to comply with the NRC's  
17 regulations.

18 Section 4, the time-limited aging  
19 analysis, our plant-specific safety analyses that  
20 involved time-limited assumptions defined by the  
21 current operating term, the staff reviewed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 information in the application to determine whether  
2 the applicant has provided sufficient information  
3 pursuant to the regulations for the time-limited  
4 aging analysis and for the plant-specific TLAAs.

5 The applicant evaluates its calculations  
6 and analysis against the six criteria specified in  
7 the regulation. And that involves the SSEs within  
8 the scope of license renewal to consider its aging  
9 effects and are determined to be relevant by the  
10 applicant in making its safety determination.

11 The current licensing basis includes the  
12 updated UFSAR, engineering calculations, technical  
13 reports, engineering work requests, licensing  
14 correspondence, and applicable vendor reports. The  
15 applicant stated that it did not identify any  
16 exemptions granted under 50.12 based on the TLAAs as  
17 defined in CFR 54.3.

18 The plant-specific TLAAs are listed on  
19 this slide that were reviewed both in audits and in  
20 the office.

21 The staff has concluded that in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 accordance with Part 54, the applicant has provided  
2 an adequate list of TLAAs, that the TLAAs will  
3 remain valid for the period of extended operations,  
4 and that the TLAAs have been projected to the end of  
5 the period of extended operation, and that the aging  
6 effects will be managed by those TLAAs.

7 Future commitments have been identified  
8 and a schedule is documented in the SER such that  
9 there is reasonable assurance that the activities  
10 approved by the license renewal will continue to be  
11 conducted in accordance with the current licensing  
12 basis and the changes associated with the license  
13 renewal.

14 In conclusion, the staff found that the  
15 requirements of 10 CFR 54.29(a) have been met for  
16 the license renewal of the Vogtle Electric  
17 Generating Plant. And that's all I have, sir.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: Donnie, regarding the  
19 Boral questions, I think we've heard that the staff  
20 is planning to issue Interim Staff Guidance  
21 regarding Boral inspections. Is that correct?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. ASHLEY: I believe Matt Yoder -- is  
2 Matt here? Matt or Emma Wong has some recent  
3 information on that.

4 MS. WONG: This is Emma Wong of the  
5 staff. Yes, that's true. We're working on that  
6 right now.

7 MEMBER STETKAR: I just -- so some of  
8 the issues I think the applicant mentioned that they  
9 have committed to do inspections by -- I wrote down  
10 the date -- 2017 or something like that. But with  
11 respect to this Interim Staff Guidance, those --  
12 there may be requirements to perform inspections as  
13 part of the current licensing basis. Is that  
14 correct?

15 MS. WONG: Well, we're working on an  
16 Interim Staff Guidance for license renewal right  
17 now.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

19 MS. WONG: So that would cover --

20 MEMBER STETKAR: So that's strictly  
21 within the context of license renewal.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MS. WONG: Right.

MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Thank you.

That's -- I was just trying to sort this out whether the Boral issue is going to become similar to the non-EQ cables in manholes where it has been brought up in the license renewal but has essentially gravitated into a current licensing basis.

MEMBER SIEBER: Well, let's ask that question. Does the staff plan to do anything on Boral with regard to current licensees outside of license renewal?

MR. PELTON: Yes, this is Dave Pelton from DOR. As, you know, Emma just introduced herself. And she and her branch are looking at this both, you know, generically for license renewal but also for the current licensing bases.

So the answer is yes. What form that takes ultimately, whether it is an ISG or some other generic NRC communication, that hasn't been resolved yet. So it is still under review.

Nonetheless, it doesn't resolve -- or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 doesn't absolve the licensee from the responsibility  
2 of making their criticality calculations, you know,  
3 are current and suitable. But nonetheless, we are  
4 looking at it for both.

5           And as we do with all of these issues,  
6 water in the manholes, et cetera, we work closely  
7 with our tech staff to make sure that we understand  
8 aging management but also what's the impact on Part  
9 50 in the current licensing bases.

10           MEMBER SIEBER: I think that's  
11 important. I would not like to see any issue of  
12 this type rest solely in the license renewal arena.

13           MR. PELTON: Absolutely agree.

14           MR. ASHLEY: Part of the commitment that  
15 the applicant made was to monitor industry operating  
16 experience and obviously to comply with any new  
17 requirements that would come out of the agency.

18           MEMBER ARMIJO: Now I'm a little  
19 confused here. The applicant's slide 16 says there  
20 is, to date, no industry operating experience  
21 showing evidence of loss of neutron absorption of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 Boral. And if that's correct, why is the staff so  
2 concerned about this issue. You know something is  
3 inconsistent here.

4 MR. PELTON: Emma, can you address that?

5 I'll give you the -- you know, my perspective is --  
6 this is Dave Pelton again. As the Branch Chief and  
7 talking closely with Emma and the folks in her  
8 branch is that, you know, it's -- you know, there's  
9 known physical changes in Boral over time. And it  
10 is recognized in EPRI guidelines and a lot of  
11 operating experience.

12 And the concern is, we talked about it  
13 yesterday that as a blister forms, you know, right  
14 now there hasn't been a Boral issue related where  
15 the material, the substrate, the boron powder, you  
16 know, fall away and changes its configuration, thus  
17 maybe changing the criticality assumptions.

18 That doesn't mean it won't happen. So,  
19 you know, my impression is that these actions are  
20 precautionary to make sure that the licensee doesn't  
21 inadvertently -- you know doesn't find themselves

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 down the road in a situation where the criticality  
2 assumptions have changed because the configuration  
3 with the Boral plates themselves have changed based  
4 on these physical changes.

5 So we think it is prudent if nothing  
6 else at this point to make sure they are monitoring  
7 it.

8 MEMBER ARMIJO: So far, have there been  
9 any measurements of neutron absorption in plants  
10 that have exhibited this blistering? And have you  
11 found that there have been lots of them?

12 MR. PELTON: Emma, I'm going to turn  
13 that over to you.

14 MS. WONG: There has been blistering  
15 seen. But they all have been water filled. Our  
16 concern is if it is going to be gas filled, and then  
17 that changes the criticality analysis if they  
18 haven't accounted for it in their original  
19 criticality analysis.

20 MR. LAKE: But, you know, this is not a  
21 Vogtle issue. I'm just saying why is Vogtle being -

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 - this is not a Vogtle problem. This is a broader  
2 issue.

3 MR. PELTON: It is. And, you know,  
4 historically, you know I'm not going to pretend to  
5 be an absolute expert or all knowing, which -- well,  
6 sometimes I am but nonetheless -- you know in the  
7 past with Boroflex, you know, we did see changes  
8 both in physical properties and in its neutron-  
9 absorbing capability.

10 And there has been a relatively recent  
11 issue at Palisades with a material I've heard -- I  
12 believe it is Carborundum -- where, again, they had  
13 physical changes and then when the licensee did some  
14 neutron-absorbing tests, they found that some  
15 assumptions had changed in that regard as well.

16 So, you know, we're trying to stay one  
17 step ahead of --

18 MEMBER ARMIJO: I just want to get it  
19 straight. Have there been any measured losses in  
20 neutron-absorbing capability on Boral in in the  
21 industry?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MS. WONG: No.

MR. PELTON: I don't believe that there has been. Emma, is that true?

MS. WONG: I don't believe there is.

MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay. There have been measurements but nobody has found the loss but you've seen the blistering. You are anticipating there could be loss.

MR. PELTON: Correct.

MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay. I understand it. Thank you.

MEMBER BANERJEE: I have a question. What is the status with regard to inspections and so on related to CRDM cracking? Any potential for this?

MR. ASHLEY: From regional inspections?

MEMBER BANERJEE: Or by the licensee. Are there any issues related to it in the long term?

MR. ASHLEY: We're not aware of that for

--

MR. COLLINS: This is Jay Collins from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 the Piping and NDE Branch. We currently have issued  
2 a rule in September of 2008 which updated our  
3 requirements for a CRDM inspection. And the Vogtle  
4 licensee will continue to follow those requirements  
5 going forward. We don't anticipate anything that  
6 would be in the current licensing.

7 MEMBER BANERJEE: It's not one of the  
8 plants which are closer to the limits is it?  
9 Pressure, temperature, chemistry?

10 MR. COLLINS: The requirements --

11 MEMBER BANERJEE: I'm not talking about  
12 inspection but where is it in the sort of hierarchy  
13 of plants which are susceptible to this sort of --

14 MR. COLLINS: I can get back to you with  
15 the specifics but --

16 MEMBER BANERJEE: Okay.

17 MR. AJLUNI: Mark Ajluni, Southern  
18 Nuclear Licensing.

19 Vogtle is a low-TF plant and ranks low  
20 in susceptibility.

21 MEMBER BANERJEE: Thank you for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1       answering.

2                   CHAIR BONACA:  On page 17, you list  
3       three ways in which you may deal with TLAA.  And the  
4       question I have is could you highlight which of the  
5       TLAAs as such that the aging effects would be  
6       managed for the period of extended operation?

7                   MR. ASHLEY:  All the plant-specific  
8       TLAAs would fall into that category to be managed.  
9       Unless I misunderstood your question.

10                  CHAIR BONACA:  Well, I'm trying to  
11       understand, you know, of the -- you are saying the  
12       TLAA will remain valid for the period of extended  
13       operation or they will be project or they will be  
14       managed typically means that that TLAA doesn't reach  
15       the 60 years.

16                  MR. ASHLEY:  They would continue to  
17       monitor the TLAAs --

18                  CHAIR BONACA:  That's right.  I would  
19       have liked to see a list of those.

20                  MR. ASHLEY:  -- over the path -- over  
21       the entire period of extended operations to make

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 sure that they remained valid.

2 CHAIR BONACA: I understand that. I'm  
3 trying to understand which ones.

4 MR. ASHLEY: Oh, which ones  
5 specifically?

6 CHAIR BONACA: Yes.

7 MR. ASHLEY: Well, the plant specific  
8 ones obviously. But any additional that would  
9 require updates, I don't know a specific list of  
10 those.

11 CHAIR BONACA: Okay.

12 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. I think the  
13 vessel TLAAs require ten-year updates, something  
14 like that. That would be an example.

15 MR. ASHLEY: Yes, they would be on the  
16 list.

17 Jim Medoff?

18 MR. MEDOFF: This is Jim Medoff with the  
19 staff. Typically the ones that you see aging  
20 management on, you may see them used on the III  
21 criterion for a fatigue TLAA. You may see it on, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 think it is EQ, but Doug can verify that with me.  
2 And you may see it occasionally on some plant-  
3 specific TLAAs that are in Chapter 47 of the  
4 application.

5 CHAIR BONACA: Yes, I mean the reason  
6 why I asked that question is that there is a special  
7 interest in those where aging effect have not been  
8 projected to the end of the license period. And,  
9 therefore, they have to be managed.

10 MR. ASHLEY: That is correct.

11 CHAIR BONACA: So that's why I asked  
12 that question.

13 MR. ASHLEY: Thank you.

14 MEMBER SIEBER: Is there any other  
15 questions from members?

16 (No response.)

17 MEMBER SIEBER: If there are no other  
18 questions, I think this concludes this portion.

19 CHAIR BONACA: Okay. Thank you for the  
20 presentation.

21 And we are well ahead of time. But we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 cannot start the next session until 10:15. So we  
2 will recess until 10:15.

3 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record  
4 at 9:23 a.m. and went back on  
5 the record at 10:14 a.m.)

6 CHAIR BONACA: This section is on  
7 digital instrumentation and control interim staff  
8 guidance. Before I turn over the meeting to Mr.  
9 Brown, I would like to just announce that myself,  
10 Sam Armijo, and Abdel-Khalik will meet with the EDO  
11 at noontime, so we will be leaving, and I would like  
12 Bill Shack to chair the meeting for the brief time  
13 in which we will not be here, until we start the  
14 meeting at 1:00, if we are not back by that time.

15 With that, I'll turn over the meeting to  
16 Mr. Charlie Brown.

17 MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
18 Just for a piece of information, this meeting is  
19 strictly to cover, and I say that -- try to make  
20 sure we focus on these two particular subjects, is  
21 Interim Staff Guidance 5. It's a new Section 3,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 which are human factors of the overall ISG, but it's  
2 really as a result of some questions from us, or  
3 requests from the Committee on crediting manual  
4 operator actions for diversity and defense-in-depth  
5 as a substitute, as opposed to automated systems. I  
6 think I phrased that roughly correctly.

7           And the second one is to try -- ISG-6 is  
8 what's referred to as the licensing process for  
9 digital I&C. And the purpose of that is to try to  
10 put a little meat to go out to the folks submitting  
11 these, telling them what types of information they  
12 have to submit in order to allow the Staff to do a  
13 satisfactory job of evaluating those designs. And,  
14 right now, it's just kind of amorphous.

15           So, with that, I will turn it over to  
16 David Desaulniers, Steve Arndt, and Ed Miller. I  
17 guess Steve is the leader of the pack.

18           MR. ARNDT: I'm the first speaker,  
19 anyway.

20 Good morning.

21           (Chorus of good mornings.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. ARNDT: Mr. Brown mentioned what  
2 we're going to do today, is give you a highlight of  
3 the ISG-5 update, and the status of ISG-6 licensing  
4 process update. We reviewed this with the Digital  
5 I&C Subcommittee on February 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>.

6 I will start off with giving you just a  
7 real basic background, hopefully skip through the  
8 slides fairly quickly, give you a reminder of the  
9 ISG process, and how we go to this point;  
10 particularly, for those of you who didn't read the  
11 article in this month's ANS Nuclear News that goes  
12 into this in detail. Then, Dave will give you an  
13 overview of what's actually in ISG-5 Rev. 1.

14 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Which month is  
15 this, Steve?

16 MR. ARNDT: March. Then Ed will give  
17 you an overview of ISG-6. We are requesting a  
18 letter on this this week.

19 As a result of the November 2006  
20 Commission meeting on Digital Instrumentation and  
21 Control, the Commission requested that the Staff put

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 together a project plan for improving the efficiency  
2 and effectiveness of digital I&C reviews, and, also,  
3 establish a Steering Committee to oversee those  
4 activities, and to coordinate interactions with the  
5 industry. We've had extensive interactions with the  
6 industry, as well as the public. We're up to almost  
7 150 public meetings over the last two and a half  
8 years on developing and improving the digital I&C  
9 guidance.

10 One of the first things we did was  
11 establish a set of high-priority, short-term actions  
12 that we wanted to look at to improve the efficiency  
13 and effectiveness of the process. There is concerns  
14 by the industry, and by the Commission, that our  
15 process was good, it was adequate, we could get  
16 where we needed to be, but we didn't have everything  
17 well-established. It wasn't very efficient. We  
18 didn't know how to go through it in an effective  
19 way. So, what we did, was we established a set of  
20 particular issues to improve. Those were assigned  
21 to seven task working groups listed there. We

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 determined that the process by which we would update  
2 the guidance would be to develop interim staff  
3 guidance through public interactions and  
4 discussions.

5           Once those were established, we'd go  
6 back and update the regular guidance. We had a Reg  
7 Guide SRP Chapter, NUREG, whatever the appropriate  
8 guidance would be. During that discussion, the ACRS  
9 asked to be briefed on a regular basis on ISGs as  
10 they were being developed. Done that, in most cases  
11 prior to issuance, in some cases just after  
12 issuance, depending upon the schedule. And we're  
13 tried to incorporate as many of the inputs and  
14 guidance the Committee has provided to us in those  
15 guidance. The Committee will get another  
16 opportunity when they become part of the update to  
17 the regular regulatory guidance.

18           A few basic examples. I'll walk through  
19 this fairly quickly, so we can get to the meat.  
20 ISG-1, which was in cyber security. The ACRS  
21 reviewed it as part of their review, and issued a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 letter in April. This was, basically, to look at  
2 the issue associated with the guidance for  
3 developing safety systems under Reg Guide 1.152, and  
4 the equivalent industry guidance, NEI 04-04. We  
5 reviewed those. We provided an ISG for additional  
6 information on how to meet those requirements in  
7 either 1.152, or the NEI guidance.

8           Diversity and defense-in-depth, which is  
9 a particularly challenging area for I&C, we provided  
10 a significant amount of additional technical  
11 guidance on what we meant, how we meant it, and what  
12 would be an acceptable guidance. This is acceptable  
13 guidance. Jack Herb likes to call it the fast lane,  
14 the HOV lane. If the industry chooses to do this  
15 particular methodology, we will have a more  
16 expedited review. In that, it includes discussions  
17 of how much diversity is sufficient, what kind of  
18 diversity, these kinds of issues.

19           One of the issues that was brought up  
20 during that review was, if you're going to credit  
21 manual operator action as part of your diversity

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 strategy, what would be the criteria associated with  
2 that crediting? ISG-2, which, again, is the fast  
3 lane, indicated that the criteria would be 30  
4 minutes. If you have 30 minutes of time to evaluate  
5 and assess, that would be considered an acceptable  
6 mechanism. If it was less than that, the default  
7 position would be additional diverse actuation would  
8 be necessary.

9 Obviously, there are alternatives that  
10 have been proposed, and some that have been  
11 tentatively approved. The Committee, however, felt,  
12 as did the Staff, that a more formalized review  
13 process would be appropriate, so ISG-5 now is being  
14 updated to include that, and we'll get to that  
15 shortly.

16 Risk, of course, was a major issue.  
17 We've looked at this extensively. One of the  
18 challenges, of course, is that digital systems are  
19 incorporated in all the new plants, and Part 52  
20 requires a comprehensive PRA to be evaluated, so the  
21 first part of that issue was to provide some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 guidance on what would be an acceptable Part 52 PRA.  
2 That was issued after ACRS review in August of  
3 2008. Other issues were brought up associated with  
4 what can we do for relaxing requirements based on  
5 risk information? Staff determined that that was not  
6 yet a ripe subject. That has been deferred to the  
7 Research Program.

8 ISG-4 looks at communications,  
9 electronic communications in the control room,  
10 issues associated with multi-divisional video  
11 display units, inter-channel communications, et  
12 cetera.

13 As I mentioned, ISG-5 looks at a number  
14 of issues. The first revision, which was issued in  
15 September of 2007, included -- help me, Dave.

16 MR. DESAULNIERS: First, included  
17 computer-based procedures.

18 MR. ARNDT: Thank you.

19 MR. DESAULNIERS: And minimum inventory.

20 MR. ARNDT: And minimum inventory. This  
21 new update goes on to include manual operator

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 action. One of the issues that was raised, the  
2 safety parameter display system, wording in the  
3 actual rule was going to require rule making, and  
4 that's been put on that track, instead of the ISG  
5 track.

6 Licensing process you'll hear more  
7 about, but this was the whole issue of what level of  
8 detail needs to be reviewed, how is it reviewed,  
9 when is it reviewed, how do you stage the reviews,  
10 how do you provide a level of assurance that the  
11 reviews are going well for the industry, so that  
12 they can better plan their resources?

13 ISG-7 is the fuel cycle facility.  
14 Originally, we were not going to have this, but as  
15 we looked more at the fuel cycle facilities, these  
16 are enrichment plants, the fuel facilities, and  
17 things like that that are being built right now, it  
18 looks like a lot of distributed computer-based  
19 control, a lot of very similar kinds of issues. So,  
20 we are in the process of taking care of the  
21 electronic and digital issues associated with that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Slightly different issues associated with  
2 consequence, slightly different issues associated  
3 with how distributive the systems are, but we'll  
4 have a very similar one. That's currently under  
5 development, and we'll talk to the Subcommittee  
6 probably in August about that.

7 In addition, there's a lot of other I&C  
8 work going on. We talked to the Committee in  
9 February a little bit about the Oconee review. Wolf  
10 Creek is - I'm looking at Bill Kemper - we've just  
11 issued the Wolf Creek safety evaluation report,  
12 which is using a newer technology, field-  
13 programmable gate arrays for some of their safety  
14 systems.

15 We're also going back and looking at  
16 some of the operational issues associated with what  
17 are the challenges associated with digital I&C, when  
18 you actually get in the plant. How do you do 50.59  
19 determinations? If you have an event, how do you do  
20 significant determination process? Are there going  
21 to be any challenges?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   We believe that most of these will be  
2 fairly straightforward analysis. You just have to  
3 work them through the process. Since we don't have  
4 particularly good risk models, it will be a little  
5 bit more difficult. Maybe expert panel, like we do  
6 for the maintenance rule for systems, we don't have  
7 the model for things like that. We're in the  
8 process of working through those right now.

9                   So, as the Steering Committee moves  
10 forward, we're going to complete the ISGs.  
11 Hopefully, we'll get the good alignment with our  
12 industry colleagues. We've been using very  
13 collaborative interactions with our industry  
14 colleagues. We've been using the ISGs in the  
15 reviews of Oconee, and Wolf Creek, and a number of  
16 other review items. Also, in the advanced reactor  
17 area for the review of topical reports in those  
18 areas. We've gotten pretty good feedback on it. We  
19 will update the regulatory guidance as we get more  
20 experience, and get the time to do those. We'll  
21 integrate those into our international

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 collaboration. We're getting a lot of input from  
2 our international colleagues, and, also, requests  
3 for how did we come up with this? How are we  
4 implementing it, things like that. We're  
5 proactively working in a number of bilateral areas.

6 We're working extensively in the MDEP program. Ian  
7 Jung is one of the chairs of the INC part of the  
8 MDEP program. The International Database program on  
9 digital system failures important to safety,  
10 COMPSIS, we're collaborating, so we're continuing to  
11 work on this issue.

12 One of the biggest challenges, of  
13 course, is digital systems evolve so quickly  
14 compared to their analog inputs, we need to stay  
15 ahead of the curve, if we can, or, at least, keep up  
16 with it.

17 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Steve, in your  
18 interactions with international organizations, have  
19 you noticed any differences in the emphasis they  
20 place, for example, here, we think now we are all on  
21 the same wavelength, and we're thinking potential

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 failure modes, and the risk part can wait until we  
2 know more. Although, these guys usually are not too  
3 hot about risks, is there a difference, you think,  
4 in perspectives?

5 MR. ARNDT: There is some difference.  
6 And I'll take a first crack at it, and let Ian weigh  
7 in if I don't capture everything.

8 Depending upon the regulatory structure,  
9 for example, the Brits have a much more heavily  
10 structured risk component in their licensing  
11 process. So, they're a little more enthusiastic  
12 about the risk efforts. The French, as you know,  
13 are very adverse to incorporating this, and we're  
14 kind of in-between. But, depending upon the  
15 licensing process, the structure of their issues,  
16 there are some differences. But we are seeing a lot  
17 of similarity, as well.

18 Diversity, for example. Most of the  
19 companies are coming in fairly close to where we are  
20 on diversity, in some cases, actually even more  
21 conservative than we are. But we're starting to see

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 a convergence in that area. Ian, would you like to  
2 amplify on that at all?

3 MR. JUNG: Yes, Ian Jung with NRO. One  
4 of the insights that we are gaining through new  
5 reactor reviews, for example, EPR, we've been  
6 interacting with the French and Germans extensively  
7 last couple of years. I think what we are finding  
8 is the design stages for those countries are not --  
9 none of the reviews are completed. What we're  
10 finding as we go, we are finding that some of the  
11 new design details that brings out some of the new  
12 concerns. But, in all cases, the way each country  
13 is approaching, is based on sort of mostly a  
14 deterministic approach, that they are making  
15 significant assumptions of common cause failure, for  
16 example, and how to deal with that. And their  
17 approach has been somewhat different, and they have  
18 a hard-wire backup, for example. But, in the French  
19 case, they haven't even decided exactly what is  
20 acceptable diversity and defense-in-depth at this  
21 point. So, as we work together, I think we are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 gaining a lot of insights.

2 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So, is the approach  
3 that, if there is a common cause failure, and we  
4 don't even know why, are we protected? Which is  
5 really what I think one of our old NUREGs is doing.

6 Are they following the same kind of philosophy?  
7 You have to speak up.

8 MR. JUNG: Oh, yes. I think we're  
9 making the same assumption, that we don't know  
10 exactly what failure modes we are talking about yet.

11 We have to deal with it.

12 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Do you think any of  
13 those groups are ahead of us, in the sense of  
14 they've done more work?

15 MR. ARNDT: I think from the area of  
16 operational experience, certainly, some countries  
17 have more years of dealing with the systems than we  
18 do, so they may have a little bit more insight in  
19 that aspect. But, by and large, we're probably as  
20 far along, if not ahead, of most countries in terms  
21 of actually figuring out what we want, why we want

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 it, and what the technical basis is associated with  
2 that.

3 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Final question.

4 MEMBER BROWN: Don't worry. I'll  
5 interrupt you in a minute. This is not a common  
6 mode failure of this meeting.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: You will address  
9 the issue of operator action, and timing, and all  
10 that. Are they addressing that, at all?

11 MR. ARNDT: I have not seen a lot of --  
12 most of the international interactions I've had,  
13 have basically been, we generally agree with your  
14 30-minute criteria, and we're either implementing  
15 it, or modifying it, but they're taking lead from  
16 us. Ian, you may have a different perspective.

17 MR. KEMPER: Yes. This is Bill Kemper.  
18 I'll just try to answer -- add some information to  
19 your question here, George. In that meeting that we  
20 had a couple of years ago with seven different  
21 regulators, we asked them specifically what was the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 time response for operator actions, and almost of  
2 them had some criteria. It varied from 15 minutes,  
3 to 30 minutes, but they almost all were sensitive to  
4 that, and they brought that into their regulatory  
5 criteria.

6 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Thank you.

7 MR. ARNDT: Okay.

8 MEMBER RAY: Let me make one comment  
9 here in the context of your talking about other  
10 organizations. Something you might not have  
11 noticed, perhaps you did. The March 19<sup>th</sup> FERC  
12 agenda had an interesting comment about that FERC  
13 would regulate all critical equipment within nuclear  
14 power plants that's not regulated by the NRC. So,  
15 it would be interesting to know how the heck we  
16 figure out what's regulated by the NRC. But that's  
17 not for this meeting. I just want to make sure you  
18 knew.

19 MR. ARNDT: We are intimately aware of  
20 that issue, both the electrical and the I&C branches  
21 both in NRR, NRO, and NSIR are working those issues

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 right now.

2 MEMBER RAY: Okay.

3 MR. ARNDT: With that, I am going to  
4 turn it over to my colleague, Dave. And he's going  
5 to go through, at some level of detail, ISG-5,  
6 Revision 1.

7 MR. DESAULNIERS: Good morning, all. My  
8 name is David Desaulniers. I'm Senior Technical  
9 Advisor for Human Factors in the Office of New  
10 Reactors. I'm also a member of TWG-5, as the human  
11 factors lead for that group.

12 Today, I'll be providing an overview of  
13 the most recent interim staff guidance developed by  
14 TWG-5. And, as Steve has already told you, that  
15 guidance concerns the crediting of manual operator  
16 actions in diversity and defense-in-depth analyses.

17 We amended ISG-5 in November of '08, to  
18 include that manual operator action guidance, and  
19 that's why the slide title here Rev. 1. As noted,  
20 also, previously, the subject is also an ISG-5,  
21 computer-based procedures and minimum inventory.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 That guidance was completed in September of '07, and  
2 the Committee has been provided a presentation  
3 regarding those topics, previously.

4 By way of background to discuss the  
5 manual operator action guidance in ISG-5, I'm going  
6 to briefly speak to ISG-2, and we have Ian Jung  
7 here, so if I misrepresent ISG-2, please correct me  
8 here if I go astray. But, ISG-2 was really the  
9 genesis for this particular guidance in ISG-5. ISG-  
10 2 was addressing concern that a software problem,  
11 digital protection, reactor protection system could  
12 affect multiple channels, and result in a common  
13 cause failure of -

14 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So, is the issue of  
15 operator action part of ISG-2 or 5, or both? Are  
16 they looking at different things?

17 MR. DESAULNIERS: No. They're looking  
18 at the same thing. What we're doing here is, is  
19 we're simply providing additional clarification and  
20 guidance that was in ISG-2, and we're expanding upon  
21 that to provide greater detail on how to credit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 manual operator actions they hadn't discussed in  
2 ISG-2.

3 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But 2 and 5 will be  
4 consistent.

5 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes.

6 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Okay.

7 MEMBER BROWN: They hope. ISG-2 says  
8 greater than 30 minutes.

9 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Right.

10 MEMBER BROWN: The default is greater  
11 than 30 minutes.

12 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Right.

13 MEMBER BROWN: If you have less than  
14 that, you build hardware, or something. This says  
15 -

16 MR. DESAULNIERS: The Staff -

17 MEMBER BROWN: You all asked, and I went  
18 back and read the minutes and the letter, and you  
19 all asked them to evaluate a process that would  
20 allow consideration of operator response in less  
21 than 30 seconds.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MR. DESAULNIERS: Thirty minutes.

MEMBER BROWN: Thirty. That would be -  
(Simultaneous speech.)

MEMBER BROWN: I don't know. Okay. If we had a PRA, maybe we would. I'm just teasing. Okay. But, yes. Less than 30 minutes, yes. So that's --the thrust here was to lay out a process and methodology to address that, to address the less than 30 minutes issue, fundamentally. Although, to apply to whether it's greater than 30 minutes, is really valid, also.

MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: I understand that, but my question is, why does it appear in two places, 2 and 5?

MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes. Why didn't you review 2, I guess is George's question.

MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: What is my question?

(Laughter.)

MEMBER CORRADINI: Why didn't you just review 2, and put this in.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

(Simultaneous speech.)

MR. DESAULNIERS: ISG-2 is currently in the process of being revised so that it appropriately points to ISG-5, where the human factors guidance is provided. So, we are working to insure the guidance appropriately point to each other, and we just put the details of the guidance in ISG-5 as human factors guidance.

MEMBER CORRADINI: Just so I understand, just for clarity. So, what you're saying is, if you accept 30, plus or minus 30, you'd stick with 2. If you want to get into the realm of less than 30, go see 5.

MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: No, I don't think that's what I said.

MEMBER CORRADINI: That's what I heard you say. I apologize.

MR. DESAULNIERS: What we're doing is, basically, providing guidance that will -- ISG-2, basically said if you're going to credit manual operator action, you need to do a human factors

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 evaluation in order to credit that action. We're  
2 providing the guidance for how to do that human  
3 factors evaluation.

4 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Okay.

5 MR. DESAULNIERS: Now, there was an  
6 assumption under ISG-2 that you were, basically,  
7 crediting action over 30 minutes. This guidance  
8 that we are providing, as Charlie mentioned, will  
9 provide methodology to credit action, whether it's  
10 over 30 minutes, or under 30 minutes.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: Thank you.

12 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But, I thought your  
13 answer would be that this issue of human factors  
14 appears naturally both in 2 and 5. In 2, it may be  
15 part of defense-in-depth. In 5, we are dealing with  
16 an integrated control room, and we want to know,  
17 again, how -- what the timing is, and all that. Is  
18 that the correct perception, that it's an issue that  
19 naturally appears in both? That's why it's in both.

20 MR. DESAULNIERS: I believe that would  
21 be a fair characterization.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

(Off the record comments.)

MR. DESAULNIERS: Under the D3 analysis, going back to vulnerability for common cause failure, such vulnerabilities are identified. As previously stated, there's the option of using an inverse automated backup system to address such vulnerabilities. Alternatively, ISG-2 provides, as we've been discussing, the option to use manual operator action.

Specifically, with regard to manual operator action, ISG-2 stated what's on your screen here, and they may be credited for responding to events in which the protective actions subject to the common cause failure is not required for at least 30 minutes, and the plant response is bounded by the Branch Technical Position 7-19, recommended acceptance criteria.

This is the guidance that the Committee had heard. There was recommendation that we consider a process that looks at 30 minutes, above and below 30 minutes, and this is where we developed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.



1 guidance in ISG-5.

2 Not only did we hear that message from  
3 the Committee, but also industry. They were  
4 recommending that we consider guidance for less than  
5 30 minutes. ACRS provided us a letter in October of  
6 '07 recommending development of such a process. So,  
7 the TWG-5 action plan was expanded to incorporate an  
8 action item to address this issue. We proceeded  
9 with public interactions with our industry  
10 counterparts to develop that guidance. Industry  
11 developed a White Paper for a methodology which we  
12 took into consideration as we were developing the  
13 ISG, so we gave that consideration, and we  
14 incorporated it into -- much of that into the  
15 process that I will go on to describe.

16 The ISG has three major sections to it,  
17 scope, Staff position, and methodology. And I'll  
18 address each of these in more detail in the  
19 subsequent slides. The guidance is review guidance.

20 We're not specifying a specific mitigation strategy  
21 here, but, rather, outlining a methodology by which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 licensees and applicants can demonstrate that the  
2 proposed manual actions are feasible, can be  
3 implemented reliably. You will, ultimately, see a  
4 key component of this process is a demonstration in  
5 real time of the ability to perform those actions.

6 This slide summarizes material and scope  
7 section of the ISG. This is where we, basically,  
8 highlight fundamental assumptions and expectations  
9 associated with this guidance. The scope covers the  
10 credited actions in the D3 analysis, as we've been  
11 discussing, talking about instances of abnormal  
12 operational occurrences, and postulated accidents  
13 concurrent with the software common cause failure,  
14 the digital protection system. Again, in the  
15 context of ISG-2, the digital protection system  
16 here, you're talking about the reactor trip system,  
17 and the SFAS system. As a result, you're talking  
18 about instances where you're looking at cases of  
19 beyond design-basis to consider for those actions,  
20 where you're talking about backup actions in this  
21 case. The guidance is applicable to both new and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 existing reactors, so that summarizes the scope.

2 The Staff position, again, the general  
3 high-level expectations that the actions that are  
4 going to be credited would be included in the  
5 emergency operating procedures, they would be  
6 executed from within the main control room, so we're  
7 not, in this case, talking about crediting actions,  
8 local actions elsewhere in the plant. These should  
9 be demonstrated to be both feasible and reliable.  
10 And, ultimately, they can be addressed in the human  
11 factors engineering program consistent with Reg  
12 Guidance for that program, which is NUREG 0711.

13 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: You have an  
14 argument why you have excluded outside the control  
15 room?

16 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes. Again, we're  
17 talking about actions that -- the emphasis in  
18 developing this guidance was clearly on can we  
19 credit actions in less than 30 minutes? So, there  
20 is a limited time -

21 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: This is the -

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes, the guidance can  
2 be applied to instances of greater than 30 minutes,  
3 but going into development of guidance for actions  
4 outside the control room takes into additional  
5 considerations of environmental conditions, and  
6 transient requirements that we didn't attempt to  
7 encompass in this cut of the guidance.

8 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But if somebody --  
9 so, it's an application, and they give you a  
10 systematic approach to addressing this, you would  
11 still look at it. It's not excluded. You would  
12 probably question the timing, and the conditions,  
13 and so on, but -

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: This is guidance, and  
15 it doesn't prohibit the applicant from proposing  
16 approaches that would be outside that guidance.

17 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Okay.

18 MEMBER MAYNARD: I guess, I still am not  
19 sure that it's a good idea for the Staff's position  
20 to exclude it. It may take more work, or it may be  
21 more difficult, or whatever. But when you put in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the Staff position that it excludes -- basically,  
2 just for actions in the control room, you're kind of  
3 into a no-man's land. And I agree that more  
4 scrutiny on actions outside the control room, but a  
5 lot of plants have unique features, and different  
6 things that -- you're probably going to have to  
7 address that, anyway. Are you going to address that  
8 within guidance, or are you going to do it totally  
9 outside of the Staff position?

10 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: The word  
11 "exclusion" is kind of strong.

12 MEMBER MAYNARD: Right. Yes. David?

13 MR. DESAULNIERS: Ultimately, the  
14 interim staff guidance will be developed further to  
15 be incorporated into a permanent guidance document.

16 An opportunity will be there to address further  
17 issues. But, at this point, the objective was to  
18 try to get out something in a timely fashion for  
19 industry, so we limited the scope to where the Staff  
20 and industry believes it was most likely going to be  
21 needed, at this point. So, it was within the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 control room.

2 MEMBER RAY: The bullet there about  
3 demonstrated to be feasible and reliable seems -- of  
4 course, you want that to be a criterion, but how to  
5 accomplish that would be awfully tough. Do you have  
6 any thoughts as to what that -

7 MR. DESAULNIERS: As I go into the  
8 process, you will see that that's specifically what  
9 the process is all about, demonstrating both the  
10 feasibility and reliability.

11 MEMBER RAY: Okay. I didn't attend the  
12 Subcommittee, so just go right ahead.

13 MR. DESAULNIERS: Okay. So we will go  
14 in, and we'll address that more in detail later in  
15 this presentation.

16 The methodology section is comprised of  
17 four phases; analysis, preliminary validation,  
18 integrated system validation, and then long-term  
19 monitoring. These phases roughly correspond to the  
20 phases you have seen in the industry White Paper.  
21 There are some differences in particular details,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 and emphasis amongst these, but the process,  
2 overall, is -- we're fairly close. I'll move on to  
3 the analysis section, which is the first slide.

4 The objective of the analysis phase  
5 here, and this is the first part of -- again, the  
6 first section of the overall process. And the  
7 emphasis here is, preliminary assessment of what is  
8 the time available to perform the required actions,  
9 and that's based on analysis of a plant response.  
10 And, then, what is the time required for the  
11 operator to actually implement the actions necessary  
12 for the mitigation?

13 The objective here, also, is to identify  
14 what are the critical assumptions in critical  
15 operator errors that would underline this analysis.

16 And, ultimately, establish an adequate margin  
17 between your estimate of time available, and your  
18 estimate of what the time required is.

19 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Now, estimate, what  
20 -- are you going to tell us how people estimate  
21 things? Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes. More  
2 specifically, time available is estimated using  
3 methods consistent with those described in ISG-2.  
4 We're talking about realistic assumptions regarding  
5 the plant response, and the criteria in BTP 7-19.  
6 To estimate the time required, it's expected that  
7 that time required would be based on an analysis of  
8 a documented sequence of actions, such as that you  
9 may find in the task analysis, the emergency  
10 procedure guidelines, or EOPs. And you would use  
11 one of several acceptable methods for developing  
12 those estimates. And we'll provide on a subsequent  
13 slide some of those methods.

14 The margin calculation, the methodology  
15 proposed by the Staff is that that would be --  
16 margin would be established based on the time  
17 required to recover from credible errors. So what's  
18 the longest time that would be required to recover  
19 from a credible error? And you would use that as  
20 your margin, difference between your time available,  
21 and time required.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1                   This slide lists acceptable methods.  
2                   This is not an all-inclusive list. They're not  
3                   limited to these, but the guidance provides examples  
4                   of acceptable methods. And they range from  
5                   developing your estimate of time required based on  
6                   operator interviews and surveys, or looking at  
7                   operating experience, making use of software models  
8                   that model human behavior and task sequences, using  
9                   mockups, control room mockups as a tool, expert  
10                  panel elicitation, and it includes a ANSI Standard,  
11                  which is ANSI/ANS 58.8, which was developed to  
12                  provide a basis for estimating time required to  
13                  perform safety-related operator actions.

14                  That methodology, we provide as a means  
15                  for basically doing the task decomposition, which  
16                  means breaking down those operator actions into the  
17                  particular elements so that you have a detailed  
18                  analysis of that action sequence, provides a good  
19                  framework for doing that. We're not, necessarily,  
20                  endorsing that guidance through our risk, as a means  
21                  of coming up with the specific numbers that are in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that guidance document, because there are specific  
2 numbers associated with action sequences that we  
3 don't believe, perhaps, are appropriate to  
4 application here in a digital control room.

5 MEMBER BROWN: Relative to this, though,  
6 if I go through that list and look at it, it's a  
7 pretty soft, very qualitative list, which, when I  
8 read the ISG and how that was put together,  
9 effectively - now, correct me if I'm wrong - but it,  
10 effectively, established a methodology for each  
11 licensee can develop his own metrics based on his  
12 operator interviews, his analysis, his surveys, his  
13 own particular experience. And there's no common  
14 metric that then gets carried forth from licensee to  
15 licensee. So, every time somebody wants to do it,  
16 you're going to have to re-evaluate whether that  
17 qualitative approach is satisfactory, how thorough  
18 was it, what was the detail of the modeling that  
19 they did, what standard, from where did they draw  
20 the standard when they did the analysis, if it was a  
21 standard?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 I mean, it just seemed fairly vague when  
2 I went through it relative to a nice -- I didn't  
3 expect it to be hammered in concrete, but I would  
4 have expected some metrics to be laid out to define  
5 how you would do this. I mean, you can talk to  
6 people and say oh, yes, it only takes me five  
7 minutes to do that. Well, every time I figure it's  
8 only going to take me five minutes to do something,  
9 it takes me an hour. I'm being a little facetious,  
10 but I did it for a purpose. The individual's  
11 ability to estimate their time to perform something  
12 in a non-stressful situation is, I think, fraught  
13 with peril, from that standpoint.

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: I don't disagree with  
15 your observations, and I believe that is, in fact,  
16 why the subsequent phase, preliminary validation, is  
17 intended to be a independent confirmation of the  
18 initial analysis. Also, it behooves the applicant  
19 to be conservative in their assessments with respect  
20 to the time that's required. In other words, not to  
21 under-estimate the time required, but to estimate on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the high side, because, ultimately, this action will  
2 need to be proven out in a demonstration of  
3 integrated system validation. And if, at that  
4 point, that time required exceeds what was in their  
5 analysis, they're failing one of the criteria of  
6 their integrated system validation. So, yes, it's  
7 qualitative, and it would have been nice to be able  
8 to go to something more like ANSI/ANS 58.8, which  
9 provided specific time criteria associated with each  
10 of these elements, but we didn't believe we were  
11 prepared to do that at this point. And that's  
12 something that we have as a plan to develop in the  
13 future -

14 MEMBER BROWN: Having endorsed that  
15 standard. I think it said that when we go to the  
16 presentation somewhere, if I remember correctly.

17 MR. DESAULNIERS: Ultimately, we would  
18 like to support further development of ANSI/ANS  
19 58.8, so that it could be endorsed as a standard  
20 appropriate to the application of digital control.

21 MEMBER BROWN: So, then are you -

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. ARNDT: We have not endorsed the  
2 standard.

3 MEMBER BROWN: Yes, okay. I got that.  
4 I wasn't going to beat that to death. But here's a  
5 circumstance, whether you want to issue this late  
6 this year, or later this year, for actual use by the  
7 licensees when they're doing analyses. I think you  
8 said something about the fall, or whatever, you  
9 wanted to issue this.

10 MR. ARNDT: Well, we've already issued  
11 the interim guidance. We'd like to issue the long-  
12 term permanent regulatory guidance later this year,  
13 early next year.

14 MEMBER BROWN: Oh, so this -- I didn't  
15 understand. Is that actually already out, this  
16 Section 3?

17 MR. ARNDT: Yes, sir.

18 MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

19 MR. ARNDT: It can be revised.

20 MEMBER BROWN: I didn't know that.

21 That's all. You answered a question, I was going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 ask that, and I forgot to, so I appreciate the  
2 answer.

3 MR. ARNDT: I'd also like to point out,  
4 there are industry standards, at least in the  
5 nuclear business, on how to conduct operator  
6 interviews, and operator surveys, and task network  
7 modeling, and things like that, so it's -- there are  
8 standardized methodologies out there, so it's not  
9 quite as loosey-goosey as it might seem.

10 MEMBER BROWN: Go ahead.

11 MR. DESAULNIERS: Okay. The -- I won't  
12 go into the detailed review criteria, but the  
13 general topics that are provided associated with the  
14 analysis phase for NRC review are listed here,  
15 ranging from time required, and time available, to  
16 the staff size, composition, and augmentation of  
17 that staff, and identification of credible operator  
18 errors.

19 As, for an example, one of the criteria  
20 would be that time required estimate to allow  
21 sufficient -- should be sufficient to allow for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 implementation of the symptom or function-based EOPs  
2 to address the particular event. So, it would not -  
3 - it would allow for that type of response.

4 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: I have a question.  
5 I'm sorry.

6 MR. DESAULNIERS: Oh, I was going to  
7 say, a second example with regard, for example,  
8 staff size, is the criterion would be that they  
9 would be able to implement the actions, assuming the  
10 minimum crew size required by the technical  
11 specifications.

12 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Something that has  
13 been bothering me for a long time, there appears to  
14 be a disconnect between this kind of approach, which  
15 you're proposing, which also has been proposed in  
16 the context of human actions under fire conditions,  
17 and the human reliability models that another group  
18 has developed. You are placing time available, and  
19 time requirement at the center of your evaluation.  
20 That's not the only thing, but your decision is  
21 primarily based on these estimates, and the margin

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that there will be between the two times. That's  
2 not exclusive, but you are also considering other  
3 things.

4 Every time I propose to the Staff that  
5 was working on this time, really has to be central  
6 to their thinking, time just as another performance-  
7 shaping factor, varied in stress and other things.  
8 And I'm bothered by that inconsistency. The  
9 question is, who's right? I think you -

10 (Laughter.)

11 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But I don't  
12 understand that. I don't understand. And then we  
13 have the experiments, I don't know if you're  
14 familiar with them, of Haldon. But they're really  
15 looking at time sequences. They have crews, and did  
16 they do it in time, and so on. So, it's not really  
17 a question to you, especially after I said that  
18 you're right.

19 MR. DESAULNIERS: I'll agree.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But something that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com



1 has been bothering me, and the conflict is primarily  
2 from my colleagues, so next time we talk about human  
3 reliability models, I will raise the issue again. I  
4 really don't think that time should be just another  
5 common shaping factor. I mean, it's -

6 MEMBER MAYNARD: I think another key  
7 element in this probably is training. And, also,  
8 recognition of when there is a time limit, not  
9 really the right term, but when timing is important,  
10 if an operator knows that, and that's part of the  
11 training and everything, they will generally meet  
12 that. If they're not aware that something needs to  
13 be done within 30 minutes, or 20 minutes, or  
14 whatever, they may, or may not make that time frame,  
15 just depending on what else is going on. So, I  
16 think that it needs to be clear if there is a time  
17 that something needs to be accomplished. And then,  
18 also, training, because -- and ongoing training. We  
19 run into this in fire protection and some others of  
20 shutdown outside the control room, of where when  
21 programs were initially put together, people trained

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 them that they were able to do it within the time  
2 frame, several years later go back and ask them to  
3 do it, and they couldn't do it within that time  
4 frame. So, I think that needs to be factored in, and  
5 I think it's implied that it needs to specifically  
6 be -

7 MR. DESAULNIERS: It specifically  
8 addresses part of the long-term monitoring phase,  
9 which is the last part of that. It addresses that  
10 point, exactly.

11 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Actually, this  
12 raises the issue really of the other performance-  
13 shaping factors. Training is one, but, I mean, the  
14 issue of stress, and so on. Are you considering  
15 those at all in your evaluation?

16 MR. DESAULNIERS: Well, some of these  
17 other performing-shaping factors is what would be  
18 ferreted out in the end in terms of the integrated  
19 system validation when operators are expected to  
20 perform these activities in real time. That time  
21 factor would be a stressor, of sorts, as well as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 some of the other factors.

2 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So, they are part  
3 of this evaluation, of your evaluation, or the  
4 methodology.

5 MR. DESAULNIERS: Right. It's  
6 addressed, ultimately, in part of the integrated  
7 system validation.

8 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Okay.

9 MR. DESAULNIERS: It's also, I believe,  
10 addressed as part of when we say that the margin  
11 should be based on credible operator errors, the  
12 expectation is, is that the analyst will be  
13 considering what some of those stressors are. And,  
14 as a result, what the potential for those errors  
15 are.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: Dave, I think all of  
17 these discussions are really good, like talking  
18 about operator responses, and uncertainty, and  
19 variability, and all that kind of stuff. The ISG,  
20 and everything you've spoken about so far,  
21 inherently presumes that we know the time required

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 absolutely, precisely. And it doesn't seem to  
2 provide much guidance, or warning about the fact  
3 that there could be just as much uncertainty in our  
4 ability to estimate that time required, as our  
5 ability to estimate the operator response times. In  
6 particular, the time available may be a function of  
7 the specific scenarios that you're asking people,  
8 the fidelity of the thermal hydraulic models to be  
9 able to -- and I don't see any of those kind of  
10 warnings in here for the time available part of the  
11 big equation. The fact the methodology does have  
12 some surrogate ways to account for crew variability,  
13 because of the mean value estimates that you use,  
14 and some -- your margin to account, essentially, for  
15 uncertainties in the time required. How do you  
16 answer questions when people say well, there could  
17 be just as much uncertainty in the time available,  
18 and I don't see those same kind of warnings in the  
19 ISG.

20 MR. ARNDT: Right now, the ISG assumes  
21 that you take those times as a direct pass-off from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 your BTP-19 analysis, so the conceptual concept was  
2 that that would be a given in this analysis, and  
3 those issues would be dealt with in ISG-2, and/or  
4 BTP-19.

5 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

6 MR. ARNDT: We understand that those are  
7 issues. We had this discussion associated with it,  
8 and there is a criteria associated with how you do  
9 the analysis, and what assumptions are made in your  
10 thermal hydraulic models in the BTP-19 analysis.  
11 It's certainly an area that needs, probably, some  
12 additional looking at in that part of it, but for  
13 this analysis, it's a boundary condition.

14 MEMBER STETKAR: Along that line -

15 MR. ARNDT: I know that's not a perfect  
16 answer, but -

17 MEMBER STETKAR: One of the sources of  
18 uncertainty might be similar, but not identical  
19 scenarios, so I don't recall how you pick the  
20 scenarios that this is based on, and if there's any  
21 -- if you consider the range of scenarios, you can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 suffer some of this uncertainty through that kind of  
2 an approach.

3 MR. ARNDT: Without going into gory  
4 detail, which we really don't have time for at this  
5 meeting, but the BTP-19 time required numbers are  
6 based on doing a best estimate thermal hydraulic  
7 analysis of the Chapter 15 analysis, and the AAOs.  
8 Strictly, that's the set.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: That's the set.

10 MR. ARNDT: That's the set. It's a  
11 deterministic analysis, assumed to be bounding based  
12 on that.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: I think, with that,  
15 unless there's additional questions, I'll move on to  
16 the discuss of the preliminary validation phase.

17 Now, this phase, Phase Two, in essence,  
18 is intended to be an independent confirmation of the  
19 analysis results. And, it's really only applicable  
20 to those vendors and applicants under the Part 52  
21 process, because it's a means of addressing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 providing reasonable assurance where you have  
2 instances where the applicant would not have the  
3 benefit of trained crews, and full-scope simulator  
4 available to do a full validation, as would be  
5 available at an existing reactor.

6 The expectation here is that the methods  
7 used would be diverse, and as realistic as the  
8 maturity of the design allows consistent with my  
9 prior comments here. These analyses for the  
10 preliminary validation, this is the part where it  
11 would be submitted to the NRC as part of the D3  
12 diversity and defense-in-depth submittal.

13 (Off the record comments.)

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: The methods, here,  
15 again, these are examples of acceptable methods.  
16 Applicants are not limited to these. They range  
17 from basic tabletop analysis, in which the applicant  
18 would be using people with expertise in the response  
19 of the plant and operation of the plant in order to  
20 be able to go over drawings and background material,  
21 basically just as the methodology implies. Tabletop

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 of a talk-through of what actions would be required,  
2 and how the plant would respond. A little bit more  
3 developed concept is actually walking through this  
4 activity, where you may have mockups associated with  
5 it, but you can begin to go into greater detail of  
6 the actual actions that would be required to be  
7 taken. There are software models, again, that can  
8 be used to perform these types of analyses. Man-in-  
9 the-loop testing, and even going to the extent that  
10 you have part task simulators that you could use to  
11 simulate some of the activities associated with  
12 this.

13 The intent here is that you would be  
14 going through these activities with a team of  
15 individuals that was independent of those that  
16 performed your initial analysis to identify any  
17 potential pitfalls, or missing pieces in the  
18 assumptions, and to come up with an independent  
19 assessment of the time required, and time available  
20 to perform the actions, and the margin, and confirm  
21 that the initial analysis was on target. That would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 be used as the basis, again, for the D3 submittal.

2 MEMBER BROWN: Again, on something like  
3 tabletop walk-throughs, where these people sit down,  
4 they develop that methodology on their own. The  
5 level of detail, how they do it, the documents they  
6 have available, their vision of what the scenario  
7 looks like. Are there any established practices  
8 which define these things, which tell people how to  
9 develop those practices, and utilize them, or is it  
10 just going to be up to each licensee to figure out  
11 how to do the tabletop, whatever? And, then come --

12 I mean, part of your ability to accept a final  
13 decision that they make, to come into acceptance,  
14 having some fidelity to the methodology that they  
15 use based on some type of an accepted standard by  
16 industry, or what have you. And this, like the  
17 previous ones, just seems to be come in and tell us  
18 how you did it, and we'll evaluate it ad hoc with --

19 I agree, you can't tell them how to do it, unless  
20 you want to give them a standard that's an industry  
21 standard, based on previous comments. But there are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 -- it sounds to me like, based on your comments,  
2 there are no real standards for these within which  
3 they would operate.

4 MR. DESAULNIERS: Well, there's various  
5 guideline documents and best practices, but there's  
6 nothing that's specifically cited in the ISG that  
7 says -- points to specific practices.

8 MEMBER BROWN: Well, prototype testing  
9 or simulator to you, and it's the level of detail  
10 that you're simulating, the level of detail of the  
11 prototype man-in-the-loop testing that you do, how  
12 far down do you track that relative to information  
13 he gets, the processes he has to go through, it just  
14 seems a little bit -

15 MR. ARNDT: As Dave has said, there are  
16 guidelines out there, 0700, 0711, are two NRC  
17 guidelines. There are other ones out there. But,  
18 as you'll see later on in the presentation, it  
19 behooves the licensee to do this in sufficient  
20 detail that they have a very high confidence that  
21 when they get to final validation, that they will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 pass. So, why don't we revisit this at the end of  
2 the presentation, and see if you're a little more  
3 comfortable with it?

4 MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, the process, I  
5 take it that it initially would be up to the  
6 applicant to pick the method, and defend the method.

7 And the NRC would be reviewing it at some point to  
8 determine whether those are appropriate methods for  
9 the type of actions that are being required.

10 Because a walk-through may be very appropriate for  
11 one thing, but -- our tabletop may be appropriate  
12 for one thing, but inappropriate for another. They  
13 would propose that you would review the -

14 (Off mic comment.)

15 MEMBER BROWN: Isn't that a little late?

16 By the time it gets in here, to finally say no, you  
17 didn't do it the way we like it. What I've heard in  
18 previous meetings, you'll have a hard time doing  
19 that if you haven't defined a standard or what have  
20 you within which they have to operate. If it's ad  
21 hoc -

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MR. DESAULNIERS: Well, we provided the  
2 review criteria, again, associated with these  
3 activities, so while it doesn't prescribe  
4 methodologies, there are criteria with respect to  
5 the preliminary validation that they would need to  
6 make, need to meet, in addition to the analysis.  
7 And as Steve commented, in the end, here they're  
8 expected to use multiple methods within these so  
9 that they -- again, while there may not be specific  
10 standards that they're pointing to, use of multiple  
11 methods should insure that they're coming to some  
12 convergence on what the appropriate time is. And,  
13 in the end, because the times have been developed as  
14 part of the analysis and preliminary validation,  
15 that time required will be one of the standards  
16 they'll be held to in the actual demonstration of  
17 the -- in the integrated system validation. There's  
18 incentive there to insure that this is a bounding  
19 analysis.

20                   MEMBER BROWN: Okay. We've got to move  
21 on, so I'll wait.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So what would you  
2 do if some licensee came to you and said as part of  
3 my preliminary validation, I used a human  
4 reliability model, probability that things will go  
5 wrong is ten to the minus four.

6                   MR. DESAULNIERS: The review criteria  
7 that we've just put up on the screen here -- no, you  
8 were right. Go back. We were just talking about  
9 using validation of two or more methods, the  
10 particular -- what I was expecting to see is that  
11 there's an expectation that they're going to be  
12 evaluating time required and time available. To  
13 just give me a probability that there wouldn't be an  
14 error in performance is not going to address the  
15 minimum criteria of addressing those.

16                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But that's my  
17 question, why? I mean, what if they come in as --  
18 you guys at the NRC could develop ATHEANA, and we  
19 did a great application of ATHEANA, and the numbers  
20 turned out to be very low. I mean, why -- how can  
21 you turn down something that somebody used, an NRC-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 developed methodology?

2 MR. DESAULNIERS: It goes back to the  
3 broader comment of we're providing, as Steve  
4 mentioned in the opening remarks, what is attempting  
5 to be a fast track of here's a methodology that if  
6 you're within these bounds, it will facilitate Staff  
7 review. It doesn't preclude an applicant from  
8 coming in with an alternative approach. But, yes,  
9 we would require additional review time to address  
10 that alternative approach. So that flexibility is  
11 available, it just wouldn't be considered part of  
12 the fast track, as described here.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Let me see if I can  
14 sort that out in my head. Somebody came in with an  
15 ATWS situation where they, according to this  
16 methodology they demonstrated that the time required  
17 is just 15 seconds less than the time available.  
18 That would probably bother you a little bit. But,  
19 on the other hand, if they did some sort of detailed  
20 risk assessment, and could convince the Staff,  
21 through whatever means, that the frequency of ATWS

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 challenge -- those challenges was ten to the minus,  
2 pick a small number, per year, that might be taken  
3 into consideration. Is that reading too much into  
4 what you're saying, or is it -

5 MR. ARNDT: Let's not mix ATWS with  
6 common cause software failure diversity analysis.  
7 It's a little bit different beast, but similar  
8 requirements. But, the point being, if you come in  
9 with a analysis that does not meet this particular  
10 criteria, but you would like us to evaluate it  
11 irregardless of that, that's fine.

12 MEMBER STETKAR: And that would, I think  
13 -

14 MR. ARNDT: And both the criteria and  
15 the methodology would be evaluated. I'll use the  
16 Oconee trip example. When Oconee submitted their  
17 application for their SFAS and RPS upgrade, they  
18 provided certain accidents that did not bust the  
19 Part 100 requirement, so they didn't have to worry  
20 about the diversity requirement for that part of it.  
21 Certain accidents that did, and they chose to put

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 in a diverse actuation automated system, that met  
2 that checkbox. And one accident scenario that did  
3 neither, and would require manual operator action.  
4 So that last one, we evaluated, and although the  
5 methodology would have been appropriate to this, the  
6 actual criteria was not. It was much shorter.

7 We went in, and we looked at that, we  
8 look at what they provided, which was operational  
9 history, training, and other things, that gave us  
10 sufficient assurance that they could meet that in a  
11 reliable fashion. Most of it was done that way, one  
12 outside.

13 MEMBER CORRADINI: Just a comment. I  
14 can't find the restriction to Part 52 for this  
15 anywhere in the document. It's on the slide, but it  
16 doesn't say that in the document.

17 MR. DESAULNIERS: This is -- this  
18 portion - MEMBER CORRADINI: This  
19 portion, right.

20 MR. DESAULNIERS: This portion,  
21 preliminary validation. Okay. Well, I can look

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com



1 through it. I can tell you that that's the intent.

2 I'd have to look through the document to point  
3 specifically to where -

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: It's very specific -  
5 - you won't find it mentioned in that context.

6 MEMBER BROWN: Are you talking about the  
7 ISG itself, or Part -- ISG is Section Phase Two.  
8 It's on page 16.

9 MEMBER CORRADINI: But it doesn't say  
10 that it's restricted to Part 52.

11 MR. DESAULNIERS: The preliminary  
12 validation part here -

13 (Simultaneous speech.)

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: The middle of the  
15 document on page 16, "Note: Licensees upgrading  
16 existing plants should skip this phase, and go  
17 directly to Phase Three, Integrated System  
18 Validation. The preliminary validation is only  
19 required for those vendors or applicants who are  
20 using the 10 CFR Part 52 process."

21 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Let me see if I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 understand your response to Mr. Stetkar's question.  
2 Phrase it a little differently. This evaluation is  
3 done -

4 MEMBER STETKAR: Mine came out of ADAMS.

5 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: -- independently of  
6 the accident sequence? In other words, we're just  
7 looking at the software, and we're postulating  
8 common cause failures, and so on, and we want to --  
9 and if they want to take credit for manual action,  
10 they have to follow this process. Is this done  
11 independently of which accident sequences might be  
12 needed, and how unlikely that accident sequence  
13 might be? Or are you kind of neutral on that?

14 MR. ARNDT: Let me explain it again, and  
15 see if I -- because I'm not exactly sure of the  
16 question you're asking. The process is, you look at  
17 the BTP-19 accident scenarios, which are, basically,  
18 you make all your Chapter 15 accidents and you AOs,  
19 you assume a concurrent software common mode  
20 failure. You then look at how that scenario plays  
21 out in thermal hydraulics, and other things.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So it's not really  
2 embedded in the PRA, which goes beyond those  
3 accidents.

4                   MR. ARNDT: No. It's a deterministic  
5 analysis. Because of the way the Commission policy  
6 is, it permits best estimate analysis, but it's not  
7 a PRA-based beyond-design-basis type analysis.

8                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Thank you.

9                   MR. DESAULNIERS: Okay? Let's go on to  
10 the next slide here. I think I've already largely  
11 covered this slide here, the results for the  
12 preliminary validation documented in the D3 analysis  
13 for NRC review. Ultimately, they should support  
14 high confidence that the time required for manual  
15 operator action will satisfy the success criteria  
16 for the integrated system validation, which is the  
17 next phase of the analysis.

18                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So this is like  
19 beyond a reasonable doubt. It remains undefined,  
20 but sort of wait and see, that type, high  
21 confidence. I remember in an earlier document

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 within fire protection, they demanded that there was  
2 a numerical guidance as to how much shorter the time  
3 required should be, time available. Are you giving  
4 anything like that here, or is it just judgment?

5 MR. DESAULNIERS: No, it's based on the  
6 calculation of a margin, which the guidance in this  
7 document, base that margin based on the time  
8 necessary to recover from a credible operator error.  
9 The error with the longest recovery.

10 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Are you saying that  
11 the required language should be based on the  
12 available time by at least 10 minutes or something?

13 MR. DESAULNIERS: The time required to  
14 recover from -- so, analyze your action sequence,  
15 what errors might occur, identify that okay, there  
16 may be a mismanipulation of a switch, that the time  
17 to recover from that error, how much time is it? If  
18 that is your bounding error, that would be the basis  
19 for your margin.

20 MEMBER BROWN: Effectively, what it  
21 says, there's no addressing how short is too short.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 I phrased it slightly different when I looked at  
2 it, so if somebody came in and said we only need  
3 eight minutes, we require five -- no, we require  
4 eight, but we can react in five, that would be --  
5 theoretically, for this, that would be okay. If we  
6 require five, but we can do it in two, because our  
7 analysis -- that could be okay. There is no how  
8 short is too short.

9 MEMBER RAY: But George is asking about  
10 the use of the words "high confidence." What do you  
11 base high confidence on? The answer seems to be  
12 well, if it's capable of recovering from an  
13 operator error in the time required, then I have  
14 high confidence it will be done. That sounds like  
15 an answer to me.

16 MR. ARNDT: And it can be demonstrated  
17 in the validation.

18 MEMBER BROWN: That's our one -- I can  
19 show you that I can do it. Now that I have high  
20 confidence that I will do it, leaves me -- I don't  
21 know.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. DESAULNIERS: Well, they need to  
2 demonstrate it in multiple scenarios with multiple  
3 crews.

4 MEMBER BROWN: That's what I'm listening  
5 for, is how do I arrive at this high confidence.  
6 George is saying one way, is they have some  
7 arbitrary, admittedly, margin.

8 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Right.

9 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: I understand  
10 that this has to be done for the Chapter 15 accident  
11 scenarios, and for the anticipated operational  
12 occurrences.

13 MR. DESAULNIERS: Correct.

14 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: But doesn't  
15 this depend on when this common mode failure occur  
16 during a specific scenario? I mean, put yourself in  
17 the position of the applicant, who's trying to go  
18 through this process. There's just an infinite  
19 number of scenarios for a specific accident  
20 scenario, depending on when you assume this failure  
21 to occur.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. DESAULNIERS: That's correct.

2 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: Have you shown  
3 this to be at all workable?

4 MR. ARNDT: What we're trying to do is  
5 define a set of scenarios that are, in our opinion,  
6 will be provide a reasonable assurance that all of  
7 this -- billions of possible scenarios would be  
8 reasonably recoverable based on these actions.  
9 Because of the way the BTP-19's structure is set up,  
10 we're looking at those scenarios that would possibly  
11 bust the Part 100 acceptance criteria. Admittedly,  
12 there is lots of other ways of doing this, but this  
13 is, what we hope, is a reasonable set of scenarios  
14 that the operator can use to demonstrate that their  
15 actions can be accomplished in a reasonable time  
16 period.

17 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: My concern is  
18 that the scope of the evaluations that the applicant  
19 would have to go through, even for a single accident  
20 scenario, you have to assume that the common cause  
21 failure would occur anytime during that accident,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 and the operator actions required to recover at that  
2 time will depend on when that common cause failure  
3 occurs. And, therefore, this process is just  
4 incredibly open-ended. Demanding, I would say, the  
5 least, in terms of what the operator -

6 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: What you're saying,  
7 Said, is the starting point of the time required and  
8 the time available may not be the same.

9 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: Right.

10 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: That's what you're  
11 saying.

12 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: Well, not  
13 just, but the progression of the scenario can -

14 (Simultaneous speech.)

15 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: -- when this  
16 common cause failure occurs. I think you're asking  
17 something that would be very difficult, if not  
18 impossible, to do.

19 MR. ARNDT: It will certainly be  
20 challenging. However, you've got to remember, this  
21 is only one of several different options that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 licensee has in meeting the diversity requirements.

2 Alternatively, they could install an automated  
3 diverse actuation, or they could have the actual  
4 system originally designed to be sufficiently  
5 diverse, not to be subject to the software common  
6 cause failure. So, there are a number of different  
7 options -

8 MEMBER RAY: But you said you met with  
9 industry, and worked with them on this. What would  
10 be their response to Said's comment, which is,  
11 basically, that you have to assume the failure could  
12 occur at any time. That's not their assumption, is  
13 it, or do you assume the failure initiates the -

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: Well, we can say that  
15 this phase of the methodology is largely consistent  
16 with what industry had proposed in their's, so I  
17 don't believe that they had identified that as an  
18 insurmountable problem.

19 MEMBER RAY: That's my point, exactly.  
20 They're assuming, I would think, that the common  
21 mode failure occurs initially, or is pre-existing,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 or something of that kind, rather than that it  
2 occurs on demand. That's my -- what I would bet.

3 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: But is that  
4 logical?

5 MEMBER RAY: I don't know. I'm just  
6 asking them if they talked about this. I don't know  
7 the answer to that question.

8 MR. KEMPER: This is Bill Kemper, again.  
9 If I can provide some insights on this. The way we  
10 have evaluated this phase as, we assume, and  
11 licensees do their analysis in this method, that the  
12 reactor trip system, or the engineered safety  
13 feature system fails, concurrent with the accident.

14 In other words, once you have a large break LOCA,  
15 it is assuming that the reactor trip fails. It does  
16 not perform its safety function at that point, and  
17 then the accident is evaluated from there, from a  
18 thermal hydraulic perspective, if you will. So,  
19 we've always considered that to be an enveloping  
20 scenario, if you will, because if the system  
21 partially actuates, then you still have some safety

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 function, if you will. Like, say one train of SFAS  
2 actuates, another train doesn't, that's not  
3 perceived as onerous as both trains not operating.  
4 So, that's been historically the way that's been  
5 treated.

6 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So, what you are  
7 saying, Bill, is that the assumptions under which  
8 this ISG has been developed are bounded.

9 MR. KEMPER: That's correct.

10 MEMBER RAY: Said's hypothesis would  
11 argue with that, I think.

12 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: I guess I will  
13 have to think about specific scenarios in which this  
14 might not be the case.

15 MR. KEMPER: Well, the scope is limited  
16 primarily to the reactor trip system and engineer  
17 safety features.

18 (Off mic comments.)

19 MR. KEMPER: Okay. Yes, because, for  
20 example, during a LOCA scenario, once SFAS has  
21 initiated, of course, the safety function is being

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 enacted now. Obviously, there are other actions  
2 that have to be carried out pursuant to the EOPS,  
3 but the primarily safety system has performed its  
4 safety function.

5 MR. ARNDT: In terms of experience in  
6 what scenarios give us the most problem meeting the  
7 acceptance criteria, most of those are initial  
8 actuation-type issues. SFAS doesn't work, you don't  
9 have low pressure injection, you have fuel problems,  
10 you bust your Part 100 requirement. So, at least  
11 the ones we've looked at so far would argue that you  
12 probably wouldn't have too many problems with five  
13 minutes down, ten minutes down, things like that.  
14 Without having looked at every possible scenario, I  
15 can't give you a statement -

16 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: Same here.

17 MR. ARNDT: The things that we've looked  
18 at so far, the major issues are those immediate  
19 action-type issues.

20 VICE CHAIR ABDEL-KHALIK: Thank you.

21 MR. JUNG: This is Ian Jung. Just to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 provide more perspective on this, none of the plants  
2 that have come in have not had the -- follow this  
3 particular approach, that to the extent that we have  
4 to worry about this time available, and all this  
5 elements. In some designs, like Wolf Creek case,  
6 for example, we told them we are making a decision  
7 for that from NR perspective. They don't even need  
8 to get into even diverse actuation scenarios, so we  
9 have to consider some scenarios. Some of the  
10 scenarios end up being according to the D3 analysis,  
11 it could be a very simple one manual action that  
12 punching reactor trip system. It could be as simple  
13 as that, so we need to think about that, and whether  
14 we need automatic actuation for that, versus a  
15 simple manual action that's going to do it in a few  
16 minutes. Maybe all this analysis might be over-  
17 killing it.

18 MEMBER RAY: Just take the swamp over  
19 water storage tank in the containment sump, for  
20 example, that's a pretty critical time critical  
21 thing. Let's assume a failure -- I'm taking too

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 much time here. But I think that that's the kind of  
2 thing we're talking about, not if a plant tripped or  
3 it didn't trip. And that's the end of the  
4 discussion.

5 MEMBER BROWN: Can we move on?

6 MR. DESAULNIERS: I think we might be  
7 running tight on time.

8 MEMBER BROWN: Poor management of time  
9 here.

10 MR. DESAULNIERS: Okay. With regard to  
11 integrated system validation, this is the point at  
12 which the objective is to confirm that operators are  
13 able to perform the credited actions in real time  
14 using the as-built design. The method is to use a  
15 plant reference simulator capable of realistically  
16 representing the abnormal operational occurrences in  
17 postulated accidents concurrent with the common  
18 cause failure. The intent here is to validate time  
19 required using both nominal and tech spec minimum  
20 crews to make sure that the actions can be  
21 implemented in both those configurations. And,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 again, this is consistent with the overall human  
2 factors engineering process, can be implemented  
3 consistent with NUREG 0711.

4 The review criteria associated with the  
5 integrated system validation address these following  
6 areas; integration with the human factors  
7 engineering program, that should be done. The  
8 criteria for the simulator, the personnel used to  
9 run those scenarios, the operational conditions  
10 represented in those scenarios, as well as the  
11 performance times. And for, I guess, purposes of  
12 example, and perhaps the most critical area of  
13 criteria, I'll speak about the performance time  
14 criteria, just in the next slide

15 These two criteria, again, bring us back  
16 to some of the discussions earlier in the  
17 presentation that tie us back to looking at what was  
18 coming out of the analysis phase, specifically, the  
19 first criterion here. Multiple crews will be  
20 running for each abnormal operational occurrence, or  
21 postulated accident. The mean performance time of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the crew should be less than, or equal to the  
2 estimated time required derived from the analysis  
3 phase. So, this is where I was saying it behooved  
4 the applicant to insure that they provided a time at  
5 the analysis phase that was conservative to  
6 incorporate the times that they're actually going to  
7 see under the -- for the performance of the crew in  
8 the simulator, is if they under-estimate at the  
9 analysis phase, they will not meet the first  
10 criterion. And it brings that -- and, as a result,  
11 it brings in the analysis phase -- the analysis into  
12 question, because it would show somewhere that your  
13 analysis was not incorporating, perhaps, appropriate  
14 assumptions with regard to what was required to  
15 implement those operator actions. I'm sorry. You  
16 had a question?

17 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: I'm trying to  
18 digest all this. So, the first one refers only to  
19 the time required. Right?

20 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes.

21 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Second one to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com



1 operator.

2 MEMBER RAY: You justify the mean time  
3 by what? Mean time less than required.

4 MR. DESAULNIERS: That case, we're  
5 looking, again, at verifying that the analysis was a  
6 valid analysis, and that it provided an estimate  
7 that was going to bound what those operators, on  
8 average, were going to be able to do. Ultimately -

9 MEMBER RAY: Bound and on average, those  
10 words just don't go together, to me.

11 MR. DESAULNIERS: Because the next  
12 criterion deals with the actual performance of each  
13 individual crew relative to time available,  
14 including margin. So, that addresses the other  
15 piece. So, both of those criteria have to be met.

16 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, I've been  
17 listening. Can I see the first bullet, again, since  
18 you started with the first bullet?

19 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes.

20 MEMBER CORRADINI: So, you're saying if  
21 there's some sort of analysis of how the crews

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 behave, is there a mean performance time compared to  
2 a pre-done analysis that says we need to do it by X?

3 If we need to do the action in an hour, and the  
4 mean crew performance shows by whatever mechanism is  
5 less than an hour, then you set aside bullet one.

6 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes.

7 MR. ARNDT: Not quite. You didn't say  
8 it quite right.

9 MEMBER CORRADINI: Well -

10 MR. ARNDT: It's, if you do an analysis  
11 and it says you can do the operation in an hour, and  
12 then you later on say we do it, and we only take an  
13 hour or less, it's okay. This is the analyzed  
14 amount of time it takes to perform the action.

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: Oh, excuse me.

16 MEMBER MAYNARD: The term "time  
17 required" is a little misleading.

18 MR. ARNDT: Yes.

19 MEMBER MAYNARD: You have to read it in  
20 a different context.

21 MR. ARNDT: You have to read it in a -

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: Oh, so this is the  
2 time to perform the action, not the time available  
3 before the action must be performed.

4 MR. ARNDT: Right.

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. I'm sorry.  
6 Excuse me.

7 MR. ARNDT: I know. I do the same  
8 thing.

9 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes. The time  
10 required to perform the action based on the  
11 analysis.

12 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So, this is based  
13 on some sort of crew performance. Right?

14 MR. DESAULNIERS: Exactly.

15 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Why are you  
16 allowing the mean in the first bullet, but in the  
17 second you want every crew to pass the test?

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: Because it's a  
19 different thing.

20 MR. DESAULNIERS: It's a different  
21 criteria.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: It is different.

2 MR. DESAULNIERS: It is.

3 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: By why is the mean  
4 more appropriate in the first, and not the second?

5 MR. ARNDT: The mean is appropriate  
6 because it's -- you're going to have an analysis.  
7 The analysis is going to say, it's going to take an  
8 hour, or 30 minutes, or whatever. The first one  
9 you're simply saying, our analysis was acceptable,  
10 and we're validating our analysis by saying on  
11 average, the crews are meeting where we said we were  
12 going to. So, that's validating the analysis. The  
13 second one is validating -

14 MEMBER ARMIJO: I don't understand that.  
15 The analysis should be independent of the crew  
16 performance.

17 MEMBER STETKAR: No. This is the  
18 analysis of the crew performance. You've got --  
19 there's two analyses going on here.

20 (Simultaneous speech.)

21 MR. ARNDT: Sorry. Keep going.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1                   MR. DESAULNIERS:  It's also important to  
2                   take a look at this, because when you get to the --  
3                   looking at performance time, there you are looking,  
4                   presumably, at just correct operator performance,  
5                   and you may not have the benefit of operator error.  
6                   So, with respect to that margin, you're not -- you  
7                   don't have a means to validate that your margin is  
8                   right, necessarily.  And by going back and  
9                   validating that at least your analysis of the time  
10                  required, your margin is largely based on that.  
11                  It'll also give you confirmation that you have an  
12                  appropriate margin.

13                  MEMBER CORRADINI:  So, can I try one  
14                  more time now with the two bullets, just for  
15                  numbers.  So, what you're saying, if the required  
16                  time to perform the action is 30 minutes, the mean  
17                  time of the crew performance has got to be 30  
18                  minutes or less.  If the time available is an hour,  
19                  then you're going to look at the crew performance in  
20                  some methodology to determine not just the mean, but  
21                  also the wings in the mean to make sure that that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 falls within the hour.

2 MR. DESAULNIERS: Right.

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: Got it.

4 MR. DESAULNIERS: Yes.

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Thank you.

6 MR. ARNDT: For each crew.

7 MEMBER CORRADINI: Got it.

8 MEMBER BROWN: Estimated time required  
9 for what? The first bullet.

10 MR. DESAULNIERS: The time required to  
11 perform the mitigation action.

12 (Simultaneous speech.)

13 MR. DESAULNIERS: Not time required to  
14 mitigate the accident. Time required to perform the  
15 mitigation action, but not, necessarily, to mitigate  
16 the accident.

17 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: That's time  
18 available.

19 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Let's go on.

20 MR. DESAULNIERS: Okay.

21 MEMBER BROWN: I'll work on that one

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

later.

MR. DESAULNIERS: The last phase is long-term monitoring, and this addresses, I believe, some of the comments or questions that were raised earlier with regard to training, and insuring that if, I guess, the experience -- someone noted that if you train operators that they need to do it within a specific time available, that they generally will meet that. Part of this is insuring that that message remains clear throughout the life of the plant, or for as long as those actions are credited, and that programs should be to insure that there are no inadvertent changes to the design configuration of a plant, such that it would change the time available to perform the actions. So, in essence, through training, ongoing training process, there would be a continued look at the ability of operators to perform these actions within the credited period of time. And if that were failing to meet those times, to feed back into corrective action process to insure that the training was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 modified, or whatever was necessary, to insure that  
2 they can continue to perform those actions within  
3 the credited time.

4 I think I largely addressed the points  
5 in this slide previously, so long-term, where do we  
6 go from here? That describes the process. The  
7 Staff's intent is, ultimately, to develop a Branch  
8 Technical Position that would incorporate the  
9 guidance that we have in this ISG, and to revise the  
10 Standard Review Plan in order to reference that  
11 Branch Technical Position.

12 Longer term in the future, we would hope  
13 to support future development of 58.8 as a  
14 methodology that addresses, again, some of the  
15 questions that I heard today, to provide a  
16 standardized methodology appropriate to the  
17 application in digital control rooms.

18 MR. ARNDT: We'll go on right now,  
19 because we're a little pressed on time, with ISG-6.

20 This is a review -

21 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Is this the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com



1 estimated time?

2 MEMBER BROWN: The time available.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. ARNDT: Our margin has been eaten  
5 into quite a bit. ISG-6 is in the process of  
6 development, and Ed will go through what it is,  
7 where it is, and where we are going in the future.

8 MR. MILLER: Okay. Great. Good  
9 afternoon. As Steve said, my name is Ed Miller.  
10 I'm a Project Manager in Operating Reactor Licensing  
11 in NRR. I've been in this position for about five  
12 years. Prior to that, I spent about two years in  
13 instrumentation controls, as a member of TWG-6,  
14 providing licensing perspective for ISG-6. What I'd  
15 like to do real quick, though, is go over -

16 (Off the record comments.)

17 MR. MILLER: Okay. Just real quick, who  
18 I was. Then I'd like to go into the purpose of ISG-  
19 6, initially. The first two purposes on there  
20 really get to reduction of regulatory uncertainty.  
21 We'd like to do that by creating a refined licensing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 process that I'll discuss in more detail a bit  
2 later. And, clearly, defining our expectations for  
3 documentation. We'd like to do this both by laying  
4 out clearly the criteria we expect to evaluate these  
5 submittals by, and giving just a list of documents,  
6 and documentation that we would expect to be  
7 submitted, both with the application later on, and  
8 kept available for audit throughout the process.

9           Lastly, that we also expect this ISG to  
10 serve as a knowledge management tool. This will  
11 provide a learning tool for new reviewers as they  
12 come in, and as is becoming a very real situation  
13 right now, losing our senior review staff to  
14 retirement. And it will also promote consistency  
15 throughout the review process by serving as that  
16 guide. We certainly intend to incorporate lessons  
17 learned from recent ISG amendment reviews, such as  
18 Wolf Creek and Oconee. Next slide, please.

19           This is a very basic flow chart. It  
20 gives an overview of the process. And recognizing  
21 that digital instrumentation and controls are a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 significant licensee resource commitment, we  
2 developed a phased approach to acknowledge that not  
3 all the information needed to make the decision is  
4 initially available when they submit a license  
5 amendment request. And, additionally, we structured  
6 the phases of this to parallel the life cycle of the  
7 digital I&C upgrade for a site.

8 Starting off with Phase Zero, which  
9 actually begins before they've even submitted a  
10 license amendment request. This is when they're  
11 engaging the NRC Staff in a discussion of what they  
12 plan to do for digital I&C upgrade, if it happens.  
13 And, we actually envision this being one of the most  
14 important aspects of the licensing process, even  
15 though it occurs before the submittal of an  
16 amendment request. And this is because we're trying  
17 to propose a creative use of our public meetings to  
18 discuss what they're intending to do. In these  
19 meetings, we're going to cover things, such as  
20 defense-in-depth and diversity, any other unique or  
21 potentially complex topics associated with what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 they're planning on submitting.

2 In addition to that, we're planning on  
3 using the meeting summaries that we issue after any  
4 public meeting today to document initial Staff  
5 assessments of what the licensee has presented to  
6 us. Included in those assessment would be  
7 identification of what we, as the NRC Staff, really  
8 find to be the critical factors in what they  
9 presented to us. This will serve a number of uses  
10 as we get into later phases by feeding into the  
11 acceptance review that we would perform. Again,  
12 we've already identified what's important to us in  
13 the submittal ahead of time, identifying with the  
14 licensee if you change something, do you think it's  
15 going to be as big of an impact? Granted, it's not  
16 set in stone. If they change something that we  
17 didn't identify before, it could come up. But, like  
18 I said, it reduces the regulatory uncertainty that  
19 changing something that we didn't identify as a  
20 critical factor before, is less likely to.

21 Phase One begins when they submit their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 license amendment application. We'll put that  
2 through the acceptance review, which, as I said  
3 before, will be benefitted by the meeting summaries  
4 that have already been conducted, or issued. Moving  
5 into the RAI process. This is another point where  
6 we're going to try to make some creative use of our  
7 existing processes.

8           Typically, right now we ask questions  
9 when we need information, and leave it at that. We  
10 get responses, and, basically, silence is no more  
11 information needed. We'd like to start providing  
12 feedback in the RAI process of areas of review that  
13 we no longer have any questions on. This provides  
14 more of a positive feedback to the licensee that we  
15 have come to an understanding on that point. And,  
16 again, this doesn't mean that we're done, it's  
17 approved, no more questions can come up. But it  
18 does provide a reduction of regulatory uncertainty  
19 by identifying those areas that we feel are being  
20 addressed adequately at this point.

21           Phase Two picks up when promised

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 information that would be on a schedule established  
2 with the original submittal of the application comes  
3 in. There really is no absolute defining line  
4 between Phase One and Phase Two. We would certainly  
5 still continue to ask RAI questions on information  
6 submitted during Phase One, as we go into Phase Two.

7 But, Phase Two is where we would expect to conduct  
8 the regulatory audits. Again, we've developed a new  
9 Office within NRR to govern those activities.

10 At the conclusion of all that, we would  
11 render a regulatory decision. In the case of  
12 approving the digital I&C upgrade, we transition  
13 into Phase Three. And this really breaks with the  
14 licensing, or breaks the end of the licensing  
15 process, when we issue that SE. Obviously, we're  
16 doing no more licensing reviews of it. It  
17 transitions into an inspection process. So, at this  
18 point, it goes out, they install the system in the  
19 plant, perform site acceptance testing, and all  
20 these reviews of those will be conducted by the  
21 region under their Inspection Procedure 52003,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 which, again, was updated recently to address these  
2 issues. Go to the next slide, please.

3 For the format of ISG-6, we modeled it  
4 heavily after RS001, which is the review standard  
5 for extended power uprates. Basically, we had a  
6 good model that had been proven to be successful  
7 there, so we figured, if it's not broke, don't fix  
8 it.

9 MEMBER BROWN: Ed, I'm going to  
10 interject one point here, that for the table, the  
11 flow chart, I just checked the rest of the sheets  
12 and didn't really see this point. Once, if I  
13 remember from reading through the ISG that you  
14 presented, you will effectively step out of this  
15 process at the end of the Phase Two process. That  
16 means, it goes -- it's now the region. It's now the  
17 licensee, applicant, whoever, they install stuff,  
18 and everything else happens. NRC, the Staff, nobody  
19 looks at this anymore.

20 MR. ARNDT: Headquarters.

21 MEMBER BROWN: Headquarters doesn't. I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 sorry. I apologize. I didn't mean to -- I was not  
2 excluding the region folks, staff from doing that.  
3 That's just a point that was not articulated in the  
4 rest of the slide.

5 MR. ARNDT: Headquarters steps out after  
6 the SE is issued. Right?

7 MEMBER BROWN: Correct. Yes.

8 MR. ARNDT: Okay.

9 MEMBER ARMIJO: Just before -- what do  
10 you actually issue? Is this -- do they get an  
11 amendment to the existing plant license?

12 MR. ARNDT: Correct.

13 MEMBER ARMIJO: That's what they get.  
14 Okay.

15 MR. MILLER: Yes. The headquarters  
16 staff is still available as a consult to the region  
17 when they do their inspection. And that has come up  
18 before.

19 MEMBER MAYNARD: Typically, what I've  
20 seen, they may be out of it from the design review  
21 and acceptance, but when it comes to implementation,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 to testing and stuff, typically, somebody from  
2 headquarters has been aware of the inspection, and  
3 communicated, been a part of it, sometimes.

4 MR. MILLER: Right. So, again, you  
5 could see the format here. In the first part of the  
6 ISG, we describe that process in significant detail,  
7 going over the very smaller points of what we want  
8 to make sure it's accomplished. Again, providing an  
9 example, meeting summary to be issued that  
10 delineates the summary be included, identifying the  
11 critical points, things like that.

12 The other part of this is going to  
13 contain the review areas. And what we did was we  
14 broke down the overall digital I&C upgrade review  
15 into a number of conceptual review areas that allow  
16 somebody to get their mind around an individual  
17 review area first, and then put all those individual  
18 review areas together into a digital I&C review.

19 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Is there anything  
20 unique to I&C here?

21 MR. ARNDT: In the format slide?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: It seems to me,  
2 this is a standard process that one would follow.

3 MR. ARNDT: We actually borrowed from  
4 the extended power uprate. The concept was we  
5 wanted to have a more formalized, more structured  
6 approach. And what we looked at was other  
7 complicated reviews.

8 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: But, I mean, this  
9 is not something we're going to review. This is  
10 standard. Unless there is something unique to I&C.

11 MR. MILLER: The review areas, which we  
12 get into now. But that's what's the -

13 MEMBER BROWN: Yes. The ISG identifies,  
14 8, 9, 10, whatever the number is, specific review  
15 areas and provides a definition of what they're  
16 looking for within those review areas.

17 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Okay. That is of  
18 interest, the overall approach.

19 MR. MILLER: Okay. Moving on real  
20 quick. I'll go through this very quickly. This is  
21 just the tiers of review. It's another way to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 reduce regulatory uncertainty. We also came up with  
2 the concept of defining different tiers for where an  
3 application would fall. Tier One is where you need  
4 a topical report already pre-approved with no  
5 deviations. This review is very confirmatory,  
6 making sure that you fit the envelope within which  
7 we approved the topical report. Tier Two is where  
8 you use a previously approved topical report, no  
9 deviations. I'm sorry, with deviations, so in that  
10 case, you identify some points that you need to  
11 change from the approval had previously. The parts  
12 of it that you do within the previous envelope would  
13 be confirmatory, the new parts would require more  
14 significant review. Finally, Tier Three is where  
15 there's a totally new system, and that requires,  
16 basically, a thorough review of all the technical  
17 areas that we would do if it were coming in under a  
18 topical report. Again, that's to reduce regulatory  
19 uncertainty. What tier it falls under will be  
20 discussed during the Phase Zero meetings, that we  
21 have broad feedback, again, in the meeting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 summaries. Move on from that one.

2 So, this is really the part of it that's  
3 very, very specific to digital I&C. These are our  
4 working list of review areas. And what we're trying  
5 to do, as I mentioned before, is break it down into  
6 some conceptual areas to help our new reviewers get  
7 their minds around what this is, and really define  
8 kind of the points of the process that we get into  
9 here.

10 As you can see, we start off with  
11 defense-in-depth and diversity, move into the  
12 hardware architecture, how is the hardware built,  
13 the hardware design process. Is the design process  
14 such that it produces robust product? Looks at the  
15 communications on that hardware both within the  
16 system, with other class warning systems, and with  
17 non-safety systems. Then we look at the software  
18 that runs on the hardware, look at the design  
19 process that was used to develop the software. And  
20 then system qualifications, bins it up into okay,  
21 here's the whole system. What are my acceptance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 criteria for running the system as a whole?

2 System, hardware, software, and  
3 methodology modifications really is only applicable  
4 to a Tier Two review. That's where they've got a  
5 previously approved topical report with deviations.

6 And the idea here is we're going to delineate what  
7 really consider a deviation. We'll talk about how  
8 to address those. But, obviously, that wouldn't be  
9 a problem for a Tier One and for a Tier Three. We'd  
10 be reviewing everything, so there really wouldn't be  
11 any deviations.

12 Technical specifications, as with any  
13 license amendment, we certainly review the technical  
14 specifications to make sure that the LCOs and  
15 remaining SRs define the minimum level of  
16 functionality for the system. One of the things  
17 we're trying to include here, and we've been working  
18 with stakeholders on this one, is trying to figure  
19 out some of the things that might be specific to a  
20 digital I&C upgrade that we could prepare reviewers  
21 to see as technical specification changes. Are we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 going to be getting rid of checks, because that  
2 would be something that's very important to a  
3 reviewer from a historical aspect.

4 MEMBER BROWN: Can you say that again?  
5 I didn't read that anywhere. You want to get rid of  
6 channel checks.

7 MR. MILLER: Just as a possible benefit,  
8 yes. The system has a self-checking feature.

9 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. You didn't read it  
10 in context.

11 MR. MILLER: I'm sorry. So, kind of a  
12 question we asked them was, what would you be  
13 anticipating you would like as a technical  
14 specification change in some of these to help  
15 prepare our reviewers to -

16 MEMBER BROWN: But if you're going to do  
17 that, I'm very familiar with it, because I actually  
18 did it. But, you have to have -- you just can't do  
19 that willy-nilly. You have to have a way how you  
20 check the checker.

21 MR. MILLER: Right.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1                   MEMBER BROWN: So there's some process  
2 you have to incorporate in running that. And you  
3 also have to have some process that utilizes those  
4 self-checking type things, such that they provide  
5 you information as to what they did and didn't. If  
6 you don't have that, then you don't have the ability  
7 to know where you are at any one time. So, I just  
8 throw that out as a -- and I'm sorry I didn't  
9 understand the context. Why don't you tell me what  
10 you're thinking of that.

11                   MR. MILLER: But, I think your point,  
12 though -- I mean, there's a big benefit, that if we  
13 bring that up as -- if a licensee proposes to delete  
14 a channel check, here's some of the things you  
15 really need to be on the watch for, too. I mean, we  
16 have a chance to introduce some consistency in how  
17 we look at those things, and make sure that we catch  
18 everything, too.

19                   MEMBER BROWN: Yes. Just bear in mind,  
20 the self-checking doesn't necessarily check all  
21 aspects from input to output. So, it's a subset of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 things you may or may not be able to do. Okay. Go  
2 ahead. I'm sorry.

3 MEMBER ARMIJO: I know at the  
4 Subcommittee meeting we talked about the guidance  
5 that's being prepared for how to deal with DAC  
6 items. An awful lot of the stuff on this list for  
7 the new plants is DAC. Can you say anything about  
8 how these requirements and how you would normally  
9 review them are going to work under DAC?

10 MR. WERMEIL: Do you want me to answer  
11 that? This is Jared Wermeil from the Staff. The  
12 guidance that we're writing in ISG-6 is not intended  
13 to be used in accordance with the DAC process under  
14 a Part 52 application.

15 MR. ARMIJO: Okay. I thought this did  
16 apply to Part 52.

17 MR. WERMEIL: It does not. This is  
18 strictly for operating plant amendments under 50.90.

19 MR. ARMIJO: I misunderstood.

20 MR. WERMEIL: Now, the elements in that  
21 working list of review areas are typical of any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 digital system, and they would fit into a DAC  
2 process. I believe that was your point. That is  
3 absolutely true. However, this document is going to  
4 describe for a licensee how they would structure  
5 their amendment to address these review areas. It  
6 doesn't help a COL applicant, because the timing of  
7 the information that's asked for here is very  
8 different when you're providing a COL application  
9 that's referencing a standard design, as opposed to  
10 amending your operating license. And this is not  
11 going to help them in that regard. The types of  
12 documentation, the kind of information is the same,  
13 but it will be coming at very different times, and  
14 it may look very different. And this document won't  
15 help in that particular aspect.

16 I know that NRO is developing a DAC  
17 implementation guidance document. And, eventually,  
18 I would expect, because both offices have been  
19 talking about this, that there will be some  
20 similarities. But, at this particular moment, the  
21 structure of this document is not going to assist in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the DAC implementation. It's just for operating  
2 plant amendments.

3 MEMBER BROWN: I still want to emphasize  
4 one point. If you look at the draft review areas  
5 which they're talking about in here, and based on  
6 the ESBWR presentations, and the USABWR  
7 presentations at this point, these review areas not  
8 under this process, but are applicable relative to  
9 types of information that people really ought to be  
10 getting. It's a matter of how we do it, and how we  
11 fit it into this DAC ITAAC process, which would  
12 improve that process immensely, in my own personal  
13 opinion.

14 MR. WERMEIL: One point I would also  
15 make, with the implementation of DAC, there is even  
16 a question of who would be responsible for the  
17 review of those aspects, because DAC is a subset of  
18 ITAAC. And ITAAC is, basically, an inspection  
19 function. So it's hard to say at this point, and  
20 that's something that is being worked out.

21 MEMBER CORRADINI: I guess, just since

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 you have now gone into this realm, I really do  
2 think, though, this isn't directly applicable, so  
3 the timing is different. And the only one part of  
4 the thing that you had said at the end that I just  
5 want to make sure I understood it properly, was when  
6 we asked the question about who would be looking at  
7 DACs, we were told the regional office, or Region  
8 II, as well as headquarters together. Right?

9 MR. JUNG: Yes. Ian Jung with NRO.  
10 Current decision for NRO is the Division of  
11 Engineering in headquarters will take the lead on  
12 review of the DAC items. And, obviously, we need to  
13 coordinate with the program office for ITAAC  
14 construction inspection program.

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: Thank you.

16 MEMBER BROWN: I think you are just  
17 about done, aren't you?

18 MR. MILLER: Pretty much.

19 MEMBER BROWN: I wanted to introduce one  
20 other point, in that when I went through the list of  
21 this stuff, it effectively addresses what I would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 call standard -- you get the software design process  
2 and stuff in, but it doesn't really -- the software  
3 design based systems bring a different perspective  
4 to the development of determinacy and independence  
5 in terms of how you assess those, and how are they  
6 meeting them relative to the rest of the general  
7 criteria for a plant. And this list does not really  
8 cover those very explicitly, so my thought process  
9 is, you need to expand this list by those two items  
10 to cover hey, what should we be getting to make sure  
11 we have a good assurance of the determinacy and the  
12 independence, and how, not telling them how, but how  
13 the licensee or the applicant decides they're going  
14 to meet those requirements. So, that's my thought  
15 process on the thing.

16 MR. KEMPER: Yes. Bill Kemper, again.  
17 If you could just go back a slide, and show us the  
18 list. Software design process, software  
19 architecture, those two items there are intended to  
20 address the entire software life cycle development  
21 process.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER BROWN: I understand, but it  
2 still doesn't cover explicitly the -- I mean, you  
3 bring software into the picture, and you start  
4 communicating between channels, there's nuance in  
5 how you get determinacy and independence. It's not  
6 straightforward, because of how you do it. So, you  
7 need to know how the guy is going to do it. You  
8 don't have to tell him how, but you need to know  
9 how, but you need to have some way of addressing it  
10 so that he presents the information in a manner in  
11 which you can understand how he's doing it. That's  
12 all. That's trying to -- I don't care how you -- if  
13 you want to expand the review area, the software,  
14 the other thing to do that, because it is  
15 intertwined with the hardware part of it, as well.  
16 They are not separable.

17                   MR. KEMPER: Right. And the  
18 communications, the tick mark up there under  
19 communications, really that's a broad overarching  
20 area -

21                   MEMBER BROWN: It's just not clear when

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 you read the document. One other point. You all  
2 significantly modified this from the first round.  
3 It went from this table, which was somewhat  
4 incomprehensible. Was that driven by a previous  
5 Committee meeting, or was that your choice?

6 MR. ARNDT: That was driven by a number  
7 of inputs.

8 MR. KEMPER: It's still there. The  
9 table will not disappear, but it will take on a  
10 different form, if you will. So the list of  
11 documents -

12 MEMBER BROWN: That will be back in the  
13 back as an Appendix.

14 MR. KEMPER: Yes, that's correct. The  
15 list of documents that licensees need to submit is  
16 extremely important to provide regulatory clarity on  
17 what's expected, and when they need to submit that.

18 MEMBER BROWN: Excuse me. Thank you.  
19 Are there any other questions? Number one, I wanted  
20 to thank everybody for a very interesting session,  
21 as I thought it would be. And I -- while we kind of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

ran over five minutes here, I thought the discussion on ISG-5 was far more critical to the overall process here today, than the ISG-6. So, Ed, I apologize for shortchanging you a little bit, but I think a lot of good stuff came out, so I did want to thank you all for the time, and a very good presentation, and a good articulation of the thought process. Back to the chairman.

MEMBER SHACK: Okay, gentlemen. We're ready to adjourn for lunch. We will resume at 1:05.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 12:06:42 p.m., and went back on the record at 1:04:19 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

(1:04 p.m.)

MEMBER SHACK: Okay. If we can come into session.

Our next topic is the license renewal and final safety evaluation report for the National Institutes of Standard and Technology Reactor. And it is Jack Sieber again. It is a big day for Jack.

MEMBER SIEBER: Yes. I am earning my money today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank all of you for attending. I guess as an introduction, when I look at what we have done, and what the staff and the licensee has done here on the NIST project, it is not really a license renewal but a relicensing of the plant. And I will spend a couple of minutes explaining why I used that term as opposed to what we have been used to in the last 52 or 53 license renewals under Part 54.

NIST, which is the National Institute of Standards and Technology -- when I was young we were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 called the National Bureau of Standards -- and the  
2 reactor, which is located at, if you are going  
3 northbound, Exit 11, southbound Exit 10, on I-270,  
4 is known as NSBR. And that stands for National  
5 Bureau of Standards, NBSR, Reactor.

6 This reactor differs from those that we  
7 have renewed licenses for over the last 10 years, in  
8 that it is a Type 104C reactor, which is a research  
9 and test reactor. And because of that it falls  
10 under different portions of the rule, the rules  
11 which we use for normal power reactor relicensing,  
12 and it stems from actually the Atomic Energy Act of  
13 1954, as amended.

14 And the Congress at that time had the  
15 foresight to recognize what research and test  
16 reactors do, along with educational reactors, and  
17 noted the fact that the power levels in research and  
18 test reactors are a couple of orders of magnitude  
19 lower than power reactors, and the source term is  
20 several orders of magnitude lower.

21 And the temperature and pressure

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 conditions -- for example, at full power -- a NIST  
2 reactor operates at 7.2 pounds per square inch,  
3 which is not a high pressure, and 115 degrees  
4 Fahrenheit, which is roughly bath water, if you  
5 don't mind tritium. But we wouldn't want you to do  
6 it because we don't want you to contaminate the  
7 moderator.

8           And so the rules are different. And if  
9 you trace through from the broad statement in the  
10 Atomic Energy Act to how this is interpreted in  
11 Title X, you find that the description of -- and the  
12 repeat of the statement in the Atomic Energy Act  
13 related to this is in Part 50.41, which basically  
14 grants broad leeway to the operator and owner of  
15 research and test reactors to modify the reactor,  
16 modify its operation, in a way to suit the  
17 experiments that it is conducting, keeping in mind  
18 the foremost consideration of public health and  
19 safety.

20           And because of that, certain of the  
21 regulations do not apply, and, of course, others do.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 For example, a lot of Part 50 does not apply to  
2 research and test reactors -- notably, Appendix A,  
3 which is the general design criteria. And,  
4 therefore, you can't regulate a reactor like this to  
5 meet those criteria.

6 In addition to that, Part 54, which is  
7 license renewal, does not apply. On the other hand,  
8 there is a whole host of provisions of the Title X  
9 that do apply, and, for example, Part 19, which is  
10 notices; Part 20, basically health physics  
11 requirements; parts of Part 50, security; Part 100,  
12 accident doses, and so forth.

13 These reactors are built to national and  
14 local codes and standards, including the ASME boiler  
15 and pressure vessel code for unfired pressure  
16 vessels and NIST reactor vessels built to that  
17 standard, and B31.1 piping standard, and commercial  
18 codes for the confinement building and auxiliary  
19 building supporting the reactor. And that is in  
20 keeping with the low source term and mild  
21 environment of that reactor.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   Now, we had our subcommittee meeting on  
2 February 4th of this year, which I thought was well  
3 done by both the applicant and the staff, and by our  
4 subcommittee members at the time. And we had a  
5 number of questions, which we collected during the  
6 meeting and after the meeting. And with the use of  
7 transcripts, which should make our Court Reporter  
8 happy, that we used -- actually used the transcripts  
9 to figure out what the questions really were,  
10 compiled those, submitted them to the staff, and  
11 between the staff and the applicant provided  
12 answers.

13                   And I have provided all of you copies of  
14 this by e-mail, two drafts, one which was  
15 preliminary and then a final, and paper form here.  
16 And during the meeting today what I would like to do  
17 is you can read through the questions, and if your  
18 name is listed as the questioner you can read the  
19 response to that and determine whether you are  
20 satisfied with that response or not.

21                   When I read through them, I see one

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 commitment, and it has to do with the first question  
2 on the adequacy of seismic analysis, where we talked  
3 about doing a seismic walkdown, and had you done  
4 one, and, of course, you aren't required to do one.

5 On the other hand, the applicant took the  
6 initiative and performed one, found a block wall  
7 that potentially might not meet power reactor  
8 seismic qualifications, but if it failed could  
9 endanger essentially safety-related equipment.

10 And the licensee has agreed to either  
11 analyze that wall or remediate the wall, either by  
12 fixing it or removing it or replacing it or  
13 something like that. And I presume that the staff  
14 is incorporating that response into their SER.

15 And on the other hand, it seemed to me,  
16 at least from the questions I was involved in, that  
17 the answers were very thorough and satisfactory.

18 I would like to bring up an issue that  
19 is late arising, and this is an issue involving the  
20 safety analysis, and has to do with loss of flow in  
21 the coolant system. And I will just describe it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 enough to let you know that that -- this issue is  
2 still out there, but not enough so that you will  
3 find fault with my description.

4           If you look at the loss of flow, this is  
5 loss of forced flow. There are four coolant pumps  
6 of roughly 100 horsepower each, 13-inch impellers.  
7 I think the capacity is something like 9,000 gpm or  
8 something like that. Three out of four must operate  
9 under the technical specifications, and the modes of  
10 failure is loss of one pump or rotor seizing of a  
11 pump while the other ones continued to run, and loss  
12 of all power to all pumps, which by my way of  
13 examining the analysis is the most severe case.

14           And the figure of merit is the critical  
15 heat flux ratio. The licensee has decided that, if  
16 you look at the actual flow coast down curve  
17 compared to the curve used in the analysis, which is  
18 supposed to fit the actual data, that there is a  
19 difference and the difference is probably not  
20 conservative. And it would appear to me, based on  
21 napkin calculation, that what it does is affect the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 margin and to -- for the critical heat flux ratio  
2 roughly 10 to 15 percent.

3           On the other hand -- and I think that  
4 this issue needs to be addressed, and I would like  
5 the applicant and the staff to address it here, but  
6 it also needs to appear in the updated FSAR for this  
7 facility in a corrected form, in the SER, that says  
8 that the new analysis continues to meet the  
9 regulations. And that will be an open item from  
10 this meeting.

11           My intention is to cover everything that  
12 we can cover that relates to the license renewal for  
13 this reactor at this meeting. And when the  
14 applicant and the staff are ready to fully address  
15 this one outstanding issue, we can have another full  
16 committee meeting of short duration where we can  
17 hear your official analysis and the staff's review  
18 of that, and limit that meeting to that discussion  
19 and generate whatever letters or reports that we  
20 have to generate at that time.

21           I think that minimizes staff time and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 minimizes the applicant's time. And I would also  
2 offer that this is the way the system ought to work,  
3 where the applicant finds and evaluates its own  
4 errors, reports those. Second best is if the staff  
5 finds, and the worst is if we find them. And so you  
6 are in the best of all situations at this point, and  
7 I think that is a very safety-conscious attitude on  
8 everybody's part with this regard.

9           And so with that introduction, what I  
10 would like to do is turn it over to Ted Quay, who is  
11 Deputy Director of NRR, Division of Policy and  
12 Rulemaking. And that is the division, as opposed to  
13 our ordinary License Renewal Division, this division  
14 is the division that does this type of reactor.

15           Ted?

16           MR. QUAY: Thank you. Good afternoon,  
17 Dr. Sieber, and members of the Committee.

18           My name is Ted Quay. I am the Deputy  
19 Director of the Division of Policy and Rulemaking in  
20 NRR. Our division is responsible for the NIST  
21 relicensing application, review of it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   With me, on the far end of this table I  
2 have Kathryn Brock, Chief of the Research and Test  
3 Reactors Branch A. Ms. Brock's branch has primary  
4 responsibility for relicensing reviews. Sitting  
5 next to me is Mr. William Kennedy. He is here as a  
6 Project Manager for the relicensing review. Mr.  
7 Kennedy will lead the staff presentation.

8                   This afternoon we will begin with a  
9 presentation by the licensee that will include  
10 discussions of the concerns voiced by members of the  
11 ACRS Committee during last February's meeting.  
12 Following the February meeting, the staff issued a  
13 request for additional information to collect and  
14 document information related to the ACRS members'  
15 concerns. Mr. Kennedy reviewed the licensee's  
16 information and visited the facility to examine the  
17 licensee's seismic walkdown.

18                   After the licensee's presentation, Mr.  
19 Kennedy will outline the licensing history of the  
20 facility, explain the staff's review criteria, and  
21 give an overview of the staff's final safety

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 evaluation report. Mr. Kennedy will also explain  
2 the closure of the open item and the staff's draft  
3 safety evaluation report.

4 The open item has been successfully  
5 resolved, and the staff final safety evaluation  
6 report will be in management concurrence in the next  
7 few days.

8 As you are aware, this week the licensee  
9 identified an error in two of their accident  
10 analyses. The staff will review the licensee's  
11 effort on this error and present the findings to the  
12 Committee later on this year. I expect the final  
13 safety evaluation report to be published as a NUREG  
14 this summer.

15 With that, I will turn the presentation  
16 over to the licensee.

17 MEMBER SIEBER: Thank you.

18 MR. RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
19 members of the ACRS. Thank you for letting us come  
20 and present our responses to your questions. I have  
21 a number of people here to assist in the responses.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Dr. Williams is the head of our nuclear analysis  
2 section. Dr. Rowe is a special assistant to the  
3 NCNR Director.

4 And in the back, from my left to your  
5 right, Dave Brown is the head of our health physics  
6 section, Dan Flynn is the -- an SRO, Dan Hughes is a  
7 trainee right now in the operations section, Dr.  
8 Brand is the Chief of Reactor Engineering, and Mr.  
9 Copley is the consultant we choose from Envirotech  
10 to answer some of the climactic questions.

11 And I am Wade Richards, and I am the  
12 Chief of Reactor Operations and Engineering.

13 Dr. Dimeo was unable to be here today.  
14 He had a family emergency, so -- he is our Director.

15 So I will be -- I will very briefly go through his  
16 description of the NIST Center for Neutron Research  
17 at the NCNR, and then we will briefly describe the  
18 NBSR. We were asked to summarize our licensing  
19 basis accidents. We will be doing that. And then,  
20 we will get into the subcommittee followup items, if  
21 that is acceptable.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   The NIST reactor is a source of the NIST  
2 Center for Neutron Research and its neutron-  
3 scattering user facility, serving over 2,200  
4 researchers annually. Our mission is to assure that  
5 availability of neutron measurement capabilities to  
6 meet the needs of the U.S. researchers from  
7 industry, university, and other government agencies.

8                   The research done at the NCNR is highly  
9 multidisciplinary, spanning basic and applied  
10 materials research to investigate into some of  
11 nature's most fundamental questions. In most of the  
12 research done at the NCNR, neutrons are used to  
13 probe matter. In some research, the neutron itself  
14 is to be studied.

15                   Our scientific productivity is widely  
16 regarded as the highest of any neutron facility in  
17 the U.S., most recently cited in the 2008 APS  
18 report.

19                   MEMBER BANERJEE: How many beam lines do  
20 you have with that --

21                   MR. ROWE: Currently about 24. I am not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 actually giving you beam lines. What I am giving  
2 you is instrumented positions.

3 MEMBER BANERJEE: Okay. So --

4 MR. ROWE: Sometimes we share beam  
5 lines.

6 MEMBER BANERJEE: Yes.

7 MR. ROWE: But it is on the order of 20  
8 to 24. A little of it depends on how you count, but  
9 it is of that order.

10 MEMBER BANERJEE: Well, the reason I was  
11 interested in beam lines was, where do you -- you  
12 know, how many penetrations do you get to the core?

13 MR. ROWE: Okay. Penetrations going in  
14 are nine beam ports that penetrate into the reactor,  
15 plus one cold neutron port, which penetrates into  
16 the vessel. Then, there are two tangential tubes  
17 which come in underneath the fuel, so they come in  
18 low in the vessel and go across, and there are four  
19 rabbit tube possibilities.

20 MEMBER SIEBER: Yes. I have nine radial  
21 beam tubes, two through-reactor tubes, a cold

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 neutron source, a thermal column, four pneumatic  
2 tubes, and seven vertical tubes.

3 MR. ROWE: I guess I left out those  
4 other --

5 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay.

6 MR. RICHARDS: Okay. We are one of four  
7 major neutron-scattering facilities in the U.S., but  
8 the only one not run by the Department of Energy.  
9 Reports from the White House and the American  
10 Physicists Society emphasize a number of important  
11 observations regarding this essential measurement  
12 technique.

13 NIST is the only facility providing a  
14 broad range of world-class measurements and  
15 capabilities. NIST has the largest user program,  
16 mainly because of the cold neutron source, and the  
17 way to reduce the gap between the U.S. and Europe is  
18 through exploiting the best neutron sources and  
19 increasing the number of beam lines and instruments.

20 We are way behind the Europeans in neutron sources  
21 for the use of neutron-scattering.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   Given the success of the NCNR and its  
2 national and international reputation for  
3 excellence, and its critical role in the NIST  
4 mission, it is not surprising that it has received  
5 and continues to receive very strong support from  
6 senior leadership at NIST and at the Department of  
7 Commerce, to operate the NIST reactor costs  
8 effectively and while assuring safety of the staff  
9 and the general public.

10                   An example of the agency's strong  
11 commitment to the NIST Center for Neutron Research  
12 is that we are in the midst of an initiative to  
13 significantly expand our cold neutron measurement  
14 capability over the next five years as part of the  
15 American Competitive -- Competitive -- Competitiveness  
16 -- America Competes Act.

17                   (Laughter.)

18                   NIST and the Department of Commerce will  
19 continue to remain committed to the safe, reliable  
20 operation of the NIST reactor.

21                   Are there any questions on the mission

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 of the NCNR?

2 (No response.)

3 If not, I want to go into a description  
4 of the NBSR itself very briefly.

5 I guess before we get into the  
6 description of the NBSR, the Chairman indicated  
7 there was a question on aging of the NBSR. The NBSR  
8 reactor first went critical in 1967, and it has been  
9 operating -- started out at 10 megawatts?

10 MEMBER SIEBER: That's right.

11 MR. RICHARDS: I am looking at these  
12 gentleman because they have been there the --

13 (Laughter.)

14 -- 10 megawatts, then went to 15, and  
15 then went to 20. But in the time that we have been  
16 operating, very recently, as recently as about a  
17 year and a half ago, we did a vessel investigation  
18 with a boroscope. And we looked down at the areas  
19 in the reactor tank where the effects of aging would  
20 be greatest -- that is, at the tips of our beam  
21 tubes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   Let me go back here and point out -- the  
2 tips of the beam tubes --

3                   MEMBER CORRADINI: You are going to have  
4 to, unfortunately, be near a microphone.

5                   MR. RICHARDS: Let me go back to the --

6                   MEMBER CORRADINI: You have to --

7                   MR. RICHARDS: There it is.

8                   MR. ROWE: That is the tip of the cold  
9 neutron penetration, the way it is pointing at --  
10 over on the other side you can see one of the normal  
11 radial beam tubes coming in. And then, down low you  
12 can see the thermal -- the tangential tubes that run  
13 below the actual fuel --

14                  MEMBER CORRADINI: So, Mike, just like  
15 trigger reactors, which is what I think I know, you  
16 guys come in and then you cap off, so it is  
17 essentially at the end of this so-called insertion  
18 is where you are working by the insert --

19                  MR. ROWE: That is right. It is right  
20 in -- at the inner end is the highest flux point.

21                  MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. ROWE: And basically what we have  
2 done is to look at aging, look at embrittlement,  
3 and, you know, or at least as many of you know,  
4 there is an aluminum vessel. This is not a steel  
5 vessel. There is no brittle ductile transition per  
6 se.

7 And what you have is a continuous  
8 degradation of ductility with thermal neutron  
9 fluence, not fast neutron fluence. The amount of  
10 that reduction in ductibility depends on the ratio  
11 of thermal to fast.

12 What we have done to estimate the effect  
13 of aging is to look at a program that was undertaken  
14 at Brookhaven reactor, the HFBR before it was shut  
15 down, and to look at that and to compare the thermal  
16 and fast flux in that to ensure that we were  
17 comparing the right kind of radiation condition.

18 At the end of the license period that we  
19 are asking for at the moment, we will not have  
20 reached half of the fluence that they had reached in  
21 their testing program. And we are well within any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 reasonable -- ductility is still fine. We still  
2 would meet a make-before-break criterion.

3           The last thing I would mention is the --  
4 in fact, there is a very low -- as the Chairman  
5 said, there is a very low pressure vessel, and the  
6 region of highest fluence is a region of  
7 compression, not tension. Where there is no tension  
8 -- and one of the things we have in our tech spec,  
9 we look very carefully at putting anything in there  
10 which could create a pressure in there. In fact, we  
11 are doing a lot of --

12           MEMBER SIEBER: The phenomena of concern  
13 is the aluminum in the structure and the vessel when  
14 it captures neutrons it creates silicon. Silicon is  
15 an embrittling agent, and the -- this is not pure  
16 aluminum. This is already an alloy that has  
17 additives to it so that it is not so ductile. And  
18 for -- in the short run you may be improving the  
19 strength of the vessel back in the neutron  
20 embrittlement before it becomes ductile enough to  
21 show cracks.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. ROWE: Certainly, the ultimate  
2 strength is rising capacity.

3 MEMBER SIEBER: That is right.

4 MR. ROWE: At the cost of some  
5 ductility. But as I say, we have done the  
6 calculations and we satisfied that the ductility  
7 will be fine until the end of this license period.

8 MEMBER ARMIJO: Just an order of  
9 magnitude, what kind of strain would you expect from  
10 -- at end of life for this vessel?

11 MR. ROWE: What kind of strain?

12 MEMBER ARMIJO: Yes. How much strain?  
13 Is it like five percent strain capability without --

14 MEMBER SHACK: Ductility at the end of  
15 life.

16 MEMBER ARMIJO: Yes, ductility at the  
17 end of life, as measured by strain or a reduction in  
18 area --

19 MR. ROWE: I guess I can't pull that off  
20 the top of my head really quickly.

21 MEMBER ARMIJO: Just ballpark. You

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 know, is it the order of -- these are inherently  
2 very ductile materials, so big numbers are -- at  
3 beginning of life are --

4 MR. ROWE: It is several percent, but I  
5 --

6 MEMBER ARMIJO: It is several percent.

7 MR. ROWE: That is the -- I won't try to  
8 go any closer, because I don't trust my memory  
9 anymore.

10 MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay.

11 MR. ROWE: Maybe 20 years ago I would  
12 have remembered that, but --

13 MEMBER ARMIJO: You don't have any  
14 materials guys around here that might --

15 MR. ROWE: Paul, do you remember? Paul  
16 Brand.

17 MR. BRAND: I am the Chief of Reactor  
18 Engineering, and I am trained as a Metallurgist, but  
19 it is a long time ago that I have discussed this.  
20 But roughly when Mike and I looked -- last looked at  
21 this the ductility and the amount of strain you will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 get when you will do a uniaxial tensile experiment  
2 would go roughly to 50 percent to one-third. That  
3 is what I remember.

4 Before I would go in writing on that, I  
5 have to go back to that discussion with Mike.

6 MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay.

7 MR. BRAND: But it definitely doesn't go  
8 to a fraction of a percent. It goes to -- and I  
9 cannot possibly see a mechanism that would invoke  
10 that kind of ductility.

11 MEMBER ARMIJO: Yes. There is no  
12 loading mechanism.

13 MR. BRAND: There is no loading  
14 mechanism that we can think of that would invoke  
15 this. And then, add that to the fact that the thing  
16 has become a lot stronger, I don't think that this  
17 should be a consideration at this point.

18 MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay. Thank you.

19 MEMBER SHACK: What did we say the end-  
20 of-life fluence was going to be?

21 MR. ROWE: It is in the documentation,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 and I will look it up for you at the break. I just  
2 don't have it -- again, I am not going to pull  
3 things off the top of my head.

4 MEMBER SIEBER: I probably have it here.

5 MR. ROWE: I just don't trust my memory  
6 on this.

7 MEMBER SIEBER: You applied for the  
8 extension April 9, 2004. And under provisions of  
9 timely renewal, the license continues. A renewed  
10 license would be a period of 20 years from the  
11 2004 --

12 MR. ROWE: I guess the question was,  
13 what the fluence rate -- what the total fluence  
14 would be. I will look it up. I just -- I just  
15 don't want to do it off the top of my head.

16 MEMBER BANERJEE: What is the flux?  
17 What is the flux?

18 MR. ROWE: The flux is on the order of  
19 two times  $10^{14}$ . Thermals, that is the one that  
20 counts. That is the one that matters in this case,  
21 as you know. But I will get you that number.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 MEMBER SIEBER: Thank you.

2 MR. RICHARDS: Any more questions on the  
3 aging?

4 (No response.)

5 If not, we will move ahead on the very  
6 brief description of the National Bureau of  
7 Standards reactor. It is heavy water moderated and  
8 cooled, and it is enriched fuel, tank-type reactor  
9 designed to operate at 20 megawatts. It is actually  
10 a custom designed variation of the Argonne CP-5  
11 reactor.

12 MEMBER BANERJEE: There is actually no  
13 pressure in this. It is --

14 MEMBER SIEBER: It is hydrostatic  
15 pressure.

16 MEMBER BANERJEE: Hydrostatic.

17 MR. RICHARDS: Hydrostatic.

18 MEMBER BANERJEE: And you have to pump  
19 stuff through it, I take it.

20 MR. RICHARDS: It really is hydrostatic.

21 MEMBER SIEBER: It's hydrostatic.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MR. ROWE: There is --

MEMBER SIEBER: It's vented.

MR. ROWE: -- helium pressure above the vessel, above the motor in it. It sits in a few inches of water. It really is a hydrostatic process.

MR. RICHARDS: This picture depicts the four cadmium shim arms, two on this side and two on the other side.

MEMBER SIEBER: You have to sit by the mic.

MR. RICHARDS: The four cadmium shim arms and the 30 fuel elements, you can see the top of the fuel element heads, and then the one large hydrogen cold source are shown here.

The fuel element itself is very unique. It is an MTR-type element of U-308 with an aluminum-dispersion clad. It is 93 percent enriched in U-235, has about 350 grams per element, 17 plates. There are 17 plates in the upper section, and there are 17 plates in the lower section, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 you can see that there is a gap in the middle. The  
2 plates are about 13 inches long by about 2.7 inches  
3 wide, and there should be no clads.

4 (Pause.)

5 MR. ROWE: While we have a break, let me  
6 give you the number you asked for -- two times  $10^{23}$ .

7 MEMBER SHACK: And I just -- I looked up  
8 -- the elongation of that is somewhere around eight  
9 to 10 percent. So it is ductile stuff. We didn't  
10 just decide on a number between us, but I just  
11 didn't want to give you a number without --

12 MR. RICHARDS: This is the seven-inch  
13 gap, which is a rather unique feature of our fuel.  
14 It is non-fueled, and this is actually on the center  
15 line of the core, so that we are actually increasing  
16 the thermalization by not having a fueled area  
17 looking right at the center line. And then, of  
18 course, there is the lower section. The overall  
19 length of the fuel is about 70 inches.

20 MEMBER ARMIJO: Are all of the  
21 assemblies the same -- have that gap in --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. RICHARDS: Yes, they are.

2 MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay.

3 MEMBER BANERJEE: And what is the --  
4 does it have a positive void coefficient or --

5 MR. ROWE: No.

6 MEMBER SIEBER: No.

7 MR. ROWE: So we will get to that,  
8 because that was one of the questions asked. We are  
9 going to talk about that.

10 MEMBER SIEBER: All of the coefficients  
11 are negative.

12 MEMBER BANERJEE: Oh, okay. That is  
13 right there.

14 MR. RICHARDS: Yes, we just -- I tried  
15 to point it out here.

16 The MBSR includes many inherent capacity  
17 systems. The prompt neutron lifetime is long due to  
18 the heavy water. These are unique features of this  
19 heavy water reactor, makes everything very slow.  
20 The reactivity coefficients, void, and temperature  
21 are all negative.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   As the Chairman said, the reactor  
2 operates at a very low temperature compared to what  
3 you are used to seeing, and a very low pressure.  
4 And it has no large energy content.

5                   MEMBER BANERJEE: Does this have a lot  
6 of tritium?

7                   MR. RICHARDS: Oh, yes.

8                   (Laughter.)

9                   MEMBER SIEBER: Well, I think you have  
10 to --

11                  MR. RICHARDS: You probably have to  
12 quantify that.

13                  MEMBER SIEBER: There are a number of  
14 replaceable things in this reactor besides the fuel.  
15 One of them is the --

16                  MR. RICHARDS: Heavy water.

17                  MEMBER SIEBER: -- heavy water, which is  
18 replaced basically for ALARA principles, radiation  
19 dose.

20                  MR. RICHARDS: Operational  
21 considerations, yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER SIEBER: But it also aids in  
2 coolant purification. There is an online coolant  
3 purification system that is replacing the entire  
4 heavy water load, guarantees periodic refreshing of  
5 that. The same thing with the -- in fact, talking  
6 about void coefficient, one of the emergency  
7 shutdown mechanisms, the third one, is to dump the  
8 moderator out of the reactor and that shuts it down.

9                   MR. RICHARDS: One of our passive  
10 systems.

11                   MEMBER SIEBER: And the control rods are  
12 also replaced from time to time, depending on  
13 depletion as opposed to mechanical issues that might  
14 occur.

15                   MEMBER BANERJEE: So is the tritium  
16 distilled off? I mean, tritium oxide or dioxide?

17                   MR. RICHARDS: We actually have a tech  
18 spec limit on the amount of tritium that we will  
19 tolerate in the water, and it is -- when the tritium  
20 reaches the five curie level --

21                   MR. ROWE: Five curies per liter.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. RICHARDS: -- we will replace the  
2 whole tritium inventory.

3 MEMBER BANERJEE: So you --

4 MR. RICHARDS: I am sorry, the whole  
5 P20.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MEMBER BANERJEE: So you don't have an  
8 online tritium removal system.

9 MR. ROWE: No, we don't.

10 MEMBER SIEBER: No.

11 MR. ROWE: In fact, we have always  
12 replaced the heavy water far ahead of the time that  
13 we got to five times -- to five curies per liter.  
14 If we never replaced it, five curies per liter would  
15 be the limiting concentration at the end of life,  
16 but we replace it long before then, as the Chairman  
17 said, for ALARA purposes.

18 MEMBER BANERJEE: So how long does it  
19 take to reach five curies?

20 MEMBER SIEBER: Several years.

21 MR. ROWE: To reach five curies, I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1       sorry, you said? Typically, we would replace it --  
2       I am going to ask Dave Brown, who is the head of  
3       Health Physics Branch.

4                   MR. BROWN: Dave Brown, Health Physics.  
5       I would estimate about 12 years.

6                   MEMBER BANERJEE: Okay.

7                   MR. BROWN: Twelve full power operating  
8       years.

9                   MEMBER ARMIJO: What happens with the  
10       tritiated water that -- do you send it somewhere  
11       else?

12                   MEMBER SIEBER: Yes.

13                   MR. RICHARDS: We sent it to ACL. Take  
14       it and pour it in their reactor.

15                   MEMBER ARMIJO: There is nobody else.

16                   MEMBER SIEBER: Right.

17                   MEMBER BANERJEE: Well, they know how to  
18       separate it.

19                   MR. RICHARDS: Yes, they do.

20                   MEMBER BANERJEE: Okay.

21                   MR. RICHARDS: The next topic is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 licensing basis accident. We were asked to just  
2 very briefly summarize the accidents that we did  
3 analyze. The startup accident -- it is an accident  
4 that goes from 100 kilowatts to 130 percent of full  
5 power, which was 20 megawatts, at a delta rho over  
6 delta T over times  $10^{-4}$  per second.

7 Maximum reactivity insertion accident,  
8 experiment removed .5 percent delta rho in half a  
9 second. Loss of coolant accident, inlet pipe break  
10 in the process room, offsite tritium doses with this  
11 accident were found to be well within the 10 CFR  
12 Part 20 limits.

13 Misloading of a fuel element, we put a  
14 fresh element in all possible locations. The loss  
15 of flow -- if you'll notice, loss of flow, we have  
16 the loss of offsite power, and there is an asterisk  
17 on that one. And there is an asterisk on the single  
18 pump seizure. That is because of the --

19 MR. ROWE: No, five.

20 MR. RICHARDS: I'm sorry?

21 MR. ROWE: On loss of both shutdown

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 pumps, the other asterisk.

2 MR. RICHARDS: Oh, I'm sorry. It is one  
3 missing, you said?

4 MR. ROWE: It is missing, unfortunately,  
5 in the viewgraph, but it should have been on number  
6 five. It seems to show --

7 MR. RICHARDS: Oh, loss of both shutdown  
8 pumps.

9 MEMBER SHACK: So, number two, it  
10 disappears and it goes to --

11 MR. RICHARDS: There is no issue with  
12 number two. It is just on number five.

13 MR. ROWE: One and five.

14 MR. RICHARDS: One and five. Got my  
15 asterisk in the wrong place.

16 MR. ROWE: And one -- five is a  
17 modification of one, in which the shutdown pumps  
18 don't start up.

19 MR. RICHARDS: And the asterisks are  
20 there because of this situation with the coast down  
21 curve, which we will talk about.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MEMBER SIEBER: Right.

MR. RICHARDS: Throttling of the inlet valves to either plenum, and the spurious signal closing of DWV-19. This is one of the ones that you identified -- you folks asked about, and that we have done the analysis on now. And, of course, the MHA, maximum hypothetical accident, postulates a complete melting of an MTR-type fuel. And even after that melting, complete melting, we still satisfy the 10 CFR 100 limits at our site boundary.

Now, the open item that was discussed before is the fact that when we were actually doing the analysis for DWV-19, we decided to start looking at a number of flow situations besides that one, and we found that the 20-second coast down curve that is in the present SAR, and also mentioned in the SER, is incorrect. And we let the non-power branch know that what we wanted to do was do some recalculations on that coast down curve.

We are collecting the data tomorrow. We will actually get -- the reactor portion is down

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 right now. We will collect up all of the data  
2 tomorrow, and then send the analysis off to BNL to  
3 run the RELAP code for us, and we should get some  
4 updated coast down curves.

5 We consider this situation analogous to  
6 -- analogous, and bounded by the way, by the DWV-19  
7 valve situation, which we have analyzed, because  
8 that is a complete loss of flow. So we -- as the  
9 Chairman stated, we will be coming back to you  
10 probably in a month, or whenever we can get back on  
11 your calendar, with an analysis of a new coast down  
12 curve.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: What is the  
14 worth of a control rod in --

15 MR. RICHARDS: The control rods are  
16 usually worth eight to sometimes even \$10.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: Bob Williams. The group  
18 of them together is more than \$30. So roughly eight  
19 to \$10.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: So where  
21 did the .5 percent delta rho in half a second come

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 from then?

2 MR. WILLIAMS: That is from the removal  
3 of the -- an experiment from the core with the  
4 maximum reactivity allowed.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: But it  
6 doesn't have anything to do with the --

7 MR. WILLIAMS: No. Actually --

8 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: -- kind of  
9 failure?

10 MR. WILLIAMS: -- the startup accident  
11 has to do with it. The reactivity insertion rate  
12 there is our tech spec limit. So we just assume  
13 that that reactivity insertion rate continues  
14 unabated from 100 kilowatts to -- is it 100  
15 kilowatts? To full power, yes.

16 MR. ROWE: Until it's --

17 MR. WILLIAMS: Without a period scram.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: Thank you.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: That is the maximum  
20 reactivity insertion rate, and then the other  
21 accident is the experiment, the highest worth

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 experiment.

2 MEMBER SIEBER: I just might add at this  
3 time you have the SER -- SAR available to you. It's  
4 Figure 4.9 -- 4-9 in the SAR, that compares the  
5 curve of flow coast down for -- that was used in  
6 RELAP versus plant data that existed at the time.  
7 And the issue is not so much the displacement of the  
8 curve but the slope, as I see it. And the coast  
9 down slope looks to be steeper, a little bit  
10 steeper, for the actual plant data than the curve  
11 used in RELAP.

12 MEMBER BANERJEE: So I presume that the  
13 mode of cooling -- and I think we may have addressed  
14 it -- is natural circulation when the pumps --

15 MR. RICHARDS: Yes.

16 MEMBER BANERJEE: Now, you said a way to  
17 chop this thing down is to dump the heavy water,  
18 right? So what happens when you dump the heavy  
19 water?

20 MR. ROWE: It is not dumped all the way.

21 MEMBER BANERJEE: Oh. You just dump --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. ROWE: We don't empty the vessel.  
2 We drop it down until the top reflector is removed.

3 MEMBER BANERJEE: And that is enough --

4 MR. ROWE: And that is enough -- that is  
5 enough to give us a shutdown margin against full  
6 removal of all four amounts.

7 MEMBER BANERJEE: So when you drop it to  
8 that level you still have sufficient natural  
9 circulation to keep it cool?

10 MR. ROWE: No. No, you would want the  
11 pump running. And we don't use that -- that's a  
12 backup shutdown mechanism.

13 MEMBER BANERJEE: Normal shutdown is  
14 with the rods.

15 MR. ROWE: Normal shutdown is with the  
16 rods, and then we leave that water there. But where  
17 the level drops to the natural circulation would not  
18 be as good as we would want to have.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: One more thing. Bob  
20 Williams. Our inner reserve tank, then, would empty  
21 into the fuel elements in the case that they dropped

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the moderator level. So there would be cool  
2 reporting on top of the fuel.

3 MEMBER SIEBER: Yes, cool --

4 MEMBER BANERJEE: From heavy water.

5 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.

6 MEMBER BANERJEE: And where is your heat  
7 sink in this problem?

8 MR. ROWE: When it's in natural  
9 circulation? There is a vessel plus the core  
10 support structures plus the biological shield.

11 MEMBER BANERJEE: Thanks.

12 MR. ROWE: Okay.

13 MR. RICHARDS: The next area to cover is  
14 the actual response to the items that the Committee  
15 came up with from our last meeting. I would like to  
16 ask the Chairman -- I am not exactly sure how to  
17 proceed here. There are over 19 of these items, and  
18 we can either address the ones that you have -- you  
19 have all had the writeups. We can either address  
20 the questions that you have or I can go through each  
21 one and -- with a small summary.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1                   MEMBER SIEBER: I think that would be  
2 pretty time-consuming to do it that way,  
3 particularly since the answers that you provided us  
4 and the staff provided us are so thorough. What I  
5 had initially asked members to do is to look at the  
6 list that I -- we had handed out to them, to find  
7 the questions that they asked, and if they are  
8 satisfied with the answers, so be it. If they have  
9 further questions based on what they read as  
10 responses, then they should feel free to ask those  
11 followup questions.

12                   MEMBER RAY: Well, Jack, I have done as  
13 you asked, and I will start, if it's okay, with the  
14 following question.

15                   MEMBER SIEBER: Okay.

16                   MEMBER RAY: The subject is groundwater  
17 monitoring, and I have read the answer, the  
18 response. And I know I am not an expert in this.  
19 Maybe Mike Ryan --

20                   MEMBER RYAN: Could you jump in on what  
21 question it is, please, just what page you are on?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER RAY: I would if they were  
2 numbered. It happens to be on page 6 of my -- the  
3 copy I have, Mike. It's entitled ground --

4                   MEMBER SIEBER: The pages are numbered.

5                   MEMBER RAY: -- groundwater monitoring.

6 I don't have a numbering of them. I have it by  
7 titles. Anyway, as Jack has said, it is a complete  
8 response referring to this having been looked at by  
9 URS, and USGS I guess.

10                   But the conclusion seems -- can I say  
11 sort of hedged? And the rationale provided is -- I  
12 would just say reads like it is sort of, well, this  
13 is the best we can surmise. It ends by saying there  
14 appears to be a technically adequate approach to  
15 monitoring potential offsite migration of  
16 constituents in groundwater.

17                   So, anyway, it just seemed to be like  
18 less than the kind of response we would expect  
19 normally. And I wondered if there was anything  
20 stronger that could be said.

21                   MEMBER RYAN: The first rule of geology

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 is you always want to dig one more hole.

2 MEMBER RAY: Well, Mike, while I am  
3 talking here, read it yourself and see what you  
4 conclude.

5 MEMBER RYAN: No. I appreciate your  
6 point that it is not as definitive as one might  
7 like.

8 MEMBER RAY: You are a better judge of  
9 this than I would be.

10 MEMBER RYAN: I guess the proof is in  
11 the pudding on the second question. I am interested  
12 in -- because the second question informs whether we  
13 need to push the first question further. And you  
14 told -- let's see, it is the one regarding the  
15 tritium. Maybe it is not on that page, it is one  
16 later on.

17 MEMBER RAY: Right below it. Member  
18 Ryan asked about the applicant's environmental  
19 monitoring. You know, you say monitoring for  
20 tritium, and you never really said what your finding  
21 -- you are saying it is below the drinking water

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 standard, but is it 1,000 or 2,000 or 19,600?

2 MR. RICHARDS: I'd refer to Dave.

3 MR. BROWN: Dave Brown, Health Physics.

4 I guess I am wondering, what is your exact  
5 question?

6 MEMBER RYAN: Well, in the groundwater  
7 monitoring results you monitored for tritium. Can  
8 you give me a range of values that you see in  
9 groundwater?

10 MR. BROWN: Zero.

11 MEMBER RYAN: It is not zero. It is  
12 background.

13 MR. BROWN: Oh, it is background, excuse  
14 me.

15 MEMBER RYAN: Okay. So background in  
16 your area is 1,000? 800? What is the background  
17 you measured, do you know, have a range of numbers  
18 or --

19 MR. BROWN: Background --

20 MEMBER RYAN: For tritium.

21 MR. BROWN: -- for tritium?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER RYAN: Yes, picocuries per mL.

2 MR. BROWN: Picocuries per mL we are  
3 measuring -- our lower level detection is on the  
4 order of -- I am trying to convert picocuries per  
5 mL. It is like 10 -- a couple dpm per mL, and we  
6 don't see anything above that.

7 MEMBER RYAN: Okay. That is really,  
8 really low.

9 MR. BROWN: We don't measure any  
10 positive results in our environmental samples.

11 MEMBER RYAN: Really? Okay. All right.  
12 Thank you. That is fine.

13 So if the numbers are at or near  
14 background, and they are not creeping up or you  
15 don't see any trends, that is my --

16 MR. BROWN: That's correct.

17 MEMBER RYAN: -- second question, you  
18 don't see any trends up or down because you are not  
19 measuring anything. I don't mean to be critical,  
20 but there is two reasons. You are not looking in  
21 the right place, which I am thinking you are looking

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 in the right place, or the numbers really confirm  
2 that there is no area of concern.

3 So I guess with that, Harold, I am  
4 satisfied that if the tritium values are very low  
5 compared to the drinking water standard that it is  
6 reasonable to conclude that, you know, they are  
7 okay.

8 MEMBER RAY: I will accept it on that  
9 basis, then, and I really wasn't going to say I  
10 wouldn't accept it anyway. I just want to draw  
11 attention to the fact that it was a very qualified  
12 and hedged answer about why the sampling points were  
13 adequate.

14 MEMBER RYAN: The proof is in the  
15 numbers in the samples to me. That is where you  
16 really gain confidence in statements that are  
17 equivocal, you know, about what is actually  
18 happening.

19 MEMBER RAY: Yes. Well, I had a leaking  
20 spent fuel pool, and we never found anything until  
21 we dug it up. But that is okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER BANERJEE: How do you know to dig  
2 it up?

3                   MEMBER RAY: We decommissioned the  
4 plant.

5                   MEMBER SIEBER: Don't have to worry  
6 about shutting it down then.

7                   MEMBER RAY: Okay. Anyway, that is --  
8 the other one I had was on this issue of what we  
9 would normally refer to as the tech specs on the  
10 diesel generators. The answer is we don't need them  
11 anyways. They are just there as backup.

12                   It is a little confusing, because, you  
13 know, these things are always for backup. But I --  
14 in this case, I think what Jack said at the outset  
15 is probably the right way to look at it, which is at  
16 such low power density, and so on, that it is  
17 inherently safe without emergency power --  
18 electrical power supplies.

19                   So the fact that you have them out of  
20 service for an extended period of time is not  
21 something we would take exception to I guess. So,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 anyway, those are the two questions I had.

2 MEMBER RYAN: I can finish up pretty  
3 quick, Jack, if it's all right.

4 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. Go ahead.

5 MEMBER RYAN: I really appreciate the  
6 experimental review flow diagram, and so forth, that  
7 you provided. It certainly answered my question  
8 there.

9 And then, I guess on the waste question  
10 you really have until the end of facility lifetime  
11 to store waste, so --

12 MR. ROWE: Yes.

13 MEMBER RYAN: And, again, I am not  
14 looking for a further followup question, but you  
15 addressed the, you know, access and personnel  
16 control, and that kind of thing, I am sure in your  
17 in-house procedures for who can get in, when they  
18 can get in. Are you going to get to any kind of  
19 inventory where you would be, you know, of concern  
20 of how much inventory you had? Are we talking  
21 curies or thousands of curies?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 MR. RICHARDS: I am not aware we are  
2 going to get to that level, are we, Dave?

3 MEMBER RYAN: And I would permit it for  
4 storage separately from the operation of the reactor  
5 I guess.

6 MR. BROWN: Dave Brown, Health Physics.  
7 Right now there is reactor-produced material, and  
8 it is included within the reactor license.

9 MEMBER RYAN: So they are authorized to  
10 store that onsite, right?

11 MR. BROWN: As far as I know, yes.

12 MEMBER RYAN: Well, how many curies of  
13 stuff do you have in inventory in waste?

14 MR. BROWN: Right now?

15 MEMBER RYAN: Yes.

16 MR. BROWN: Well, we just did a shipment  
17 in June before the site closure, so we are very low.

18 MEMBER RYAN: So very low.

19 MR. BROWN: Millicuries.

20 MEMBER RYAN: Where would you get -- I  
21 mean, what do you think -- and, again, I am asking

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 for an insight, so please don't take this as a  
2 question, but where would you anticipate  
3 accumulation might cause you some operational, you  
4 know, concerns, where you are going to be more  
5 focused on managing the waste in storage than you  
6 are now?

7 MR. BROWN: Well, our plans are pretty  
8 straightforward. It is passive storage. When we  
9 reach a level to where we normally would ship, if  
10 there is no site available to ship it to we will put  
11 it in the same type of package, transfer it to one  
12 of these storage facilities, and put the sealed lead  
13 on it and wait for a --

14 MEMBER RYAN: Around the storage areas.

15 MR. BROWN: Yes.

16 MEMBER RYAN: Yes, okay. And how many  
17 years in between shipments did you go?

18 MR. BROWN: Four to five.

19 MEMBER RYAN: Four to five.

20 MR. BROWN: That is for the Class C  
21 waste.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER RYAN: Right. Okay. Thank you.  
2                   That's it. I just -- that is good enough detail.  
3                   I appreciate the followup. Thanks so much.

4                   MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. Does any other  
5                   member have followup questions to the questions that  
6                   they posed at the last meeting --

7                   MEMBER STETKAR: Yes.

8                   MEMBER SIEBER: -- based on the answers?

9                   MEMBER STETKAR: A few, and I know we  
10                  are short on time here, so --

11                  MEMBER SIEBER: Go ahead.

12                  MEMBER STETKAR: The DWV-19 closure, I  
13                  really appreciate all of the analysis you did, but a  
14                  couple of questions. One is the conclusion is that  
15                  the maximum temperature remains quite low for at  
16                  least a couple of hours, if not longer than that.  
17                  And you make the statement that there has been ample  
18                  opportunity to reopen the valve and provide  
19                  supplemental cooling.

20                  If you can't open the valve, suppose you  
21                  can't open the valve, it has fallen apart, are there

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 other -- you mentioned other vent paths and things  
2 like that, and I couldn't find -- I didn't have  
3 enough wherewithal to go try to search through  
4 different drawings, because part of the question was  
5 also on venting -- vent capability. Are there  
6 enough vent paths available that you could remove  
7 heat, you know, in the event that you couldn't get  
8 that valve open, if the gate --

9 MR. ROWE: We have enough vent paths  
10 that we don't have to worry about pressure, in spite  
11 of the fact that DWV-19 remains closed. We are  
12 vented as well as -- we have vents equivalent to the  
13 one that is beyond the pipe. But heat transfer goes  
14 -- we actually have done measurements looking at  
15 what happens over -- for a long period of time. We  
16 would be fine for a long time.

17 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Okay.

18 MR. ROWE: It has been measured. And I  
19 can't give you a good calculation.

20 MEMBER STETKAR: Well, that was my  
21 sense. I was just curious whether there was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 something magic about this couple of hours, and we  
2 would have enough time to --

3 MR. ROWE: The statement about a couple  
4 of hours is under normal circumstances what we would  
5 do is -- as soon as we had the problem, we would go  
6 down, and there is a disconnect for the automatic  
7 operator. We would use that disconnect and close  
8 them manually.

9 Now, if the valve completely failed,  
10 that is not -- that is obviously not what we are  
11 going to do. Well, I guess you wait for it to  
12 happen, understand the question, and then we would  
13 be fine. We would have to --

14 MEMBER STETKAR: I was --

15 MR. ROWE: -- understand how to deal  
16 with it over the longer term.

17 MEMBER STETKAR: Occasionally valves  
18 fall apart.

19 MR. ROWE: Occasionally valves fall  
20 apart.

21 MEMBER STETKAR: Not very frequently.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 That is enough, because of the time.

2 Responses on -- we had questions on the  
3 general topic of single failure criterion. But you  
4 made the statement that says because you only have  
5 one DC bus, one DC power supply is adequate because  
6 DC power is not necessary to achieve or maintain  
7 safe shutdown. That was a simple --

8 MR. ROWE: Right.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: -- sentence. There  
10 were a couple of amplifying paragraphs after that  
11 sentence, but those paragraphs basically describe  
12 redundancy and instrumentation and things like that  
13 that -- it is not clear if you had -- if you didn't  
14 have any DC power you would have any  
15 instrumentation.

16 So I was curious, what is the basis for  
17 the statement that said DC power is not necessary to  
18 achieve or maintain safe shutdown?

19 MR. ROWE: Let me first try and explain  
20 what the supplementary paragraphs were intended for,  
21 and then try to answer your actual question. In the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 supplementary paragraphs we are addressing the  
2 question which had been asked about diversity of  
3 detection capability.

4 And there was some question -- and I  
5 don't remember who asked the question anymore, but  
6 anyway there was a question about, was it really a  
7 single detector in which the failure --

8 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Those are not  
9 relevant to the --

10 MR. ROWE: But safe shutdown goes -- we  
11 can scram, and after rescrum that is all we have to  
12 do. With DC power you are not required to scram.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Right.

14 MR. ROWE: And we can scram. And the  
15 reactor, when it has scram, it will just sit there.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Okay. That's  
17 what I thought. I got a bit confused whether the  
18 second --

19 MR. ROWE: I'm sorry.

20 MEMBER STETKAR: -- was somehow a  
21 qualification of that first statement somehow.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MR. ROWE:  And then, the only other ones  
2                   I had were I understand now -- thank you very much  
3                   -- I had a question about scaling of the return  
4                   period or the frequency on high wind speed, the 100  
5                   mile per hour wind speed.  And I understand now how  
6                   the calculation was performed.  It is not -- still  
7                   not clear to me how data derived from wind speeds in  
8                   Kingston, Jamaica, are necessarily relevant to  
9                   scaling of wind speeds in Rockville or Gaithersburg,  
10                  Maryland.

11                  What I -- that is just a whiny statement  
12                  in a sense.  The real question I had was I  
13                  understand now how the numbers that you used were  
14                  calculated.  My question was:  how do you account  
15                  for the actual historical data that I pointed out in  
16                  the subcommittee meeting about high wind speeds  
17                  measured here in the greater metropolitan D.C. area?

18                  And there is a paragraph -- and I  
19                  honestly don't understand -- it is on page 22 for  
20                  the other Committee members, the middle of the page.

21                  And I would like you to explain to me a little bit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 better what that discussion means about -- it starts  
2 off, "These data points are relevant only to the  
3 extent," and so forth. So if somebody could help me  
4 out on that, I would really appreciate it.

5 MR. CROSBY: Good afternoon. My name is  
6 John Crosby. I am with Envirotech. I am a  
7 consultant to NIST on the project. We did the  
8 climate study.

9 It is an interesting question. Let me  
10 just read through. Is your question at the end, the  
11 last sentence, sir, about the --

12 MEMBER STETKAR: It was actually the  
13 whole paragraph.

14 MR. CROSBY: The whole paragraph.

15 MEMBER STETKAR: Well, yes, the whole --  
16 I was trying to understand a little bit better what  
17 the --

18 MR. CROSBY: There doesn't seem to be a  
19 method to incorporate data that happened, and I will  
20 say yesterday, not in a sarcastic way, but in the  
21 recent future to put those into the tables that are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 used in these volumes provided by ASME and others.  
2 So, in effect, something that happened in the last  
3 few years hasn't been incorporated and would -- but  
4 would be incorporated in the next update of the  
5 volume.

6 MEMBER STETKAR: Oh. Is that -- oh.

7 MR. CROSBY: That is what we are trying  
8 to say.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: Ah. That is --

10 MR. CROSBY: I apologize.

11 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Now I understand  
12 what you are trying to say.

13 MR. CROSBY: Then, what we tried to do  
14 was explain that in the old days -- in recent past  
15 they would use the highest wind data per year, the  
16 one epochal data point.

17 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

18 MR. CROSBY: Currently, they are using  
19 what they call peaks over threshold, so they are  
20 trying to determine what is this threshold supposed  
21 to be, and then any time the wind goes above that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that data point would count, which makes it a much  
2 better data set, much more realistic.

3 So they could -- because there could be  
4 many data points above this threshold. And that was  
5 the last sentence where apparently there is an  
6 ongoing discussion point about what that threshold  
7 would be, so --

8 MEMBER STETKAR: Oh, okay. Thank you.  
9 I now understand what that paragraph means. I am  
10 not sure if it answers my original concern, because  
11 I think --

12 MR. CROSBY: Well, the original  
13 concern --

14 MEMBER STETKAR: The original concern  
15 was basically taking your -- the curve that you show  
16 in Figure 1, which is derived from data in Jamaica  
17 --

18 MR. CROSBY: Yes, right.

19 MEMBER STETKAR: -- and saying how --  
20 how would that curve change if I actually looked at  
21 historical wind data for this area?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. CROSBY: Right.

2 MEMBER STETKAR: Which in principle you  
3 could do.

4 MR. CROSBY: I would refer you then to  
5 that Table C6-7 at the top of page 22. The data  
6 from Kingston, Jamaica, because of the fact that it  
7 is a well-instrumented island, they are able to  
8 collect a lot of data there over a number of years,  
9 and they developed the numbers in Table 1 on page 21  
10 as well as confirmed this reverse Weibull curve,  
11 which is the curve on the top of page 21.

12 What they show is that the numbers are  
13 actually higher than what the current ASCE shows in  
14 that Table C6-7. So --

15 MEMBER STETKAR: But that is an average  
16 of the continental United States, and I am talking  
17 about --

18 MR. CROSBY: Right.

19 MEMBER STETKAR: -- you know, the D.C.  
20 area.

21 MR. CROSBY: But we have --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 MEMBER STETKAR: Which might be better  
2 or worse, but I don't know.

3 MR. CROSBY: Right. Well, the wind  
4 curve data, though, that we -- I hate to keep  
5 flipping here. Let me just go back a minute. There  
6 are wind speed charts, if you will, like the one we  
7 show on page 19. While it is in wind pressures as  
8 opposed to velocity, you can basically see that we  
9 are in a very, very low wind area compared to, say,  
10 the south tip of Florida, which receives hurricanes,  
11 or the Outer Banks. Those darker areas have much,  
12 much higher potential wind velocities than we do.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Yes.

14 MR. CROSBY: I think if we were on the  
15 coast, we would have a much bigger concern about the  
16 winds than we do here from hurricanes.

17 MEMBER STETKAR: Thanks. And because of  
18 the time, I -- you have explained -- I understand.  
19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. CROSBY: You're welcome.

21 MEMBER SIEBER: John, any further

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 questions?

2 MEMBER STETKAR: I don't have -- I have  
3 some for the staff, but we need to get them --

4 MEMBER BROWN: Just one other one on the  
5 radiation monitors. You talk about -- this is on  
6 the redundancy. How did you get redundancy? And  
7 you mentioned your basic reactor monitoring devices.

8 You are required to have a redundancy by your tech  
9 specs, I presume. So you've got two, and I presume  
10 one out of two is enough to shut you down on any one  
11 of the particular functions, is that correct?

12 MR. ROWE: That's correct.

13 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. And then, you went  
14 on to talk about the radiation monitors for airborne  
15 radioactive material. You said you had two  
16 detectors monitoring the normal air and irradiated  
17 air drawn into the building air exhaust system. And  
18 I didn't quite catch -- and you had -- your third  
19 one was actually monitoring stack exhaust.

20 MR. ROWE: Yes.

21 MEMBER BROWN: So I am not quite -- what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 is this -- you said measure normal air. Is this  
2 from outside the building, bringing it in into the  
3 intake? Are you talking about normal air into the  
4 exhaust or irradiated air into the exhaust?

5 MR. ROWE: Let me try, and if I get in  
6 trouble I will bring Dan Flynn in. We have two  
7 different air systems within the reactor, two  
8 different ventilation systems -- one that we call  
9 normal air, which is just taking air out of the  
10 normal places, others that we call the active air  
11 system, where we -- there are actually places where  
12 we expect that we might have a problem, close to the  
13 beam port, places where we might generate argon.

14 So those are the two systems, but they  
15 are both taking air from inside the reactor and  
16 taking it to the outside.

17 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. So there is one  
18 detector in each of those, and each one of them is  
19 supposed to cause a scram, if it detects radiation  
20 according to the statements in here. Okay? Is that  
21 correct?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. ROWE: I'll let Dan --

2 MR. FLYNN: Dan Flynn, Reactor  
3 Operations.

4 MEMBER BROWN: There is three of them.  
5 There is normal air, irradiated air expected places,  
6 and then there is the stack, stuff going out to the  
7 environment.

8 MR. ROWE: Right.

9 MEMBER BROWN: So just two of those  
10 three?

11 MR. FLYNN: We need two out of the  
12 three. Dan Flynn, Reactor Operations. We need two  
13 out of three. Each channel will give you a scram.

14 MEMBER BROWN: But two out of -- oh, you  
15 need two out of three to be operational? Is that  
16 what you mean?

17 MR. FLYNN: That is correct. Each  
18 channel will give you a scram at 50,000 counts.

19 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. All right. Thank  
20 you.

21 MEMBER SIEBER: Any additional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 questions?

2 MEMBER ARMIJO: Just a couple of things  
3 on the spent fuel pool. I asked questions about  
4 that.

5 I was looking for any issues related to  
6 accidents, and not necessarily criticality, but, you  
7 know, things dropping on the fuel, misloading, which  
8 actually is a criticality event. So that is what I  
9 was looking for, but I -- I think you pretty much  
10 answered that question.

11 But in the case of the criticality  
12 analysis, you do some very conservative analysis.  
13 And do you or don't you take into account the Boral  
14 in your racks?

15 MR. WILLIAMS: No, I do not.

16 MEMBER ARMIJO: You do not.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: I did not take into  
18 account any poisons when I did those calculations.  
19 And I didn't take into account structural material  
20 either. I just put the fuel in the geometry that it  
21 is with water and concrete. The only exception was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 one rack had stainless steel cans, and I put the  
2 stainless steel there. But that doesn't make a huge  
3 difference.

4 MEMBER ARMIJO: Which are the racks that  
5 have the Boral? Is it most of your racks?

6 MR. WILLIAMS: No. Two of them do, and  
7 two of them don't. There is a rack that holds 24  
8 elements I think, 22, that -- whether it's Boral  
9 separating the pairs of elements, that are just in  
10 two rows. And then, the combination rack that has  
11 one row of fuel elements and shelves with fuel  
12 pieces. The fuel pieces would be one section of our  
13 fuel element, just where the plates are.

14 MEMBER ARMIJO: In your operations, do  
15 you have to assure yourself that the Boral is still  
16 effective? You know, there is a current issue in  
17 power reactors that some Boral is losing its neutron  
18 capture ability.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: I heard that. I don't --  
20 I don't really know. But that is why I didn't  
21 include it in the calculations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MEMBER SIEBER: Right.

2 MEMBER ARMIJO: So it is not in your  
3 calculations.

4 MEMBER SIEBER: Not in the --

5 MEMBER ARMIJO: It is in the safety  
6 analysis that --

7 MR. WILLIAMS: That is correct.

8 MEMBER ARMIJO: Okay.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Just in case.

10 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay.

11 MEMBER ARMIJO: All right. Thank you.

12 MEMBER SIEBER: Any further questions?

13 MEMBER BANERJEE: I just have a general  
14 question. What is the largest sort of credible  
15 penetration that could break, and how long would it  
16 take your tank to drain them? Is there a  
17 penetration into the tank that could conceivably  
18 break? And, if it did, how long would it take the  
19 tank to drain through that?

20 MR. ROWE: The answer to the first  
21 question is not in any credible way that we have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 found. We have calculated the worth of flooding the  
2 tanks, and that is all well within the controls  
3 of --

4 MEMBER BANERJEE: There are no pipes  
5 leading in/out of the tank?

6 MR. ROWE: Well, only the one that we  
7 analyzed in the loss of coolant accident. We did an  
8 analysis without -- without saying how it happened,  
9 and said that we had a rupture in the lower part  
10 under the reactor, we had a complete rupture. I  
11 don't remember the time it took to drain, but that  
12 is one of the accidents that we actually analyzed.

13 MEMBER BANERJEE: And you made up --

14 MR. ROWE: But that would be the fastest  
15 way to drain it that I know of. I can't think of a  
16 faster way to drain it.

17 MEMBER BANERJEE: Yes. I wasn't at the  
18 subcommittee meeting, so I -- so you did analyze  
19 that.

20 MR. ROWE: We analyzed the loss of  
21 coolant.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER BANERJEE:  Emergency water which  
2                   is --

3                   MR. ROWE:  Yes, we do.  We have a  
4                   completely passive emergency tank, which will start  
5                   to drain.  That is adequate for half an hour.  With  
6                   a single reactor operator intervention, we are good  
7                   for a couple of hours.  Following that, we have  
8                   backup systems to either use potable water or to  
9                   bring the heavy water back up from where it is  
10                  collected in the process room and feed it back in.

11                  MEMBER SIEBER:  We are running a little  
12                  bit behind time, so if there are additional  
13                  questions that are important to the process, let me  
14                  know now.  If not, I would like to thank the  
15                  applicant for being well prepared and responsive to  
16                  our questions and concerns, and invite the staff to  
17                  just summarize the preparation of their SER.

18                  And while they are getting ready to do  
19                  that -- and thank you very much -- I will point out  
20                  that because of the complexity of licensing and  
21                  relicensing of Type 104 reactors there is a standard

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 review plan which each of you got a copy. It is  
2 NUREG-1737, and it was published about 13 years ago.

3 Volume 1 tells applicants how to write  
4 their final safety analysis report and tech specs.  
5 Volume 2 tells the NRC staff how to review it and  
6 what the acceptance criteria are.

7 This process that NIST has gone through  
8 now has basically updated the FSAR, since they are  
9 not required to annually update the FSAR for this  
10 type of reactor, as power reactors are required to  
11 do.

12 And so the review job is extensive. The  
13 SER has been provided to all of you electronically.

14 At least I got a paper copy of it, which I will  
15 give to anybody who wants it. And maybe you can  
16 summarize the findings and conclusion from your  
17 review.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Good  
20 afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members  
21 of the subcommittee. My name is William Kennedy. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 am the NRR Project Manager for this license renewal.

2 I want to thank you all for being here, and also  
3 thank the members of the subcommittee for raising  
4 some good concerns that really helped us to improve  
5 the process overall and the review of the  
6 application.

7 And my goal today is just to provide  
8 common understanding for everyone regarding our  
9 conclusions in the safety evaluation report or  
10 resolution of the open items. And also, if there  
11 are any additional questions regarding your concerns  
12 from the subcommittee meeting, I can try to address  
13 those as well.

14 What I am going to cover briefly is the  
15 licensing history, the staff review criteria,  
16 overview of the safety evaluation report, resolution  
17 of the open item, and I can mention again briefly  
18 the additional open item if there are more questions  
19 on that.

20 This reactor was originally licensed for  
21 construction in 1963, and received a provisional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 license from the Atomic Energy Commission for short-  
2 term operation, kind of start up and verify the  
3 reactor was operating as designed. That was in  
4 1967.

5 They got their 15-year license in 1970.

6 They applied for a license renewal and a power  
7 uprate in 1980, and that was -- the license was  
8 issued in 1984. And we recently received the  
9 application in 2004 for the current licensing  
10 action.

11 Some of the requirements have already  
12 been covered, so I am going to go through these  
13 briefly. Part 54 does not apply to test reactors,  
14 and there is a statement in the Atomic Energy Act  
15 calling for the minimum amount of regulation  
16 necessary for the NRC to complete its obligations  
17 under the Atomic Energy Act.

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: Just for background.

19 The Section 104, that was instituted for primarily  
20 test reactors or for what was the -- what you know  
21 to be the historical intent? I assume --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 MR. KENNEDY: Research and test  
2 reactors, yes. The test reactor criteria that  
3 applies in this case is that the power level is over  
4 10 megawatts, not that they do excursion testing or  
5 fuel testing. It is just based on power level  
6 alone.

7 MEMBER CORRADINI: And then, this goes  
8 down to a level of what? The Section 104 goes down  
9 to any power you want.

10 MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

11 MEMBER SIEBER: If it's critical, it's  
12 in there.

13 MR. KENNEDY: We have five watts and --

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: I just wanted to make  
15 sure. Thanks.

16 MR. KENNEDY: This has already been  
17 covered. Just to clarify, Part 100 is applicable to  
18 test reactors, but it is only -- only the part about  
19 accident doses. The seismic appendix is not  
20 applicable.

21 This is our standard review plan, NUREG-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 1537, and we are doing the application and also  
2 associated reg guides, standards, and other NUREGs.

3           These are the areas we reviewed.  
4 Seismic and groundwater monitoring fall under the  
5 siting criteria; the structures, systems, and  
6 components; reactor characteristics like the  
7 moderator, void, and temperature coefficients;  
8 electrical power systems, including the backup power  
9 systems that are provided for defense-in-depth,  
10 their experiment program.

11           We spent a lot of work on the accident  
12 analyses and also rewrote essentially the technical  
13 specifications to conform to the format of the  
14 current standard. And we also looked at prior use  
15 of reactor components, which you would call aging.

16           These are the principal safety  
17 conclusions that we reached as a result of our  
18 review. We found that the structures, systems, and  
19 components that are important to safety continue to  
20 be acceptable, and we can expect them to ensure safe  
21 operation of the facility. We also concluded that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the licensee's management organization is acceptable  
2 to maintain and operate the reactor safely.

3 The research programs at the reactor,  
4 including a failure of those programs, will not pose  
5 a significant risk to continued safe operation.  
6 They do have limits in their technical  
7 specifications that cover the experiment program,  
8 and those limits were appropriately analyzed for  
9 accidents.

10 We also concluded that routine exposures  
11 will be below the limits in Part 20 for members of  
12 the public and personnel at the facility, and there  
13 won't be any releases to the environment in excess  
14 of the concentration limits specified in Appendix B  
15 to Part 20. And they also have provisions for  
16 maintaining doses as low as reasonably achievable.

17 MEMBER CORRADINI: Just for my own  
18 edification -- I should have asked the licensee, but  
19 you probably know -- what is the curie content of  
20 tritium residing in the reactor on a basis?

21 MR. KENNEDY: The number of curies

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 total?

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes, approximate.

3 MR. KENNEDY: I don't know that number.

4 We heard that the --

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Or how about --

6 MR. KENNEDY: -- concentration limit was  
7 five curies per liter of primary coolant.

8 MEMBER CORRADINI: Is it significantly  
9 below that?

10 MEMBER SIEBER: Yes.

11 MR. KENNEDY: I would ask the licensee  
12 to clarify that.

13 MR. BROWN: Dave Brown, Health Physics.

14 We are currently about 1.1 curie per liter.

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: How many liters do  
16 you have? How many liters do you have in the  
17 vessel?

18 MEMBER SIEBER: It is six feet by 12  
19 feet, so --

20 MEMBER CORRADINI: So it is like about  
21 100,000 curies.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER BLEY:  What are you just before  
2 you discharge and start over again?  How high does  
3 it get?

4                   MR. BROWN:  Historically, anywhere  
5 between one and a half to two and a half curies per  
6 liter.  It is about 100,000 pounds of D<sub>2</sub>O in the  
7 system, so convert that, maybe 40,000 liters.

8                   MEMBER SIEBER:  Right.

9                   MEMBER CORRADINI:  Thank you.

10                  MR. KENNEDY:  Okay.  And we also  
11 concluded based on our review of the accident  
12 analyses that the licensee has conservatively  
13 considered a range of accidents, including a maximum  
14 hypothetical accident that is bounding in its  
15 consequences.  And the radiological consequences of  
16 this maximum hypothetical accident are below the  
17 guidelines in Part 100, and actually well below the  
18 limit for members of the public in 10 CFR Part 20.  
19 I think total dose was around eight millirem, I  
20 believe.

21                  I mentioned that we -- there was a lot

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 of work done to update and get the tech specs into  
2 conformance with the standard, and found -- we  
3 concluded that those tech specs and the operating  
4 license provide reasonable assurance that this  
5 facility can be operated as it has been analyzed,  
6 and that that won't lead to any adverse consequences  
7 to public health and safety or the environment or  
8 facility personnel.

9           And we also found that there has not  
10 been any significant degradation of structures,  
11 systems, or components related to safety, and the  
12 surveillance requirements in the technical  
13 specifications ensure that any degradation will be  
14 caught in a timely manner and remedied.

15           MEMBER STETKAR: Can I ask about the --  
16 this came up at a subcommittee meeting. We had a  
17 few questions about surveillance requirements. I  
18 wanted to ask you because the response that we  
19 received from NIST explains a rationale. Is the  
20 staff okay with the fact that NIST is essentially  
21 taking a number of exceptions to the surveillance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 intervals specified in the ANSI ANS standards?

2           You know, for example, quarterly tests,  
3 quarterly functional testing of pumps, they say,  
4 well, once a year is good enough because their  
5 experience is that they haven't had any pump  
6 failures. And the staff is okay with that?

7           MR. KENNEDY: Yes. Not -- we are not  
8 okay with it purely based on your statement that  
9 they haven't had any pump failures, so let's extend  
10 the surveillance requirement.

11           MEMBER STETKAR: But, I mean, you --

12           MR. KENNEDY: Based on other  
13 considerations, including ALARA and the number of  
14 redundant systems they have, the quarterly testing  
15 -- annual testing I believe is what the new  
16 requirement is, would be adequate.

17           MEMBER STETKAR: I just wanted to be  
18 sure that you thought about that. I mean --

19           MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

20           MEMBER STETKAR: -- you can do --

21           MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

MR. KENNEDY: And I had a discussion while I was at the site for the seismic walkdown about the emergency power surveillance requirements or the backup power surveillance requirements. And the diesel -- the diesel surveillance requirement is in conformance with the standard. It is less restrictive than their old surveillance requirement, but it is in conformance with the standard.

And based on their operational experience with the backup battery, the slow decline in performance of that battery would be caught by annual surveillance before it became an actual issue. The battery is double the size it needs to be, and the degradation is not a rapid process that wouldn't be caught.

Not discussed here, but also in our review, were the physical security plan and the emergency plan. They were both found to be acceptable. And, finally, we concluded that the continued operation of this facility does not pose a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 significant risk to public health and safety,  
2 facility personnel, or the environment.

3 In terms of the open item, it was a  
4 timing requirement in their operator training and  
5 requalification program. They simply changed that  
6 requirement to be -- to meet the regulation. That  
7 is all documented.

8 MEMBER SIEBER: Right.

9 MR. KENNEDY: If there are any other  
10 questions about this new open item, I can briefly  
11 address them. Otherwise, I think everything that we  
12 know now has been said.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: I don't have any on the  
14 additional ones, but I did have one that I wanted to  
15 ask you. And this is -- I -- one of the questions I  
16 had on the meteorological stuff was rain-over-snow  
17 loading on the roof and how that analysis was done.

18 The response essentially says that the ASCE  
19 requirements basically don't require you to add rain  
20 loading as long as the expected snow loading is  
21 greater than, whatever it is, 20 pounds per square

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 foot or something like that.

2 Now, I know historically the staff has  
3 always required a rain-on-snow loading. What is  
4 your position on that? Are you willing -- do you  
5 accept the fact that -- essentially, what they are  
6 saying is it doesn't make any difference how you do  
7 the rain-over-snow loading, because basically they  
8 are not required to do that according to the ASCE  
9 standard, which is true if you read the standard.

10 MEMBER SIEBER: It has to meet the local  
11 building code.

12 MEMBER STETKAR: It has got to meet the  
13 local building codes, but I --

14 MEMBER BROWN: Right.

15 MEMBER STETKAR: -- know in other types  
16 of licensing applications the NRC staff has  
17 required, despite that, that you have to put the  
18 rain on top of snow. So it is --

19 MEMBER BLEY: Which nature does.

20 MEMBER STETKAR: Which nature does also.

21 But, I mean, theoretically the ASCE thinks about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the nature of that. So I was just curious whether  
2 the -- if their essential statement that they don't  
3 really need to do that, and, therefore, however they  
4 add the rain doesn't make any difference is -- is  
5 kind of an acceptable position to the staff.

6 MR. KENNEDY: Well, if they hadn't  
7 provided that in the application, if they had just  
8 provided the standard in the application and we  
9 reviewed that, that would have been acceptable.

10 MEMBER STETKAR: That would have?

11 MR. KENNEDY: According to our guidance,  
12 yes.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Thanks. That is  
14 all -- that is basically what I was asking.

15 MEMBER SIEBER: That is the requirement,  
16 and you have met the requirement.

17 MR. KENNEDY: Once I saw their -- that  
18 statement in their response to our RAIs to address  
19 your concerns, I felt that what they had done  
20 originally was a conservative analysis and  
21 acceptable.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER STETKAR: That is true. And the  
2 reason I didn't ask them about the analysis is I  
3 just wanted to make sure the staff was okay with  
4 just meeting the standard, because I am familiar  
5 with other applications where people have made that  
6 argument and the staff has come back and said,  
7 "Well, that is not the way we want you to do the  
8 analysis." So thanks. That is it. I am happy.

9                   MR. KENNEDY: That is all I have, unless  
10 there are other questions.

11                   MEMBER SIEBER: Okay. We are running a  
12 little bit behind. I appreciate the work that the  
13 applicant has done, and also the staff. In my  
14 tenure with the ACRS, that is one of the nicest jobs  
15 I have had dealing with both the applicant and the  
16 staff, and very interesting.

17                   I think that both have been thorough in  
18 the performance of the update of the FSAR, and the  
19 rethinking of some of the accident analysis where  
20 there was questions, and also in the development of  
21 the technical specifications. And so I thank all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 for the effort that has been placed to this project.

2 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I turn it  
3 back to you, just a minute or two late.

4 CHAIRMAN BONACA: No, just on time.

5 MEMBER SIEBER: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN BONACA: We will take a break.  
7 Come back at 2:45.

8 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing matter  
9 went off the record at 2:29 p.m. and  
10 went back on the record at 2:46 p.m.)

11 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Let's resume the  
12 meeting.

13 The next item on the agenda is the draft  
14 final Regulatory Guide 1.211, Qualification of  
15 Safety-Related Cables and Field Splices for Nuclear  
16 Powerplants. And Otto Maynard will take us through  
17 the presentation.

18 MEMBER MAYNARD: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Chairman.

20 I never thought cable qualification  
21 could be so exciting until I got this --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

(Laughter.)

We previously reviewed this subject last September, and during that meeting some of the members questioned the scope. We had some questions on things, and there was also a little bit of confusion over some of the changes, and that wasn't necessarily all the staff's fault; it was the documents we were looking at. So we thought it best to come back and discuss it at a future meeting, so that is what we are here today for.

We will be hearing from the staff, and then we also have comments from NUGEQ. I think all of you got a copy of the letter from NUGEQ on the -- some of the issues and concerns that they had, so we will be hearing from them at the end of this meeting, too. So I want to make sure we leave time at the end.

A couple of things I will point out that at least from what I read has changed, and the staff and NUGEQ can both correct me if I am wrong. One of the key things on the position of condition

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 monitoring, the scope has changed. That is one of  
2 the areas that we -- some of the members have  
3 questioned a subset of risk-significant, safety-  
4 related. And I believe now the scope is for  
5 basically what is in the maintenance rule.

6 And I also want to just point out, as we  
7 are listening to the staff here, and then get to the  
8 NUGEQ, the NUGEQ is challenging the need for the  
9 condition monitoring, whether the data really  
10 supports the need for that, and also the scope of --  
11 we thought the original scope that the staff had was  
12 better than what it is now, and then also the  
13 special condition monitoring, that it lacks some  
14 specificity, it is pretty broad.

15 So we will be hearing more about that,  
16 and we will be hearing more from the staff. So  
17 right now I will turn it over to the staff to begin  
18 their presentation of Reg. Guide 1.211.

19 MR. AGGARWAL: Mr. Chairman, and the  
20 members of the Committee, good afternoon. As  
21 pointed out to you, the staff is here to make a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 presentation to you on Reg. Guide 1.211, with the  
2 expectation the Committee will agree with the  
3 position taken by the staff and look forward to  
4 receiving a letter.

5 Let me point for a moment -- recap a  
6 little background about this reg guide. As you  
7 aware, the IEEE Standard 383, first time was issued  
8 in 1974, and for 30 years actually nothing was done.

9 IEEE worked on this previously. They issued a  
10 standard in 2003, which in my opinion, in the  
11 staff's opinion, is a much-improved standard, and it  
12 actually meets the NRC requirement.

13 As you know, often these standards being  
14 a process of society, they want to write the best  
15 standard. Sometimes it happens that we may take an  
16 exception if we feel that the information given in a  
17 given standard is not enough. This is how we took  
18 the exceptions in this particular standard, which I  
19 will talk to you very briefly.

20 Ultimately, DG-1132 was issued for  
21 public comment in June 2007, and at that time we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 have taken 10 exceptions to the IEEE standard. We  
2 received five comment letters from five different  
3 organizations. And, as you know, we met with you on  
4 September 4th and made a presentation.

5 Now, I would also like to point out  
6 again that this is Standard 383. To improve the  
7 standard, the whole thing is based on testing of  
8 non-prototype cable. As you know, in a given week  
9 at a powerplant you use thousands and millions of  
10 feet of cable, and often a manufacturer will qualify  
11 a given cable based on the standard. And then, many  
12 times they will allow -- they use the same analogy  
13 to qualify by analysis cables of different kinds.

14 The bottom line is there is only one  
15 prototype for a given cable, and that is all this  
16 standard is limited to. Okay?

17 Next one.

18 Now I would like to address some of the  
19 questions which were raised at the meeting in  
20 September with the ACRS. The first question was  
21 raised that -- provide the definition of "risk-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 significant, safety-related cable." The Committee  
2 found that there was no precise information  
3 available, and the staff agreed. We went and looked  
4 in a number of regulations. The term is not really  
5 very precisely defined.

6 Therefore, the staff decided to remove  
7 those terms and said, okay, let them use the term  
8 which is commonly understood for years, and we ran  
9 -- okay, let's go back to the maintenance rule. So  
10 what we are saying, only those safety-related cable,  
11 cables -- safety-related cable, not non-safety-  
12 related cable, only the safety-related cable which  
13 falls under the maintenance rule should be the scope  
14 of the guide.

15 Again, the licensees expect you will --  
16 is supposed to know where the hottest spots are in  
17 these plants, and he can only know that by knowing  
18 the monitoring of radiation and the temperature.  
19 Once they know, so they can focus on those safety-  
20 related cables, which are in those hottest parts.

21 Based on that --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Do you mean the  
2 safety-related -- all the cables that are part of  
3 the safety-related system are themselves safety-  
4 related? Is that what these safety-related cables  
5 are?

6                   MR. AGGARWAL: After they had determined  
7 -- defined that in 50.49, and essentially it tells  
8 you that, again, what I am saying it is in the  
9 maintenance rule, have safety-related cables plus  
10 non-safety-related cables. This guide is going to  
11 address only safety-related cable.

12                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: The maintenance  
13 rule actually identifies safety-related cables?  
14 That's -- I don't --

15                   MR. KOSHY: Safety-related is those  
16 systems that are relied on for accident mitigation  
17 and the whole definition of --

18                   MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: I understand that.

19                   MR. KOSHY: But the maintenance rule has  
20 safety-related and more in it. But what we are  
21 saying is the subset of the maintenance rule cable,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 which are also classified as safety-related, are  
2 within the scope of this reg guide.

3 MEMBER SHACK: So you really do mean  
4 "and." You want safety-related and covered by the  
5 maintenance rule.

6 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Yes.

7 MEMBER MAYNARD: So this is really very  
8 close to the same scope that you had before. Before  
9 you called it risk-significant safety-related. Now  
10 you are saying the maintenance rule that are safety-  
11 related.

12 CHAIRMAN BONACA: And it is important.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Just to make sure I  
14 understand, things that come up in license renewal  
15 are underground cables that provide a station  
16 blackout recovery function, which are typically non-  
17 safety-related cables. Those would not be covered  
18 by this, is that correct?

19 MR. AGGARWAL: That is correct.

20 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

21 MEMBER BROWN: Say that again.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 MEMBER MAYNARD: Please.

2 MEMBER STETKAR: You want me to say that  
3 again?

4 MEMBER BROWN: Exactly.

5 MEMBER STETKAR: Well, I don't know if I  
6 can say it exactly, but in license renewal  
7 applications there have been questions regarding the  
8 monitoring of cables that are non-safety-related  
9 cables, but that are in scope for license renewal  
10 because they provide the function of station  
11 blackout recovery. In many cases, those cables are  
12 routed underground, and we have had those problems  
13 in manholes.

14 Those particular types of cables in  
15 those functions would not be covered by this  
16 regulatory guide.

17 MR. KOSHY: We cannot say all of it, but  
18 some of it may fall into this category, because  
19 that --

20 MEMBER STETKAR: If they are not safety-  
21 related cables.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KOSHY: If they are not safety-  
2 related and not in maintenance rule, then it --

3 MEMBER STETKAR: No. Be careful,  
4 because if they are not safety-related as I -- that  
5 is why I am trying to understand the logic of this.  
6 If they are not safety-related --

7 MR. KOSHY: It is out.

8 MEMBER STETKAR: -- it is out. Even  
9 though the maintenance rule would call them risk-  
10 significant.

11 MR. KOSHY: Yes.

12 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: So it may be  
13 limited.

14 MR. AGGARWAL: So based on what we just  
15 discussed, the position was changed as you see in  
16 yellow highlighted, the words were added. The  
17 condition monitoring of safety-related cable may be  
18 related to this -- covered by --

19 MEMBER SHACK: Why do you leave out the  
20 risk-significant cables that aren't safety-related?

21 MR. AGGARWAL: If you will recall, we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 had a lot of discussion last time in September, and  
2 the issue basically was that -- how do you define  
3 "risk-significant"?

4 MEMBER MAYNARD: There is a concern of  
5 mixing the two, because typically risk-significant  
6 isn't just limited to the safety-related part.

7 MEMBER RAY: Yes, but he is right.  
8 There isn't a definition.

9 MEMBER MAYNARD: Right.

10 MEMBER BLEY: But 50.69 sets up the  
11 alternative policy to use that definition.

12 MEMBER RAY: It does. That is right,  
13 Dennis. But the problem is that stuff that is not  
14 safety-related but is within the scope of the  
15 maintenance rule is what you are --

16 MEMBER SHACK: 50.69 is a voluntary  
17 rule.

18 MEMBER RAY: That is where I was gong.

19 MEMBER SHACK: But the maintenance rule  
20 is somewhat similar in scope to 50.69, and is  
21 certainly part of the regulations that everybody --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 you know, so it -- that certainly seems to me to  
2 give you a way to define "risk-significant."

3 MEMBER RAY: But it can't impose  
4 requirements for equipment qualification on stuff  
5 that is not safety-related merely because it is  
6 inside the maintenance rule. I mean, you know, you  
7 are talking about a huge issue here that -- you  
8 know, where the industry thinks it is well  
9 established. The maintenance rule imposes  
10 requirements on non-safety-related stuff, but the  
11 requirements are limited.

12 What the yellow ones to me do is they  
13 say something that is safety-related but not covered  
14 by the maintenance rule is excluded. And I was  
15 going to ask: well, what is that?

16 Well, wait a minute, what I said was  
17 simple.

18 MEMBER SHACK: No, no, I understand what  
19 you said.

20 MEMBER RAY: Okay. And I am just  
21 saying, well, why would you have something that is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 safety-related and not covered by the maintenance  
2 rule that you don't want to include within this reg  
3 guide? Because that is what the words said to me  
4 when I read them.

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: So you are asking, is  
6 that the null set, or is there actually something  
7 out there?

8 MEMBER RAY: Yes.

9 MEMBER MAYNARD: Let's let him -- one  
10 conversation here at a time. Do you have -- you  
11 asked a question.

12 MEMBER RAY: Well, I did ask a question.  
13 I made a statement, but there is a question  
14 implied. The statement is, the words to me said, if  
15 you've got something safety-related not covered by  
16 the maintenance rule, then the reg guide doesn't  
17 apply to that step. The implicit question is: is  
18 that correct? Is that what you intended? Because  
19 that is not what I heard him say.

20 What I heard him say was this covers  
21 everything that is in the maintenance rule that is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 safety-related.

2 MEMBER ARMIJO: Right. That is what I  
3 heard.

4 MEMBER RAY: Well, that is only the  
5 other side of the coin, Sam. I mean, if it covers  
6 -- if it is safety-related within the maintenance  
7 rule, then it doesn't cover stuff that is safety-  
8 related not within the maintenance rule.

9 MEMBER MAYNARD: As I interpreted what  
10 you have written and what you have said is that we  
11 are dealing with a subset of safety-related. It is  
12 not all the safety-related. It is only the safety-  
13 related that are within the maintenance rule.

14 MEMBER RAY: Correct. And I would just  
15 ask the question, then, what is not in the  
16 maintenance rule that is safety-related?

17 MR. KOSHY: Let me give you a quick  
18 example. For example, the feedwater system is  
19 falling within the maintenance rule, but it is not  
20 considered safety-related.

21 MEMBER RAY: What is safety-related and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 not within the maintenance rule? That is the  
2 question.

3 MR. KOSHY: Feedwater system.

4 MEMBER RAY: It is safety-related?

5 MR. KOSHY: No. Feedwater system is  
6 non-safety-related but within maintenance rule.

7 MEMBER RAY: My question is: what is  
8 safety-related but not within the maintenance rule?

9 MR. AGGARWAL: Nothing.

10 MEMBER RAY: Nothing. And that is what  
11 this is saying to me is, if it's safety-related and  
12 not in the maintenance rule, then it is not covered.

13 That is what the words say. You are telling me  
14 what you intended was if it is within the  
15 maintenance rule in safety-related it is covered.  
16 Why don't you just say if it's safety-related and in  
17 there.

18 MR. AGGARWAL: That's what I --

19 MEMBER RAY: I mean, that eliminates the  
20 confusion that we are all having here.

21 MR. RICHARDS: This is Stu Richards with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 Research. I think -- Mr. Ray, how are you?

2 MEMBER RAY: I'm fine.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. RICHARDS: I think the idea here was  
5 to go look for a widely used definition, and we  
6 looked at the maintenance rule and said, okay, here  
7 is a whole scheme of things that is already laid out  
8 in the regulations that has been widely addressed by  
9 the industry, so the industry will know what is  
10 covered by this definition. And I think the  
11 challenge was, what does "safety-significant" and  
12 "safety-related" mean? That was what we had before.

13 Now we've gone to a definition that the  
14 industry I think is comfortable with, and we have  
15 excluded the non-safety items that are addressed by  
16 the maintenance rule. So, to answer your question,  
17 you know, we went looking for a good definition that  
18 was pre-existing. We didn't really take it that  
19 next step to figure out, well, you know, what is  
20 excluded by this.

21 MEMBER RAY: I am not asking you to do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that. I was only trying to establish that -- didn't  
2 you end up with just the safety-related stuff? What  
3 does reference to the maintenance rule add to --

4 MR. RICHARDS: It points to a pre-  
5 existing program for which there is a long history  
6 of what is in it and what is not.

7 MEMBER BLEY: Safety-related is even  
8 older than that.

9 MEMBER RAY: Okay. I give up. To me,  
10 you are talking about what is safety-related, and  
11 that is the set that you are referring to. The  
12 maintenance rule has us all confused, but it doesn't  
13 seem to add anything. But with that I will just  
14 quit repeating myself.

15 MEMBER BROWN: No. You shouldn't quit  
16 repeating yourself, because --

17 MEMBER MAYNARD: Is it your opinion or  
18 position that still all the safety-related cables  
19 are covered by this condition monitoring?

20 MR. AGGARWAL: Correct.

21 MEMBER ARMIJO: That is your intention.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MEMBER MAYNARD: So I think what they  
2 saying is this applies to safety-related cables.

3 MEMBER BROWN: I do, too. But I am --

4 MEMBER MAYNARD: So I think we are  
5 struggling with why do we even bring in the  
6 maintenance rule aspect. Why don't we just say  
7 "safety-related cable"?

8 MEMBER BLEY: I guess I'm -- I just went  
9 back and looked at 50.65, and it says safety-related  
10 SSCs, and then it qualifies which ones. So I don't  
11 know of any, but maybe there are some that don't  
12 meet those qualifications.

13 MEMBER RAY: No, that's right. I am not  
14 an expert in plant design, so --

15 MEMBER SHACK: I mean, certainly we know  
16 if you look at 50.69 there are safety-related  
17 components that are not risk-significant. Whether  
18 they are cables or not I -- you know, I would  
19 suspect that varies from plant to plant. I don't  
20 know. So I think this, in fact, could limit the set  
21 somewhat.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MEMBER RAY: In principle.

MEMBER SHACK: In principle, it could.

MEMBER RAY: Yes.

MEMBER SHACK: But if their intent is to cover all safety-related cables, then --

MR. KOSHY: Yes. The very title is qualification of safety-related cable, how to qualify if it is doing a safety-related function.

MEMBER RAY: But I am with everybody else, why bring in the maintenance rule if that's what you want?

MR. AGGARWAL: I will concede if the committee recommends to drop that into maintenance rule, we will do so, and simply say "safety-related cables."

MEMBER RAY: That is what you mean. It would be okay to exclude some safety-related stuff that is not covered by the maintenance rule probably. And if that is what you meant, then fine, that is what --

MEMBER BLEY: And the maintenance rule

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 does give a qualification. I don't know what is in  
2 the qualification. I mean, I know what --

3 MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, why don't we --  
4 this is an area we may want to come back to later.  
5 Let's go ahead and move on. And after we get  
6 through the rest of it, we will see if we want to  
7 come back and talk a little bit more about this. So  
8 let's go ahead and move on.

9 MEMBER BROWN: Well, the only question I  
10 thought -- there is still disagreement somewhere on  
11 whether you should even have condition monitoring at  
12 all, isn't there? If you read some of the other  
13 paper, there is --

14 MEMBER BLEY: Yes.

15 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. We will get to  
16 that later?

17 MEMBER BLEY: The disagreement is not at  
18 the staff level. It is --

19 MEMBER BROWN: I understand. I  
20 understand that, and I -- I've got some other  
21 questions I wanted to address on that. Go ahead.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

MR. AGGARWAL: One of the other questions which was raised by ACRS was again on this code, and we just discussed we really meant safety-related cables, and this is wrong.

Next?

One of the questions that was raised, again in the September meeting, are the cables covered under Appendix R? Are they within the scope of this guide? And the answer is no. The requirements for Appendix R are somewhat different as compared to this requirement for qualification of cables for low power environment, to a different issue. And for reference we have pointed out here that -- there the requirements for Appendix R are included.

The bottom line is for purposes of this reg guide requirement for Appendix R not covered by this reg guide.

MEMBER BROWN: But this reg guide is just not -- "condition monitoring" means go off and monitor this, the environment in which these cables

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 are, for the life of their application. So this is  
2 more than just qualification of cables. This is  
3 actual plant requirements on the licensees over the  
4 40-year or 60-year life of the application.

5 So it is more than just qualification,  
6 so I would just take an issue with the point -- the  
7 difference between fire -- that fire doesn't cover  
8 qualification. Well, this also has non-  
9 qualification attributes in it also. That is -- I  
10 was quibbling a little bit, but it is clarifying.

11 MR. KOSHY: The IEEE Standard 323, even  
12 the recent version, includes monitoring the  
13 qualification as part of the qualification process.  
14 That is how the industry has addressed that issue,  
15 in the sense --

16 MEMBER BROWN: For fire.

17 MR. KOSHY: No, for qualification. IEEE  
18 323, 2003 version, which we are going to endorse,  
19 and we have endorsed the previous version already.  
20 That is -- considers maintaining qualification as  
21 part of the qualification process itself. And,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 therefore, monitoring falls into the same  
2 qualification standard.

3 MEMBER BROWN: To ensure you don't  
4 exceed the qualification environment.

5 MR. KOSHY: The assumptions -- you are  
6 within the assumptions, and that is what the  
7 industry chose to go with. And chances are when we  
8 endorse it we will be considering the endorsement in  
9 the full scope of the standard itself.

10 MEMBER BROWN: That is in 323?

11 MR. KOSHY: Yes.

12 MR. AGGARWAL: That is the model  
13 standard.

14 MR. KOSHY: That is a model document for  
15 all standards. And this is -- you can -- this  
16 standard you can see it as a daughter standard,  
17 focusing just on cables. 323 addresses the  
18 qualifications at large for all -- all components.

19 MEMBER MAYNARD: And I do think that is  
20 important to note. This isn't the only requirement  
21 dealing with condition monitoring and with equipment

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 qualification. This is specific to the cables. It  
2 does fall under other standards, and there are other  
3 requirements.

4 Okay. Let's move on.

5 MR. AGGARWAL: Okay. The next concern  
6 the Committee has, they wanted us to justify the  
7 need for protecting specialty cable with connectors  
8 for tri-axial and bi-axial. That position has been  
9 removed from the reg guide.

10 MEMBER ARMIJO: Why did you remove it?  
11 All we needed -- we asked for a justification. We  
12 may have agreed with you, but we --

13 MR. AGGARWAL: We conceded the standard  
14 adequately covers, so we didn't have to take an  
15 exception.

16 MR. KOSHY: But what you will also see  
17 is that in the discussion part we have shared the  
18 thought that in some specialty cables, some must be  
19 tested with this respective connector. It may not  
20 work very well, in the sense if you separately  
21 qualify the connector and the specialty cable

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 separately, when you put it together you find that  
2 functionally it may fail.

3           So that thought is shared in the  
4 discussion part, but we did not go to the extent of  
5 saying that in every case you shall test it like  
6 that. So that is where we backed out and said,  
7 okay, we have shared that concern, and now the  
8 industry knows it. And the standard also talks  
9 about the same discussion, so that should be  
10 adequate, rather than addressing another exception.

11           MEMBER ARMIJO: Was that issue of the  
12 cables and the connectors addressed? Is it  
13 addressed in some other regulation, in some other --

14           MR. KOSHY: No, it is not.

15           MEMBER ARMIJO: So, if it is a real  
16 problem, why isn't it?

17           MR. KOSHY: Okay. It is a real problem,  
18 but it may not be widespread, in the sense what we  
19 know of is certain connectors and certain cables,  
20 when separately qualified and put it together, it  
21 didn't work right. But that is not a generality, in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the sense all cases are not like that. So we shared  
2 that thought in the discussion part, and we left it  
3 rather than going for a specific example.

4 MEMBER ARMIJO: And you said that point  
5 is also raised in the standard.

6 MR. KOSHY: That point is discussed, and  
7 it's in the standard also, yes.

8 MEMBER BLEY: But it is not a  
9 requirement to test it.

10 MEMBER ARMIJO: Well, maybe we will ask  
11 the industry guys whether they believe it is  
12 significant or not.

13 MR. KOSHY: And, you know, as we  
14 progress in testing, if we come across cases, we had  
15 -- the other method would be to issue an information  
16 notice stating, okay, in this particular application  
17 we find this to be available, and let the industry  
18 know about it.

19 MR. AGGARWAL: So, finally, the issue  
20 was raised with regard to that the staff has not  
21 specified or offered any specific condition

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 monitoring techniques. And the requirement of  
2 condition monitoring is imposed without any  
3 condition monitoring techniques.

4           Let me now address that issue. My  
5 position is that the staff continues to believe that  
6 condition monitoring is required and must be  
7 implemented. And the reason is that that is -- as  
8 was stated previously, all we do is do one prototype  
9 testing, and that test, whether it is in Plant A or  
10 Plant B or C, that test is used not only in U.S.A.  
11 but all over the world, to focus attention that one  
12 prototype, one cable, is tested, and you come back  
13 that, hey, I don't want to do anything for 40 years.  
14       The staff thinking is not acceptable.

15           And this is also based on our operating  
16 experience, particularly includes the power cable.  
17 Therefore, the staff is saying that there are  
18 probably 14 techniques available for condition  
19 monitoring now. We are not in a position at this  
20 time to tell you that Technique A, B, or C, you are  
21 leaving to licensee that you can put any technique

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 which may fit to the type of the cables you have or  
2 the environment you are exposed to, and take a lot  
3 of factors.

4           The bottom line is that we require that  
5 you do something other than test the cable, and the  
6 cable is good for 40 years, 60 years, and some  
7 plants are now thinking to go 80 years. So you need  
8 to know in your plan really how these are. You  
9 should know the temperature, you should know the  
10 radiation, and, once you know, then you should have  
11 simple walkdowns, or use any appropriate techniques.

12           I may also point out that the staff and  
13 the international community at this time is working  
14 to focus on different matters of condition  
15 monitoring. And we may be back before this  
16 Committee some time in the near future when we may  
17 specify that this kind of technique for this  
18 particular type of cable is appropriate. For the  
19 time being, the staff is submitting that, hey, we  
20 would like something to be done, and it is up to the  
21 licensee to pick any technique. They can pick what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 they think is best justified.

2 With that, I conclude.

3 MEMBER RAY: This is a reg guide. How  
4 does it get implemented in the way that you have  
5 just now been talking about it?

6 MR. AGGARWAL: Very good question. You  
7 are 100 percent. Reg guides are advisory. And not  
8 only that, it is voluntary. If you are in an  
9 operating plant, you don't have to use this at all.

10 MEMBER RAY: If you are what?

11 MR. KOSHY: If it is an operating plant.

12 MEMBER RAY: Oh, okay.

13 MR. KOSHY: It is voluntary. But for  
14 new licensees, they need to address all of the reg  
15 guides.

16 MR. AGGARWAL: They are expected to  
17 attend.

18 MEMBER RAY: Understood.

19 MR. AGGARWAL: So all I am saying, this  
20 is the staff intention which we are expressing in  
21 black and white that is -- that some kind of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 condition monitoring will be done.

2 MEMBER RAY: Okay. So this isn't going  
3 to have a big impact on the existing operating  
4 plants, except those who voluntarily follow the  
5 guidance.

6 MR. AGGARWAL: Correct. They don't have  
7 to do anything at all.

8 MEMBER RAY: Okay. No, I understand.

9 MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, the existing --  
10 they don't have to do anything relative to this.  
11 They have to meet whatever their current commitments  
12 are.

13 MEMBER RAY: Yes. They --

14 MR. AGGARWAL: However, I must caution  
15 you that a nuclear powerplant -- suppose they decide  
16 to change the system in entirety on their own, okay?

17 Not that NRC is asking, but they decided to change  
18 their whole RPS system, for example, then they must  
19 comply with this reg guide, because this is a change  
20 in the system.

21 MEMBER RAY: Well, okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER MAYNARD: You said that later you  
2 may have -- well, one of the questions relative to  
3 this, and I think we will be hearing more from NUGEQ  
4 on this, is the broadness of this without much  
5 specifics on exactly what to be done. And that is a  
6 two-edged sword.

7                   You mentioned that you may come back  
8 later with more specifics as to what types of  
9 monitoring are appropriate in what cases. Would  
10 that be like a revision to the reg guide or --

11                   MR. AGGARWAL: It could be.

12                   MEMBER MAYNARD: -- how would that be  
13 done?

14                   MR. AGGARWAL: It could be test revision  
15 on a new reg guide.

16                   MR. KOSHY: There are two things in the  
17 works. One is our research is working with one of  
18 our national labs to look at the essential elements  
19 of the cable test program. That is actually  
20 possibly -- the draft reg guide should be coming out  
21 by the end of the year. They have just finished

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 their initial work. We saw some initial reports, so  
2 that is coming, to essentially explain the essential  
3 elements of a test program.

4 The second part which Satish referring  
5 to is the -- these techniques are gradually getting  
6 refined. We know of one technique developed in the  
7 Haldon project which is -- looks very promising. It  
8 has been tested in about four nuclear stations  
9 overseas, three of the Swedish plants, and I forgot  
10 the other name. And they find that to be one test  
11 that is suitable for all types of cable. That is  
12 the first one of its kind.

13 And so far all of their tests have been  
14 very successful, and it is able to measure the  
15 insulation all the way to the full run of the cable.

16 And within their country EPRI also has experimented  
17 with the same technique, and their report is that it  
18 looks very promising.

19 So what I am hoping is in the near  
20 future we should be able to -- if this test is one  
21 -- one for all, it will be a great success. If not,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 we may have to look at a couple more and present a  
2 reg guide explaining why this is the most suitable  
3 way to go.

4 In the meantime, there are three IEEE  
5 standards which essentially talk about all of the  
6 best techniques that are in the market now, and  
7 giving level of clarification as to which technique  
8 is best suited for which type of cable. So there  
9 are three IEEE standards in the works already.

10 We are holding off an endorsement  
11 because of the -- see this industry work that is  
12 progressing, and we hopefully looking at this one  
13 technique that may be applicable to all types of  
14 cables.

15 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. I want to -- a  
16 little more calibration and then a question.  
17 Condition monitoring -- there is two things called  
18 out in this, environmental condition monitoring  
19 whereas -- and I presume -- and then condition  
20 monitoring. These are -- so you've got two --  
21 there's two aspects to this.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   So as far as the environmental, I am  
2 just trying to understand it. Wherever the cables  
3 run, if they are in a space, you should have  
4 cognizance monitoring of that space -- its  
5 temperature, radiation, whatever the appropriate  
6 parameters are -- so that you know now the  
7 environment in which whatever cables are in there  
8 are enduring, and you an evaluate that relative to  
9 their qualification status.

10                   Second is what I would -- condition  
11 monitoring. That is tests of the cable, like megger  
12 tests, hi-pots, time domain reflectometer test, you  
13 know, impedance measurement, whatever the heck they  
14 are for co-ax, etcetera. And I am just reflecting  
15 back on some experience.

16                   The last thing I ever wanted to do was  
17 take cables apart. Every time I took cables apart  
18 and put them back together I ended up with loose  
19 connections somewhere. Okay? So I've got kind of a  
20 very jaded thought process. If you have to do it  
21 every now and again, what type of periodicity are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 you talking about relative to making these -- and  
2 there is a second piece of this -- this condition  
3 monitoring, are you talking about every year, every  
4 10 years, every shutdown for refueling? Is there  
5 something in your mind relative to that?

6 Second question related to this is, most  
7 of the cables that are safety-related are actually  
8 energized in performing their function. For  
9 example, neutron detectors, pressure detectors,  
10 temperature detectors. And you are reading those  
11 all the time. Motors are running, all kinds of  
12 stuff like that. So you know that they are working.

13 Now, lights, you know, cables that go  
14 off to something that is intermittently on, you  
15 don't know what their status is at any time, unless  
16 the light is on all the time, which is a different  
17 circumstance. So do you -- there is no  
18 differentiation in here in terms of cables which are  
19 continuously energized with a visual evidence of  
20 their application in work? Or is it just cables --  
21 there is nothing in here, okay, that just cables

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that are not in a state where you can know what  
2 their operational mode is?

3 MEMBER RAY: That is a harsh environment  
4 qualification.

5 MEMBER BROWN: Well, I mean, go through  
6 -- you know, the harsh environment is where you have  
7 a -- I mean, cables are in radiation environments,  
8 and I just didn't -- co-ax cables, and I didn't go  
9 take them apart, just --

10 MR. KOSHY: We are trying to gain  
11 assurance that these cables can in fact withstand a  
12 LOCA environment to the accident, so that we are  
13 confident of the information that comes into the  
14 control room and the actions that we need to take.

15 So the fact that it is functioning now  
16 is not an assurance that it can survive a LOCA  
17 environment. And the next part about the  
18 environment that -- the question that you addressed,  
19 too -- during the qualification process, we make  
20 some assumptions on what is the probable environment  
21 in its operating life -- for example, a certain

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 level of radiation and certain level of temperature  
2 condition.

3 And in the test process we tried to  
4 integrate it and accelerate its aging, bringing it  
5 to its end of life and then expose it to an accident  
6 radiation. That is --

7 MEMBER BROWN: I saw that. Yes, I got  
8 that part.

9 MR. KOSHY: Okay. Now, so the fact that  
10 it is functioning now gives me assurance that under  
11 fair conditions it is functional. But if I am to  
12 have an accident, and parts of the cable is exposed  
13 to this extreme environment, would it still do it  
14 with the same level of, you know, conductivity and  
15 lack of leakage current through that accident?  
16 Because that affects my setpoints and the  
17 preciseness of the signal that I am expecting.

18 Now, some more details on the  
19 environmental side, you are going back to the  
20 environment to reconfirm that the cable that you  
21 have qualified is still within the original design

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 assumptions. Speaking from operating experience,  
2 these days we come across a problem only if it  
3 fails. For example, in some thermal lagging on a  
4 steam pipe, it was removed to enter into the update  
5 early and so some of the fire work. That heat  
6 dissipation was so much on the cable, the MO, it  
7 stopped functioning.

8 Then, we noticed -- looked into it  
9 earlier and found out that insulation had completely  
10 hardened, and it was breaking. So what we noticed  
11 in the normal operating experience is only when  
12 things are crossed far beyond to the extent they are  
13 failing, or we catch it in the next surveillance.

14 So in looking into the safety  
15 significance, what we are hoping is this program  
16 will give us reasonable assurance that this cable  
17 can function through the accident environment and  
18 serve its safety function. That is why we are going  
19 this far to say that you need to do additional  
20 testing to make sure that the insulation is  
21 remaining intact to serve its function.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MR. AGGARWAL: Let me also add that it  
2 is not the staff's intention that licensees remove  
3 all the cable, dismantle, only doing for condition  
4 monitoring. We are expecting them to use their  
5 judgment, and pick some selective cables, and the  
6 given technique that is useful for the plant.

7                   We totally agree with you that  
8 dismantling cable, connecting them back, will create  
9 more problems. But they are techniques available  
10 now while the cables are energized and operational  
11 you can use relative to the techniques.

12                  MR. KOSHY: And you had one more  
13 question regarding the frequency. We stated in the  
14 reg guide that condition monitoring and its  
15 frequency may be adjusted based on the cable  
16 performance. For example, if I am buying a cable  
17 now, the cable chemistry is so good, if I took a  
18 baseline data, in about probably five to seven years  
19 I don't have to look at it at all. I take annual  
20 reading at, let's say, five years or seven years. I  
21 will find that the rate of degradation is very low.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 I will endure only for the next 10 years.

2 So, in a sense, you can adjust your  
3 frequency based on what you read from this test  
4 program. But if you see a serious degradation, we  
5 expect the frequency to become closer, by the same  
6 token.

7 MEMBER BROWN: Well, the techniques I  
8 have experienced that have had wide -- that have  
9 wide variability in application. So that your data  
10 trending is hard.

11 MR. KOSHY: Well, we are hoping they  
12 will dwell on the same techniques, so that you can  
13 --

14 MEMBER BROWN: Are you using the same  
15 technique, whether it's a megger test or whether  
16 it's a time domain reflectometer, to make sure  
17 you've got continual continuity, the level of  
18 continuity you want on certain types of co-ax  
19 cables, things of that nature? Those are -- you  
20 don't get the nice, you know 1.0 times 10<sup>6</sup> every  
21 time. They bounce around, so --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. KOSHY: We can limit some reasonable  
2 radiation, so long as, you know, your outages kind  
3 of reflect the same way on cables of comparable,  
4 let's say, average and also application. If it is  
5 exhibiting certain level of difference, you can  
6 eliminate some of those questions.

7 But, you know, if you see a gross  
8 difference, that is an early indication that  
9 insulation is seriously degraded. And we want  
10 licensees to be prepared to attend to it, rather  
11 than finding out later that this is not working.

12 MEMBER BROWN: Are megger tests on your  
13 list?

14 MR. KOSHY: We were not going to supply  
15 a list in --

16 MEMBER BROWN: No. Is that one of the  
17 14 techniques?

18 MR. KOSHY: If it -- yes, it is one of  
19 them, and they cannot use that -- the lowest one of,  
20 you know, unrolled megger for doing that testing.

21 MEMBER BROWN: Well, I am just saying,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 take a 5,000-volt megger on a 5 kV system, whatever  
2 it is, and you will find -- depending on all types  
3 of conditions, you will get numbers from one meg-ohm  
4 to 100 meg-ohms or 100 gig-ohms over a five-year  
5 period. And I don't know what you are going to do  
6 with this.

7 MR. RUSSELL: This is George Russell,  
8 NRR. I have -- Tom Koshy in Research is writing, as  
9 he stated earlier, the effective characteristics of  
10 a cable monitoring program. We don't want just one  
11 test. You are going to have to evaluate what type  
12 of cables do you have in your plant, and do a series  
13 or a combination of tests.

14 To answer your other question, there is  
15 methods out right now that provide a pretty good  
16 trending, such as partial discharge and tan delta,  
17 but they are using them for power cables and they  
18 are doing correlation curves and deciding when to  
19 replace the cables.

20 So with your one method, yes, your  
21 megger won't give you that, but the tan delta method

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 will give that, so -- for certain types of cables.  
2 So there already is methods out there that I can  
3 trend and make a choice through a correlation curve  
4 when I am going to replace the cable. So there is  
5 methods right now that the utilities are utilizing,  
6 and several of them in the southeast part of the  
7 United States have -- they are trying to perfect the  
8 tan delta, and there are several companies going  
9 after partial discharge.

10 I understand with your megger, but we  
11 are not talking about just doing a megger, we would  
12 like to see a correlation of tests based on the  
13 cables that you have. And then, you can get your  
14 trend.

15 MEMBER MAYNARD: The way I read the reg  
16 guide, at this point you are not specifying a  
17 frequency or a test. You basically do something.  
18 And as long as it is even close to reasonable at  
19 this point you would be accepting that. But at some  
20 time in the future you may be coming out with  
21 another reg guide or whatever to get some --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. KOSHY: And we will build confidence  
2 on certain techniques that we can say, okay, this is  
3 the way to go.

4 MEMBER MAYNARD: So you are not saying  
5 that people have to disassemble cables or whatever.  
6 They can take a look on a case-by-case basis and  
7 what they --

8 MR. AGGARWAL: Exactly.

9 MR. KOSHY: Some of these techniques --  
10 you know, like if you have a break in one and the  
11 opening on one side of the cable is sufficient for  
12 running the test. And especially the one technique  
13 that I was referring to -- is referred to as LIRA,  
14 Line Impedance Resonance Assessment.

15 They are also experimenting on doing  
16 that on live wire in the sense not at all  
17 disconnecting, but just attaching two patches to the  
18 end and running the signal.

19 MR. AGGARWAL: And the cables are  
20 energized.

21 MR. KOSHY: While the cables remain

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 energized, yes.

2 MEMBER MAYNARD: And at this point, you  
3 are not really -- although some of the plants and  
4 some of the utilities may be doing some research and  
5 developing new plants, you are not really asking  
6 anyone to go beyond the current state of knowledge  
7 or capability.

8 MR. AGGARWAL: Correct. Yes.

9 MEMBER MAYNARD: I think we will hear  
10 some more from NUGEQ on this.

11 MEMBER BROWN: Yes, I just -- I wanted  
12 to get my thoughts out there. That's all.

13 MEMBER MAYNARD: Okay.

14 MR. AGGARWAL: Thank you.

15 MEMBER MAYNARD: All right. Did you  
16 have any more? I think that is your last slide,  
17 right?

18 MR. AGGARWAL: Yes.

19 MEMBER MAYNARD: I guess I would like --  
20 before you leave, I would like to go back -- we  
21 talked a little bit on scope earlier. Is everybody

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 clear on the scope that they are proposing?

2 CHAIRMAN BONACA: Yes.

3 MEMBER MAYNARD: And does anybody have  
4 any more questions on that scope?

5 (No response.)

6 Okay. With that, thank you very much.

7 MEMBER BROWN: Good morning.

8 MEMBER MAYNARD: Oh no, we are not done  
9 yet.

10 I believe we have an individual here  
11 from NUGEQ.

12 MR. HORIN: I am here.

13 MEMBER MAYNARD: All right. All right.  
14 Come to a microphone anyway there. Introduce  
15 yourself. Why don't you come on up here, yes.

16 MR. HORIN: Good afternoon, Mr.  
17 Chairman, and the rest of the Committee. We come  
18 before you again.

19 Thank you very much for allowing us to  
20 take some time to discuss this guide and the  
21 direction that we are going in some of these areas.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 I think that the progress that has been made over  
2 the last couple of years in looking at this guide is  
3 important. But we still have a couple of issues  
4 that we think are very important that we have not  
5 fully resolved.

6 My name is Bill Horin. I am with  
7 Winston & Strawn. We are the counsel to the Nuclear  
8 Utility Group on Equipment Qualification.

9 Phil Holzman, who is our Technical  
10 Consultant with Strategic Technology and Resources,  
11 is listening in on the phone. We have been in  
12 existence since 1981, and the sole purpose of this  
13 group is to examine issues related to equipment  
14 qualification and primarily the environmental  
15 qualification of electric equipment.

16 We represent over 95 of the operating  
17 reactors in the United States, and we have been  
18 following this issue for many years and continue to  
19 follow it. It is an important one.

20 Let me say first that we do not object  
21 to condition monitoring. I heard that mentioned on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 a couple of occasions. We believe that it must be  
2 clearly laid out that proven and effective means of  
3 condition monitoring are the ones that we must focus  
4 on.

5           There is a lot of discussion about, you  
6 know, 14 methods, but the applicability of any one  
7 of those to a broad set of cables that would result  
8 in -- provide results and provide any information  
9 that is useful for determining the survivability of  
10 that cable in a harsh environment is very limited.

11           The slides that we I guess -- next  
12 slide. Or do I do this? Okay. Thank you, Tom.  
13 One moment.

14           Okay. What I wanted to start with here,  
15 because I think it is an important factor, and there  
16 were only -- there is only a handful of the  
17 Committee members that were here in 2002 when this  
18 issue came before you -- is to provide a bit of  
19 background related to the substantial research  
20 effort that the staff undertook in the 1992 to 2003  
21 timeframe to address qualification, the adequacy of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 our qualification standards, to address also  
2 specifically the availability of reasonable  
3 condition monitoring techniques.

4 We said at the very beginning -- and  
5 this was a comment with NUMARC, and we worked  
6 closely with them, is that we believe research in  
7 the area of condition monitoring may be useful  
8 toward developing information for assessing the  
9 actual service life of equipment. We didn't object  
10 to doing research on condition monitoring, and we  
11 don't object again, as I pointed out, more effective  
12 and proven methods of condition monitoring to be  
13 considered for facilities.

14 MEMBER ARMIJO: Let me ask you, do you  
15 consider it -- you know, maybe useful isn't a real  
16 big endorsement. Do you think it is important and a  
17 high priority to do condition monitoring?

18 MR. HORIN: If we get useful  
19 information.

20 MEMBER ARMIJO: Sure, I agree, you know,  
21 that is a prerequisite. But do you really think --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 so you -- you are not against it, but you are  
2 against it if it is -- provides garbage --

3 MR. HORIN: The way this guide is  
4 written presents a very broad and undefined  
5 expectation with respect to the application of cable  
6 condition monitoring. And perhaps we should back up  
7 just for a second. We are distinguishing here  
8 between cable monitoring, environmental monitoring,  
9 walkdowns, corrective action programs, which  
10 licensees do already and which future licensees will  
11 do.

12 The issue that we are focusing on here  
13 is supplementing those efforts with actual cable  
14 condition monitoring techniques. And so if we,  
15 again, have, you know, proven and effective means,  
16 it would be -- to provide the information that we  
17 need, you know, it would be an appropriate thing to  
18 expect.

19 But we don't have that at this point in  
20 time, and the reg guide is written in a way that  
21 would expose licensees who either adopt this at new

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 plants, or who are, as Mr. Aggarwal pointed out,  
2 conducting a major change to their facility where  
3 you are fundamentally changing the licensing basis,  
4 and, therefore, you may be expected to utilize the  
5 newest guidance available, under those circumstances  
6 we don't believe that this is adequately defined.

7 In the 1992 to 2003 timeframe, the NRC  
8 undertook a substantial research effort, which was  
9 to address the question in the Generic Safety Issue  
10 168 and to address several components related to the  
11 environmental qualification standards. Now, one of  
12 those components was the adequacy of the existing  
13 standards, the adequacy of the application of  
14 testing techniques.

15 We have heard today that we do a single  
16 prototype, and then licensees go off and change,  
17 manufacturers go off and change the configuration.  
18 Well, that is not 100 percent clear or accurate,  
19 because when you do a prototype of a particular type  
20 of cable you are required to evaluate and maintain  
21 that that qualification applies to cable which is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 similar design and function and materials, and you  
2 have to do a detailed analysis of that.

3 And the generic safety issue resolution  
4 and the task action plans, a result of the task  
5 action plan efforts, concluded that that type of  
6 testing was adequate, and that it was appropriate  
7 given the standards and conditional measures of  
8 conservatism we have in our regulatory system.

9 But most importantly, with respect to  
10 this particular issue that we are dealing with right  
11 now, and that is -- and I am focusing first on the  
12 condition monitoring question -- we identified as  
13 part of that task action plan 12 techniques I  
14 believe it was, and we have tacked on a couple of  
15 others that are out there now, that have -- at least  
16 in laboratory applications are in limited  
17 applications, potential benefit, or have the  
18 possibility of providing some information with  
19 respect to the condition of the cable.

20 But whether any one of these is  
21 appropriate for any particular type of cable in situ

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 that will provide information that tells you, which  
2 is what we are most concerned about, how this will  
3 perform in the event of an accident as opposed to  
4 some particular, you know, gross failure of the --  
5 you know, of the insulation or some part of the  
6 cable construction -- is -- was the focus of this  
7 task action plan, a review of condition monitoring.

8 And we -- the staff spent taxpayer's dollars,  
9 millions of dollars on this effort.

10 Let's see. So in October of 2000, this  
11 testing was completed, and the staff briefed the  
12 ACRS. There were still a number of questions  
13 related to the characterization of the results of  
14 the testing that were performed under the GSI, and  
15 so some additional meetings and interactions were --  
16 took place over the next couple of years to focus on  
17 in particular, you know, the need for monitoring  
18 plant environments and cable condition monitoring.

19 In June of 2002, the staff came before  
20 this Committee and described what the results were  
21 of that process. What the staff demonstrated or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 stated -- and we provide specific citations to the  
2 ACRS transcripts on our web -- that with respect to  
3 the methods that no single technique was effective,  
4 and a combination of techniques would be needed to  
5 provide useful information, and that overall -- and  
6 this goes to the question of terminating,  
7 determinating, and whether or not there is a higher  
8 risk component with respect to equipment performance  
9 versus cable performance, but the benefits of  
10 conducting condition monitoring were modest at best.

11 And, fundamentally, that was done by a  
12 risk analysis that the NRC had conducted that  
13 examined the question of, you know, we are going to  
14 establish the specific -- assume failure probability  
15 for cable. And even if we are able to reduce that  
16 down to zero, okay, the change in the risk related  
17 to, you know, cable failures was going to be -- that  
18 could be prevented by condition monitoring, even if  
19 condition monitoring could take the risk to zero,  
20 there was not a significant change in the risk  
21 involved.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MEMBER STETKAR: Can I ask a question  
2 about that? I am not familiar with that study,  
3 although I have some background in risk assessment  
4 and electrical things. So I -- I am kind of  
5 curious. You are characterizing the study. Are you  
6 familiar with that study and how it was done?

7                   MR. HORIN: Yes. Bill is our technical  
8 consultant for it.

9                   MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. He is on the  
10 line.

11                  MR. HORIN: He is listening.

12                  MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

13                  MEMBER MAYNARD: We can open it up if  
14 you need him to answer a question. We'll see how --

15                  MEMBER STETKAR: My experience has been  
16 that: a) cables are not modeled in any risk  
17 assessment, so determining the net changes of  
18 failure rate of something that is not there is --

19                  MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: Problematic.

20                  MEMBER STETKAR: -- problematic. Thank  
21 you, George.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

(Laughter.)

And, second of all, that if -- I have seen risk assessments that have included cables, but the presumption is those cables are under good condition. In other words, the presumption is that they are not degraded, and that sufficient monitoring has been done to ensure that they are in condition as -- essentially the same condition that they were installed when the plant was built.

So that is why I am curious about the conclusion that making the cables perfect doesn't change things.

MR. HORIN: There was a failure rate model, then, for the cable. And I believe it was one percent.

MEMBER STETKAR: I am not sure what a one percent failure rate means, but that's okay.

MEMBER BLEY: You are saying somebody took a PRA of a whole powerplant, modeled all of the cables, and put in a one percent --

MR. HORIN: All of the cabling with a --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 an assumed --

2 MEMBER BLEY: Something is real suspect  
3 about that.

4 MEMBER STETKAR: I have never heard of  
5 anyone ever doing that, so that is curious.

6 MEMBER APOSTOLAKIS: That is something  
7 that perhaps --

8 MR. HORIN: Yes, Phil might be able to  
9 provide more, so go ahead and open up the line.

10 MEMBER MAYNARD: Go ahead.

11 MR. HORIN: Phil, we're going to try and  
12 tap you in here.

13 MR. HOLZMAN: Can you hear me?

14 MR. HORIN: Okay.

15 MR. HOLZMAN: Okay. Good afternoon.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: Good afternoon. Have  
17 you been listening?

18 MR. HOLZMAN: Of course.

19 MEMBER STETKAR: Are you familiar with  
20 the study that was done that concluded that perfect  
21 cables has no effect on -- making cables perfect has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 no effect on risk?

2 MR. HOLZMAN: I am reasonably familiar  
3 with it. And, in fact, I think we provided an  
4 overview of that -- of that study in Enclosure 2 to  
5 the letter we provided to the ACRS. But, in  
6 summary, I believe that the PRA evaluation took a  
7 look at the most risk-significant accident  
8 scenarios, particularly those that were scenarios  
9 that produced harsh environments in the plant, and  
10 then it looked at the specific ones that were the  
11 most significant in terms of risk contributions.

12 And it looked at -- and those scenarios  
13 and the equipment necessary to support those  
14 scenarios were a substantially smaller subset of the  
15 equipment than the whole plant.

16 And then, Arthur Buslick, who I think  
17 was the NRC staffer that did work on this, and his  
18 contractors -- I don't know really who actually did  
19 the work -- took a look at the available research  
20 information that the NRC had conducted on cable  
21 performance during accidents and other information.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1       And based on that, they came to the conclusion that  
2       for the purposes of modeling cables in the PRA they  
3       would assume a failure rate of .01 for the cables,  
4       which I think is a number to start with.

5               I think those of us who have experience  
6       in qualification would have disagreed with that  
7       number and thought it was very low. Oh, excuse me,  
8       very high in terms of failure rate.

9               My understanding also is that in the  
10       modeling, the PRA modeling they did, they assumed  
11       that if there was a cable that failed in one  
12       redundant train of a system that the -- that the  
13       cable also failed in the other train. So you had a  
14       .01 failure rate for actually both cables in both  
15       trains.

16              And they modeled that -- those cables in  
17       as supporting the equipment, and then they came up  
18       with a CDF for that model. And then, they took the  
19       same model and they said, okay, let's take in that  
20       model the -- and assume now that the failure -- that  
21       the cables don't fail, they have a failure rate of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 zero, and see what the change in CDF is.

2           And then, they went through that  
3 process, and I think the conclusions that Bill just  
4 expressed to you are stated in their study, which  
5 was part of the proposed -- was part of the  
6 technical assessment for this GSI, which was that  
7 the -- that the -- I think they would have called it  
8 the monetized benefit in terms of however this goes  
9 on for latent cancer fatalities and everything else  
10 -- that given other analyses they had done for other  
11 reasons that this was a modest -- that there was a  
12 modest benefit.

13           And there was a recognition that it was  
14 modest even assuming that the cable -- that the  
15 cables were perfect now, that the condition  
16 monitoring took the failure rate from .01 to zero.  
17 And I think the study also went on and said if there  
18 were -- if there was credit for other licensee  
19 activities, such as environmental monitoring,  
20 walkdowns, and things like that, the benefit would  
21 be even less. And then, obviously, recognizing that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 you can't make the cables perfect, the benefit would  
2 be even less than that.

3           And I think in the enclosure that we  
4 provided to you that is -- I think on page 2 of that  
5 enclosure there is an interaction between Satish  
6 Aggarwal, Arthur Buslick, and one of the members of  
7 the ACRS. And they in essence all said that the  
8 benefits -- it says the benefit -- I will just get  
9 down to -- to the ACRS member's statement at the  
10 end. "So the benefits of industry actions are,  
11 then, even smaller than modest, because you are  
12 getting all the way to zero." And the ACRS said,  
13 "That's right."

14           And I think even Satish said at that  
15 time, when he was making the presentation, said  
16 that, "And we find that any requirements such as  
17 condition monitoring, the benefits are zero to  
18 modest." And so we are confused. I will let you  
19 get back to the discussion. But, I mean, frankly,  
20 we are confused because, as you saw today, there has  
21 never been a mention of GSI-168 or the significant

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 efforts that the staff had in that area.

2 And it seems like the conclusions --  
3 they are bringing up the same questions and the same  
4 perspectives they had before the GSI was even  
5 started. I mean, I can remember back in '93 we were  
6 hearing the same thing, that condition monitoring is  
7 necessary. And they set about in the GSI-168  
8 program in essence to prove it, so that they could  
9 make it a regulatory requirement.

10 MEMBER MAYNARD: Okay. John, did you  
11 get --

12 MEMBER STETKAR: I did. And thanks for  
13 your elaboration. As you were speaking, I kind of  
14 reread the Enclosure 2. It is my understanding that  
15 the study you are citing looked at Surry and  
16 Peachbottom and only the contributions from LOCA  
17 events, and made some assumptions about how much  
18 cables might contribute to LOCA events. And that is  
19 really not a risk assessment. It is --

20 MR. HOLZMAN: I don't believe that they  
21 were looking at LOCAs. I think they were looking

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 at --

2 MEMBER MAYNARD: I would like to move  
3 along. I think we understand their position.

4 MR. HORIN: Okay. To move on, I think  
5 the fundamental point, or actually there is another  
6 point to be made on this particular slide -- we have  
7 already talked about the conclusions, but also there  
8 was an additional contractor report that was issued,  
9 and it is NUREG/CR-6704, that was issued at that  
10 time, which indicated that you had to look at the  
11 condition monitoring methodologies closely because a  
12 lot of the information that comes from them were  
13 obtained in laboratory settings.

14 And that the conclusion was that  
15 additional testing needed to be performed on the  
16 effect in actual plant conditions in situ to truly  
17 assess the viability, the efficacy, of these  
18 condition monitoring techniques.

19 So, ultimately, at the conclusion of 10  
20 years of research and effort, the ultimate  
21 conclusion was that we were not going to impose

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 specific expectations with respect to condition  
2 monitoring, and that we needn't change the  
3 fundamental qualification criteria that we have used  
4 with respect to environmental qualification of  
5 electric equipment.

6 To jump ahead, there has been nothing  
7 that has been placed before stakeholders -- and I  
8 would ask that if there is anything that is in the  
9 public document room, give me an ADAMS number. If  
10 there is anything that has been fully vented with  
11 stakeholders concerning supporting any change to the  
12 conclusions of the task action plan, and if they  
13 come forward with it, and we will be happy to  
14 examine it.

15 But all we have at this point in time  
16 is, well, we have some condition monitoring  
17 techniques that are promising. There is one in  
18 particular that we think may be good. But the tooth  
19 fairy -- you know, thinking what the tooth fairy is  
20 going to bring you until that quarter is under your  
21 pillow doesn't tell you what is happening.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   And we haven't had the opportunity, as  
2 we mentioned, that -- to examine any change in the  
3 basis for the conclusions that were reached in 2002  
4 and 2003. I think that it is also important to note  
5 that EPRI, with respect to the one methodology that  
6 Mr. Koshy mentioned, is planning to do in situ  
7 examination of that methodology in 2010, but we are  
8 not there yet.

9                   I mean, we have some claims of promising  
10 results in some plants in Europe, but we don't have  
11 anything that tells us, as U.S. regulated and  
12 regulatory bodies, that, yes, this is the answer.  
13 And yet we are looking to put language into a reg  
14 guide that will apply to new plants, can apply under  
15 some circumstances to existing plans, that expects  
16 condition monitoring with essentially no limitation  
17 on that provision.

18                   MEMBER MAYNARD: I am going to have to  
19 ask you to move it along a little bit. We do have  
20 some other questions for the staff, so --

21                   MR. HORIN: Okay. So we will move it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 along here. We have heard the suggestion that doing  
2 nothing is what licensees are doing, and that is a  
3 mischaracterization. We are doing environmental  
4 monitoring. We are doing walkdowns and inspections.

5 Anything that we find we put in corrective action  
6 programs and follow through with the root cause  
7 analyses.

8 Those are not nothing, and those have  
9 been shown to be effective in identifying situations  
10 where you have cables, other equipment in the plant,  
11 that may have been stressed in a manner that is, you  
12 know, not expected from the original design.

13 We have already talked about the  
14 efficacy of condition monitoring techniques to put  
15 it in --

16 MEMBER RAY: Let me interrupt you for  
17 just a second, just very briefly. All those things  
18 that are being done now would not satisfy this reg  
19 guide in your judgment?

20 MR. HORIN: No, because they add  
21 additional language with respect to cable condition

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 monitoring, which we distinguish between monitoring,  
2 environmental monitoring. And those elements -- and  
3 the new language -- we just saw this new language  
4 today, because this wasn't released previously. The  
5 new language seems to confuse condition monitoring  
6 with the type of environmental monitoring that is  
7 being conducted.

8 We would view monitoring, cable  
9 monitoring, as involving inspections, walkdowns,  
10 environmental monitoring. That would be cable  
11 monitoring. Condition monitoring is specific to and  
12 would be in addition to those other efforts that are  
13 undertaken already. And this reg guide suggests  
14 that you should be doing this condition monitoring  
15 -- cable condition monitoring in addition to the  
16 other methods that you are doing.

17 MEMBER RAY: And that is not being done  
18 now.

19 MR. HORIN: And it is not being done,  
20 because we don't have any proven ways. There are  
21 some cables -- I think we mentioned some power

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 cables. There are some methods that are useful for  
2 particular cables. But we are talking about  
3 instrumentation and control cables, medium voltage  
4 cables, we don't have some method that we can point  
5 to that is the silver bullet here.

6 And all we are asking is that there be  
7 some recognition in this language that those  
8 techniques, to the extent that condition monitoring  
9 remains in the guide, that there be some  
10 qualification on that language that suggests that it  
11 has to be some proven and effective means of  
12 condition monitoring, not just, "Well, do something.

13 We want you to do something. We don't know what  
14 that is, but do something."

15 And if we don't have any criteria or any  
16 standard by which to even approach this, we are  
17 running into a situation where licensees will be  
18 unable to demonstrate that they reasonably satisfied  
19 what the expectation is. So that is our  
20 fundamental --

21 MEMBER RAY: Okay. But it would seem --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 and I can -- I have been admonished we need to move  
2 on here, but it would seem like the guide, were it  
3 to exist, would invite licensees to propose what  
4 they would intend to do specifically. And it would  
5 be whatever was available at the time. And I gather  
6 your concern is that that wouldn't be enough.

7 MR. HORIN: No. The guide is not clear  
8 on that point.

9 MEMBER RAY: So it is a matter of  
10 clarity.

11 MR. HORIN: So it is a matter of  
12 clarity. And our suggestion, which we have at the  
13 end of our presentation, and we have essentially cut  
14 through these -- let's go right to here -- is we use  
15 language that says that, where appropriate, these  
16 activities should be supplemented with -- "these  
17 activities" being conditioned or -- being cable  
18 monitoring or environmental monitoring -- should be  
19 supplemented with condition monitoring techniques  
20 that are proven to be effective for assessing in  
21 situ degradation for the cables and conditions of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 concern.

2           And we provide some additional language  
3 that we should also be focusing on those that are  
4 most at risk. But our question here is, if we are  
5 really intending to have licensees that are --  
6 become committed to this reg guide only do those  
7 things that really work, then what is wrong with  
8 putting that language in?

9           I mean, we are looking for clarity here,  
10 and all we are saying is that, given the uncertainty  
11 -- significant uncertainty that exists with respect  
12 to the applicability of particular of any of those  
13 14 methods of condition monitoring, and, in  
14 particular, the absence of any additional record  
15 beyond what was done in the Generic Safety Issue 168  
16 resolution, that it is inappropriate to simply say,  
17 "Oh, and we expect you to do condition monitoring."

18           I would point out that among the people  
19 who commented upon this guide, the draft guide  
20 originally -- we mentioned there are five different  
21 groups -- IEEE itself commented and opposed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 inclusion of condition monitoring, because the IEEE  
2 standard on which this is premised and on which an  
3 exception is being taken doesn't address condition  
4 monitoring. So that is somewhere else.

5           And we recognize that there are going to  
6 be additional efforts, that there is an additional  
7 reg guide that is going to be evaluated, and we  
8 would suggest that this language, if we are going to  
9 come out with this reg guide now, would be  
10 appropriate in that to the extent that more detailed  
11 guidance with respect to condition monitoring and  
12 the status of that within the -- you know, our  
13 universe of activities we can employ to provide  
14 additional assurance of cable condition, is best  
15 addressed in the context of these additional efforts  
16 that are ongoing and will result in additional  
17 guidance -- sometime by the end of the year that we  
18 are looking for another reg guide that would focus  
19 -- draft reg guide that would focus on condition  
20 monitoring.

21           MR. KOSHY: Essential elements of a test

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 program.

2 MR. HORIN: Essential elements. But  
3 that type of effort that is focused purely on this  
4 issue, which is -- I hope we have gotten across is  
5 not clear that we can point to any one of those 14  
6 methods and say, "Use it."

7 MEMBER MAYNARD: What I see is a key  
8 difference between what you are proposing -- you are  
9 limiting -- you are saying "where appropriate,"  
10 whereas they are saying "all within the scope." So  
11 you are saying -- and that is one key difference.

12 The other is to basically only use it  
13 when there is a proven method or technique proven to  
14 be effective.

15 MR. HORIN: Right.

16 MEMBER SHACK: Where do you think it is  
17 appropriate?

18 MR. HORIN: In what respect?

19 MEMBER SHACK: Well, you say "where  
20 appropriate." I want to know what your definition  
21 of "appropriate is."

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MR. HORIN: We were looking at -- if you  
2 look -- on the next line down, or the next sentence,  
3 most effective when applied to cables with the least  
4 margin due to qualification level, service  
5 condition, those cables that are at risk, those  
6 cables that we know are right on the border in terms  
7 of their, you know, temperature environment, so  
8 their radiation environments, to look at those  
9 perhaps that have, you know, greater potential risk  
10 or significance in the plant, because we know that  
11 there are a number of cables that are out there that  
12 are subject -- that are safety-related, that are  
13 subject to 50.49, and it is only because they just  
14 barely exceed a temperature limit that licensees  
15 will have in their plants.

16                   MEMBER BLEY: How about cables that are  
17 in service in environments for which they weren't  
18 qualified?

19                   MR. HORIN: Well, that is something for  
20 corrective action. I mean, if they are not  
21 qualified, then they need to be qualified. I mean,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that is a separate issue. That is a regulatory  
2 compliance issue.

3 MEMBER MAYNARD: I would like to bring  
4 this to a close. I think we are clear on your  
5 position here. And unless there are some other  
6 burning questions for him, I think Charlie had a  
7 couple of questions for the staff on IEEE itself, I  
8 believe.

9 MEMBER BROWN: Yes, these are general.  
10 The IEEE standard 383-2003 is relatively general in  
11 a couple of places, and so a little bit of this is  
12 to make sure I understand how this is supposed to be  
13 applied. You describe design basis event  
14 simulations, but the design basis event environment  
15 will be different for different plants, if I am not  
16 mistaken, isn't that correct?

17 MR. AGGARWAL: Correct.

18 MEMBER BROWN: And so for applications  
19 in the commercial plants, do licensees qualify  
20 explicitly for theirs? Or do the cable  
21 manufacturers have an envelope within which they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 operate that they may qualify? I mean, I just don't  
2 know the difference. I know what I used to do. I  
3 don't know what you all do.

4 MR. AGGARWAL: Take a worst-case  
5 scenario. Going back to IEEE Standard 32374, they  
6 have provided typical cases of PWR and BWR. And  
7 most of the cables in that country have been  
8 qualified based on those presumptions.

9 MEMBER BROWN: So that is what the  
10 licensees and other folks --

11 MR. AGGARWAL: The obligation for the  
12 licensees to show that their plant-specific  
13 conditions did not exceed what is --

14 MEMBER BROWN: They try to fit it within  
15 a generic qualification. But if a plant has a  
16 unique situation, they may have to do a supplemental  
17 test or qualification.

18 MEMBER BROWN: And that is in another  
19 IEEE standard?

20 MR. KOSHY: That is another document  
21 that I referred to, 323-2003.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MR. HORIN: All right. And it is also a  
2 compliance issue. I mean, if you are outside --

3                   MEMBER BROWN: No, that is fine. I just  
4 didn't -- I didn't see it in this one, and I didn't  
5 have a reference to the other document.

6                   When you do -- again, this is aging.  
7 What I am used to seeing is you bend cables, because  
8 that is the stress point.

9                   MR. AGGARWAL: That is after the LOCA  
10 testing.

11                  MEMBER BROWN: Yes, I saw that also.  
12 But it just -- you are doing it to radii that are  
13 somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 to 40 times --

14                  MR. AGGARWAL: Yes.

15                  MEMBER BROWN: -- the diameter of the  
16 cable. And the applications I have used to qualify  
17 were like in the eight to 12, whatever the design  
18 bend radius was of the cable. That is the way we  
19 tested it, because that way we knew that if we ran  
20 into a condition during building a plant we could --  
21 we would not exceed the qualification capability.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1                   And 40 times a two-inch diameter cable  
2 is 80 inches, which is a huge bend radius. So --

3                   MR. AGGARWAL: But, remember, these are  
4 brand-new cables.

5                   MR. KOSHY: The presumption is this is  
6 verification after the post-LOCA condition. In a  
7 sense, I aged -- radiation aging, thermal aging,  
8 exposed LOCA environment. Then, I am making sure it  
9 has enough life for a basic flexibility, not the  
10 pulling conditions of the cable.

11                   MEMBER BROWN: But why aren't you  
12 interested in the performance of a cable within  
13 where it might be installed? For instance, if it's  
14 installed with a 15 bend radius, why wouldn't you  
15 test it to that, and then just -- in the LOCA  
16 conditions?

17                   MR. KOSHY: When the cable is new, you  
18 are stressing to a higher surface tension, and you  
19 have installed it in place already. So the LOCA is  
20 happening much later. So when it is new, it is  
21 capable of flexing more, and we believe -- at least

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the standard community believes that is not  
2 seriously affecting enough to reduce its qualified  
3 life.

4 MEMBER BROWN: I was talking about after  
5 your temperature -- after your aging you would have  
6 it bent to --

7 MR. KOSHY: Because the cable is -- we  
8 are not going to move in the post-accident  
9 environment. It is fixed in place. It is routed,  
10 connected --

11 MEMBER BROWN: I understand that.

12 MR. KOSHY: -- stays in place.

13 MEMBER MAYNARD: And just to see if it  
14 could withstand some flexibility.

15 MEMBER BROWN: I've got it installed  
16 with a 20-inch bend radius. I would do the aging,  
17 the thermal -- you know, thermal and radiation, and  
18 then I would do the LOCA. And that is just like it  
19 is installed. Then, I would go see, does it  
20 embrittle? Does it fall apart or not? As opposed  
21 to trying to bend it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   MR. KOSHY: Yes. Some rough bending to  
2 see if the insulation will fall apart.

3                   MEMBER BROWN: Okay. You answered my  
4 question. We can get on.

5                   VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: Let me just  
6 ask -- maybe I'm missing something. After a plant  
7 is built, how would you test a cable in situ at LOCA  
8 conditions?

9                   MR. HORIN: That is one of the questions  
10 that we have here. In terms of being able to test  
11 the cable proven and effective for the purposes for  
12 which you are trying to do the testing, if you are  
13 able to utilize the condition -- if there is a  
14 condition monitoring technique that is ever shown to  
15 be able to get down to the level of measurement that  
16 would give you some indication of whether this cable  
17 is capable of performing in a LOCA, you know, that  
18 would be -- you know, somebody ought to go out and  
19 patent that right now.

20                   Right now, condition monitoring, some of  
21 the techniques we will find gross failures. They

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 will find more significant degradation of cables.  
2 But it is very difficult to even suggest that there  
3 is anything that would get you to that point.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: But if the  
5 bottom-line purpose of this is to show -- is to  
6 monitor the condition of the cable to prove that  
7 they will actually perform adequately under LOCA  
8 conditions, to limit this to in situ methods, is in  
9 my opinion inappropriate.

10 MR. HORIN: Well, that is what we are  
11 talking about here.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: But you are  
13 saying --

14 MEMBER RAY: I think they are looking  
15 for change. I am just offering that in situ can  
16 only, obviously, detect change.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: Detect  
18 change, but not at LOCA conditions.

19 MEMBER RAY: That's right. But if you  
20 find change, then you have to do something to say,  
21 "Well, is the change indicative of a loss of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 qualifications."

2 MEMBER MAYNARD: Especially looking  
3 for --

4 MEMBER ARMIJO: Well, it's reducing your  
5 margin from the original qualification, right?

6 MR. HORIN: Yes.

7 MEMBER ARMIJO: So there must be some  
8 margin at which you would say it probably won't --

9 MR. HORIN: And that is the question:  
10 do we have any techniques that can get us to that?

11 MEMBER RAY: And then, you look at what  
12 is the significance of the change to the  
13 qualification? Which means you had to pull some  
14 cable in. All right? But the first thing you do is  
15 figure out, has there been any change?

16 Now, the argument is that isn't  
17 sufficiently dispositive on qualification.

18 MR. AGGARWAL: Just for clarify,  
19 condition monitoring is not replacing your regular  
20 testing of the cable that you had to have creating  
21 the cable -- thermal radiation, and then the LOCA

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 testing, and the tests we talked about. That is  
2 what you call testing at Level III. So the staff is  
3 not telling that condition monitoring is going to  
4 replace LOCA testing. That is given, that you will  
5 do that.

6 What the staff is saying, that -- just  
7 do the test once, and then don't walk away for 40  
8 years, 60 years, 80 years. And Bill described some  
9 of those matters with -- they are doing, but that is  
10 not in any of the regulatory guides. But that will  
11 be one of the acceptable ways to meet the  
12 requirement of the guide.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: I guess,  
14 you know, I brought up this question reading the  
15 suggested alternate wording that you have on this  
16 page where you say, "Where appropriate, these  
17 activities should be supplemented with condition  
18 monitoring techniques that are proven to be  
19 effective for assessing in situ degradation for the  
20 cables and conditions of concern."

21 MR. HORIN: You want me to say what that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 means?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: Please.

3 MR. HORIN: Yes. This guide is focused  
4 on providing some guidance, and what we are looking  
5 at is whether, for cables that have already been  
6 installed -- and Mr. Aggarwal was pointing out --  
7 this doesn't address the testing issue -- for cables  
8 that have already been installed, do we have a  
9 methodology that will provide information that will  
10 address the condition of the cable with respect to  
11 its ability to perform under the conditions for  
12 which it is expected to perform? And that is all  
13 that is saying, and that these methods would not be  
14 -- we wouldn't be pulling cable. We would have to  
15 be determining, reterminating. We would be --

16 MEMBER RAY: Yes. But you are never  
17 going to meet the standard. What you need, as I  
18 said to Said, is something that detects a change,  
19 and then you pull the cable and see if the change  
20 affects --

21 MR. HORIN: And I think that is a great,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 you know, point, and I think that is the type of  
2 thing that would be in the context of what we are  
3 talking about coming up later this year.

4 MEMBER RAY: All right. Okay.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: Or perhaps  
6 laboratory samples that are appropriately aged.

7 MEMBER RAY: That is another way to do  
8 it, pull some samples.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: That would  
10 truly represent the conditions in the field and you  
11 measure how the degradation is with aging at LOCA  
12 conditions. So my objection is to the word "in  
13 situ," because that sort of constrains the  
14 acceptability of the --

15 MR. HORIN: And we say "in situ" here  
16 because that is what this is aimed -- this reg guide  
17 is aimed at.

18 MEMBER RAY: Yes. The demonstration of,  
19 you know, ability to provide information doesn't  
20 necessarily mean that demonstrating the adequacy of  
21 that particular technique is limited to in situ. It

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 could be laboratory. But what we are concerned with  
2 is we right now have a situation where it is  
3 essentially a guidance document that would say do  
4 something, we don't care what it is, just do  
5 something.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN ABDEL-KHALIK: I'm sorry,  
7 but I read your wording differently.

8 MR. HORIN: Okay. And we'll stop.

9 MEMBER MAYNARD: I think we've aired  
10 this out enough. I think we understand the  
11 positions, and we have tried to solve the problems  
12 and everything here. But I think we have enough to  
13 lead our discussion when we get to this. So unless  
14 there is any other pressing questions for the staff,  
15 or for Mr. Horton --

16 MR. HORIN: Horin.

17 MEMBER MAYNARD: -- Horin, I will go  
18 back to my original opening statement. I never  
19 thought cable qualification could be so exciting.

20 (Laughter.)

21 And with that, I will turn it over --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

back to you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BONACA: Thank you. And with that, if there are no further questions from the public, we are going to take a break until 4:30, and we will start then.

(Whereupon, at 4:13 p.m., the proceedings in the foregoing matter went off the record.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1  
2  
3  
4

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



**Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS)  
License Renewal Full Committee  
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP)  
Safety Evaluation Report (SER)**

April 2, 2009

Donnie J. Ashley, Project Manager  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

# Introduction

- Overview of VEGP license renewal review
- License Renewal Audit and Inspection
- SER Section 2: Scoping and Screening review results
- SER Section 3: Aging Management review results
- SER Section 4: Time-Limited Aging Analyses (TLAAs)

# Overview

- License Renewal Application (LRA) submitted June 2007

## Recap of November 2008 Subcommittee Meeting

- 87 RAI items issued
- 173 Audit Questions
- 40 Commitments
- Additional Components Brought Into Scope
- Draft SER issued November 19, 2008
- Final SER issued March 13, 2009
- No Open Items (OIs)
- No Confirmatory Items
- Three (3) License Conditions [\(1\)](#)

# Overview

## Recap of November 2008 Subcommittee Meeting (cond't)

- Material Condition in Containment
  - Identified during June Regional Inspection
  - Region has evaluated past inspections and will continue to monitor
- Boral
  - Questions about adequacy of AMP
  - Telecon with Applicant and Tech Staff
  - Revised AMP commitment
- Water in Cable Pull-Box
  - Applicant revised monitoring program
  - Region will continue to monitor

## Overview (cond't)

### Subsequent to sub-committee meeting

- 7 additional RAIs issued on Boral
  - Resulted in a revised commitment to provide for inspection of panels in addition to water chemistry program.
- 94 total RAIs
- Applicant provided update on Commitments
  - Added one new commitment on debris screens.



# Audits and Inspections

- Scoping and Screening Methodology Audit  
9/17 – 9/21, 2007
- Aging Management Program (AMP) Audit  
10/15 – 10/19, 2007
- Aging Management Review (AMR) Audit  
12/9 – 12/14, 2007
- Region II Inspection (Scoping and Screening & AMP)  
5/19/ – 06/06, 2008

# Audit and Review

- Audit Summary (ADAMS Accession No. ML080430373)
  - Publicly Available, Issued on September 30, 2008
  - Audit Summary Includes :
    - Audit and Review Results
    - Audit and Review Q&A Database
    - List of Documents Reviewed by the Audit and Review Team

# Regional Inspection

- Two Weeks on Site
- AMP inspection May 19 – June 6, 2008
- 10 CFR 54.2(a)
- License renewal chapter - MC 2516
- License renewal inspection procedure IP 71002

# Regional Inspection

- Inspectors identified enhancements
  - Manhole flooding with Medium Voltage Non-Safety Related Cable
  - Condition inside containments
- Region II will follow up on these issues during a future IP 71003 inspection

## Regional Inspection

The inspection team concluded that the scoping and screening of non-safety related systems, structures, and components, was implemented as required by the rule and the aging management portions of the license renewal activities were conducted as described in the application.

## **SER Section 2: Structures and Components Subject to Aging Management Review**

Section 2.1 Scoping and Screening Methodology

Section 2.2 Plant-Level Scoping Results

Section 2.3 Mechanical Systems Results

Section 2.4 Structures Results

Section 2.5 Electrical and I&C Control Systems

## Section 2 – Conclusion

Based on its review of the LRA, the onsite audit results, and additional information submitted as the result of RAIs, the staff concluded that:

The applicant's scoping and screening methodology meets the requirements of 10 CFR 54.4 and 54.21(a)(1), and

That the applicant adequately identified those SSCs within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a), and those SCs subject to an AMR in accordance with 10 CFR 54.21(a)(1)

## Section 3: Aging Management Review Results

### Aging Management Programs (AMPs)

- 38 AMPs
  - 14 are NEW programs
  - 24 are EXISTING programs
- 20 programs with exceptions and/or enhancements
- 11 are plant specific
- 7 are consistent with GALL



## Section 3 – Conclusion

Based on its review of the LRA and additional information submitted as the result of RAIs, the staff concluded that:

Aging effects will be managed so that the intended functions will be maintained consistent with the CLB for the period of extended operation, per 10 CFR 54.21(a)(3), and

That activities authorized by the renewed license would continue to be conducted in accordance with the CLB, and any changes made to the CLB in order to comply with 10 CFR 54.21(a)(3), would be in accordance with the NRC's regulations

## SER Section 4: Time-Limited Aging Analyses

- 4.1 TLAA Process
- 4.2 Reactor Vessel Neutron Embrittlement
- 4.3 Metal Fatigue
- 4.4 Environmental Qualification of Electrical Equipment
- 4.5 Concrete Containment Tendon Prestress
- 4.6 Containment Liner Plate Metal Containments and Penetration Fatigue
- 4.7 Other Plant Specific TLAA

## 4.7 Other Plant Specific TLAs

- 4.7.1 Leak Before Break Analysis
- 4.7.2 Fuel Oil Storage Tank Corrosion Allowance
- 4.7.3 Steam Generator Tube, Loss of Material
- 4.7.4 Cold Overpressure Protection System
- 4.7.5 Underclad Cracking of Reactor Pressure Vessel

## Section 4 - Conclusion

Based on its review of the LRA and additional information submitted as the result of RAIs, the staff concluded that the applicant provided an adequate list of TLAAs, per 10 CFR 54.3 and that the:

TLAAs will remain valid for the period of extended operation, per 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(i)

TLAAs have been projected to the end of the period of extended operation, per 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(ii)

Aging effects will be managed for the period of extended operation, per 10 CFR 54.21(c)(1)(iii)

## Overall Conclusion

The staff has concluded there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the renewed license will continue to be conducted in accordance with the CLB, and that any changes made to the VEGP CLB in order to comply with 10 CFR 54.29(a) are in accordance with the Act and the Commission's regulations.



# U.S.NRC

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

---

*Protecting People and the Environment*

## License Conditions <sup>(1)</sup>

- The first license condition requires the applicant to include the UFSAR supplement required by 10 CFR 54.21(d) in the next UFSAR update, as required by 10 CFR 50.71(e), following the issuance of the renewed license.
- The second license condition requires future activities identified in the UFSAR supplement to be completed prior to the period of extended operation.
- The third license condition requires that all capsules in the reactor vessel that are removed and tested meet the requirements of American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E 185-82 to the extent practicable for the configuration of the specimens in the capsule. Any changes to the capsule insertion and withdrawal schedule, including use of spare capsules, must be approved by the staff prior to implementation. All capsules placed in storage must be maintained for future insertion. Any changes to storage requirements must be approved by the staff, as required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix H.



# Digital Instrumentation Control Interim Staff Guidance on Highly Integrated Control Room - Human Factors, Licensing Process Issues, and Related Matters

April 2, 2009

Steven Arndt  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

David Desaulniers  
Office of New Reactors

G. Edward Miller  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation



- **Background on Steering Committee**
  - Digital I&C Project Products
  - Path Forward
- **Overview of ISG-5, Revision 1**
  - Manual Operator Action Background
  - Overview of ISG for crediting manual operator actions
- **Overview of ISG-6**
  - Process Overview
  - Format of ISG-6
  - Tiers of Complexity
  - Phases of Process
  - Areas of Review
  - Path Forward

# Background on Steering Committee

- Digital I&C Steering Committee formed January 2007
- 7 Task Working Groups formed to address specific issues
  - TWG-1 Cyber Security
  - TWG-2 Diversity and Defense in Depth (D3)
  - TWG-3 Risk-Informing Digital I&C
  - TWG-4 Highly-Integrated Control Room – Communications
  - TWG-5 Highly-Integrated Control Room – Human Factors
  - TWG-6 Licensing Process
  - TWG-7 Fuel Cycle Facilities
- Industry established counterpart groups
- Over 100 public meetings to define, discuss and resolve issues

## Status of Digital I&C Products

- TWG-1: Cyber Security - ISG-1 Issued 12/2007
  - ACRS Review: Letter dated April 29, 2008
  - Next Steps: Update SRP and RG 1.152 following rulemaking and RG 5.71
- TWG-2: Diversity and Defense in Depth (D3) - ISG-2 Issued 9/2007
  - Industry Concern: Credit defensive measures and component level actuation
  - ACRS Review: Letter dated October 16, 2007
    - Recommends Process to Evaluate < 30 Minute Operator Action
  - Next Steps: Complete NUREG on diversity attributes, update SRP

## Status of Digital I&C Products (cont'd)

- TWG-3: Risk Informing Digital I&C - ISG-3 Issued 8/2008
  - Industry Concern: Risk informing guidance on D3 and policy on diverse actuation systems
  - ACRS Review: Letter dated April 29, 2008
    - Recommends emphasize failure modes vs. sensitivity studies
    - ISG-3 was revised to incorporate recommendations
  - Next Steps: Methods for obtaining risk insights and risk informing digital I&C to be addressed in 5-year research plan
- TWG-4: Highly Integrated Control Room Communications  
ISG-4 Issued 9/2007
  - ACRS Review: Letter dated October 16, 2007
  - Next Steps: Update SRP, RG 1.152, and IEEE 7.4.3.2

## Status of Digital I&C Products (cont'd)

- **TWG-5: Highly Integrated Control Room Human Factors**  
ISGs issued 9/2007 and 11/2008
  - ACRS Review: Letter dated October 16, 2007
    - Present ISG on Manual Action today
  - Next Steps: Rulemaking on Safety Parameter Display System, and update NUREG, Reg. Guide, and SRP
- **TWG-6: Licensing Process - ISG-6 under development, inspection procedure issued 10/2008, audit procedure issued 12/2008**
  - Industry Concern: Level of staff review and slow progress on ISG
  - ACRS Review: Letter Dated April 29, 2008
    - Present update today
  - Next Steps: Bi-weekly public meetings, workshop on licensing experiences in Spring 2009, add cyber security, issue final ISG

## Status of Digital I&C Products (Cont.)

- TWG –7: Fuel Cycle Facilities - ISG-7 under development
  - ACRS Review: Request Review End of Summer
  - Next Steps: Issue ISG, update and issue appropriate NUREGs
- Ongoing Work
  - Updates to Regulatory Documents
  - Operational Program Updates

- Complete ISG for Licensing and Fuel Cycle Facilities
- Update Regulatory Documents
- Address Operational Issues
- Continue to use ISGs in Ongoing Reviews
- International Cooperation
  - MDEP
  - Bilateral Work
  - COMPSIS
  - IAEA and Other Interactions
- Ongoing Research Activities

- Manual operator actions
- Computer-based procedures
- Minimum inventory



## ISG-02, Interim Staff Guidance on Diversity and Defense-in-Depth Issues, September 26, 2007

- Provided acceptable methods for implementing diversity and defense-in-depth (D3) in digital I&C system designs
- Clarified use of operator action as a diverse defensive measure and established corresponding operator action times

ISG-02 states:

“Manual operator actions may be credited for responding to events in which the protective action subject to a CCF is not required for at least the first 30 minutes and the plant response is bounded by BTP 7-19 recommended acceptance criteria.”

- Industry sought flexibility and guidance to credit manual operator actions in less than 30 minutes
- ACRS letter (10/16/07) recommended development of an alternative process to the 30-minute criterion
- Scope of TWG-5 action plan expanded to develop guidance for crediting manual operator actions
- Public interactions between TWG-5 and industry counterparts
- Industry developed white paper methodology for crediting manual operator actions
- Staff considered and incorporated, as appropriate, white paper methods in developing an amendment to ISG-05

## Manual Operator Action ISG

- Scope
- Staff Position
- 4-Phase Methodology

## Scope

- Manual actions credited in D3 analyses for coping with abnormal operational occurrences and postulated accidents (AOO/PAs) concurrent with software CCF of the digital protection system
- New and existing reactors

## Staff Position

Credited actions should be:

- Included in emergency operating procedures (EOPs)
- Executed from within the main control room
- Demonstrated to be feasible and reliable
- Addressed in the human factors engineering (HFE) program consistent with NUREG-0711

## Method

### 4-Phases:

- Analysis
- Preliminary Validation
- Integrated System Validation
- Long-term Monitoring

## Analysis

### Objective

- Estimate *time available* and *time required*
- Identify critical assumptions and credible operator errors
- Establish adequate *margin*



## Analysis

### Method

#### Time Available

- Use methods and realistic assumptions consistent with BTP 7-19.

#### Time Required

- Use a documented sequence of actions (from task analysis, EPGs, EOPs)
- Use one of several acceptable methods for developing estimates of time required to perform action sequence

#### Margin

- Time to recover from credible errors

## Analysis

### Examples of Acceptable Methods

- Operator interviews and surveys
- Operating experience reviews
- Software models of human behavior, such as task network modeling
- Use of control/display mockups
- Expert panel elicitation
- ANSI/ANS 58.8, *Time Response Design Criteria for Safety-Related Operator Actions (task decomposition)*

## Analysis

### Review Criteria Topics

- Time required
- Time available
- Use of alarms, controls, and displays
- Use of symptom/function-based EOPs
- Staff size, composition and augmentation
- Level of detail
- Identification of credible operator errors

## Preliminary Validation

### Objective

- Independent confirmation of analysis results

### Applicability

- Only required for those vendors/applicants who are using the 10 CFR Part 52 process

### Method

- Use diverse methods that are as realistic as maturity of design allows
- Submit analysis and results for NRC review as part of D3 submittal(s)

## Preliminary Validation

### Examples of Acceptable Methods

- Tabletop analysis
- Walkthrough/talkthrough analysis
- Software models of human behavior, such as task network modeling
- Use of control/display mockups
- Man-in-the-loop prototype testing
- Real-time validation using part-task simulator

## Preliminary Validation

### Review Criteria Topics

- Independence from Phase 1
- Validation team qualifications
- Use of two or more methods
- Validation of time required

## Preliminary Validation

### Results

- Shall be documented in the D3 analysis for NRC review
- Should support high confidence that the time required for manual operator actions will satisfy the success criteria for the integrated system validation

## Integrated System Validation

### Objective

- Confirm operators are able to perform credited actions in real-time using as-built design

### Method

- Use plant-referenced simulator capable of realistically representing AOO/PA with CCF
- Validate time required using both nominal and TS minimum crews
- Accomplish as part of HFE program activities per NUREG-0711



## Integrated System Validation

### Review Criteria Topics

- Integration with HFE program
- Simulator
- Personnel
- Operational Conditions
- Performance Times

## Integrated System Validation

### Performance Time Criteria

- For each AOO/PA, the *mean performance times* of the crews is less than or equal to the estimated *time required* derived from the analysis phase.
- For each AOO/PA, the *performance time* for each crew, *including margin* determined in the time required analysis, is less than the analyzed *time available*.

## Long-term Monitoring

### Objective

- Ensure credited actions remain feasible and reliable

### Method

- Design and configuration controls ensure discrepancies from D3 assumptions and constraints are identified and corrected
- Training keeps performance within assumptions of the analysis

## Long-term Monitoring


### Review Criteria

- A long-term monitoring strategy is capable of tracking performance of the manual operator actions to demonstrate that performance continues to support the associated D3 analysis
- The program is structured such that corrective actions are formal, effective, and timely

- Develop BTP and revise SRP
- Support future development and revision of ANSI/ANS 58.8, Time Response Design Criteria for Safety-Related Operator Actions

- Purpose of ISG-6
  - Refined licensing process
  - Expectations for documentation
  - Knowledge management
- Lessons learned from recent I&C amendment reviews

# Process Overview



- Introduction
- Purpose
- Licensing Process
  - Process Overview
  - Pre-Application Meetings
  - Initial Application
  - Continued Review and Audit
  - Implementation and Inspection
  - Review Areas
    - Scope of Review
    - Information to be Provided
    - Regulatory Evaluation
    - Technical Evaluation
    - Conclusion
- Appendices (Example Formats)




- Each Tier corresponds to an expected review complexity:
  - Tier 1: Previously approved system, no deviations from topical report, review to focus on plant specific aspects, least review effort expected.
  - Tier 2: Previously approved system, with deviations, moderate review effort expected.
  - Tier 3: Totally new system, extensive review effort expected. Thorough review of all technical areas.

- Working List of Review Areas
  - Defense-in-depth & Diversity
  - Hardware Architecture
  - Hardware Design Process and Quality Control
  - Communications
  - Software Architecture
  - Software Design Process
  - System Qualifications
  - System, Hardware, Software, and Methodology Modifications
  - Technical Specifications
  - IEEE 603 Compliance
  - IEEE 7-4.3.2 Compliance
  - Cyber Security

- Monthly Public Meetings
  - Next meeting is April 28, 2009
- Monthly conference calls on status
- Full Draft of ISG for Public Comment
  - Summer, 2009
- ISG-6 Issued
  - Fall, 2009
- Pilot application encouraged

# NIST Center for Neutron Research ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009



# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- **NIST Participants**
- Dr. Robert Dimeo, Director NCNR
- Dr. Michael Rowe, Special Advisor to the NCNR Director
- Dr. Wade Richards, Chief Reactor Operations & Eng.
- Dr. Paul Brand, Chief Reactor Engineering
- Dr. Robert Williams, Section Head Nuclear Analysis
- Mr. David Brown, Supervisor Health Physics
- Mr. Daniel Flynn, Senior Reactor Operator
- Mr. John Crosby, Enviro Tech Sensors Inc.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Description of NCNR
- Description of the NBSR
- Licensing Basis Accidents
- Subcommittee Follow-up Items

ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

**Description of the NCNR**

# The NIST Center for Neutron Research

## A National User Facility

The mission of the NIST Center for Neutron Research is to assure the availability of neutron measurement capabilities to meet the needs of U.S. researchers from industry, university and other Government agencies.

- 23 instruments with access based on technical merit
- Highly interdisciplinary: basic/applied materials science & fundamental physics
- More than 2200 research participants per year
- Over 300 scientific publications per year
- Numerous partnerships with other agencies, industry, and academia (e.g. NSF, ExxonMobil, FDA, Smithsonian, Johns Hopkins, UMD,...)

*Largest user program and highest productivity of any neutron facility in the US [1]*



# The National Context

“The NIST facility is the only U.S. facility which currently provides a broad range of world-class capability.” [1]

“...the NIST Center for Neutron Research (NCNR) currently has the largest number of users in the United States, largely because of its modern suite of cold neutron instruments.” [2]

“The highest priority for federal investments in neutron scattering is to fully exploit the best U.S. neutron source capabilities...for the benefit of the broadest scientific community.” [1]

“To improve access and to enable the user community to grow it is critically important to increase the number of beamlines and instruments at major facilities in the US.” [2]

[2] The American Physical Society: *Access to Major International X-Ray and Neutron Facilities*, November 2008.

[1] The Office of Science and Technology Policy Interagency Working Group on Neutron Science: *Report on the Status and Needs of Major Neutron Scattering Facilities and Instruments in the United States*, June 2002.

# Strong Management Support NIST and DoC

*NIST and DoC leadership have been extremely supportive of and remain committed to the safe, effective, and reliable operation of the NIST Reactor as a critical component of the NIST measurement mission.*

## Past

- Upgrade from 10 MW to 20 MW (1984)
- Cold neutron source/guide hall (1994)
- Upgraded cold source installed (2002)
- Cooling tower w/plume abatement installed (2002)
- Initiative to expand access by supporting more instruments and developing new capabilities (2004)

## Present/future

- NCNR Expansion and Reliability Enhancements Project (2007-2011)


ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

**Description of the NBSR**


# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- The National Bureau of Standards Reactor (NBSR) is a heavy water moderated and cooled, enriched fuel, tank type reactor designed to operate at 20Mw.
- It is a custom designed variation of the Argonne CP-5 class reactor.

# NIST Center for Neutron Research



# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009



# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- The NBSR includes many inherent, passive safety features
- The prompt neutron lifetime is long due to the heavy water
- The reactivity coefficients of void and temperature are negative
- Reactor operates in a low temperature, unpressurized condition and has no large stored energy content.

ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

**Licensing Basis Accidents**



# Accidents Analyzed

- **Startup Accident**
  - 100 kW → 130% at  $\Delta\rho/\Delta t = 5 \times 10^{-4} \Delta\rho/s$
- **Maximum Reactivity Insertion**
  - Experiment removed  $\Delta\rho = .5\%$  in .5 sec
- **Loss of Coolant**
  - Inlet pipe break in process room
  - Offsite tritium doses within 10 CFR 20 limits
- **Misloading of Fuel**
  - Fresh element in all locations

# Accidents Analyzed II

- **Loss of Flow**

1. Loss of Offsite Power \*
2. Single Pump (1 of 3) Seizure \*
3. Throttling of Inlet Valves to either Plenum
4. Spurious signal closing DWV-19 (Hot Leg)
5. Loss of Both Shutdown Coolant Pumps

- **Maximum Hypothetical Accident**

- Postulates complete melting of fuel element
- Satisfies 10 CFR 100 limits

\* Open Item

# Open Item

- Flow coastdown data out-of-date.
- New data will be measured this week.
- BNL will analyze loss of flow accidents again with updated coastdown data.

ACRS April 2, 2009

## **Subcommittee Follow-up Items**

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Discuss the methodology used to monitor the groundwater at the reactor site for contamination by releases of radioactive material from the facility.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Provide a discussion of seismically-induced damage to any structures and components that have been installed since the analysis in 1966 whose failure could impact proper operation of safety-related structures and components.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- The most recent revision of the proposed Technical Specifications contains some surveillance requirements that are less conservative than those specified in the current TSs. Provide a discussion that explains why the recommended surveillance requirements contained in ANS 15.1-2007 are inappropriate or overly conservative for the NBSR. Provide a discussion that explains how the decrease in conservatism maintains the current level of safety.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Provide a detailed step-by-step explanation of the experiment review, approval, and implementation process. Include discussions of the applicable requirements specified in the proposed Tss and administrative requirements that ensure no experiment will have an adverse impact on reactor safety or the health and safety of the public and staff personnel.



# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Provide a discussion and analysis of the adequacy of natural circulation cooling in the event that DWV-19 is isolated during extended full-power operation. Include a discussion of the heat sinks, flow paths, peak vessel temperature, and ability of the pressure relief valve to perform its intended function. Also discuss any actions or preventative measures to mitigate the consequences of such a occurrence or measures taken to prevent it altogether.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- The moderator temperature coefficient and moderator void coefficient appeared to be inconsistent with each other. Discuss how these coefficients were determined including methods of calculation. Discuss whether these coefficients necessarily need to be consistent given the methods of calculation. Discuss how these coefficients represent the most limiting conditions in the coolant and/or how the values chosen for these coefficients provide adequate conservatism.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Discuss the storage and disposal of Class B and Class C waste that may be generated at the NBSR during the period of the renewed license.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Proposed TS 3.9.1, "Fuel Storage", specified that "all fuel elements shall be stored and handled in a geometry such that the calculated  $k_{\text{eff}}$  shall not exceed 0.90 under optimum conditions of water moderation and reflection". Provide a summary and discussion of this calculation for storage in the spent fuel pool.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Clarify whether the confinement building design is based on loading from 100-mph sustained winds or a 100-mph wind gust.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Discuss the derivation of the 50-year and 100-year numerical scaling factors for wind speeds. If Caribbean hurricane wind data was used to estimate the 100-year maximum wind gust speed at the NBSR site, provide a discussion of the relevance of that data to winds at the NBSR site. Otherwise, provide a discussion of the wind data used to estimate the 100-year maximum wind gust speed for the NBSR site.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- In March 2008, storms in the Washington DC metro area generated wind gust speeds of 74 mph and 60 mph measured at Regan National Airport and 66 mph measured at Dulles International Airport. Discuss how this storm data affects the projection of the 100-year maximum wind gust speed.

# ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

- Discuss the technical basis for the applied additional rain-on-snow loading including historical data to justify the assumed 50% rain fraction.



ACRS Meeting April 2, 2009

**The End**



**U.S.NRC**

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Protecting People and the Environment*

# **Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) License Renewal Full Committee**

**National Institute of Standards and Technology  
National Bureau of Standards Test Reactor  
License Renewal**

April 2, 2009

William B. Kennedy, Project Manager  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

# Introduction

- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) National Bureau of Standards Reactor (NBSR) License Renewal
- Topics:
  - Licensing History
  - Staff Review Criteria
  - Overview of the Safety Evaluation Report (SER)
  - Resolution of Open Items in the draft SER
  - Additional Open Item in the final SER

# Licensing History

- 1961
  - The National Bureau of Standards applied for a construction permit and operating license for a 10 Megawatt thermal (MW(t)) heavy-water-cooled-and-moderated reactor
- 1963
  - The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) issued a construction permit
- 1967
  - The AEC issued Provisional Operating License No. TR-5

# Licensing History

- 1970
  - The AEC issued Facility License No. TR-5 with a term of 15 years
- 1980
  - The National Bureau of Standards applied for a 20-year renewal and an increase in the maximum licensed power level to 20 MW(t)
- 1984
  - The NRC issued the renewed license at the increased power level for a period of 20 years
- NIST filed an application for license renewal  
April 9, 2004



# Regulatory Review Criteria

- In accordance with Section 104 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the NRC must “impose the minimum amount of regulation consistent with its obligations under this Act...”
- 10 CFR Part 54 does not apply to license renewal for non-power reactors

# Regulatory Review Criteria

- Non-power reactor license renewal is primarily conducted in accordance with 10 CFR Parts 20, 50, 51, and 100 (in part, for test reactors)
  - Part 100 guidelines for radiological consequences of accidents apply to test reactors
  - Part 100, Appendix A, “Seismic and Geologic Siting Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants,” does not apply

# Staff Review Guidance

- NUREG-1537, Part II, “Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Applications for the Licensing of Non-Power Reactors: Standard Review Plan and Acceptance Criteria,” dated February 1996, provides the staff with review criteria, including:
  - NUREGs pertinent to special areas of the review, e.g., emergency planning
  - Regulatory Guides, division 2
  - American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society ANSI/ANS-15 series standards



# Areas of Review

- Facility siting criteria
- Structures, systems, and components
- Reactor characteristics
- Electrical power systems
- Experiment program
- Radiation protection
- Accident analyses
- Technical specifications
- Prior use of components

# Safety Conclusions

Based on its safety evaluation, the staff concludes:

- The design, testing, and performance of SSC important to safety during normal operation are acceptable; safe operation can reasonably be expected to continue
- The licensee's management organization is acceptable to maintain and safely operate the reactor

# Safety Conclusions

- The licensee's research activities and programs, including experiment malfunctions, will not pose a significant risk to continued safe operation of the facility
- Exposures from and releases of radioactive effluents and waste from the facility are not expected to result in doses or concentrations in excess of the limits specified in 10 CFR Part 20, and are consistent with as-low-as-reasonably-achievable principles

# Safety Conclusions

- The licensee has conservatively considered the consequences of a bounding maximum hypothetical accident and shown the radiological consequences to be a small fraction of those specified in 10 CFR Part 100
- The licensee has conservatively considered an appropriate range of postulated credible accidents using appropriate initiating and mitigating assumptions

# Safety Conclusions

- The renewed Facility Operating License and TSs provide reasonable assurance that the licensee will operate the facility in accordance with the assumptions in the SAR
- No significant degradation of SSC has occurred, and the TSs will continue to provide reasonable assurance that no significant degradation of SSC will occur

# Safety Conclusions

- The licensee's physical security plan continues to be acceptable to protect its special nuclear material
- The licensee's emergency plan provides acceptable assurance that the licensee will continue to be prepared to assess and respond to emergency events

# Safety Conclusions

- Continued operation of the NBSR during the period of the renewed license poses no significant radiological risk to the health and safety of the public, facility personnel, or the environment

# Resolution of Open Item

- Draft SER contained one open item regarding a timing requirement in the operator training and requalification program
- NRC issued an RAI on February 18, 2009
- The licensee responded March 3, 2009, stating that the requalification “program shall be administered over a period not to exceed 24 months, followed by successive 24 month periods.”



# Resolution of Open Item

- The RAI response resolved the open item by changing the timing requirement in the operator training and requalification program to meet the regulatory requirement
- Final SER concludes that the program meets all applicable regulatory requirements and is consistent with standard ANSI/ANS-15.4, “Selection and Training of Personnel for Research Reactors,” issued 1988

## **Additional Open Item**

- In addressing the concerns of the ACRS subcommittee members, the licensee identified an unrelated inaccuracy in the pump coastdown data used in two loss-of-flow accident analyses
- The licensee will perform additional analyses to determine if the inaccuracy is safety-significant
- The staff will review the analyses, verify that the conclusions in the final safety evaluation report remain valid, and present the findings to the ACRS full committee later this year



# Backup Material

- Responses to ACRS subcommittee member concerns

# Seismic Hazard Analysis

- NRC staff reviewed the seismic design basis for the facility (0.1 g peak ground acceleration)
- NRC staff reviewed past AEC and NRC approvals of the seismic design for the facility
- The staff concludes that the seismic design is adequate and conservative

# Seismic Hazard Analysis

- The licensee performed a seismic walk-down that identified a wall that, if it collapsed, could affect emergency core cooling system piping
- NRC staff visited the facility to review the walk-down
- The licensee will perform a seismic analysis for a 0.1 g earthquake and reinforce the wall if necessary
- The staff finds this acceptable

# Groundwater Monitoring

- The licensee performs groundwater monitoring by sampling surface water fed by groundwater for tritium and other nuclides
- This is consistent with analysis performed by the U.S. Geological Survey during initial licensing
- A 2006 report confirmed the original analysis
- The staff finds the current groundwater monitoring program acceptable

# Natural Circulation Cooling

- The licensee performed an analysis of natural circulation cooling following full power operation
- The safety margin is greater than 2
- There is adequate time (more than 2 hours) to manually open a valve to reestablish flow
- Even with no action, the reactor vessel will not over-pressurize
- The staff finds the analysis acceptable and the consequences are bounded by the MHA

# Single Failure Criterion

- The staff reevaluated redundancy in systems
- Electrical power is not required for maintaining safe shutdown, so redundancy only provides defense-in-depth
- Multiple monitoring devices for a single variable have diverse designs and are electrically and physically separated
- The staff finds the level of redundancy acceptable to prevent a single failure from causing an unanalyzed accident



# Surveillance Requirements

- The licensee provided additional justification for relaxing surveillance requirements
- Annual emergency sump pump testing is justified by the redundancy in emergency coolant sources
- Quarterly start tests of the diesel generators is consistent with the approved standard
- Annual surveillance of the station battery is supported by operational data and experience
- The staff finds the surveillances acceptable

# Experiment Review Process

- The licensee provided additional clarification of the extent of the experiment review and approval process
- The experiment review process meets the guidance found in the accepted standards
- The staff found that the technical specifications ensure that the licensee's experiment program will not pose a significant risk to the health and safety of the public

# Moderator Coefficients

- The licensee provided additional clarification of the consistency of the moderator void and temperature reactivity coefficients
- The coefficients are consistent when calculated for the entire coolant volume
- The coefficients are always negative
- The accident analyses do not take credit for the coefficients and are conservative
- The staff finds the licensee's treatment of the moderator coefficients acceptable

# Waste Disposal

- The licensee provided additional information on plans for storage and disposal of Class B and Class C wastes
- The NBSR license TR-5 provides possession limits for these wastes and requires appropriate storage and disposal
- The licensee plans to construct an interim storage facility with 40 years of capacity
- The staff finds the licensee's storage and disposal of these wastes acceptable

# Spent Fuel Pool Safety

- The licensee provided results of calculations of criticality safety for the spent fuel storage pool
- The licensee used conservative assumptions to show that the stored fuel cannot achieve criticality
- The effective multiplication factor remains below the limit of 0.9 in the technical specifications
- The staff finds the spent fuel pool storage facility acceptable for storage of spent fuel in accordance with license TR-5

# Site Meteorology - Wind

- The licensee provided additional information on the confinement building design for wind loads
- The building was design and built to the accepted standards at the time of construction
- The licensee's derivation of the maximum 100-year return wind speed was conservative
- The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) standard gives a wind speed of 96 mph which is below the design limit of 100 mph

# Site Meteorology – Snow

- The licensee provided additional information on potential roof snow loading
- The licensee's analysis is conservative compared to the ASCE standard
- The licensee's calculations and the ASCE standard give maximum snow loads that are below the design load for the confinement building roof




*Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards  
561<sup>st</sup> ACRS Meeting  
April 2-4, 2009*

**Draft Final Regulatory Guide 1.211, "Qualification of Safety-Related Cables and Field Splices for Nuclear Power Plants"**

***Comments of the Nuclear Utility Group on Equipment Qualification***





# Nuclear Utility Group on Equipment Qualification ("NUGEQ")

- *Formed in 1981 to address issues related to equipment qualification.*
- *NUGEQ includes utilities operating nuclear power reactors in the United States and Canada.*
- *NUGEQ represents over 95 operating nuclear power plants in the United States*


William A. Horin – Winston & Strawn, Counsel to NUGEQ

Philip M. Holzman – Strategic Technologies & Resources, Inc., Consultant to NUGEQ



# NRC EQ Task Action Plan (EQ TAP) GSI-168, "Environmental Qualification of Low Voltage Instrumentation and Control Cables"


- NUGEQ actively participated in industry interactions with NRC staff – 1993 to 2003:
- Clear industry support for cable CM research
  - NUMARC comments to NRC, "we believe that research in the area of condition monitoring may be useful toward developing information for assessing the actual service life of equipment." (Reprinted in 1993 workshop proceedings NUREG/CP-0135 (pp. H-3 to H-6))
- Clear NRC staff interest in cable CM
  - 11/15/96 memorandum to the Commission – staff states it would be prudent to have some form of cable CM
- NRC undertook a new cable test program to address six issues.
  - Two of these issues involved cable condition monitoring (CM):
    - ✦ Issue 5 – whether condition monitoring methods exist that could be used to monitor the condition of cables in situ, and
    - ✦ Issue 6 – whether condition monitoring could be used to predict the accident survivability of cables



# NRC EQ Task Action Plan (EQ TAP) GSI-168, "Environmental Qualification of Low Voltage Instrumentation and Control Cables"


## Consideration of Cable Conditioning Monitoring

- October 2000 – testing completed; NRC Staff briefs ACRS on GSI-168
  - Subsequent public meetings and interactions including input on the need for monitoring plant environments and cable CM
- June 2002 – NRC presents GSI-168 proposed resolution to ACRS, including results of CM research and estimates of CM risk benefits




# NRC EQ Task Action Plan (EQ TAP) GSI-168, "Environmental Qualification of Low Voltage Instrumentation and Control Cables"

- NRC Staff Conclusions Regarding Cable Condition Monitoring
  - Methods – No single technique was effective and a combination of techniques would be needed.
  - Risk Benefits – the benefits of reducing cable failure probability to zero [an unrealistic but bounding condition that assumed *perfect* condition monitoring techniques exist] were modest at best.
- ACRS and NRC Conclusion
  - Actual cable condition monitoring benefits, if any, would be even less than modest.
- GSI-168 Contractor Report
  - Condition Monitoring results obtained in laboratory setting
  - Additional testing needed to determine effect of plant conditions on use of techniques in  
situ




# Regulatory Guide Regarding "Qualification of Safety-Related Cables and Field Splices for Nuclear Power Plants"

- Draft Guide DG-1132
  - NRC concluded some form of cable CM needed to establish reasonable assurance of performance.
  - NRC asserted CM is needed in lieu of "doing nothing"
  - NUGEQ perspective
    - "Doing nothing" is mischaracterization
      - Environmental Monitoring
      - Walkdowns/Inspections
      - Corrective Action Programs
    - Efficacy of CM techniques not supported by the record
      - GSI-168 or subsequent information
    - Risk benefit of CM (even assuming perfect techniques) not supported by the record



# Regulatory Guide Regarding "Qualification of Safety-Related Cables and Field Splices for Nuclear Power Plants"

- **NUGEQ Conclusions and Recommendations**
  - Environmental Monitoring & walkdowns/inspections are proven & effective (NRC and industry concur).
  - Condition Monitoring can supplement environmental monitoring and walkdowns/inspections when the method is proven and effective for the cable design and conditions of concern.
  - Cable aging management activities should be focused on risk significant cables.
  - Cable aging management activities should be focused on "at risk" cables (those with the least margin).
  - Regulatory Position 7 in Regulatory Guide should be modified to reflect above perspectives.



# Regulatory Guide Regarding "Qualification of Safety-Related Cables and Field Splices for Nuclear Power Plants"

## NUGEQ Proposed Language

- (7) Programs for monitoring of environmental conditions (such as temperature, radiation levels) coupled with walkdowns to look for visible signs of anomalies attributable to aging with particular emphasis on the identification of localized adverse environments or "hot spots" should be implemented for power, instrumentation, and control cables whose failures could disable risk-significant equipment. Where appropriate these activities should be supplemented with condition monitoring techniques that are proven to be effective for assessing in situ degradation for the cables and conditions of concern. Such activities are most effective when applied to cables with the least margin due to qualification levels, service conditions, or other application considerations. For safety-related power cables, which are inaccessible or installed underground and may be exposed to condensation and wetting, appropriate inspection, testing and monitoring programs should be implemented to detect degradation.

Query: Why is this language unreasonable?



# **Regulatory Guide 1.211**

## **Qualification of Safety-Related Cables and Field Splices**

ACRS Meeting: April 2, 2009

Satish Aggarwal  
Division of Engineering  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research  
301-251-7627



## BACKGROUND

### Standards Activities:

- IEEE Std 383-1974
- IEEE Std 383-2003 published in June 2004

### Regulatory Activities:

- DG-1132 was issued for public comment in June 2007 with 10 exceptions to IEEE Std 383-2003.
- Received comment letters from 5 organizations.
- Staff met with the ACRS on September 4, 2008.

## ACRS Concerns and the Staff Responses

### ACRS:

- 1) Provide the definition of risk-significant safety-related equipment (e.g. cable).

### Staff:

The terminology “risk significant” safety-related equipment has been removed from the RG. The condition monitoring of the safety-related cables is limited to those covered by the maintenance rule.

## Regulatory Guide 1.211 (March 2009)

### C. Regulatory Position (Revised)

- (6) Programs for monitoring of environmental conditions (such as temperature, radiation levels), and condition monitoring should be implemented for power, instrumentation, and control cables (***the condition monitoring of safety-related cables may be limited to those cables covered by 10 CFR 50.65, “Requirements for monitoring the effectiveness of maintenance at nuclear power plants.”***). Condition monitoring programs may include any appropriate technique(s), supplemented with walkdowns to look for visible signs of anomalies attributable to aging with particular emphasis on the identification of localized adverse environments or “hot spots.” For safety-related power cables that are inaccessible or installed underground, appropriate inspection, testing and monitoring programs should be implemented to detect degradation. The condition monitoring and its frequency may be adjusted based on the cable performance.

## ACRS Concerns and the Staff Responses

### ACRS:

2) Clarification is needed in the scope of the guide which should be limited to safety-related cables.

### Staff:

The scope of the guide is limited to only safety-related cables.

## ACRS Concerns and the Staff Responses

### ACRS:

3) The cables under Appendix R (Fire Protection) are not within the scope of the RG.

### Staff:

The Appendix R requirements are not covered within this RG, however, they are covered by:

- Regulatory Guide 1.189 “Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants”; March 2007; Rev 1.
- NUREG-0800 “Standard Review Plan Sec 9.5.1: Fire Protection System”; October 2003; Rev 4, (Formerly NUREG-75/087 March 1979).
- “Guidelines for Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants”; Branch Technical Position ASB 9.5-1; May 1976.
- “Guidelines for Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants”; Branch Technical Position ASB 9.5-1; Rev 1; March 1978.
- “Recommended Fire Protection Policy and Program Actions” (GL 85-01); October 26, 1984.
- “NRC Positions on Certain Requirements of Appendix R to 10CFR50” (GL 83-33); October 1983.

## ACRS Concerns and the Staff Responses

### ACRS:

- 4) Justify the need for testing specialty cables with connectors.

### Staff:

This regulatory position was removed from the RG.

## **ACRS Concerns and the Staff Responses**

### **ACRS:**

The RG does not offer any specific condition monitoring techniques to assess physical and operational conditions of the cables. The requirement for condition monitoring is being imposed without any conditions monitoring techniques being endorsed by the staff.

### **Staff:**

The condition monitoring of safety-related cables should be implemented. The licensees need to choose the most applicable technique(s) based on the cable type and environment. There are about 14 condition monitoring techniques available.