

MINUTES FOR
EFCOG SAWG AUTHORIZATION BASIS SUBGROUP MEETING
5/1/2000 IN SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
J.S. Davis 6/1/2000

Chair: Floyd Galegar
Sandia National Laboratories - Albuquerque
P.O. Box 5800, MS 1173
Albuquerque, NM 87185-1173
Voice: (505) 844-8147
Fax: (505) 845-8952
E-mail: fgaleg@sandia.gov

Attendees: See list in Attachment 1.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION A: Brad Evans will follow up with Rich Stark on the status of the Authorization Agreement issue. (See Item 3 in Attachment 3.)

ACTION B: Dick Englehart will hold teleconferences with the volunteers on each action for the five-year update of DOE-STD-3009 and -3011 to determine what is to be done, who will do what, how tasks will get accomplished, and schedules for completion. (See Item 1 in Attachment 3.)

ACTION C: Sam Savani will contact John Johnson and Art Crawford about providing summaries for the sessions they chaired at the January 2000 AB Workshop. (See Item 2 under "AB Workshops" below.)

INTRODUCTION AND CHANGE OF COMMAND

1. Sam Savani, the outgoing chairman, introduced Floyd Galegar, the new chairman. The attendees introduced themselves.

AB WORKSHOPS

2. Art Francis gave a report on lessons learned during preparation for the January 2000 AB Workshop. (See Attachment 2.) He cautioned future organizers that financial aspects need to be tracked rigorously. Five of the seven sessions have completed summaries posted on the EFCOG web site.
3. The group discussed the vision for future AB Workshops. Considerations were:
 - (a) We may not need a workshop every year. We should only have a workshop if there are issues to be worked. We seem to have issues fairly continuously.
 - (b) We need to work on translating AB Workshop discussions into actions.
 - (c) Much of the feedback on previous AB Workshops has been positive.
 - (d) We need to consider travel limitations.
 - (e) Alternatives to Workshops include (1) assigning resolutions to individuals or task teams, (2) using SAWG teleconferences more, and (3) making the AB Workshop part of the annual SAWG Workshop.
 - (f) Making the AB Workshop a part of the annual SAWG Workshop would address the problem where people may be allowed to travel once, but not twice, in one year. But when a workshop is embedded in another Workshop the results can get diluted.
 - (g) It is difficult to dedicate time through use of teleconferences. Having a workshop forces people to take time to work on issues.
 - (h) Perhaps we can dedicate portions of the workshop to bringing issues to closure.
 - (i) People who work on AB issues need to have upper management support in order to succeed.
 - (j) We need to determine what "closure" means on AB Workshop issues - A list of lessons learned? A list of recommendations? Implementation of recommendations?
 - (k) Perhaps a small task team should be assigned to determine which issues would be good for a workshop forum and which issues would be better served by another forum.
 - (l) *Subsequent to the meeting, the issue of whether to have additional AB Workshops was elevated to the SAWG Steering Committee.*

JANUARY 2000 AB WORKSHOP ISSUES

4. The issues addressed at the January 2000 AB Workshop are listed in Attachment 3 along with specific action items and current status.
5. Regarding DOE/NRC design criteria (item 5 in Attachment 3): Beginning in 2000 new DOE nuclear facilities are to be designed and constructed considering NRC licensing guidance. (A statement was made in a different workshop session that significant modifications to nuclear facilities would also be required to be designed and constructed considering NRC licensing guidance.) Rich Stark is working with NRC on developing a standard review guide for 10 CFR Part 70. NRC appears to be receptive to stating that implementation of DOE-STD-3009, DOE O 420.1, and the Implementation Guide for the SAR Rule would be sufficient for implementation of 10 CFR Part 70. NRC regulation of DOE is still possible.
6. Regarding training for safety analysts (item 2 in Attachment 3): We need to determine how to improve mentoring and on-the-job training of safety analysts. Perhaps we need a list of qualified individuals that can provide these functions. It would also be good to "grow experts locally".
7. Regarding use and application of evaluation guidelines (item 4 in Attachment 3):
 - (a) Dick Englehart says there is a lack of understanding of Appendix A to DOE-STD-3009. It is meant only to determine which SSCs should be safety class. Analysts often don't know the relationship between accident dose calculations and safety.
 - (b) Irv Spickler noted that the appendix plays down the "pencil-sharpening" approach, and that the only required dose assessment is for the maximum offsite individual, to be used in determination of safety class SSCs. Onsite dose calculations are not required, and the issue of location of the onsite receptor (e.g., 100 m vs. 600 m) is moot. With the limited funding available for SARs, we need to put our money where it counts - not into consequence modeling, meteorology, release fractions, etc. We must not lose sight of the goal of an appropriate amelioration strategy. Worker protections should be defined based on estimated consequences (e.g., "low," "medium," and "high"). We should not be using the philosophy of "if I'm under the evaluation guideline, I don't have to do anything."
 - (c) Interpretation of DOE-STD-1027 regarding "reportable quantities" is applicable to this issue. Terms such as "inventory" and "releasable amount" are often used interchangeably. There are also issues with "form," "quantity," and "segmentation." Irv Spickler agreed that the words on DOE-STD-5502 are confusing, and stated that a revision of DOE-STD-1027 would never

get published in today's political climate. It was noted that we have the official interpretation mechanism as a source for resolution of these issues.

(d) This issue appears to be worthy of being an AB workshop topic.

OTHER ISSUES

8. "Graded approach" is being interpreted inconsistently across the DOE complex, partly due to "personality-driven" expectations (e.g., DOE-STD-3009 format required in BIOs). It was noted that a paper would be presented at the Workshop in which a 6-chapter SAR would be recommended, where the traditional programmatic chapters would be replaced with references to each program manual. There was interest in determining the AB Subgroup's reactions to this presentation. Dick Englehart noted that the intent of the programmatic chapters in SARs is to describe how the programs fit into facility operation.
9. There is no AB process in place for decontamination and decommissioning activities, and it is difficult to deal with the uncertainties in these activities. (Uncertainties include things we don't know as well as discoveries.) Dick Englehart noted that decontamination and decommissioning are the most dangerous activities DOE is doing now.
10. Fred March suggested creating an Operational Readiness Review group within the SAWG. One goal of the group could be to help prevent analytical, judgmental, and philosophical issues from being dragged into ORRs. Other goals would be to facilitate appropriate application of "graded approach" and provide guidance on the transition process following AB approval.
11. Irv Spickler stated that "when you do the right thing, you will meet the regulations." Brad Evans noted that even when the standards are understood, activities are often driven by funding and almost impossible schedule demands. Others noted that it is difficult to work in the current regulatory environment that is becoming more detail-oriented, voluminous, and varied.
12. Barbara Hawks noted that the DOE-sponsored USQ course brought a lot of consistency to the DOE complex in the USQ process. She suggested that consistency in other aspects could be obtained if the "basics" were the same at all field offices. A recent ISM finding indicates that safety and authorization basis documents are incomplete, inconsistent, and inaccurate. For example, some safety analyses are full of minutia, while others are more general.
13. If the Nuclear Safety Rules are issued, people will want clarifications.

14. The memo written by Frank Rowsome (DP-45), "The Safety Basis Debacle in DOE's Nuclear Weapons Program," was discussed. This personal memo criticizes DOE's ability to review and approve safety documentation, and the narrow scope of hazard analyses. It has influenced the EH-2 assessments such that they are now focusing on the AB process.

POTENTIAL MERGER OF AB AND TSR SUBGROUPS

15. The possibility of merging the TSR and AB Subgroups was discussed.
- (a) Because of travel restrictions and no significant TSR concerns recently, the TSR Subgroup has been relatively inactive. But there is still a need for TSR-related resources.
 - (b) One reason for not bringing the TSR Subgroup into the AB Subgroup is that the AB Subgroup already has so many issues to address.
 - (c) A suggestion was made to merge several subgroups together because of their interrelationships (e.g., Accident Analysis, Training, TSR, and AB Subgroups). In response it was noted that a single large group could be overburdened, and that it is the role of the SAWG Steering Committee to assure integration of the Subgroups as appropriate.
 - (d) It was suggested that the TSR and USQ Subgroups develop lists of subject matter experts, so that even if the TSR Subgroup were dissolved, a resource list would be available to those who need it.
 - (e) There are currently very few TSR instructors (this is related to the training issue also). The purpose of the earlier DOE-sponsored TSR, USQ and 3009 courses was to create instructors at the local level, but this hasn't happened.
 - (f) Various aspects of the DOE/DP TSR course are being taught to particular sites as needed.
 - (g) If the Nuclear Safety Rules are issued, nuclear/explosive safety will be included. Pantex has HAR and ABCD documents, and a crosswalk from these documents to the TSR Order / Rule will be needed.
 - (h) One problem is that TSRs are separate from SARs, even though TSRs are very dependent on SARs.
 - (i) A related emerging issue from the DNFSB is whether we've done enough to assure that safety functions will work as assumed when needed.
 - (j) The TSR issues could be broadened to include TSR and SSC selection and strategies.
 - (k) *Subsequent to the meeting, the SAWG Steering Committee decided to continue the TSR Subgroup, broaden its scope, and potentially change its name. For more information, see the minutes for the 5/3/2000 Steering Committee meeting (to be posted on the EFCOG web site when completed).*

ATTACHMENT 1

AB SUBGROUP MEETING ATTENDEES
5/1/2000

Name	Company	Phone	E-Mail
Beach, Rex	LLNL	925-422-7592	Beach3@llnl.gov
Bond, Alan	LANL	505-685-7024	ajb@lanl.gov
Bosted, Chris	DOE-Richland	509-376-7661	C_Chris_Bosted@rl.gov
Buhl, Tony	EnergX	303-426-4351	AnthonyBuhl@worldnet.att.net
Davis, Janet S.	CH2M Hill Hanford	509-376-9284	Janet_S_Davis@rl.gov
Englehart, Dick	DOE HQ (EH-31)	301-903-3718	Richard.Englehart@hq.doe.gov
Evans, Brad	Fluor Hanford	509-372-2744	C_B_Brad_Evans@rl.gov
Ferrer, Jorge A	DOE-Oak Ridge	865-576-6638	FerrerJA@ORO.doe.gov
Francis, Art	Bechtel Nevada	702-295-1155	Franciaadoe.nv.gov
Galegar, Floyd	SNL	505-844-8147	Fgaleg@sandia.gov
Gordon, Derek	LANL	505-665-1951	DGordon@lanl.gov
Grill, Dick	DOE-Richland	509-372-0848	Richard_P_Dick_Grill@rl.gov
Gupta, M. K.	WSMS	803-502-9674	MGupta@wxsms.com
Hawks, Brenda L.	DOE/ORO	865-576-2503	HawksBL@ORO.doe.gov
March, Fred	SNL	505-323-6784	FMarch@sandia.gov
Martin, Chip	DNFSB Staff	202-694-7132	CharlesM@dnfsb.gov
McCormick, J. A.	WSMS	803-502-9799	Jim.McCormick@wxsms.com
McKeehan, Rob	ORNL/UT-Battelle	865-576-5313	M5r@ornl.gov
Moreno, Mario	DOE-Richland	509-376-6844	Mario_R_Moreno@rl.gov
Niemi, Belinda	WIPP Site	505-234-8489	Bniemi@wipp.carlsbad.nm.us
Paik, Ingle	WSMS	803-502-9621	Ingle.Paik@wxsms.com
Rice, John W	Bechtel BWXT Idaho	208-526-4206	wjr@inel.gov
Savani, Sam	WSRC/WSMS	803-502-9638	Sam.Savani@wxsms.com
Shannon, Michael H.	M.H. Chew & Assoc.	925-455-3558	MRMichaelShannon@hom
Spickler, Irwin	ATL International	301-353-9464	Ispickler@atlintl.com
Steele, Chris	DOE/LAAO	505-667-3418	CSteele@doeal.gov
Wood, John	DOE-Oakland	925-422-0683	John.Wood@oak.doe.gov

ATTACHMENT 2

AB WORKSHOP 2000 LESSONS LEARNED

Art Francis

1. Include hosting of the workshop in a scope of work to enable accumulation of administrative costs, i.e., clerical efforts in development of the announcement, etc., and meeting facility deposits.
2. Review the draft announcement with Prime Contract officials before making distribution. This will ensure that the host organization is not violating contract requirements.
3. Include a clear explanation in the announcement that the workshop is not a product of the host, but instead is a product of the DOE EFCOG. This is to clarify the appropriateness of DOE attendees to pay the fee for attendance.
4. Include a clear explanation of the registration cancellation and refund policy.
5. Ensure that all forms including the registration form and all take-off forms include such standard information as attendees' full name, company name and address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address.
6. Ensure that all of the individual information is available for verification by the attendees. This can be accomplished by posting a master list (broken into several parts alphabetically for ease of use) at the registration table for review during breaks, etc.
7. A lap top computer at the meeting site with a printer would be a big help to develop a real-time list of attendees to be available for review and correction by attendees. A laptop and printer can also be used to prepare nametags for late registrations and substitutes.
8. If DOE or host copy machines are not going to be available, the announcement should clearly explain options available to presenters who do not bring sufficient handout materials. One suggestion might be that the presenters utilize a commercial copy center and request reimbursement as an expense item on their travel.

ATTACHMENT 3
AB WORKSHOP 2000 ISSUES AND STATUS

Note: The issues were discussed at the May 2000 AB Subgroup meeting, but the detail in this table was developed after the meeting from the issue summaries available on the EFCOG web site.

ITEM	ISSUE	SUMMARY ON WEB?	ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION ITEMS	STATUS
1	Five-year update of DOE-STD-3009 and -3011	Yes	Minimum SAR for Category 3 facilities	Dick Englehart (for overall issue) JC Laul (LANL) Fred March (SNL) Art O'Grady (LLNL) Guy Bishop (DOE-RL) Chris Kimura (LLNL)	All in process. Draft materials provided by Dick Englehart.
			TSR and other implications of SC SSC	Brad Evans (FHI) John Johnson (BBWXI) Floyd Galegar (SNL) Robert Boston (DOE-ID) David Renfro (ORNL) Art O'Grady (LLNL) Al MacDougall (DOE-KAO) Liz Royball (DOE-AL)	
			Clarification of HA binning examples	JC Laul (LANL) Fred March (SNL) David Renfro (ORNL) Scott Hildum (LLNL) Al MacDougall (DOE-KAO) Ken Eger (Foster-Wheeler) Jerry Bueck (LANL)	
			Guidance on treatment of chemical hazards	Guy Bishop (DOE-RL) Rick Haynes (DOE-SR) JC Laul (LANL) John Rice (BBWXI)	

ITEM	ISSUE	SUMMARY ON WEB?	ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION ITEMS	STATUS
			Guidance on integration and inclusion of FHA, NPH, criticality safety analysis, etc.	Brad Evans (FHI) Robert Boston (DOE-ID) David Renfro (ORNL) Liz Royball (DOE-AL) JC Laul (LANL) John Johnson (BBWXI)	
			PSAR content guidance	Jerry Bueck (LANL) Brad Evans (FHI) Rick Haynes (DOE-SR) David Renfro (ORNL) Liz Royball (DOE-AL)	
1 (cont'd)	Five-year update of DOE-STD-3009 and -3011 (cont'd)	Yes (cont'd)	Guidance on SARs during change of mission	Maria Gavrilas-Gwinn (DOE-EM5) Dick Grill (DOE-RL) Scott Hildum (LLNL) Al MacDougall (DOE-KAO)	All in process. Draft materials provided by Dick Englehart. (cont'd)
			Guidance on source term and leakage rate assumptions (passive ventilation)	JC Laul (LANL) Lowell Tripp (DOE-SR) Chris Kimura (LLNL) David Renfro (ORNL) Guy Bishop (DOE-RL) Dick Grill (DOE-RL)	

ITEM	ISSUE	SUMMARY ON WEB?	ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION ITEMS	STATUS
2	Training and retraining to ensure core competency	Yes	<p>The SAWG Training Subgroup will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Become more active in contacting AB training site representatives, compiling the information used at sites, and posting the information on EFCOG SAWG Training Subgroup web page. • Develop an example Training Matrix • Develop and distribute training and qualification criteria for independent safety reviewers • Become more active with Subgroup chairs and the Steering Committee in addressing consistency of core qualification requirements at sites • Identify and post info on existing safety analysis training courses • Identify safety analysis training courses that can be accomplished by OJT • Gather and post safety analysis training course evaluation information • Work closer with DOE-HQ and field offices regarding safety analysis training and establishing consistent requirements 	Lorraine Segura Gene Hochhalter	All in process

ITEM	ISSUE	SUMMARY ON WEB?	ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION ITEMS	STATUS
			<p>The SAWG Training Coordinator will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide copies of the Safety Analyst Training Plan to new AB training site points of contact • Actively encourage greater participation on the Training Subgroup by AB training site points of contact 	<p>Lorraine Segura Gene Hochhalter</p>	<p>All in process</p>

ITEM	ISSUE	SUMMARY ON WEB?	ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION ITEMS	STATUS
			•		
3	Authorization Agreements	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the checklist for Maintenance of Authorization Agreements where it refers to a "USQ or USQ-like process". Clarify use of terms such as "Authorization Basis" and "Authorization Agreement" Update examples of Authorization Agreements on the ISM homepage Make further improvements to the format for Authorization Agreements 	Henry P. (Hank) Himpler Emil Morrow Mitch Kunich	In revision of DOE 450.4 (ISM Guide), Rich Stark (DOE-HQ) included information from EM/DP AA survey.
4	Use and application of evaluation guidelines	Yes	Revise the draft position paper to address the points and concerns raised at the workshop.	Brad Evans	In process
5	NRC/DOE design criteria comparison	Yes	Unknown	Carl Smith Guy Bishop Lew Miller Don Edwards	No resolution yet. Carl Smith presented paper at 2000 SAWG Workshop. Possibility of DOE-HQ initiatives. Rich Stark is working with NRC.
6	Assuring quality of safety analyses and documentation	No	Unknown	John Johnson	No resolution yet.
7	Design / QA controls for safety SSCs	No	Unknown	Art Crawford Brad Evans Carl Smith	No resolution yet.