Minutes

CSSG / CSCT Meeting
San Diego, CA
November 15, 2012, Eaton Room
12:00 – 17:00

CSSG Meeting - 12:00 – 13:00

Called to order @ 12:03

Present: Trumble, Erickson, Heinrichs, Wilson, McLaughlin, Kimball, Garcia, Hopper, Hayes
McKamy, Felty, Ellis, Scott, Kuferer (DNFSB)

- Introduce David Kupferer; experience - site rep at Y-12, Pantex prior. With DNFSB for 12 years. Turnover from Ernie. CS experience is limited to Y-12 and some classes, other than interaction. Reviewed a number of CSEs and know a bit how to utilize SCALE.

- Introduction of New Member (McKamy/Trumble)
    Mikey Brady-Rapp the newest meber of the CSSG going to be taking Calvins spot at the end of the year. Interested in the tasking related to fire safety.

- Discussion of possible/upcoming tasks and ideas for new taskings (Erickson/McKamy)
    - Something to do with waste. Managed as multiple locations, how to treat. Indicated Mikey may have more information.
        - *Action: Mikey, any more insight on issue, or possible tasking? (Mikey)*
    - In the past have proposed a workshop on CS. How do you know that what is credited is there?, how measured?, what is waste?, a standard for waste?. Was interest, but no budget. There may be another opportunity for something in ATL in 2013 with a number of international attendees. Both the UK and the French now appear to have similar questions.
    - CCR in 3007: Do not audit or assess, but still issues regarding what is it, and what floats to DSA. Once we have standards, and train on it, then there is divergence. What can CSSG do? Provide interpretive guidance? 420.1C relies on 1066 and 1020 and 3009? 1066 is signed, 1020 is reported to be close, 3009 is a problem.
        - *Action: Draft Tasking to prepare for path forward based on 3009: review what is there, and potential programmatic impacts. (Erickson)*
    - Ask if LANL field office wants CSSG review of LANL CAP in response to prior CSSG finding(s) [Jerry M. wants this]
    - Special session on Metrics: What has been good, bad, indifferent? A CSSG white paper? Annual report to DNFSB has a good summary of different metrics utilized. Address in context of, and dovetail with, ANS Stds and oversight model: how used, and by whom. Topical: Monitor, maintain, improve programs. May be good source of information.
    - CSSG position on support of ANS attendance to maintain awareness of CS needs/issues/positives.

    CS needs to be functionally independent of operations. This means funding needs to be separate as well. 1158 was intended to help with identifying these types of issues. NCS funding, > 30% should be separate from operational funding. Pay by the drink leads to lack of independence. Does 1158 need to be reaffirmed/reviewed to identify some of the high level issues.
    - What can CSSG do to grow/maintain an appropriate culture related to CS.
        - Programs are getting better or worse. Very few are stagnant. Safety has to be getting better, else due to facility/operational changes could be putting people at risk.

- Status of current taskings – in particular "criticality safety versus fire safety" (Trumble)
  - Tasking 2013-01 Fire safety and CS: will be approved (JM has draft) and move forward, A sub-team will be convened to address. Mikey has interest so should be a part.
    - *Action: Tasking to be approved and team assembled to address (include Mikey.) (Trumble/McKamy)*

- Update on Standards Revisions/Cancellations (NCSP staff)
  - No update at this time.

- NRC vs DOE interpretations of ANS-8 Standards (McLaughlin)
  - Not necessarily an issue within the regulators (but needs more focused research), but is an issue within organizations. Process analysis statement – accidents are not credible. Simple black and white if 'shall' is taken on its own. But in the context of the overall ANS-8 framework, much more gray in the mix… ANS-8.10 was generated to indicate there are other considerations. Foremost goal is to prevent people from getting hurt. Management can go over and above as appropriate. We will help ourselves if we elaborate, within the standards, on some of the 'trouble' spots. Point to the overarching of ANS-8. CSC voice may be ignored by management, but DOE cannot be as easily ignored. Maybe CSCT can better assist – are CSCs being effectively utilized and listened to? The application of a MAY vs using a SHOULD in the standard, for the use of a CSC, could be part of the problem. A CSC, if it exists, should be providing status to upper management.
    - *Action: re: NRC vs DOE interpretations of ANS-8 Standards, reconvene on future telecom to further discuss. (McLaughlin)*

Joint CSSG/CSCT Meeting - 13:00 – 16:00

- Introductions
  Jerry Hicks, Tom Nirider, Victor Callahan

- Coordination/Communication (Erickson/Nirider)
  - Discussions on the roles and charters of the two committees
    - CSSG is an 'expert' group, serving at Jerrys behest to address CS issues, primarily with NNSA or complex wide impact.
    - Joint meeting is a big step in the right direction to improve communication. Even though some members have dual CSSG/CSCT membership there is some isolation, also not convinced adequately take advantage of CSCT and/or CSSG resources available.
    - At prior CSCT meeting there were some negative comments regarding the CSSG in that focus was on a few sites. White papers were too focused on opinions of only a few. However, the diversity of the CSSG is involved. Also CSCT is a resource that can be better utilized.
    - CSSG needs to better include CSCT regarding potential site or complex issues.
    - Purpose of CSCT: Provide consistent oversight of CS programs. Understand orders and then implement similarly. Promote Continuous Improvement, but may be where weakest, due to compliance orientation. Discuss issues and provide feedback to CSSG and Mgmt of CS issues/needs.
    - Recommendation to have a bi-annual joint telecom to continue the interactions between the two committees.

  - Ideas of collaboration between the committees.
    - Included in discussion below.

  - How to improve communication and coordination between the CSCT, CSSG, and NCSP.
    - Exchange of minutes between groups when appropriate.
      - *Action: Determine if exchange of minutes between groups should be via email or post on NCSP website. (Erickson/Nirider)*

- Set time aside at beginning of telecom to status needs by CSSG or CSCT for the other. CSSG may not have significant progress, or have topics, of interest monthly, but can utilize as appropriate to share.
- CSSG liaison to CSCT (telecom) can (should) share results with other CSSG members.
- Vic - At Hanford & ORP & WTP – CSSG has been called in twice, DOE-HQ has been involved, DNFSB has investigated. Possibly could use help in addressing/understanding how oversight should be working. Would appreciate another look, a new set of eyes, to look at CS for WTP, and indicate if OK or not.
  - *Action: CSCT to determine if CSSG assistance should be requested. (Callahan)*

- Discussion of recent work products of the CSSG. (Trumble)
  - NCSP website lists all (except for sensitive). Reviewed 2010, 2011 taskings.
  - Role of CSSG is not to become staff aug for a site. Can support high level, more complex-wide, support.

- Criticality Safety Support (Nirider)
  - Question on training needed – a potential listing of SMEs that can help either contractor or Feds get qualified.
    - Interest by CSCT, a list including BIOs and statement of interest has been compiled. Names can be provided
    - Concern is having oversight without 'on the floor' practical experience (evaluations, codes, experiments, etc.).
    - Should CSSG/CSCT help facilitate training? Tasking on best practices white paper for Fed CS quals?
      - *Action: Send out feeler for interest regarding 'best training practices' white paper. (Nirider)*

  - Convergence question on codes. (Identified by the CSCT, more info on the specific question needed)
    - Defer – Robert McBroom bought Forest Browns line of reasoning to demonstrate convergence (multiple runs with different random numbers gives a larger std deviation than that predicted by internal code algorithms.)
    - Convergence is not the most important piece, there are bigger issues that can cause problems.
      - *Action: CSCT will clarify question on convergence for later discussion if warranted. (Nirider)*

  - Criticality Safety Evaluation (CSE) quality – are the CSCT members (or others) seeing any areas where poor CSEs are being developed, and if so, where and potential whys?
    - Issues were raised during the development of the two-week training course regarding hazard analysis for CS.
    - Generally the weak link is identification of upset conditions and the conclusions drawn.
    - UNM and UT, etc. courses need to make sure they are aware of any potential training related issues and address them.
    - Plenty of tools available to teach. No substitute for mentoring and ensuring questioning attitude. No substitute that expectations are shared. Expectations need to be shared and enforced.
    - Hanford identified unsupported conclusions, peer review has not been adequate to capture (rubber stamp? checklist?). ORP - Since not very many CSERs, not much opportunity to see good vs bad. Need to ask hard questions.
    - CSCT can invite other feds to 'assist' and/or learn/mentor. Provide sample CSEs for review?
    - Issues identified associated with small programs where there is less opportunity learn from others.

- Emerging Problems
  - What technical/policy decisions are causing the site criticality safety programs problems?

- None brought forward.

  o Impact of DOE approval process for conference/training travel
    - First was big impact to Health Physics Society conference. Some individual letters have been sent out with little impact. Now many Technical Societies (~26) have joined in, drafting joint letter to all DOE/NNSA/Govt. regarding impact. Next step is letters directly to Mr. President and Congressional Representatives. It is thought that impact on travel is not just a blip.
    - Being associated w/ ANS conference may be a liability – need to watch developments and decide at appropriate time.
    - Need to consider support of ANS – great opportunity for professional development, and association may help highlight. Wanted to ensure Jerry knew CSSG value of trying to remain tied to ANS technical information/conferences.
    - Likely to impact foreign travel for FY13 and perhaps beyond. May/will need to rework 5-year plan approvals for foreign trips.

- Feedback from the CSCT relative to the products and services of the NCSP is solicited. How can the NCSP better meet the needs of the site programs? Training? Any long range planning for experimental needs (benchmark or differential data)? Code enhancements/complaints?
  o Is CSCT requesting enough from CSSG?
  o NCSP not seeing experiment requests.
  o Reluctance to update code versions (cost)
  o Reluctance to implement sensitivity/uncertainty – TSUNAMI (cost)
  o FEDs (via CSCT) need to be more proactive to ask contractor these questions – it may help identify funding issues and accomplishing the task.

Note: the last 30 min of the joint meeting will be a closed CSSG/CSCT only meeting

Closed CSSG/CSCT Meeting - 15:30 – 16:00

- Status of the LANL criticality safety program
  o LANL has provided a CAP in response to CSSG assessment (significant internal delay). In review by field office., incl. Jerry M. and Jerry H. JM has indicated that LANL needs to justify continuing operations in light of current staffing issues. Any blip could have significant impact. Wants CSSG to review the CAP, to ensure it covers all bases. If there are flaws and it is executed, then LANL has an out (but we did what you said) because DOE approves the CAP.
  o *Action: Draft Tasking for CAP review. (Erickson)*

- Where are the major criticality safety risks and NCS programs at risk that could use support from the CSSG? Are there emerging real criticality safety risks that the CSSG needs to know about?
  o None identified.

- What problems are the DNFSB Staff causing the sites relative to NCS?
  o Potential issues with 1020, and likely 3009.
  o DNFSB vs Site DOE willingness to push back.

Closed CSSG Only Meeting (if necessary) - 16:00 – 17:00

- Any other topics identified or close on topics from prior discussions
  o Nothing identified.

Adjourn @ 16:05

Actions Summary:

CSSG

- *Action: Mikey, any more insight on issue, or possible tasking? (Mikey)*
- *Action: Draft Tasking to prepare for path forward based on 3009: review what is there, and potential programmatic impacts. (Erickson)*
- *Action: Tasking 2013-01 to be approved and team assembled to address (include Mikey.) (Trumble/McKamy)*
- *Action: re: NRC vs DOE interpretations of ANS-8 Standards, reconvene on future telecom to further discuss. (McLaughlin)*
- *Action: Draft Tasking 2013-02 for CAP review. (Erickson)* ***(Complete, review on hold until further notice 11/26/12.)***

CSSG/CSCT

- *Action: Determine if exchange of minutes between groups should be via email or post on NCSP website. (Erickson/Nirider)*

CSCT

- *Action: CSCT to determine if CSSG assistance should be requested. (Callahan)*
- *Action: Send out feeler for interest regarding 'best training practices' white paper. (Nirider)*
- *Action: CSCT will clarify question on convergence for later discussion if warranted. (Nirider)*