

CERTIFIED

Date issued: 4/16/99

Date signed: 4/28/99

ACRS-3147
PDR

TABLE OF CONTENTS
MINUTES OF THE 460TH ACRS MEETING

March 10-13, 1999

	<u>Page</u>
I. <u>Chairman's Report (Open)</u>	1
II. <u>Proposed Commission Paper on 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments) (Open)</u>	1
III. <u>Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA Methodology (Open)</u> .	4
IV. <u>Proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality (Open)</u>	6
V. <u>Proposed Rule for Event Reporting Requirements (Open)</u>	8
VI. <u>Reevaluation of the Generic Safety Issue Process (Open)</u>	9
VII. <u>Licensing Framework for Fuel Burnup Extension/NRC Participation in the CABRI Reactor Fuels Research Program (Open)</u>	11
VIII. <u>Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement Policy (Open)</u> ..	12
IX. <u>Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report Regarding Tritium (Open)</u>	14
X. <u>NRC Safety Research Program</u>	16
XI. <u>Executive Session (Open)</u>	16

Reports, Letters, and Memoranda

REPORTS

- SECY-99-054, "Plans for Final Rule - Revisions to 10 CFR Parts 50, 52, and 72: Requirements Concerning Changes, Tests, and Experiments" (Report to Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 22, 1999.)
- Core Research Capabilities (Report to Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 22, 1999)

RS01

LETTERS

- Lessons Learned from the ACRS Review of the AP600 Design (Letter to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 22, 1999)
- Proposed Amendment to 10 CFR 50.72, Immediate Notification and 50.73, Licensee Event Reporting System (Letter to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 23, 1999)
- Application of Westinghouse Best-Estimate Loss-of-Coolant Accident Analysis Methodology to Upper Plenum Injection Plants (Letter to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 24, 1999)
- High Burnup Fuel Phenomena Identification and Ranking (Letter to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 24, 1999)
- Guidance Memorandum for Implementation of the Revised Enforcement Policy (Letter to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 24, 1999)
- Proposed ASME Standard for Probabilistic Risk Assessment for Nuclear Power Plant Applications (Phase 1) (Letter to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dana A. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, dated March 25, 1999)

MEMORANDA

- Degraded Switchyard Voltage Issues at Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Units 1, 2, and 3 (Memorandum to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS, dated March 22, 1999)
- Safety Evaluation Regarding Combustible Gas Control in Containment at Indian Point Unit 2 (Memorandum to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS, dated March 23, 1999)

- A. Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations
- B. Report on the Meeting of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee Held on March 9, 1999 (Open)
- C. Future Meeting Agenda

APPENDICES

- I. Federal Register Notice
- II. Meeting Schedule and Outline
- III. Attendees
- IV. Future Agenda and Subcommittee Activities
- V. List of Documents Provided to the Committee

CERTIFIED

MINUTES OF THE 460TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
MARCH 10-13, 1999
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The 460th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards was held in Conference Room 2B3, Two White Flint North Building, Rockville, Maryland, on March 10-13, 1999. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate action on the items listed in the attached agenda. The meeting was open to public attendance. There were no written statements nor requests for time to make oral statements from members of the public regarding the meeting.

A transcript of selected portions of the meeting was kept and is available in the NRC Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 I (Eye) Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. [Copies of the transcript are available for purchase from Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1014, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.]

ATTENDEES

ACRS Members: Dr. Dana A. Powers (Chairman), Dr. George Apostolakis (Vice-Chairman), Mr. John Barton, Dr. Mario V. Bonaca, Dr. Mario H. Fontana, Dr. Thomas S. Kress, Dr. Don W. Miller, Dr. William J. Shack, Dr. Robert L. Seale, Dr. Robert E. Uhrig, and Dr. Graham Wallis. [For a list of other attendees, see Appendix III.]

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Open)

[Note: Dr. John T. Larkins was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. Dana A. Powers, Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. and reviewed the schedule for the meeting. He discussed a number of administrative items for the Committees attention during this meeting.

II. Proposed Commission Paper on 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments) (Open)

[Note: Mr. Michael T. Markley is the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Mr. John J. Barton, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Plant Operations introduced the topic to the Committee. He stated that the purpose of this meeting was to

review the proposed Commission paper on the staff's proposed reconciliation of public comments and recommendations for revising 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments) described in SECY-99-054, "Plans for Final Rule - Revisions to 10 CFR Parts 50, 52, and 72: Requirements Concerning Changes, Tests, and Experiments." Mr. Barton noted Commissioner Diaz had made an interesting speech at the recent NRC Regulatory Information Conference regarding the issue of "margin of safety."

NRC Staff Presentation

Ms. Eileen McKenna, NRR, led the discussions for the NRC staff. Mr. Frank Akstulewicz, NRR, provided supporting discussion. Significant points raised during the presentation include:

- Policy issues addressed in SECY-99-054 include: allowance of "minimal" changes without prior NRC approval, options for "margin of safety", consistency of other regulations including 10 CFR Parts 71 and 72, implementation and enforcement, and issues related to the scope of 10 CFR 50.59.
- The staff supports the use of the term "minimal" for increase in probability and consequences. NEI 96-07 is more consistent with the term "negligible." The staff recommends the following rule language for the proposed revision to 10 CFR 50.59:
 - frequency of occurrence of accidents,
 - likelihood of occurrence of malfunction,, and
 - systems, structures, and components.
- The Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) alternate approach (i.e., maintaining the integrity of the design bases of fission product barriers) for margin of safety was endorsed by a majority of public comments and is acceptable to the NRC with modification to include support systems.
- The staff agrees with public comments to make other regulations consistent with proposed changes to 10 CFR 50.59 and proposes to revise 10 CFR Part 71 for packaging and transportation of radioactive materials and Part 72 for independent storage of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

- The staff recommends an 18-month implementation period to allow for the development and review of guidance including NEI 96-07, "Guidelines for 10 CFR 50.59 Safety Evaluations." This would facilitate licensee implementation of revisions to procedures and training.
- The staff recommends continuation of enforcement discretion for violations of low safety significance during the implementation period.

NEI Discussion

Mr. Russell Bell of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) offered comments and discussion but did not provide a presentation on this matter. Mr. Bell stated that members of the NEI 10 CFR 50.59 Task Force were in attendance. He summarized the history and development of the proposed revisions to 10 CFR 50.59. Significant points made during the discussion include:

- Much progress has been made in the two years since issuance of (SECY-97-035) NUREG-1606, "Proposed Regulatory Guidance Related to Implementation of 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests, or Experiments)."
- The key issue of concern to the industry is margin of safety. Much was learned during the enforcement discretion period for updating Final Safety Analysis Reports (FSARs).
- The staff's definition of "minimal" is more explicit than NEI prefers. NEI continues to believe that "negligible" is a more appropriate term for use by the industry but would not object to the use of minimal if the staff insists.

Dr. Apostolakis questioned the staff's proposal to use "likelihood" rather than "probability" as it now exists in the regulations. He questioned the staff's apparent rejection of his suggestion from the February 1999 ACRS meeting that the staff should drop use of the term "probability." Dr. Apostolakis stated that likelihood and probability have essentially the same meaning. He noted that 10 CFR 50.59 is a process requiring judgment and suggested that the process is not well suited for the evaluation of probability. The staff stated that they would have to check with the Office of the General Counsel and noted that such a change might require the proposed rule to be reissued for public comment. Dr. Powers questioned whether margin of safety could be defined such that probability is not an issue. The staff stated that a proper understanding might be set in the criteria. The staff stated that

a meeting with NEI was scheduled for later in the day to work through possible criteria using case study examples. The Committee requested Mr. Markley, ACRS senior staff engineer to attend and report back to the Committee.

Dr. Kress questioned the staff's evaluation of margins. He questioned whether or not uncertainty was considered. He also suggested that the issue of margins was problematic because of different plant designs, analysis methodologies, and degrees of conservatism. The staff stated that they did not evaluate uncertainty with a high degree of rigor but looked at margin in a qualitative way to ensure that there was adequate margin. Dr. Powers stated that the analysis was demonstratively conservative and suggested that the focus assure that only minimal changes in the methods of analysis. The staff stated that there would still be a need for a means of judging the methods.

Dr. Shack suggested that the term "minimal" was more appropriate than the term "negligible." The staff stated that the Commission appears to think that minimal is greater than negligible. Dr. Shack stated that negligible is within the subsets of minimal.

Conclusion

The Committee issued a report to the Chairman Jackson dated March 22, 1999, on this matter.

III. Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA Methodology (Open)

[Note: Mr. Paul A. Boehnert was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Dr. Thomas S. Kress, Acting Cognizant Member, introduced this topic to the Committee. He noted that the Westinghouse Electric Company intends to apply its best-estimate large-break loss of coolant accident (LOCA) methodology, using the WCOBRA/TRAC code, to its two-loop Upper Plenum Injection (UPI) plants. This methodology is similar to that previously applied to the Westinghouse 3- and 4-loop plant designs. The Thermal-Hydraulic Phenomena Subcommittee met on December 16, 1998 and February 23, 1999 to consider this matter. The focus of the Subcommittee's review was on the modeling differences engendered by

UPI. Dr. Kress said that the results of the Subcommittee's review showed results similar to that for AP600 core cooling; i.e., the physics is difficult to model, but the plant system and emergency core coolant system (ECCS) is robust. Experimental data shows that the figure of merit (peak cladding temperature) is insensitive to the UPI code's physical models and that core cooling progresses from the bottom-up.

In response to questions from Dr. Powers, Dr. Kress noted that best-estimate methods are being used to provide licensees relief from the overly conservative strictures of Appendix K to the ECCS Rule. He also said that Westinghouse ranged sensitivity analyses to address the issue of uncertainties.

Westinghouse Presentation

Mr. M. Nissley, Westinghouse, discussed the extension of the Westinghouse best-estimate large-break LOCA methodology to UPI plants. He addressed three central topics associated with use of this methodology: (1) application of the Code Scaling, Applicability, and Uncertainty (CSAU) evaluation methodology to UPI modeling, (2) demonstration that cooling of the high power regions of the core in UPI plants is by bottom-up reflood, and (3) ranging of interfacial condensation and drag is appropriate for uncertainty analysis of UPI plants.

The key points noted by Westinghouse included the following:

- The WCOBRA/TRAC code validation matrix was expanded to assess phenomena ranked "high" based on the CSAU evaluation methodology. These phenomena and the associated test data were: subcooled counter current flow limit (GE tests, Upper Plenum Test Facility (UPTF)), entrainment/de-entrainment (UPTF, Cylindrical Core Test Facility (CCTF)), upper plenum condensation (UPTF, CCTF)
- Assessment results show some biases exist with as-coded models (i.e., under prediction of core drain rate and upper plenum condensation, over prediction of hot leg entrainment).
- Ranging of parameters was defined using separate effects tests (GE, CCFL, UPTF). These tests were used to fix the interfacial condensation and drag multipliers and to justify modeling UPI as a continuous liquid film.

In response to Dr. Powers question, Westinghouse stated that they did not address the issue of experimental error. In response to Dr. Wallis, Mr. Nissley indicated that the physics associated with upper plenum injection are a second-order affect with regard to peak cladding temperature. Dr. Wallis said that Westinghouse should have ranged its phenomena more extensively than it did for this effort in order to determine how much margin exists in its analysis. As a result of further discussion, Westinghouse indicated that one UPI plant utility (Wisconsin Electric) intends to pursue a power uprate using the WCOBRA/TRAC UPI best-estimate code.

NRC Staff Presentation

A summary of the NRC staff's review of the acceptability of the WCOBRA/TRAC UPI code version was provided by Mr. F. Orr, NRR. He discussed the review scope, process, key technical issues, findings and conclusions. NRR finds the UPI best-estimate large-break LOCA methodology to: be consistent with the CSAU process and the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.157, satisfy the requirements for a realistic model provided in 10 CFR 50.46, and meet the requirements of Appendix A and GDC 35.

During the general discussion, Westinghouse responded to Dr. Powers by indicating that the phenomena of breakaway oxidation of the cladding was not possible. Dr. Wallis expressed concern that the staff's review was too perfunctory. In response to Dr. Wallis's question, Mr. Wermiel, NRR, indicated that the staff would not approve this review if the ACRS's concerns were not adequately addressed.

Conclusion

The Committee issued a letter to the NRC Executive Director for Operations (EDO) dated March 24, 1999, on this matter.

IV. Proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality (Open)

[Note: Mr. Michael T. Markley was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Dr. George Apostolakis, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment introduced the topic to the Committee. He stated

that the purpose of this meeting was to review the proposed American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Standard for Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) for Nuclear Power Plant Applications (Phase 1).

ASME Presentation

Mr. Gerry Eisenberg introduced the ASME representatives and working group participants in attendance. Sidney A. Bernson, American Nuclear Society, led the discussions for the ASME Committee on Nuclear Risk Management (CNRM). Ronald L. Simard, NEI, Duncan Brewer, Duke Power Company, and Mary Drouin, NRC/RES, provided supporting discussion. CNRM representatives described the ASME organization, process for developing codes and standards, and mission of the CNRM in developing the proposed standard. Significant points made during the presentation include:

- The purpose of the Standard is to provide a means to ensure that the technical quality of PRAs is sufficient to support the regulatory review and approval of licensee risk-informed applications.
- The scope of the Phase 1 Standard is for Level 1 PRA. Some Level 2 PRA requirements related to large, early release frequency are also considered.
- The ASME process defined in the Standard includes:
 - evaluation of the extent to which a "reference" PRA technical elements are necessary and sufficient.
 - evaluation of differences between the site-specific PRA and reference PRA.
 - identification of areas where augmented evaluation is needed.
 - evaluation of safety significant structures, systems, and components.
 - use of peer reviews and expert judgment to ensure adequate quality.

NEI Discussion

Mr. Biff Bradley of NEI provided a brief report on the status of industry activities to certify PRAs and discussed possible integration of these initiatives with the ASME Standard. He stated that all NSSS Owners Groups have PRA certification programs. He also stated that the Owners Groups hope that the ASME Standard

may acknowledge these certification programs in some way in the final version of the Standard.

Dr. Apostolakis questioned the level to which the Standard defines what is necessary and sufficient. Dr. Bonaca noted that the Standard only has two paragraphs that address the sufficiency. Dr. Wallis questioned how to assure quality and who decides when quality is sufficient. ASME representatives stated that the Standard is intended to support a broad range of possible applications and was not designed to be overly specific with regard to a particular approach. Drs. Powers and Apostolakis agreed that the Standard should not prescribe methods but noted that the discussion on the treatment of expert judgment was an exception to the flexibility built into other parts of the Standard. Dr. Powers questioned the Standard's apparent reliance on expert judgment. ASME representatives stated that Standard was developed to support a risk-informed audience and noted that the use of expert judgment was intended to compensate for areas where PRA is incomplete.

Committee Members offered a number of detailed suggestions which ASME representatives agreed to take under consideration. Dr. Apostolakis informed the CNRM representatives that the Committee would also offer detailed written comments in its letter on this matter.

Conclusion

The Committee issued a letter to the Executive Director for Operations dated March 25, 1999, on this matter.

V. Proposed Rule for Event Reporting Requirements (Open)

[Note: Mr. Noel F. Dudley was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Mr. John Barton, Chairman of the Plant Operations Subcommittee, summarized the objectives and background of the proposed amendment to 10 CFR 50.72, "Immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power reactors," and 50.73, "Licensee event report system." Dr. Powers requested that the staff, during its presentation, identify the current NRC reporting needs.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Scott Newberry, NRR, stated that the staff's positions contained in the proposed amendment have not been finalized. He identified the sources of information and the public comments that the staff used to develop the amendment. Mr. Dennis Allison, NRR, presented the objectives of the amendment and the schedule for issuing a final rule and associated event reporting guidelines. He described the major changes proposed in the amendment and explained how the changes would effect the burden on the NRC and licensees.

The ACRS Members and the staff discussed the rationale for the required length of time within which licensees must report events, how the staff verifies that licensees make required reports, and the different possibilities for developing site-specific lists of reportable engineered safety feature (ESF) system actuations.

Nuclear Energy Institute Presentation

Mr. James Davis, NEI, explained that the industry has worked closely with the staff to develop the proposed amendment and to reach closure on modifying the reporting process. He noted that for some licensees the proposed requirement for reporting ESF system actuations could apply to systems outside a plant's design basis. Mr. Davis concluded that the important issues that need to be resolved are determining the appropriate length of the required reporting times and maintaining the focus of the amendment on reporting risk-significant events.

The ACRS Members and Mr. Davis discussed the optimal length of required reporting times and the requirement for reporting the actuation of risk-significant systems.

Conclusion

The Committee issued a letter to the EDO dated March 23, 1999, on this matter.

VI. Reevaluation of the Generic Safety Issue Process (Open)

[Note: Mr. Amarjit Singh was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Dr. Don W. Miller, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Plant Systems, introduced the topic to the Committee. He noted that this matter was discussed during previous ACRS meetings. The Committee wrote two letters regarding the generic safety issue (GSI) process and identified a number of concerns. In the October 16, 1998 letter, the Committee recommended that there is a need for a systematic reevaluation of the GSI process.

NRC Staff Presentation

Mr. John Craig, RES, began by updating the Committee on the status of the activities related to the GSI process. He stated that the purpose of this briefing was to provide a progress report on the proposed revisions to the GSI process. The staff conducted a self-assessment of the GSI process and issued a final evaluation report.

The staff summarized the principal observations made during the self-assessment process. There are many misconceptions of the GSI process; the most significant one is that safety is adversely affected while a generic safety issue remains unresolved. Evolution of the program, since it was initiated in 1972, has caused it to deviate from original objectives which included supporting the reactor licensing process and using information from operating experience to pursue changes to regular requirements.

The GSI process should be implemented using two levels of guidance; the first at the agency-wide level would take the form of a Management Directive (MD) or Commission Policy Statement, and the second would entail more detailed office level procedures, which consider explicitly the distinctive aspects of work in the office. The staff stated that the recommended changes in the GSI process in the self-assessment report will be implemented through the MD. The staff plans to issue the MD for public comment in early May 1999.

Significant key points raised by the Committee included the following:

- Dr. Wallis expressed a concern regarding why does it take from three to six months to screen the issue before it is prioritized.

- Dr. Wallis suggested that the staff conduct a pilot study to evaluate the new process recommended in the MD.

Conclusion

The Committee plans to issue a letter on this matter during a future meeting.

VII. Licensing Framework for Fuel Burnup Extension/NRC Participation in the CABRI Reactor Fuels Research Program (Open)

[Note: Mr. Medhat El-Zeftawy was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Dr. Dana A. Powers, the cognizant ACRS Member, introduced the topic to the Committee. He stated that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the status of activities associated with a proposed use of phenomena identification and ranking in a confirmatory research program to validate the regulatory decision on high-burnup fuel extension. Dr. Powers also stated that the ACRS, in its recent letter to Chairman Jackson, had suggested that the staff look forward and determine necessary information to support burnup extension beyond the current regulatory limit of 62 GWd/t.

NRC Staff Presentation

Ms. Margaret Chatterton, NRR, led the discussions for the NRC staff. Ms. Chatterton stated that the NRC will be working with the industry to develop a strategy and a plan to address high-burnup fuels. She presented NRR's perspectives on the high-burnup fuel issues, which include the current licensing requirements, risk-informed approach, emphasis on lead test assemblies, and fuel performance monitoring program.

Dr. Powers questioned whether the staff had documentation on the magnitude of power history effect on fuel behavior. The staff stated that comprehensive power history effect on fuel behavior at high-burnup is not available.

Mr. Ralph Meyer, RES, presented RES's plan of using the phenomenon identification and ranking table (PIRT) to guide its confirmatory research program

to validate the regulatory limit of high-burnup fuel extension to 62 GWd/t. In addition, the PIRT will be used to help establish the data and analyses needed to support applications for extending burnups beyond the current regulatory limit of 62 GWd/t.

Dr. Wallis questioned whether an experimental test on fuel for high-burnup was done using PIRT. The staff stated that some tests were performed at 62 GWd/t, however, the tests results may not be valid because they were conducted with inappropriate power shape, and coolant environment. In addition, there is an interest to extend the burnup limit up to 75 GWd/t for which the staff does not have available data. The staff also stated that cooperative work with the industry using PIRT to validate high-burnup fuel would allow the staff to establish the data and phenomena, not only to address the extended high-burnup issue but also to confirm the current regulatory limit of 62 GWd/t.

The ACRS members and the staff discussed the following key issues:

- Development of PIRT for high-burnup fuel,
- Update on Argonne National Laboratory fuel program on LOCA and mechanical properties,
- Status of CABRI and U.S. participation, and
- Comments on new source term at high-burnup.

Mr. Terry Rieck, Commonwealth Edison Company, stated that the industry is working with the staff on the PIRT process to identify the type of experiments and representative fuels to establish data to support a high-burnup fuel extension program.

Conclusion

The Committee issued a letter to the Executive Director for Operations, dated March 24, 1999, on this matter.

VIII Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement Policy Open)

[Note: Mr. Noel F. Dudley was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Introduction

Dr. Robert Seale, Acting Chairman of the Policy and Practices Subcommittee, summarized the status of the latest revision to the Enforcement Policy. He noted that the staff has discussed a proposed approach for making the Enforcement Policy risk-informed with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) and is planning a pilot program of this approach at several plants over the next six months. Dr. Seale urged the speakers to identify, during their presentations, possible pitfalls associated with the proposed enforcement approach.

Staff Presentation

Mr. James Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement, described the expanded use of non-cited violations for Level IV violations and the types of violations that could result in the issuance of a notice of violation (NOV). He noted that the guidance and examples for implementing the new policy is contained in a recent Enforcement Guidance Memorandum.

Mr. Lieberman explained a proposed enforcement approach that would be coordinated with the plant assessment process. He stated that the proposed enforcement approach would use the traditional enforcement process for violations that resulted in actual safety consequences and for violations not included in the assessment process. Mr. Lieberman stressed that the proposed approach would maintain a compliance focus based on risk and licensee performance. The ACRS Members and the staff discussed the following:

- issuance of NOVs for repetitive violations,
- quality of the Enforcement Guidance Memorandum,
- expected NRC response to adverse assessment findings, and
- determination of risk associated with fire protection systems.

Nuclear Energy Institute Presentation

Ms. Ellen Ginsberg, NEI, stated that the latest revision to the Enforcement Policy serves the public interest. She noted that the exception for issuing an NOV for repetitive violations should be eliminated and that non-safety significant violations should not be used in the plant issues matrix (PIM), which is a tool used in the assessment process. Ms. Ginsberg indicated that the industry strongly supports the

proposed enforcement approach which would result in enforcement actions being more risk-informed.

The ACRS Members, the staff, and Ms. Ginsberg discussed the following:

- use of inspection findings and repetitive violations in the assessment process,
- reduction in the number of civil penalties due to the proposed approach,
- use of risk in adjusting severity levels of identified violations, and
- development of risk metrics for use in implementing the Enforcement Policy.

Conclusion

The Committee issued a letter to the Executive Director for Operations dated March 24, 1999, on this matter.

IX. Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report Regarding Tritium (Open)

[Note: Dr. Medhat El-Zeftawy was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee heard presentations by and held discussions with representatives of the Department of Energy (DOE) and its contractors, and the NRC staff regarding the tritium production issue.

The Secretary of Energy and the Chairman of the NRC signed a joint DOE/NRC Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Under the terms of this MOU, the NRC will provide review and consultation services to assist DOE in assessing and resolving technical and licensing issues for tritium production.

DOE is responsible for establishing the capability to produce tritium by the end of year 2005, in accordance with a Presidential decision directive. DOE has selected the commercial light water reactor (CLWR) as the primary path to produce tritium, with the accelerator production of tritium as a backup. DOE has developed burnable poison rods using lithium, rather than boron, in pressurized water reactor fuel assemblies. As a result of irradiation by neutrons in the reactor core, some of the lithium in the target rods is converted to tritium. The irradiated burnable poison rods can then be removed from the fuel assemblies and shipped to another location (e.g., Savannah River Plant) for tritium extraction.

DOE, through its contractor Westinghouse, submitted a topical report entitled, "Tritium Production Core (TPC) Topical Report." This topical report presents the technical information related to the production of tritium using tritium production burnable absorber rods (TPBARs) in CLWRs. DOE representatives stated that the purpose of the topical report is to establish an envelope of design, methodology, and analysis to be referenced by licensees participating in the tritium program production. The topical report describes an evaluation and analysis assuming a large number of TPBARs in the core (more than 3000). A reference CLWR design was used to provide a representative configuration upon which the impact of full core of TPBARs was determined. The results of this effort are not bounding for all CLWRs, but bounding for many characteristics and representatives of the effort and anticipated outcome.

DOE used the NRC Standard Review Plan (SRP) (NUREG-0800) as a guide to determine the areas for evaluation in the nuclear steam supply system. For those SRP sections which are not impacted by the TPBARs, and no evaluation was required, DOE provided the basis for its judgment. DOE states, in the topical report, that the results of the evaluation for the representative CLWR demonstrate that operation of a CLWR with a large number of TPBARs in the core is feasible and does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety, operability, and productivity of the plant.

The NRC staff reviewed the DOE topical report and prepared a draft safety evaluation report. The staff determined that there are certain plant-specific interface issues for which a licensee must provide additional information and analyses in support of a plant-specific amendment to the facility operating license for authorization to operate a tritium production core. These issues include:

- Reactor vessel integrity analysis,
- Specific assessment of hydrogen source and timing or recombiner operation,
- Light load handling system,
- Station service water system,
- Ultimate heat sink,
- New and spent fuel storage,
- Spent fuel pool cooling and cleanup system, and
- Demineralized water makeup system.

In addition, the staff has determined that a facility undertaking irradiation of a tritium production core will require changes to the technical specifications contained in Appendix A of any facility operating license. These changes include:

- Reactor coolant system pressure and temperature,
- Low temperature overpressure protection system,
- Spent fuel assembly storage, and
- Design features, fuel storage.

Conclusion

The Committee plans to continue its follow-up regarding this issue and will participate in the license amendment review of a plant-specific application.

X. NRC Safety Research Program

The Committee continued its discussion of the 1999 report to the Commission regarding the NRC safety research program. Several research areas were discussed, including human factors and human-machine interface; high-burnup fuel performance; thermal-hydraulic code integration and in-house capabilities; advanced instrumentation and controls; steam generator integrity; reactor pressure vessel integrity; irradiation-assisted stress corrosion cracking; severe accident research; and NRC policy issues.

Conclusion

The Committee plans to issue a report to the Commission during a future meeting.

XI. EXECUTIVE SESSION (Open)

[Note: Dr. John T. Larkins was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

A. Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations

[Note: Mr. Sam Duraiswamy was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

- The Committee discussed briefly the response from the NRC Executive Director for Operations (EDO) dated March 8, 1999, to ACRS comments and recommendations included in NUREG-1635, Vol. 1, Review and Evaluation of the NRC Safety Research Program.

The Committee decided to continue its discussion of the EDO response during the April 7-10, 1999 ACRS meeting.

B. Report on the Meeting of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee (Open)

The Committee heard a report from Dr. Powers and the Executive Director, ACRS, on the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee meeting that was held on March 9, 1999. The following items were discussed:

- The schedule for the March ACRS meeting, Members' workload for this meeting, and the priorities for ACRS reports and letters were discussed. Also, methods for improving the cognizant Member's summaries and draft positions and better incorporation of comments and issues raised during Committee discussion of a particular matter into draft letters were discussed.
- The ACRS Members asked the Subcommittee to develop a rationale for choosing items to be scheduled for ACRS review and to exercise a level of selectivity in the choice of these items. In a memorandum to the Subcommittee, Dr. Powers suggested the following priority scheme for the selection of issues, listed from the highest to the lowest priority:
 - Statutory mandate
 - Commission direction
 - Public request
 - Staff request
 - Industry request
 - Individual member interest
 - Historical interest to the ACRS
 - Useful information for future ACRS deliberations

In addition, the Committee should consider prioritizing an issue according to the ability of the ACRS to add value to the Commission decision process because of a particular Member expertise.

- The Subcommittee discussed ACRS priority activities for CY99, retreat commitments, and ACRS Member workload. In a Memorandum to the Subcommittee, Dr. Powers proposed that the following guidelines be used to manage Member workload:
 - Maintain the current Subcommittee structure
 - Assign technical issues to the appropriate Subcommittee chairmen
 - Assign issues on an availability basis rather than on an expertise basis
 - Use special project teams of Members (ad hoc subcommittees) on issues of major impact or complexity
 - Include in the Future Activities Report a Member-by-Member breakdown of issues
 - Include in the Future Activities Report draft topical agendas for future meetings
- The Subcommittee discussed the status of Dr. Uhrig's draft report to the Commission on NRC research. Dr. Uhrig had prepared a draft of the research report that incorporates the ACRS Members' input. The ACNW expects to finalize its input during their March 23-25, 1999 meeting.
- During the February 1999 ACRS meeting, Dr. Powers suggested that the Committee consider establishing an Adopt-a-Region Program instead of the existing Adopt-a-Plant Program. The Adopt-a-Region Program is not a substitute for the Members' annual visit to selected NRC Regional Offices and plants. The ACRS staff prepared a paper that provided ideas, suggestions, and pros and cons related to the proposed Adopt-a-Region Program. This paper was distributed to the Members during the February meeting and the Members were asked to be prepared to discuss the proposal at the March 1999 ACRS meeting.

- During the October 1998 ACRS meeting, the Committee suggested that the ACRS staff follow-up on the NRC staff activities associated with control room habitability, and that this matter be scheduled for discussion at the March 1999 Planning and Procedures Subcommittee meeting. Information concerning the NRC staff activities related to main control room habitability was sent to the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee members on March 1, 1999.
- The Arizona Public Service (APS) sent a letter dated February 16, 1999, to the Executive Director for Operations (EDO) commenting on the statement made by the Committee in its letter dated November 23, 1998, regarding the proposed resolution of GSI-171. In their letter, the Committee stated "NRR has raised concerns that degraded switchyard voltage events at Salem and Palo Verde nuclear plants indicate it is possible that plants have either not implemented undervoltage protection properly or conditions have changed that invalidate original design basis capability." This statement was quoted from background information contained in a memorandum from Charles Rossi, AEOD, to John Craig, RES, dated August 18, 1998.

The APS letter provides results of analyses of Palo Verde station's electrical configuration under a LOCA/grid collapse/LOOP scenario. APS evaluated this scenario and concluded that operating experience and analysis show that tripping a plant causes only a minor perturbation to the grid. APS concluded that a LOCA/grid collapse/LOOP scenario is improbable for Palo Verde. APS offered the opportunity to brief the ACRS on this issue.

According to NRR staff, APS believes that the ACRS statement implies that Palo Verde is vulnerable to a degraded switchyard voltage event, and that the plant has not properly implemented switchyard voltage protection or plant conditions have changed that invalidate original design capability.

- During the February 1999 ACRS meeting, the Committee recommended that Dr. Fontana prepare a program plan for reviewing the license renewal issue, topical reports, as well as Calvert Cliffs and Oconee License Renewal Applications.

- The appointment of one of our Senior fellows ends in October 1999. The guidelines for reappointment of ACRS Fellows for a second term are that the Fellow's performance during the first term was satisfactory and that the Committee still has a need for the Fellow's services. The Subcommittee will make a recommendation to the full Committee.
- Jack Sorensen has been closely following the activities of the NRC PRA Steering Committee and would like to provide a short briefing to the ACRS during the Future Activities session of the March meeting.
- A letter has been received from Professor H.D. Fisher discussing RSK involvement in a working group on digital safety instrumentation and control. Professor Fisher also states that Siemens representatives have suggested a visit by Dr. Apostolakis and a small group of other ACRS members to the Siemens Laboratories.
- The ACNW will hold a workshop on the Linear No-Threshold Hypothesis on March 23 and the morning of March 24, 1999. Dr. Powers has been kept informed as to the planned activities of this workshop. A decision will be made on ACRS attendance.
- Issues have recently been raised at NRC with regard to some individuals using Government telephones for personal purposes. Dr. Savio had sought legal advice from OGC on the issue of the use of Government equipment for non-Government purposes by Members while at the NRC on Government business and obtained OGC's advice on limited use for reasonable purposes. GSA is currently developing a policy that, if implemented, would allow federal employees to use fax machines, telephones, and computers for personal use if doing so results in minimal expense and does not interfere with Government business. This appears to be similar to the advice Dr. Savio obtained from OGC. Members are asked to review the guidance from OGC and to be sensitive to the fact that concerns have been raised in other offices with regard to the personal use of Government equipment. Members should also be aware that non-Government visitors to ACRS meetings are only permitted to use NRC office equipment for support of ACRS activities and not for personal or other business activities.

- In October 1995, the Committee established guidelines for foreign and domestic travel. These guidelines were developed to provide an equitable system for approval of foreign travel in light of budget cuts, particularly in foreign travel, and in response to the Chairman's request that foreign travel be limited to NRC mission-related activities. These guidelines limit the total number of foreign trips a year to 10 and a limit per member of 2 foreign trips a year (excepting Quadripartite Meetings or bilateral exchanges). The guidelines also limit the number of days for which members can receive compensation to 4 per trip, including travel days. If members wished to extend their travel, per diem was paid for additional days, but not compensation. OGC has advised that members cannot receive per diem unless they also receive compensation. Therefore, members will only be authorized for a specific number of days to conduct agency business. Should a member decide to stay longer, they will receive neither compensation nor per diem for additional days. The Executive Director is responsible for authorizing all travel and for ensuring that budget limits are not exceeded.
- A draft Commission paper on the results of the ACRS and ACNW self-assessment for CY 98 has been provided to ACRS members for review and comment.
- The reorganization of the ACRS/ACNW Office will be effective on March 14, 1999. Dr. Larkins will brief the members on the assignments and distribution of responsibilities.
- Members were given a copy of the draft revised Bylaws during the February ACRS meeting and were asked to provide comments.
- Six of the ten ACRS full Committee meetings scheduled for Calendar Year 1999 fall during the second week of the pay period. Approximately two years ago, ACRS/ACNW management assured the NRC labor union that a limited number of ACRS full Committee meetings would be held during the second week of the pay period to facilitate the engineers to utilize the CWS Pilot Program. The CWS Pilot Program allows an employee to take off equivalent overtime hours worked on a Saturday, or any other meeting day within the

same pay period. According to the regulations, employees cannot be asked to work overtime without compensation. This is the only way most of the engineers can be compensated for overtime they work during full Committee meetings, since they are not entitled to overtime pay.

Additionally, we note that each Saturday meeting costs the agency approximately \$2,000 to run the HVAC system in support of ACRS meetings, in addition to the cost for security and staff overtime. As the agency budget decreases, we will be asked to hold fewer Saturday meetings.

- MEMBER ISSUES

Dr. Apostolakis suggested that interested ACRS staff engineers be encouraged to attend the August 1999 ANS meeting on PRA to be held in Washington, D.C.

- FOREIGN TRAVEL

Drs. Powers and Uhrig requested approval to attend the Enlarged Halden Programme Group meeting to be held at Loen, Norway, on May 22-30, 1999.

During the February Planning & Procedures meeting, the Subcommittee recommended approval of Dr. Powers' request, since he was invited to speak at this meeting. Dr. Uhrig will attend other auspices.

C. Future Meeting Agenda

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the 461st ACRS Meeting, April 7-10, 1999.

The 460th ACRS meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. on March 13, 1999.

Foundation announces the following meeting.

Name: Advisory Panel for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (1171).

Date and time: March 11 and 12, 1999—8:30 a.m.—5:00 p.m. each day.

Place: Rm. 970, NSF, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

Type of meeting: Closed.

Contact person: Dr. Stuart Plattner, Cluster Coordinator for Anthropological and Geographic Sciences Cluster, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1758.

Purpose of meeting: To carry out Committee of Visitors (COV) review, including program evaluation, GPRA assessments, and access to privileged materials.

Agenda

Closed: March 11 and 12 from 8:00–5:00 each day—To review the merit review processes covering funding decisions made during the immediately preceding three fiscal years for the Anthropological and Geographic Sciences Cluster.

Reason for closing: During the closed session, the Committee will be reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if they are disclosed. If discussions were open to the public, these matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: February 17, 1999.

Linda Allen-Benton,
Acting Director, Division of Human Resource Management.

[FR Doc. 99-4365 Filed 2-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision (OMB Clearance No. 3150-0101).

2. The title of the information collection: Amended Final Rule—Requirements for Initial Operator Licensing Examinations.

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often the collection is required: No additional information submittals are required. Each facility that elects to prepare its own licensing examinations will be required to establish (a one-time activity) and periodically maintain (approximately biennially) procedures to control examination security.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: Power reactor facility licensees.

6. An estimate of the number of responses: 66.

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 33.

8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 5,800 during the first year and 660 hours per year thereafter (2,373 hours annualized over 3 years).

9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104-13 applies: Not applicable.

10. Abstract: NRC is amending its previously published (62 FR 42426) proposed rule, 10 CFR 55, "Initial Licensed Operator Examination Requirements," to add additional information collection requirements and is publishing the revised document as a final rule. The new information collection requirements will require power reactor facility licensees to establish, implement, and maintain procedures to control examination security and integrity if they elect to prepare their own licensing examinations.

Submit, by (insert date 30 days after publication in the Federal Register), comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance packages are available at the NRC worldwide web site (<http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/OMB/index.html>). The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by March 25, 1999.

Erik Godwin,

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0101), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, 301-415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of February 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-4392 Filed 2-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7580-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

* Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Notice

In accordance with the purposes of Sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on March 10-13, 1999, in Conference Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64105).

Wednesday, March 10, 1999

8:30 A.M.–8:45 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of the meeting.

8:45 A.M.–10:15 A.M.: Commission Paper on 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments) (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the Commission Paper on the summary of public comments and staff recommendations for revising 10 CFR 50.59.

10:30 A.M.–12:00 Noon: Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA Methodology (Open/Closed)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the Westinghouse Electric Company and the NRC staff regarding the application of the Westinghouse best-estimate large-break LOCA methodology to upper plenum injection plants.

(Note: A portion of this session may be closed to discuss Westinghouse Electric Company proprietary information.)

1:00 P.M.-4:15 P.M.: Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Task Force and the NRC staff regarding the Phase 1 Standard, developed by the ASME Task Force, for PRA quality as well as industry programs for certifying PRAs.

4:30 P.M.-7:15 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports, including those on NRC Safety Research Program, Core Research Capabilities, Lessons Learned from the Review of the AP600 Design, and Role of Frequency-Consequence Curves in Risk-Informed Decisionmaking.

Thursday, March 11, 1999

8:30 A.M.-8:35 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of the meeting.

8:35 A.M.-10:00 A.M.: Event Reporting Requirements Rule (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the rule for event reporting requirements.

10:15 A.M.-11:45 A.M.: Reevaluation of the Generic Safety Issue Process (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the results of the reevaluation of the Generic Safety Issue process.

1:00 P.M.-2:30 P.M.: Fuel Burnup Extension Licensing Framework/NRC Participation in the CABRI Reactor Fuels Research Program (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the proposed use of a systematic process, such as Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table (PIRT) for fuel burnup extensions, and the status of the NRC participation in the CABRI reactor fuels research program.

2:45 P.M.-7:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports.

Friday, March 12, 1999

8:30 A.M.-8:35 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of the meeting.

8:35 A.M.-10:00 A.M.: Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement

Policy (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding guidance for implementing the revised Enforcement Policy, as well as the staff's plans to make the Enforcement Policy risk informed.

10:15 A.M.-11:45 A.M.: Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report Regarding Tritium Production Core (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Department of Energy (DOE) regarding the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report associated with the tritium production core, which describes how the inclusion of a significant number of tritium-producing-burnable absorber rods affects the performance of nuclear plant systems and components for a representative commercial light-water reactor.

11:45 A.M.-12:00 Noon: Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations (Open)—The Committee will discuss the responses from the NRC Executive Director for Operations (EDO) to comments and recommendations included in recent ACRS reports and letters. The EDO responses are expected to be provided to the ACRS prior to the meeting.

1:00 P.M.-1:30 P.M.: Report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee (Open/Closed)—The Committee will hear a report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee on matters related to the conduct of ACRS business, and organizational and personnel matters relating to the ACRS.

(Note: A portion of this session may be closed to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of this Advisory Committee, and information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.)

1:30 P.M.-2:00 P.M.: Future ACRS Activities (Open)—The Committee will discuss the recommendations of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee regarding items proposed for consideration by the full Committee during future meetings.

2:00 P.M.-7:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will continue its discussion of proposed ACRS reports.

Saturday, March 13, 1999

8:30 A.M.-3:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will continue its discussion of proposed ACRS reports.

3:00 P.M.-3:30 P.M.: Miscellaneous (Open)—The Committee will discuss

matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on September 29, 1998 (63 FR 51968). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written views may be presented by members of the public, including representatives of the nuclear industry. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during the open portions of the meeting and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify Mr. Sam Duraiswamy, Chief of the Nuclear Reactors Branch, at least five days before the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting may be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the Chief of the Nuclear Reactors Branch prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACRS meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with the Chief of the Nuclear Reactors Branch if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

In accordance with Subsection 10(d) P.L. 92-463, I have determined that it is necessary to close portions of this meeting noted above to discuss Westinghouse Electric Company proprietary information per 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4), matters that relate solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of this Advisory Committee per 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(2), and to discuss information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy per 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor, can be obtained by contacting Mr. Sam Duraiswamy, Chief of the Nuclear Reactors Branch (telephone 301/415-7364), between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., EST.

ACRS meeting agenda, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are available for downloading or viewing on

the internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/ACRSACNW>.

Videoteleconferencing service is available for observing open sessions of ACRS meetings. Those wishing to use this service for observing ACRS meetings should contact Mr. Theron Brown, ACRS Audio Visual Technician (301-415-8066), between 7:30 a.m. and 3:45 p.m. EST at least 10 days before the meeting to ensure the availability of this service. Individuals or organizations requesting this service will be responsible for telephone line charges and for providing the equipment facilities that they use to establish the videoteleconferencing link. The availability of videoteleconferencing services is not guaranteed.

Meeting Date Change

The July 1999 ACRS meeting previously scheduled for July 7-9, 1999, has been changed to July 14-16, 1999.

Dated: February 17, 1999.

Andrew L. Bates,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. 99-4394 Filed 2-22-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7530-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316]

Indiana Michigan Power Company,
Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1
and 2; Issuance of Director's Decision
Under 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has issued a Director's Decision with regard to a Petition dated October 9, 1997, and an Addendum to the Petition dated January 12, 1998, filed by Mr. David Lochbaum on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists, hereafter referred to as the "Petitioner." The Petition pertains to the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (D. C. Cook).

The Petitioner requested that the operating licenses for D. C. Cook be modified, revoked, or suspended to prevent operation of the units until there is reasonable assurance that significant non-compliances have been identified and corrected so that systems are in conformance with their design-basis and licensing-basis requirements. The Petitioner also requested that a public hearing into this matter be held in the Washington, D.C. area before the first unit at D. C. Cook is authorized to restart. As the basis for these requests, the Petitioner stated that the NRC completed an architect/engineering (AE)

design inspection at D. C. Cook (NRC Inspection Report (IR) No. 50-315, 50-316/97201) on November 26, 1997. Findings by the NRC during the AE inspection led to the Licensee having to declare the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) inoperable at both units at D. C. Cook. As a result, the Licensee shut down both units in accordance with its Technical Specifications (TS). The systems reviewed during the AE inspection were the same systems that the Licensee had previously reviewed as part of its design-basis documentation reconstitution program, and the program did not identify any deficiencies concerning system operability. Therefore, the Petitioner asserted that the Licensee's design-basis documentation reconstitution programs lacked the necessary rigor and focus to identify potential design-related operability issues. The Petitioner further asserted that deficiencies in the Licensee's design control programs may also be responsible for similar issues in safety systems that have not been examined by the NRC. On the basis of this potential, the Petitioner also requested that the NRC increase the inspection scope at D. C. Cook. By letter dated January 12, 1998, the Petitioner issued an Addendum to the Petition.

The following six specific concerns were raised in the Addendum:

- (1) ice condenser concerns.
- (2) 10 CFR 50.59 Safety Evaluation process.
- (3) engineering calculations.
- (4) net positive suction head (NPSH) calculations.
- (5) licensee's response to the CAL.
- (6) NRC inspection process.

The Addendum also raised concerns about the 10 CFR 2.206 process, the NRC inspection process, and generic concerns with ice condenser containments. On February 23, 1998, the NRC acknowledged receipt of the additional information and informed the Petitioner that all specific concerns related to the D. C. Cook plant and the Petition would be considered in the Director's Decision. Further, the NRC informed the Petitioner that the concerns not directly applicable to the request in the Petition would be evaluated and transmitted to the Petitioner in separate correspondence. By letters dated July 10 and December 28, 1998, the NRC sent the Petitioner the status of the review of these issues.

On August 19, 1998, an informal public hearing was held at the NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. Both the Petitioner and the Licensee made presentations during the hearing. The hearing gave the Petitioner an

opportunity to clarify the issues raised in the Petition and the Addendum.

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has determined that the request to prevent operation of the units at D. C. Cook until there is reasonable assurance that significant non-compliances have been identified and corrected so that systems are in conformance with their design-basis and licensing-basis requirements has been satisfied. The regulatory oversight actions being taken by the NRC will provide reasonable assurance that systems at D. C. Cook will be in conformance with their design bases and licensing bases, thus meeting the request made in the Petition and eliminates the need to modify, suspend or revoke the licenses at D. C. Cook. The reasons for this decision are explained in the Director's Decision Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 (DD-99-03), the complete text of which follows this notice and is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D. C., and at the local public document room located at Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085.

A copy of the Director's Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. As provided for by this regulation, the Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance, unless the Commission on its own motion institutes a review of the Decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of February 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,
Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.

[DD-99-03]

Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

I. Introduction

On October 9, 1997, Mr. David A. Lochbaum submitted a Petition to the Executive Director for Operations of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) pursuant to Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 2.206). The Petition was submitted on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS or Petitioner) and requested that the operating licenses for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (D. C. Cook) be modified, revoked, or suspended to prevent operation of the units until there is reasonable assurance that significant non-compliances have been



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

March 3, 1999

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
460th ACRS MEETING
MARCH 10-13, 1999

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1999, CONFERENCE ROOM 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH,
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 1) 8:30 - 8:³⁵45 A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)
1.1) Opening statement (DAP/JTL/SD)
1.2) Items of current interest (DAP/NFD/SD)
1.3) Priorities for preparation of ACRS reports (DAP/JTL/SD)
- 2) 8:³⁵45 - 10:²³15 A.M. Proposed Commission Paper on 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments) (Open) (JJB/MTM)
2.1) Remarks by the Subcommittee Chairman
2.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the proposed Commission Paper on the summary of public comments and staff recommendations for revising 10 CFR 50.59.
- Representatives of the nuclear industry will provide their views, as appropriate.
- 10:²³15 - 10:⁴⁰30 A.M. ***BREAK***
- 3) 10:⁴⁰30 - 12:⁵⁰00 Noon Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA Methodology (Open/Closed) (GBW/PAB)
3.1) Remarks by the Subcommittee Chairman
3.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the Westinghouse Electric Company and the NRC staff regarding the application of the Westinghouse best-estimate large-break LOCA methodology to upper plenum injection plants.
- [Note: A portion of this session may be closed to discuss Westinghouse proprietary information applicable to this matter.]
- 12:⁵⁰00 - 1:⁵⁰00 P.M. ***LUNCH***
- 4) 1:⁵⁰00 - 4:⁵⁰15 P.M. Proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality (Open) (GA/MTM)
(-2:30-2:45 P.M. BREAK)
3:00-3:45
4.1) Remarks by the Subcommittee Chairman
4.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Task Force and the NRC staff regarding the proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA quality, as well as industry programs for certifying PRAs.

Representatives of the nuclear industry will provide their views, as appropriate.

3:22 - 7:05
10) 2:45 - 7:00 P.M.

Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)

Discussion of proposed ACRS reports on:

- 10.1) NRC Safety Research Program (REU/MME)
- 10.2) Proposed Rule for Event Reporting Requirements (JJB/NFD/DTD)
- 10.3) Proposed Use of PIRT Process for Fuel Burnup Extension (DAP/MME)
- 10.4) Role of Frequency-Consequence Curves in Risk-Informed Decisionmaking (TSK/MTM)
- 10.5) Reevaluation of Generic Safety Issue Process (DWM/AS)
- 10.6) Proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality (GA/MTM)
- 10.7) Application of Westinghouse Large-Break LOCA Methodology to Upper Plenum Injection Plants (GBW/PAB)

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1999, CONFERENCE ROOM 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

11) 8:30 - 8:35 A.M.

Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open) (DAP/SD)

12) 8:35 - 10:00 A.M.

Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement Policy (Open) (RLS/NFD)

- 12.1) Remarks by the cognizant ACRS Member
- 12.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding guidance for implementing the revised Enforcement Policy, as well as the staff's plans to make the Enforcement Policy risk informed.

Representatives of the nuclear industry will provide their views, as appropriate.

10:00 - 10:15 A.M.

BREAK

13) 10:15 - 11:45 A.M.

Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report Regarding Tritium Production Core (Open) (RLS/MME)

- 13.1) Remarks by the Cognizant ACRS Member
- 13.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Department of Energy (DOE) regarding the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report associated with tritium production core, which describes how the inclusion of a significant number of tritium producing burnable absorber rods affects the performance of nuclear plant systems and components for a representative commercial LWR.

14) 11:45 - 12:00 Noon

Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations (Open) (DAP, et al./SD, et al.)

Discussion of the responses from the NRC Executive Director for Operations to comments and recommendations included in recent ACRS reports and letters.

11:55 1:10
12:00 - 1:00 P.M.

LUNCH

NOTE:

- **Presentation time should not exceed 50 percent of the total time allocated for a specific item. The remaining 50 percent of the time is reserved for discussion.**
- **Number of copies of the presentation materials to be provided to the ACRS - 35.**

APPENDIX III: MEETING ATTENDEES

460TH ACRS MEETING

March 10-13, 1999

NRC STAFF (March 10, 1999)

J. Mitchell, OEDO
N. Yuki, NRR
E. McKenna, NRR
F. Akstulewicz, NRR
S. Newberry, NRR
E. Weiss, NRR
F. Orr, NRR
J. Wermiel, NRR
R. Barrett, NRR
G. Parry, NRR
M. Cheok, NRR
M. Drouin, RES
J. Kelly, RES

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

E. Schmidt, NUS
L. Heffer, Winston & Strawn
L. Grihe, L. A. Grihe & Assoc.
S. Bauer, APSCo
P. LeBlond, Self
W. J. Boatwright, TU Electric
M. Nissley, Westinghouse
K. Takeuchi, Westinghouse
R. Bell, NEI
D. Brewer, Duke Power
G. Eisenberry, ASME
R. Simard, ASME
S. Bernsen, ASME
T. Sutter, Bechtel
L. Etffinger, Oxford Group
B. Bradley, NEI
B. Youngblood, Sciencetech
J. LaChance, Sandia National Lab
R. Montgomery, Anatech

NRC STAFF (March 11, 1999)

J. Mitchell, OEDO
T. Scarborough, NRR
S. Newberry, NRR
D. Fischer, NRR
R. Auluck, NRR
J. Tappert, NRR
M. Chatterton, NRR
J. Wermiel, NRR
R. Emch, NRR
R. Caruso, NRR
T. Collins, NRR
N. Yuki, NRR
S. LaVie, NRR
K. Shimomura, RES
M. Marshall, RES
F. Cherny, RES
P. Lewis, RES
A. Serkiz, RES
H. Scott, RES
J. Shaperow, RES
C. Tinkler, RES
F. Eltawila, RES
J. Uhle, RES
R. Meyer, RES

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

A. Wyche, SERCH
M. Frank, NUS
J. Davis, NEI
T. Riech, ComEd
R. Montgomery, EPRI

NRC STAFF (March 12, 1999)

J. Mitchell, OEDO
J. Lieberman, OE
D. Nelson, OE
B. Borchardt, OE
E. Thom, NRR
L. Kopp, NRR
B. Martin, NRR
R. Hernan, NRR
T. Attard, NRR
E. Weiss, NRR
D. Nguyen, NRR
C. Carpenter, NRR
K. Heck, NRR
T. Essig, NRR
J. Davis, NRR
S. Newberry, NRR
J. Wilson, NRR
K. Shimomura, RES

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

D. Raleigh, Bechtel
K. Green, NUS
E. Ginsberg, NEI
G. Carter, Strategic Energy Resources
M. Travis, Westinghouse
M. Clausen, DOE
R. Ankney, Westinghouse
S. Stack, DOE
S. Sohinki, DOE
G. Sorensen, PNNL
B. Reid, PNNL
C. Thornhill, PNNL
J. Kelly, Sandia National Lab.
J. Chardos, TVA
S. André, Westinghouse
J. Sejvar, Westinghouse

April 7, 1999

**REVISED
SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
461st ACRS MEETING
APRIL 7-10, 1999**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1999, CONFERENCE ROOM 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH,
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

- 1) 1:00 - 1:15 P.M. Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)
- 1.1) Opening statement (DAP/JTL/RPS)
 - 1.2) Items of current interest (DAP/NFD/RPS)
 - 1.3) Priorities for preparation of ACRS reports (DAP/JTL/RPS)
- 2) 1:15 - 2:45 P.M. Draft Commission Paper on Proposed Improvements to the Generic Communications Process (Open) (MHF/MTM/DTD)
- 2.1) Remarks by the Cognizant ACRS Member
 - 2.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the draft Commission Paper on proposed improvements to the Generic Communications Process.
- Representatives of the nuclear industry will provide their views, as appropriate.
- 2:45 - 3:00 P.M. *****BREAK*****
- 3) 3:00 - 4:30 P.M. Steam Generator Tube and Reactor Pressure Vessel Integrity Issues (Open) (RLS/NFD)
- 3.1) Remarks by the Cognizant ACRS Member
 - 3.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the status of ongoing regulatory activities associated with steam generator tube integrity; staff's draft safety evaluation of Boiling Water Reactor Vessel and Internals Project-14 (BWRVIP-14), "Evaluation of Crack Growth in BWR Stainless Steel Reactor Pressure Vessel Internals;" suggested changes to 10 CFR 50.61, pressurized thermal shock rule; and related matters.
- Representatives of the nuclear industry will provide their views, as appropriate.
- 4:30 - 4:45 P.M. *****BREAK*****
- 4) 4:45 - 7:15 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Report and the ACRS Bylaws (Open)
- Discussion of:
- 4.1) Proposed ACRS report on the NRC Safety Research Program (REU/MME)
 - 4.2) Proposed revisions to the ACRS Bylaws (DAP/JTL/SD)

**THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1999, CONFERENCE ROOM 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH,
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

- 5) 8:30 - 8:35 A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open) (DAP/RPS)
- 6) 8:35 - 10:00 A.M. Insights Gained from the Risk-Informed Pilot Applications (Open) (WJS/PAB)
- 6.1) Remarks by the Cognizant ACRS Member
- 6.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) regarding the Insights gained from the risk-informed pilot applications, including those from the pilots for inservice inspection, extension of allowed outage times, and online maintenance.
- 10:00 - 10:15 A.M. *****BREAK*****
- 7) 10:15- 11:45 A.M. Proposed Final Revision to 10 CFR 50.65(a) of the Maintenance Rule and an Associated Draft Regulatory Guide (Open) (JJB/AS)
- 7.1) Remarks by the Cognizant ACRS Member
- 7.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and NEI regarding the proposed final revision to 10 CFR 50.65(a) of the Maintenance Rule that would require licensees to perform safety assessments prior to performing maintenance activities, and an associated draft Regulatory Guide.
- 11:45 - 12:45 P.M. *****LUNCH*****
- 8) 12:45 - 2:15 P.M. Proposed Approach for Revising the Commission's Safety Goal Policy Statement (Open) (GA/TSK/MTM)
- 8.1) Remarks by the Subcommittee Chairman
- 8.2) Briefing by and discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the proposed approach for revising the Commission's Safety Goal Policy Statement.
- Representatives of the nuclear industry will provide their views, as appropriate.
- 2:15 - 2:30 P.M. *****BREAK*****
- 9) 2:30 - 6:15 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
- (4:00-4:15 P.M. BREAK) Discussion of proposed ACRS reports on:
- 9.1) Proposed Improvements to the Generic Communications Process (MHF/MTM/DTD)
- 9.2) Steam Generator Tube and Reactor Pressure Vessel Integrity Issues (RLS/NFD)
- 9.3) Insights Gained from Risk-Informed Pilot Applications (WJS/PAB)
- 9.4) Proposed Final Revision to Maintenance Rule and an Associated Draft Regulatory Guide (JJB/AS)

- 9.5) Proposed Approach for Revising the Commission's Safety Goal Policy Statement (GA/TSK/MTM)
- 9.6) Proposed Amendment to 10 CFR 50.55a, "Codes and standards" (WJS/NFD)
- 9.7) Reevaluation of GSI Process (DWM/AS)

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1999, CONFERENCE ROOM 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 10) 8:30 - 8:35 A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open) (DAP/RPS)
- 11) 8:35 - 10:00 A.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
Discussion of proposed ACRS reports on:
 - 11.1) Proposed ACRS report on the NRC Safety Research Program (REU/MME)
 - 11.2) Proposed Improvements to the Generic Communications Process (MHF/MTM/DTD)
 - 11.3) Steam Generator Tube and Reactor Pressure Vessel Integrity Issues (RLS/NFD)
 - 11.4) Insights Gained from Risk-Informed Pilot Applications (WJS/PAB)
 - 11.5) Proposed Final Revision to Maintenance Rule and an Associated Draft Regulatory Guide (JJB/AS)
 - 11.6) Proposed Approach for Revising the Commission's Safety Goal Policy Statement (GA/TSK/MTM)
 - 11.7) Proposed Amendment to 10 CFR 50.55a, "Codes and standards" (WJS/NFD)
 - 11.8) Reevaluation of GSI Process (DWM/AS)
- 12) 10:00 - 10:30 A.M. Subcommittee Report (Open) (GBW/PAB)
Report by the Chairman of the ACRS Subcommittee on Thermal-Hydraulic Phenomena regarding matters discussed at the March 23, 1999 meeting.
- 10:30 - 10:45 A.M. *****BREAK*****
- 13) 10:45 - 11:45 A.M. Impact of the Use of High Burnup or Mixed Oxide Fuel on the Revised Source Term (Open) (DAP/MME)
Discussion of proposed ACRS response to a Commission request, included in the March 5, 1999 Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM), that the ACRS consider the impact of the use of high burnup or mixed oxide fuel on the revised source term.

Representatives of the NRC staff will participate, as appropriate.
- 11:45 - 1:00 P.M. *****LUNCH*****

- 14) 1:00 - 2:00 P.M. Relationship and Balance Between PRA Results and Defense-In-Depth (Open) (TSK/MTM)
Discussion of proposed ACRS response to a Commission request, included in the March 5, 1999 SRM, that the ACRS consider the appropriate relationship and balance between PRA results and defense-in-depth in the context of risk-informed regulation.
- Representatives of the NRC staff will participate, as appropriate.
- 15) 2:00 - 2:15 P.M. Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations (Open) (DAP, et al./SD, et al.)
Discussion of the responses from the NRC Executive Director for Operations to comments and recommendations included in recent ACRS reports and letters.
- 16) 2:15 - 3:00 P.M. Report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee (Open/Closed) (DAP/JTL)
Report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee on matters related to the conduct of ACRS business, and organizational and personnel matters relating to the ACRS.
- [Note: A portion of this session may be closed to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of this Advisory Committee, and information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.]
- 3:00 - 3:15 P.M. *****BREAK*****
- 17) 3:15 - 4:00 P.M. Future ACRS Activities (Open) (DAP/JTL/RPS)
Discussion of the recommendations of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee regarding items proposed for consideration by the full Committee during future meetings.
- 18) 4:00 - 7:00 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
Continue discussion of proposed ACRS reports on:
- 18.1) NRC Safety Research Program (REU/MME)
 - 18.2) Proposed Approach for Revising the Commission's Safety Goal Policy Statement (GA/TSK/MTM)
 - 18.3) Proposed Improvements to the Generic Communications Process (MHF/MTM/DTD)
 - 18.4) Steam Generator Tube and Reactor Pressure Vessel Integrity Issues (RLS/NFD)
 - 18.5) Insights Gained from Risk-Informed Pilot Applications (WJS/PAB)
 - 18.6) Proposed Final Revision to Maintenance Rule and an Associated Draft Regulatory Guide (JJB/AS)
 - 18.7) Impact of High Burnup or Mixed Oxide Fuel on the Revised Source Term (DAP/MME)

- 18.8) Relationship and Balance Between PRA Results and Defense-in-Depth (TSK/MTM)
- 18.9) Proposed Amendment to 10 CFR 50.55a, "Codes and standards" (WJS/NFD)
- 18.10) Reevaluation of GSI Process (DWM/AS)

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1999, CONFERENCE ROOM 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 19) 8:30 - 2:00 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
(12:00-1:00 P.M. LUNCH) Continue discussion of proposed ACRS reports listed under Item 18.
- 20) 2:00 - 2:30 P.M. Miscellaneous (Open) (DAP/JTL/RPS)
Discussion of matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

NOTE:

- Presentation time should not exceed 50 percent of the total time allocated for a specific item. The remaining 50 percent of the time is reserved for discussion.
- Number of copies of the presentation materials to be provided to the ACRS - 35.

APPENDIX V
LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

[Note: Some documents listed below may have been provided or prepared for Committee use only. These documents must be reviewed prior to release to the public.]

MEETING HANDOUTS

AGENDA
ITEM NO.

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman
 1. Items of Interest, dated March 10-13, 1999
- 2 Proposed Commission Paper on 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments)
 2. Recommendations for Final Rulemaking for 10 CFR 50.59, 72.48, and Related Sections, presentation by NRR, E. McKenna, et al [Viewgraphs]
- 3 Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA Methodology
 3. Report of ACRS Consultant, N. Zuber, Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA [Handout #3-1]
 4. Extension of Best-Estimate LOCA Methodology to Upper Plenum Injection Plants, presentation by M. Nissley, Westinghouse Electric Corp. [Viewgraphs]
 5. Review of Upper Plenum Injection Realistic LBLOCA Methodology, presentation by F. Orr, NRR [Viewgraphs]
- 4 Proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality
 6. ASME presentation to ACRS on March 10, 1999, Sidney A. Bernsen, Chairman, ASME Committee on Nuclear Risk Management, Ron L. Simard, Chairman, CNRM Project Team, Mary Drouin, CNRM Project Team Member, Duncan Brewer, CNRM Project Team Member [Viewgraphs]
- 5 Proposed Rule for Event Reporting Requirements
 7. Proposed Rule to Modify the Event Reporting Requirements in 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73, presentation by NRR [Viewgraphs]
- 6 Reevaluation of the Generic Safety Issue Process
 8. Restructuring of Generic Issue Process presentation by RES, Division of Regulatory Application [Viewgraphs]
- 7 Licensing Framework for Fuel Burnup Extension/NRC Participation in the CABRI Reactor Fuels Research Program
 9. High-Burnup Extension presentation, M. Chatterton, NRR [Viewgraphs]
 10. Status of NRC Research Activities on High Burnup Fuel presentation, R. Meyer, RES [Viewgraphs]
- 8 Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement Policy

- 11. Changes in Enforcement presentation, J. Lieberman, OE [Viewgraphs]
 - 12. Industry Perspectives on NRC Enforcement Process Reform presentation, E. Ginsberg, Deputy General Counsel, NEI [Viewgraphs]
 - 12a. Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement Policy, N. Dudley, ACRS [Handout]
- 9 Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report Regarding Tritium Production Core
- 13. Tritium Production in Commercial Light Water Reactors, Tritium Production Core Topical Report presentation, by DOE [Viewgraphs]
 - 14. Tritium Production and NRC's Role presentation, by NRR [Viewgraphs]
- 10 Report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee
- 15. Final Draft Minutes of Planning and Procedures Subcommittee Meeting -March 12, 1999 [Handout #15-1]
- 11 Future ACRS Activities
- 16. Future ACRS Activities - 460th ACRS Meeting, March 12, 1998 [Handout #16.1]
- 12 Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations
- 17. Letter to Dr. Dana A. Powers dated March 8, 1999, Subject: ACRS Report on the NRC Research Program, "Review and Evaluation of the NRC Safety Research Program," NUREG-1635, Vol. 1 [Handout]
- 13 18. E-mail from A. Buslik, RES/DST/PRAB, to D. Powers regarding Response to ACRS Letter on Resolution of B-61

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

TAB

DOCUMENTS

- 2 Proposed Commission Paper on 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments)
 1. Table of Contents
 2. Proposed Agenda/Schedule
 3. Project Status Report, dated March 10, 1999
 4. E-mail dated March 1, 1999, from D. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, to G. Apostolakis, Chairman, RPRA Subcommittee, Subject: 10 CFR 50.59
 5. Report dated February 18, 1999, from D. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, to Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman, NRC, Subject: List of Key Issues Associated with the Proposed Revision to 10 CFR 50.59
 6. Staff Requirements Memorandum dated September 25, 1998, from John C. Hoyle, Secretary, NRC, to L. Joseph Callan, EDO, Subject: SECY-98-171
 7. Report dated July 16, 1998, from R. L. Seale, Chairman, ACRS, to Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman, NRC, Subject: Proposed Revisions to 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests and Experiments)

- 3 Westinghouse Best-Estimate Large-Break LOCA Methodology
 8. Table of Contents
 9. Proposed Schedule
 10. Project Status Report, dated March 10, 1999
 11. Working Copy, Minutes of ACRS T/H Phenomena Subcommittee Meeting, February 23, 1999 (**Internal Committee Use Material**)
 12. Report from ACRS Consultant V. Shrock on February 23, 1999 Meeting of T/H Phenomena Subcommittee (**Internal Committee Use Material**)
 13. Safety Evaluation by Office of NRR, Related to Acceptability of Topical Report WCAP-14449(P). "Application of Best Estimate Large Break LOCA Methodology to Westinghouse PWRs with Upper Plenum Injection" (**Draft**)
 14. ACRS Report, dated February 23, 1996, Subject: Westinghouse Best-Estimate Loss-of-Coolant Accident Analysis Methodology
 15. ACRS Report, dated April 19, 1996, Subject: Westinghouse Best-Estimate Loss-of-Coolant Accident Analysis Methodology

- 4 Proposed Phase 1 Standard for PRA Quality
 16. Table of Contents
 17. Proposed Schedule
 18. Status Report dated March 10, 1999
 19. E-mail dated February 7, 1999, from G. Apostolakis, Chairman, RPRA Subcommittee, to ACRS Members, Subject: Review of ASME Standard for PRA
 20. Facsimile dated March 1, 1999, from D. Powers, Chairman, ACRS, to G. Apostolakis, Chairman, RPRA Subcommittee, Subject: Expert Opinion in PRA
 21. Memorandum dated February 7, 1999, from A. Thadani, RES, to PRA Steering

- Committee, Subject: Comments on Proposed PRA Standard
22. ASME White Paper and Guidance for Reviewers of the Draft ASME Standard for PRA for Nuclear Power Plant Applications
- 7 Proposed Rule for Event Reporting Requirements
23. Table of Contents
24. Proposed Schedule
25. Status Report dated March 11, 1999
26. Memorandum dated February 19, 1999, from David Mathews, NRR, to NRC Office Directors and Regional Administrators, Subject: Office Review and Concurrence on a Proposed Rule to Modify the Event Reporting Requirements for Power Reactors in 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73
27. Draft U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission SECY, "Rulemaking to Modify the Event Reporting Requirements for Power Reactors in 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73"
28. Draft Regulatory Analysis for Proposed Modification to 10 CFR 50.72, "Immediate notification," and 10 CFR 50.73, "Licensee event reporting system."
29. Draft NUREG-1022, Rev. 2, "Event Reporting Guidelines 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73," Table 1 - Proposed Amendments
- 8 Reevaluation of the Generic Safety Issue Process
30. Table of Contents
31. Proposed Schedule
32. Status Report dated March 11, 1999
33. Pre-decisional draft Management Directive 6.4, Generic Issue Process dated February 22, 1999
34. Memorandum to John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS, from John W. Craig, Director, Division of Regulatory Applications, Office of the Nuclear Regulatory Research, Subject: Transmittal of Presentation Material for March 11, 1999 presentation to ACRS dated February 8, 1999 (Executive Summary)
- 9 Licensing Framework for Fuel Burnup Extension/NRC Participation in the CABRI Reactor Fuels Research Program
35. Table of Contents
36. Proposed Agenda
37. Status Report dated March 11, 1999
38. EPRI Robust Fuel Program, March 30, 1998
39. PIRT Chart
40. ACRS letter dated June 9, 1998
41. EDO Response dated June 25, 1998
- 12 Guidance for Implementing the Revised Enforcement Policy
42. Table of Contents
43. Proposed Schedule
44. Status Report dated March 12, 1999
45. ACRS Report dated November 17, 1998, from R. L. Seale, Chairman, ACRS, to

- Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman, NRC, Subject: Proposed Revision to the Enforcement Policy
46. SRM dated January 22, 1999, from Annette Vietti-Cook, Secretary, NRC, to William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations, Subject: Staff Requirements-SECY-98-256-Proposed Revision to the Enforcement Policy to Address Severity Level IV Violations at Power Reactors
 47. Draft memorandum received February 22, 1999, from James Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement, to multiple addresses, Subject: Enforcement Guidance
 48. Nuclear Energy Institute proposed Enforcement Table B - Potential Consequences
- 13 Safety Evaluation Report on the Topical Report Regarding Tritium Production Core
49. Table of Contents
 50. Proposed Agenda
 51. Status Report dated March 12, 1999
 52. Tritium Production Core (TPC) Topical Report (Unclassified, Non-proprietary Version) - NDP-98-181, Westinghouse Non-Proprietary Class 3, 1999
 53. Safety Evaluation Report related to the Department of Energy's topical report on the tritium production core (Draft), March 1999