CERTIFIED

Date Issued: 12/20/06
Date Certified: 12/19/06

TABLE OF CONTENTS
MINUTES OF THE **537th** ACRS MEETING

November 1-3, 2006

I. Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)

II. Final Review of the License Renewal Application for the Palisades Nuclear Plant (Open)

III. Proposed Revisions to Regulatory Guide 1.189, "Fire Protection for Operating Nuclear Power Plants" (Open)

IV. Draft Final Rule to Risk-Inform 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors"(Open)

V. Proposed Revisions to Regulatory Guides and Standard Review Plan (SRP) Section in Support of New Reactor Licensing (Open)

VI. Potential Collaborative Research on Human Reliability Analysis Methods (Open)

VII. Executive Session (Open)

A. Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations

B. Report on the Meeting of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee Held on **November 2, 2006** (Open)

C. Future Meeting Agenda

REPORTS:

The following reports to Dale E. Klein, Chairman, NRC, from Graham B. Wallis, Chairman, ACRS:

1. **Draft Final Rule to Risk-Inform 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors,"** dated November 16, 2006

2. **Report on the Safety Aspects of the License Renewal Application for the Palisades Nuclear Power Plant**, dated November 17, 2006

LETTERS:

The following letters to Luis A. Reyes, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Graham B. Wallis, Chairman, ACRS:

1. **Proposed Revision to Regulatory Guide 1.189 (DG-1170), "Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants,"** dated November 17, 2006

2. **Proposed Revision 3 to Regulatory Guide 1.7, "Control of Combustible Gas Concentrations in Containment Following a Loss-of-Coolant Accident," and Standard Review Plan Section 6.2.5, "Combustible Gas Control in Containment,"** dated November 17, 2006

MEMORANDA:

The following memoranda to Luis A. Reyes, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS:

1. **Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 1 - Extended Power Uprate Application and Supplemental Application,** dated November 7, 2006

2. **Proposed Revisions to Regulatory Guides in Support of New Reactor Licensing**, dated November 6, 2006

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

MINUTES OF THE 537th MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
November 1 - 3, 2006
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The **537th** meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) was held in Conference Room 2B3, Two White Flint North Building, Rockville, Maryland, on **November 1-3, 2006**. Notice of this meeting was published in the *Federal Register* on **October 19, 2006** (71 FR **61806**) (Appendix I). The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate action on the items listed in the meeting schedule and outline (Appendix II). The meeting was open to public attendance.

A transcript of selected portions of the meeting is available in the NRC's Public Document Room at One White Flint North, Room 1F-19, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. Copies of the transcript are available for purchase from Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Transcripts are also available at no cost to download from, or review on, the Internet at http://www.nrc.gov/ACRS/ACNW.

ATTENDEES

ACRS Members: Dr. Graham B. Wallis (Chairman), Dr. William J. Shack (Vice Chairman), Mr. John D. Sieber, (Member-at-Large), Dr. Said Abdel-Khalik (via teleconference), Dr. George E. Apostolakis, Dr. J. Sam Armijo, Dr. Sanjoy Banerjee, Dr. Mario V. Bonaca, Dr. Michael Corradini, Dr. Thomas S. Kress, Mr. Otto L. Maynard, and Dr. Dana A. Powers. 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. Graham B. Wallis, Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:30 A.M. He announced in his opening remarks that the meeting was being conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. In addition, he reviewed the agenda for the meeting and noted that no written comments or requests for time to make oral statements from members of the public had been received. Dr. Wallis also noted that a transcript of the open portions of the meeting was being kept and speakers were requested to identify themselves and speak with clarity and volume. He discussed the items of current interest and administrative details for consideration by the full Committee.

II. Final Review of the License Renewal Application for the Palisades Nuclear Plant (Open)

[Note: Michael Junge, Senior Staff Engineer, was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee met with representatives of the NRC staff and the Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC) to discuss the license renewal application for the Palisades Nuclear Plant (PNP), and the final Safety Evaluation Report (SER) prepared by the NRC staff. The operating license for PNP expires on February 20, 2011. The applicant has

requested approval for continued operation for a period of 20 years beyond the current license expiration date. The applicant discussed operating experience; major equipment replacements and repairs; major exceptions to the Generic Aging Lessons Learned Report; and the commitment tracking system. The staff discussed the results of its evaluation of the Palisades license renewal application as well as the results of the inspection and audit. In the final SER, the staff concluded that the requirements of 10 CFR 54.29(a) have been met.

Committee Action

The Committee issued a report to the NRC Chairman on this matter, dated November 17, 2006, recommending that the NMC application for renewal of the operating license for PNP be approved. The Committee noted that continued operation during the entire period of extended operation is contingent on the resolution of the issues associated with three Time-Limited Aging Analyses (TLAAs) related to reactor pressure vessel integrity.

III. Proposed Revisions to Regulatory Guide 1.189, "Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants" (Open)

[Note: Michael Junge, Senior Staff Engineer, was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee met with representatives of the NRC staff to discuss Proposed Revision 1 to Regulatory Guide 1.189 (DG-1170), "Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants." This draft guide provides comprehensive fire protection guidance and identifies the scope and depth of fire protection that the staff considers acceptable for nuclear power plants. DG-1170 would apply to both existing and new plants. The staff discussed past changes to fire protection regulations and described the proposed changes to Regulatory Guide 1.189.

Committee Action:

The Committee issued a letter to the Executive Director for Operations on this matter, dated November 17, 2006, recommending that Proposed Revision 1 to Regulatory Guide 1.189 (DG-1170) be issued for public comment. The Committee stated that it would like to have an opportunity to review the draft final version of this Guide after resolution of public comments.

IV. Draft Final Rule to Risk-Inform 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors" (Open)

[Note: Mr. Eric Thornsbury, Senior Staff Engineer, was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee met with representatives of the NRC staff to discuss the draft final rule to risk-inform 10 CFR 50.46, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants." Dr. Shack, the cognizant Committee Member, for this issue, introduced the topic at approximately 1:35 P.M. Dr. Shack noted that the subcommittee reviewed the topic the previous day and described some of the issues raised during that meeting. Dr. Shack then asked Mr. Richard Dudley, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, to begin the presentation.

NRC Staff Presentation

Mr. Dudley began the presentation by describing the staff's request for an ACRS letter on the draft final rule. While the staff is reviewing its position on seismic analysis for the PWR transition break size (TBS) due to the crack indications found at Wolf Creek, they would like the Committee's letter to address all the technical aspects of the rule. If any changes occur due to the Wolf Creek indications, Mr. Dudley stated that the staff will return to the Committee. He then briefly outlined the agenda for the presentation, then turned it over to Mr. Gary Hammer to discuss the selection of the TBS for BWRs.

Mr. Hammer first provided the process the staff used to select the TBS, starting with an estimated LOCA frequency of 10^{-5}. The staff then adjusted the break size to account for uncertainties in the elicitation process and other failure modes such as seismic loads. Finally, the staff considered the sizes of actual pipe in BWR plants and selected a TBS that would provide regulatory stability. This results in a break size between 13 and 20 inches.
Mr. Hammer described how such a size corresponds to the approximate sizes of feedwater and residual heat removal (RHR) piping, which is typically 18-24 inches. Because larger breaks would require the complete failure of the large recirculation piping (which has a much lower frequency), the staff set the BWR TBS at the larger of the attached feedwater or RHR lines inside containment.

Mr. Stephen Dinsmore next provided a discussion of public comments related to the risk analysis and operational requirements portions of the proposed rule. These comments addressed the scope of facility changes requiring a risk evaluation, changes that require prior NRC approval, the tracking of risk changes, updating of the plant PRA, acceptance criteria for risk increases, and operational restrictions related to mitigation equipment. Mr. Dinsmore described the issue of the scope of facility changes requiring a risk evaluation as a critical objection from industry. Industry claimed that the staff did not appropriately credit the existing change control processes and that such a requirement would make the rule too burdensome to use. The draft final rule limits the risk evaluation to changes that are potentially risk-significant. Mr. Dinsmore discussed a diagram of the decision process for making such determinations, which relies on existing change-control regulations and the maintenance rule to control the changes. This solution also applies to the public comments on the identification of changes requiring prior NRC approval.

Mr. Dinsmore then discussed the comments received on tracking risk increases and acceptance criteria for risk increases, along with the staff's responses. In both cases, the staff decided to retain their proposed language. With regard to updating of plant PRAs, the industry agreed to update the PRA every two refueling outages, but suggested reporting only the results of this assessment to the NRC. The final draft rule requires this update, along with reporting of plans to bring the plant back into compliance if the acceptance criteria have been exceeded and a list of potentially risk-significant changes implemented without NRC review that increased risk.

Mr. Dinsmore also identified the issue of operating restrictions as an important objection from industry. The proposed rule had prohibited operation in a configuration not demonstrated to meet the acceptance criteria for breaks above the TBS. The final draft rule proposed allowing operation in such configurations up to 14 days per year. He provided some justification for the selection of 14 days, but noted that no guidance directly addresses such an issue.

Mr. Tony Browning, representing the BWR Owners' Group, provided comments from the group summarizing their opinions of the draft final rule. They are pleased that work on the rule has progressed, but believe that BWR licensees would be unlikely to adopt the rule in its present form. Mr. Browning stated that the staff's selection of the BWR TBS is overly conservative, and argued that analyses support a minor change to the TBS that would allow more burden reduction while maintaining safety margins and defense-in-depth.

During the above discussions, the ACRS Members and other participants made the following points:

- Dr. Banerjee suggested that a meeting to review the expert elicitation report is needed to make a decision regarding the BWR TBS. Mr. Thornsbury clarified the staff's plans for such a meeting. Dr. Armijo and Dr. Apostolakis agreed that such a meeting was necessary to reach a final decision.

- Dr. Shack commented that the change control process seems to use different criteria depending on the path taken, and also different from Regulatory Guide 1.174. Mr. Michael Tschiltz answered that the staff does not expect any actual differences during implementation. Mr. Mark Rubin noted that the items on the right side of the figure are already outside of our regulatory scope.

- Dr. Apostolakis asked if unrelated changes to the plant can be bundled during the risk evaluation. Mr. Dinsmore answered affirmatively. Dr. Apostolakis commented that the use of the cumulative risk change seems to be a different approach than used in Regulatory Guide 1.174. Dr. Wallis suggested removing some of the detail from the rule and defining it in the regulatory guidance.

- Dr. Apostolakis stated a concern that the rule appears to require a PRA in one place ((d)(4)), but not in other places ((f)(2)), suggesting that one should be required.

- Dr. Bonaca questioned the meaning of a configuration "not demonstrated" to meet the acceptance criteria beyond the TBS. He asked if it meant not proven, but believed, or if no burden of proof existed at all. Mr. Tschiltz explained that most equipment outages would be limited by tech specs, and this aspect of the rule would only come into play for equipment only needed to mitigate beyond-TBS breaks. He further explained that the treatment of this equipment is commensurate with its low risk-significance. Dr. Bonaca stated that this leaves a window in the defense-in-depth assurance.

- Dr. Powers asked how the seismic contribution to pipe break frequencies is captured. Mr. Dinsmore explained that without cracks, a seismic event must be so large that all other equipment will likely be lost as well. On the other hand, if cracks already exist in the piping, a smaller seismic event may be able to create a LOCA, which is the reason for the staff's review in light of the crack indications at Wolf Creek.

- Dr. Armijo asked if multiple, smaller breaks could occur and be equivalent to a large break. Mr. Tim Collins replied that the staff had not examined such a condition.

- Dr. Armijo asked if the BWR Owners' Group believed that one TBS should apply to all BWRs. Mr. Browning stated that it should be the same for most plants, unless a plant is an outlier for some reason, such as water chemistry.

Committee Action:

The Committee issued a report to the NRC Chairman on this matter, dated November 16, 2006, recommending that the draft final rule not be issued in its current form. The Committee recommended that the staff revise the rule to strengthen the assurance of defense-in-depth for breaks beyond the TBS. The Committee also recommended that the revision of draft NUREG-1829, "Estimating Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA) Frequencies Through the Elicitation Process," to include changes resulting from the resolution of public comments, be completed before the revised rule is issued. The Committee also noted that the interpretation that this rule limits the total increase in core damage frequency represents a significant departure from current guidance for risk-informed regulation and recommended that it be reviewed for its implications.

V. Proposed Revisions to Regulatory Guides and Standard Review Plan (SRP) Sections in Support of New Reactor Licensing

[Note: David Fischer, Senior Staff Engineer, was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee discussed "high-priority" Regulatory Guides and Standard Review Plan (SRP) Sections that are being revised or developed in support of new reactor licensing. The Committee identified three Regulatory Guides that it decided not to review: proposed Revision 1 to Regulatory Guide 1.61, Damping Values for Seismic Design of Nuclear Power Plants (DG-1157); proposed Revision 3 to Regulatory Guide 1.136, Materials, Construction, and Testing of Concrete Containments (DG-1159); and draft Regulatory Guide DG-1146, A Performance-Based Approach to Define the Safe Shutdown Earthquake Ground Motion. The Committee also identified three SRP Sections that it decided not to review: proposed Revision 2 to SRP Section 9.1.3, Spent Fuel Pool Cooling and Cleanup System; proposed Revision 3 to SRP Section 10.3.6, Steam and Feedwater System Materials; and draft Final Revision to SRP Section 17.5, Quality Assurance Program Description - Design Certification, Early Site Permit and New License Applicants. Dr. Apostolakis deferred making a recommendation to the Committee on whether the ACRS should review SRP Section 17.4, Reliability Assurance Program because it is a new SRP Section and he wanted to give it a more thorough review.

Committee Action

The Committee issued a Memorandum to Luis A. Reyes, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS: Proposed Revisions to Regulatory Guides in Support of New Reactor Licensing, dated November 3, 2006. The Committee also issued a Memorandum to Luis A. Reyes, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS: Proposed Revisions to Standard Review Plan Sections in Support of New Reactor Licensing, dated November 6, 2006. The Committee plans to conduct an accelerated review of all Regulatory Guides and SRP Sections that it determines warrants ACRS review.

VI. Potential Collaborative Research on Human Reliability Analysis Methods (Open)

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

The Committee met with representatives of the NRC staff to discuss the Committee's views on the need for collaborative research within the agency and between the agency and industry on human reliability analysis (HRA) methods. Dr. Apostolakis, the cognizant Committee Member, for this issue, introduced the topic at approximately 8:35 A.M Dr. Apostolakis described various interactions the Committee and the staff have had related to human reliability analysis (HRA) and the conclusion that the agency appears to have at least three different HRA models - ATHEANA, SPAR-H, and a method for manual actions in response to fire. He then noted another concern regarding the reduction of time available for operator actions following a power uprate. The industry typically assesses these actions using the EPRI HRA Calculator, which the staff has not specifically reviewed. Dr. Apostolakis described the purpose of the briefing to review the staff's status on HRA activities and the possibility of merging the different models, then asked Mr. John Monninger, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, to begin the presentation.

NRC Staff Presentation

Mr. Monninger briefly discussed the number of interactions the staff has had with the Committee related to HRA over the last few years and the wide range of HRA activities currently underway. He then introduced Dr. Erasmia Lois to describe the staff's future plans, suggesting that the research to benchmark various HRA methods at Halden will go a long way toward addressing some of the Committee's questions.

Dr. Lois began by providing an agenda for her presentation that would summarize recent HRA research activities, outline plans for the next few years, and specifically discuss HRA issues identified by the ACRS. She described the overall objectives of the HRA Research Program that support the agency's risk-informed regulatory activities and involve collaboration with domestic and international organizations. Dr. Lois also described some of the staff's recent accomplishments, such as the HRA Good Practices report and the evaluation of methods against those good practices. In response to Committee questions, she also provided some additional background on human reliability analysis and the agency's models.

Following discussions among the Committee regarding the use of simulator experiments for HRA, Dr. Lois described the staff's thoughts on issues raised by various Members, including the need for a comparison of the fundamental assumptions within the NRC's models and the EPRI model, and the need for one consolidated agency HRA model. She stated that the staff believes that the planned "HRA Methods Benchmarking Using Simulator Data" project will help address many of the issues identified by the Committee Members.

Dr. Gareth Parry, NRR, added comments from his perspective that the important question is whether a specific HRA model is good enough for a specific application. He also stated his beliefs that a more proceduralized method can be useful, particularly for staff who are reviewing licensee applications.

Mr. Jeff Julius, representing the EPRI HRA Calculator, commented that he believes the models are converging in some areas, such as the important performance-shaping factors. Now the

work is looking at the impacts of the performance-shaping factors. He acknowledged EPRI's plan to participate in the Halden benchmarking exercise.

Dr. Lois also explained the staff's project to collect human performance data, beginning with an evaluation of licensee event reports and other event analyses. The project is a long-term activity with the goal of eventually providing an objective measure of the predictability of HRA methods. Mr. Monninger explained that if the Committee writes a letter, the staff would like recognition of the accomplishments thus far and an endorsement of the staff's plans for the benchmark exercise. He would also welcome further briefings and interactions on the project.

During the above discussions, the ACRS Members and other participants made the following points:

- Dr. Apostolakis pointed out the different ways that different models approach an analysis, particularly in their use of the available time for action.

- Dr. Wallis asked if verification of models is used in HRA. Dr. Apostolakis answered that it is not. Dr. Corradini asked if any sort of experimental comparison is used to judge the models. Dr. Lois answered that the benchmarking exercise is planned to begin to address those concerns. Dr. Susan Cooper added that, just because verification is not possible in HRA, doesn't mean the models have no basis. She then explained how the second-generation HRA models are based on psychological, behavioral, and cognitive science models, in addition to using the years of nuclear power plant operational experience.

- Dr. Apostolakis explained his primary objection to the different methods lies in their use of different underlying assumptions, not that some methods are more simplified than others. He does not disagree with the way the various models have been developed to this point, but believes it is time to critically compare the models and their bases. Dr. Lois confirmed the staff's plans to address such issues during the benchmarking exercises.

- Dr. Bonaca stated his primary concern is the possibility that different models would come up with very significant differences in results.

- Mr. Maynard believes that while it seems worthwhile to try to come closer together in HRA, he's not sure we can get to just one method. It will then be up to industry to show that their model is as good as or better than the NRC's if it is to be accepted.

- Dr. Armijo stated that he would like to see a ranking of the most important parameters, perhaps followed separate-effects tests to see how the factors affect performance. Dr. Wallis agreed that a model with as many as sixty parameters is not useful. Dr. Banerjee pointed out that models in other fields may have hundreds of parameters, but only the most important few are tested. He encouraged the staff to proceed with the simulator exercises.

Committee Action:

The Committee plans to consider a letter to the Executive Director for Operations on this matter during the December 2006 ACRS meeting.

VII. 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/EDO COMMITMENTS

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

The Committee discussed the response from the NRC Executive Director of Operations (EDO) to ACRS comments and recommendations included in recent ACRS reports:

- The Committee considered the EDO's response of October 25, 2006, to comments and recommendations included in the September 22, 2006 ACRS letter on Lessons Learned From the Review of Early Site Permit Applications. The Committee decided that it was satisfied with the EDO's response.

- The Committee considered the EDO's response of October 19, 2006, to comments and recommendations included in the September 19, 2006 ACRS report on the Safety Aspects of the License Renewal Application for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. The Committee decided that it was satisfied with the EDO's response.

- The Committee considered the EDO's response of October 3, 2006, to comments and recommendations included in the August 2, 2006 ACRS letter on Draft NUREG Report, "Integrating Risk and Safety Margins." The Committee decided that it was satisfied with the EDO's response.

- The Committee considered the EDO's response of October 26, 2006 to comments and recommendations included in the September 21, 2006 ACRS letter on the Proposed Direct Final Rule to Amend 10 CFR 50.68, "Criticality Accident Requirements." The Committee decided that it was satisfied with the EDO's response.

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

The Committee heard a report from the ACRS Chairman and the Executive Director, ACRS, regarding the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee meeting held on **November 1, 2006**.

The following items were discussed.

Review of the Member Assignments and Priorities for ACRS Reports and Letters for the September ACRS meeting

Member assignments and priorities for ACRS reports and letters for the **November** ACRS meeting were discussed. Reports and letters that would benefit from additional consideration at a future ACRS meeting were also discussed.

Anticipated Workload for ACRS Members

The anticipated workload for ACRS members through February 2007 was discussed. The objectives were:

- Review the reasons for the scheduling of each activity and the expected work product and to make changes, as appropriate
- Manage the members' workload for these meetings
- Plan and schedule items for ACRS discussion of topical and emerging issues

During this session, the Subcommittee also discussed any developed recommendations on items requiring Committee action.

ACRS Meeting with the NRC Commissioners

The Committee met with the NRC Commissioners on October 20, 2006 to discuss the following topics:

I. Overview
   - Accomplishments
   - License Renewal
   - Power Uprate
   - Risk-Informing 10 CFR 50.46
   - Ongoing/Future Activities

II. PWR Sump Performance

III. ACRS Report on the NRC Safety Research Program

IV. Lessons Learned from the Review of Early Site Permit Applications

V. Future Plant Design Activities/Coordination with the Staff on the Master Integrated Schedule

In a draft SRM resulting from this meeting, the Commission stated the following:

- As licensing continues, the Committee should advise the Commission on effectiveness and efficiency of staff's implementation of lessons learned in areas it has reviewed, for example, the development of guidance documents for early site permits.

- The Committee should provide its views to the Commission on digital instrumentation and controls and what is a reasonable backup. Consideration should be given to other technologies.

- The ACRS should provide its views to the Commission with respect to work on a technology neutral licensing framework with a focus on ensuring the value of such an approach versus the development of a licensing framework for a specific design, such as a high temperature gas cooled reactor.

- The ACRS should provide the Commission with its recommendations and basis for areas in which NRC should perform long term research.

Some Commissioners also raised questions on reliability modeling in PRAs and the potential benefits of the NRC staff evaluating the different models in this area. Additionally, it was suggested that the ACRS followup on the implementation of B5B analyses.

Quadripartite Meeting

The 2006 Quadripartite meeting was held on October 18-20, 2006. The summary of this meeting including any observations, conclusions, and/or recommendations is being circulated to the participating countries for comment. The Chief, ACRS Technical Support Branch, will finalize the summary after receipt of comments. The next formal Quadripartite meeting is scheduled to be held in France in October 2010. Several participants suggested that Working Groups be established to discuss specific matters in more detail prior to scheduling such matters for discussion at the regular meeting. The ACRS Executive Director suggested that the Chairmen of the Member Countries discuss this matter further and develop a position and that they followup on the NRC Chairman's comments regarding the establishment of an International Senior Advisory Committee, which might support the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership and Multi-National Design Evaluation Program.

The Committee appreciates the contributions made by the staff, especially Mugeh Afshar-Tous and the Executive Director, to make this meeting a very successful one. The Committee and the ACRS Executive Director acknowledge Hossein Nourbakhsh's work by reviewing all the papers prepared by the members and assisting some members in preparing their papers and presentation slides. The Committee thanks the members for their contributions.

Election of ACRS Officers for CY 2007

The Committee will elect Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the ACRS and Member-at-Large for the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee during the December 7-9, 2006, ACRS meeting. In accordance with the ACRS Bylaws, those members who do not wish to be considered for all or any of the Offices should inform the ACRS Executive Director in writing two weeks before the election.

Search for New ACRS Members

The ACRS Screening Panel met this month to review applications for new members on the ACRS. The Panel expects to have a proposed list of candidates during the December meeting. The schedule of interviews will take place in early 2007. We are currently looking for potential members with technical expertise in digital I&C, PRA, and nuclear plant operations.

Member Issues

- Reappointment of Dr. Apostolakis for a Fourth-Term

  The Commission voted unanimously to make an exception to their policy on term limit and reappoint Dr. George E. Apostolakis to a fourth term.

- Proposed White Paper on Technology Neutral Regulatory Framework

  In view of the interest expressed by some Commissioners during the ACRS meeting with the Commission on October 20, 2006, Dr. Kress proposes that the ACRS send a White Paper on this matter.

C. Future Meeting Agenda

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the **538th** ACRS Meeting, **November 1-3, 2006**.

The **537th** ACRS meeting was adjourned at on **11:00 A.M., November 3, 2006.**