

5/5/81

Minutes of ACRS  
Procedures Subcommittee Meeting

April 7, 1981  
Washington, D. C.

CERTIFIED

Purpose: This meeting was held to discuss -

- 1) Arrangements for services of ACRS Members;
- 2) Scope, format, content of ACRS reports;
- 3) Activities of Members - Designated ACRS liaison to the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Committee/APS Task Force on selected LMFBR safety issues; and
- 4) Use of telecommunications equipment in support of ACRS activities  
(See Attachment 1).

Attendees:

ACRS Members:

- J. Carson Mark, Chairman
- C. P. Siess, Member
- M. W. Carbon, Member

ACRS Staff:

- R. F. Fraley
- M. W. Libarkin
- M. C. Gaske



Discussion:

1) Arrangements for Services for Members

In view of the increased workload of members, which has resulted in several members working in excess of 130\* days per year, and the related burden

(\*The average time per member during FY-1980 was 132 legal days/123 compensation days)

associated with the processing and storage of documents provided for review and reference, it has been proposed that a change in the arrangements for hiring ACRS members and support of their activities is appropriate. At present, compensation is based on the daily rate equivalent to that of a GS-18 full-time employee which is based on the annual salary divided by 260 working days/yr. This does not take into account an allowance for annual leave and holidays nor the benefits (retirement, etc.) and facilities (e.g., office space) provided full-time employees. Several alternate schemes have been proposed for consideration consisting primarily of the following:

- 1.1 Appointment as an ACRS member by the Commission with a letter of appointment which specifies the terms of employment, including salary, benefits, expenses, etc.
- 1.2 Contractual arrangement whereby members would be hired under a negotiated contract with them or their full-time employers.
- 1.3 Designation of members as permanent, part-time government employees. This would make the benefits of retirement, health and life insurance available to them on a prorated basis.
- 1.4 Continue to designate members as WAE government employees (intermittent employees) but increases the expenses allowed for support of their activities at their normal duty station (e.g., home or full-time employer).

(See Attachments 2, 3, and 4 for additional detail.)

Dr. Siess expressed concern regarding any change that would interfere with the independence of the Committee in its relationship with the Commission. He also expressed concern regarding any changes that could increase costs to some members (e.g., FICA payments would increase to approximately 8% - 12% under Alternate 2 vs. approximately 6% under the current arrangement) without commensurate benefits. Questions regarding the subpoenaability and liability of members under Alternates 1 and 2 were raised.

Both Dr. Siess and Dr. Carbon noted that the present arrangement appears acceptable and proposed instead that the ACRS Staff explore an increase in the daily rate of compensation (e.g., use 220 working days/yr. as the basis for the daily rate of compensation vs. 260 working days) and take action to resolve other problems (e.g., individual members needs for document storage space) on a case-by-case basis.

It was noted that this matter was scheduled for discussion on April 8, 1981 with key members of the NRC Offices of Administration, Legal Counsel, and Personnel. This will provide an opportunity to discuss the areas of concern noted to determine how they can be resolved.

2) Scope, Content, and Format of ACRS Reports (See Item 2 of Attachment 1)

The need for more specificity in ACRS reports was discussed, particularly with respect to the priority for resolution of ACRS recommendations and better definition of what is expected of the NRC Staff, the AS&LB and/or the applicant.

Dr. Siess emphasized the desirability of separating recommendations regarding generic issues from reports on projects.

The need for a more specific definition of terms (e.g., conservative) frequently use by the ACRS and the NRC Staff was discussed briefly. The members decided not to pursue this matter further since it is a very complex issue.

### 3) Activities of ACRS Members

(See Item 3 of Attachment 1 for additional detail.)

#### 3.1 Designated ACRS Liaison to ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code

Committee - Mr. Etherington has questioned the need for continuing to have a designated ACRS member as liaison to the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Committee. Meetings which have been held since he was designated in 1979 have not warranted his participation and he has not found it necessary to report related activities to the ACRS.

The ACRS members agreed that a designated liaison is not needed, but that the Committee should keep itself informed of any substantive developments by having Dr. Siess keep himself informed of activities regarding Section III, Division 2 - Concrete Reactor Vessels and Containments and having Dr. Shewmon keep himself informed re Section III, Division 1 - Nuclear Power Plant Components (metal) by contact with

NRC Staff members who are working with the applicable ASME Subcommittees. In addition, the offer by Dr. Bush to keep the ACRS informed of related activities should be supported. It was noted that Dr. Bush is still an active member of the ASME Subcommittee on Section XI, Rules for Inservice Inspection.

3.2 APS Study Regarding LMFBR Selected Safety Issues

Dr. Plesset has been approached regarding his interest in chairing an APS Task Force to examine selected LMFBR safety issues. Dr. Carbon expressed concern that this could present a conflict with respect to ACRS activities to develop LMFBR criteria, particularly if the Committee were to consider the APS study.

The consensus was that the Committee should not object to such an assignment, although there was a residual concern about the impact it might have on the amount of time Dr. Plesset can devote to ACRS activities.

4) ACRS Use of Telecommunications Equipment (See Item 4 of Attachment 1 for additional detail.)

Mr. Gaske reported on several devices which have been evaluated to assist the Committee members in rapid transmittal and receipt of information among members and with the ACRS Office. Most members have expressed a lack of interest in such equipment except possibly for use of a speaker phone or a device such as a QWIP-2000 to rapidly transmit written documents.

It was proposed that the ACRS Office should arrange for the use of such devices for those members who want them, but they should not be developed as a Committee-wide system of communication.

- 5) Procedures for Appointment of ACRS Members (See Attachment 5 for additional detail.)

The attached memo regarding the procedures for nomination and appointment of ACRS members was discussed briefly. It was agreed that the Committee will not take any action regarding this matter until the Commission asks for ACRS comments.

Dr. Siess suggested that this might be an appropriate time to suggest setting up a separate Advisory Committee on Radiation Effects rather than enlarging the ACRS as suggested as an alternate in the attached memo.

- 6) ACRS Procedures Subcommittee

Dr. Siess suggested that the ACRS Procedures Subcommittee has become too large to consider issues in depth. He mentioned the possible benefits of a smaller Executive Committee.

Dr. Mark proposed and the other members endorsed a reduction in size of the Procedures Subcommittee to 4-5 members who would consist of the present and past Chairmen and 2 recent past Chairmen who have an interest and the ACRS Vice-Chairman, provided they have an interest in procedural matters.