ACRS-2701

CERTIFIED

TABLE OF CONTENTS
MINUTES OF THE
360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7 AND 18-19, 1990

D F02
0/1

APPENDICES
MINUTES OF THE 360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7 AND 18-19, 1990

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

Revised: April 5, 1990

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7, 1990

Thursday, April 5, 1990, Room, P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

1) 8:30 - 8:45 A.M. Chairman's Remarks (Open)
1.1) Opening Remarks (CM/GRQ)
1.2) Items of current interest (CM/RFF)

3) 8:45 - 9:30 A.M. Future Activities (Open)
TAB ---------- 3.1) Discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities (RPS/RFF)
TAB ---------- 3.2) Discuss topics proposed for consideration by the full Committee (CM/RPS)
3.3) Revised ACRS subcommittee assignments (CM/RPS)

4) 9:30 - 10:00 A.M. ACRS Subcommittee Activities (Open)
4.1) Briefings and discussion of assigned ACRS subcommittee activities, including safety-related matters such as containment design crtieria for future plants (DAW/CPS/MDH/EGI)

6) 10:00 - 11:00 A.M. NRC Safety Research Program (Open)
6.1) Discuss proposed ACRS report to NRC regarding the impact of budget reductions on the NRC safety research program (IC/SD)

11:00 - 11:15 A.M. Break

5) 11:15 - 12:15 P.M. Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (Open)
Discuss proposed ACRS report to NRC (CJW/CM/MME)

12:15 - 1:15 P.M. Lunch

5) 1:15 - 4:45 P.M. Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (Open)

TAB 5 ----------

5.1) Equipment Survivability - Briefing by representatives of the NRC staff

5.2) Briefing by representatives of NRC staff and the nuclear industry regarding ABWR containment vent design (CJW/JCC/MME)

6) 4:45 - 5:30 P.M. NRC Safety Research Program (Open)

6.1) Discuss proposed ACRS report to NRC regarding the impact of budget reductions on the NRC safety research program (IC/SD)

Friday, April 6, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

7) 8:30 - 10:30 A.M. ✓ NRC Regulatory Impact Survey (Open)

TAB 7 ----------

7.1) Briefing by representatives of the NRC staff regarding results of survey of licensees regarding the impact of regulatory requirements (HWL/GRQ)

10:30 - 10:45 A.M. Break

8) 10:45 - 12:15 P.M. ✓ NRC Severe Accident Research Program Plan (Open)

TAB 8 ----------

8.1) Report by ACRS subcommittee chairman regarding March 20-21, 1990 subcommittee meeting (WK/MDH)

8.2) Meeting with representatives of the NRC staff

12:15 - 1:15 P.M. LUNCH

9) 1:15 - 3:15 P.M. ✓ Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)

TAB 9 --------

9.1) Report by ACRS subcommittee chairman regarding proposed NRC rule for renewal of nuclear power plant licenses (HWL/GRQ)

9.2) Meeting with representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry, as appropriate

3:15 - 3:30 P.M. Break

10) 3:30 - 3:45 P.M. Appointment of New Members (Open/Closed)

10.1) Briefing and discussion regarding the

status of appointment of new members to the Committee (CM/MFL)
(Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.)

11) 3:45 - 6:45 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
11.1) Discuss proposed ACRS reports to NRC:
11.1-1) Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (CJW/MME)
~~11.1-2) IPEEE (CPS/EGI)~~
11.1-3) NRC safety research program budget (IC/SD)

Saturday, April 7, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

12) 8:30 - 12:00 Noon Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
12.1) License renewal for nuclear power plants (HWL/GRQ)
12.2) NRC severe accident research program plan (WK/MDH)

12:00 - 1:00 P.M. Lunch

1:00 - 3:00 P.M. Recessed at 2:30 p.m.
12.3) NRC safety research program budget (IC/SD)
12.4) Evolutionary light water reactor certification issues (CJW/MME)

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

Revised: April 13, 1990

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 18-19, 1990

Wednesday, April 18, 1990, Room, P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

1) 3:15 - 3:30 P.M. Chairman's Remarks (Open)
1.1) Opening Remarks (CM/GRQ)
1.2) Items of current interest (CM/RFF)

2) 3:30 - 6:30 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
2.1) Discuss proposed ACRS reports to NRC:
2-1) Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (CJW/MME)
2-2) NRC severe accident research program plan (WK/MDH)

Thursday, April 19, 1990, Room, P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

3) 8:30 - 12:30 P.M. Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)
Continue discussion of the proposed ACRS reports noted above.

Cont'd. 360th ACRS Mtg 4/18-

identify other possible sources of financial support for a particular project, and list those sources from which financial support has been or will be requested.

The information provided in this section must be brief and specific. Detailed background information may be included as supporting documentation to the proposal.

The following format shall be used for the project description:

(a) *Project Goals and Objectives.* The project's objectives must be clearly and unambiguously stated. The proposal should justify the project including the problems it intends to clarify and the development it may stimulate.

(b) *Project Outline.* The proposal should show the project format and agenda, including a list of principal areas or topics to be addressed.

(c) *Project Benefits.* The proposal should indicate the direct and indirect benefits that the project seeks to achieve and to whom these benefits will accrue.

(d) The proposal should describe the physical facilities required for the conduct of the project. Further, the proposal should include brief biographical sketches of individuals responsible for planning the project.

(e) *Project Costs.* As education institutions, HBCUs shall adhere to the cost principles set forth in OMB Circular A-21.

The proposal must provide a detailed schedule of project costs, identifying in particular—

(1) Salaries—in proportion to the time or effort directly related to the project;

(2) Equipment (rental only);

(3) Travel and Per Diem/Subsistence in relation to the project;

(4) Publication Costs;

(5) Other Direct Costs (specify)—e.g., supplies or registration fees; (Note: Dues to organizations, federations or societies, exclusive of registration fees, are not allowed as a charge.)

(6) Indirect Costs (attach negotiated agreement/cost allocation plan); and

(7) Supporting Documentation. The supporting documentation should contain any additional information that will strengthen the proposal.

Proposal Submission and Deadline

The notice is valid for part of the Federal Government Fiscal Year 90 (March 30, 1990 to September 30, 1990). Potential grantees are advised that due to the limited funding available, proposals received after June 15, 1990 may or may not be considered for funding in Fiscal Year 90.

FY90 Funds

For Fiscal Year 90, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, anticipates making a total of $150,000 available for funding research Cooperative Agreements to HBCU institutions. Because of the limited funds proposed Cooperative Agreement budgets should be restricted to no more than about $50,000 per year, with total project funding not exceeding $100,000 over a period of two years.

Evaluation Process

All proposals received as a result of this announcement will be evaluated by an NRC review panel.

Evaluation Criteria

The award of NRC Cooperative Agreements is discretionary. Generally, projects are supported in order of merit to the extent permitted by available funds.

Evaluation of proposals for research projects will employ the following criteria. No level of importance is implied by the order in which these criteria are listed.

1. Adequacy of the research design.
2. Scientific significance of proposal.
3. Technical adequacy of the investigators and their institutional base.
4. Relevance to a research area(s) described above.
5. Reasonableness of estimated cost in relation to the work to be performed and anticipated result.
6. Potential benefit of the project to the overall benefit of the institution's undergraduate and graduate research program.

Disposition of Proposals

Notification of award will be made by the Grant (Cooperative Agreement) Officer and organizations whose proposals are unsuccessful will be so advised.

Proposal Instructions and Forms

Questions concerning the preceding information, copies of application forms, and applicable regulations shall be obtained from or submitted to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Grant Officer, Division of Contracts and Property Management, Mail Stop P-1042, Office of Administration, Washington, DC 20555. (Note: Cooperative Agreement application packages. Standard Form 424 must be requested in writing.)

The address for hand-carried applications is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Grant Officer, Division of Contracts and Property Management, Office of Administration, Mail Stop P-1042, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD 20814.

(Note: Upon delivery of the application to the NRC guard desk (at the above address), the guard should be requested to telephone the Division of Contracts and Property Management (Extension x24297) for a pick-up of the application.)

Nothing in this solicitation should be construed as committing the NRC to dividing available funds among all qualified applicants.

Dated at Bethesda, MD this 9th day of April 1990. For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mary H. Mace,

Grant Officer, Contract Negotiation Branch #2, Division of Contracts and Property Management, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 90-8828 Filed 4-12-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Revised Meeting Agenda

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 continue its 360th meeting on April 18-19, 1990, in Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland. Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on March 21 (55 FR 10557) and April 3, 1990 (55 FR 12432). This revised meeting notice consists of continued sessions to complete Committee deliberations regarding items considered during this meeting, namely SECY-90-016, Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues and Their Relationship to Current Regulatory Requirements and the proposed NRC Severe Accident Research Program Plan. The schedule for these sessions is noted below.

Wednesday April 18, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

3:15 p.m.-6:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports to the NRC (Open)—The Committee will continue discussion of the proposed ACRS reports to the NRC regarding SECY-90-016, Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues and Their Relationship to Current Regulatory Requirements and the proposed NRC Severe Accident Research Program Plan.

Thursday, April 19, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8:30 a.m.-1230 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports to the NRC (Open)—The Committee will continue discussion of

the proposed ACRS reports noted above.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on September 27, 1989 (54 FR 39594). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS Executive Director as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture and television cameras during this meeting as determined by the Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be limited to selected portions of the meeting may be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the ACRS Executive Director, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley, prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACRS meetings may be adjusted by the Chariman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with the ACRS Executive Director if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the ACRS Executive Director, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley (telephone 301/492-8049), between 7:45 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Dated: April 10, 1990.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 90-8623 Filed 4-12-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-309]

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Co.; Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 115 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-36 issued to Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station located in Lincoln County, Maine. The amendment was effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment modifies specifications with respect to section 5.12, High Radiation Area. The amendment addresses the administrative controls for locked high radiation area access and provides clarification for determining the high radiation area dose value.

The application for amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR chapter 1, which is set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Opportunity for Hearing in connection with this action was published in the Federal Register on February 8, 1990 (55 FR 4499). No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

The Commission has prepared an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (55 FR 12970) related to the action and has concluded that an environmental impact statement is not warranted and that the issuance of this amendment will not have a significant adverse effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The application for amendment dated December 22, 1989 (2) Amendment No. 115 to License No. DPR-36 and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation and Environmental Assessment.

All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, P.O. Box 367, Wiscasset, Maine 04578.

A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Projects I/II.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of April, 1990.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Eric J. Leeds,

Project Manager, Division of Reactor Projects I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 90-8627 Filed 4-12-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Co., et al.; Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49, issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of Millstone Unit No. 3 located in New London County, Connecticut.

On March 15, 1990, a leak in the Millstone Unit No. 3 yard fire water supply header was detected. To make a repair, it was determined that an underground section of the northeast fire water header needed to be isolated. On March 19, 1990, bypass jumper 390-16 was approved by the plant operations review committee (PORC) which established compensatory measures to be taken during the isolation and repair of the northeast fire water supply header to be isolated and removed from service for excavation, location and repair of the leak. Additional lengths of fire hose were supplied to hydrant hose No. 4. A continuous fire patrol was established at the reserve station service transformer and alternate sources of fire protection water were supplied to the fuel and engineered safety features buildings to ensure compliance with the Limiting Condition for Operation of Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.12.1 Subsequently, on March 30, 1990, Millstone Unit 3 shutdown for unrelated causes. Since Millstone Unit 3 was being operated within the "Action Statement" of TS 3.7.12.1, the requirements of TS 3.0.4 would not allow restart of the plant without repair of the fire water supply header.

The NRC staff has recognized that TS 3.0.4 has been applied in an inconsistent fashion. In this regard, TS which allow unlimited operation with compensatory measures being taken for inoperable equipment, restart of the facility with the same inoperable equipment should not be prevented. The NRC staff position on TS 3.0.4 is contained in Generic Letter (GL) 87-09, "Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operations and Surveillance Requirements," which we issued on June 4, 1987. A resolution for generic problems associated with TS 3.0.4 was proposed by GL 87-09.

By letter dated April 1, 1990 the licensee requested a Temporary Waiver

Revised agenda 360th 4/5-6/90

Division of Instrumentation and Resources, Room 312, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. NW., Washington, DC 20550, Telephone: (202) 357-9880.

Purpose of advisory panel: To provide advice and recommendations concerning support for training activities in research areas supported by the Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciencies Directorate of the National Science Foundation.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are within exemptions (4) and (6) of 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: March 29, 1990.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 90-7805 Filed 4-2-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee on Severe Accidents and Probabilistic Risk Assessment; Meeting

The Subcommittees on Severe Accidents and Probabilistic Risk Assessment will hold a joint meeting on April 18, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, April 18, 1990—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittees will continue their discussion of NUREG-1150, "Severe Accident Risks: An Assessment for Five U.S. Nuclear Power Plants."

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS staff member named below as far in advance as is practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittees, along with any of their consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittees will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, its consultants, and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefore can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the cognizant ACRS staff member, Mr. Dean Houston (telephone 301/492-8521) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named indiviudal one or two days before the scheduled meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., which may have occurred.

Dated: March 26, 1990.

Gary R. Quittschreiber,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 90-7809 Filed 4-2-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Revised Meeting Agenda

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 April 5-7, 1990, in Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland. Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on March 21, 1990. This revised meeting notice incorporates a session on the NRC Regulatory Impact Survey and reschedules other sessions accordingly.

Thursday, April 5, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8:30 a.m.-8:45 a.m.: Comments by ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will comment on items of current interest.

8:45 a.m.-10:45 a.m. Individual Plant Examination for External Events (Open)—The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss a proposed NRC generic letter regarding Individual Plant Examination for External Events.

11:a.m.-12:45 p.m. NRC Severe Accident Research Program Plan (Open)—The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss the status of work in the NRC Severe Accident Research Program. Representatives of the NRC staff and its contractors will participate, as appropriate.

1:45 p.m.-5 p.m.: Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (Open)—The Committee will hear briefings regarding selected certification issues such as equipment survivability and ABWR containment vent design. Also, the Committee will continue its discussion of a proposed report to the Commission on this matter. Members of the NRC staff will participate, as appropriate.

5 p.m.-6 pm.: NRC Safety Research Program (Open)—The Committee will discuss a proposed ACRS report on the impact of budgeting on the NRC safety research program.

Friday, April 6, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8:30 A.M.-10:30 a.m.: NRC Regulatory Impact Survey (Open)—A briefing will be given by representatives of the NRC staff regarding the results of discussions with nuclear power plant owners and operators regarding the impact of regulatory requirements on nuclear power plant operations.

10:45 a.m.-11:15 a.m.: Future ACRS Activities (Open)—The Committee will discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities and items proposed for consideration by the full Committee.

11:15 a.m.-12 Noon: ACRS Subcommittee Activities (Open)—The Committee will hear and discuss reports of ACRS subcommittees regarding the status of designated activities, including containment design criteria for future plants and ACRS consideration of operating nuclear facilities.

1 p.m.-3 p.m.: Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)—The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss a proposed NRC rule for renewal of nuclear power plant operating licenses. Representatives of the NRC staff will participate, as appropriate.

3 p.m.-3:15 p.m.: Appointment of ACRS Members (Open/Closed)—The Committee will discuss the status of appointment of ACRS members and qualifications of candidates proposed for consideration for ACRS membership.

Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

3:15 p.m.-6:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports to the NRC regarding topics considered during this meeting, including the

evolutionary light water reactor certification issues, IPE for external events, and the NRC safety research program budget.

Saturday, April 7, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md. 8:30 a.m.–12 Noon and 1:00 p.m.–3:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports to the NRC regarding topics considered during this meeting, including license renewal for nuclear power plants, the severe accident research program plan, evolutionary LWR certification issues, and the NRC safety research program budget. Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on September 27, 1989 (54 FR 39594). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS Executive Director as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the 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 a prepaid telephone call to the ACRS Executive Director, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley, 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 ACRS Executive Director if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

I have determined in accordance with subsection 10(d) Public Law 92–463 that it is necessary to close portions of this meeting as noted above to discuss information the release of which would represent to clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6)).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the ACRS Executive Director, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley (telephone 301/492–8049), between 7:45 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Dated: March 28, 1990.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 90-7810 Filed 4-2-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Rel. No. 34-27847; March 26, 1990 (File No. SR-MBSCC-90-01 & SR-BSECC-90-01)]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Proposed Rule Changes by MBS Clearing Corporation and Boston Stock Exchange Clearing Corporation Relating to Membership in Securities Clearing Group

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"), 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1), notice is hereby given that on February 23, 1990, and on March 16, 1990, respectively, the MBS Clearing Corporation ("MBSCC") and Boston Stock Exchange Clearing Corporation ("BSECC") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the identical proposed rule changes (File Nos. SR–MBSCC–90–01 and SR–BSECC–90–01) as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organizations. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule changes from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organizations' Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Changes

As discussed below, the proposed rule changes concern the agreement of MBSCC and BSECC with several other clearing agencies to become members of the Securities Clearing Group ("SCG").[1]

II. Self-Regulatory Organizations' Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Changes

In their filings with the Commission, the self-regulatory organizations included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule changes and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule changes. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Items IV below. The self-regulatory organizations have prepared summaries, set forth in section (A), (B), and (C) below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

[1] For background on SCG, See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 27044 (July 18, 1989), 54 FR 30983.

(A) Self-Regulatory Organizations' Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Changes

The proposed rule changes allow MBSCC and BSECC to become members of the SCG. The SCG was formed in 1988 by seven clearing agencies for the purposes of, among other things, (i) creating procedures to minimize risks posed by participants in more than one clearing agency, and (ii) confirming each clearing agency's authority to provide to other SCG members confidential information concerning the financial and operating condition of clearing agency participants that are also participants in other SCG member clearing agencies. The original seven SCG members are: Midwest Securities Trust Company, Midwest Clearing Corporation, Depository Trust Company, National Securities Clearing Corporation, Options Clearing Corporation, Stock Clearing Corporation of Philadelphia and Philadelphia Depository Trust Company. The original SCG agreement sets forth the purposes of the group, the method of participation and relevant legal considerations,[2] and was approved by the Commission on July 18, 1989.[3]

At the November 9, 1989, meeting, SCG members unanimously voted to allow BSECC and MBSCC to become parties to the SCG Agreement and members of SCG. The SCG believes that the participation of both MBSCC and BSECC will enhance the goals of the organization by expanding the sources for information sharing, thereby further decreasing risks in the National Clearing and Settlement System. In addition to allowing MBSCC and BSECC participation in the SCG, the amendments to the SCG Agreement also modify the notice provisions as set forth in section 1(A) and (C) of the original SCG Agreement, allowing more efficient handling of such notices by centralizing distribution through the Secretary of the SCG.

The proposed rule changes are consistent with the purposes and requirements of section 17A of the Act, as amended, in that they foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in the clearance and settlement of securities transactions and remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a national system for the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions.

[2] See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 27044 (July 18, 1989), 54 FR 30983.

[3] See, *supra*, note 1.

360th ACRS ratg 4/5-7/9

requirements for Chilled Water Systems design, and (3) criteria being used by the NRC staff to review the Chilled Water Systems design.

Reliability Assurance, date to be determined, Bethesda, MD. The Subcommittee will discuss the status of implementation of the resolution of USI A-46, "Seismic Qualification of Equipment in Operating Plants," and other related matters.

Joint Regulatory Activities and Containment Systems, date to be determined, Bethesda, MD. The Subcommittees will review the proposed final revision to appendix J to 10 CFR part 50, "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors."

ACRS Full Committee Meetings

360TH ACRS Meeting, April 5-7, 1990, Bethesda, MD. Items are tentatively scheduled.

*A. *Evolutionary Light-Water Reactor Certification Issues (Open)*—Continue discussion of the proposed ACRS comments and recommendations regarding Evolutionary Light-Water Reactor Certification Issues and their relationships to current regulations. Representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry will participate, as appropriate.

*B. *Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)*—Review and comment on the proposed NRC rule regarding renewal of operating licenses for nuclear power plants. Representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry will participate, as appropriate.

*C. *IPE for External Events (Open)*—Review and comment on the proposed NRC generic letter and supporting documentation regarding Individual Plant Examinations for External Events. Representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry will participate, as appropriate.

*D. *Severe Accident Research Plan (Open)*—Briefing and discussion of the status of work in the NRC Severe Accident Research Program. Representatives of the NRC staff and their contractors will participate, as appropriate.

*E. *NRC Safety Research Program (Open)*—Discuss proposed ACRS report on the budgeting of the NRC safety research program.

*F. *Future ACRS Activities (Open)*—Discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities and items proposed for consideration by the full Committee.

*G. *ACRS Subcommittee Activities (Open)*—Hear and discuss the status of assigned subcommittee activities including containment performance criteria and ACRS consideration of operating nuclear power plants.

*H. *Appointment of ACRS Members (Open/Closed)*—Discuss the status of appointment of ACRS members, and qualifications of candidates proposed for consideration as ACRS members.

361st ACRS Meeting, May 10-12, 1990—Agenda to be announced.

362nd ACRS Meeting, June 7-9, 1990—Agenda to be announced.

ACNW Full Committee Meetings

19th ACNW Meeting, April 26-27, 1990, Bethesda, MD. Items are tentatively scheduled.

*A. Review and comment on Characterization of the Yucca Quaternary Regional Hydrology Study Plan.

*B. Review results of the waste confidence review group's final review report which includes the disposition of public comments.

*C. Briefing on recent BEIR V report regarding, "Health Effects of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation."

*D. Briefing by N.E. Todreas, Chairman of the NRC's Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee on the NRC's radwaste research program.

*E. Continue ACNW considerations of EPA's High-Level Radioactive Waste Standards, as appropriate.

*F. Committee Activities—The Committee will discuss anticipated and proposed Committee activities, future meeting agenda, and organizational matters, as appropriate.

20th ACNW Meeting, May 23-25, 1990—Agenda to be announced.

21st ACNW Meeting, June 28-29, 1990—Agenda to be announced.

Dated: March 15, 1990.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 90-6422 Filed 3-20-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Agenda

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 April 5-7, 1990, in Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland. Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on February 23, 1990.

Thursday, April 5, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD.

8:30 a.m.-8:45 a.m.: Comments by ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will comment on items of current interest.

8:45 a.m.-12 Noon: Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (Open)—The Committee will hear briefings regarding selected certification issues such as equipment survivability and ABWR containment vent design. Also, the Committee will continue its discussion of a proposed report to the Commission on this matter. Members of the NRC staff will participate, as appropriate.

1 p.m.-5 p.m.: Individual Plant Examination for External Events (Open)—The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss a proposed NRC generic letter regarding Individual Plant Examination for External Events. Representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry will participate, as appropriate.

5 p.m.-6 p.m.: NRC Safety Research Program (Open)—The Committee will discuss a proposed ACRS report on the impact of budgeting on the NRC safety research program.

Friday, April 6, 1990, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD.

8:30 a.m.-10:45 a.m.: NRC Severe Accident Research Program Plan (Open)—The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss the status of work in the NRC Severe Accident Research Program. Representatives of the NRC staff and its contractors will participate, as appropriate.

11 a.m.-12 Noon and 1 p.m.-2 p.m.: Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)—The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss a proposed NRC rule for renewal of nuclear power plant operating licenses. Representatives of the NRC staff will participate, as appropriate.

2 p.m.-2:45 p.m.: Future ACRS Activities (Open)—The Committee will discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities and items proposed for consideration by the full Committee.

3 p.m.-3:30 p.m.: ACRS Subcommittee Activities (Open)—The committee will hear and discuss reports of ACRS subcommittees regarding the status of designated activities, including containment design criteria for future plants and ACRS consideration of operating nuclear facilities.

3:30 p.m.-3:45 p.m.: Appointment of ACRS Members (Open/Closed)—The Committee will discuss the status of appointment of ACRS members and qualifications of candidates proposed for consideration for ACRS membership.

Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information the release of which would represent a

clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

3:45 p.m.–6:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports to the NRC regarding topics considered during this meeting, including the evolutionary light water reactor certification issues, IPE for external events, and the NRC safety research program budget.

Saturday, April 7, 1990, Room P–110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD

8:30 a.m.–12 Noon and 1 p.m.–3 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports to the NRC regarding topics considered during this meeting, including license renewal for nuclear power plants, the severe accident research program plan, evolutionary LWR certification issues, and the NRC safety research program budget.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on September 27, 1989 (54 FR 39594). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS Executive Director as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the 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 a prepaid telephone call to the ACRS Executive Director, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley, 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 ACRS Executive Director if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

I have determined in accordance with subsection 10(d), Public Law 92–463 that it is necessary to close portions of this meeting as noted above to discuss information the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6)).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the ACRS Executive Director, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley (telephone 301/492–8049), between 7:45 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Dated: March 15, 1990.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 90–6423 Filed 3–20–90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Eight Auxiliary Local Public Document Rooms for Nuclear Power Reactors Closed

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of closing of eight auxiliary local public document rooms for nuclear power reactors.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has closed eight auxiliary local public document rooms (LPDRs) for nuclear power reactors that had been maintained for selective documents. A complete, full-service LPDR continues to be maintained for each of these facilities.

These partial LPDRs were located in the following libraries: Miami-Dade Public Library, Homestead, FL (Turkey Point Plant); University of Illinois Library, Champaign, IL (Clinton Power Station); Founders Library, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb (Byron Station); Free Library of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA (Limerick Generating Station); Pattee Library, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station and Beaver Valley Power Station); South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC (Catawba Nuclear Station); Austin Public Library, Austin, TX (South Texas Project); and San Antonio Public Library, San Antonio, TX (South Texas Project).

DATE: These partial LPDRs were closed effective February 23, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Teresa D. Linton, Information Services Librarian, Freedom of Information Act/ Local Public Document Room Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone 301–492–7143, or Toll-Free 800–638–8081.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Each of these partial LPDRs was established to meet a specific need for a limited time. Some were established at the request of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board or the former Office of the Executive Legal Director for intervenors in licensing proceedings. A recent review of these LPDRs found that the collections were no longer being used by the public. The closings were approved by the Agency's Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeals Board, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, and Office of the General Counsel. The LPDR libraries have been given the option of storing or discarding the records. The locations and hours of operation of the full-service LPDRs maintained for each of these facilities can be obtained by contacting the NRC Local Public Document Room staff at 800–638–8081, Toll-Free.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 14th of March, 1990.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

John D. Philips,

Deputy Director, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 90–6414 Filed 3–20–90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–245, 50–336, and 50–423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Co., Millstone Nuclear Power Station; Relocation of Local Public Document Room

Notice is hereby given that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has relocated the local public document room (LPDR) for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station from the Waterford Public Library, Waterford, Connecticut, to the Learning Resources Center, Thames Valley State Technical College, Norwich, Connecticut. The relocation was at the request of the Waterford Public Library, which was no longer able to maintain the voluminous collection. Members of the public may now inspect and copy documents and correspondence related to the operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station at the Learning Resources Center, Thames Valley State Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut 06360. The Library is open on the following schedule: Monday through Thursday 8 am to 8:30 pm; and Friday 8 am to 4:30 pm.

For further information, interested parties in the Norwich area may contact the LPDR directly through Dr. Paul Price, telephone number (203) 886–0177. Parties outside the service area of the LPDR may address their requests for records to the NRC's Public Document Room,

CERTIFIED

MINUTES OF THE 360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7 AND 18-19, 1990

The 360th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) was held at Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md., between April 5-7 and 18-19, 1990. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate actions on the items listed in the attached agenda. Owing to lack of time during the April 5-7, 1990 session, the Committee was not able to complete a report to the Commission, that was due on April 20, 1990, related to evolutionary light water reactor certification issues proposed by the NRC staff in SECY-90-016. Consequently, the meeting was recessed at 2:30 p.m. on April 7, 1990 and reconvened at 3:15 p.m. on April 18, 1990.
A transcript of selected portions of the meeting was kept and is available in the NRC Public Document Room. (Copies of the transcript are available for purchase from Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd., 1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.)

I. Chairman's Report (Open)

[NOTE: Mr. R. Fraley was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Mr. Michelson, the full Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. with a brief summary of the planned meeting schedule and the provisions under which the discussions were to be held. He stated that the Committee had received neither written comments nor requests for time to make oral statements from members of the public.

Items of Current Interest

Mr. Michelson stated that the following items are of current interest:

- Dr. Wilkins has been appointed recently to the ACRS by the Commission and he will be attending this meeting as an observer.

- All the paper work, including security clearance, associated with Mr. Minnick's appointment to the ACRS has been completed and he is now a voting member of the ACRS.

- Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) has reduced 1430 positions, effective March 1, 1990, from its nuclear power organization. This reduction is distributed as shown below:

- Browns Ferry	415
- Sequoyah	230
- Watts Bar	220
- Nuclear power headquarters in Knoxville	300
- Nuclear power headquarters in Chattanooga	265

- The schedules proposed by the staff for restart of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 and Browns Ferry are May 5, 1990 and September 9, 1990, respectively.

- The International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) is expected to recommend limits for hot particles and the NRC staff believes that these limits may be significantly lower than those recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) in the NCRP Report No. 6.

  Mr. Carroll stated that he does not believe that the difference between the ICRP and NCRP limits will be significant as has been envisioned.

- An Incident Investigation Team has been formed to investigate the loss-of-ac-power incident at the Vogtle Nuclear Plant Unit 1.

II. Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues (Open)

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

ABWR Containment Vent Design

The Committee heard presentations from representatives of the NRC staff and the General Electric Company (GE) regarding the staff's proposal that the Commission approve the use of a containment overpressure protection system in the ABWR design certification process.

GE presented a summary of the ABWR containment vent design and the operation of the overpressure protection system. In addition, GE presented a summary of the results of PRAs that have been performed for this system. GE's analysis indicates that the vent would provide a reduction in estimated risks, although ABWR plants could operate within the Commission's safety goal guidelines with or without the vent.

Dr. Sawyer, GE, stated that the ABWR containment overpressure protection system (Seismic Category I) incorporates a pressure relief path from wetwell vapor space to the plant stack, and it is designed for 150 psig. The rupture disks relieve at pressure less than ultimate capability. The pressure relief operation is automatic and passive and does not require operator decision. After pressure is relieved and suppression pool cooling is regained, the operator closes air-operated valves to regain containment integrity. Dr. Sawyer noted that the desirability of venting a BWR containment to mitigate multiple-failure accidents far beyond the design basis has been accepted for some time. Since 1981, the BWR emergency procedure

guidelines (EPGs), developed by the BWR Owners Group and approved by the NRC for existing BWRs, have called for venting the containment wetwell air space. GE believes that containment overpressure protection represents a practical and beneficial feature to incorporate in the ABWR design. The overpressure protection system is relatively inexpensive in a new plant and provides insurance against the consequences and financial risks associated with end-of-spectrum accident scenarios.

GE has established two severe accident goals in the risk analysis submitted to the staff. The first goal states that the frequency of a severe accident release resulting in a whole body dose of 25 rem beyond one-half mile from the reactor should not exceed 10^{-6}/Ryr. This goal is basically the same as that specified in the EPRI ALWR Requirements Document. The second goal states that the conditional containment failure probability (CCFP) should be less than 0.1. The ABWR design with the vent system is expected to meet these goals. GE has performed an analysis that indicates the CCFP for the ABWR design without the vent is 0.5; however, with a vent system, the CCFP was calculated to be 0.06.

Mr. Scaletti, NRR, stated that the staff's review of the containment overpressure protection system proposed by GE is not yet complete. However, based upon a preliminary review of the ABWR severe accident design, the staff has determined that, as far as the overall risk impact is concerned, the GE ABWR public safety goal is significantly more stringent than the Commission's quantitative health objectives. Currently, the staff recommends that the Commission approve the use of the vent system in the ABWR design certification process.

Mr. De Vine, EPRI, stated that the EPRI Utility Steering Committee opposes inclusion of a requirement for a containment vent in advanced LWRs because it is philosophically inconsistent for advanced plants to design in a vent path when technical rationale for venting is addressed by other design features. In addition, there is significant concern for institutional issues related to actual operation of a containment vent. No clear regulatory policy exists on vent operation.

Mr. De Vine stated that the NRC staff's draft SER related to Chapter 5 of the EPRI ALWR Requirements Document includes the staff's position in favor of CCFP or other equivalent containment performance criterion. He noted also that the staff's interpretation of containment failure as unisolable leakage (as opposed to definition based on dose) has the effect of requiring a vent. The Utility Steering Committee is opposing the use of CCFP. However, EPRI has looked at the implications and concluded that:

- Requiring the ALWR to meet a 0.1 CCFP where failure is defined in terms of a safety-significant dose is consistent with other safety goals and 0.1 CCFP can be met without a vent.

- Requiring the ALWR to meet a 0.1 CCFP where failure is defined in terms of ability to control the leakage pathway is inconsistent with other safety goals and is a de facto requirement for a vent.

Mr. De Vine referred to the February 16, 1989 ACRS report on the Safety Goal Policy that states "...each subordinate level of the safety goal hierarchy should be consistent with the level above and should not be so conservative as to create a de facto new policy."

Mr. Carroll said it is important to note that GE has provided in the ABWR design additional means of decay heat removal. This would reduce the frequency of the sequences involving loss of containment heat removal function, thus reducing the benefit of the ABWR vent system for these types of accident sequences. Mr. Carroll expressed several concerns regarding the design of the containment overpressure protection as proposed by GE. Some of these concerns are:

- The potential that such a system might increase the risk through spurious actuation or malfunction.

- The sizing of the system (a system with lower flow capability may be more controllable and result in less release of radioactivity).

- The need for a demisting device in the system to reduce the release of radioactive aerosols if the system is ever actuated.

- The reliability and testability of the rupture disks that will be used in the system.

During the April 18-19, 1990 meeting, the Committee decided to recommend that use of a containment overpressure protection system be approved subject to the results of the regulatory review.

Equipment Survivability

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Scaletti summarized the staff's position regarding the "equipment survivability" issue specified in SECY-90-016. They stated that the staff believes that features provided in the ELWR designs that are intended only for severe accident protection need not be subject to 10 CFR 50.49 (Environmental Qualification Requirements), 10 CFR 50, Appendix A (Redundancy and Diversity Requirements), and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B (Quality Assurance Requirements). The reason for this judgment is that the staff does not believe that severe core damage accidents should be design basis

accidents (DBA) in the traditional sense that DBAs have been treated in the past.

With reference to a statement in SECY-90-016 which states that "Notwithstanding that judgment, however, mitigation features must be designed so there is reasonable assurance that they will operate in the severe-accident environment for which they are intended and over the time span for which they are needed," Dr. Siess stated that this implies that the staff's position on this issue includes much more than the underlined portion of the enclosure to SECY-90-016. He believes that this statement should have been underlined as part of the staff position on this issue. The ACRS, however, endorsed the staff's position on this issue.

ACRS Action

The Committee provided comments and recommendations on the proposed staff positions related to the 15 ELWR certification issues that are delineated in SECY-90-016, and issued a report to the Commission, dated April 26, 1990, discussed in Section VIII. The Committee concurred in the proposed staff positions for certain issues. For several other issues, it agreed with the proposed staff positions with additions and clarifications.

Additional remarks provided by ACRS members Dr. Lewis and Mr. Carroll and by ACRS members Dr. Kerr, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Carroll were appended to the April 26, 1990 report to the Commission.

III. NRC Regulatory Impact Survey (Open)

[NOTE: Mr. P. Boehnert was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. Lewis, Chairman of the Regulatory Policies and Practices Subcommittee, noted that the NRC had initiated a survey of selected licensees regarding the impact of the agency's regulatory policy. This survey was initiated in response to expressed concerns that there was a lack of feedback from licensees as to how the agency goes about its business. Dr. Lewis said the Commission is to be congratulated for launching this effort. He noted that the survey results are delineated in draft NUREG-1395, "Summary of Significant Survey Comments," that is appended to SECY-90-080, "Initial Staff Assessment." Dr. Lewis stated that the above NRC staff documents were "well done."

Need for the Survey - Dr. T. Murley, NRR

Dr. Murley reviewed the origins of the survey. He said that the agency's concern over the impact of regulatory policies began after the issuance of numerous requirements subsequent to the TMI-2

accident. This concern led to a reorganization of NRC's senior management structure and the issuance of the Backfit Rule. The loss-of-feedwater event at Davis-Besse and the overcooling event at Rancho Seco in 1985 led the agency to conclude that it needed to get more involved in plant diagnostic activities and closer monitoring of plant operations. Dr. Murley showed statistics to make the point that the agency's move in the above direction has resulted in both improved plant performance and consistently fewer accident precursor events.

Dr. Murley stated that data from the NRC Accident Sequence Precursor Study (ASPS) also indicate an improving trend in plant safety. The ASPS provides an overall estimate of mean core damage frequency (CDF) in RYs for the current population of U.S. plants. Figures cited by Dr. Murley show a steady decrease in CDF estimates from 1969 to 1988.

In response to a question from Dr. Shewmon, Dr. Murley stated that the ASPS evaluates LER data; events that evidence a potential CDF below 10^{-6} are ignored.

In response to a question from Dr. Kerr, the NRR staff stated that evaluations performed in conjunction with the ASPS lead them to believe that the CDF values are "real". Dr. Murley said that ~ 30-40 events/year exceed the 10^{-6} "cutoff" value.

Considering NRC's conduct of its business, Dr. Murley acknowledged that NRC is now more intrusive in the licensees' affairs. He stated also that the use of the Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) ratings by "Wall Street" is resulting in unfair pressure on licensees; the agency needs to consider changes to the SALP process to rectify this situation.

Dr. Murley said that, prior to this survey, licensee criticisms were unfocused and largely anecdotal. The agency does not feel the need to apologize for its current regulatory policies. However, given the need to ensure "checks and balances" in the NRC's operations, the subject survey was performed. He noted that the survey lacks balance, as the NRC sought criticisms only from selected licensees.

Process and Results of the Survey - Mr. B. Davis, Region III

Mr. Davis, Regional Administrator, Region III, discussed the process and the results of the survey. He stated that thirteen utilities were interviewed for this survey: Alabama Power, Arizona Nuclear Power, Commonwealth Edison, Duke Power, Illinois Power, Louisiana Power and Light, Nebraska Public Power, Northeast Utilities, Northern States Power, Pacific Gas and Electric, Pennsylvania Power and Light, South Carolina Electric and Gas, and Vermont Yankee. Mr. Davis stated that, with the exception of the utilities surveyed in his

Region, he and his co-worker (Ms. C. Pederson) attended all the interview sessions. For each utility interviewed, NRC held discussions with representatives ranging from the CEOs to plant operators. All comments were taken as confidential to assure no fear of retribution.

Mr. Davis noted that the principal themes that emerged from the survey are:

- Licensees acquiesce to NRC requests, (both formal and informal), in order to avoid poor SALP ratings and the consequent financial and public relations problems that result.

- NRC's demands on licensees' resources, resulting from both formal and informal requirements, impact to such a degree that licensees feel their plants would be more reliable, and perhaps more safe, if they were freer to manage their own assets.

The comments were grouped into ten categories as noted below. The key concerns/complaints raised by the licensees are also noted under each category:

- Requirements and Perceived Requirements

  - The NRC is issuing so many new requirements that it is actually managing the utilities' resources rather than regulating the industry.

  - The licensees consider informal guidance, such as generic correspondence, policy statements, and inspector and reviewer comments, as formal requirements since they do not want to appear unresponsive to NRC initiatives.

  - The NRC does not consider the cumulative impact of all of its initiatives on the industry.

- NRC Licensing Activities

  - The NRC review of licensing submittals is untimely. Technical Specifications are poorly written, resulting in excessive surveillance.

  - There is no effective appeal process for technical issues.

  - The NRC inspectors impose many unauthorized backfits by setting successively higher standards of performance.

- o NRC Inspection Activities
  - Team inspections place a large resource burden on the licensees.
  - When reviewing an event, the Augmented Inspection Team so dominates the licensee's resources that the licensee's ability to investigate the event independently is impaired.
- o Performance Evaluations
  - The SALP process is an improper mechanism for obtaining improved performance, and the public and outside organizations (e.g., Wall Street) misuse and misinterpret SALP results.
  - Licensees are afraid that complaining about these issues to the NRC will result in retaliatory action.
- o Impact of Multiple Oversight Organizations
  - Regulation and oversight by multiple organizations have significant impact on licensee resources and also have potential adverse safety implications.
  - Involvement of State Governments is unnecessary and the NRC should control such involvement.
  - The NRC should establish minimum requirements and leave the pursuit of excellence to the licensees and industry organizations.
- o Operator Licensing
  - Examiner standards are continually changing and not implemented uniformly.
  - Too many organizations are involved in the requalification process.
  - The NRC should not conduct examinations but should merely monitor the performance of an INPO-accredited program.
- o Enforcement and Investigations
  - Enforcement actions taken for violations are inconsistent among the regions.
  - Even though licensee performance is improving, the enforcement actions are also increasing.

- Licensees are reluctant to challenge the enforcement actions because of the fear that the NRC inspectors may lower the licensees' SALP ratings.

o Reporting Events

- The NRC needs to examine its requirements for reporting events because reporting thresholds are too low.

- Interpretations of what is reportable are inconsistent.

- The agency's call recipients sometimes lack adequate knowledge.

o Communications

- The verbal communications skills of NRC personnel during exit meetings could be improved, and written products were of poor quality.

- Licensees are afraid to communicate their concerns about unfair and wrong actions of NRC employees to the NRC management because they fear retaliation.

o Qualification Training and Professionalism of NRC Personnel

- While NRC, as an organization, rates high marks, some NRC staff members lack adequate knowledge and interpersonal skills.

- Some NRC inspectors have difficulty in distinguishing between significant and less significant items.

Mr. Carroll said he was troubled that some utilities don't seem to be aware of Nuclear Management and Resource Council (NUMARC) activities that directly impact them. Mr. Davis agreed with the remark.

Dr. Lewis inquired whether the integrity of the survey was corrupted by the presence of NRC "authority figures." Mr. Davis stated that, based on the interpersonal actions he observed, only one of the 65 groups interviewed didn't level with them.

In response to a question from Mr. Carroll, Mr. Davis said the level of interviewees' preparedness varied; some discussions were orchestrated by the cognizant management.

Mr. Minnick asked Mr. Davis if this survey left him feeling any better or worse about plant safety. Mr. Davis stated that the survey

confirmed his view that there is a spectrum of utility capability across the country vis-a-vis operation of nuclear plants.

Staff's Plans in Response to the Survey - Dr. T. Murley

Dr. Murley discussed NRC's plans to respond to the survey. Three areas are under consideration for regulatory improvements. These involve examination of means and methods for:

- Accounting for the cumulative impact of generic communications/ requirements
- Better scheduling and control of inspections, especially team inspections
- Improved training, preparation, and management of inspectors.

Drs. Kerr and Lewis complimented the Staff for the survey effort.

Mr. Michelson indicated that the Committee will discuss this item at future ACRS Meetings as the staff's actions progress.

IV. NRC Safety Research Program (Open)

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

The Committee issued a report to the Commission on this matter as discussed in Section VIII. The Committee expressed concern about the continually dwindling NRC Safety Research Program budget, and provided bases for its belief that a viable research program should be an essential part of the NRC regulatory process. The Committee stated that unless the trend of continually diminishing funding for the NRC research program is arrested, the overall effectiveness of the agency will be seriously compromised. The Committee stated that, in its judgment, the present research funding level is below the minimum, and if there are any further reductions RES will not be able to support and maintain an effective research program. The Committee suggested that a guideline of at least one-quarter of the agency budget is more appropriate for a viable research program. The Committee suggested also that the Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee advise the RES Director on general safety research philosophy and long-range strategy, rather than on the details of specific ongoing research programs.

V. NRC Severe Accident Research Program Plan (Open)

[NOTE: Mr. D. Houston was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. Kerr, Chairman of the Severe Accidents Subcommittee, indicated that the subcommittee had met with the staff on March 20 and 21, 1990 to review the Severe Accident Research Program (SARP). He stated that most of the review was devoted to the short-term program, defined as those issues related to early containment failure. He stated also that the staff had provided responses to two questions posed by Dr. Shewmon in regard to depressurization and core melt progression.

Dr. Speis, RES, mentioned that the questions raised by Dr. Kerr regarding two issues included in the Severe Accident Policy Statement will be discussed later by Dr. Sheron, or a response provided in writing. Dr. Kerr agreed that a written response would be satisfactory.

Dr. Sheron, RES, presented an overview of the status of the SARP. He stated that the SARP was a major supporting element of the severe accident integration plan and would provide technical input in the areas of Individual Plant Examinations (IPEs), containment performance improvement (CPI), and accident management. He discussed the elements of the short-term and long-term programs. The issues given higher priority were those associated with early containment failure, e.g., Mark I liner attack or direct containment heating (DCH).

Dr. Sheron next discussed the status of activities in the following areas:

- o BWR Mark I Liner Issue

  A report, NUREG/CR-5423, "The Probability of Liner Failure in a Mark-I Containment," prepared by RES contractor Dr. Theofanous, has been issued. Peer-review comments on this report are being reviewed and assessed by the staff.

  A final workshop is planned to be held to discuss remaining issues.

- o Direct Containment Heating

  All DCH tests were stopped in 1989. A workshop was held during December 1989 at Annapolis, Md., to discuss DCH issues. Conclusions of this workshop include:

- Scaling of initial and boundary conditions is very important to the ability to interpret and utilize test results.

- A key phenomenon that plays a critical role in determining the severity of a DCH event is the fragmentation and entrainment/deentrainment of corium as it enters the lower cavity.

Current thinking is to determine fragmentation and entrainment/deentrainment through separate effects tests in which particle size and distribution can be measured.

o Code Development

A letter has been issued to code developers to apportion funding such that codes would be documented by the end of FY 1989. Specific actions taken on major codes include:

- Development of MELPROG code has been essentially terminated.

- Development of COMMIX code has been stopped pending completion of the assessment.

- Contract has been issued to Scientech to evaluate other severe accident codes with respect to status, need for further development, etc.

o Scaling Methodology

Dr. Zuber headed up a team of experts to address scaling of severe accident experiments.

The basic approach was to develop an equation describing the rate of pressure change in the cavity accounting for all heat sources and sinks.

SNL and ANL are currently developing detailed scaling rationale for further testing.

o Accident Management

The major issue is the consequences of adding water to a degraded core. The Reactor and Plant Systems Branch is performing some bounding calculations on hydrogen and steam production resulting from adding water to a degraded core. The Accident Evaluation Branch is examining whether the FARO facility can perform tests to determine the consequences of adding water to a degraded core.

Dr. Sheron indicated that 40 percent of his Division's budget has been allocated for SARP, and SARP is the largest single budget item in the agency. He highlighted some of the international participation, namely in France, Italy, Japan, and Russia. He also noted that NRC and EPRI have been working closely together to ensure that there will be no duplication of programs and that the programs are complementary.

Dr. Sheron indicated that a Commission briefing on the status of SARP had been scheduled for May 14, 1990. He stated that a Committee letter on this matter would be helpful to the staff.

Mr. Michelson asked where accident initiators are being studied. Dr. Sheron replied that this is being done by the PRA Branch, and it is not part of the SARP.

Dr. Kerr expressed enthusiasm about the results of the Severe Accident Scaling Methodology (SASM) effort and asked if a SASM-type approach could be applied to other elements of the SARP. Dr. Sheron stated that contractors are being asked to apply the SASM approach to all experiments.

Mr. Minnick asked whether any requirement is being proposed to ensure water in the Mark I cavity since the Mark I liner study has shown this to be very beneficial. Dr. Speis stated that utilities have been aware of this benefit but that NRC has not proposed any requirements in this area.

Dr. Catton expressed a concern about the deletion of melt spreading studies at BNL. Dr. Sheron indicated that this was due to the lack of a BNL response when they were asked to show how further experiments could be related to actual nuclear plants. Dr. Sheron indicated that the MELTSPREAD code was being developed at EPRI with some small experiments at ANL. In response to Dr. Catton's inquiry, Dr. Eltawila agreed to send him a copy of the ANL report on this matter.

Dr. Shewmon asked for clarification regarding natural circulation, intentional and unintentional depressurization, and the effect on heat transfer that is ascribed to hydrogen generation. In their response, the staff cited studies at INEL and SNL on these issues. Also, Dr. Sheron indicated that much of this effort was being conducted in regard to accident management, an area not discussed or presented at this meeting.

Dr. Shewmon asked why there was apparently little effort in the current studies to translate hydrogen detonation load into containment failure values. Dr. Sheron indicated that there are codes currently developed that will do this.

During the meeting, the Committee discussed and approved a report on the SARP activities. The context of this report is discussed in Section VIII.

VI. Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)

[NOTE: Mr. G. Quittschreiber was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. Lewis, Chairman of the Regulatory Policie and Practices Subcommittee, stated that the Subcommittee met on March 26, 1990 to review the proposed license renewal rule.

Staff's Proposed License Renewal Rulemaking Package, Mr. Karl Kniel, RES

Mr. Kniel summarized the proposed License Renewal Rulemaking package that was provided to the ACRS on March 7, 1990. The staff is planning to publish the proposed rule (10 CFR 54) during June 1990. A proposed regulatory guide describing the content, format, and other details of license renewal submittal is scheduled to be published during December 1990. The final rule will be published during May 1991 and the final regulatory guide during April 1992. Mr. Kniel noted that a major industry technical report program is under way to cover the license renewal problems associated with the major components and structures. Three of the ten reports have already been submitted to the NRC and to the ACRS for review and comment. The staff plans to write an SER on each of these industry reports. The first lead plant seeking license renewal is scheduled to come to the Commission during June 1991 and the second during December 1991.

Current Licensing Basis, Mr. Karl Kniel, RES

Mr. Kniel stated that the basic regulatory philosophy for the rule is that except for age-related concerns, the current licensing basis (CLB) is sufficient to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection of the public health and safety. The licensing basis that was originally accepted and then modified over the years will continue to be modified and will be the licensing basis for the plant when it is brought in for license renewal. This is acceptable to the staff for life extension. Age-related degradation will be managed so that structures, systems, and components important to safety will perform in accordance with and maintain the current licensing basis.

In response to a question from Mr. Michelson concerning the present performance of cost benefit for potential backfits, assuming a 40-year life instead of an extended life, Mr. Kniel stated that the additional 20-year period would have a small effect (factor of about

2) which would not be significant. Old issues will not be reopened to perform a cost-benefit with the extended life.

The staff is not proposing that licensees be required to submit the CLB as documents or by reference to documents already submitted to the NRC. The rule will require that licensees compile the CLB for their own use in the screening process for structures, systems, and components important to license renewal.

In response to questions from the Committee concerning the CLB, Mr. Kniel stated that it would include any document submitted to the NRC during the plant life which specify requirements; however, the utility is not required to submit documents or to reference documents for purposes of providing the NRC with a definition of the CLB for the plant life extension.

In response to a question from Mr. Michelson concerning the industry's responsibilities, it was noted that it is the intent of the NRC that whatever is needed to justify the continuation of operation will be up to the utility to do and to provide the basis to the NRC for the additional license renewal period.

Systems, Structures and Components Important to License Renewal, Mr. Karl Kniel, RES

Mr. Kniel stated that the term "systems, structures, and components (SSCs) important to license renewal" is defined in the rule in terms of the need to ensure integrity of pressure boundary and safe shutdown for the design basis. It is also defined to include all SSCs used in safety analysis for the licensing basis including ATWS and station blackout; SSCs in the balance of plant would only be addressed to the extent they are included in the FSAR.

The screening process specified in the draft rule is meant to be an effective program to identify all SSCs important to license renewal which contribute to performance of a safety function or whose failure could preclude an SSC from performing a safety function. The process is meant to identify effective programs to control aging and/or to describe actions taken to manage aging.

Application of the Backfit Rule, Mr. Karl Kniel, RES

Mr. Kniel stated that the staff is proposing that the Backfit Rule not be applied to the license renewal process. The Commission has recommended that the Backfit Rule be applied during the individual plant license renewal proceeding. Age-related requirements to ensure conformance with the CLB, and adequate protection would be permitted without respect to cost. Any related requirements that go beyond the CLB would be subject to cost/benefit analysis and justification provisions of the Backfit Rule. The proposed Rule on License Renewal

specifies that the Backfit Rule is applied again after the license has been renewed.

Industry Approach to License Renewal, Mr. Bill Rasin, NUMARC

Mr. Rasin discussed the industry effort with regard to license renewal. NUMARC has established a working group that includes representatives from the lead plants and other utilities in the industry. The industry effort dates back to the late 1970 and the EPRI economic feasibility study shows that life extension should be pursued. Pilot studies performed on the Surry and Monticello plants looked at the technical feasibility and licensing problems.

Mr. Rasin noted that the technical reports being prepared by the industry focus on the major components in the plant, selected from the pilot studies. There is no technical basis for the selection of the 20-year extension period. The industry is in "agreement" with the direction being taken by the staff with regard to license extension.

Mr. Rasin stated that the industry has performed a detailed time dependency study to look at regulations which contain a time dependency element and they provided the results of this study to the NRC.

Mr. Rasin mentioned the concerns that the industry has with the proposed License Renewal Rule, such as compiling the CLB upfront, along with possible misuse and mischief in the process. If the CLB is required in a rule, then all the information that is compiled is subject to discovery in a hearing.

Northern States Power Company, Mr. Terry Pickens

Mr. Pickens stated that the Monticello plant, which is the lead BWR plant for license renewal, has been active in the area of license renewal and plant life extension since 1984. Through pilot plant studies, the Northern States Power Company (NSP) has identified a set of critical components. They have not identified any major obstacle to extending the plant life of Monticello by up to 35 years.

In response to a question from Mr. Michelson concerning whether they would look at degradation of materials, for example electrical insulation and its flammability with time, Mr. Pickens stated that looking at such things is part of their CLB.

Mr. Pickens stated that they intend to forward a letter to the staff requesting that they consider a changed definition of effective programs addressing aging that differ from that described in the FSAR.

Mr. Pickens mentioned several concerns he has with the conceptual rule presented to the Commissioners on January 30, 1990. Some of these concerns included documenting the CLB, the amount of information required on the SSCs, and the methods for controlling activities necessary to manage aging. The rule should not be used to resolve issues beyond the scope of aging and its impact during the license renewal term and should focus on review of age-related degradation for those components that can directly affect the public health and safety.

Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Mr. Don Edwards

Mr. Edwards noted that the Yankee Atomic Electric Company (YAEC) has followed the pilot plant studies very closely. It is a member of the industry advisory committees, and by and large feels that its plants are "not getting older but are getting better." The average plant capacity factor has been going up with time and that there are major improvements being made to the plants.

Mr. Edwards expressed agreement in principle with the NRC's approach to the license renewal process in that the staff is focussing primarily on hardware and that the current level of safety and licensing basis are acceptable. He indicated that based on SECY-90-021, "Report on License Renewal Workshop and Proposed Revisions to the Program Plan and Schedule for Rulemaking," the NRC's evaluation method is cumbersome and essentially ignores the existing NRC oversight of the current license. He also felt that the rule provides no controls over the scope of backfits.

Mr. Edwards noted that changes to the CLB imposed by the staff, except for those proposed as a result of the analysis, should be justified as necessary for adequate safety or cost justified as meaningful safety improvements. Renewal should focus in on age degradation of long-lived equipment. The plant should only be reviewed to ensure that the identified hardware continues to perform its intended function.

In response to questions from Dr. Shewmon concerning licensing the Yankee Rowe pressure vessel for another 20 years, Mr. Edwards stated that a great deal of thinking and work have been and are being done with regard to the Yankee Rowe pressure vessel. The YAEC met with the staff a few weeks earlier to lay out the program to ensure that the pressure vessel would not be on the critical path for license extension.

In response to a question from Mr. Michelson concerning whether the CLB is also the Current Design Basis for the plant, the answer was yes. It was noted that the 40-year design basis can be extended.

ACRS Action

The Committee issued a report to the Commission on this matter which is discussed in Section VIII.

VII. Appointment of ACRS Members (Open)

[NOTE: Mr. R. F. Fraley was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee discussed briefly the new procedures approved by Chairman Carr for appointment of new ACRS members that were transmitted through a memorandum from Sandy Showman, SECY, to Ray Fraley, ACRS, dated March 23, 1990. These procedures apparently supersede the previous procedures approved by then NRC Chairman Zech that are delineated in memoranda dated March 14, 1988 and February 8, 1989. These procedures require that vacancies be filled on a case-by-case basis from a panel of applicants to be considered for each position. They require also that a public announcement be made in the Federal Register and/or other publications for initial and replacement membership vacancies so as to provide an opportunity to the public to suggest nominees.

The Committee decided that the ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures should review these new procedures and develop a recommendation for consideration by the full Committee during the May 10-12, 1990 ACRS meeting. A meeting of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee scheduled for May 9, 1990 to discuss this matter was subsequently postponed to June 6, 1990. Therefore, this matter is expected to be discussed by the Committee during the June 7-9, 1990 meeting.

VIII. Executive Sessions (Open)

A. Reports to the Commission (Open)

1. Proposed Rule on Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Report to Chairman Carr, dated April 11, 1990)

   The Committee concurred in the approach being proposed by the NRC staff for dealing with the nuclear power plant license renewal with several observations and comments.

2. NRC Safety Research Program Budget (Report to Chairman Carr, dated April 11, 1990)

   The Committee expressed concern about the continually dwindling NRC Safety Research Program budget, and provided bases for its belief that a viable research program should be an essential part of the NRC regulatory process. The

Committee stated that, in its judgment, the present research funding level is below the minimum, and if there are any further reductions RES will not be able to support and maintain an effective research program. The Committee suggested that a guideline of at least one-quarter of the agency budget is more appropriate for a viable research program. The Committee suggested also that the Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee advise the RES Director on general safety research philosophy and long-range strategy, rather than on the details of specific ongoing research programs.

3. Severe Accident Research Program (Report to Chairman Carr, dated April 24, 1990)

The Committee provided comments and recommendations on several elements of the NRC Severe Accident Research Program (SARP). The Committee pointed out that the same areas that were being explored ten years ago are still being investigated under SARP. However, there is little assurance that the proposed research would reduce uncertainties to an acceptable value. The Committee stated that, in its perception, various elements of the SARP lack focus and it is probably not altogether the fault of the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research. Part of this lack of focus comes from the inability of the agency to deal with severe accidents in a regulatory context.

4. Evolutionary Light Water Reactor Certification Issues and Their Relationship to Current Regulatory Requirements (Report to Chairman Carr, dated April 26, 1990)

The Committee provided comments and recommendations on the proposed staff positions related to the 15 evolutionary light water reactor certification issues that are delineated in SECY-90-016 and an associated enclosure. The Committee concurred in the proposed staff positions for certain issues. For several other issues, it agreed with the proposed staff positions with additions, clarifications, and comments.

Additional remarks provided by ACRS members H. W. Lewis and J. C. Carroll and ACRS members W. Kerr, D. A. Ward, and J. C. Carroll were appended to this report.

B. Subcommittee Report (Open)

1. Containment Systems/Structural Engineering

[NOTE: Mr. D. Houston was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Mr. Ward, Chairman of the Containment Systems Subcommittee, reported on the joint subcommittee meeting held on April 4, 1990. He indicated that this was the fifth in a series of meetings which had been held to gather information from experts in the containment design field. This information is to be used by the ACRS in its effort to develop new containment design criteria for future plants. At this meeting, invited speakers addressed design features of filtered containment vents and containments for BWR and PWR passive plants.

During this Committee meeting and the April 4, 1990 subcommittee meeting, Mr. Ward distributed the following draft documents that he had prepared:

- Summary of Presentations by Invited Speakers
- Summary of Existing NRC Requirements for Containment Design
- Matrix of Containment Functions/Features/Issues; current position by NRC and Industry and Proposed ACRS Position
- Comparison or Positions on Implementation of the Safety Goal Policy.

In conclusion, Mr. Ward requested written comments from members in regard to the third document in the above list. These comments will be evaluated in the development of the ACRS paper on proposed containment design criteria for future plants.

C. Other Matters (Open)

1. Meeting with Japanese Representatives

During this meeting, which is tentatively scheduled to be held between September 16-21, 1990 in Japan, the Committee plans to meet with representatives of Hitachi, Toshiba, Tokyo Electric, and MITTI. Items tentatively proposed for discussion include:

- APWR
- ABWR, including the basis for containment selection
- Seismic issues, including seismic design basis
- Siting
- Quality assurance
- Maintenance.

The Committee decided to discuss this matter and develop a detailed agenda during the May 10-12, 1990 ACRS meeting.

2. Memorandum from Thomas J. Kenyon, NRR, to Charles L. Miller, NRR, dated March 26, 1990, Subject: Summary of March 8-10, 1990 ACRS Meeting on SECY-90-016

The Committee felt that the summary report prepared by Mr. Kenyon does not reflect accurately the Committee's deliberations and preliminary decisions related to the ELWR certification issues included in SECY-90-016. The Committee expressed concern about the potential impact of this summary report on ACRS activities.

The Committee instructed Mr. Michelson, ACRS Chairman, to call Mr. Taylor, EDO, and bring this matter to his attention as well as the Committee's concern.

D. Summary/List of Follow-Up Matters (Open)

- The Committee instructed Mr. Michelson, ACRS Chairman, to bring to the attention of Mr. Taylor, EDO, the potential impact on ACRS activities of the summary report dated March 26, 1990 that was prepared by Mr. Kenyon, NRR, regarding the Committee's deliberations and preliminary decisions related to the ELWR certification issues. (Mr. Michelson has already brought this matter to the attention of the EDO.)

- During the May 10-12, 1990 ACRS meeting, the Committee decided to discuss additional issues, other than those identified by the staff in SECY-90-016, that it believes should be considered by the staff for the ELWRs. (Mr. Quittschreiber has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- The Committee decided that the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee should review the new procedures approved by Chairman Carr for appointment of new ACRS Members and develop a recommendation for consideration by the full Committee during the May 10-12, 1990 ACRS meeting. A meeting of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee scheduled for May 9, 1990 to discuss this matter was subsequently postponed to June 6, 1990. Therefore, this

matter is expected to be discussed by the Committee during the June 7-9, 1990 ACRS meeting. (Mr. Fraley has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- During the May 10-12, 1990 meeting, the Committee will try to develop a detailed agenda for the meeting with the Japanese representatives which is tentatively scheduled to be held between September 16-21, 1990. (Mr. Fraley and Mr. Quittschreiber have the follow-up action on this matter.)

- Mr. Fraley informed the Members that if they want to visit the MDH containment facility on June 29, 1990 during their visit to Germany, they would not be able to depart for the U.S. on June 29, 1990 as scheduled previously. He suggested that those who want to visit the MDH facility let him know as soon as possible. (Mr. Fraley and Mr. Quittschreiber have the follow-up action on this matter.)

- The Committee decided to discuss further the NRC staff's Regulatory Impact Survey of Selected Utilities after the staff has completed its final assessment of the results of the survey and taken a position whether the NRC should change its regulatory approach to ensure continued safe operation of nuclear power plants. (Mr. Quittschreiber has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- Mr. Ward requested that the Members provide written comments within two weeks on a draft paper, prepared by him, regarding: Matrix of Containment Functions/ Features/Issues; current NRC and Industry Position, and Proposed ACRS Position. (Mr. Houston has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- The Committee decided to review the restart of Browns Ferry Unit 2. Mr. Wylie, Chairman of the TVA Plant Licensing and Restart Subcommittee, agreed to hold a meeting to review the restart and TVA organizational issues associated with this plant. A Subcommittee meeting, including site visit, has been scheduled tentatively for July 24-25, 1990. (Mr. Houston has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- The Committee suggested that the ACRS Subcommittees on Computers in Nuclear Power Plant Operations and on Instrumentation and Control Systems hold a joint meeting to discuss the CE, GE, and Westinghouse approaches to advanced solid state control systems and control room designs. (Mr. Boehnert and Dr. El-Zeftawy have the follow-up action on this matter.)

- Dr. Sheron, RES, agreed to provide written information, as requested by Dr. Kerr, regarding the progress being made by RES in addressing the following issues included in the Severe Accident Policy Statement. (Mr. Houston has the follow-up action on this matter):

  - "A clarification of containment performance expectations will be made including a decision on whether to establish new performance criteria for containment systems and, if so, what these should be."

  - "The Severe Accident Research Program as well as NRC's extensive severe accident studies of certain individual plants will aid in determining the extent to which carefully analyzed reference plants can appropriately serve as surrogates for a class of similar plants as the basis for any generic conclusions. ... Any generic changes that are identified as necessary for public health and safety will be required through rulemaking and will be consistent with the Commission's backfit policy."

- During the discussion of SARP, Dr. Catton requested a copy of the ANL report on core melt spreading experiments. Dr. Eltawila, RES, agreed to provide a copy of this report. (Mr. Houston has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- Mr. Michelson suggested that the ACRS staff provide copies of NUREG/CR-4674 related to the Accident Sequence Precursor Program to all ACRS members. (Mr. Alderman has distributed copies of this document to all members on April 16, 1990.)

- Mr. Carroll proposed, and the Committee agreed, that there is no need to discuss the Proposed Rulemaking on the Emergency Response Data System at a subcommittee meeting; staff presentation to the full Committee would be sufficient. This matter is tentatively scheduled for discussion by the full Committee during the June 1990 ACRS meeting. (Mr. Boehnert has the follow-up action on this matter.)

- Mr. Michelson requested that the Members provide comments within a week on the proposed revisions to subcommittee assignments. Comments received from the members have been incorporated and a revised list of subcommittee assignments

distributed on April 27, 1990. (Dr. Savio has the follow-up action, if any, on this matter.)

E. Future Activities (Open)

1. Future Agenda

The Committee agreed on a tentative future agenda for the 361st ACRS meeting as shown in Appendix II.

2. Future Subcommittee Activities

A list of future ACRS subcommittee meetings was distributed to Committee members (Appendix III).

The meeting was recessed at 2:30 p.m. on April 7, 1990, reconvened on April 18, 1990 at 3:15 p.m. for further discussion of proposed ACRS reports, and adjourned on April 19, 1990 at 2:30 p.m.

APPENDICES
MINUTES OF THE 360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7 AND 18-19, 1990

I. Attendees

II. Future Agenda

III. Future Subcommittee Activities

IV. Other Documents Received

APPENDIX I
ATTENDEES
360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7, 1990

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1990

Public Attendees

Eve Fotopoulos, SERCH Licensing, Bechtel
Margo Barron, NUS Corp.
Darius Depa, Illinois Dept. of Nucl.Safety
L. N. R. S, [sic], ABCLT
J. F. Quirk, GE
C. D. Sawyer, GE
J. D. Trottor, EPRI
R. Marriott, GE
W. T. Pratt, BNL
S. L. Additon, TENERA
L. Connor, The NRC Calendar

NRC Attendees

J. L. Caron, RES
K. Olive, OC
E. Heumann, OC
A. Vietti-Cook, OCM/KC
H. Pastis, NRR
M. Taylor, OEDO
R. Architzel, NRR
J. Kudrick, NRR
D. Scaletti, NRR
J. Rogge, OEDO
L. Norrholm, OCM/KC
B. Claudia, NRC
C. L. Miller, NRR
A. Burda, RES
E. Beckjord, RES

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1990

Public Attendees

Phyllis Rich, NUMARC
Margo Barron, NUS Corp.
John MacEvoy, Bishop Cook Purcell& Reynolds
Dave Noonan, SERCH Lic., Bechtel
Masashi Yokoler, Tokyo Electric PWR
R. Borsum, BWNS Co.
David Modeen, NUMARC
Claudia Guild, Bishop Cook Purcell&Reynolds
B. Virg, Wright & Talisman
Darius Depa, Illinois Dept. of Nucl.Safety
Edward P. Griffing, NUMARC
Bill Rasin, NUMARC
Kurt Cozens, NUMARC
Don Edwards, YAEC
Tricia Heroux, NUMARC
Terry Pickens, Northern States Power Co.
Patrick Ward, Grove Engr.
John Trotter, EPRI
D. Calandre, Bishop Cook Purcell&Reynolds
B. Franklin, McGraw-Hill
Dan Giessing, DOE
Scott Humphries, SCIENTECH
Vince Panciera, SCIENTECH

NRC Attendees

C. D. Pederson, III
A. Bert Davis, R III
Tom Cox, NRR
M. Virgilio, NRC
L. Plisco, NRR
J. Hopkins, NRR
T. Murley, NRR
H. Pastis, NRR
R. Virgilio, GPA
E. Doolittle, OCM/FR
V. Clifford, OEDO
G. Grant, NRR
L. Whitney, NRR
G. Mizunno, OGC
W. Farmer, RES
R. Bosnak, RES
J. J. Burry, RES
J. W. Craig, NRR
Gerry Gears, NRR
Bill Borchardt, OEDO
F. Akstulewicz, NRR
Karl Kniel, RES
Paul Norian, RES
John O. Thoma, NRR
Don Cleary, RES
George Sege, RES
William Travers, NRR
Tom King, RES
Elise Heumann, OC
A. Vietti-Cook, OCM/KC
Beth Doolittle, OCM/FR
Jack Heltemes, RES
J. Vora, RES
Dave Trimble, OCM/JC
M. Taylor, OEDO
L. Norrholm, OCM/KC

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1990

John Trotter, EPRI

D. Scaletti, NRR
K. Hart, SECY

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1990

John Trotter, EPRI

D. Scaletti, NRR

APPENDIX II

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR THE 361ST ACRS MEETING, MAY 10-12, 1990

The Committee agreed to the tentative schedule for the 361st ACRS meeting, May 10-12, 1990:

- Reactor Operating Experience (Open) - Briefing and discussion of NRC activities related to reactor operations and nuclear plant operating events.

- Siting of Nuclear Power Plants (Open) - Briefing by NRC staff representatives regarding their efforts to decouple nuclear plant siting and source term.

- Decommissioning of Nuclear Power Plants (Open) - Briefing by representatives of the NRC staff regarding the status of decommissioning of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Station (SECY-90-084).

- Individual Plant Examination for External Events (Open) - The Committee will hear a briefing and discuss a proposed NRC generic letter regarding consideration of external events in Individual Plant Examinations (IPEs).

- Maintenance Performance Indicators (Open) - Briefing by NRC staff representatives on the status of work related to the development of maintenance performance indicators.

- Accident Sequence Precursor Program (Open) - Briefing on the status of the NRC-sponsored Accident Sequence Precursor Program. Representatives of the NRC staff and the ORNL will participate as appropriate. (NOTE: This item has been deferred to the June 7-9, 1990 ACRS meeting.)

- NRC Aging Research Program (Open) - Briefing by representatives of NRC staff and industry, as appropriate, regarding the NRC research program on aging of nuclear power plants.

- ACRS Subcommittee Activities (Open) - Status of reports and discussion of designated ACRS subcommittee activities including evaluation of BWR core power instabilities at reduced power/flow conditions.

- Future ACRS Activities (Open) - Discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities and items proposed for consideration by the full Committee.

- Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open) - The Committee will discuss comments and recommendations resulting from matters considered during this meeting.

360TH ACRS MEETING

APPENDIX III
FUTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES
Revised: April 7, 1990

ACRS/ACNW COMMITTEE & SUBCOMMITTEE MEETI

April 7, 1990

Joint Severe Accidents and Probabilistic Risk Assessment, April 18, 1990, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Houston), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittees will continue their discussion of NUREG-1150, "Severe Accident Risks: An Assessment for Five U.S. Nuclear Power Plants." Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the hotels indicated for the night of April 17:

Dr. Kerr	NONE	Dr. Siess(tent.)	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Lewis	EMBASSY SUITES	Mr. Bender	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Catton	HOLIDAY INN	Mr. Davis	NONE
Mr. Ward	HOLIDAY INN	Dr. Lee	HOLIDAY INN
Mr. Wylie	HOLIDAY INN	Dr. Okrent(tent.)	NONE
Mr. Michelson	DAYS INN (CONGR)	Dr. Saunders	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Shewmon	NONE	Dr. Johnson	NONE

Occupational and Environmental Protection Systems, April 25, 1990, - POSTPONED: Per J. Bell, RES, slipped to May/June timeframe.

Joint Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors and Advanced Boiling Water Reactors, April 26, 1990 - POSTPONED.

19th ACNW Meeting, April 26-27, 1990, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

Joint Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena and Core Performance, April 27, 1990, Bethesda Holiday Inn, 8120 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Boehnert), 8:30 a.m., Pennsylvania Room. The Subcommittees will continue their review of boiling water reactor core power stability pursuant to the core power oscillation event at LaSalle County Station, Unit 2. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the hotels indicated for the night of April 26:

Dr. Kerr	NONE	Dr. Lipinski	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Catton	HOLIDAY INN	Dr. Plesset	HOLIDAY INN
Mr. Ward	HOLIDAY INN	Mr. Schrock	HOLIDAY INN
Mr. Wylie	HOLIDAY INN	Dr. Sullivan	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Lee	HOLIDAY INN		

Materials and Metallurgy, May 1, 1990 - POSTPONED.

Advanced Reactor Designs, May 2, 1990 POSTPONED

Reliability Assurance/Materials and Metallurgy, May 8, 1990, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Igne), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittees will discuss the status of the Nuclear Plant Aging Research (NPAR) Program and the industry efforts for dealing with the aging-related issues with regard to license renewal. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Wylie
Dr. Shewmon
Mr. Ward
Mr. Michelson
Mr. Carroll
Dr. Siess (tent.)

Improved Light-Water Reactors, May 9, 1990, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (El-Zeftawy), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will review the "passive plant" designs of Westinghouse, Combustion Engineering, General Electric and the EPRI's future passive plant requirements document. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Wylie
Dr. Catton
Mr. Michelson
Dr. Siess
Mr. Ward

Planning and Procedures (Closed), May 9, 1990, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Fraley), (est. 5:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.), after completion of Improved LWR's Subcommittee meeting, Room P-110. The Subcommittee will discuss procedures for appointment/reappointment of ACRS members and for election of Committee Officers. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Michelson
Mr. Wylie
Mr. Carroll

361st ACRS Meeting, May 10-12, 1990, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

20th ACNW Meeting, May 23-25, 1990, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

Materials and Metallurgy, May 24, 1990, Royce Hotel, 1601 Belvedere Road, West Palm Beach, FL (Igne). 8:30 a.m., Atrium Room. The Subcommittee will review low Charpy upper shelf energy matters relating to the integrity of reactor pressure vessels. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the Royce Hotel (407/689-6400) for the night of May 23:

Dr. Shewmon
Dr. Lewis
Mr. Michelson
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wylie (tent.)
Dr. Bush
Mr. Etherington NONE

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, May 31-June 1, 1990, Bethesda, MD (Boehnert) The Subcommittee will discuss the status of several research programs including: the 2D/3D Program, Calculational Capability for Accident Management, and the RELAP/SCDAP and TRAC/MELCOR codes. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated.

Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr (tent.)
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wylie
Dr. Plesset
Mr. Schrock
Dr. Sullivan

Quality and Quality Assurance in Design and Construction, Date to be determined (May/June) (tentative), Bethesda, MD (Igne). The Subcommittee will discuss the performance-based concept of quality, what it means, its implementation, and preliminary results. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Siess
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wylie
Dr. Stevenson
Mr. Cerzosimo (tent.)

Improved Light-Water Reactors, Date to be determined (May), Bethesda, MD (El-Zeftawy). The Subcommittee will review the draft SER for Chapter 5 of the EPRI ALWR Requirements Document. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Wylie
Dr. Catton
Mr. Michelson
Dr. Siess
Mr. Ward

Decay Heat Removal Systems, Date to be determined (May), Bethesda, MD (Boehnert). The Subcommittee will continue its review of the proposed resolution of Generic Issue 23, "RCP Seal Failures." Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Ward
Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr
Mr. Michelson (tent.)
Mr. Wylie
Mr. Davis

Joint Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors and Advanced Boiling Water Reactors, Date to be determined (May/June), Bethesda, MD (El-Zeftawy/Alderman). The Subcommittees will discuss the licensing review basis documents for CE System 80+ and GE ABWR designs. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Carroll
Mr. Michelson
Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wylie
Dr. Shewmon

Joint Severe Accidents and Probabilistic Risk Assessment, Date to be determined (May/June), Bethesda, MD (Houston). The Subcommittees will continue their review of NUREG-1150, "Severe Accident Risks: An Assessment for Five U.S. Nuclear Power Plants." Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Kerr
Dr. Lewis
Dr. Catton
Mr. Michelson
Dr. Shewmon
Dr. Siess
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wylie
Mr. Bender
Mr. Davis
Dr. Lee
Dr. Okrent
Dr. Saunders

Occupational and Environmental Protection Systems, Date to be determined (May/June), Bethesda, MD (Igne). The Subcommittee will review the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on hot particles. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Carroll
Mr. Wylie
Dr. Moeller

Materials and Metallurgy, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Igne). The Subcommittee will review the proposed resolution of Generic Issue 29, "Bolting Degradation or Failure in Nuclear Power Plants." Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Shewmon
Dr. Lewis
Mr. Michelson
Mr. Ward
Mr. Bender
Dr. Kassner

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, Date to be determined (July?), Idaho Falls, ID (Boehnert). The Subcommittee will review the details of the modifications made to the RELAP-5 MOD-2 code as specified in the MOD-3 version. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr
Mr. Ward
Mr. Wylie
Dr. Plesset
Mr. Schrock
Dr. Sullivan
Dr. Tien

Decay Heat Removal Systems, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Boehnert). The Subcommittee will explore the use of feed and bleed for decay heat removal in PWRs. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Ward
Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr
Mr. Michelson (tent.)
Mr. Wylie
Mr. Davis

Decay Heat Removal Systems, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Boehnert). The Subcommittee will review the NRC staff's proposed resolution of Generic Issue 84, "CE PORVs." Attendance by the following is anticipated.

Mr. Ward
Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr
Mr. Wylie
Mr. Davis

Auxiliary and Secondary Systems, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Duraiswamy). The Subcommittee will discuss: (1) criteria being used by utilities to design Chilled Water Systems, (2) regulatory requirements for Chilled Water Systems design, and (3) criteria being used by the NRC staff to review the Chilled Water Systems design. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Catton
Mr. Carroll
Mr. Michelson
Mr. Wylie

Reliability Assurance, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Duraiswamy). The Subcommittee will discuss the status of implementation of the resolution of USI A-46, "Seismic Qualification of Equipment in Operating Plants," and other related matters. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Wylie
Mr. Carroll
Mr. Michelson
Dr. Siess

Joint Regulatory Activities and Containment Systems, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Duraiswamy/Houston). The Subcommittees will review the proposed final revision to Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors." Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Siess
Mr. Ward
Mr. Carroll
Dr. Catton
Dr. Kerr
Mr. Michelson
Mr. Wylie

APPENDIX IV
MINUTES OF THE 360TH ACRS MEETING
APRIL 5-7 AND APRIL 18-19, 1990
OTHER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

MEETING NOTEBOOK

Tab

2 INDIVIDUAL PLANT EXAMINATION FOR EXTERNAL EVENTS PROGRAM

- Tentative Schedule
- Status Report with attachments:
  - Memorandum to R. Fraley from W. Minners, RES, dated March 8, 1990, Subject: Proposed Generic Letter on Individual Plant Examination for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities Due to External Events (IPEEE) with Attachments:
    - -- PROPOSED SECY paper, Subject: Individual Plant Examination for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities Due to External Events (IPEEE) (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY).
    - -- DRAFT NUREG-xxx, "Procedural and Submittal Guidance for IPEEE for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities," dated February 27, 1990. (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY)
  - Letter to C. P. Siess, Subcommittee Chairman, ACRS, from W. Rasin, NUMARC, regarding invitation to address April 5, 1990 ACRS full Committee meeting re IPEEE, dated April 2, 1990

3.1 List of Future ACRS Subcommittee Meetings & ACRS and ACNW Meetings

5 EVOLUTIONARY LIGHT WATER REACTOR CERTIFICATION ISSUES

- Tentative Agenda
- Status Report with Attachments:
  - Attachment I - SECY-90-016, "Evolutionary Light Water Reactor (LWR) Certification Issues and Their Relationship to Current Regulatory Requirements," dated January 12, 1990
  - Attachment II - Memorandum from S. Chilk, Secretary for J. Taylor, EDO and C. Michelson, ACRS, Re: "Staff Requirements - SECY-89-334 Recommended Priorities for Review of Standard Plant Designs," dated December 15, 1989.

- Attachment III - Memorandum from S. Chilk, Secretary, for J. Taylor, EDO and C. Michelson, ACRS, Re: "Staff Requirements - SECY-89-311, "Resolution Process for Severe Accident Issues on Evolutionary Light Water Reactors," dated December 15, 1989
- Attachment IV - Memorandum from R. Fraley, ACRS to ACRS Members, Re: Certification Issues for Evolutionary LWRs, dated March 1, 1990
- Attachment VI - SECY-90-056, "Evoplutionary and Passive Advanced Light Water Reactor Resources and Scheduled," dated March 17, 1990.

- Presentation materials provided during the meeting.

7 NRC REGULATORY IMPACT SURVEY

- Presentation Schedule
- Project Status Report with Attachments:
  - Excerpt from DRAFT NUREG-1395, Summary of Significant Survey Comments (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY)
  - Excerpt from SECY 90-080 "Initial Staff Assessment" (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY)
- Presentation materials provided during the meeting

8 SEVERE ACCIDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM PLAN

- Tentative Agenda
- Status Report with Attachments:
  - NUREG-1365, Revised Severe Accident Research Program, August 1989
  - ACRS Report on Severe Accident Research Program, March 15, 1989
  - Overview of Status of Severe Accident Research Program - Handout by B. Sheron for March 20, 1989 Severe Accident Subcommittee meeting
- Presentation materials provided during the meeting.

9 LICENSE RENEWAL DRAFT RULE

- Presentation Schedule
- Status Report with Attachments:
  - Existing 10 CFR 50.51 Requirements for License and License Renewal.
  - DRAFT Proposed Rule "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants" (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY)
  - Backfit Considerations - Staff's discussion in the Statement of Considerations (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY)

360th ACRS Meeting Minutes Appendix IV-3

MEETING
HANDOUTS

Agenda
Item

3.1 List of Scheduled ACRS/ACNW Committee & Subcommittee Meetings (same as distributed in April 5-7, 1989, 360th ACRS Meeting Notebook)

3.2 Memorandum for ACRS Members from R. Savio, ACRS, Subject: Future ACRS Activities - 361st ACRS MEETING, MAY 10-12, 1990 with attachments, dated April 4, 1990.

3-3 Memorandum to ACRS Members from R. Savio, Subject: Proposed Revised ACRS Subcommittee Assignment/Adopted Plants Lists

PNO-IIT-90-02A, dated March 29, 1990 - Vogtle Unit 1 - truck backing into support post for 230kV line

Nuclear Regulatory Commission - Charter - Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee, Filing Date February 9, 1990 /s/ J. C. Hoyle, ACMO

5-1 Memorandum to Charles Miller, NRR from Thomas Kenyon, NRR, Subject: Summary of March 8-10, 1990 ACRS meeting on SECY-90-086, dated March 26, 1990 with Enclosure

5-2 Memorandum to Mr. Kenyon, NRR, from L. A. Keller, forwarding Optimization Subject papers that were originally given to NRC for the Evolutionary ALWR, undated with "Enclosure 3: Advanced LWR Plant Optimization Subjects for Chapter 1 of the Requirements Document, dated March 12, 1986, Contents 1.0, Introduction and Summary; 2.0 ALWR Approach, 3.0 Plant Optimization Subjects.

10-1 Memorandum dated March 30, 1990 to C. Michelson, ACRS from R. Fraley, Subject: Appointment of New Committee Members with Attachments - INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY

360th ACRS Meeting Appendix IV-4

CONTINUATION OF 360TH ACRS MEETING, APRIL 18-19, 1990

Meeting
Notebook

2.1 EVOLUTIONARY LIGHT WATER REACTOR CERTIFICATION ISSUES

- Tentative Agenda
- Status Report with Attachments:
  - Attachment I - SECY-90-016, "Evolutionary Light Water Reactor (LWR) Certification Issues and Their Relationship to Current Regulatory Requirements," dated January 12, 1990
  - Attachment II - Memorandum from S. Chilk, Secretary for J. Taylor, EDO and C. Michelson, ACRS, Re: "Staff Requirements - SECY-89-334 Recommended Priorities for Review of Standard Plant Designs," dated December 15, 1989.
  - Attachment III - Memorandum from S. Chilk, Secretary, for J. Taylor, EDO and C. Michelson, ACRS, Re: "Staff Requirements - SECY-89-311, "Resolution Process for Severe Accident Issues on Evolutionary Light Water Reactors," dated December 15, 1989
  - Attachment IV - Memorandum from R. Fraley, ACRS to ACRS Members, Re: Certifiction Issues for Evolutionary LWRs, dated March 1, 1990
  - Attachment VI - SECY-90-056, "Evolutionary and Passive Advanced Light Water Reactor Resources and Schedules," dated March 17, 1990.

2.2 SEVERE ACCIDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM PLAN

Table of Contents
Tentative Agenda
Status Report with attachments (see Agenda Item Tab 8 on p. 2 above of Appendix IV re April 5-7, 1990 meeting notebook and handouts): NUREG-1365, ACRS Report of March 15, 1989, and B. Sheron, NRR, April 6, 1990 Slides.