

ACRS-2662

**CERTIFIED**

PDR 10/11/90

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
MINUTES OF THE 353RD ACRS MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1989

- I. Chairman's Report (Open)..... 1
- II. Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants (Open)..... 1
- III. Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)..... 3
- IV. Individual Plant Examination for External Events (IPEEE) (Open) 5
- V. Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Open)..... 6
- VI. GSI A-29, "Nuclear Power Plant Design for the Reduction of Vulnerability to Sabotage" (Open)..... 9
- VII. Accident Severity Scales (Open)..... 11
- VIII. EPRI Requirements for Advanced Light-Water Reactors (Open)... 12
- IX. NUMARC Activities (Open)..... 17
- X. Executive Session (Open/Closed)..... 18
  - A. Subcommittee Reports (Open/Closed)..... 18
    - 1. Regional Programs Subcommittee's August 28-29, 1989 Meeting (Open)..... 18
    - 2. Nominating Committee (Closed)..... 20
  - B. Reports, Letters and Memoranda (Open)..... 20
    - 1. Emergency Plan for Full-Power Operation of the Seabrook Station, Unit 1 (Report to Chairman Carr dated September 13, 1989)..... 20
    - 2. Electric Power Research Institute Advanced Light Water Reactor Requirements Document..... 21
    - 3. Proposed Resolution of Generic Issue A-29, "Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage" (Report to Chairman Carr dated September 12, 1989)..... 21
  - C. Other Conclusions (Open)..... 21
    - 1. Future Agenda Items..... 21
    - 2. Decision as to Review of Regulatory Guide, Task No. DG-1001, "Maintenance Programs for Nuclear Power Plants"..... 21
    - 3. Scheduling of Meeting with Dr. Beckford, Director, RES..... 22

9010170078 901011  
PDR ACRS  
2662 PDC

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By EMB

QFOZ  
0/11

4.	Extreme External Phenomena Subcommittee's Review of Proposed Approach for Consideration of External Events in the IPE.....	22
5.	Regional Programs Subcommittee Visit to Regions/ Regional Offices' Activities.....	22
6.	Advanced BWR Subcommittee to Explore Differences in Positions on Containment Venting Between EPRI and GE.	
7.	Decision to Review License Conversions for Oyster Creek, Dresden 2, San Onofre 1, and Palisades.....	23
8.	Dr. Shewmon's Request for Information on Plant Life Extension in the INEL Research Program.....	23
9.	TVA Commitment to Review Incident Reports of Sister Plants.....	23
D.	Future Activities (Open).....	24
1.	Future Agenda.....	24
2.	Future Subcommittee Activities.....	24

Supplement - OFFICIAL USE ONLY - Section X.A.2 - Deleted - FOIA EX(b)4

APPENDICES  
MINUTES OF THE 353RD ACRS MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1989

- I. Attendees
- II. Future Agenda
- III. Future Subcommittee Activities
- IV. Other Documents Received



proper controls had been in place and followed.

**Cause or Causes**—The licensee stated that the misadministration was caused by human error on the part of the staff endocrinologist and lack of training of involved personnel. The root cause was done to inadequate supervision of activities.

#### Actions Taken To Prevent Recurrence

**Licensee**—The licensee stated that: (1) The Chief of Nuclear Medicine will review all requests for Iodine-131 whole body scans, and (2) there will be weekly interdepartmental meetings of the Nuclear Medicine Department and the Department of Endocrinology.

**NRC**—NRC Region I conducted a special inspection on June 5, 1989, to review the circumstances associated with the event, and the appropriateness of the licensee's corrective actions. The results of the inspection are under review. Region I requested an NRC medical consultant to review the incident.

Dated at Rockville, MD this 29th day of August, 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Samuel J. Chalk,  
Secretary of the Commission.  
[FR Doc. 89-20793 Filed 9-1-89; 8:46 am]  
BILLING CODE 7890-01-01

#### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Revised Meeting Agenda

In accordance with the purposes of sections 20 and 182b of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on September 7-8, 1989 in Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD. Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on July 26, 1989 and August 22, 1989.

Thursday, September 7, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD.

**8:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.: Comments by ACRS Chairman**—The ACRS Chairman will report on items of current interest.

**8:45 a.m. - 12:00 Noon: Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants (Open)**—The Committee will review and report on the proposed NRC policy statement and an associated draft regulatory guide related to maintenance programs at nuclear power plants.

**1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.: License Renewal (Open)**—The Committee will hear and discuss a report from NRC staff representatives regarding the status of activities related to license renewal for nuclear power plants.

**2:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.: Individual Plant Examination for External Events (IPEEE) (Open)**—A briefing and discussion with representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry will be held regarding the status of the IPEEE program.

**4:45 p.m. - 5:45 p.m.: Industrial Sabotage (Open/Closed)**—The Committee will review and report on a proposed resolution of Generic Issue A-29, Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage.

Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information related to security provisions at nuclear power plants.

**5:45 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.: Accident Severity Scale (Open)**—A briefing and discussion regarding proposed accident severity scale for use in the public announcement of nuclear power plant events and accidents will be held.

Friday, September 8, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD.

**8:30 a.m. - 12:00 Noon: Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Open)**—The Committee will review and report on the proposed off-site emergency preparedness for full power operation of the Seabrook nuclear power plant.

**1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. and 3:15 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.: EPRI Requirements for Advanced Light Water Reactors (Open)**—A briefing and discussion will be held regarding the status of the NRC review of the proposed EPRI Requirements for Advanced LWRs.

**4:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m.: NUMARC Activities (Open)**—A briefing and discussion will be held regarding NUMARC activities related to nuclear power plant TPEs and accident management.

**5:15 p.m. - 5:45 p.m.: Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors (Open)**—A briefing and discussion will be held regarding the status of the NRC staff review of Westinghouse and Combustion Engineering standardized nuclear power plants.

**5:45 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.: Future ACRS Activities (Open)**—The Committee will discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities and items proposed for consideration by the full Committee.

Saturday, September 9, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD.

**8:30 a.m. - 12:00 Noon: Preparation of ACRS Reports to NRC (Open)**—The Committee will continue the discussion of the proposed ACRS reports to NRC regarding items considered during this meeting.

**1:00 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.: Appointment of ACRS Members (Open/Closed)**—The Committee will discuss qualifications of candidates proposed for nomination as ACRS Members.

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

**1:00 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.: Subcommittee Activities (Open)**—The Committee will discuss the status of assigned ACRS subcommittee activities, including activities of NRC regional offices.

**1:45 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.: Miscellaneous (Open)**—The Committee will complete discussion of items considered during this meeting.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on October 27, 1988 (53 FR 43487). 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)) and Safeguards/Security Information applicable to specific nuclear facilities (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3)).

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 310/492-8049), between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Dated: August 28, 1989.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 89-20794 Filed 9-1-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7880-01-8

**Issuance and Availability of NUREG-1217, "Evaluation of Safety Implications of Control Systems in LWR Nuclear Power Plants—Technical Findings Related to USI A-47," and NUREG-1218, "Regulatory Analysis for Resolution of USI A-47"**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is issuing the resolution of Unresolved Safety Issue (USI) A-47, "Safety Implications of Control Systems." The resolution is documented in two final reports entitled "Evaluation of Safety Implications of Control Systems in LWR Nuclear Power Plants—Technical Findings Related to USI A-47" (NUREG-1217) and "Regulatory Analysis for Resolution of USI A-47 (NUREG-1218)." The proposed resolution and the draft NUREG reports had been published for public comment on May 27, 1988. All the comments received were addressed and summarized in appendix C of NUREG-1217. Safety Implications of Control Systems was identified as an Unresolved Safety Issue in the NRC 1980 Annual Report to the Congress pursuant to section 210 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 as amended on December 13, 1977.

Nuclear power plant instrumentation and control systems are composed of safety-related protection systems and non-safety related control systems. The safety-related protection systems are designed to satisfy the General Design Criteria identified in appendix A to 10 CFR part 50. They are used in part to trip the reactor when certain plant parameters exceed allowable limits and to protect the core from overheating by actuating emergency core cooling systems. Non-safety-related control systems are used to maintain the plant within prescribed pressure and temperature limits during shutdown, startup, and normal power operation. The non-safety-related control systems are not relied on to perform any safety functions during or following postulated transients or accidents. They are used, however, to control plant processes that

could have an impact on plant dynamics.

The purpose of the USI A-47 study was to perform a review of the non-safety-related control systems and to assess the effects of control system failures on plant safety. To this end, tasks were established to identify potential control system failures that, either singly or in selected combinations, could cause overpressure, overcooling, overheating, overflow, or reactivity events.

The NRC staff concluded from its A-47 investigations that certain actions should be taken to further enhance safety in LWR plants. These actions recommend that plants: (1) Provide systems to protect against reactor vessel/steam generator overflow events and to prevent steam generator dryout, (2) include in their plant procedures and their technical specifications provisions to periodically verify operability of these systems, and (3) modify selected emergency procedures to ensure safe plant shutdown following a small-break loss-of-coolant accident. Most plants already have substantial design protection against control system failures. The recommended safety improvements would apply to those plants for which additional or enhanced protection is warranted. The recommended actions are included in Appendix C of NUREG-1218.

Copies of the documents included in the final resolution for USI A-47 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013-7082. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. A copy is also available for public inspection and/or copying at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Lower Level, Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28th day of August 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
R. Wayne Houston,

Director, Division of Safety Issue Resolution,  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 89-20741 Filed 9-1-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7880-01-8

[Docket Nos. 89-237 and 89-249]

**Commonwealth Edison Co.;  
Withdrawal of Application for  
Amendments to Facility Operating  
Licenses**

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Commonwealth

Edison Company (the licensee) to withdraw its October 29, 1985, application for proposed amendment to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-19 and Facility Operating License DPR-25 for the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, located in Grundy County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications to implement detection requirements of Generic Letter 84-11 for Dresden 2, revise the ISI time period to reflect the second 10-year program, and correct various typographical errors for Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit Nos. 2 and 3.

The Commission has previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on April 23, 1986 (51 FR 15394). However, by letter dated August 4, 1989, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 29, 1985, and the licensee's letter dated August 4, 1989, which withdrew the application for the license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and the Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28th day of August 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Byron L. Siegel,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects III, IV, V, and  
Special Projects.

[FR Doc. 89-20742 Filed 9-1-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7880-01-8

[License No. 21-24472-01; Docket No. 030-18655; EA 89-068]

**Nuclear and Radiologic Imaging  
Physicians, Troy Professional Building,  
Order Suspending License and  
Revoking License**

Nuclear and Radiologic Imaging Physicians, Troy Professional Building, 2151 Livernois, Suite 201, Troy, Michigan 48063 (the licensee) is the holder of Byproduct Material License No. 21-24472-01 (the license), which was issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission or NRC) on April 17, 1985 and is due to expire on April 30, 1990. The license authorizes Nuclear and Radiologic Imaging Physicians to possess byproduct material for use in

Nuclear Reactor Regulation,  
Washington, D.C. 20555. Telephone (301)  
492-3016.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** These meetings are intended to be workshops where technical personnel from nuclear power plants or utility corporate offices may obtain information on expected responses to the Generic Letter. In order to assist NRC staff in preparing for these meetings, individuals planning to attend are requested to forward questions on the Generic Letter to their respective NRC Project Manager and to indicate the particular meeting they will attend. As time permits, additional questions will be solicited from the audience. Opportunities will be provided for the public to ask questions although priority will be given to nuclear utility personnel.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 16th day of August 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Thierry M. Ross,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects-III, IV, V and  
Special Projects, Office of Nuclear Reactor  
Regulation.

[FR Doc. 89-19627 Filed 8-22-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7890-01-01

#### 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 September 7-9, 1989 in Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md. Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on July 26, 1989.

Thursday, September 7, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8:30 a.m.-8:45 a.m.: *Comments by ACRS Chairman*—The ACRS Chairman will report on items of current interest.

8:45 a.m.-12:00 Noon: *Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants (Open)*—The Committee will review and report on the proposed NRC policy statement and an associated draft regulatory guide related to maintenance programs at nuclear power plants.

1:00 p.m.-1:45 p.m.: *Severe Accident Risks (NUREG-1150) (Open)*—The Committee will meet with the NRC staff representatives to discuss the NRC staff's resolution of ACRS comments included in its report of May 9, 1989 regarding proposed use of NUREG-1150, Severe Accident Risks: An Assessment for Five U.S. Nuclear Power Plants.

1:45 p.m.-4:15 p.m.: *Individual Plant Examination for External Events*

(IPEEE) (Open)—A briefing and discussion with representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry will be held regarding the status of the IPEEE program.

4:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.: *Industrial Sabotage (Open/Closed)*—The Committee will review and report on a proposed resolution of Generic Issue A-29, Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage.

Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information related to security provisions at nuclear power plants.

5:30 p.m.-6:15 p.m.: *Accident Severity Scale (Open)*—A briefing and discussion regarding proposed accident severity scale for use in the public announcement of nuclear power plant events and accidents will be held.

Friday, September 8, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.: *Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Open)*—

The Committee will review and report on the proposed off-site emergency preparedness for full power operation of the Seabrook nuclear power plant.

11:30 a.m.-12:00 Noon: *Future ACRS Activities (Open)*—The Committee will discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities and items proposed for consideration by the full Committee.

1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m. and 3:15 p.m.-4:15 p.m.: *EPR Requirements for Advanced Light Water Reactors (Open)*—A briefing and discussion will be held regarding the status of the NRC review of the proposed EPR Requirements for Advanced LWRs.

4:15 p.m.-5:15 p.m.: *Improved RHR Capability for Residual Heat Removal Capability in LWRs (Open)*

A briefing and discussion will be held regarding the NRC staff evaluation of the implementation of requirements pursuant to the NRC generic letter regarding this matter, including, in particular, the strictures pertaining to containment closure.

5:15 p.m.-5:45 p.m.: *Advance Pressurized Water Reactors (Open)*—A briefing and discussion will be held regarding the status of the NRC staff review of Westinghouse and Combustion Engineering standardized nuclear power plants.

5:45 p.m.-8:30 p.m.: *Preparation of ACRS Reports to NRC (Open)*—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports regarding items considered during this meeting.

Saturday, September 8, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8:30 a.m.-9:15 a.m.: *Appointment of ACRS Members (Open/Closed)*—The Committee will discuss qualifications of candidates proposed for nomination as ACRS Members.

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

9:15 a.m.-12:00 Noon: *Preparation of ACRS Reports to NRC (Open)*—The Committee will continue the discussion of the proposed ACRS reports to NRC regarding items considered during this meeting.

1:00 p.m.-1:45 p.m.: *Subcommittee Activities (Open)*—The Committee will discuss the status of assigned ACRS subcommittee activities, including activities of NRC regional offices.

1:45 p.m.-2:30 p.m.: *Miscellaneous (Open)*—The Committee will complete discussion of items considered during this meeting.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on October 27, 1988 (53 FR 43487). 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) Pub. L. 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. 552(c)(6)) and Safeguards/Security Information applicable to specific nuclear facilities (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3)).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling or 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 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Dated: August 21, 1989.

John C. Hoyle,  
Advisory Committee Management Officer.  
[FR Doc. 89-20712 Filed 8-22-89; 9:11 am]  
BILLING CODE 7550-01-0

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[New Form 5, File No. 270-323; Rev. Form 4, File No. 270-125, Rev. Form 3, File No. 270-126]

### Forms Under Review by Office of Management and Budget

Agency Clearance Office—Kenneth A. Fogash, (202) 272-2142

Upon written request copy available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Public Reference Branch, Washington, DC 20549-1002

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") has submitted for OMB approval amendments to Forms 3 and 4, as well as a new Form 5, which will restructure the manner in which transactions and holdings by persons subject to section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 are reported. The amendments should reduce the number of filings on each form. With respect to Form 3, the Commission estimates that approximately 9,856 respondents would be effected at an estimated one-half burden hour per response. Form 4 would be filed by 69,162 persons annually at an estimated one-half burden hour per response. Form 5 would be filed by 40,500 persons at one burden hour per response. The estimated average burden hour are made solely for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act and are not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of the Commission's rules and forms.

Direct general comments to Gary Waxman at the address below. Direct any comments concerning the accuracy

of the estimated average burden hours for compliance with the Securities and Exchange Commission rules and forms to Kenneth A. Fogash, Deputy Executive Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-6004 and Gary Waxman, Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Budget (Paperwork Reduction Project 3235-0104, 0287, and 0362), Room 3206, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: August 17, 1989.

Shirley E. Hollis,  
Assistant Secretary.  
[FR Doc. 89-19650 Filed 8-22-89; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 8010-01-0

[File No. 22-19572]

### Application and Opportunity for Hearing: Delta Air Lines, Inc.

August 17, 1989.

Notice is hereby given that Delta Air Lines, Inc. (the "Company") has filed an application pursuant to clause (f) of section 310(b)(1) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") for a finding by the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") that the trusteeship of Citizens and Southern Trust Company (Georgia), National Association (the "Bank") under ten indentures (the "1989 Indentures") to be qualified under the Act relating to the 1989 Equipment Trust Certificates, Series A through J, under seven indentures dated October 25, 1988 (the "1988 Indentures") that were qualified under the Act relating to 1988 Equipment Trust Certificates, Series A through G, and under an indenture dated January 1, 1986 (the "Other Indenture") that was not qualified under the Act because the securities were exempt from registration under the Securities Act, is not so likely to involve a material conflict of interest as to make it necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors to disqualify Bank from acting as trustee under the aforementioned indentures.

Section 310(b) of the Act provides in part that if a trustee under an indenture qualified under the Act has or shall acquire any conflicting interest (as defined in the section), it shall within ninety days after ascertaining that it has such conflicting interest, either eliminate such conflicting interest or resign. Subsection (1) of that section provides, with certain exceptions stated therein, that a trustee under a qualified indenture shall be deemed to have a conflicting interest if such trustee is trustee under another indenture of the same obligor.

The Company alleges:

(1) Pursuant to the 1988 Indentures, the Company has issued \$253,471,000 aggregate principal amount of 1988 Equipment Trust Certificates, Series A through G. (the "1988 Certificates") and pursuant to the Other Indenture, the Company has outstanding \$44,900,000 aggregate principal amount of its Development Authority of Clayton County Special Facilities Adjustable Tender Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 1988 (Delta Air Lines, Inc. Project) (the "Bonds"). The 1988 Certificates were registered under the Securities Act of 1933 (the "1933 Act") and the 1988 Indentures were qualified under the Act. The Bonds were exempt from registration and the Other Indenture was not qualified under the Act.

(2) Pursuant to the 1989 Indentures, the Company will issue \$285,983,000 aggregate principal amount of its Equipment Trust Certificates, Series A through J (the "1989 Certificates"). The 1989 Certificates will be registered under the 1933 Act and the 1989 Indentures will be qualified under the Act.

(3) The Company is not in default under the 1988 Indentures or the Other Indenture. The Company's obligations under the 1989 Indentures, the 1988 Indentures and the Other Indenture are general, wholly unsecured obligations and rank *pari passu inter se*. Each of the 1988 Indentures and 1989 Indenture is separately collateralized by a security interest in different aircraft and the lease relating thereto. The Other Indenture is secured by payments made pursuant to a Loan Agreement and Promissory Note.

(4) The provisions of the 1988 Indentures, the Other Indenture and the 1989 Indentures are not so likely to involve a material conflict of interest as to make it necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors to disqualify the Bank from acting as Trustee under said Indentures.

The Company has waived notice of hearing, bearing and any and all rights to specify procedures under the Rules of Practice of the Commission in connection with this matter. For a more detailed statement of the matters of fact and law asserted, all persons are referred to as said application which is on file in the Office of the Commission's Public Reference Section, File Number 22-19572, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Notice is further given that any interested persons may, no later than September 10, 1989 request in writing that a hearing be held on such matter stating the nature of his interest, the





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

Revised: September 7, 1989, 1:00 p.m.

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION  
353RD ACRS MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1989  
BETHESDA, MARYLAND

Thursday, September 7, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

- 3) 1:30 - 2:30 P.M.      Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)  
TAB 3 ----- 3.1) Comments by ACRS Chairman (HWL/GRQ)  
3.2) Briefing by and discussion with NRC  
staff representatives
- 4) 2:30 - 3:00 P.M.      Individual Plant Examination for External  
Events (IPEEE) (Open)  
TAB 4----- 4.1) Comments by ACRS subcommittee chairman  
regarding status of IPEEE (CPS/EGI)
- 6) 3:00 - 4:00 P.M.      Accident Severity Scale (Open)  
TAB 6 ----- 6.1) Comments by ACRS subcommittee chairman  
(JCC/MDH)  
6.2) Briefing by NRC staff representative  
regarding proposed accident severity  
scale for classification of nuclear  
incidents
- 4:00 - 4:15 P.M.      BREAK
- 10) 4:15 - 5:15 P.M.      NUMARC Activities (Open)  
TAB 10 ----- 10.1) Briefing by NUMARC representative  
on activities regarding the IPE and  
Accident Management (WK/MDH)

Friday, September 8, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

8) 8:30 - 1:30 P.M.

TAB 8 -----

Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1

- (Open)
- 8.1) 8:30-8:45: Report by ACRS subcommittee chairman (WK/EGI)
  - 8.2) 8:45-9:45: Meeting with NRC Staff representatives
  - 8.3) 9:45-10:00 - BREAK
  - 8.3) 10:00-11:30: Meeting with Applicant/Licensee representatives
  - 8.4) 11:30-11:45 - BREAK
  - 8.4) 11:45-1:15 - Meeting with representatives of the Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Seacoast Anti-Pollution League; and New England Coalition On Nuclear Pollution
  - 8.5) 1:15-1:30: Questions and discussion

1:30 - 2:30 P.M.

LUNCH

9) 2:30 - 5:45 P.M.  
(3:00-3:15-BREAK)

TAB 9 -----

EPRI Requirements for Advanced Light-Water Reactors (Open)

- 9.1) Comments by ACRS subcommittee chairman (CJW/MME)
- 9.2) Meeting with EPRI and NRC staff representatives

5) 5:45 - 6:45 P.M.

TAB 5 -----

Industrial Sabotage (Open/Closed)

- 5.1) Report of ACRS subcommittee regarding proposed resolution of Generic Issue A-29, Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage (HWL/HA)
- 5.2) Meeting with representatives of NRC Staff

(Note: Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information related to security provisions at nuclear power plants.)

Saturday, September 9, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

11) 8:30 - 12:00 Noon

Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)

- 11.1) Discuss proposed ACRS reports to NRC regarding:
- 11.1-1) Seabrook Nuclear Station - (WK/EGI)
  - 11.1-2) Proposed maintenance policy statement and an associated Regulatory Guide (CM/HA)
  - 11.1-3) Industrial Sabotage (HWL/HA)

12:00 - 1:00 P.M.

LUNCH

12) 1:00 - 1:30 P.M.

ACRS Subcommittee Activities (Open)

- 12.1) Report of the Regional Programs Subcommittee regarding its August 29-30 meeting with NRC Region I personnel (FJR/PAB)

13) 1:30 - 2:15 P.M.

Appointment of ACRS Members (Open/Closed)

- 13.1) Discuss qualifications of candidates proposed for appointment to the Committee (CM/MFL)

(Note: Portions of this session will be closed as appropriate to discuss information the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.)

14) <sup>1:30</sup>~~2:15~~ - <sup>2:15</sup>~~2:30~~ P.M.

Miscellaneous (Open)

- 14.1) Complete discussion of items considered during this meeting





UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20556

Revised: September 1, 1989

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION  
353RD ACRS MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1989  
BETHESDA, MARYLAND

Thursday, September 7, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

- 1) 8:30 - 8:45 A.M. Chairman's Remarks (Open)
  - 1.1) Opening remarks
  - 1.2) Items of current interest (FJR/RFF)
  
- 2) 8:45 - 12:30 P.M.  
(10:30-10:45-BREAK) Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants (Open)
  - 2.1) Comments by ACRS Chairman regarding proposed NRC maintenance policy statement and an associated Regulatory Guide (CM/HA)
  - 2.2) Meeting with NRC staff representatives
  - 2.3) Discuss proposed ACRS report
  
- 12:30 - 1:30 P.M. LUNCH
  
- 3) 1:30 - 2:30 P.M. Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)
  - 3.1) Comments by ACRS Chairman (HWL/GRQ)
  - 3.2) Briefing by and discussion with NRC staff representatives
  
- 4) 2:30 - 4:00 P.M. Individual Plant Examination for External Events (IPEEE) (Open)
  - 4.1) Comments by ACRS subcommittee chairman regarding status of IPEEE (CPS/EGI)
  - 4.2) Briefing by and discussion with NRC staff representatives
  
- 4:00 - 4:15 P.M. BREAK
  
- 5) 4:15 - 5:15 P.M. Industrial Sabotage (Open/Closed)
  - 5.1) Report of ACRS subcommittee regarding proposed resolution of Generic Issue A-29, Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage (HWL/HA)
  - 5.2) Meeting with representatives of NRC Staff

(Note: Portions of this session will be closed as necessary to discuss information related to security provisions at nuclear power plants.)

- 6) 5:15 - 6:15 P.M. Accident Severity Scale (Open)  
 6.1) Comments by ACRS subcommittee chairman (JCC/MDH)  
 6.2) Briefing by NRC staff representative regarding proposed accident severity scale for classification of nuclear incidents

- 7) 6:15 - 6:45 P.M. Future ACRS Activities (Open)  
 7.1) Discuss anticipated ACRS subcommittee activities (GRQ/RPS)  
 7.2) Discuss items proposed for consideration by the full Committee (FJR/RPS)

Friday, September 8, 1989, Room P-110, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

- 8) 8:30 - 1:30 P.M. Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Open)  
 8.1) 8:30-8:45: Report by ACRS subcommittee chairman (WK/EGI)  
 8.2) 8:45-9:45: Meeting with NRC Staff representatives  
9:45-10:00 - BREAK  
 8.3) 10:00-11:30: Meeting with Applicant/Licensee representatives  
11:30-11:45 - BREAK  
 8.4) 11:45-1:15 - Meeting with representatives of the Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Seacoast Anti-Pollution League; and New England Coalition On Nuclear Pollution  
 8.5) 1:15-1:30: Questions and discussion

1:30 - 2:30 P.M.

LUNCH

- 9) 2:30 - 5:45 P.M.  
 (3:00-3:15-BREAK) EPRI Requirements for Advanced Light-Water Reactors (Open)  
 9.1) Comments by ACRS subcommittee chairman (CJW/MME)  
 9.2) Meeting with EPRI and NRC staff representatives

- 10) 5:45 - 6:45 P.M. NUMARC Activities (Open)  
 10.1) Briefing by NUMARC representative on activities regarding the IPE and Accident Management (WK/MDH)

# CERTIFIED

## MINUTES OF THE 353RD ACRS MEETING SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1989

The 353rd meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards was held at 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Md., on September 7-9, 1989. The purpose of this meeting was to conduct the discussions and to perform the actions described in the attached agenda. The meeting was chaired by Dr. Remick.

All of the discussions were held in open session except for a short session during which the Committee discussed qualifications of candidates proposed for consideration as ACRS members. 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 the Heritage Reporting Corporation, 1220 L St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.]

### I. Chairman's Report (Open)

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

Dr. Remick began the meeting with a brief summary of the planned agenda and the provisions under which the meeting discussions were to be conducted. Dr. Remick noted that a decision had been made to decommission the Pathfinder reactor. He also noted that the Commission was discussing the issue of the prioritization of NRC resources for the licensing of foreign reactors.

### II. Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants (Open)

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

Mr. Carlyle Michelson, Chairman of the Maintenance Practices and Procedures Subcommittee, noted that the purpose of this session was to discuss the revised maintenance policy statement. He recommended that the Committee review the proposed regulatory guide on maintenance after the public comment period.

Mr. Thomas King, NRC-RES, noted that the briefing would address the staff's plans for responding to the Commission's June 26, 1989 Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) on maintenance and the content of a proposed revised policy statement on maintenance. He noted that an ACRS letter was requested on the revised policy statement.

Mr. King noted that the June 26, 1989 SRM directed the staff to:

- ° Issue a revised policy statement
- ° Publish a draft regulatory guide for comment



- ° Develop a final regulatory guide for issuance with the rule on maintenance
- ° Proceed with the validation and implementation of AEOD maintenance effectiveness indicators
- ° Invite voluntary participation of licensees in a demonstration project
- ° Establish criteria to determine when plant-specific orders or other enforcement actions should be taken under the policy statement.

Mr. King stated that, as per the Commission's instructions, rulemaking would be held in abeyance for an 18-month period from the time of publication of the policy statement. The revised policy statement is expected to be published in October 1989.

During this 18-month period, the staff will work on a maintenance standard (in the form of a draft regulatory guide) and have it available prior to the end of this period. The staff will provide an option for industry to contribute to the development of the standard. The industry will be encouraged to voluntarily adopt the standard. Industry maintenance programs will be monitored and, based upon industry's performance, the NRC staff will develop recommendations by April 1991 for any required additional regulatory action. The staff plans to provide a first draft regulatory guide and rule to the Commission for information prior to the end of the 18-month evaluation period. This is estimated to be about January 1991.

Mr. King discussed some of the key points of the revised policy statement on maintenance. The policy statement will emphasize the need for continued improvement in industry maintenance. The expanded use of NPRDS and the further development and use of maintenance performance indicators is encouraged. The policy statement will state the staff's intention to issue plant-specific orders where there is declining performance and will identify the principal elements of an acceptable maintenance program.

Mr. King stated that the policy statement indicates that additional improvements are needed in engineering support, recordkeeping, trending, root cause analysis, and the use of preventive and predictive maintenance. He noted that the NRC will take appropriate enforcement action where there is poor or declining maintenance performance. This could include enforcement of existing requirements, plant-specific orders, and corrective action plans. He said the Commission's intent was to develop and use maintenance performance indicators and to encourage license and industry development and use of maintenance performance indicators.

Mr. King noted that the scope of the policy statement includes all safety system improvements the failure of which could impact on public health and safety.

The Committee discussed the initial draft of the proposed letter on the revised maintenance policy statement but did not complete the report. Additional discussion on this report was scheduled for the October 5-7, 1989 ACRS meeting.

### III. Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal (Open)

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

Mr. Michelson, acting for the Subcommittee Chairman, Dr. Lewis, noted that the license renewal subject was of considerable interest to the ACRS and the Commission. He stated that the purpose of this briefing was to present a status report on the NRC staff's activities in this area and that should provide a basis for a better understanding of the kinds of ACRS actions needed on this matter in the future.

Mr. Karl Kniel, Chief of the Reactor and Plant Safety Issues Branch in the Division of Safety Issue Resolution in the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, briefed the Committee on the status of the license renewal rulemaking effort being conducted by the NRC staff. The general approach to license renewal involves a rulemaking in which the staff is proposing to define the requirements for license renewal. A rulemaking is not necessary in a legal sense since there is no regulation that says licenses cannot be renewed. There is, however, no definitive decision as to what should be involved in a license renewal process. There is a 40-year limit on a license, as stated in the Atomic Energy Act, which was arrived at on the basis of financial and accounting considerations. There was no technical basis regarding the effects of aging that was used to establish the 40-year license limit.

The staff intends to issue a number of regulatory guides as part of the rulemaking effort. The industry, through NUMARC, will have a corresponding effort to develop technical positions. The industry presently has about ten different technical reports scheduled to be issued on related subjects.

Mr. Kniel said the basic problem they see in the license renewal area is the adequacy of the existing licensing basis (i.e., the actual plant configuration and its adequacy in the safety sense) for the renewal period. Another basic question which needs to be addressed is what considerations need to be focused on to assure that an additional 20-year period of operation can be achieved with a level of risk comparable to that of the initial period of licensing. Mr. Kniel said there seemed to be a consensus that 20 years is the number to use for a renewal period. He discussed the four alternatives that were considered

in NUREG-1317 with regard to the staff's currently suggested approach, which is being recommended to the Commission as follows:

To use the current licensing basis (original licensing basis as amended up to the date of the renewal application) and to require assessment of aging-related issues and the establishment of programs for managing these issues, guided in part by a plant-specific PRA.

The approach being proposed would require one to decide on what systems and components, including passive components, need to be reviewed with regard to aging effects and to establish that the plant could operate safely for the renewal period. Part of this consideration is to use PRA technology to evaluate risk from aged components, systems, and structures. The rule would establish that some actions that would be required would not be considered as backfits.

In response to questions from Committee members as to how PRA could be used in this evaluation, Mr. Kniel felt that ultimately PRA could be used to determine the importance of deterioration of components, systems, and structures on risk. This would be done by taking the information on aging and intelligently applying it in the PRA to help show its importance. He indicated that this is only being done to a small extent in PRAs at this time. The Nuclear Plant Aging Requirements (NPAR) Program will help show how the effects of aging can be included in PRAs.

Mr. Kniel said that the staff's information indicates that utilities will need the license renewal decision 10 to 12 years prior to the expiration of the original license in order to make proper planning decisions. In response to questions from the Committee concerning what equipment changes might be needed in order to get the license renewal, Mr. Kniel said that the NPAR Program has not yet shown the NRC what might be required, but that, with a 10-12 year time period, many changes could be implemented if necessary. Mr. Wylie suggested that there are a lot of different compounds used by different utilities in electrical wiring and components that age at different rates. In this area the needed changes would be very plant-specific.

In response to questions from the Committee on the timing requirements for industry submittal of applications for renewal, Mr. Kniel said the only limiting feature would be that they would want the utility to have as much experience as possible on the original license before the staff renews the license, e.g., 15 to 20 years experience.

Mr. Kniel noted that the staff has just finished a draft SECY paper to be sent to the Commission proposing a course of action, similar to that described at this meeting, along with a proposed schedule. In addition, they are suggesting that the staff should prepare a single generic environmental impact statement to cover the rulemaking which would limit the number of issues subject to litigation in individual licensing



actions. The staff is proposing to handle decisions on severe accidents on a case-by-case basis. By the time most plants apply for license renewal the licensees will already have implemented any requirements of the Severe Accident Policy Statement and will have been accepted by the staff, such that the severe accident issue will be resolved outside of the license renewal rule.

The staff is preparing to conduct a workshop in the fall of 1989 to solicit public and industry participation on specific technical issues of concern on license renewal as well as on the scope of a generic environmental impact statement.

Two lead plants, Yankee Rowe and Monticello, will be included in the strategy. The experience with these two plants should provide information that will be used as part of the rulemaking and the regulatory guide process.

EPRI will be issuing several reports, through NUMARC, representing the industry's positions on technical matters associated with license renewal issues. Mr. Kniel noted that there are a lot of existing programs which already address aging and that generally these programs require periodic inspections. The staff will compare the existing programs with the aging concerns for the renewal period to identify any additional areas not covered by the existing programs. If the current programs are adequate to cover the renewal period they will not be covered in the rule.

Mr. Kniel stated that the staff expects to discuss a draft license renewal rule for comment with the ACRS in March 1990. They expect to publish draft regulatory guides, Standard Review Plan changes, and a draft generic environmental impact statement in the late 1990 time frame. Many or all of these documents will be coming to the ACRS for review and comment before being sent out for public comment.

Mr. Kniel noted that the Yankee Rowe license renewal application will be submitted to the staff in June 1990 and they will review the application before the final license renewal rule is issued. Yankee Rowe will be reviewed using the guidance and criteria of the proposed rule such that the staff will have the benefit of factoring the lead plant review into the development of the final rule.

#### IV. Individual Plant Examination for External Events (IPEEE) (Open)

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

Dr. Siess' report to the Committee was based on a meeting of the Extreme External Phenomena Subcommittee held with the NRC staff on September 6, 1989.

The staff has organized a group called the NRC External Events Steering Group (EESG) whose mission is to make recommendations to NRC senior management regarding the role of external events within the NRC's Severe Accidents Policy, guidance for implementation of external events in the individual plant examinations (IPEs), integration of all of the NRC's external events programs, and any additional needed research or technical assistance. Key external events are earthquakes, internal fires, external floods, wind and tornados, transportation accidents and others. Mr. L. Shao, NRC-RES, is the Chairman of the EESG. The EESG has three subcommittees: seismic (headed by Mr. L. Reiter), fire and high wind (headed by Mr. C. McCracken), and flood and other events (headed by Mr. D. Jeng). NUMARC is coordinating a counterpart industry organization. The two working groups in the organization are: seismic issues, under Mr. W. Lindbead, and severe accidents, under Mr. C. Reed.

It was stated that the NRC's seismic working group seems to be well along in its work. The fire and other working groups have not progressed as rapidly.

Dr. Siess quoted from the report NUREG-1070, "NRC Policy on Future Reactor Designs," as the basis for the IPE Program as follows:

"Recognizing that plant-specific PRA's have yielded valuable insights to unique plant vulnerabilities to severe accidents leading to low-cost modifications, licensees of each operating reactor will be expected to perform a limited-scope, accident safety analysis designed to discover instances (i.e., outliers) of particular vulnerability to core melt or unusually poor containment performance, given core melt conditions."

Dr. Siess noted that a well-designed walkdown inspection was an important element of the IPEEE program.

The NRC staff will brief the Subcommittee again in late 1989/early 1990 when the document package is complete.

#### V. Seabrook Station, Unit 1 (Open)

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

A subcommittee report and NRC staff and licensee presentations on the Seabrook Station, Unit 1, radiological emergency plans for full-power operation were presented to the Committee. Dr. Kerr, Chairman, ACRS Subcommittee on Seabrook, stated that a previous report on Seabrook by the ACRS provided its conclusion that the Seabrook Station could be operated up to five percent of its design power of 3411 Mwt. The ACRS also noted that the emergency plan for the nuclear power plant had not been completed at the time of the report, and thus had not been

reviewed. The licensee in its presentation stated that, in formulating the emergency plan for the Seabrook Station, it had to take into account the fact that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and some local communities within the State of New Hampshire have chosen not to participate in emergency planning and in the emergency exercises that were planned. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts had stated that their evaluation indicates that the population near the nuclear power plant cannot be evacuated safely if a major accident occurred at the Seabrook Station.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in its presentation stated that it had concluded, after evaluating that part of the emergency plan dealing with the offsite population, that the proposed plan is acceptable but specified some corrective actions to be taken. These corrective actions are the public alert notification system and the vehicular alert notification system. These system must be verified to be in satisfactory operating condition before full power operation of the Seabrook Station. In addition to these items, FEMA identified other corrective actions in its evaluation of the June 28 and 29, 1988 full participation exercise at Seabrook; these are not required to be completed before issuance of a full power license because they are not considered, by themselves, to adversely impact health and safety.

In its evaluation, FEMA included measures taken by the licensee to devise a system for providing information to people in areas within the 10-mile emergency planning zone where local community authorities have not accepted this responsibility. Consideration was also given to plans made by the licensee for other emergency actions that might be required in case of a major accident. Major consideration was given to plans for evacuating the beach areas within the 10-mile zone in case an accident occurs at a time when there is significant transient beach population.

The NRC staff has evaluated the licensee's planning and training of the licensee's staff for dealing with emergencies. Practice exercises have been held. The staff is prepared to recommend approval of the licensee's emergency plan that has been evaluated by FEMA. Emergencies that would require evacuation, even with peak occupancy of the beaches and other areas, would require about eight hours to evacuate. This complies with NUREG-0654, Rev. 1. They further stated that the Seabrook Station emergency plan appears to meet the standards that have been formulated by FEMA and by the NRC. In reply to a question, the staff stated that it will address the issues that arose during low power testing related to actions which occurred on June 22, 1989 during the performance of a natural circulation test.

The Committee heard presentations from representatives of three intervenors in the Seabrook Station emergency plan hearings. They were M. Brock, representing the Office of the Attorney General, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; R. Backus, representing the Seacoast Anti-Pollution League, and D. Curran, representing the New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution.



Mr. M. Brock in his opening comment stated that what the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office is asking the ACRS to do is to enforce the NRC regulations fully, and that the licensee not be granted a full-power operating license unless and until they meet the regulatory requirements of providing reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken for the public in the event of a radiological emergency. It is his view that the licensee has not even come close to accomplishing this.

Mr. Brock then discussed FEMA's position during the September 1987 time frame. Mr. Brock stated that during the 1987 time frame FEMA had stated that adequate emergency planning had not been achieved for the Seabrook site. Mr. Brock also stated that this was FEMA's position until about six months ago when FEMA withdrew that position and filed a new testimony which now states that the emergency planning for Seabrook was adequate to protect the public. Mr. Brock attributed this reversal to pressures from the Governor of New Hampshire, the White House, and the NRC against FEMA and Mr. E. Thomas of FEMA's staff. He stated that Mr. Thomas was ultimately removed from the witness panel. Mr. E. Reis, Deputy Assistant Counsel, NRC, stated in a reply to a Committee question that the ASLB, after reviewing this matter, rendered a decision saying that there were no inappropriate pressures on FEMA.

Mr. R. Backus, discussed evacuation on local highways during radiological emergencies. A videotape provided by Ms. Fallon was shown. In response to a Committee question, the licensee stated that during the ASLB hearing a statement was made that the maximum number of vehicles that would be expected to leave the beach areas which are within the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts is about 31,000. To obtain the estimated maximum number of people to be evacuated, the number of vehicles has been multiplied by an assumed factor (based on observations) of 2.4 people per vehicle which results in 73,000 people.

Ms. Curran stressed that regardless of what PRA studies may indicate concerning the likelihood of a severe accident at Seabrook, the Commission has already stated, after the TMI-2 accident, that one has to assume a range of accidents at a nuclear plant and that emergency plans have to be demonstrated capable of responding to such an accident. She stated that, in her view, Seabrook has done nothing much to protect the public in the event of an early release accident at Seabrook.

In addition to the intervenor oral presentations, the Committee received for its consideration a number of written statements on the Seabrook Station emergency plan for full-power operation. All of these written statements were from people living near the Seabrook nuclear power plant. They essentially stated that in the event of a postulated major accident at the plant, evacuation cannot be performed safely.

The ACRS in its deliberation on the Seabrook Station emergency plan decided to write a report on this matter. This report is discussed in Section X.

VI. G1 A-29, "Nuclear Power Plant Design for the Reduction of Vulnerability to Sabotage" (Open)

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

Dr. Lewis, Chairman of the Safeguards and Security Subcommittee, gave a brief summary of the subcommittee's activities in this area.

Mr. Warren Minners, NRC-RES, made the primary presentation. He noted he would discuss actions proposed for operating plants and Mr. Wilson would discuss future plants.

Mr. Minners said that industrial sabotage concerns dated back to the late 1960's. The initial Commission guidance on physical protection of power reactors against radiological sabotage was published in 1977 in 10 CFR 73.55. The requirements in 10 CFR 73.55 addressed:

- ° Physical security organization
- ° Physical barriers
- ° Access control
- ° Detection aids
- ° Communications
- ° Testing and maintenance programs
- ° Response capability.

GSI A-29 was established in 1978 to study alternative methods, i.e., design features, to deter sabotage.

Mr. Minners discussed the historical data of safeguards events for the 1979 to 1987 time period. During this time period, 1001 safeguards-related events were reported at U.S. reactor sites. Of these reported safeguards events, bomb threats and alcohol- or drug-related events constituted the majority of these reports. Only a small percentage of these events had sabotage significance.

The staff has determined that:

1. The frequency of occurrence of events which could be indicative of a sabotage threat is low.
2. The current plant physical security requirements appear to be effective for detecting and deterring sabotage.
3. Employee disgruntlement coupled with widespread destructive activity is not occurring.

Mr. Minners summarized the safety findings of studies related to potential sabotage:

- ° NUREG-0933 (11/85) - The core melt frequency associated with sabotage was estimated to be  $4 \times 10^{-6}$  per reactor year for PWRs and to be  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  per reactor year for BWRs.
- ° NUREG/CR-4462 (1/86) - The core melt frequency associated with sabotage was estimated to be  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  per reactor year depending on the design of the plant systems.
- ° A-45 plant-specific studies (1986-1987) - Core melt frequencies of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  to  $1 \times 10^{-3}$  per reactor year were derived on the assumption "If safety system is accessible -- disablement is highly probable."

The staff has reached the following technical findings:

1. The potential for "insider" sabotage cannot be totally eliminated or designed away.
2. Reliable and trustworthy personnel are the best deterrent to "insider" sabotage.
3. Current safeguards requirements are important and appear to be effective.
4. Certain plant design features are an impediment to sabotage (i.e., physical barriers, redundant safety trains, and surveillance cameras).

The conclusions reached are:

1. History does not show "insider" sabotage to be a significant problem.
2. Current plant safeguards regulations appear to be working and should be maintained.
3. Major plant retrofits are not supportable from the cost-benefit point of view (i.e., A-45 "bunkered system" was not selected).
4. Complete elimination of "insider" sabotage potential is not possible.

The resolution of GI A-29 was stated as:

1. Backfit action cannot be justified.



2. Licensees should continue to implement current plant physical security measures and hire reliable personnel.
3. NRC should continue to monitor and assess security effectiveness via the SALP process.
4. Guidance for future plants is provided in SECY-89-13.

Mr. J. W. Wilson, RES/ARGIB, discussed future plants. He noted that evolutionary LNRs would meet the current requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. He said the staff would encourage designers to include design features that decrease reliance on physical security programs. He noted that for advanced reactors the staff will consider development of additional requirements for plant design features to resist sabotage.

The Committee decided to write a report on this matter. This report is discussed in Section X.

#### VII. Accident Severity Scales (Open)

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

Mr. Carroll, Chairman of the Plant Operating Procedures Subcommittee, indicated that the matter to be discussed was addressed in SECY-89-266, "Event Severity Scales for Commercial Power Reactor Facilities," August 28, 1989.

Mr. Jack Heltemes, Jr., AEOD, discussed the status of development and use of severity scales in the international community. France and Japan have developed a six-level and nine-level scale, respectively, and intend to use these scales on a trial basis for one to two years. The United Kingdom, IAEA, and the Federal Republic of Germany are considering the development of a scale. Mr. Heltemes indicated that these scales are being developed primarily for public information purposes.

Mr. Heltemes discussed the four-level scale that has been in use for emergency response in the United States over the past ten years. These are classified as unusual events, alert, site area emergency, and general emergency. He indicated that the nuclear community and the public media seem to understand the NRC scale and are able to work with it.

In response to a question from Mr. Wylie, Mr. Heltemes indicated that other countries do not use their scales for emergency response action.

Mr. Heltemes said that the NRC staff position was that the benefit of using a severity scale in the U.S. would be negligible and possibly lead to confusion and adverse impacts. The staff supports the development of severity scales in those countries without established public

notification systems but recommends that these scales be the same or at least consistent. They also wish to be involved in discussions of these matters.

Dr. Remick asked, if such scales exist elsewhere wouldn't the U.S. public and media expect a domestic scale, or a comparison with local events to foreign scales? Mr. Heltemes presented a table in which domestic events were cross-referenced to the French scale. He acknowledged that this is a potential problem. He also stated that any change in the domestic event characterization would most likely have to proceed by rulemaking.

#### VIII. EPRI Requirements for Advanced Light Water Reactors (Open)

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

Mr. Wylie, Chairman of the Improved LWRs Subcommittee, indicated that the NRC staff and EPRI representatives are prepared to brief the full Committee on the EPRI requirements for ALWRs. Items of interest are (a) the purpose and goals of the program, (b) description of the program, (c) deviations from previous practices and requirements, (d) key outstanding issues and disagreements with the NRC, (e) safety goals and severe accident issues, (f) ATWS, and (g) generic issues. Mr. Wylie indicated that the Commission met with the NRC staff on August 1, 1989 to discuss this subject. There are several problems such as the difficulty of resolving the open items. The staff has reported more than 40 open items in its review of Chapters 1 through 5 of the EPRI requirements document. None of these open items are in the severe accident area.

The staff reported that it had reached an agreement with GE on the broad resolution of severe accident issues for the ABWR. Mr. Wylie noted that, while many of these issues are still open with EPRI, in effect it was perceived that the GE/ABWR program was ahead of the EPRI program.

Mr. Wylie indicated that the staff currently intends to resolve severe accident issues on a design-specific basis rather than on a generic basis, as proposed by EPRI. Mr. Wylie noted that EPRI perceives this as a problem in that it reverts back to the old licensing approach in which each licensee was required to commit to a specific set of design features in order to get a license rather than to conform to a more stable licensing approach based on the consensus-derived generic resolutions to licensing issues. Mr. Wylie also said that the Commission is currently questioning the practical value of the EPRI program and the expense of the staff resources to maintain a review of the EPRI program along with the other advanced light water reactor designs being considered for certification.

Mr. E. Kintner, Executive Vice President of GPU Nuclear, and Utility Steering Committee Chairman, stated that the utility sponsors are funding the EPRI program and the utility experience of the last 15 years (which includes 1300 reactor years of operation) is being factored into the designs. The Utility Steering Committee consists of 15 senior executives from the U.S. and six participants from foreign nuclear operating utilities. Much of the work is being performed by General Electric (GE), Westinghouse (W), and Combustion Engineering (CE). However, the eventual technical content of the EPRI requirements document is reviewed and approved by the utility participants.

The philosophy of the ALWR requirements document differs from the past and current approach to safety. In the past, the approach to safety has been one which is fundamentally to protect the public against accidents once they occur, and, therefore, has concerns rated very heavily on accidents after they have occurred. The EPRI program focuses on avoiding accident initiators that present any kind of a threat to the public, and concentrates on designing a more reliable and safer nuclear plant rather than on reducing the consequences of accidents.

A second way in which the ALWR program differs from the early development of nuclear commercial power is the approach to nuclear safety. In the early days of nuclear energy there was commercial competition in size, thermal efficiency, and initial capital cost. That competition resulted in reduced margins. Rapidly increased system complexity to protect against accidents presented unnecessary challenges to operators and maintenance personnel. For future reactors it is essential to reduce risk to investment and ease the burden of operations and maintenance. Improvement in these areas would have a direct positive effect on safety.

A third way in which the ALWR program differs is in the approach to conceptualization. EPRI is concentrating on simplification throughout the plant and emphasizing significant additional engineering margins (e.g., thermal margins and negative reactivity requirements).

Mr. Kintner indicated that three years ago EPRI had an understanding with GE, W, and CE that EPRI would have a chance to comment and resolve (or not) any of the fundamental issues in the design before their submittal of design certifications to the NRC Commission. However, that understanding and process has essentially fallen apart.

Mr. J. DeVine, Senior Program Manager for ALWR/EPRI, indicated that the EPRI requirements document is an attempt to create a sound technical foundation for the next generation of LWRs. There are two concepts being developed. The first is the evolutionary ALWR which is intended to be a simple, rugged, and reliable advancement of today's LWR designs, using conventional safety system concepts. The second is the passive plant which is intended to be a greatly simplified ALWR which employs primarily passive means for accident prevention and mitigation. The



EPRI requirements document work is a utility initiative to develop a safer, reliable, and economical nuclear plant through emphasis on simplification, margin, man-machine interface, and proven technology. Mr. DeVine stated that the involvement of international utilities has permitted expansion of the ALWR workscope.

The evolutionary ALWR concept is for a PWR or BWR higher rated plant (1100-1300 MWe) with substantial improvements in safety, simplification, and margin. This is closely linked to U.S. vendor products such as the ABWR (GE), APWR (SP/90W), and Systems 80+ (CE).

The passive ALWR concept is for a PWR or BWR plant with about 600 MWe output, which utilizes primarily passive means (gravity, natural circulation, stored energy) for accident prevention and mitigation. The concept emphasizes keeping the core protected without operator action for about three days. The intent is that the passive plant can be constructed in about three years, and will utilize extensive modularization and prefabrication.

The passive ALWR requirements document consists of three volumes. Volume I is the ALWR top-tier requirements that include executive summary, policies, and key requirements. Volume II addresses the evolutionary plant ALWR requirements that include overall performance and design requirements (Chapter 1) and requirements for systems and structures (Chapters 2 through 13). Volume III addresses the passive plant ALWR requirements.

Mr. DeVine indicated that the ALWR requirements document applies to the entire nuclear plant and incorporates resolutions of generic safety issues and optimization issues. The document reflects industry and NRC consensus on principal safety, performance, and design issues.

For the evolutionary plant, 12 chapters (of 13) of the requirements document (Vol. II) were submitted to the NRC. Man-machine interface systems (Chapter 10) will be completed by September 1989. The NRC staff has reviewed the first four chapters and drafted an SER. The final version (called the roll-up document) will be completed and issued by April 1990.

For the passive plants requirements documents (Vol. III), the first set of chapters on reactor and safety systems is scheduled for completion in late 1989. The remainder of chapters are to follow by mid-1990.

Mr. G. Vine, EPRI, summarized the ALWR program for treatment of severe accidents. He indicated that the NRC staff presentation to the ACRS Improved LWRs Subcommittee meeting in April 1989 revealed further delays in Chapter 5 DSER, and a potential for the ABWR design certification preempting NRC review of the ALWR severe accident positions. The NRC issued SECY-89-153, "Severe Accident Design Features of the ABWR." On June 22, 1989, EPRI presented its ALWR program on source term and

related issues to NRC/NRR. An outline of the technical issues is as follows:

- ° Timing of fission product release from fuel
- ° Fraction of fission products released from core
- ° Chemical form of iodine
- ° Fraction of iodine which is released to and suspended in the containment atmosphere
- ° Fission product aerosol removal from containment atmosphere
- ° Amount of fuel clad oxidized
- ° Hydrogen concentration criteria to prevent detonation
- ° Containment vent/overpressure protection.

Mr. Vine indicated that the ALWR criterion for hydrogen detonation is that containment mixtures of 13% hydrogen or less are sufficient to avoid detonability. Mr. Vine also indicated that using a conditional containment failure probability (CCFP) criterion for the containment performance criteria would be an unnecessary and counterproductive regulatory requirement for ALWR. In addition, EPRI believes that a containment vent for severe accident protection is an unnecessary, undesirable, and potentially unworkable design feature.

Mr. Vine stated that the ALWR requirements document offers extensive accident prevention features to meet regulatory and investment protection objectives. A rugged containment is required regardless of calculated core damage frequency. Features for improved accident mitigation capability are also provided.

Some of the extensive ALWR accident prevention features are a significant reduction in transient initiation frequency, improved reliability and diversity of on-site AC sources (e.g., third EDG for third safety division for BWRs), improved DHR system reliability, higher pressure RHR, and improved depressurization capability.

Some of the ALWR requirements document features for improved mitigation capability rely on preventing direct containment heating, cavity configuration to capture, contain, and cool core debris, and cavity flooding capability via direct path from proximate water source.

The ALWR will meet the NRC Safety Goal, with margin, via existing requirements. The ALWR public safety criterion is more stringent. A dose of 25 Rem is a low dose, causing no observable health effects.

Mr. DeVine stated, in summary, that the ALWR will be a fundamentally better plant through the EPRI requirements document and there is a strong utility consensus to standardize future plants around ALWR requirements. The potential future issues are continued source term improvements and the technical basis for EPZ reduction.

Dr. Kerr expressed concern that there is no numerical reliability requirement for the nuclear systems in the ALWR requirements document.

Dr. Catton expressed some concern about the usage of the MAAP computer code in the ALWR program and indicated that the documentation for this code has been very poor and is not readily available.

Mr. Michelson expressed some concern regarding the containment venting issue. He stated that the GE/ABWR design does have containment vent and yet the ALWR requirements document does not recommend that the use of this design feature. A decision by ACRS has to be made very shortly (perhaps as early as November 1989) based on a persuasive argument.

Mr. T. Kenyon, NRC-NRR, Project Manager, briefed the Committee regarding the status of the EPRI requirements document review. He indicated that the staff has reviewed the first five chapters of the requirements document and SECY-89-228, dated July 28, 1989, has transmitted the draft SER on Chapter 5 to the Commission, discussing major licensing and severe accident issues. EPRI has not received the NRC staff's DSER on Chapter 5. The staff is currently reviewing the remaining chapters. The NRC staff's schedule for completing all DSERs is late 1990.

Mr. Kenyon indicated that there are approximately 60 open items in the first five chapters alone. The major open issues are:

- Severe accident containment performance criteria
- Hydrogen generation and control
- High pressure core-melt ejection/RCS depressurization
- Source term
- Intersystem LOCA at high/low pressure interface
- Mid-loop operation
- Equipment survivability during a severe accident.

Issues to be addressed in future chapter reviews are:

- ALWR public safety goal
- Station blackout
- ATWS
- Fire protection
- Core-concrete interaction/ability to cool core debris.

The Committee, following its discussion, considers the development of the EPRI ALWR requirements document to be a valuable contribution which can serve as a rational basis for safer and improved LWR plant designs.



The Committee decided to write a report to the Commission recommending that the NRC continue its cooperative effort on this program with appropriate resources to accomplish an effective and timely review. This report is discussed in Section X.

#### IX. NUMARC Activities (Open)

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

Dr. Remick welcomed Mr. W. Rasin of NUMARC and expressed his appreciation that Mr. Rasin could accommodate the last-minute change in the Committee's schedule.

Mr. Rasin discussed the severe accident issue activities within NUMARC. He indicated that a Severe Accident Working Group had been established with Mr. C. Reed (Commonwealth Edison) as Chairman. The mission of the Working Group and a list of the other members drawn from utilities were shown. The issues under study were given as: (a) individual plant examinations (IPEs), (b) external events for IPEs, (c) the containment performance improvement program, (d) accident management, and (e) the severe accident closure process.

With respect to the IPE process, Mr. Rasin indicated that NUMARC has encouraged the NRC staff and the utilities to get on with the IPE studies. He stated that NUMARC had taken the position that each utility should develop its own decision criteria with regard to defining a vulnerability.

In response to a question by Dr. Shewmon, Mr. Rasin said that only about six utilities had a staff with the experience to perform an IPE. The rest of the utilities would have to depend on consultants and service organizations.

Mr. Rasin indicated that NUMARC differed with the ACRS on its recommendation that ISAP was preferred over IPE. NUMARC believed that this would lead to greater dependency on outside consultants and give rise to licensing problems arising from the integrated schedule.

As a carry-over from the IDCOR study, Mr. Rasin indicated that NUMARC had supported the improvements to the MAAP code and has made presentations to the staff seeking their approval to use the code during the IPE process.

Mr. Rasin discussed the efforts for addressing external events in the IPE process. These events included fire, seismic, external floods, high winds, and man-made hazards. The industry position is that these events are conservatively treated in the design basis or are being addressed in other regulatory programs. In response to a question by Mr. Wylie, Mr. Rasin indicated that the effects of lightning were not part of this

study since NUMARC did not feel that this event was a contributor to core melt frequency.

With regard to the containment performance improvement program, Mr. Rasin indicated that NUMARC agreed with the Committee that these issues should be pursued as part of the IPEs and not generically.

Mr. Rasin discussed the use of IPE results and other information to develop plant-specific accident management procedures. He indicated that NUMARC had supported the EPRI/SAROS effort to develop guidance to assess the utility's capabilities to manage a severe accident. In response to a question by Dr. Remick, he said that NUMARC has not specified the persons/group that might operate the plant during an accident but rather specifies that a decision-making process be in place prior to an accident.

On the issue of the severe accident closure process, Mr. Rasin indicated that this matter was still under review. It was uncertain if this could be done generically or had to be on a plant-specific basis.

On other matters, Mr. Carroll asked if Mr. Rasin could address the issue of systems interactions. Mr. Rasin indicated that NUMARC had followed this issue for some time and that they were currently looking at the multiple systems response program to see where the industry can make a contribution. In response to a question by Mr. Michelson, Mr. Rasin indicated that there was no structured program under way to develop an understanding of systems interactions at operating plants.

X. Executive Sessions (Open/Closed)

A. Subcommittee Reports (Open/Closed)

1. Regional Programs Subcommittee's August 28-29, 1989 Meeting (Open)

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

Dr. Remick, Chairman, ACRS Regional Programs Subcommittee, reported on its August 28-29, 1989 meeting held at NRC's Region I Offices at King-of-Prussia, Pa. Dr. Remick noted that ACRS Members Carroll, Catton, Kerr, Ward, and Wylie attended. This meeting marked the end of the first tour of the five regional offices begun over two and one-half years ago. The Chairman said this meeting was productive, as have been the previous four meetings.

Highlights of the meeting as noted by Dr. Remick included:

- ° The Region I facilities are first-rate.



- The unique tasks of the regional office include acting as home base for the NDE mobile van and operating the TLD program for the agency's offsite radiation monitoring effort at all nuclear power plant sites in the country.
- The Region expressed concern as to their capability for maintaining adequate manpower and skill levels. Because of the federal salary cap, there has been a steady loss of experienced people and difficulties in recruiting new hires. This situation is particularly worrisome as it impacts the resident inspector (RI) program.
- It was noted that the ACRS had suggested that the regions could adopt use of human factors tools for the screening of prospective RI candidates. The Region had indicated that each RI is trained and is closely observed by Region personnel before he/she is assigned to a given plant site.
- Dr. Remick noted that Region I supports the need for a maintenance rule. He also said Region I has conducted inspections of eight licensees' maintenance programs in support of the proposed rulemaking. Of the eight programs inspected, five were found acceptable and one was found unacceptable.
- Region I disagreed with Dr. Kerr's assertion that NRC is using the SALP programs as a form of ad hoc regulation.

Mr. Carroll noted that Mr. Russell (Regional Administrator) had taken the initiative of performing a SALP at the troubled CE fuel fabrication facility located at Windsor, Conn. In response to Dr. Shewmon, Dr. Remick said the Region admitted that SALPs are a ratchet on the licensees. Dr. Remick also said the Subcommittee drew an analogy from the current problems at Calvert Cliffs to the SALP process; i.e., NRC is relying on talented personnel to circumvent shortcomings in the regulations vis-a-vis regulation of operating plants. Dr. Remick also said the SALP process is manpower intensive -- 25% of the Region managers' time is devoted to SALP reviews.

- The increasingly strong involvement of state governments in nuclear matters is proving a challenge to the region.
- Plants with strong internal safety review capabilities are generally good performers.



- ° The Region disagreed with the assertion, advanced by Dr. Kerr, that prolonged operation at low-power levels may potentially impact safety. Mr. Russell noted that he allowed Peach Bottom to operate up to 35% for its initial power plateau, based on problems seen at Pilgrim which was limited to 25% power.
- ° It was noted that about 17% of licensed operators are failing their requalification exams. The high failure rates are believed to be caused by older operators who are now being forced to upgrade their skill levels as a result of the revisions to Part 55 of 10 CFR. The Region is in agreement with the ACRS and Commission Policy Statement on use of degraded operators.

Dr. Remick said he believed the Subcommittee/Region Office meetings have been a source of direct information on plant operations that is not readily available at Headquarters. He also recommended that these meetings continue.

Dr. Siess suggested the ACRS hold similar type meetings with Headquarters officials. He said a subcommittee could meet with a selected group of people from a given Office/Division, etc., for one and one-half to two days.

Mr. Carroll noted that subsequent discussions between him and Mr. Ward resulted in agreement that NRC is regulating by a form of vigilantism. He feels that ACRS should try to get the NRC to move toward the "rule of law" by revision of the regulations as needed. Dr. Remick agreed that improvements are needed in this area.

2. Nominating Committee (Closed)

Contained in Official Use Only Supplement.

B. Reports, Letters, and Memoranda (Open)

1. Emergency Plan for Full-Power Operation of the Seabrook Station, Unit 1 (Report to Chairman Carr dated September 13, 1989)

The Committee concluded that the Seabrook Station emergency plan appears to meet the standards that have been formulated by FEMA and by the NRC. The Committee concluded also that, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the issues that arose during low-power testing and corrective actions recommended by FEMA, there is reasonable assurance that Seabrook Station, Unit 1, can be operated at core power levels up to

3411 Mwt without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.

2. Electric Power Research Institute Advanced Light Water Reactor Requirements Document (Report to Chairman Carr dated September 12, 1989)

The Committee stated that it considers the development of the EPRI ALWR Requirements Document to be a valuable contribution and that this document can serve as a rational basis for safer and improved LWR plant designs. The Committee noted that many of the issues being considered are quite complex and difficult to resolve and that these issues are being carefully considered and addressed. The Committee recommended that the NRC continue its cooperative effort on this program with appropriate resources to accomplish an effective and timely review.

3. Proposed Resolution of Generic Issue A-29, "Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage" (Report to Chairman Carr dated September 12, 1989)

The Committee concurred in the NRC staff's proposed resolution of this generic issue. The Committee noted that although in the proposed resolution the NRC staff addresses design and procedural measures to reduce the likelihood of insider sabotage for future plants, the NRC staff is nonspecific with respect to these measures. The Committee cautioned that some measures which improve security can degrade the ability of plant personnel to respond to an emergency and that this has to be considered when decisions are made.

C. Other Conclusions (Open)

1. Future Agenda Items:

- ° The Committee decided not to review the proposed amendments to 10 CFR Part 34: "ASNT Certification of Industrial Radiographers." (See SECY-89-194)
- ° The Committee decided to review the proposed resolution of Generic Issue 135, "Steam Generator and Steam Line Overfill Issues," during the October 5-7, 1989 ACRS meeting. (Mr. Igne has the follow-up action on this matter.)

2. Decision as to Review of Regulatory Guide, Task No. DG-1001, "Maintenance Programs for Nuclear Power Plants"

The Committee decided to review the proposed Regulatory Guide, Task No. DG-1001, "Maintenance Programs for Nuclear Power



Plants," after the public comment period. (Mr. Alderman has the follow-up action on this matter.)

3. Scheduling of Meeting with Dr. Beckjord, Director, RES

The Committee will meet with Dr. Beckjord, Director of RES, during the October 5-7, 1989 meeting to discuss items of mutual interest. Mr. Duraiswamy is the coordinator for this activity. The topics identified by the Committee for discussion with Dr. Beckjord include the following:

- ° Impact of the budget reduction proposed by the Congress for the FY-1990 NRC Safety Research Program.
- ° Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee's views on the proposed budget reduction.
- ° Progress being made in obtaining greater diversity of research providers
- ° Status of, and progress being made in, bringing outside expertise on board as recommended by the National Research Council.
- ° Contribution, so far, to the NRC Safety Research from the implementation of the recommendations of the National Research Council.

4. Extreme External Phenomena Subcommittee's Review of Proposed Approach for Consideration of External Events in the IPE

Dr. Siess briefed the Committee on the status of the Extreme External Phenomena Subcommittee's review of the approach being proposed by the NRC staff for consideration of external events in the IPE. The Subcommittee will continue its review of this matter as soon as related documents, describing the NRC staff's approach, are made available. It is expected that this matter will be brought before the ACRS full Committee for action by January-February 1990. (Mr. Igne has the follow-up action on this matter.)

5. Regional Programs Subcommittee Visit to Regions/Regional Offices' Activities

Dr. Remick briefed the Committee on the results of the August 29-30, 1989 meeting of the Regional Programs Subcommittee held at NRC's Region I Offices. He also summarized activities of the NRC Regional Offices. The Subcommittee has completed its first round of visits to all of the Regional offices. It was suggested by Dr. Siess that similar discussions could be held



with key personnel from some of the Headquarters offices. (Mr. Boehnert has the follow-up action on this matter.)

6. Advanced BWR Subcommittee to Explore Differences in Positions on Containment Venting Between EPRI and GE

Mr. Michelson noted that the EPRI generic position on a containment vent (e.g., venting is not included) and the position taken by General Electric (e.g., venting is provided for the ABWR) are different. Mr. Michelson stated that he would explore the basis for the differences in the Subcommittee's review of the Advanced BWR. (Mr. Alderman has the follow-up action on this matter.)

7. Decision to Review License Conversions for Oyster Creek, Dresden 2, San Onofre 1, and Palisades

Four plants (Oyster Creek, Dresden 2, San Onofre 1, and Palisades) remain to be converted from POLs to FOLs. The Committee agreed to review these license conversions. The former SEP Subcommittee will be reconstituted to handle these reviews with Dr. Siess as the Chairman. (Mr. Duraiswamy is the cognizant staff engineer for these reviews).

8. Dr. Shewmon's Request for Information on Plant Life Extension in the INEL Research Program

Dr. Shewmon expressed interest in the INEL research program regarding plant life extension and asked to be provided with information on these programs. (Mr. Quittschreiber has the follow-up action on this matter.)

9. TVA Commitment to Review Incident Reports of Sister Plants

During ACRS review of the Sequoyah Plant restart, TVA committed to review incident reports of sister plants and make use of applicable operating experience. Mr. Carroll noted that TVA has recently indicated that it plans to make use of INPO evaluations of operating experience rather than doing the evaluations themselves as previously agreed upon. The Committee agreed to schedule discussions with the NRC staff to discuss the staff's basis for allowing TVA to change this commitment and to discuss what the usual industry practice was in regard to using operating experience from other plants. Mr. Michelson called the Committee's attention to the work which AEOD has performed in evaluating industry use of generic operating experience.

D. Future Activities (Open)

1. Future Agenda

The Committee agreed to the tentative future agenda shown in Appendix II.

2. Future Subcommittee Activities

A schedule of future subcommittee activities was distributed to members (Appendix III).

The 353rd ACRS Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m., Saturday, September 9, 1989.

APPENDICES  
MINUTES OF THE 353RD ACRS MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1989

- I. Attendees
- II. Future Agenda
- III. Future Subcommittee Activities
- IV. Other Documents Received



APPENDIX I  
ATTENDEES

PUBLIC ATTENDEES

NRC ATTENDEES

September 8, 1989

David R. Noonan, SERCH Bechtel  
T. Hampster, NHY  
E. Lieberman, KLD Assoc.  
R. J. DeLoach, NHY  
H. Joseph Flynn, FEMA  
Bill Pearce, Consultant  
Bob Backus, SNL Intervenor  
Mimi Fallon, SAPL  
John Trotter, Grove Engineering  
Allegendre, NHY  
Jack DeVine, EPRI  
Louis N. Rib, AECL Technology  
E. F. Kintren, GPU N  
Bill Rasin, NUMARC  
Steve Additon, TENERA  
D. M. Chapin, MPR  
Bob Coward, MPR  
J. H. Back, KOPEC  
S. W. Lee, KOPEC  
M. Beaumont, Westinghouse  
R. E. Enkerboll, NUMARC

Dick Wessman, NRR  
R. J. Bores, Reg. I  
Steve Long, NRR  
Robert Erickson, NRR  
J. E. Dyer, OEDO  
Sherwin Turk, OGC  
D. Persinko, NRR  
Edwin Reir, OGC  
F. Kantor, NRR  
R. J. Serbu, NRR  
Tom McKenna, AEOD  
C. Ader, OCM  
Jerry Wilson, RES  
Charles Miller, NRR  
T. Kenyon, NRR  
L. Soffer, RES  
J. Morningner, NRR  
Brad Hardin, RES  
Paul Norian, RES  
John Davidson, NMSS  
P. F. McKee, NRR  
B. T. Mendelsohn, NRR  
Ci Li, NRR

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR THE 354TH ACRS MEETING, OCTOBER 5-7, 1989

Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants - Complete review and report on proposed NRC Policy Statement on maintenance programs for nuclear power plants.

Definition of "Adequate Protection" - Discuss and report on proposed ACRS-NRC staff positions regarding the definition of adequate protection related to implementation of the NRC safety goals.

Generic Issue 135, "Steam Generator and Steam Line Overfill Issues" - Review and report on proposed NRC staff resolution of this generic issue.

Generic Issue B-56, "Diesel Reliability" - Review and report on proposed NRC staff resolution of this generic issue.

Generic Issue 87, "Failure of HPCI Steam Line Without Isolation" - Review and report on proposed resolution of this generic issue and the performance of other valves in nuclear power plants.

Standardized Nuclear Plants CANDU-3 - Briefing regarding proposed design of the CANDU-3 reactors.

Meeting with NRC Director of Research - Discuss items of mutual interest, including status of action of the NAS report on revitalizing the research program, impact of budget reductions on the NRC program, and diversity of views and contractors in the research effort.

SEP 09 1989

ACRS/ACNW COMMITTEE & SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Joint Containment Systems and Structural Engineering, September 12, 1989, San Francisco International Airport Hilton, Bayshore 2, San Francisco, CA (Houston), 8:30 a.m. The Subcommittees will discuss containment design criteria for future plants with invited speakers from industry and National Laboratories. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the Airport Hilton (415/589-0770) for the nights of September 11 and 12:

Mr. Ward	Dr. Kerr	NONE
Dr. Siess	Dr. Shewmon	
Mr. Carroll	Mr. Wylie	
Dr. Catton	Dr. Corradini	

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, September 13 and 14, 1989, San Jose, CA - Postponed to November 8 and 9, 1989.

13th ACNW Meeting, September 13-15, 1989, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

Joint Severe Accidents and Probabilistic Risk Assessment, September 19, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Houston), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittees will discuss the second draft 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 September 18:

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

Severe Accidents, September 20, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Houston), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will discuss the proposed Generic Letter by NRR, the NRC research program, and the NUMARC/EPRI activities in the accident management area. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the hotels indicated for the night of September 19:

Dr. Kerr	NONE	Mr. Wylie	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Catton	HOLIDAY INN	Dr. Corradini	HOLIDAY INN
Dr. Siess	HOLIDAY INN	Mr. Davis	HOLIDAY INN
Mr. Ward	HOLIDAY INN	Dr. Lee	HOLIDAY INN



HTGHR Containment Meeting, September 26, 1989, 1000 Independence Avenue, Washington, DC, (E1-Zeftawy), 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon, DOE Forrestal Building, Room 2E071. The Group will meet with a representative of the FRG RSK (H. Nickel) to discuss the ACRS' position with regard to the need for a containment on the HTGR. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Remick  
Dr. Siess

Mr. Ward

Safety Philosophy, Technology, and Criteria, September 26, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Houston), 1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will discuss the preparation of a joint paper which gives the ACRS and NRC staff position on the concept of adequate protection. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Ward  
Dr. Kerr  
Dr. Lewis

Dr. Remick  
Mr. Wylie

Human Factors, September 27, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Alderman/Igne), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will review the proposed Access Authorization Rule, and performance indicators. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the hotels indicated for the night of September 26:

Dr. Remick  
Mr. Carroll  
Dr. Kerr

HOLIDAY INN  
HOLIDAY INN  
NONE

Mr. Michelson  
Mr. Ward  
Mr. Wylie

DAYS INN (CONGR.)  
HOLIDAY INN  
HOLIDAY INN

Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors, September 28, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (E1-Zeftawy), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will discuss the WAPWR (RESAR SP/90) design. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the hotels indicated for the night of September 27:

Mr. Carroll  
Dr. Catton  
Dr. Kerr  
Mr. Michelson

HOLIDAY INN  
HOLIDAY INN  
NONE  
DAYS INN (CONGR)

Dr. Remick  
Dr. Shewmon  
Mr. Ward  
Mr. Wylie

HOLIDAY INN  
NONE  
HOLDIAY INN  
HOLIDAY INN

General Electric Reactors, October 2, 1989 rescheduled to November 14, 1989.

AC/DC Power Systems Reliability, October 2, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (El-Zeftawy), 1:00 p.m., P-110. The Subcommittee will discuss the proposed final resolution of Generic Issue B-56, "Diesel Generator Reliability," and proposed Revision 3 to Regulatory Guide 1.9, "Selection, Design, Qualification, Testing, and Reliability of Diesel Generator Units Used as Onsite Electric Power Systems at Nuclear Power Plants." Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Wylie  
Mr. Carroll

Dr. Kerr  
Dr. Lewis

Mechanical Components, October 3, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Lyne), 8:30 a.m. to 12 Noon, P-422. The Subcommittee will review the proposed resolution of Generic Issue 87, "Failure of HPCI Steamline Without Isolation," -- specifically the matter of implementing current design requirements on MOVs, status of Task Action Plan on check valves; and it will discuss also Generic Letter 89-04, "Guidance on Developing Acceptable Inservice Testing Program." Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Michelson  
Mr. Carroll  
Dr. Siess

Mr. Wylie  
Mr. Wohld

Probabilistic Risk Assessment, October 3 (1:00 p.m.) and October 4 (8:30 a.m.), 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Ward/Lewis) (Houston/Stella), Room P-110. The Subcommittee will have

- o Professor George Apostolakis
- o Dr. Edward Burns
- o Dr. Robert P. Kennedy

213 825-1300  
408 559-4514  
714 777-2163

354th ACRS Meeting, October 5-7, 1989, \_\_\_\_\_

14th ACNW Meeting, October 11-13, 1989, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

Joint Containment Systems and Structural Engineering, October 17, 1989, Hyatt Regency O'Hare International Airport, 9300 West Bryn Mawr Avenue, Rosemont, IL, (5 minutes from O'Hare Airport, Chicago, IL) (Houston), 8:30 a.m. The Subcommittees will continue to discuss containment design criteria for future plants with invited speakers from industry. Attendance by the following is anticipated, and reservations have been made at the Hyatt Regency (312/696-1234) for the night of October 16:

Mr. Ward  
Dr. Siess  
Mr. Carroll  
Dr. Catton

Dr. Kerr  
Mr. Wylie  
Dr. Corradini

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, October 27, 1989, San Jose, CA - Cancelled.



Advanced Boiling Water Reactors (GE ABWR), October 31, 1989, Bethesda, MD  
(Alderman), 8:30 a.m., Room P-422. The Subcommittee will review the NRC staff's SER on Module One of GE ABWR. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Michelson	Mr. Ward
Dr. Catton	Mr. Wylie
Dr. Kerr	Dr. Okrent (tent.)
Dr. Shewmon	

Meeting with Canadian Advisory Committee on Nuclear Safety (Closed), November 1 and 2, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Remick/Fraley), Room P-110. A meeting will be held in Bethesda to discuss several items of mutual interest such as institutional safety culture, severe accident analysis, decommissioning, software QA, etc. A detailed agenda is still being worked out.

We expect the following members to attend: F. Remick, J. Carroll, W. Kerr, C. Michelson, D. Ward, and C. Wylie; H. Lewis will probably attend. We are not sure regarding the following members -- please let us know if you can arrange to attend: I. Catton and P. Shewmon. We do not expect Dr. Siess to attend -- let us know if you change your mind.

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, November 8 and 9, 1989, San Jose, CA (Boehnert), 8:30 a.m. The Subcommittee will discuss: (1) the capability of the thermal hydraulic codes to model BWR core power instability, and (2) the key thermal hydraulic design aspects of the GE ABWR related to the ECCS, and LOCA analyses. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Catton	Dr. Corradini
Mr. Carroll	Dr. Lee
Dr. Kerr	Dr. Plesset
Mr. Ward	Dr. Schrock
Mr. Wylie	Dr. Sullivan
	Dr. Tien

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, November 14, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD, (Boehnert), 8:30 a.m., Room P-422. The Subcommittee will discuss selected topics related to the NRC-RES thermal hydraulic research program, including future research needs. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

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



General Electric Reactors, November 14, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Alderman), 8:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will review the restart of Nine Mile Point Unit 1. -Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Kerr	Dr. Michelson
Dr. Lewis	Dr. Siess

Regulatory Policies and Practices (Closed), November 15, 1989, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, MD (Quittschreiber), 9:30 a.m., Room P-110. The Subcommittee will discuss the ACRS comments on integration of the regulatory process. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Lewis	Dr. Siess
Mr. Carroll	Mr. Ward
Dr. Kerr	Mr. Wylie

355th ACRS Meeting, November 16-18, 1989, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

Joint Containment Systems and Structural Engineering, November 30, 1989, Bethesda, MD, (Houston), 8:30 a.m. The Subcommittees will continue to discuss containment design criteria for future plants with invited speakers from industry. Lodging will be announced later. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Ward	Dr. Kerr
Dr. Siess	Dr. Shewmon
Mr. Carroll	Mr. Wylie
Dr. Catton	Dr. Corradini

Regulatory Policies and Practices (Closed), December 1 and 2, 1989, Williamsburg, VA (tentative) (Quittschreiber). The Subcommittee will discuss aspects of the regulatory process of interest and/or concern.

All ACRS members are invited to attend.

356 ACRS Meeting, December 14-16, 1989, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

15th ACNW Meeting, December 27-29, 1989, Bethesda, MD, Room P-110.

Joint Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena and Core Performance, Date to be determined (October), Bethesda, MD (Boehnert/Houston). 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:

Dr. Kerr	Dr. Lee
Dr. Catton	Dr. Lipinski
Mr. Michelson	Dr. Plesset
Dr. Shewmon	Mr. Schrock
Mr. Ward	Dr. Sullivan
Mr. Wylie	Dr. Tien

Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors, Date to be determined (October/November), Bethesda, MD (El-Zeftawy). The Subcommittee will review the licensing review bases document being developed by the Staff for Combustion Engineering's Standard Safety Analysis Report-Design Certification (CESSAR-DC). Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Mr. Carroll	Dr. Remick
Dr. Kerr	Dr. Shewmon
Mr. Michelson	Mr. Wylie

Severe Accidents, Date to be determined (October/November), Bethesda, MD (Houston). The Subcommittee will discuss the NRC Severe Accident Research Program (SARP) plan. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Kerr	Mr. Ward
Dr. Catton	Mr. Davis
Dr. Shewmon	Dr. Lee
Dr. Siess	

Decay Heat Removal Systems, Date to be determined (October/November), 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	Mr. Wylie
Dr. Catton	Mr. Davis
Dr. Kerr	

Decay Heat Removal Systems, Date to be determined (November), 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	Mr. Michelson (tent.)
Dr. Catton	Mr. Wylie
Dr. Kerr	Mr. Davis

Systematic Assessment of Experience, Date to be determined (November/December), Bethesda, MD (Alderman). The Subcommittee will review the proposed power level increase for Indian Point Unit 2. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Lewis	Dr. Remick
Mr. Carroll	Mr. Ward
Mr. Michelson	Mr. Wylie

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

Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Boehnert). The Subcommittee will discuss the status of Industry best-estimate ECCS model submittals for use with the revised ECCS Rule. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

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

Auxiliary and Secondary Systems, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Duraiswamy). The Subcommittee will discuss the: (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:

Mr. Michelson	Mr. Wylie
Mr. Carroll	

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. Michelson
Mr. Carroll	Dr. Siess



Joint Regulatory Activities and Containment Systems, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Duraishwamy/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

Regulatory Policies and Practices, Date to be determined, Bethesda, MD (Quittschreiber). The Subcommittee will review the proposed Plant Life Extension Rule. Attendance by the following is anticipated:

Dr. Lewis  
Dr. Kerr  
Mr. Michelson

Dr. Siess  
Mr. Ward  
Mr. Wylie

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

Mr. Hazelton  
Dr. Kassner

APPENDIX IV  
353RD ACRS MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7-9, 1990

OTHER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

MEETING  
NOTEBOOK

Tab

2 PROPOSED MAINTENANCE POLICY STATEMENT

Slides used by speaker during the presentation

Tentative Schedule

Status Report

ACRS letter to Chairman Zech, Subject: Proposed Final Rulemaking Related to Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants, dated April 11, 1989.

Letter to R. Fraley from B. Morris, RES, Subject: Revised Policy Statement on the Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants with Enclosure (Enclosure-Draft Commission Paper (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY)).

Draft SECY paper with Revised Policy Statement on Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plants -INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY.

DRAFT REGULATORY GUIDE DG-1001, "Maintenance Proposed for Nuclear Power Plants" (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY).

3 LICENSE RENEWAL BRIEFING

Slides used by the speaker during the presentation

Table of Contents

Tentative Agenda

Status Report

Portion of Certified Minutes of 323rd ACRS Minutes, Section IV-Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal, pp.4-6.

Highlights of RES Briefing on Aging in March 1989.

Highlights of RES Conference Session on License Renewal in April 1989.

4 INDIVIDUAL PLANT EXAMINATION FOR EXTERNAL EVENTS (IPEEE)

Table of Contents

Schedule

Status Report

- 5 PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF GENERIC ISSUE A-29, NUCLEAR POWER PLANT DESIGN FOR REDUCTION OF VULNERABILITY TO INDUSTRIAL SABOTAGE

Table of Contents

Schedule

Status Report

Memorandum to R. Fraley from R. Houston, Subject: Resolution of A-49, "Sabotage," dated June 26, 1989 with: Enclosure 1: Proposed Draft 6-13-89 Memorandum for V. Stello from E. Beckjord, RES, Subject: Resolution of Generic Safety Issue A-29, "Nuclear Power Plant Design for Reduction of Vulnerability to Industrial Sabotage" - (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY).

Enclosure 2: Draft NUREG-1267 (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY).

Memorandum for B. Morris, RES from F. Gillespie, NRR, Subject: Design for Resistance to Sabotage, dated January 23, 1989 (no enclosures).

- 7.1 LIST OF FUTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

- 7.2 FUTURE ACTIVITIES FOR THE 354TH ACRS MEETING, OCTOBER 5-7, 1989

Memorandum (Handout) for ACRS Members from R. Savio, Subject: Future ACRS Activities 354th ACRS Meeting, October 5-7, 1989.

- 8 SEABROOK: EMERGENCY PLANS FOR FULL OPERATING LICENSE

Slides used by the speaker during the presentation

Table of Contents

Schedule

Status Report with SSER and letter from J. Ebersole, ACRS to Chairman Palladino, Subject: ACRS Report on Low Power Operation of the Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2, dated April 19, 1983.

Working Copy of Minutes of ACRS Subcommittee on Seabrook Meeting of August 17, 1989 (INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY).

Consultant's Report - M. Bender



## Tab 8 (Continued):

## Intervenors Submittals

- o Letter from the Essex Board of Selectmen, received July 31, 1989 concerning unresolved reactor safety issues and requesting that the ACRS intervenor in their behalf
- o Letter from Leslie Greer, Office of the Attorney General, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts to Dr. W. Kerr, ACRS dated August 16, 1989, transmitting two enclosures that have been submitted to the ASLAB and ASLB reflecting their viewpoint on NHRERP and SPMC. (Three documents measuring about 3½" thick can be seen by contacting me).
- o Letter from Matthew Brock, Office of Attorney General, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, dated August 18, 1989, requesting time to make an oral presentation.
- o Letter from Diane Curran, New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution to Dr. W. Kerr, dated August 21, 1989, requesting time to make an oral presentation.
- o Letter from R. A. Backus, Seacoast Anti-Pollution League to F. Remick, dated August 23, 1989, requesting time to make an oral presentation.
- o Letter from Manchester Board of Selectmen, to ACRS, dated August 25, 1989 endorsing Essex Board of Selectman's letter.
- o Letter from Congressman N. Mavroules, MA to W. Kerr, ACRS, dated August 24, 1989, writing in support of the request from the Essex Board of Selectmen.
- o Letter from Patricia Pierce-Bjorklund, Essex, MA, to Judge J. W. Smith, ASLB, (dated August 11, 1989) rec'd in the ACRS August 26, 1989, submitting visual evidence companion to the letter from the Essex Board of Selectmen.

9 EPRI ALWR REQUIREMENTS

Slides used by the speaker during the presentation  
Table of Contents  
Schedule  
August 1, 1989 Commission Briefing Slides on EPRI Design Requirements Document for Advanced Light Water Reactors.

10 NUCLEAR MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES COUNCIL (NUMARC) ACTIVITIES

Slides used by the speaker during the presentation  
Memorandum to ACRS Members from E. Igne, ACRS Staff,  
Subject: NUMARC Activities at the 353rd ACRS Meeting:  
IPEEE and Accident Management Programs.  
Letter to E. Igne from David Modeen, NUMARC, without attachments, regarding NUMARC's presentation before ACRS on September 8, 1989.

HANDOUTS

4 INDIVIDUAL PLANT EXAMINATION FOR EXTERNAL EVENTS

Excerpt (pp. 18, 19, cover) of NUREG-1070, "NRC Policy on Future Reactor Designs."

6 PROPOSED PUBLICATION OF EPA DRAFT MANUAL OF PROTECTIVE ACTION GUIDES (PAGs)

DRAFT SECY-89-253, same subject - INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY.

8.1 SEABROOK STATION REVIEW

Letter from M. Bender, ACRS Consultant, to E. Igne, ACRS, dated August 24, 1989, submitting a report of his talk in 1979 entitled, "Depending on the Grace of God is no way to Protect the Health and Safety of the Public."

Memo from D. Drum, M.D., ACRS Consultant, received September 1, 1989, regarding comments on the Seabrook Emergency plans.

Letter from T. Kevern, ACRS Consultant, to E. Igne, ACRS, on report on Seabrook Emergency Preparedness Issues.

8.2 SEABROOK REVIEW - Meeting with NRC Staff Representatives

Memorandum to E. Igne, ACRS, from Richard H. Wessman, Dir, Project Directorate I-3, Div. of Reactor Projects, NRR, Subject: Responses to ACRS Subcommittee Questions on Seabrook, dated September 6, 1989.

8.3 SEABROOK

R. Fraley memorandum to ACRS Members, dated September 7, 1989, Subject: Seabrook Nuclear Station Emergency Planning, transmitting Comments Provided by Diane Curran on behalf of the New England Coalition for the Committee's consideration; transmitted as Part 1 and Part 2, each part consisting of about 2-1/2 inches documents.

12.1 MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 29-30, 1989 REGIONAL PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE

WORKING COPY OF SUBJECT MINUTES-INTERNAL COMMITTEE USE ONLY.

\*