

CERTIFIED

ACRS - 2316
PDR 080585

CERTIFIED COPY
ISSUED: MAY 21, 1985

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE ACRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON
THE LONG RANGE PLAN FOR NRC
MAY 16, 1985
WASHINGTON, DC

A meeting was held by the ACRS Subcommittee on the Long Range Plan for NRC on May 16, 1985 in Washington, D.C. The purpose of this meeting was to continue discussions on developing a Long Range Plan for the NRC. Topics under discussion were primarily technical issues related to the regulation of nuclear power plant safety and safety regulation over the next five to ten years. The majority of the meeting consisted of discussions with Dr. John Ahearne, Vice President, Resources for the Future (RFF); Mr. Carl Giesler, Vice President-Power Production, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation (WPSC); Mr. James Knight, Acting Director, Division of Engineering, NRR; and Mr. John West, Vice President (retired), Combustion Engineering (CE). Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, May 1, 1985 (Attachment A). A meeting schedule is Attachment B. The entire meeting was open to the public. Richard Major was the assigned staff member for this meeting.

Participants

ACRS

M. Carbon, Chairman
D. Moeller, Member
F. Remick, Member
C. Wylie, Member
R. Major, Staff

Speakers

J. Ahearne, RFF
C. Giesler, WPSC
J. West, CE
J. Knight, NRR

Discussion With: John Ahearne, Vice President, Resources for the Future

Dr. Ahearne suggested that a long range plan must go beyond technical issues. It would be necessary to try to predict the future, honestly and objectively, prior to formulating a long range plan. Items such as power requirements and availability of power sources other than nuclear should be considered. Issues such as a separation of power generation companies from power distribution companies could be addressed. A long range plan for a regulatory agency could encourage new plant designs,

8508090239 850521
PDR ACRS
2316

PDR

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By

Bkr

but should not attempt to design them. He felt the Committee should have input to the formulation of a long range plan but should not be the group to actually write it. A long range plan, it was felt, would lose strength if it were a consensus document.

Dr. Ahearne felt that the U.S. energy supply was fairly diversified at present, that environmental issues will have an impact on the economics of various forms of power generation, and that, in the final analysis, the economics of power production will govern this country's choices.

In the future the NRC may be faced with reviewing a nuclear power plant of foreign design for operation in the U.S. He felt NRC should maintain the capability to accept such designs and review them efficiently.

One item Dr. Ahearne thought to be worthwhile is a review of the agency's regulations to see if they could be streamlined, consolidated, and, in some cases, discarded. A more coherent whole is needed. The NRC must face the question of how safe is safe enough, and decide if all good ideas must be backfit. He noted the United Kingdom (UK) performs a less detailed review than the U.S. The UK issues a certificate similar to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and then leaves the design alone. Once an acceptable level of risk is met, backfitting is not required.

Regarding quality assurance, Dr. Ahearne felt that what was really needed was tough standards. He feels current quality assurance problems are due in part to NRC not being tough enough.

In setting a safety goal it was suggested that NRC must set the standard and then have Congress endorse it. A level picked by Congress should be made in comparison to other risks taken by society as a whole. Such a process was estimated as taking four to five years.

In discussing research it was suggested that it be more focused on NRC's regulations. Research should attempt to quantify whether or not a regulation is too conservative or not conservative enough. The focus of the research in reviewing rules would depend on the areas thought to be important in the long range plan. The scenario picked for the future in the long range plan would guide the priorities of the research effort.

On the area of standardization Dr. Ahearne thought that for standardization to really work what would be necessary is a complete plant. What he believed to be necessary was something similar to an airworthiness certificate issued by the FAA. Standard plants would be identically the same.

Dr. Ahearne thought the use of designated representatives in areas of design, manufacturing and construction would be a good idea. Certification points built into the system to close out portions of a project seemed appropriate.

Discussion With: Carl Giesler, Vice President-Power Production,
Wisconsin Public Service Corporation

Mr. Giesler felt that economics would make nuclear power important in the 1990's and early 2000's. He felt the cost of cleaning emissions from fossil plants will make the nuclear option more desirable.

Mr. Giesler explained that several conditions would be necessary prior to building another nuclear unit. The Price-Anderson Amendment would have to be extended. The enforcement policy should not be so punitive. Backfitting can not continue as it has. The licensing process must be revamped; some assurance is necessary for a company to believe they can bring a nuclear unit on line in a timely manner. He also felt the issues of high- and low-level wastes are a political issue that must be resolved.

The current backfit process is unworkable. He explained there are over a hundred changes scheduled to be made on WPSC single nuclear unit Kewaunee. This vast number of changes is felt to be counterproductive to safety. A true cost/benefit evaluation for every backfit must be made.

The morale of the operating crews was characterized as low. The requalification process requires operators to study and master many academic disciplines which are not relevant to plant operations. To keep up with the requalification challenge, operators spend 20-25% of their time in training.

Mr. Giesler thought it would be worthwhile for NRC managers to be rotated through a utility corporate structure. This would allow NRC managers to observe the situations that arise when constructing or operating a nuclear plant. He also felt that the NRC's senior resident inspectors should be more involved with licensing actions. The resident inspectors do have an appreciation of the physical plant.

Mr. Giesler mentioned that nuclear plant operators were paid a wage similar to fossil plant operators. However, at Wisconsin Public Service nuclear operators are starting to be paid a premium to reflect the additional effort associated with nuclear operations.

A one-step licensing process was characterized as a necessity. The hearing process was blamed for extreme delays that contributed little to safety.

In discussing the nuclear industry's approach to quality assurance, Mr. Giesler felt it was overdone. Minor errors are blown out of proportion. He felt a performance-based quality assurance program would help and felt the designated representative concept had merit.

The amount of unquantified conservatism applied to nuclear power plants needs to be put into perspective. Some sort of societal goals are necessary, so that resources spent on nuclear plant design conservatisms are not diverted from other areas of industrial safety, for example, the chemical or natural gas industries.

The plant operators at Wisconsin Public Service are high school graduates, qualified for the job of operator through testing. The best people are then promoted.

Mr. Giesler felt the area of plant security was receiving enough attention. He noted that plant security measures had stricter compliance requirements than safety related equipment. He was also concerned that security arrangements at plants might adversely affect operability.

In the future, Mr. Giesler expects utilities to build plants smaller than the current generation plants. Penalties imposed by public utility commissions on excess capacity will tend to encourage utilities to construct smaller units. He also said he would seriously consider buying a complete standard plant that includes balance of plant features.

Discussion With: John West, Vice President (Ret.), Combustion Engineering

Mr. West discussed the current effort by EPRI on standardization. He suggested the ACRS become more involved with this development effort especially at the outset. The effort was said to be a fresh look at light water power reactors, designed to take the best features from existing experience and produce a standard plant concept.

Some distinction between new plants and old plants needs to be made. Care must be taken in adding improvements to plants once they begin operation. Some more thought needs to be given to cost/benefit. Currently if an improvement makes a plant a little safer it is added.

Mr. West encouraged pursuing the source term. A foolproof containment that would always contain fission products would virtually eliminate offsite hazards. Emergency planning would then be unnecessary. The benefits to the public perception of nuclear power would be worth the added cost of such a containment.

Mr. West wondered about the sharing of industry's R&D dollars. If one vendor proves a concept, why should the NRC Staff require the next supplier to use the concept to prove it again?

Prior to any more nuclear plants being ordered, utility executives must have more confidence that schedules and costs can be predicted. Economics will drive the choice between nuclear and fossil plants, but Mr. West believes both will survive in the next fifteen years.

James Knight, Acting Director, Division of Engineering, NRR

Mr. Knight thought the agency should have a Long Range Plan. He noted that often available resources are used addressing the day-to-day situations that arise. He believed the agency should develop the internal energy to look ahead.

He felt that in some cases administrative issues have driven technical issues. In one instance he noted that the licensing process was so cumbersome it inhibited making changes. Approved designs are not improved or modified for fear of regulatory delays.

In the area of quality assurance Mr. Knight expressed some concerns. He was concerned that even at the current levels improper components are

installed and they are not found until a much later time. He was concerned that the current quality assurance system has increased costs, but felt quality had not risen in proportion to costs. He also wondered why good quality commercial grade material is not sufficient for nuclear plant use. He noted that the increased procedures and costs associated with producing nuclear grade material is driving vendors from the nuclear business.

Mr. Knight felt the long range plan effort would force a look at the current regulations and regulatory publication. A prioritization should be established to review these documents.

In the future, Mr. Knight felt, the Staff must learn to use the expertise that exists in industry rather than trying to duplicate it.

Closing Session

Dr. Carbon explained the next meeting of the Long Range Plan Subcommittee is scheduled for July 10, 1985. He will invite an additional group of guests with whom the Subcommittee will continue discussions.

* * * *

NOTE: A complete transcript of the meeting is on file at the NRC Public Document Room at 1717 H St., N.W., Washington, D.C. or can be obtained at cost from Ann Riley & Associates, 1625 I St., N.W., Suite 921, Washington, D.C. 20006, telephone (202) 293-3950.

supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's application for amendment dated April 9, 1985, the steam generator inspection interval report submitted March 19, 1985, and the NRC staff's safety evaluation dated February 7, 1984 which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C., and at the San Clemente Public Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92672.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 25th day of April 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
John A. Zwolinski,
Chief, Operating Reactors Branch No. 5,
Division of Licensing.
[FR Doc. 85-10576 Filed 4-30-85; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7550-01-01

Nuclear Regulatory Commission Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety; Subcommittee on Long Range Plan for NRC; Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Long Range Plan for NRC will hold a meeting on May 16, 1985, Room 1046, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for subject meeting shall be as follows:

Thursday, May 16, 1985—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will continue to develop a long range plan for the NRC. Topics to be discussed are technical and administrative issues related to the regulation of nuclear power plant safety and safety regulation over the next 5 to 10 years.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its

consultants, and Staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS staff member named below as far in advance as is practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

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

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

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, 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 therefor can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the cognizant ACRS staff member, Mr. Richard Major (telephone 202/634-1414) between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., EST. Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two days before the scheduled meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., which may have occurred.

Dated: April 25, 1985.

Morton W. Libarkin,

Assistant Executive Director for Project Review.

[FR Doc. 85-10575 Filed 4-30-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7550-01-01

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety; Subcommittee on Systematic Evaluation Program (San Onofre); Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Systematic Evaluation Program (San Onofre) will hold a meeting on May 15, 1985, Room 1046, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, May 15, 1985—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will review the Integrated Plant Safety Analysis Report (IPSAR) for San Onofre Unit 1.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept.

and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and Staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS staff member named below as far in advance as is practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

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

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

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, 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 therefor can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the cognizant ACRS staff member, Mr. Herman Alderman (telephone 202/634-1414) between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., EST. Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two days before the scheduled meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., which may have occurred.

Dated: April 25, 1985.

Morton W. Libarkin,

Assistant Executive Director for Project Review.

[FR Doc. 85-10574 Filed 4-30-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7550-01-01

POSTAL SERVICE

Privacy Act of 1974; Systems of Records

SUBJECT: Postal Service.

ACTION: Advance notice of new routine use to be added to an existing system of records, and final notice of the deletion of a temporary routine use.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this document is to provide information for public comment concerning the Postal Service's proposal to add a new routine use to system USPS 050.028, Finance Records—Payroll System, and to publish notice of the deletion of a temporary routine use to that system.

DATE: Any interested party may submit written comments on Part 2 of this notice regarding the proposed new routine use. Comments must be received on or before May 31, 1985. Part 1 became effective February 3, 1985.

ATTACHMENT A

PROPOSED SCHEDULE
ACRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLAN FOR NRC
MAY 16, 1985
WASHINGTON, DC

8:30 a.m.	1. Chairman's Introduction a. Objectives b. Discussion of schedule	10 min
8:40 a.m.	2. Discussion with: John Ahearne Vice President, Resources for the Future	2 hrs
10:40 a.m.	* * * B R E A K * * *	10 min
10:50 a.m.	3. Discussion with Carl Giesler, Vice President-Power Production, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	2 hr
12:50 p.m.	* * * L U N C H * * *	1 hr
1:50 p.m.	4. Discussion with: John West, Vice President (ret.), Combustion Engineering	2 hrs
3:50 p.m.	* * * B R E A K * * *	10 min
4:00 p.m.	5. Discussion with James Knight, Acting Director, Division of Engineering, NRR	2 hrs
6:00 p.m.	ADJOURN	