

**From:** E. William Brach  
**To:** MJV  
**Date:** Fri, Jul 28, 2000 1:42 PM  
**Subject:** SFPO Items of Interest for Friday 7/28

Marty, sorry for the delay in preparing this e-mail. I have been in meetings since the 8:00 this morning.

PFS Salt Lake City Meeting, 7/27: Susan Shankman called to inform us that approximately 200 people attended the public meeting last night to discuss the PFS DEIS and to receive public comments. The meeting lasted 5 ½ hours, it was originally scheduled from 7:00 - 10:00 pm. 60 people provided comments, including the Utah Governor, State House legislators, and a representative from the Slat Lake City Mayor's office (8 elected officials spoke). Almost all speakers were opposed to the planned PFS facility. Main objections included: (1) transportation risk including radiation risk from transportation accident and at site dose, (2) radiation dose model does not adequately address dose risk to women and children (my understanding is the model assumes a 70 kg male), (3) seismic concerns, and (4) wildfire concerns. The crowd was hostile, many complained that hotel security would not let them bring in signs, posters, and drums, all handbags were searched, the NIRS truck was not allowed on the hotel property. A large group from Nevada was there advocating concern that PFS was just a step in Yucca Mt approval. NRC agreed to another public meeting in Salt Lake City to receive additional comments on the PFS DEIS. Another meeting is planned for tonight from 7:00 to 10:00 in Grantsville, Utah (site near proposed PFS facility).

Meeting with NAC/Maine Yankee: SFPO met with Ed Davis, NAC and Mike Meisner, MY on 7/28 from 11:00 to about 1:00 to discuss review schedules for the NAC UMS amendment to support the Maine Yankee decommissioning. Staff discussed review schedules for two rulemaking paths, a proposed rule and a direct final rule. MY commented that with the exception of the direct final rule with no significant adverse comments, the schedules do not support their needs. MY asked about the time potentially required to consider an exemption request, SFPO stated that based on only one data point (ANO exemption for VSC-24 to load BPRAs), the approximate time would be 90 days, but noted that the ANO exemption was based on operational safety need for full core offload capability, while presumably the MY request would be based on decommissioning schedule/costs impacts. Staff plans to complete the draft SER/CoC for the NAC UMS MY amendment by 09/15/00. A proposed rule with public review/comment would be completed by 09/05/01. If a direct rule path is followed, a direct final rule with no comments would be completed by 03/28/01, or a direct final rule with significant adverse comments received and addressed by staff would be completed by 07/20/01.

Follow up items: NAC/MY requested a copy of the staff's internal schedule for the rulemakings, they questioned why NRC takes so long to get a rule through the review process (Brach advised he can not release the schedule but will respond with an answer to their request for the schedule). NAC/MY wanted to be apprized as soon as possible on the NRC decision to follow either the proposed rule or final rule path (Brach advised they will be notified as soon as a decision is made. Davis asked to be involved in the decision, Meisner stated he was under impression the decision was already made to use direct final rule). Davis asked the staff to consider a 30 day public comment period instead of the standard 75 day period (generally referred to as NAFTA requirement). Davis also asked that the 30 day delay in effectiveness of a final rule be changed to be effective immediately upon final approval. Meisner asked about

C/80

redress to address MY needs based on NRC's not providing/meeting his needs (Brach referred him to Kane's comments made at the NEI/EPRI workshop in response to his comments.).

**CC:** EJL, MWH, SFS