

299-3  
0 235

# Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : G. W. Morgan, Chief, State and Interagency  
Branch, Division of Licensing and Regulation  
AEC Headquarters

FROM : J. R. Horan, Director, Division of  
Health and Safety, Idaho Operations *JRH*  
Office

SUBJECT: CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR PLANT SITE PROBLEMS

SYMBOL : HSPHS:RDC

DATE: MAR 6 1959

IDO and the U. S. Public Health Service are jointly sponsoring a Conference on Nuclear Plant Site Problems for representatives from about 25 states, USPHS and AEC. This meeting is to be unclassified and will be held in Idaho Falls, Idaho the week of May 4.

The session of Friday morning May 8, will cover part of the field of AEC-State relations. We have set aside thirty minutes of this session for a discussion of the program of your Branch. Will you please advise us as soon as possible whether you will be able to appear at this session.

A tentative agenda is enclosed for your reference. This agenda is not final inasmuch as it represents hoped-for speakers, not confirmed speakers.

You are cordially invited to attend as much of the conference as your time permits.

Enclosure:  
Agenda

*A/5/1-2*

**ACTION**

*(Handwritten initials)*

*Metcalf was  
consulted  
(J)*

Memo

TO: Horan

FR: Morgan

Subj: CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR PLANT SITE PROBLEMS

This is to acknowledge your memorandum of March 6, 1959, subject as above, inviting me to participate in a conference of which a tentative agenda was attached. The subject matter covered by the agenda is obviously of considerable importance, and it is presently receiving detailed attention in this Division by the Reactor Hazards Evaluation Branch, in discussions with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards and on a consulting basis with the Divisions of Reactor Development and Biology and Medicine.

In view also of detailed consideration at the General Manager and Commission level of the subject of Federal-State relationships in the nuclear energy field and the detailed preparations for hearings before the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on this subject scheduled for early May, questions arise as to how we should participate in this conference. As you are probably aware, the AEC is proposing changes in the Atomic Energy Act to clarify the relationships between the AEC and the states. These proposed modifications have recently been discussed with state representatives and a number of jurisdictional ~~questions~~ and policy questions arose which have not as yet been settled. These areas will be subject to detailed consideration at the JCAE hearings. In view of the fact that you indicate representatives from about 25 states and the Public Health Service will be attending this conference, we feel it is extremely important that they

(Continued)

*(Handwritten notes and signatures)*  
P 2 B 5 d  
X M Y S  
X O S M  
T M T

Horan

AEC's position in this area be carefully described and understood and kept into perspective.

Consideration of the above factors raises a number of specific questions concerning the tentative agenda which are listed as follows:

(1) On Monday, May 4, on the panel of "Basis for Discharge", no AEC representative is listed. It seems to us that since the AEC obviously has the responsibility and an important interest in this area that this represents a serious omission.

(2) On the "Discharge Criteria Panel" on the same day, although there is an AEC representative listed, the person is not indicated. Would it not be important here to be sure that the over-all AEC position is noted?

(3) On Tuesday, May 5, it is noted that Bill Harris will describe New York Operations recommendations, apparently with regard to site surveys. Is this restricted to areas of direct interest to the New York Operations Office or are these to be generalized recommendations?

(4) In the all day work groups, scheduled for Wed., the subject of reactor hazards reports is one of primary concern to the AEC in connection with its working relationships with the ACRS. What is the objective of the work group on this subject?

(5) On Thursday, May 7, Bill Harris is to discuss "Position with Regard to Pre-Operational Surveys". Is this to be technical or administrative in character?

(6) On Friday, May 8, the Accident Problem and Emergency Assistance Program, as you know, has been the major responsibility of Dr. Beard in Biology and Medicine. If the general aspects of the emergency program are to be discussed, should not Dr. Beard be involved?

(Continued)

Horan

(7) Although it is assumed that the topics listed, which follow on the agenda, all relate to the accident and emergency problem it appears likely that the discussions will entail detailed phases of federal-state relationships.

This detailed reply to your memorandum and your kind invitation is not meant to be critical in any way, but is intended to raise some questions regarding the subject which I am sure we all agree is exceedingly important from the standpoint of a coordinated position of the Washington Headquarters and the Operations Offices.

In view of the expected wide participation of the states and the fact that the Commission's position on AEC-State Relations is being re-evaluated and that detailed hearings are planned on this subject by the JCAE, I should like to raise the question as to whether the meeting would not be much more fruitful if it were postponed until after the JCAE hearings. I, therefore, suggest that serious consideration be given to postponing the meeting until later on in the summer.