

CERTIFIED

PDR 8/6/93

MINUTES OF THE 47TH ACNW MEETING
OCTOBER 21, 1992

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

	<u>Page</u>
I. Chairman's Report (Open)	1
II. U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Activities at the Proposed High-Level Radioactive Waste Repository at Yucca Mountain (Open)	1
III. Seismic Investigations at the Proposed Yucca Mountain Site - Specific Information Regarding the Little Skull Mountain Earthquake of June 29, 1992 (Open)	7
IV. Working Group Chairman's Report on the Meeting on the Potential for Presence of Natural Resources at a High-Level Radioactive Waste Repository (Open)	10
V. Comments on the Proposed High-Level Radioactive. Waste Repository from Representatives of the State, Local Counties, and Indian Tribes (Open)	10
VI. Executive Session (Open)	16
A. Systems Analysis Approach to Reviewing the Overall High-Level Waste Program (Open)	16
B. ACNW Future Activities (Open)	16
C. Future Meeting Agenda (Open)	17

- APPENDICES -

- I. Federal Register Notice
- II. Meeting Schedule and Outline
- III. Meeting Attendees
- IV. Future Agenda and Working Group Activities
- V. List of Documents Provided to the Committee

Q & A - 7 (ACNW)

FOB
11

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By EMB

CERTIFIED

Issued: November 18, 1992

MINUTES OF THE 47TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
OCTOBER 21, 1992
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

The 47th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste was held Wednesday, October 21, 1992, in the Conference Center, St. Tropez Hotel, 455 East Harmon Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate actions on the items listed in the attached agenda.

A transcript of selected portions of the meeting was kept and is available in the NRC Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. [Copies of the transcript taken at this meeting may be purchased from Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd., 1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006.]

Dr. Dade W. Moeller, Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. and briefly reviewed the schedule for the meeting. He stated that the meeting was being conducted in conformance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. He stated that the Committee had received neither written comments nor requests from members of the public for time to make oral statements. However, he invited members of the public, who were present and had something to contribute, to let the ACNW staff know so that time could be allocated for them to make oral statements.

ACNW members, Drs. William J. Hinze, Paul W. Pomeroy, and Martin J. Steindler, were present. ACNW consultants, Drs. George Thompson, Kenneth Foland, and Jack Corbett, were also present. [For a list of attendees, see Appendix III.]

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Open)

[Note: Mr. Richard K. Major was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. Moeller introduced the members of the Committee and the consultants, then provided a brief history of the Committee's activities since its inception.

II. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE) ACTIVITIES AT THE PROPOSED HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE REPOSITORY AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN (Open)

[Note: Mr. Giorgio N. Gnugnoli was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Mr. Carl Gertz, Project Manager of the U.S. Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Project Office (YMPO), addressed a number of topics

relating to the status, progress and future strategy of the Yucca Mountain proposed high-level radioactive waste (HLW) repository. Mr. Gertz indicated that the focus of the HLW site characterization effort in FY 1992 was twofold:

1. Optimizing site geologic investigations
2. Design of the initial exploratory studies facility (ESF) surface facilities (pad, portal, and starter tunnel)

Mr. Gertz highlighted a public information and education effort (Outreach), whose flagship is the on-site tours conducted by DOE and its contractors. He stressed the positive and convincing nature of this process toward achieving the ultimate goal of licensing a facility.

Mr. Gertz indicated that DOE would continue the extensive field work and focus on construction of the ESF. Tunnel boring machines (TBM) are on order for drilling the ESF. It is expected that construction of the pads, portal and launch chamber will begin in FY 1993.

He briefly discussed the various governmental agencies - local, State and Federal - that interact with the Yucca Mountain Project Office and described their roles and responsibilities. In describing the DOE's efforts, he characterized all aspects of the HLW program (permitting, drilling, field work, etc.) to be proceeding satisfactorily, except for the required funding.

After the above introduction, Mr. Gertz directed his remarks to the FY 1992 accomplishments in some detail, including:

- The LM-300 drill rig is in place and producing core samples to the depth of approximately 800 feet (244m). This dry drilling technology was developed specifically for the Yucca Mountain site characterization effort.
- Neutron boreholes, test pits, trenches and environmental monitoring wells have been excavated or drilled. Studies have begun in areas of volcanism, soil/rock properties and infiltration.
- The first Total Systems Performance Assessment has been issued.
- The Early Site Suitability Evaluation Report has been issued. The report supported continuation of site characterization at Yucca Mountain.

- Preparation of the skeletal outline for a license application has been completed.

Mr. Gertz pointed out that the funding limitations have impacted the extent of FY 1992 accomplishments, such as waste package, near-field and source term characterization.

Mr. Gertz indicated that the outreach program, especially the site tours, has had a positive effect. He noted that the most effective aspect of the tour was the opportunity for visitors to speak directly to the scientists and engineers who are working on the site.

Mr. Gertz indicated that one major challenge has come from the U.S. Congress regarding the overall program costs. The DOE established an independent cost estimate (ICE) tracking system and has attempted to focus on the setting of priorities for testing.

Dr. Hinze asked whether the major change (e.g., changing the ESF from vertical to a ramp excavation) and the testing prioritization would affect important testing of the overlaying vadose zones. Mr. Gertz indicated that test alcoves are planned for each significant stratigraphic layer as the ESF is constructed. Mr. Gertz also indicated that the study plans would be modified to incorporate such program changes, as well as to include new tests.

Mr. Gertz proceeded to break down the unescalated cost estimates for the Yucca Mountain site characterization. The total \$6.3 billion estimated cost includes 20 years of activity through FY 2002. Actual costs through FY 1992 were about \$1.3 billion. Payments to the State of Nevada, from FY 1993 through FY 2002 are estimated to be \$800 million. The unescalated cost to complete the "project" activities is about \$3.6 billion. These project activities include surface-based activities, construction of and testing in the ESF, and waste-package and repository-design activities.

The ICE team found the cost projections reasonable for the currently planned work. They believe that a license application in 2001 is achievable, if adequate funding is received in the out years. They also suggested that the HLW program could be more success oriented, if taken "off budget" to reduce the uncertainty of the appropriation process.

Mr. Gertz briefly discussed the DOE Yucca Mountain Project Office work breakdown/accounting structure. The structure is subdivided into major areas, e.g., systems engineering, waste package repository, and the ESF. Mr. Gertz concentrated on site investigations, as an illustration. He showed diagrams of the interaction

and relationships among the eight major participants (TRW, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), etc.) and 44 minor participants.

Mr. Gertz next moved on to FY 1993 planned activities. The activities for major focus include:

1. ESF-related activities (e.g., construct starter tunnel into Exile Hill)
 - Issue an RFP and award contract for the TBMs
 - Upgrade power supply for excavation activities.

Mr. Gertz pointed out that the excavated rubble would need to be stored per the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) requirements because grease and oil could be present.

2. Site Investigations

- Complete borehole drilling to 1600 ft. (488 m) using LM-300 drill rig.
- Complete drilling and continue data collection for unsaturated zone infiltration configuration
- Complete and revise study plans and job packages for ESF tests in starter tunnel
- Continue hydrologic, meteorological, geochemical and seismic data collection
- Complete trenching program in Midway Valley and most of site Quaternary fault trenching program.

The discussion proceeded to the merits and feasibility between drill/blast techniques versus TBMs, mobile miners and smaller-scale boring equipment. Engineers are concerned that drill/blast techniques could cause fracturing of the surrounding media that could deleteriously affect characterization and performance.

Mr. Gertz reported on the Geophysics Integration Initiative. The need for this integration is dictated by the diverse and widespread use of geophysics throughout the program. This will be an iterative process to centralize the control of geophysical activities and to set priorities and sequencing. He speculated that this process may lead to reduction of the number of holes to drill. Dr. Hinze suggested continuation of the reliance on ground penetrating radose (GPR) to maximize the information from the trenching program.

In response to Dr. Steindler's question regarding the degree of involvement of the NRC staff in DOE's decisionmaking regarding the setting of priorities and the excavation/trenching strategies, Mr. Gertz indicated that the NRC staff is being provided with the study plans, as well as with the opportunity to participate in DOE's design reviews.

Mr. Gertz summed up the site investigation portion of his presentation by noting that all of the program scientific activities are codified in the study plans, but not all design activities are addressed in the study plans. This is designed to provide more flexibility in the field.

3. Regulatory

Mr. Gertz recounted the various activities falling under this category that would include interactions with the ACNW, the preparation of the early site suitability evaluation reports and peer reviews. One of the activities he highlighted was the accelerated seismic initiative. There was interest in this subject at this meeting because of the June 1992 earthquake near the Little Skull Mountain (20 km. from the proposed Yucca Mountain site). He expects to have a seismic design basis for the repository by 1996. Mr. Richard Quittmeyer, management and operation (M&O) contractor, indicated that broader methodologies will be considered for this initiative beyond those discussed in the Site Characterization Plan.

Other regulatory activities discussed by Mr. Gertz included:

- Revision of the YMPO Compliance Plan
- Revision of the ESF and Surface Base Testing (SBT) study plan
- Total System Performance Assessment (TSPA) - Problem definition

Mr. Gertz displayed the status of 39 SBT study plans, of which 22 have been transmitted to NRC. Of these, NRC has accepted 20 study plans and is currently reviewing two. Also, he discussed the status of the ESF study plans. Two have been accepted by NRC, and seven have been deferred by NRC and are being revised. Of these seven plans, three must be approved prior to initiating ESF construction. Although the incomplete status of the study plans (especially the modeling/synthesis studies) does affect the progress of the performance assessment effort, Dr. Jerry Boak, DOE/YMPO, pointed out that the study plans are primarily focused on individual site characterization. As a result, there is a certain amount of

progress achievable in the performance assessment sector, despite delays in the site characterization data acquisition sector. Where there are credibility problems because of the inadequacies in the site characterization models, consecutive assumptions are used on an interim basis.

4. Waste Package

Mr. Gertz indicated that despite the low funding level, waste package study activities will continue to increase (e.g., laboratory large-block tests). Dr. Hinze speculated on the value of ESF construction without sufficient information on the waste package configuration. Mr. Gertz indicated that the ESF would be designed so as not to preclude options in waste package design, as well as in other pertinent aspects of the repository design, e.g., study heat loading in the ESF drifts.

Mr. Gertz described other activities, such as test facilities, program management, financial assistance to the State of Nevada and affected counties and Indian Nations, quality assurance and information management. He summarized by acknowledging the need to focus on issue resolution, to amass the full impact of the new energy legislation, to continue progress in permit acquisition and to converge the data acquisition/interpretation to a point of suitability determination. With this, Mr. Gertz ended his formal presentation.

In response to Dr. Pomeroy's inquiry regarding availability of intermediate products within the geophysics integration initiative, Mr. Mark Tynan, DOE/YMPO, indicated that this initiative was still in the planning stage. Mr. Gertz indicated that scoping and/or planning documents may be available and would be forwarded. In response to Dr. Hinze's follow-up question, Mr. Gertz described the twofold responsibility of the M&O: 1) The M&O provides technical direction; e.g., they design the repository and the waste package; 2) they provide integration for all DOE contractors with regard to the standing governmental policies; e.g., the M&O coordinates the study plan reviews.

Dr. George Thompson, ACNW Consultant, had the following observations on Mr. Gertz's site characterization status briefing:

- Some specific problems were not addressed, e.g., the large hydraulic gradient north of Yucca Mountain and the spring deposit at the south end of Yucca Flats indicates a water level anomaly.
- An inconsistency appears to be present regarding the quality of seismic data. The reflection data south of Yucca Mountain

and the Amargosa Desert was excellent. However, it has been stated that past seismic profilings were not adequate.

Mr. Gertz stated that funding priorities have caused program delays in the investigation of the hydraulic gradient until FY 1994, when the third drill hole is scheduled. Dr. Thompson thought that a shallow drill hole at the south end of Crater Flat could provide further insight into the hydraulic gradient question. Mr. Gertz indicated that he would get back to the Committee on this question.

A member of the public raised a question regarding the level of radioactive contamination at the Nuclear Test Site and the possible exposure to members of the public taking part in the YMPO site tours. He specifically questioned whether the area had been adequately characterized for radiation levels and exposures as a result of underground nuclear testing.

Mr. Carl Johnson, State of Nevada, asked Mr. Gertz about the originally planned DOE schedule for the seismic investigation program prior to its "acceleration." Mr. Gertz indicated that he was not sure about the schedule. Then, Mr. Johnson asked whether this seismic initiative would include additional studies such as stream measurements. Mr. Gertz indicated that this was being considered.

Dr. Steindler asked a question on priorities, specifically regarding delay of important or key hydrologic investigations into 1994, especially since that information is crucial to site suitability as well as performance assessment. Again, Mr. Gertz pointed out that funding limitations have dictated some program compromises. The highest priority is to get underground. The ESF will take precedence over a second concurrent drill rig investigation.

III. SEISMIC INVESTIGATIONS AT THE PROPOSED YUCCA MOUNTAIN SITE - SPECIFIC INFORMATION REGARDING THE LITTLE SKULL MOUNTAIN EARTHQUAKE OF JUNE 29, 1992

[Note: Mr. Giorgio N. Gnugnoli was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. James Brune, University of Nevada at Reno, began his presentation by noting that a relatively strong aftershock sequence is continuing at Little Skull Mountain, thereby providing significant seismically useful data. This is especially helpful since critical field equipment was being transferred from Denver to Reno during the initial event. Dr. Brune raised the suggestion that has been made that the Landers earthquake triggered the Little Skull Mountain (LSM) earthquake. Dr. Brune suggests this contention

specifically with respect to the relative timing. Following the Landers earthquake, the seismic activity throughout the southwest increased significantly. Looking at cumulative seismic moments plots, the Rock Creek fault region is still registering micro-earthquakes and the LSM earthquake was one day later than the Landers quake. It should be noted that the Landers earthquake was in southern California approximately 240 km. from LSM. The shaking from the surface waves from the Landers earthquake caused the LSM earthquake.

In response to Dr. Hinze's inquiry, Dr. Brune indicated that direction was also a factor, since the Landers earthquake ruptured south to north. Dr. Brune described the monitoring network around the LSM, noting that the past pattern of micro-earthquake activity was very small - most magnitudes of 1 and 2, some 3s (before the June 1992 seismic activity). Dr. Brune pointed out the relatively "quiet" area around the Yucca Mountain repository, noting that the micro-earthquake net did not record any rise in micro-earthquakes there. He concluded that the Yucca Mountain area faults are relatively stable. In fact, he ventured to say that most of the earthquakes (even micro-earthquakes) described as being "near" Yucca Mountain were 50 km. away.

Dr. Brune presented several slides that shows the distribution of various magnitude seismic events throughout Nevada and noted that some of these events were underground nuclear tests. He indicated that the upgrading of the National Seismic Detection System has allowed scientists to make the following conclusions with regard to the LSM earthquake:

- The fault planes of the LSM earthquake consist of a normal fault with a plane either dipping to the southeast or to the northwest.
- The depth of the normal fault is about 10-20 km.
- The LSM earthquake was of moderate size and normal quality, but the strain pattern indicates complex faulting associated with it.
- The aftershock patterns indicate normal faulting, but no surface faulting has yet been associated with the event.

Surface observations of rock falls provided additional evidence that the fault systems at Yucca Mountain were more stable than at LSM site. Dr. Brune pointed out that there are a significant number of precariously balanced rocks on Yucca Mountain that did not fall; especially a goodly number which would be expected to tumble with peak accelerations of about 0.1 g. There were a number of rock falls around LSM.

Dr. Brune also presented data from digital recordings. He showed that the amplitudes of seismic events are doubled at the surface. Such information was obtained by making recordings in tunnels and the surface above. The rigidity of the rocks at the surface can amplify this discrepancy. Spectra ratios confirm this effect.

Dr. Brune indicated that high strain on low-frequency events causes a greater seismic effect than a high-frequency pulse, as you would expect from underground nuclear testing; long-term strain causes the largest changes, such as changes in the water table. However, Dr. Brune cautioned that the correlation between surface rupture and the moment expected from a large magnitude earthquake does not always add up. The presence of slip is not reflected on the surface, especially with 5 to 6 M. earthquakes.

When asked to speculate what would have been learned if adequate instrumentation had been in place and operating (e.g., strong motion instruments), Dr. Brune indicated that questions about directivity would have been answered. He indicated that, as part of the accelerated seismic initiative, he proposes use of a laser strain reader system to detect slips and rock motion triggered by nearby fault strain. This could be used to determine strain buildup, once a baseline is established.

Dr. Brune catalogued the kind of future effort that will be necessary, including:

1. Upgrade the microwave connection.
2. Set up side-effects studies.
3. Make the six digital broadband stations operational.
4. Convert from analog to digital stations.

In response to a question on the implications of the LSM quake on the suitability determination at Yucca Mountain, Dr. Brune indicated that our ability to adequately characterize the tectonic impacts of an earthquake, such as the LSM quake, on the surrounding environment would directly relate to our ability to design the repository to withstand the appropriately characterized seismic events.

In terms of any correlation between the earthquake at depth and any surface fault, it can be speculated that there is a detachment fault which causes disassociation. He also indicated that listric faults could move by creep slips without causing an earthquake.

IV. WORKING GROUP CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ON THE MEETING ON THE POTENTIAL FOR PRESENCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES AT A HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE REPOSITORY (Open)

[NOTE: Mr. Howard J. Larson was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. Hinze summarized the Working Group meeting held the previous day, October 20, 1992, noting that the applicable regulations require an evaluation of real and perceived resources at a proposed site. While this meeting focused primarily on the potential of and methodology for determining the value of mineral and petroleum resources, it is intended that a future working group meeting will address geothermal and groundwater resources.

He noted that the 13 invited speakers presented a broad spectrum of views. It was recognized that while more data are needed, and will be acquired, the need for applying expert judgment will remain. Consultants and members present at the Working Group meeting also presented their views, with many echoing the thought that expert judgment will need to be applied but its value will be limited if brought into the proposed site determinations at a late date. Dr. Steindler noted that the potential implications of the recently passed Energy Policy Act should not be overlooked.

Dr. Hinze noted that the recently issued report, "Natural Resources Regulatory Requirements Background and Consideration of Compliance Methodologies," prepared by the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses (CNWRA), will be important to any guidance that ACNW might provide to the Commission. Dr. Hinze recommended that a letter report to the Commission may be premature now, however, the Working Group should continue to review other related issues. Dr. Steindler observed that the studies that are to be undertaken by the National Academy of Sciences, as a result of the recent passage of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, also could have important implications to this subject.

Dr. Hinze recommended that the Committee consider scheduling working group meetings to evaluate water resources and geothermal resources at the proposed high-level waste repository site. The Committee agreed to consider this suggestion. No other action was taken by the Committee.

V. COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE REPOSITORY FROM REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE, LOCAL COUNTIES, AND INDIAN TRIBES (Open)

[Note: Mr. Howard J. Larson was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. Moeller noted that this session will provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on issues they perceive as relevant. All parties designated as "affected" were notified of this session, as well as those participating in the State-County Planning Committee (which includes the Moapa Band of Paiutes and the Western Shoshone Indians).

Senator Thomas Hickey, Chairman of the State of Nevada's Legislative Commission's Committee on High-Level Radioactive Waste, expressed his pleasure that the Committee was meeting in Nevada. After providing a brief background of his Committee's evolution and purpose, he stated his belief that it is important for all agencies involved with the proposed Yucca Mountain site to maintain as much physical presence in Nevada as possible. He noted that lack of communication is a key issue and referred to the recent transportation accident involving light water reactor fuel in Massachusetts. He stated that he was concerned about the fracturing of responsibilities in such accidents (possible involvement of DOE, Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Department of Transportation, NRC and the State of Nevada). The use of overweight casks (both truck and rail) was an issue that he believed should be resolved early in the process. Dr. Steindler noted that the accident in Massachusetts did not involve irradiated fuel and that one significant problem determined from an analysis of that accident was the failure of the licensee to maintain the required 24 hour response/surveillance capability.

The next speaker was Mr. Carl Johnson, Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects. After noting that the State "does not feel bound by any of the federal regulatory staff positions and can and will interpret the regulations as we see fit based on whatever past legal precedents," his principal points are summarized as follows:

1. 10 CFR 100, Part A - It is the State's position that this regulation is "universally applicable to the characterization of any proposed nuclear facility site." However, the results of geologic investigations should not be applied equally to all types of nuclear facilities, as the issue of designing to accommodate displacement for surface waste handling facilities is different from designing for fault displacement within the repository during the post closure period.
2. 10 CFR 960 and DOE Order 6430.1A - Nevada continues to disagree with the DOE on deciding when sufficient data will be available from site activities to evaluate site suitability. It is suggested that perhaps the NRC early site suitability procedures could be used. The State "feels that the real challenge is for the DOE to come up with a convincing plan for acquiring the neces-

sary needed physical data to provide answers to the questions before proceeding."

3. Site Characterization Plan (SCP) - December, 1988 - Nevada believes that there are a number of key study plans that are yet to be released. Further, those that have been released tend to ignore State comments. Mr. Johnson suspects that a similar situation exists between the DOE and the NRC, insofar as comment resolution.
4. Near Field Faults - Based upon recent information on the Solitario Canyon and Ghost Dance faults, the State believes that it is premature to proceed with the ESF. Mr. Johnson elaborated, in some detail, upon aspects of both fault zones. The State believes that it will be difficult for DOE to demonstrate with "reasonable assurance" that the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain should be the first exception to the current U. S. situation "that no nuclear facility in the U. S. has ever been licensed for construction that was known to have active faults running through or close to Category I structures."
5. DOE Seismic Hazards Action Plan - Nevada had several comments, observations and recommendations on this plan, such as: believing the schedule cannot be met; that 14 out of the 24 studies have not been issued in any form or are not very far through the review process; the State's confidence in the future direction of the program is not buoyed by the proposal to form a team of experts, including USGS personnel who, although they had participated earlier, had overlooked the licensing significance of much of the data that were available at the time, etc.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Johnson noted that the DOE must recognize and accept that the State does and will play a significant independent role in the regulatory process, and that the State believes that the principal issue of site suitability could be resolved now using the data that are available. Furthermore, nothing can be gained by going underground "except for the unnecessary expenditure of substantial time and funds."

Dr. Hinze queried whether there were activities underway at Yucca Mountain that were not covered by study plans. He was told that DOE had activities underway under certain study plans that still have unresolved issues, both from the NRC and the State point of view.

Mr. Calvin Meyers, Moapa Band of Paiutes, addressed the Committee. He noted that the Paiutes were not considered an affected party, since the U. S. does not have a treaty with them as such. He noted that, since much of their lands had been taken away, some questioned why they do not participate more actively in hearings. He replied that monetary difficulties restrict their ability to participate and that most tribes barely have enough funds to govern themselves. In response to a question from Dr. Moeller, Mr. Meyers noted that his tribe had occupied or lived on this land for a length of time that "goes back until you can stop counting."

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Acting Repository Program Manager from Nye County, was the next presenter. He was accompanied by Dr. Marty Mifflin and Mr. Malachy Murphy. He noted that Nye County is the site of the repository and therefore shares some of the same concerns as the Paiutes. He provided an overview of the county's nuclear waste repository oversight program, summarized their policy views, presented some technical issues of interest and discussed the licensee's regulatory strategy.

He noted that, although the County covers some 18,000 square miles, with a population of 20,000 residents, approximately 93% of the area is owned by the Federal government. The repository program for the county started in 1983 and is currently funded at the rate of \$2.2 million/year. He discussed the county program, noting that its intent is to ensure the health and safety of the public, that natural resources are not degraded and that the adverse impacts are either avoided or, at a minimum, mitigated. He also noted that the County, unlike the State, has not taken a position for or against a repository, but is attempting to look after its own interests by closely monitoring the program, and participating in organizations such as the State-Local Planning Group. The County also coordinates with the state program where it is appropriate and effective, as well as within the county on programs such as those related to hydrologic issues.

In response to a question from Dr. Steindler, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner indicated that the Moapa Band of Paiutes, represented by Mr. Meyers, attend some meetings of the planning group when their funding permits. (Some funding is provided by the State to the Paiutes to facilitate their participation in the planning group.)

Until recently the Nye County participation was one of monitoring and being reactive, but with the commencement of their onsite technical representative program, their activities have now shifted to providing proactive technical oversight. This program will have a site suitability evaluation manager backed up by a multi-disciplinary science group focused on different technical areas. Various approaches to the conduct of technical studies were

discussed as was the relationship with DOE as it evolved by virtue of the various agreed-upon protocols.

Dr. Steindler questioned how the average person in the county was aware of the multiple Yucca Mountain related activities of the county, when most of those representing them at today's presentation were not residents. Mr. Eichner explained that he was the Acting Manager, that an active recruitment drive was underway, and that until local representation was garnered it would be his charter to spend several weeks each month in the area, both providing and seeking input to/from the local citizenry.

Mr. Johnson explained the history and evolution of the Nevada-affected party involvement in the high-level waste program, indicating that the State immediately recognized that there was a needed role for local governments. The State therefore entered into agreements with several of the counties and cities and provided funds for oversight. With the passage of Nuclear Waste Policy Act, local government participation was recognized and funding provided.

The next presenter was Mr. Dennis Bechtel, Coordinator of the Clark County Nuclear Waste Division. Mr. Bechtel has been working on this program since 1984. He noted that two-thirds of Nevada's residents live in Clark County and approximately 80% of the workers at the test site reside in Clark County. Using this as a lead into transportation concerns, Mr. Bechtel expressed his concern that there has not been a complete transportation assessment since 1986, even though there are few alternative routings in the area. The main part of the traffic (rail, river, highway) goes through the center of the community of Las Vegas. He also noted that repository-induced growth would expedite the concerns regarding the limits on the water supply. The county continues to work with the State on transportation, emergency planning, and management and socioeconomic issues.

The impact of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 was discussed. Mr. Bechtel noted that Clark County is concerned about the ability of the NRC to carry out its mandate within the context of this recently enacted legislation, believing that the Act is unfairly proscriptive in defining the role of the NRC and the setting of safety standards for the proposed repository. One specific item mentioned was the fact that the County did not want engineered barrier systems to be able to override the importance of the current multiple barrier approach.

Mr. Bechtel mentioned were the possible implications of the Act insofar as the charge to the National Academy of Sciences. Also mentioned were the implications of human intrusion, 10,000 years as the period of potential interest, the possibility of a climate

change, and the extent of mineral resources. The status of the Licensing Support System (LSS) was also raised. It was noted that County access to this or similar type/form of that system will be necessary.

The Director's forum, established recently by Dr. Bartlett, Director, OCRWM, was believed to be a useful device for exchanging information. It was suggested that this forum be institutionalized and become independent of Dr. Bartlett, should he leave the project in the future. Mr. Bechtel noted that the early site suitability evaluation document that was discussed at the Director's forum must have resulted in a very frustrating experience for Dr. Bartlett because many deficiencies in the process - and the document - were found.

At the conclusion of this formal presentation, Dr. Hinze asked about the need for and anticipated value of the LSS. Mr. Bechtel indicated he would, if it were available, use it now, and that it is an item of sufficient importance such that the counties and others probably need to be more insistent in expressing their desires.

Dr. Pomeroy asked about the outreach program and was informed that, within the funding constraints, DOE publishes a newsletter on Yucca Mountain activities and maintains an informal speakers bureau. Mr. Bechtel indicated that one of their missions in 1993 is to place increased emphasis on this program.

After a short recess, Dr. Jeremy Boak, DOE, requested time to discuss some points made by the preceding speakers. He particularly indicated that he wanted to respond to the accusation that the site was unlicensable, a position contradictory to the recent statement of the Chairman of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, who stated that "he sees no reason to disqualify the site at present." Rather, he contended that the site could be disqualified any time someone concludes that the site cannot meet the requirements of the law. He also wanted to point out that DOE does not ignore the comments of the State of Nevada. It does consider their comments but recognizes that its responses may not be to the state's liking.

Dr. Boak clarified some earlier points made by others: all study plans will be in place before the ESF work begins; closure of the NRC open items is being actively pursued; the fault zone at the Ghost Dance fault is 400-600 feet wide, not 800 feet as alleged; a sincere attempt to keep an independent peer review process is being pursued intently; nuclear wastes in Nevada will travel over the same roads that are used for nuclear weapons transportation; and the health and safety of the public are the primary considerations of the DOE. He also suggested that the National Academy of Science

charge possesses considerable leeway and he encouraged participation in the Academy's open deliberative process.

Chairman Moeller thanked all presenters and adjourned the formal portion of the 47th meeting.

VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION (Open)

[Note: Mr. Richard K. Major was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

A. Systems Analysis Approach to Reviewing the Overall High-Level Waste Program (Open)

Dr. Martin J. Steindler led the discussion on the latest revisions to a draft paper that the Committee has been considering in response to a request from the Commission. (The draft under consideration at this meeting was dated October 18, 1992.)

After presenting how he had considered the comments provided by the other Members on the previous draft, and after further discussion on several items, Dr. Steindler requested that the Committee again provide him with any further suggestions or comments, that will then be factored, as applicable, into the next draft letter.

He noted that it is his intention to "run" the next draft by the Chairman to confirm that this effort by the Committee is responsive to the Chairman's request. Also, such feedback could be beneficial to the Committee as it completes the report.

The Committee intends to conclude this effort during its 47th Meeting in November.

B. ACNW Future Activities (Open)

- The ACNW members recommended that the Committee be briefed on the recent court decision related to expert judgment.
- The ACNW members recommended that Mr. Robert Bernero, NMSS, be invited to brief the Committee on the Energy Policy Act of 1992, H.R. 776.

C. Future Meeting Agenda (Open)

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the 48th ACNW Meeting, November 19-20, 1992, and future Working Group meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m., Wednesday, October 21, 1992.

ACTION: Notice of meeting

SUMMARY: The Advisory Committee on Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) will hold its next meeting on October 22 and 23, 1992. At this meeting, the NRC staff will provide the ACMUI with a medical issues document; status reports on a petition for rulemaking regarding the practice of radiopharmacy; resolution of petitions regarding patient release criteria; administration of byproduct material or radiation from byproduct material to women who are pregnant or breast feeding; abnormal occurrence criteria; and administrative issues concerned with ACMUI communication.

DATES: The meeting will begin at 8 a.m. on October 22 and 23, 1992. The entire meeting will be open to the public.

ADDRESSES: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry W. Camper, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, MS 6-H-3, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone 301-504-3417.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following information is provided concerning the topics to be discussed at the meeting:

Administrative Issues

The Commission has directed the ACMUI to review and possibly revise certain committee operating procedures regarding ACMUI communication with NRC staff and the Commission.

Medical Issues

The NRC staff has begun a reassessment of the medical use program. The staff has prepared an "issues" paper regarding certain program areas that should be reviewed to determine if changes would improve the medical use program. The paper contains many open-ended questions for which the staff is soliciting input. In addition, the staff is soliciting topics that are not addressed in the paper.

American College of Nuclear Physicians/Society of Nuclear Medicine (ACNP/SNM) Radiopharmaceutical Petition

On June 15, 1989, the ACNP/SNM filed a petition with NRC addressing five issues relating to the preparation and use of radiopharmaceuticals. On August 23, 1990, NRC published the Interim Final Rule addressing two issues in the petition. The remaining issues to be resolved are: The practice of nuclear pharmacy, including compounding; the

use of radiolabeled biologics; and the use of byproduct material for human research.

Patient Release Criteria

In response to three petitions for rulemaking, one from Carol S. Marcus, M.D. (February 6, 1991), and two from the American College of Nuclear Medicine (January 14, 1992, and April 21, 1992), regarding criteria for the release of patients administered byproduct material. The staff will review the issues and provide an approach to resolving these petitions.

Pregnancy and Breast-feeding

The staff will provide a brief status report on issues and recommendations concerning unintended radiation doses or dosages to an embryo, fetus, or nursing infant, resulting from administration of radiopharmaceuticals or radiation to pregnant or breast-feeding patients.

Abnormal Occurrence Criteria

The Quality Management Rule revised the criteria for medical use misadministrations. The staff will provide a brief status report on staff efforts to re-examine the existing criteria for selection of misadministration reports as abnormal occurrences.

Conduct of the Meeting

Barry Siegel, M.D. will chair the meeting. Dr. Siegel will conduct the meeting in a manner that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business. The following procedures apply to public participation in the meeting:

1. Persons who wish to provide a written statement should submit a reproducible copy to Larry W. Camper (address listed above). Comments must be received by October 13, 1992, to ensure consideration at the meeting. The transcript of the meeting will be kept open until October 28, 1992, for inclusion of written comments.

2. Persons who wish to make oral statements should inform Mr. Camper, in writing, by October 15, 1992. Statements must pertain to the topics at hand. The Chairman will rule on requests to make oral statements. Opportunity for members of the public to make oral statements will be based on the order in which requests are received. In general, oral statements should be limited to approximately 5 minutes. Oral statements must be supplemented by detailed written statements, for the record. Rulings on who may speak, the order of presentation, and time allotments may be obtained by calling Mr. Camper, 301-

504-3417, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. EST, on October 20, 1992.

3. At the meeting, questions from attendees other than committee members, NRC consultants, and NRC staff will be permitted at the discretion of the Chairman.

4. The transcript, minutes of the meeting, and written comments will be available for inspection, and copying for a fee, at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW, Lower Level, Washington, DC 20555, on or about November 2, 1992.

5. Seating for the public will be on a first-come, first-served basis.

This meeting will be held in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (primarily Section 161a); the Federal Advisory Act (5 U.S.C. App); and the Commission's regulations in title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, part 7.

Dated: October 1, 1992.

Joyce C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 92-24310 Filed 10-6-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7890-01-M

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 47th meeting on Wednesday, October 21, 1992, 8:30 a.m. until 6 p.m., at the St. Tropez Hotel, 455 East Harmon Avenue, Las Vegas, NV.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

A. Continue discussions of a supplemental request from Chairman Selin made on a systems-analysis approach to reviewing the overall high-level waste program.

B. Review comments on the proposed high-level waste repository from State, Local and Indian Tribes representatives.

C. Invite DOE to discuss work in progress, results and strategy for setting priorities at the proposed Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Repository Site.

D. Hear a briefing by DOE and its contractors on the Accelerated Seismic Initiative, and be provided information on the June 29, 1992, earthquake that occurred near the proposed Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Repository Site.

E. Hear a report from the Chairman of the ACNW Natural Resources Working Group on a meeting held on October 20, 1992.

F. Discuss administrative matters related to Committee activities and items that were not completed at previous meetings as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the Federal Register on June 6, 1988 (53 FR 20699). 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. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting may be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. The office of the ACRS is providing staff support for the ACNW. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Executive Director of the office of the ACRS as far in advance as practical so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the Executive Director of the office of the ACRS, Mr. Raymond F. Fraley (telephone 301/492-4516), prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule of ACNW 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 or call the recording (301/492-4600) for the current schedule if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

Dated: October 1, 1992.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 92-24311 Filed 10-6-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-70]

Renewal of Facility License No. TR-1; General Electric Co

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 16 to Facility License No. TR-1, issued to the General Electric Company (the Licensee), which renews the possession only license for the facility located on the Vallecitos Nuclear Center in Alameda County, California. The renewed license will expire on January 26, 2016.

The amended license complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended

(the Act), and the Commission's regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR chapter I. Those findings are set forth in the license amendment. Opportunity for hearing was afforded in the notice of proposed issuance of this renewal in the Federal Register on August 31, 1992, (57 FR 39408). No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following notice of the proposed action.

The Commission has prepared a related Safety Evaluation, for the renewal of Facility License No. TR-1 and has, based on that evaluation, concluded that the facility can continue to be maintained by the licensee without endangering the health and safety of the public.

The Commission also has prepared an Environmental Assessment which was published in the Federal Register on September 11, 1992, (57 FR 41792) for the renewal of Facility License No. TR-1 and has concluded that this action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see: (1) The application for amendment dated July 9, 1990, as supplemented on December 17, 1990, and August 7, 1992; (2) Amendment No. 16 to Facility License No. TR-1; (3) the related Safety Evaluation; and (4) the Environmental Assessment. These items are available for public inspections at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of September 1992.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors,

Decommissioning and Environmental Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV/V, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 92-24308 Filed 10-6-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Conversion to the Metric System

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Policy statement.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing its policy on metrication. This action is in response to the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, Executive Order 12770 of July 25, 1991, as well as concerns of certain NRC licensees and other interested parties. The policy, which affects the NRC's licensees and

applicants, is designed to allow them to respond to market forces in determining the extent and timing for their use of the metric system of measurement. The policy also affects the NRC in that the NRC will adhere to the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the General Services Administration (GSA) metrication program for its own purchases. The policy affirms that use of the metric system of measurement by Commission licensees is in accordance with protection of the public health and safety.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 7, 1992.

ADDRESSES: Documents referenced in this policy statement are available for inspection in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., (Lower level), Washington, DC between 7:45 am and 4:15 pm.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Frank A. Costanzi, Chairman, NRC Metrication Oversight Committee, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone: (301) 492-3760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 10, 1988, Congress passed the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act (the Act), (19 USC 2901 et seq.), which amended the Metric Conversion Act of 1975, (15 USC 205a et seq.). Section 5164 of the Act (15 USC 205a) designates the metric system as the preferred system of weights and measures for United States trade and commerce. The Act also requires that all Federal agencies convert to the metric system of measurement in their procurements, grants, and other business-related activities by the end of fiscal year (FY), 1992, "except to the extent that such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms, such as when foreign competitors are producing competing products in non-metric units," (section 5164(b)(2)).

Summary of Public Comments

In response to the Act, the NRC published a metrication policy statement for comment in the Federal Register on February 10, 1992 (57 FR 4891). As a result, comments were provided by twelve responders, including five power reactor licensees, three standards organizations, one comment each from a reactor vendor, a materials licensee, the Nuclear Management and Resources Council (NUMARC), and a joint letter submitted by three individuals. All commenters supported the policy. However, the materials licensee strongly



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

October 7, 1992

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
47TH ACNW MEETING
OCTOBER 21, 1992
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

Wednesday, October 21, 1992, St. Tropez Hotel, 455 East Harmon Avenue, Las Vegas, NV, Monte Carlo Room

- 1) 8:30-8:45 a.m. Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman (Open)
 1.1) Opening Remarks (DWM/RKM)
 1.2) Items of Current Interest (DWM/RKM)
- 2) 8:45-10:00³⁰ a.m. Discussion of Activities at the Proposed High-Level Waste Repository at Yucca Mountain (Open)
 (WJH/LGD/GNG)
 2.1) Carl Gertz et al., DOE, to discuss Site Characterization Activities Underway
 2.2) Results of Site Characterization to date
 2.3) Strategy for future activities
 2.4) Additional Discussion
- 10:00³⁰-10:15⁵⁰ a.m. BREAK
- 3) 10:15⁵⁰-11:15⁵⁵ a.m. Discussion by DOE of Seismic Investigations at the Proposed Yucca Mountain Site (Open)
 (PWP/LGD/GNG)
 3.1) Information available on the June 29, 1992 Little Skull Earthquake - Jim Brune, University of Nevada, Reno
 3.2) Discussion of the Accelerated Seismic Initiative
 3.3) Discussion of Geophysics Integration Initiative
 3.4) Additional Discussion
- 11:15⁵⁵-11:45^{12:25} p.m. Working Group Chairman's Report on the October 20, 1992 ACNW Working Group on the Potential for Presence of Natural Resources at a High-Level Waste Repository (Open) (WJH/HJL)
- 12:25-1:30
 11:45-12:45 p.m. LUNCH
- 5) 12:45-2:45^{1:30-4:45} p.m. Review Comments on the Proposed High-Level Waste Repository (Open) (DWM/HJL)
 Discussion with:
 5.1) State (C. Johnson, S. Frishman, et al. NV)
 5.2) Local (Nye and Clark Counties) - tentative
 5.3) Indian Tribes - tentative
 5.4) Others
- 4:05-4:25
 2:45-3:00 p.m. BREAK

{ = Transcribed portion of meeting

47th ACNW Meeting
October 21, 1992

2

- 4:45-6:00
- 6) ~~3:00-4:30~~ p.m. Systems Analysis Approach to Reviewing the Overall High-Level Waste Program (Open)
(MJS/HJL)
6.1) Current Status
6.2) Progress on Draft Report/Road Map
6.3) Future Actions
- 6:00-6:10
- 7) ~~4:30-5:30~~ p.m. Committee Activities/Future Agenda (Open)
(DWM/RKM)
Discuss anticipated and proposed Committee activities, future meeting agenda, administrative and organizational matters, as appropriate
7.1) Set November agenda
7.2) Review Working Group Schedule
7.3) Other Future Topics
7.4) Meeting Dates for 1993
- 6:10
~~5:30~~ p.m. Adjourn

APPENDIX III: MEETING ATTENDEES

47TH ACNW MEETING
OCTOBER 21, 1992

ACNW MEMBERS

Dr. William J. Hinze	<u> X </u>
Dr. Dade W. Moeller	<u> X </u>
Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy	<u> X </u>
Dr. Martin J. Steindler	<u> X </u>

ACNW CONSULTANTS

Dr. John Corbett	<u> X </u>
Dr. Kenneth Foland	<u> X </u>
Dr. George Thompson	<u> X </u>

NRC STAFF

Abraham Eiss	NMSS
Philip Justus	NMSS
Keith McConnell	NMSS
Harold E. Lefevre	NMSS
Paul Prestholt	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

John Accardi	Roy F. Weston
Don Bayer	Nevada Legislator's Counsel
Dennis Bechtel	Clark County, NV
J. Bergquist	USGS
John A. Blair	M&O/Fluor Daniel
Jeremy Boak	DOE-YMPO
Carolyn Boyle	Clark County, NV
Doug Bradford	SAIC
Tim Bradshaw	UNLV - Geosciences
Jim Brune	UNV Reno
A. C. Douglas	Las Vegas
April Gil	DOE-YMPO
Jaime Gonzalez	DOE-YMPO
John Grow	USGS/Denver
Quanita Hayes	Esmekalda County, NV
Abby Johnson	Eureka County, NV
Susan Jones	DOE-YMPO
Robert Luce	NWTRB
Mary Manning	Las Vegas-SUN
Larry McKague	CNWRA
Calvin Meyers	Moapa Band of Privtas
Marty Mifflin	Mifflin & Assoc. Inc.
Michael Miklas, Jr.	CNWRA
Homi Minwalla	Roy F. Weston
M. Murphy	Nye County, NV
P. Niedzielski-Eichner	Nye County, NV
Sean Pat	SAIC
Richard Quittmeyer	M&O
Steve Rey	Duke/M&O
Sharon Skuchko	DOE/HQ
John Stangle	
E.V. Tiesenhausen	CCCP
Mark C. Tynan	DOE-YMP
Ray Wallace	USGS
Steve Wesnousky	UNR

APPENDIX IV: FUTURE AGENDA

48th ACNW Committee Meeting November 19-20, 1992 (Tentative Schedule)

Siting of a Low-Level Waste Facility (Open) - The Committee will be briefed by a representative of the Connecticut Department of Health Services on the role and perspectives of a State Department of Health regarding the siting of a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility.

Staff Technical Position on Fault Avoidance (Open) - The Committee will be briefed by the NRC staff on a draft Staff Technical Position on Fault Avoidance.

National Profile of Mixed Wastes (Open) - The Committee will be briefed by the NRC staff on a national profile of mixed wastes.

Residual Levels of Radionuclides (Open) - The Committee will be briefed by the NRC staff on the status of enhanced participatory rulemaking related to residual levels of radionuclides acceptable following decontamination of facilities.

Meeting with the Director General of the British Nuclear Forum (Open/Closed) - The Committee will meet with the Director General of the British Nuclear Forum to discuss items of mutual interest. The Committee will also select dates for a proposed meeting with a HLW specialist from the U.K. National Radiology Protection Board.

Chairman's Report on the Impact of Long-Range Climate Change in the Area of the Southern Basin and Range Working Group Meeting (Open) - The Committee will be briefed on the Working Group meeting on the Impact of Long-Range Climate Change in the Area of the Southern Basin and Range Working, held November 18, 1992,

National Energy Policy Act (Open) - The Committee will be briefed on the recently passed National Energy Policy Act and its potential implications to the NRC.

Systems Analysis Approach (Open) - The Committee will complete a response to a supplemental request from Chairman Selin on a systems analysis approach to reviewing the overall high-level waste program.

Committee Activities (Open/Closed) - The Committee will discuss anticipated and proposed Committee activities, future meeting agenda, and organizational matters, as appropriate, including nomination of ACNW officers for 1993. Also, the members will discuss matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings.

APPENDIX V
LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

Meeting Handouts

AGENDA
ITEM NO.

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Chairman's Report
 1. Items of Interest to ACNW Members and Staff, dated October 12, 1992, by Dade W. Moeller

- 2 Discussion of Activities at the Proposed High-Level Waste Repository at Yucca Mountain
 2. Site Characterization: FY92 Accomplishments and Strategy for Future Activities Presented to ACNW, 47th Meeting, dated October 21, 1992, presented by Carl Gertz, OCRWM
 - 2a. Backup Viewgraphs, undated

- 3 Discussion by DOE of Seismic Investigations at the Proposed Yucca Mountain Site
 3. The Little Skull Mountain Earthquake of June 29, 1992, University of Nevada, Reno, Seismological Laboratory and U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado, dated October 21, 1992
 4. Cumulative Seismic Moment chart, undated

- 5 Review Comments on the Proposed High-Level Waste Repository
 5. Presentation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, dated October 21, 1992, by Carl A. Johnson, State of Nevada
 6. Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project: Oversight Strategies of the Situs Jurisdiction, dated October 21, 1992, by Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner [Viewgraphs]
 7. Clark County Nuclear Waste Repository Program Summary FY 1993, dated October 21, 1992, Prepared by the Clark County Department of Comprehensive Planning, Nuclear Waste Division
 8. Comments to the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste at the October 21, 1992 Meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada, by Dennis Bechtel