



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

AUG 29 1986

Handwritten notes:
M. Bell
J. Linehan
T. Verma
R. Cook
P. Prestholt
S. Bilhorn

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert E. Browning, Director
Division of Waste Management

FROM: Michael J. Bell, Deputy Director
Division of Waste Management

SUBJECT: ON-SITE LICENSING REPRESENTATIVE (OR) QUARTERLY BRIEFING,
JULY 30 - AUGUST 1, 1986

The subject meeting was held at the OR office for the NNWSI site in Las Vegas, Nevada. The attendees and a list of the items discussed during the 2-1/2 day meeting are presented below. The meeting minutes are attached as Enclosure 1 and Enclosure 2 provides a summary of the action items with leads identified for each.

Attendees:

M. Bell
J. Linehan

T. Verma
R. Cook

PPrestholt ✓
SBilhorn

Discussion items:

- o Administrative miscellaneous
- o OR objectivity and possibility of rotation
- o Status of follow-up from April OR meeting
- o Appendix 7 evaluation and August 19 meeting with DOE
- o Evaluation of interactions between OR's, PM's, and project teams
- o Format and content of OR reports
- o Recent issues at each site
- o Restricted access to DOE coordination group meetings
- o Possibility of OR at NRC headquarters
- o NRC headquarters staff - assignment and reassignments
- o Role of DWM Branches in direction of OR program
- o OR training and attendance at professional meetings
- o Status of current rulemaking and associated issues
- o Planning for next OR meeting at headquarters
- o Review of OR position description

8901230190 890118
PDR WASTE PDC
WM-11

- 2 - AUG 29 1986

- o Development of OR work plan
- o Year-end OR effectiveness report for Davis
- o Development and status of OR manual (R. Cook lead)
- o Plans for GTP on Configuration Management

Michael J. Bell
Michael J. Bell, Deputy Director
Division of Waste Management

Enclosures:

1. Minutes from OR Meeting in Las Vegas,
July 30-August 1
2. Summary of Action Items

Enclosure 1

MINUTES FOR OR MEETING IN LAS VEGAS ON JULY 30 - AUGUST 1, 1986

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. There was discussion concerning the OR office in Texas. Verma recommended that the OR office be established in Amarillo. There was no disagreement on this recommendation. DOE will provide a trailer at the site for use by the OR when actually at the site. Planning will be based on this recommendation. The schedule for this move should allow a 4-month lead for GSA to acquire office space in Texas. Verma indicated that SRPO plans to start their move at the end of calendar year 1986 and site activities are scheduled to begin Spring, 1987. A request to GSA should be made to move the SRPO OR office about 1 December, in order to have that office operating by April 1, 1987, when site activities begin.

It was agreed that Verma should make a scouting trip to Amarillo in connection with another trip planned for fall.

2. Prestholt requested an additional file cabinet (5 drawer, nonlegal) for his office. Cook also indicated the need for an additional cabinet. Bell agreed to resolve this via Joanne.
3. Cook will summarize regulations regarding travel, especially on the weekends. This will be forwarded to Bell for review by 8/14. Cook plans to address this subject in his OR manual.
4. It was determined that the OR secretaries could charge straight time for additional work hours if authorized by the OR. Bell will confirm the agency policy on this.

FOLLOW-UP FROM LAST MEETING

Bilhorn's memo of 5/5/86 was reviewed. The status of follow-up items are as follows:

1. ORs added Knight to distribution of reports. State and Indian tribes were also added to distribution per request of D. Mattson in a letter of July, 1986.
2. NRC plans for Appendix 7 meetings are still under discussion (see below for more details).

3. OR travel needs were forwarded to Bell in the past months. It was stated by Bell that ORs should plan to be available at their office at least 50% of the time. An open item exists on the proposed travel of Cook to Headquarters for the Appendix 7 Meeting August 19.
4. During the April OR visit to NRC HQ, Bunting discussed the OR role regarding States and indicated that OR interactions with States should be coordinated with the contact in WMPC (N. Still). Bunting emphasized his desire for ORs to have communication with State and Indian representatives and to provide feedback to WMPC, keeping HQ informed of interactions and other State/Indian related activities. The ORs consider this item adequately closed.
5. Cook noted that a basis for handling predecisional information generated by DOE and its contractors should be addressed during the August management meeting on Appendix 7 with DOE. The availability of such information to the OR, the rest of the staff and the PDR are all issues which should be considered. Linehan noted that the August 19 management meeting was to be informational. Browning is planning to attend this meeting. In a subsequent telephone conversation, Browning directed Linehan to discuss the scope of the meeting with Purcell to determine if problems related to implementation of Appendix 7 at BWIP were to be discussed. Browning indicated the need for Cook and DOE (BWIP) to be present when site specific implementation of Appendix 7 at BWIP was discussed with DOE headquarters.
6. Staff (R. Johnson lead) is still working on a letter to DOE on NRC access to WIPP facilities. Linehan indicated that this item would be expedited.
7. This item was addressed in NRC comments on the PDS. Linehan described actions to assure interactions with DOE projects on SCP preparation. It was agreed that it appears time was being incorporated in DOE schedules to provide for interactions.
8. Needed NRC/DOE actions to assure adequacy of QA program at start of site characterization have been discussed with DOE management (June 5, 1986 meeting) and documented in various other recent correspondences with DOE.
9. Bilhorn was added to general distribution on all HLW related documents generated or received by WMEG, WMGT, and WMPC, in order to assure pertinent information is sent to ORs. Linehan suggested that responsibility for this activity be reassigned to E. Tana.

Verma noted that while Federal Register Notice (FRN) for GTPs were being sent to ORs, they are not receiving the actual GTPs. ORs requested that these be sent upon notice in the Federal Register.

10. This item was addressed above under ADMINISTRATIVE.
11. The benefits and alternatives of OR rotation is an item still being researched in response to continued interest by Davis (Bilhorn lead).

QA INTERACTION

It was agreed that OR involvement in and feedback on QA activities, including audits, is important, however detailed reports on audit observations are not expected. Prestholt suggested that QA staff negotiate a separate agreement with DOE to cover NRC attendance on DOE and contractor audits. Cook and Verma agreed it is desirable to have DWM or IE staff as observers on most DOE audits, regardless of OR attendance. It was agreed that ORs would continue to participate in QA activities pro rata with the other technical areas on which the OR reports are based.

Bell indicated that ORs should continue to document QA concerns and observations in their monthly reports as considered appropriate by the individual OR.

APPENDIX 7 MEETING AUGUST 19

It was agreed that ORs would identify the pros and cons associated with Appendix 7 DOE/OR interactions. This information is desired as input for the WM/DOE meeting on August 19 and should be provided to Bilhorn by COB 8/12. Linehan indicated that the August 19 management meeting with DOE was not intended to negotiate changes to Appendix 7, but merely to obtain information from DOE on their perception of Appendix 7 interactions and to relate NRC's perception of the adequacy of the Appendix 7 interactions.

OR REPORT

Linehan indicated that it was desirable to identify the significance of items being reported. There was agreement that the reports should be aimed at providing meaningful information to management as well as to members of the project team.

Cook noted that his own guideline in preparing reports was to write them for any person who may have an interest including top NRC and DOE management.

OR/STATE/TRIBAL INTERACTIONS

It was agreed that where prepared talks are requested of ORs by State or Indian program participants, such presentations should be coordinated through WMPC. However, where specific questions are raised to the OR by State or Indian tribal representatives, the ORs should respond consistent with their understanding of NRC rules, policies, positions, etc. The ORs should keep WMPC informed regarding such interactions.

REPORTS FROM THE ORs

A. Salt (Verma)

1. SRPO (CER) is reviewing documents to list open items issues and actions that relate to the salt repository project. This will be put into an integrated data management system for tracking by DOE, NRC, and States.
2. Verma stated that SRPO plans to begin the relocation to Texas in December, 1986 and that their present goal is to have all project personnel at the Texas site by Fall of 1987.
3. Verma discussed the possibility of SRPO requesting NRC to conduct a mini-audit of one of SRPOs contractors. Verma will pursue it further with SRPO and keep RP informed.
4. Verma discussed the status of future Appendix 7 and technical meetings. SRPO has indicated a desire to set up both Appendix 7 and management meetings. Prestholt suggested that DOE Headquarters be present at management meetings with DOE projects.

B. Tuff (Prestholt)

1. Status of stopwork orders were discussed. Prestholt indicated that Sandia and the USGS are relatively far from restart. Livermore, Los Alamos, and REECO are closer to restarting work.
2. Linehan asked about the status of DOEs development and implementation of levels 1, 2, and 3 QA and questioned the benefit of the multi-level approach. Following discussions of QA levels, grades and the Q-list GTP the need was identified for further discussion in these areas. Such discussions may best be scheduled during the October OR visit to NRC headquarters.

3. Prestholt discussed NTS core handling activities in light of an old Westinghouse audit. DOE/NTS considers USGS responsible for the current problems with core handling.
4. Prestholt discussed potential design of surface fuel handling facilities for seismic events. He noted that it may not be necessary to classify these facilities as category 1 under 10 CFR 100, Appendix A.

C. Basalt (Cook)

1. A key issue at BWIP is DOE/RL treatment of Q-list items, i.e., shafts and seals. Only the prime barrier is being considered in performance allocation which raises the question of what is meant by "mitigation." DOE/RL seems to be interpreting "mitigation" in such a way as to eliminate shafts and seals from Q-list. Bell noted that the Q-list GTP should add clarification on NRC staff positions in this area.
2. Cook believes "anticipated processes and events" are being interpreted by DOE/RL as natural events which do not include human induced off-site events (i.e., gradient created by irrigation in surrounding areas). These terms need clarification. Bell indicated that clarification will be provided through the rulemaking conforming Part 60 to the EPA standard.
3. In the KE/PB design of the underground facility, no shafts (including the exploratory shaft) are being considered important to safety or waste isolation. Cook thinks the NRC rock mechanics staff should consider how disturbance may impact performance, the extent of the disturbed zone and what the staff will expect. Linehan noted that staff are considering these subjects.
4. In general the BWIP QA situation is improving. Rockwell appears to be trying to get procedures in place. However, Cook has identified several areas, i.e., records, that he thinks are not being handled right. Cook is also concerned with the timing of implementation and considers that NRC staff should expedite the review of DOE QA plans (especially OGR revised QA plan) and respond to DOE as soon as possible. Cook would like to review and provide comments on the OGR QA plan.
5. The repository size is still uncertain especially with regard to the defense waste capability. Cook is concerned with the maturity of the conceptual design to be provided in the SCP. The advanced conceptual design that KE/PB is now working on may be based on parameters different than those considered in the conceptual design to be included in the SCP. Cook questions how complete DOE/RL expect the SCP conceptual design to be

and whether it will be adequate to support the site characterization plans. This concern will be raised with BWIP team for their consideration.

RESTRICTED ACCESS TO GROUP COORDINATION MEETING

Linehan and Bell indicated that the issue of OR or staff attendance at the Coordinating Group meetings would be reviewed at the management meeting on August 19. The ORs made the point that NRC observation of these meetings would be desirable.

OR-TYPE OFFICE AT DOE HEADQUARTERS

Bell agreed to address this concept with DOE in the August 19 meeting.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO OR OFFICE

It was agreed that Bell would develop guidance on availability of OR office files to public for review. Action by 9/1/86.

LICENSING REFORM

Bell agreed to check with ELD on licensing reform and provide information to the ORs.

OR TRAINING

ORs agreed to identify training and professional meetings that they would like to attend and explain the relationship of these activities to their position. Bell indicated that there would be support for these activities as appropriate to their role in the program.

OR YEAR-END VISIT TO NRC HEADQUARTERS

Due to the EA review and other conflicts there was agreement that the year-end visit to NRC Headquarters will be scheduled for the end of October versus September, as previously planned. ORs agreed to contact Bilhorn by end of August with proposed dates and subjects for briefings.

OR MANUAL

Cook outlined the OR manual he is lead on developing. Cook plans to provide drafts to the other ORs for input as he progresses.

He spent time in Columbus developing the outline with input from Verma the previous week and plans to visit Prestholt and NNWSI soon, as well. Prestholt questioned Cook's need to participate in OR activities at NNWSI to provide input into this manual and expressed concern with the need.

OR WORK PLAN

The OR work plan has been expanded to include Division level milestones. Bilhorn has lead for the work plan and is responsible for assuring the milestones are met on a timely basis. The new work plan was discussed with no disagreement on items contained therein.

OR EFFECTIVENESS REPORT

Bilhorn addressed the purpose of the OR effectiveness report she is responsible for developing by end of FY86. The criteria for the evaluation and responsibility for input was discussed. The following five broad criteria were suggested by Verma as a basis for the evaluation:

1. Facilitate information exchange.
2. Early identification and tracking of technical issues.
3. Facilitate planning and preparation for Appendix 7 visits by NRC Headquarters staff.
4. Facilitate planning and preparation of technical and management meetings.
5. Making recommendations for resolution of issues.

It was agreed that these should be some of the criteria considered in evaluation of the OR program.

Enclosure 2

Summary of Action Items

<u>Action Items</u>	<u>Lead</u>
1. Move of SRPO OR office to Texas.	(Verma)
a. "Scouting Trip."	
b. Request to GSA by December 1.	
2. Order file cabinet (5 drawer, letter) for Prestholt and Cook.	(Joanne)
3. Summarize travel regulations relevant to OR.	(Cook)
4. Confirm procedures regarding authorization and payment of OR secretaries for hours over those designated.	(Bell)
5. Determine whether the ORs need to attend the August 19 (Bell/Linehan) meeting with DOE on Appendix 7.	
6. Expedite letter on access to WIPP.	(Johnson)
7. Identify person to be responsible for assuring that pertinent HLW information is transmitted to OR's in a timely manner.	(Bilhorn)
8. Determine need for separate agreement with DOE for staff QA activities.	(Kennedy)
9. Identify Pro's and Con's associated with the Appendix 7 agreement regarding DOE/OR interactions at each site as input for August 19 management meeting (due to Bilhorn 8/12).	(ORs)
10. Explore possibility of mini-audit of an SRPO contractor.	(Verma)
11. Send ORs OGR QA plan for review and comment.	(Bilhorn)
12. Discuss with DOE staff attendance at DOE CG meetings and the concept of OR-type office at DOE HQ in August 19 meeting on Appendix 7.	(Bilhorn)

Action Items

Lead

13. Develop guidance on availability of OR files to public (commitment to OR's by 9/1). (Bell)
14. Provide information to ORs on licensing reform. (Bell)
15. Identify and provide brief rationale for training and professional meetings for ORs. (ORs)
16. Propose dates and subjects for OR meeting at HQ in October (due to Bilhorn 8/29). (ORs)

MINUTES FOR OR MEETING IN LAS VEGAS ON JULY 30 - August 1, 1986

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. There was discussion concerning the OR office in Texas. Verma recommended that the OR office be established in Amarillo. There was no disagreement on this recommendation. DOE will provide a trailer at the site for use by the OR when actually at the site. Planning will be based on this recommendation. Timing should assure a 4 month lead for GSA to find an office. Verma estimated that late calendar year was the time DOE would move. A request to GSA should be made about 1 December, however, because site activities will begin April 1, 1987.

It was agreed that Verma should make a scouting trip in connection with a separate trip in the fall.

2. Prestholt noted that an additional file cabinet (5 drawer, nonlegal) is needed in his office. Cook indicated the need for an additional cabinet also. Bell agreed to resolve this via Joanne.

3. Cook will summarize travel regulations regarding travel, especially weekend travel. This will be forwarded to Bell for review by 8/14 to establish guidelines for Cook's OR guidance document.

4. It was agreed that straight time for additional work of the OR secretaries was OK as authorized by the OR. Bell will confirm.

FOLLOW-UP FROM LAST MEETING

Bilhorn's memo of 5/5/86 was reviewed. The status of follow-up items are as follow:

Bilhorn noted that additional follow-up is in progress.

1. ORs added Knight to distribution of reports. State and Indians were added per request of D. Mattson in a letter of July, 1986.
2. Item 2 regarding NRC plans for Appendix 7 meetings are still under discussion (see below for more details).
3. OR travel needs were forwarded to Bell in the past months it was determined that ORs should plan to be available at their office at least 50% of the time. An open item exists on the proposed travel of Cook to Headquarters for the Appendix 7 Meeting August 19.
4. During April Bunting identified the interaction of OR with staff should be via N. Still. Bunting emphasized his desire for ORs to have communication with State and Indian Reps and to feedback to N. Still information as warranted. ORs consider this item adequately closed.
5. Cook noted that a basis for handling predecisional information generated by DOE and it's contractors should be addressed during the August management meeting on Appendix 7 with DOE. The availability of such information to the OR, the rest of the Staff and the PDR are all issues which should be considered. Linehan noted that the scheduled August 19 meeting with DOE was to be informational. Browning is planning to attend this meeting. Browning indicated a desire for Cook and DOE (BWIP). To be present at Appendix 7 reviews with DOE.
6. Staff (R. Johnson lead) is still working on a letter to DOE to achieve access to WIPP facilities. Linehan indicated that this item would be expedited to achieve access to WIPP by the Staff.

7. This item was addressed in NRC comments on the PDS. Linehan described actions to assure interactions with DOE projects on SCP preparation. It was agreed that it appears time was being incorporated in DOE schedules to provide for interactions.

8. Needed NRC/DOE actions to assure adequacy of QA program at start of site characterization have been documented and discussed with DOE management. (June 5, 1986 meeting). This subject has been documented in various other recent correspondences with DOE.

9. Bilhorn was added to general distribution on all HLW related documents generated or received by WMEG, WMGT, and WMPC, in order to assure pertinent information is sent to ORs. Linehan suggested that responsibility for this activity be reassigned to E. Tana. Verma noted that while Federal Register Notice (FRN) for GTPs were being sent to ORs, they are not receiving the actual GTPs. ORs requested that these be sent upon notice in this FRN.

10. This item was addressed above under ADMINISTRATIVE.

11. The benefits and alternatives of OR rotation is an item still being researched (Bilhorn lead).

QA INTERACTION

It is agreed that OR interactions on QA and audit participation are important OR activities, however detailed audit reports are not expected. Prestholt suggested that QA staff negotiate a separate agreement with DOE to interface with them to evaluate DOE and contractor audits. Cook and Verma agreed. DWM or IE staff audit observers are desirable. It was agreed that ORs would continue to participate in QA activities in a pro rata basis with other areas of concern, i.e., the other 7 technical areas in which reporting is focused.

Bell indicated that ORs should continue to document QA concerns and observations in their monthly as considered warranted by the individual ORs given their judgment and QA experience.

APPENDIX 7 MEETING AUGUST 19

It was agreed that ORs would identify pros and cons associated with Appendix 7 DOE/OR interactions. The information is desirable for WM/DOE meeting on August 19 in which DOE will identify their perception of the Appendix 7 interactions. Linehan indicated that the management meeting was not intended to negotiate changes to Appendix 7, but merely to obtain information from DOE and to relate NRC's perception of the adequacy of the Appendix 7 interactions.

OR REPORT

Linehan indicated that it was desirable identify the significance of items being reported. There was agreement that the reports would be aimed for being meaningful to management as well as project team members.

Cook noted that his own guidelines in preparing reports was to write them for any person who may have an interest including top NRC and DOE management.

OR STATE INTERACTIONS

It was agreed that where prepared statements are being requested of ORs by State or Indian program participants, such interactions should be coordinated by WMPC. However, where specific questions are raised to the OR by such State or Indian representatives, the ORs should respond consistent with their understanding of NRC rules, policies, positions, etc.

REPORTS FROM THE ORs

A. Salt (Verma)

1. SRPD (CER) is reviewing documents to list open items issues and actions that relate to the salt repository project. This will be put into an integrated data management system for tracking by DOE, NRC, and States.

2. Verma indicated SRPDs goal was to have all project personnel at the Texas site by the middle, to Fall, of 1987.

3. Verma discussed the possibility of NRC QA audit of one of SRPDs contractors. Verma is to pursue it further with SRPD and keep RP informed.

4. Verma discussed the status of future Appendix 7 and technical meetings. SRPD has indicated a desire to set up both Appendix 7 and management meetings. Prestholt suggested that DOE Headquarters be present at management meetings.

TUFE (Prestholt)

1. QA work stoppage was discussed. Prestholt indicated that Sandia and the USGS are relatively far from restart. Livermore, Los Alamos, & REECO are further along in restarting work.

2. Linehan asked about the status of DOE's development and implementation of levels 1, 2, and 3 QA and questioned the benefit of this approach. A discussion of levels and grades and the Q list STP was conducted. No general consensus was reached on any specific issue discussed.

3. Prestholt discussed quality issues with NTS core handling activities in light of an old Westinghouse audit. DOE/NTS considers USGS is responsible for the current status of the core handling and methods of the past.

4. Prestholt discussed potential design of surface fuel handling facilities for seismic events. He noted that it may not be required to specify that the facilities be classified as category 1 facilities under 10 CFR 100, Appendix A.

BASALT (Cook)

1. Main issue - DOE/RL treatment of Q-list items, i.e., shafts and seals. Only prime barrier considered in performance allocation. Brings up question on what is meant by "mitigation". DOE/RL seems to be interpreting "mitigation" in such a way as to eliminate shafts and seals from Q-list.

2. Cook believes "anticipated processes and events" are being interpreted by DOE/RL as natural events and don't include human induced off-site events (i.e., irrigation in surrounding area creating gradient). Needs clarification. Bell indicated that the clarification will be provided through Part 60 rulemaking regarding EPA standard.

3. KE/PB design, no shafts (including the exploratory shaft) are being considered important to safety or waste isolation. Cook thinks the NRC rock mechanics staff should consider how disturbance may impact performance, the extent of the disturbance zone and what the staff will expect. Linehan noted that Staff is so considering.

4. QA situation is improving. Rockwell appears to be trying to get procedures in place. Cook has identified several areas, i.e., records, he thinks are not being handled right. Cook is concerned with the timing of implementation and considers that NRC staff should expedite the review of DOE QA plans (especially OGR revised QA plan) and respond to DOE as soon as possible. Cook would like to review and provide comments on the OGR QA plan.

5. Repository size is still uncertain especially with regard to the defense waste capability. Cook is concerned with the maturity of the conceptual design to be provided in the SCP. KE/PB is working on advanced conceptual design now based on the above indicated changes. Question - how complete does DOE/RL expect the SCP conceptual design to be and is that adequate to support the site characterization plans.

RESTRICTED ACCESS TO GROUP COORDINATION MEETING

Linehan and Bell indicated that the issue of OR or staff attendance at the Coordinating Group meetings would be reviewed at the management meeting on August 19. The ORs made the point that attendance is desirable.

OR TYPE OFFICE AT DOE HEADQUARTERS

Bell agreed to address this proposal with DOE in the August 19 meeting.

OR OFFICE OPEN TO PUBLIC

It was agreed that Bell would look into guidance for OR's office's files to public review. Action by 9/1/86.

LICENSING REFORM

Bell agreed to check with ELD on licensing reform and provide information to the ORs.

OR TRAINING

ORs agreed to identify training and professional meetings that they would like to attend and explain the relationship of these activities to their position. Bell indicated that there would be support for these activities as appropriate to their role in the program.

OR YEAR-END VISIT TO NRC HEADQUARTERS

Due to EA review and other conflicting schedules, there was agreement that the year-end visit to NRC Headquarters will be scheduled for the end of October versus September, as previously planned. ORs agreed to contact Bilhorn by end of August with proposed dates and subjects for briefings.

OR MANUAL

Cook outlined the OR manual he is lead on developing. Cook plans to provide drafts to the other ORs for input as he progresses.

He spent time in Columbus developing the outline with input from Verma the previous week and plans to visit Prestholt and NNWSI soon, as well. Prestholt questioned Cook's need to participate in OR activities at NNWSI to provide input into this manual and expressed concern with the need.

OR WORK PLAN

OR effectiveness report is being worked by Bilhorn. It was requested that comments from each OR regarding Appendix 7/OR activities be forwarded to Bilhorn by August 12, 1986. Bilhorn has lead on all other items in work plan.

OR EFFECTIVENESS REPORT

Bilhorn addressed the purpose of the OR effectiveness report she is responsible for developing by end of FY 86. The criteria for the evaluation and responsibility for input was discussed. The following 5 broad criteria were suggested by the Verma as a basis for the evaluation:

1. Facilitate information exchange.
2. Early identification and tracking of technical issues.
3. Facilitate planning and preparation for Appendix 7 visits by NRC Headquarters staff.
4. Facilitate planning and preparation of technical and management meetings.
5. Making recommendations for resolution of issues.

OR WORK PLAN
LEAD: Susan Bilhorn

- Quarterly OLR meeting
 - Summarize status of OLR activities for DWM Director
- Mid-year OLR visit to HQ
 - Briefing of NMSS Director
 - Meetings with DWM staff
 - Meeting with DOE Headquarters
- Quarterly OLR meeting
 - Summarize status of OLR activities for DWM Director
- Evaluation of Appendix 7 agreement
 - Receive DWM Director input
 - Receive OR input
 - Receive staff input
 - Meeting with DOE Headquarters
 - Develop revision and/or plan of action, if necessary
- Year-end OLR visit to HQ
 - Briefing of NMSS Director
 - Meeting with DWM staff
 - Meeting with DOE Headquarters

- Evaluation of effectiveness of OLR program
 - Establish Criteria for Evaluation of OLR program effectiveness
 - o Develop outline
 - o Receive input from ORs
 - o Receive input from DWM Directors office
 - Conduct evaluation of OLR program effectiveness
 - o Receive input from ORs
 - o Receive input from NRC headquarters staff
 - o Receive input from DOE
 - Submit report to NMSS director on OLR program effectiveness
 - o Complete draft report for review and comment by OLR's, PM's, and DWM Directors
 - o Receive comment's from above
 - o Complete final report
- Establish objectives for FY87