

*All memo to Various  
for Stein 7/9/85  
109*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
AND THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

-----X  
MEETING TO REVIEW PLANNED :  
INTERACTIONS BETWEEN :  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE) :  
AND THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY :  
COMMISSION (NRC) ON THE :  
REPOSITORY PROGRAM :  
-----X

Room Number 1E245  
DOE Forrestal Building  
1,000 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D. C.

Thursday,  
May 30, 1985

The above-styled meeting came to order, pursuant  
to notice, at 9:00 a.m.

BEFORE: RALPH STEIN  
Chairman

(Continued, Page 2)

---

8508010164 850709  
PDR WASTE PDR.  
WM-1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A T T E N D E E S

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
RALPH STEIN	DOE/RW-23	252-5355
CHARLES R. HEAD	DOE/RW-23	252-5625
H. J. MILLER	NRC/DWM	427-4177
JOHN LINEHAN	NRC/DWM	427-4672
SCOTT GRACE	NRC/DWM	427-4653
ROBERT L. JOHNSON	NRC/DWM	427-4785
KING STABLEIN	NRC/DWM	427-4611
CHAD GLENN	NRC/DWM	427-4608
AVI BENDER	NRC/DWM	427-4483
ROB MacDOUGALL	NRC/DWM	427-4439
DEAN TOUSLEY	Yakima Nation	328-3500
JOHN T. GREEVES	NRC/DWM	427-4734
ROBERT J. WRIGHT	NRC/DWM	427-4674
JERRY PARKER	DOE/RW-25	252-5679
BILL PURCELL	DOE/RW-20	252-9694
LESLIE A. CASEY	DOE/SRPO	FTS 976-5916
JERRY S. SZYWEUSKI	DOE/NU	FTS 297-1503
STEVE FERGUSON	DOE/GC	252-6947
BOB GAMBLE	Weston/Licensing	963-5215

(Continued, Page 3)

- - -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

PAGE:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN STEIN AND  
H. J. MILLER

4

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Review Procedures for Setting Up Technical Meetings

19

- Lead Time
- Advance Exchange of Information
- Management Review of Meeting Minutes

2. CY 1985 Technical Meetings

49

- Confirm Schedules
- Identify Additional Meetings Needed

3. EA Comment Resolution

8

4. Status of Appendix 7 of Procedural Agreement

46

OTHER DISCUSSION

137

RECAP OF ACTION ITEMS

143

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Good morning. I would like to  
3 welcome you all to this meeting between the Department of  
4 Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The purpose of  
5 the meet-ing is to review and discuss a series of meetings  
6 that are planned between the Department and the Commission  
7 over the next six, eight months, and also to then try to  
8 project a series of meetings that we might be able to  
9 identify next year, next calendar year.

10 We have an agenda for today's meeting. The  
11 agenda is available either on this table or at the door.  
12 So if anybody doesn't have a copy, I suggest you go and pick  
13 it up. This meeting is, was only one of a series of meetings  
14 that have occurred in the past, and will continue on into the  
15 future. They're somewhat informal in nature, but -- because  
16 they're not a licensing meeting per se, but they are a  
17 meeting that will give the NRC an opportunity to review our  
18 program and to give us some feedback on their perceptions  
19 of the activities that we have underway.

20 The agenda is fill, and I would like to get  
21 started. But before I do, I'd like to introduce the DOE  
22 people that are at the table.

23 Starting at my far right is --

24 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Jerry Szyweuski, Dewey, Nevada.

25 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And Leslie Casey, from the South

1 Project Office, Bill Purcell, who is the Associate Director  
2 of the Office of Geologic Repository. I am Ralph Stein,  
3 Director of Engineering and Licensing. To my left is  
4 Charlies Head, who is the Acting Team Leader for Licensing  
5 and Quality Assurance. And to my far left if Jerry Parker who  
6 is the Project Manager for the Environmental Development of  
7 the Environmental Assessment.

8 And seated in the audience seats, Steve Ferguson  
9 from General Counsel's, General Counsel office.

10 And with that, I'd like to turn it over to you, to  
11 hear your opening comments.

12 RM. MILLER: Okay. I think this is an important  
13 meeting. This whole process of consultation between NRC and  
14 DOE is one which is -- which centers around, to a great  
15 extent, these meetings that we are going to be talking about  
16 today, the technical meetings with each of the projects and  
17 with Headquarters, focusing on potential important licensing  
18 issues.

19 It is very difficult for you and for us to schedule  
20 these meetings, to get all of the various parties, contractors  
21 on your side, contractors on our side, all together, at a  
22 time which is mutually acceptable to all, and is timely.  
23 And so it is very important that we sit down and talk about  
24 what are the meetings that we need to have and when is a time  
25 that is appropriate and convenient for both parties.

1 So we think it's very important to have this meeting.

2 Also we hope that in this meeting today, we can  
3 review the progress that we've been making in implementing  
4 the procedural agreement that we have between the agencies,  
5 focusing mainly on, of course, the provisions of the  
6 agreements which apply to these technical meetings.

7 So with that, let me briefly introduce the folks  
8 from the NRC, and to the largest extent, the folks here today  
9 are people in the Projects Group who are responsible for  
10 the, leading the interactions with the DOE projects, and who  
11 have been spending much of their time trying to identify  
12 and at least tentatively agree upon a slate of meetings with  
13 the folks at the projects.

14 I think rather than having me introduce everyone,  
15 why don't we just start from the right, with you, Bob Wright,  
16 and go right down the line here.

17 MR. WRIGHT: I'm Bob Wright. I'm responsible in  
18 NRC for the BWIP Project.

19 MR. GREEVES: I'm John Greeves and I'm Branch  
20 Chief of the Engineering Branch within NRC.

21 MR. LINEHAN: I'm John Linehan, Section Leader of  
22 the Projects Section.

23 MR. GRACE: My name is Scott Grace. I'm in the  
24 Repository Projects Branch.

25 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Robert Johnson; I'm the SALT Project

1 Manager for NRC.

2 MR. STABLEIN: I'm King Stabline, Nevada Project  
3 Manager for NRC.

4 VOICE: -- with the Planning  
5 Section of NRC.

6 MR. MacDOUBALL: Rob MacDougall with the Policy  
7 Section of the Policy Program.

8 MR. GLENN: Chad Glenn, the -- Projects Branch.

9 MR. MILLER: You're not with us.

10 VOICE: Don't mix me up --

11 MR. MILLER: You're not with us.

12 (Laughter)

13 MR. MILLER: Okay. With that, Ralph, why don't we  
14 launch into the meeting?

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. Hub, with your agreement,  
16 I'd like to go to Item 3 on the Agenda, which is the EA  
17 Comment Resolution. The reason for that is Jerry Parker,  
18 who I'm sure you all understand is probably the busiest  
19 guy in the whole department at the present time, working on  
20 the EA activities, has been able to give up some time to  
21 come down and talk to you about the approach that, at  
22 least as far as we have developed it, on interfacing with  
23 you on the comment resolution, your NRC comment resolution.  
24 So what I would like to do is turn this portion of the  
25 agenda over to Jerry and ask him to tell you what our planning

1 is so far on developing a plan to tell the folks how we're  
2 going to handle EA comments. Jerry?

3 PRESENTATION ON EA COMMENT RESOLUTION  
4 BY JERRY PARKER (DOE)

5 MR. PARKER: Thanks, Ralph. Actually, it may be of  
6 some interest as a preface to indicate that as of now we've  
7 logged in about 20,000 comments on the EA's. We've received  
8 comments from all of the protagonists that you would imagine  
9 involving the program, all of the relevant states, several  
10 corridor states, all of the various private interest  
11 organizations, Indian tribes, and all the relevant agencies.

12 We've distributed these comments. I think we  
13 have discussed before that we have a computerized tracking  
14 system where we log these things in, assign comment letter  
15 numbers, comment numbers that will then be evolved into  
16 specific issue numbers, assigned to the comments as they  
17 apply to specific issues, and the split in these 20,000  
18 comments at this point, 35 percent of those have been  
19 Headquarters-germane type comments, meaning our decision  
20 methodology, policy questions, generic questions, program-  
21 wide; about 40 percent of the comments have been directed  
22 to our Columbus folks because of deals with the SALT sites;  
23 and the remaining 25 percent are split just about evenly  
24 between the SALT BWIP and TUFF(ph) in Nevada.

25 I guess I mentioned that just to verify what you



1 said about how busy I am, Ralph.

2 In terms of process, I saw the agenda item in our  
3 EA Comment Resolution. We have a workshop coming up, a DOE  
4 workshop, in Mid-June, June 11 to 13, where we'll be reviewing  
5 the first draft comment response documents that both  
6 Headquarters and the field have prepared. Out of that we  
7 hope to be fairly comfortable with directions for the first  
8 preparation of the final version of the environmental  
9 assessments and the comment response documents. And by the  
10 end of June, to be comfortable enough to close on the  
11 guideline evaluations, the conditions that Chapter 6 of  
12 the EA's deal with. So basically we hope to be able to  
13 close on some of the decision-relevant condition findings by  
14 the end of June, which would allow us to do the very  
15 important bottom line decision making analysis, soon there-  
16 after.

17 It is in the time frame immediately after that  
18 that we envision getting together with the states that we  
19 have done in April and May, as well as NRC and other Federal  
20 agencies, to give them a read on how we view responses to  
21 your comments and what this might mean to the bottom-line  
22 decision.

23 I met with Interior and EPA in Denver a week and a  
24 half ago, and William Stone, who some of you might know,  
25 pressed very hard for an exact definition of what we would be

1 providing before this next consultation meeting with the  
2 Agency and whether it would be a actual draft comment  
3 response document agenda. Frankly, we haven't closed on that  
4 issue yet. We do commit certainly to providing the agencies  
5 and the states that we'll be getting back to on comment  
6 responses with adequate information so they know exactly  
7 where we're coming from and somewhat what the substance of  
8 our responses will be, and the implication.

9           There is a chance that it very well could be a draft  
10 of the comment response document. We just haven't closed on  
11 that.

12           Are there any questions at this point, Hub, or --

13           MR. MILLER: Justone question. And I recognize  
14 that you're still making decisions about your approach.  
15 But is it your thought that you will produce a comment  
16 response document and that will be the principal result of  
17 your analysis of the comments or will you go back and revise  
18 the EA's themselves?

19           MR. PARKER: Oh, indeed. The comment response  
20 document will be a road map to changes, if indeed they're  
21 warranted, based on the comments, in the environmental  
22 assessment itself. And without being specific, there in many  
23 instances will be major, major revisions and major changes  
24 in the EA's. As I said, the comment resonse document will be  
25 a road map to changes in the EA.

1 MR. MILLER: I guess the next question will be,  
2 trying to define more specifically what kind of meetings,  
3 scope of meetings, that would be occurring, I guess in the  
4 July time frame, from what you describe, when will you be  
5 able to be in a position to better way what, at least from your  
6 side, you think you would need from us in the way of the scope  
7 of these meetings, whether they're single issue meetings or  
8 whether they're meetings to focus on just one site or --

9 MR. PARKER: As opposed to the two days we spent  
10 on some rather narrow clarification questions, I can see  
11 these being much more expensive meetings, point one.

12 Secondly, in terms of logistics and what would be  
13 involved, a few weeks before we would actually embark on  
14 this second round of consultation meetings to talk about  
15 comment resolution, we would provide you perhaps comment  
16 response documents, perhaps a detailed agenda from which we  
17 can then discuss all the issues so that as opposed to these  
18 clarification sessions, I think it behooves us to make sure  
19 that you know what we want to talk about. And I really don't  
20 see any onus on your side in terms of preparation other  
21 than getting a crack at the written material we'll provide  
22 you, as I said, probably two weeks in advance of us getting  
23 together again. It could be August. I shouldn't be too firm  
24 that it's July. We've couched it as a July-August time frame  
25 for getting back with all the agency and state people.

1 MR. MILLER: It sounds like it's going to be well  
2 into June and well into your process of reviewing responses  
3 that are being generated, you'll be able to know whether or  
4 not there are -- what the size of these meetings would  
5 be, what their extent would be.

6 MR. PARKER: Actually, I think in terms of scoping  
7 the size and the length of these sessions, I think we know  
8 right now. Because you know the breadth and width of your  
9 comments and the many issues that were addressed. Probably  
10 a multi-day meeting. And we intend, as we committed, to go  
11 issue by issue.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Comment by comment?

13 MR. PARKER: Well, actually issue by issue, but in  
14 many instances it may be comment by comment. That brings  
15 up the issue of how we're dealing with comments, that comment  
16 in this instance really might be an issue response document,  
17 because we are aggregating comments on the same issue and  
18 treating them on an issue level. In fact, the format we've  
19 developed will say issue and then resolution, or response.

20 MR. MILLER: The spirit of my questions is to  
21 get as much information as possible for planning purposes.  
22 And since knowing the pressures you folks are under, I hate to  
23 press so hard. But still, I think we're in a position where  
24 we've got a lot of things going on and we're trying to make  
25 our best projection for folk like John and his staff who have

1 to support these meetings, try to project when the meetings  
2 will occur and about what size --

3 MR. PARKER: The first week in July, I think we  
4 should probably get on the horn. Perhaps even we can write a  
5 note that would make implicitly clear when the meeting, when  
6 this next session of meetings should take place and when we  
7 will get you either a draft comment response document or  
8 some written record of what our comment responses are or  
9 are proposed to be and what we want to talk about.

10 MR. MILLER: I'm sure it's conceivable that in some  
11 cases you'll accept what we've said and in other cases you may  
12 want to argue with what we've said, and discuss what we're  
13 said --

14 MR. PARKER: In a collegial fashion?

15 MR. MILLER: In a collegial fashion. And I suppose  
16 a longer time would be where there are some perhaps differences  
17 of opinions. We'll know that in July.

18 MR. PARKER: I really share your concern for  
19 discipline in this process, because we could spend days on  
20 one issue. So indeed an agenda as well as the written material  
21 well in advance is going to be very important for the  
22 session.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Jerry, I want to be sure that I  
24 understand. You're not committing to send over a comment  
25 response document per se prior to its being completed.

1 MR. PARKER: Good point. We have not closed on  
2 that, you're right. That may be appropriate. We really  
3 haven't been able to determine if it makes sense at this  
4 point.

5 MR. MILLER: Okay. Well, we're committed to  
6 supporting you on this. Our ability to kind of on the spot  
7 say that sounds good to us or not is probably dependent upon  
8 having some advance preparation. Now, we spent a lot of time  
9 reviewing the document, and folks are quite well versed in the  
10 issues that they've commented on, obviously. So there's a  
11 great deal of preparation that has already been made. But  
12 it would help, of course, if we could get information ahead  
13 of time.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Hub, from your comment just now,  
15 it sounded like you sort of are looking for a second cycle.  
16 That is, that there would be a cycle following the comment  
17 response where you would review the, our responses in this  
18 interaction that we would have with you and you would expect  
19 us to then respond subsequently to whatever remained from that  
20 meeting or set of meetings that we have with you. That's what  
21 it sounded like you were saying. So it sounded like you were  
22 looking for a second cycle. Is that what you had in mind or  
23 was it just the way it sounded?

24 MR. MILLER: No, I think as we've said, in the  
25 meetings we had with you when we were going through

1 clarifications on the EA, we're going to look at what you  
2 produced in the way of a final draft, and we're going to be  
3 looking to see if there are any areas where it appears to us  
4 as if there's a problem, and we would feel duty-bound, I guess,  
5 in those instances where there is a significant problem in  
6 our view, we would let you know. I think this process of  
7 consultation before you commit to a final is helpful to  
8 everybody. I'm not -- we're not expecting anything in the  
9 way of another round. But we do feel it's appropriate to --  
10 given the extent of our comments and given the nature of our  
11 comments, for us to have some consultation. It would be helpful  
12 to you. Hopefully you see it that way.

13 MR. PARKER: And as we did with our first meeting,  
14 minutes will be recorded and entered into the record so that  
15 any views expressed at that time will again be part of the  
16 official record that we'll be acting on.

17 MR. LINEHAN: Jerry, one of the things we need to  
18 prepare for this meeting is, you're addressing things issue by  
19 issue, and you're considering not only our comments, but  
20 those of any of the other commenters. Do you have any  
21 packages together, you know, like a set of all the comments  
22 that came in? We've identified certain comments that we would  
23 like, but we're really not sure what the full set looks like,  
24 from outside parties. Do you have any packages available or  
25 anything?

1 MR. PARKER: We can provide them. We have in the  
2 Forrestal Public Reading Room tomes of comments and comment  
3 packages we've received. And as a matter of fact, I think  
4 we've spoken to your librarian about that and she might have  
5 already secured them. One of our staff people, Steve  
6 Garmberg is the chap's name, is working the distribution of  
7 comments and all the other relative materials that have to go  
8 into the public domain.

9 Yes, why don't we just arrange to have a full set  
10 now? Do you have a big room?

11 MR. LINEHAN: How big is the full set?

12 MR. PARKER: It's manageable. It isn't a full room.  
13 But that's what you're requesting? All the comments?

14 MR. LINEHAM: How many boxes -- you know, I don't  
15 want it to get out of hand. Is it several boxes?

16 MR. PARKER: Yes, that's what it would be. It would  
17 be several medium to large cardboard boxes.

18 MR. MILLER: This is not a requirement on a part.  
19 It's just we're interested in --

20 MR. PURCELL: -- public information as Jerry points  
21 out.

22 MR. MILLER: I think it's for information as much  
23 as anything and we're interested in seeing what other folks  
24 have said about the documents.

25 MR. LINEHAN: I think if you could send us one set,



1 then.

2 MR. PARKER: Thanks for that "one."

3 MR. LINEHAN: Send it to Bob's office.

4 MR. GREEVES: Do you have a computerized list of  
5 issues that might make it easier for John or anybody else to  
6 sort out which one of those comments he might be interested  
7 in that relate with an NRC responsibility?

8 Do you have such a thing?

9 MR. PARKER: Yes. It's in computerese, and that's  
10 the only reason I kind of hesitated. We have an issue  
11 classification system which then correlates with a computer  
12 data base.

13 MR. MILLER: Is that in your reading room?

14 MR. PARKER: No.

15 MR. MILLER: The reading room is here, is that  
16 right?

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Right.

18 MR. MILLER: Before we leave, why don't we try to  
19 have somebody go and look at it, and maybe -- let's leave  
20 the request stand, send us everything, but if someone looks  
21 at it and can maybe pare that down a bit and pinpoint --

22 MR. PURCELL: Did you indicate you think their  
23 librarian might have copies over there?

24 MR. PARKER: I'm not sure. I know she had called --

25 MR. PURCELL: Why don't you try that first, and it

1 may be available in your own library.

2 MR. LINEHAN: To date we don't, I know that. I  
3 just checked on it yesterday.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Maybe we can reverse the -- why  
5 don't you check in this library and if there is something  
6 you want, let us know and we'll send you what it is you  
7 want, up to and including the whole package? You may, your  
8 librarian may already have stuff, or it may be on its way.

9 MR. PARKER: The process may be unnecessary. But  
10 what we have done is made the initial cut at a project  
11 assignment obviously or headquarters assignment. The relevant  
12 key staff in the projects have then sent back on forms the  
13 issues that they think the comments apply to, and that then  
14 gets input into the computer. So there's an annotation on  
15 the incoming comment letters and packages as well. And  
16 frankly, we haven't closed because of late supplemental  
17 submissions from Nevada -- in their case, the whole submission  
18 on the classification scheme -- but we're nearly there.  
19 Why don't we find out exactly what you need and we'll provide  
20 it.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Anything else? On this topic?

22 MR. MILLER: Let me ask you, just from your side,  
23 you know the logistics of this, is it easier to copy the  
24 whole thing, or you know, if we pinpoint individual comments,  
25 is it going to be any easier? If you've got a collection of

1 stuff, it might just be easier to, for everybody, to just  
2 Xerox the whole thing and send it.

3 MR. PARKER: Sure.

4 MR. MILLER: We'll check to make sure we don't  
5 have it.

6 MR. PARKER: You want us to copy the NRC comments  
7 and send them back, too?

8 MR. MILLER: No.

9 MR. PARKER: Good. That was the largest group of  
10 comments. Actually, it wasn't, come to think of it. Thousands  
11 of pages from Houston.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. Anything else on this topic?

13 Thank you, Jerry.

14 MR. PARKER: Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Appreciate it very much.

16 We can now go back to the first item on the  
17 agenda if you'd like, or if there's any other topic you'd  
18 like to take up first. The first item is the review  
19 procedures for setting up technical meetings. And if that's  
20 all right with you, why don't we go right to that topic,  
21 next.

22 REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SETTING UP TECHNICAL  
23 MEETINGS -- RALPH STEIN

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let me tell you what I have  
25 extracted from the procedural agreements that we have

1 signed in the last couple of years. There's two basic  
2 agreements that have been developed by the Department and  
3 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. One is commonly called the  
4 Morgan-Davis Agreement, and then there is another agreement  
5 that is called the Site-Specific Agreement. Both of these  
6 agreements have been signed. One of them, the site-specific  
7 agreement, still has an issue outstanding which needs to  
8 be discussed a little bit later on, and that's Appendix 7  
9 of that procedural agreement.

10 But referring back to those two agreements, what you  
11 find are some guidance, guidelines that exist in those  
12 agreements on the issue of setting up technical meetings,  
13 lead time, advance exchange of information, management review  
14 of meeting minutes.

15 Under, for example, the Morgan-Davis agreement, it  
16 says that schedules of activities pertaining to technical  
17 meetings will be made publicly available. Potential host states  
18 and affected Indian tribes will be notified and invited to  
19 attend technical meetings covered in this section. The no-  
20 tice will be given on a timely basis by the Department of  
21 Energy. And that's basically all it says on that topic.  
22 But there is more that is said in the, what we call the  
23 procedural agreement, the Site-Specific Agreement, where we  
24 talk about developing schedules for future meetings covering  
25 approximately a three-month period, and updating them at least

1 weekly and posted prominently in the local Headquarters  
2 Public Document Rooms of both NRC and the DOE.

3           Now, in fact, we have not projected in all cases  
4 meetings three months in advance. The purpose of today's  
5 meeting is to try and rectify that situation by projecting  
6 as far in advance as we can meetings that we believe are  
7 appropriate and necessary between the Department and NRC.

8           In addition to notifying people by posting those  
9 meetings, the procedural agreement says a toll-free telephone  
10 service will be operated by DOE Headquarters to announce the  
11 meeting schedules. Now that is in place and has been in  
12 place for some period of time, and in fact, the meeting that  
13 we currently are holding is noticed on that toll-free number.  
14 But we have also tried to, in the procedural agreement,  
15 indicate how far in advance we would like to set up these  
16 meetings. In addition to talking about covering a three-month  
17 period, we say that we would like to establish dates for  
18 technical meetings and agree to them as far in advance as  
19 practical with a goal of four months in advance of the meeting.  
20 And that we would put together agendas and who would  
21 participate in these meetings a minimum of ten working days  
22 prior to the scheduled date for the meeting posted in the  
23 Public Document Rooms.

24           These are the things, the agreements, protocols if  
25 you will, for the meetings that we have collectively agreed

1 upon in the past and have written in the Morgan-Davis  
2 Agreement and procedural agreement, which were signed by  
3 Browning and Bennett and you, Hub, along with all the  
4 project managers, and your project managers.

5           What we have done in the past, because of a variety  
6 of reasons, we have not lived up to all the elements of these  
7 protocols. And recognizing that we need to do better, we  
8 of course tried to put together a series of meetings, very  
9 necessary meetings, identify them and project when these  
10 meetings might be held, post them and try to hold these  
11 meetings on a schedule that we all agree on. So that, you  
12 know, is my view of what has occurred in the past and what  
13 we're trying to do to rectify any shortcomings in these  
14 technical meetings that we have scheduled in the past on  
15 perhaps shorter notice than what we all would have liked to  
16 have had.

17           MR. MILLER: I think you accurately covered  
18 all the points that I think are significant with respect to  
19 these meetings. We, as well, I don't think have done  
20 what it says we should be doing, and that is to get these  
21 meetings projected and have this list of projected meetings  
22 displayed in Public Document Rooms. I think we have done a  
23 reasonable job of getting meetings on the phone line.  
24 But there is an area which we need to discuss, I think, where  
25 I think some improvement is needed on both our parts.

1 I'm concerned about one, the lead times that are  
2 needed for both of us to be prepared to participate in these  
3 meetings, and also about making sure that the states and  
4 tribes have notice of these meetings well in advance of the  
5 time that they're held.

6 With respect to the former, that is, our being  
7 prepared, we do have a goal of identifying meetings four  
8 months in advance. That is so ambitious that it turns out,  
9 quite frankly, that we end up most of the time, in fact I  
10 don't know if there's ever a time we've been able to  
11 successfully project a meeting four months in advance and then  
12 have it come off on schedule. We have no other milestone to  
13 shoot for. We're thinking, there is a 10-days, that's a  
14 two weeks essentially, ten working days, that is called for  
15 as far as firming up on an agenda. But we're thinking that  
16 it might be helpful to have four weeks as another milestone  
17 that we'd be shooting for as far as identification of the  
18 meeting is concerned. And a lot of it depends upon how complex  
19 the meeting is, and you know, a lot of it depends upon what  
20 the subject of the meeting is. But we're finding that we  
21 don't meet four months and then, having missed that, then  
22 it's, there's no other time frame to be shooting for. And  
23 for example, on a meeting on an involved subject like the  
24 exploratory shaft test plan, that exists -- I'm using an  
25 example of a meeting we have had in the past -- and where

1 there's a fairly thick document that has to be reviewed and  
2 in order to have a meaningful exchange it takes us some time  
3 to get through and develop comments and positions, we'd like  
4 to say that four weeks beforehand we agree to have some  
5 exchange of document.

6 For example, if we're meeting on one of our technical  
7 positions, let's take for example, when we get to the point  
8 where we've matured out thinking and have developed a draft  
9 of this technical position on the ground war travel time,  
10 fairly thick document. We would hope to be able to provide  
11 that to you four weeks before any meeting so you'd have a  
12 chance to look at, others would have a chance to look at  
13 it.

14 It is a situation-dependent thing. But I think that  
15 if we could, as a minimum, work to the 10-days, with four  
16 weeks as kind of a target that would be optimum, four  
17 months if we can do it, would help us. Now, if there is not  
18 any major document, if there's a brief document, I think that  
19 the ten days that is specified for firming up on the agenda  
20 is probably an adequate target for exchange of any information  
21 beforehand.

22 But for folks like John to organize his staff and  
23 organize the contractors that we have helping, to review the  
24 document, it just takes time. What I'm relaying to you is  
25 kind of the result of practical experience, since the time that



1 we scheduled the -- time we firmed up on this agreement.  
2 And maybe I can get your reaction to what I'm talking about  
3 here.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Sure. I think that what you're  
5 saying is that you agree with a goal four months in advance,  
6 which is what is said there, and of course, the use of the  
7 word "goal" was deliberately chosen because we all recognize  
8 that it wasn't always possible to meet a four-month advance  
9 schedule, but we wanted to do it as far in advance as we  
10 possibly can. The four-week period as I understand, you're  
11 suggesting that that would be the time prior to the meeting  
12 that information that would support the meeting would be  
13 sent over to NRC so that they would have that period of time  
14 at least to review the information in preparation of the  
15 meeting, and hopefully four weeks is achievable, so you would  
16 be able to get that much time anyhow.

17 MR. MILLER: Or vice versa. We're coming out with  
18 a document that, and I think there may be instances where we  
19 are producing guides documents that you and others want to  
20 talk to us about, and we would provide that.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: You know, I'm glad you said that  
22 because there are many things that you are producing that are  
23 very important to our program and we also would like the  
24 opportunity of seeing those as early as possible. Basically,  
25 I don't have any objection to try and get you information at

1 least four weeks in advance. I would very much like to be  
2 able to do that. In reality sometimes we find ourselves in a  
3 situation where we have a meeting that's coming up three  
4 weeks from now and we're doing everything we can do put the  
5 information together and so that we can meet the meeting  
6 date, and we walk into the meeting with the paper still warm  
7 from reproduction. That is not a real good situation. In  
8 fact it's not a desirable situation. So you know I do favor  
9 trying to have information available as early as possible, and  
10 I certainly would subscribe to trying to have information  
11 to you, again as a goal, at least four weeks in advance. I  
12 think that that is completely reasonable.

13 MR. MILLER: This doesn't really talk specifically  
14 about exchange of information. It's silent on that. All it  
15 talks about is when the meetings will be first identified  
16 and then secondly, when there will be a firming up on the  
17 agenda.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We're talking about exchange of  
19 information.

20 MR. MILLER: I'm kind of adding something in here,  
21 something that my experience, it's clear to us at least we  
22 need to have some agreement on.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: One area that we of course sometimes  
24 have difficulty with is exchange of, from our part, of  
25 draft information, that we would like to get it firmed up,

1 going through some quality check prior to the meeting.

2 But again, I think that adding a requirement for, or at least  
3 a goal, if you will, for having exchange of information four  
4 weeks in advance is entirely reasonable.

5 MR. MILLER: For instances I think, where there's  
6 not a thick document, I think that ten days is adequate.  
7 But if there's not some document that's exchanged beforehand,  
8 then the other thing that we've learned is that you have to  
9 have a pretty specific agenda, so that you go into the meeting  
10 with a real good idea of what the issues are and what we're  
11 trying to accomplish. So then in that case, you know, the ten  
12 days is adequate.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I agree that we need an agenda and  
14 that we agree on the agenda beforehand and then we focus on  
15 that agenda at the meeting and avoid sliding off of the  
16 agenda. If there are other topics that need to be covered,  
17 that are not part of the agenda, it ought to be covered,  
18 arranged to be covered separately at another meeting.

19 MR. MILLER: Is there anything else with respect  
20 to our needs that we need to bring up in terms of preparation  
21 of meetings, lead time, exchange of information?

22 The second thing that I wanted to talk about is  
23 the notification of the states and tribes and the  
24 provision of information to them. One of the other important  
25 points of the procedural agreement is that the states and

1 tribes are offered the opportunity to participate in the  
2 meetings that we have. The public is, of course, invited  
3 as observers, not as participants. And we, while the  
4 agreement calls for DOE to make notification to the states  
5 and tribes, we have a parallel service, if you will, where  
6 we have a phone line which announces, identifies all the  
7 meetings that are coming up. As well, we have committed to the  
8 states and tribes to be extending them on a weekly basis the  
9 list of upcoming meetings. This is something we are doing.  
10 There has been some instances recently where we have  
11 scheduled, you and we have scheduled meetings on short notice.  
12 I think there have been reasonably good, there has been a  
13 reasonably good basis for doing that on short notice, but I  
14 think we have to be careful to make the cases where we do  
15 schedule meetings on short notice and that is, less than  
16 10 working days, and less than the time frames we've  
17 established, make that be the rare case.

18 I don't think you'll disagree with that. We also  
19 feel it's important to in some way provide to the states and  
20 tribes, the relevant states and tribes, some information  
21 before the meetings. This is our feeling at least. So that  
22 they can be in a position to be able to make, first of all,  
23 a decision as to whether or not they want to participate and  
24 secondly, if they do make that decision, to come to the meeting  
25 reasonably prepared themselves. We, I think, for most

1 meetings, the information that's being reviewed is available.  
2 There are some cases, however, where we are discussing a  
3 specific document and I guess it's our proposal, and if you  
4 can't react to this today that's fine, but it would be our  
5 feeling that we should make sure that the states and tribes,  
6 the relevant states and tribes, would have whatever document  
7 it is we would be discussing on a timely basis as well.

8           If that means, let's say we're going to discuss a  
9 test plan of some sort, that test plan would be sent to the  
10 states and tribes as well as to us, before the meeting.

11           I guess it's our position that it's just not, doesn't  
12 seem possible to have the states be able to participate,  
13 and the tribes, without that kind of similar providing of  
14 information beforehand.

15           We are being criticized, and in responding to the  
16 criticism I think we, whatever we do, we want to make  
17 sure it's something that the Department can agree to as well,  
18 because it's a mutual thing.

19           CHAIRMAN STEIN: The States have expressed their  
20 concern to us about receiving information in a timely  
21 manner so that they can participate in these meetings.  
22 Of course, the earlier discussions that we had about notifica-  
23 tion is going to help give the states an earlier, states and  
24 Indian tribes and earlier opportunity to know about the  
25 upcoming meeting.

1           As far as the exact procedure of getting information  
2 to them, we're still trying to formulate what would best  
3 serve the needs and interests of the states. One thing that  
4 we have done recently is that we have asked the states and  
5 Indian tribes to give us their thoughts on how they might  
6 participate in the site characterization plan development.  
7 We've sent them out the annotated outline and asked them to  
8 look at that and also to let us know how they might  
9 participate, how they would like to participate in its  
10 development and we'll get some responses back. That will  
11 also help formulate an approach that would be beneficial to  
12 bringing the states into, more into the process of  
13 participation in these kinds of meetings.

14           We're still in the process, as I say, of  
15 evaluating what are the various options to give the states  
16 greatest opportunity for participation within the framework  
17 of our activities. And so at this point I can't tell you an  
18 exact approach that the Department would like to take. But  
19 I think that in general we want to make sure that the states  
20 and Indian tribes do have information as early as possible  
21 so they can come into these meetings knowing what it's all  
22 about, or conversely, elect not to come.

23           MR. MILLER: I think that the position that we're  
24 in is that we're having to respond to letters. And what we  
25 want to say is that, consistent with the agreement, that of

1 course the states and tribes would be given the opportunity,  
2 and the minimum of ten days, and I would emphasize the word  
3 "normally," because there are instances where it's necessary  
4 to meet on shorter notice, and we don't want to rule that out  
5 as a possibility. But that normally we will be providing  
6 agenda and materials, whatever materials there are, that are  
7 not otherwise available to them, ten days in advance. And if  
8 there's a longer lead time, if it's a complicated plan, and  
9 this four-week criterial that we've talked about applies,  
10 then we would provide the material to them at that time.

11 So whenever there is an exchange of information,  
12 that information would also be given to the states and tribes  
13 as well. That would be our position or our desired approach  
14 towards this.

15 And if you can't, what you're saying, Ralph,  
16 essentially, that -- you need to staff out, I guess, the  
17 Agency position on this -- but I think as early as possible  
18 we'd like to know what that is so that we can be sure that we  
19 and you are taking the same approach.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Again, I want to make sure that  
21 you understand what I'm saying. I'm reacting very positively  
22 to the need to give the states and Indian tribes an opportunity  
23 to understand, coming into the meeting, what it's about. They  
24 need information, they need early notification. The  
25 approach, what we would like to respond back to comments that

1 we have received from the states in this area is something  
2 that is still being developed internally and until that, until  
3 we complete that process, you know, I don't want to just be  
4 presumptuous and offer up an approach that might be different  
5 from what we ultimately come forward with. So I'll get back  
6 with you on that.

7 MR. MILLER: Okay. Just one last point of informa-  
8 tion on that, and that is that of course, when you send us  
9 material, that material immediately goes into the public  
10 document rooms. So if there's questions in your mind about  
11 exchange of information and what would be appropriate, I  
12 think it might be useful to you to know that that occurs  
13 immediately.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We're well aware of the rule today  
15 for information to go immediately into the Public Document  
16 Room.

17 MR. MILLER: And I guess the point of that is that  
18 when the information comes, it's public domain anyway once  
19 it's sent to us, so the only thing that would be required on  
20 your part, if it's a meeting where you're providing informa-  
21 tion ahead of time, is to make a mailing of some sort, and  
22 that's the only thing I think that would be required on your  
23 part. But I'll await you're getting back to us on this.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Anything else in that Item 1?

25 MR. MILLER: You had an item on management review of



1 meeting minutes, Ralph. I'm not sure --

2           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm sorry. Yes, there is an item  
3 there. The meeting minutes that are developed following these  
4 sessions sometimes will get signed off by the lead participant  
5 in the meeting. I would like you to know that we have  
6 currently under consideration a possibility of adding to the  
7 sign-off procedure whereby the minutes would go through the  
8 respective management of the project office and the Head-  
9 quarters management before those minutes ultimately get signed  
10 off. So there might be a step in the process where we would  
11 want the project manager, and myself, to look at the minutes  
12 and initial off on them as acknowledging that we have looked  
13 at these minutes and then go ahead through the rest of the  
14 sign-off procedure.

15           That increases the time in getting the minutes  
16 signed off. We would like to, of course, complete the sign-off  
17 at the end of the meeting. But nevertheless, what I'm suggesting  
18 as a procedure is something that we have used in the past.  
19 In fact, when we were initially meeting, the minutes would go  
20 back and as I recall, you had signed them off and I or somebody  
21 who is higher in the management chain than myself would sign  
22 them off. Most recently, when we had the meetings with you  
23 on the SEP Conceptual Design, those minutes went back and  
24 forth for some period of time until they were finally initialled  
25 off. Another example is a recent meeting between NRC and DOE

1 on the licensing information system where the minutes have yet  
2 to be signed off, pending review by NRC and DOE. So we do have  
3 precedent for not signing the minutes immediately following  
4 the meeting until other levels of management look at the  
5 minutes and this is what we are considering to put into  
6 practice, as a standard way of doing business.

7 MR. MILLER: Well, I think we maybe ought to talk  
8 about this for a moment, in what is the significance of  
9 signing meeting minutes at the meeting.

10 The agreement -- there was some ambiguity on this  
11 in the Morgan-Davis Agreement. It said the written report  
12 agreed to by both DOE and NRC would be prepared for each  
13 meeting including agreements reached. In going to the Project  
14 Agreement, it was our feeling that we needed to clarify that,  
15 and what it says in the Project Agreement is that the meeting  
16 minutes will be signed and initialled by representatives of  
17 both agencies at the conclusion of each meeting. You're right  
18 that at Nevada, I think for a while there was a case where  
19 the meeting minutes were not signed or even initialled during  
20 the meeting. But the, in the BWIP case and I think in the  
21 SALT case, where we were having meetings, the meetings were  
22 signed on the spot, and it would be our desire still to do  
23 that, to follow what the agreement says. Now, what that means  
24 is, it means that there's an understanding of both parties  
25 what happened in the meeting. Now, the meeting minutes have

1 two parts to it. They have, they are kind of a record of  
2 what happened, and they also get into agreements. They also  
3 get into what are basically positions of the DOE and positions  
4 of the NRC as well as the states and tribes, if they so wish.

5           The part that becomes tricky is the part that  
6 involves people taking positions for DOE or for NRC. At  
7 least from our side, folks are not taking positions without  
8 having those staffed out and without having confidence that  
9 those are positions of the agency. So from our side, what  
10 folks are signing up to are those things that factually  
11 occurred during the meeting, and it's kind of an agreement  
12 that we both heard the same thing; this is what happened.  
13 And secondly, signing up to those things which they have  
14 confidence are agency positions.

15           I'm afraid to get into a situation where there is a  
16 long process following the meeting of review and sign-off,  
17 because I think a lot will get lost. Now there may be a need  
18 following these meetings to have some open items, where  
19 somebody says, our tentative position is thus and such,  
20 which will trigger a process whereby we can firm up and we can  
21 go through management reviews and get sign off on a position  
22 that somebody is only feeling they can tentatively take in a  
23 meeting. But I'd be concerned, Ralph, about getting away  
24 from a situation where we have people initial, as it says  
25 here, sign or initial the meeting minutes right there in the

1 meeting.

2           Now we have, you're right, in some cases, recently,  
3 I guess, slipped from doing that. But --

4           CHAIRMAN STEIN: There is something that you really  
5 need to consider, relative to the meetings that we have with  
6 NRC. When you talk about a position, you're talking about an  
7 agency that, although it's located in a number of different  
8 buildings, is a single agency located in close proximity to  
9 one another, and have the opportunity to quickly communicate  
10 and to resolve any matters that may come up during the meeting  
11 and following the meeting.

12           At the present time, in the Department's program,  
13 we have, as you know, four projects, four active projects.  
14 Three projects, nine sites. At any one time, we may have a  
15 single site that is represented at a meeting with NRC.  
16 The concern that I'm expressing is that oftentimes in those  
17 single meetings with NRC, the individual who is representing  
18 that site gets involved in discussions that go well beyond,  
19 or may go well beyond, that single site, and may go beyond  
20 a technical issue as such and become somewhat programmatic in  
21 nature.

22           We have to be concerned, from an overall program  
23 point of view, that what is being signed up to is agreed to from  
24 a program-wide standpoint. What I'm concerned about is that  
25 occasionally we'll get into a situation where somebody will

1 make a statement, sign up to some particular position, that  
2 from a program point of view we cannot agree with, and it  
3 becomes a matter of record that that particular issue has  
4 been signed up to by a DOE representative.

5 A quick turnaround, I mean, I'd be more than happy  
6 to agree to a rapid turnaround, if you're concerned about  
7 something dragging out over a period of time. And like I say,  
8 we are still in the process of considering just how we're  
9 going to handle management overview of the particular  
10 meeting. So it isn't in concrete now, and this is sort of an  
11 early discussion on the topic.

12 But we think that it's important that we have an  
13 opportunity to review those minutes before they be -- before  
14 they are committed to by an individual for the Department.

15 MR. MILLER: Well, I understand, and it's very  
16 important that, given the significance of these meetings and  
17 the positions that are taken, that they be, the positions be  
18 ones that we both have confidence are ones that represent  
19 the real view of the agency. At least from our point, it's  
20 the staff, it's not the Commission. But we have mechanisms in  
21 place to assure that. And I understand your concern, and  
22 I'm wondering if we just can't adopt an approach where we,  
23 for those things which are very significant and to which  
24 there is uncertainty on the part of the people taking the  
25 positions, that we clearly identify those as tentative. I

1 guess maybe it's being associated with a program for many  
2 years that insisted upon a business practice of when there's  
3 a meeting, that folks don't walk out of the meeting without  
4 at least initialling what happened in that meeting with the  
5 experience being that if you don't do that, a lot gets lost  
6 later on. And in the Nevada Amendment, it's not a reflection  
7 of any one individual or any group of people, but in certain  
8 instances we had minutes signed on the spot and in other  
9 instances we didn't. And in the cases where we didn't, it  
10 dragged on. It took months. And I'm not sure that we won't  
11 get into a situation where we're all resolved to do it in two  
12 weeks and we'll be like we are right now with this four months  
13 on the advance notice of meetings.

14 I'd ask you to consider that. We can identify  
15 certain things as things that have got to be checked out  
16 later, but --

17 MR. PURCELL: Well, actually, Hub, it can be  
18 handled either way. But it's not an uncommon practice to  
19 have -- and I agree with you. You ought to have a record of  
20 the meeting and people ought to agree on what that record  
21 should be. But it's not uncommon to have the agreements  
22 certified or verified by an official at a later time.

23 MR. MILLER: Sure.

24 MR. PURCELL: They do this all the time in contractual  
25 matters. So I don't see anything wrong with having the

1 signature be identified as tentative for a certain period of  
2 time, to be confirmed at a later time. Unless you do something  
3 like that I think you wind uninhibiting people in terms of  
4 coming to closure on many items.

5           You know, to keep the process going, we'd like to  
6 have agreements and we'd like to have them in a timely fashion.  
7 But I think there is a need to get some kind of an official  
8 confirmation of whatever may have occurred in the way of  
9 agreements in the meeting. You can have it so that the signature  
10 would be tentative or would imply that this is what happened  
11 but for major agreements, like we're talking about that may  
12 have occurred, would have to be certified.

13           MR. MILLER: I think I see what you're saying.  
14 I would agree with that. Some sort of initialling there,  
15 and --

16           MR. PURCELL: I would agree wholeheartedly, you  
17 have to have a record and people ought to sign up to is as  
18 being an accurate record of the meeting. But when it comes to  
19 making commitments or taking major positions on policy or  
20 areas that get into that, then I think there has to be a  
21 confirmation by an official that the Department backs that.

22           MR. MILLER: I agree with that.

23           MR. PURCELL: And I think you can handle that by  
24 having a period of time after the meeting has been held for  
25 getting some kind of certification or withdrawal of certain

1 committments if they were inappropriate.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Hub, isn't there a further point to the  
3 one that you mentioned? If the notes are not signed at the  
4 moment, something might be lost, for the record. There's  
5 also another point. And that is that perhaps the notes are  
6 not signed at the moment and there's further discussions  
7 between the projects and Headquarters, or between Headquarters  
8 and NRC, there might be developments that did not take place  
9 at the meeting which then --

10 MR. PURCELL: Yes, and I --

11 (Simultaneous voices)

12 MR. PURCELL: I agree. And I don't favor minutes  
13 that are negotiated over a period of time following the  
14 meeting. Not at all. I think there ought to be an accurate  
15 record of what happens. People ought to sign up to it. The  
16 only thing I'm saying is there ought to be a step in the  
17 process for an official confirmation of those agreements or  
18 committments that have been made that may be outside the  
19 scope of the responsibility of the individual that's in  
20 agreement. And I think this is done all the time. I know  
21 it's done in contractual matters.

22 MR. GREEVES: Let me say, in my experience, and I've  
23 been to a lot of these meetings, any that weren't signed were  
24 on an exception basis. When you spoke about conceptual  
25 design, you folks had to go. We were looking to sit down and



1 write those meeting minutes then and there. It seems to me,  
2 Hub, that maybe if they agreed to a process whereby we do  
3 what we've always done, which is write the meeting minutes  
4 up, have them signed, and as you get them, within a one-month  
5 time frame, if on a particular set of meeting minutes it's  
6 not consistent with DOE policy, you write us a note to that  
7 extent and we could put together a protocol that allows for  
8 that time of a mechanism.

9 MR. PURCELL: That's exactly what I'm proposing.

10 MR. GREEVES: As opposed to a protocol where you  
11 have to absolutely concur on everything.

12 MR. MILLER: That's reasonable. I understand what  
13 you're saying, Bill. I want to repeat what Bob says, that  
14 it's very important to us -- that is that, and I think  
15 you'll agree with this -- that there can't be negotiation  
16 outside the meeting --

17 MR. PURCELL: No, no. The only thing I'm suggesting  
18 is that if what's document in the meeting is a little  
19 outside the responsibility of the individual who signed up, we  
20 can identify that.

21 MR. MILLER: In some written fashion.

22 MR. PURCELL: We can either confirm it, and it may  
23 be an appropriate decision, in which case we would sign up  
24 on it. If it was inappropriate, we would modify it in that  
25 respect only. There wouldn't be any negotiation, and we'd

1 recognize if there was an issue, that it be resolved.

2 MR. MILLER: Okay, provided -- I think a key here  
3 would be to put something in writing, if there was a problem,  
4 following up the meeting.

5 I guess the major reason for ever putting this in  
6 to start with was just one of common sense business practice.  
7 I tell a story of the time we were down in New Mexico and  
8 licensing a uranium mill and we had two days of very hard  
9 meetings, and at the end of the two days everybody wanted to  
10 leave and about six O'clock in the evening, and the story  
11 was well, let's write the meeting minutes. Well, we all  
12 understand what the other party said. Well, it took until  
13 Midnight that night to get something in writing that every-  
14 body could agree had happened in the meeting. So just as a  
15 point of communication, we think it's necessary to have some  
16 initially.

17 MR. PURCELL: Yes. Well, I don't disagree at all.  
18 In fact, I totally support having a documented record of the  
19 meeting, initialled, or whatever, by the participants. All  
20 I'm suggesting is that there be some kind of an official  
21 confirmation of whatever agreements are made.

22 MR. MILLER: Can we put a cap on that, Bill? How  
23 long afterwards that we would --

24 MR. PURCELL: Two weeks, I don't -- something like that.

25 MR. MILLER: Two weeks?

1 MR. PURCELL: And I'm only saying that because as  
2 Ralphpoints out, sometimes there are several other offices  
3 that have to be involved in it, just like, you know, you tell  
4 people in an office they have certain responsibilities, and  
5 you don't like to cut the legs out from under them without  
6 giving them a chance to identify that it's a problem to  
7 them.

8 Some process by which we have an official  
9 confirmation. In any case --

10 MR. MILLER: Can we say two weeks is a goal?

11 MR. PURCELL: What do you think?

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Two weeks, I think two weeks --

13 MR. PURCELL: Two weeks as a goal.

14 How do you feel about that?

15 MS. CASEY: I guess I'm still a little unclear as  
16 to whether you want to deal with it on an exception basis  
17 that Hub was discussing of if you see a problem write about  
18 it, or if you wanted to have it as a standard signature on  
19 every meeting minutes.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: It's better to hold it on every  
21 meeting minutes. We ought to go into it that way. If it  
22 turns out that this is not the way to do it, --

23 MR. PURCELL: We can send you a note after every  
24 meeting confirming it or --

25 MR. MILLER: . Either that, or, I'm just wondering

1 if, I guess what you're saying is, your feeling is that maybe  
2 the folks even participating won't see something that  
3 you have confidence in saying well, the person on the spot would  
4 be able to identify, this is one that I have to get reviewed.  
5 I mean I would prefer to have it be an exception, but from  
6 what you're saying, you'd like to have an automatic mechanism  
7 of --

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'd like to have an automatic  
9 mechanism. I think that Bill's proposal is a very good  
10 proposal, that somebody signs up on it but you have a  
11 confirmation signature. Two weeks is a reasonable period of  
12 time to do that.

13 MR. MILLER: But in a sense this is not even  
14 something that we need to negotiate because it's something  
15 that you feel as though you need and as long as we can have  
16 some agreement that it would be within a period of time, two  
17 weeks as a goal sounds reasonable to me. Any problem with that?

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. You know, what we have done  
19 we have taken something that worked out to be an item that I  
20 was going to raise to your attention, an area that we're  
21 going to consider, that we have under consideration, and  
22 brought it to a resolution. It just shows you the worth of  
23 these meetings. That's very good. I congratulate you.

24 Let's move on then. Let me ask Bill a question  
25 for a minute. Hold on.

1 MR. MILLER: Sure. There is one last point we have  
2 to raise on this meeting minute thing, if it's okay. That  
3 is that I'm reminded that one of the first things we do  
4 once we get the initial meeting minutes prepared is to  
5 distribute them to folks. And I would propose that we would  
6 continue to distribute those meeting minuts on being initialled  
7 and/or signed, and that if there is any problem later on,  
8 that would follow and be distributed to the same group of  
9 people, so if there was any problem, that could be identified  
10 later. But I don't want to hold off on -- for example, on a  
11 meeting last week on BWIP Hydrology, the State of Oregon has  
12 already asked for the meeting minutes of that meeting, and we  
13 have prohided those to them.

14 MR. PURCELL: I don't see any problem with that.  
15 In certain rare cases you might have to send out a corrected  
16 sentence.

17 MR. MILLER: Sure.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't see a problem, either,  
19 and I'd just like to point out to you that one of the  
20 additional things that we plan to do is, like, as you see,  
21 we have a Court Reporter, at this meeting; we think that  
22 it's a good idea to have these folks available at these  
23 meetings. Sometimes it just isn't practical when you have a  
24 technical meeting and you have a lot of interaction on  
25 technical subjects, it doesn't fit real well into that kind

1 of scheme. But for this kind of a meeting I think a Court  
2 Reporter is appropriate and that's the reason that I arranged  
3 for one to be here.

4 We will also send out to the interested states  
5 and Indian tribes a copy of the transcript from this meeting,  
6 too.

7 MR. MILLER: I guess that's right. When we went  
8 through the process of negotiating the same guidelines, we  
9 started off trying to take notes and it was just too  
10 difficult and it seemed like everything we said was so  
11 important. We finally went to the transcription, and I think  
12 that aim in this case would suffice for the meeting summary  
13 here. I don't think we necessarily have to produce something  
14 separately. It just dawned on me.

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. I'd like to propose that  
16 we go to Item 4, which is the Status of Appendix 7 of  
17 Procedural Agreement, take a short break after that and then  
18 go to Item 2, the Technical Meetings and end up with Item 5.

19 MR. MILLER: Sounds good.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Sound okay?

21 STATUS OF APPENDIX 7 of PROCEDURAL AGREEMENT  
22 RALPH STEIN

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. Let me just talk a  
24 moment about Appendix 7 of the Procedural Agreement.

25 Appendix 7 of the Procedural Agreement was a

1 remaining open item. The Procedural Agreement itself had  
2 been signed with the recognition that certain portions of it  
3 still needed to be completed. Appendix 7 was one of the  
4 appendices that needed to be completed or dealt with, the  
5 on-site representative and the protocols associated with the  
6 on-site rep.

7 We arranged, with your concurrence, to have a  
8 proposed Appendix 7 prepared at our BWIP office, using the  
9 services of the BWIP DOE representative interacting with  
10 the NRC on-site representative, in this case, Bob Cook, to  
11 prepared a proposed Appendix 7, which was done.

12 This came in. We then forwarded it to our NRC,  
13 for your review. You in turn marked it up, revised it, and  
14 sent it back to DOE. We then now had the NRC Headquarters  
15 position on the Appendix 7.

16 Since then, we have reviewed it, that is, since  
17 receiving it back from you we've reviewed it and are in the  
18 process of going back to you with a proposal on Appendix 7,  
19 taking into consideration your markup and our overview on  
20 that document, and plan to, after sending it back to you,  
21 and you having an opportunity to review it, meeting with you  
22 on it sometime in June, to discuss the appendix and hopefully  
23 arrive at an agreement as to the scope of that appendix and  
24 incorporate it into procedural agreement which would then  
25 become a final, complete operating document. So that's the

1 status of Appendix 7, unless you have something to add.

2 MR. MILLER: Is it possible to pick a date in  
3 June?

4 MR. PURCELL: We're going to send you our proposed  
5 resolution. Why don't you, when you get that --

6 MR. MILLER: Okay.

7 MR. PURCELL: Maybe we can agree without having a  
8 meeting --

9 MR. MILLER: When do you think you'll be sending  
10 that?

11 MR. PURCELL: A couple of days.

12 JUDGE STEIN: A couple days.

13 MR. MILLER: So --

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So today is the 30th; you'll have  
15 it by Monday.

16 MR. MILLER: All right. You don't want to tell us  
17 what the issues are?

18 MR. PURCELL: No, I think, you know -- I hope you  
19 can accept it. It's been around. There's no reason why we  
20 can't close on it.

21 MR. MILLER: I think it is important to close that  
22 out. Very important.

23 MR. PURCELL: If you feel there's a meeting  
24 necessary after -ou get our counterproposal, we'll have a  
25 meeting to resolve it.



1 MR. MILLER: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. Good. Then let's  
3 take about a 10-minute break and come back here, let's get  
4 back at 25 to 11:00. That's 14 minutes.

5 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

2A

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let's reconvene the meeting.

7 And the next agenda item is Item Number 2, and that's  
8 Calendary Year 1985 Technical Meetings. We have attached to  
9 the agenda the proposed meetings between DOE and NRC for the  
10 remainder of the calendar year as best we can project them.  
11 And although I call them technical meetings, there are some  
12 meetings, there are some topics here that may be more  
13 management-related than technical, although they are very few  
14 in number.

15 I had previously sent this over to you, Hub, for  
16 you to look at. The list of meetings. As best we can tell,  
17 these meetings are the ones that we think are needed to help  
18 us move in the direction of issuing the Site Characterization  
19 Plan now scheduled for early next year, or I should say plans.  
20 We're presently scheduling both the Tuff and the BWIP; if  
21 those two sites are selected as part of the EA process,  
22 we'll issue site characterization plans sometimes in early  
23 Spring of next year.

24 These topics are the ones that we have identified  
25 within the program as issue-related, technical issue-related

1 that we would like to meet with you on and get feedback  
2 as early as we possibly can for both input into the site  
3 characterization plan and the planning following the site  
4 characterization plan, and would like your input back at this  
5 meeting as to agreement, hopefully, that you'll be able to  
6 support these meetings that are noted here at the time that we  
7 indicate.

8           Now, what our intent is is that we would like to  
9 very quickly firm up for at least the next two months on  
10 specific dates for the meeting topics, and then hold the  
11 remainder, let's say through August, try to firm up on dates,  
12 and hold the rest of it as either firm or tentative but  
13 without a date and a month for the remainder of the meeting  
14 topic.

15           I think, by the way, that this will help those  
16 people, the states and the Indian tribes that are interested,  
17 help them in noting what meetings are coming up and be better  
18 prepared to attend those meetings that are of interest to them.

19           MR. MILLER: Okay. I think we are prepared to  
20 talk about these meetings. And I'll turn it over to John  
21 and the Project Managers to walk through this list. I think  
22 it will take some discussion. Some of these meetings are  
23 meetings that we in fact identified as ones we thought were  
24 appropriate; some of them are ones which we've got some  
25 questions about. And I think the best way to approach it is

1 to just walk through, if you don't mind, just one item at a  
2 time. There are some additional meetings and interactions  
3 which we would like to talk about and propose. So, John?

4 MR. LINEHAN: What we have been doing is, we've  
5 had extensive discussions with the different site projects  
6 on meetings they felt were necessary and we felt were necessary.  
7 Indeed, on the majority of these I think we generally agreed  
8 that if we could go down them one by one -- we've already  
9 talked about the Appendix 7. And as soon as we get the  
10 proposed revisions from you, we'll be back with you to let you  
11 know if there's a need for a meeting so we can firm something  
12 up in June. And we can just say that's firm at this point in  
13 June.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's Item 2, firm. That's fine.

15 MR. MILLER: I'm going to stick my neck out here a  
16 little bit. Presuming we get something early next week and  
17 allowing, let's say about two weeks after that, I'm just  
18 wondering if we can't pick some time at the end of the  
19 third week in June, which would give us a couple weeks.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What's the end of the third week?

21 MR. PURCELL: I would hope we could settle that one  
22 over the phone, frankly.

23 MR. MILLER: All right.

24 MR. PURCELL: I mean, it's been back and forth  
25 several times.

1 MR. MILLER: I guess I'd hoped that it would come back  
2 without any changes. We'd have to see what the issues are.  
3 We can leave it unspecified and just assume about two weeks  
4 after the time we get it.

5 MR. PURCELL: The only issue is some limitation on  
6 the ability to inject themselves in any meeting, at any time.

7 MR. MILLER: You'll have it soon. Let's take a look  
8 at it.

9 MR. LINEHAN: Next, on the Q-list Methodology.  
10 We agree on the June time frame. We would be willing to  
11 meet the third week of June. We'll be available the third  
12 week of June to meet, provided that the paper that we're to  
13 send -- Weston is preparing on the Q-list that you people  
14 will use as input to come up with your position -- is  
15 available to us at least two weeks prior to the meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right.

17 MS. CASEY: Are you still planning to come on the  
18 18th, which is that same week, to SRPO for a management  
19 meeting?

20 MR. LINEHAN: Yes.

21 MS. CASEY: Okay.

22 MR. INEHAN: But one of the things we have  
23 scheduled doesn't appear here, is on the Tuesday the 18th of  
24 June, would be a management meeting out in Columbus on the  
25 SALE project.

1 MR. MILLER: Ralph, I agree with what you were  
2 saying about trying to pick specific dates, because this  
3 whole thing is a process of starting to nail some things  
4 down and letting other things kind of fill in around them.  
5 Can we pick a date the third week of June?

6 MR. PURCELL: Do we have word processing connections  
7 with you people? It seems to me something like an agenda  
8 like this we ought to be able to get into the electronic mail  
9 system and just --

10 MR. MILLER: Avi, what's our system?

11 MR. BENDER: We both have IBM PC's, which should  
12 be no problem.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: No, there isn't any problem of  
14 communicating. We just have to set it up, if we were to do  
15 that. We do have, and we do FAX over regularly the information  
16 between the departments, between agencies.

17 MR. MILLER: Can we pursue that, though?

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We all are doing this as part of  
19 our licensing information system. There is, if you recall,  
20 I don't know if you were at the meeting, the last meeting that  
21 we attended, that we had, we showed a hookup that would  
22 give the Department and NRC access.

23 MR. PURCELL: I think it would be good if we set  
24 that up, for a lot of reasons.

25 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. So you need it two weeks

1 prior to the meeting.

2 MR. MILLER: Can we pick a date here and shoot for  
3 it?

4 How about the 19th?

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: The 19th is fine.

6 Leslie, if you don't like that, speak up.

7 MS. CASEY: Well, we can get someone in here on  
8 the 19th. It won't be me, but --

9 MR. PURCELL: 19th for Appendix 7?

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: No, for Q-list.

11 MR. MILLER: The condition there was something by  
12 the 5th, which would be Wednesday of next week. If you don't  
13 think that's enough time, maybe we could push it back toward  
14 the end of that week.

15 MS. CASEY: 20th?

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Leslie, you're one of the  
17 principals on the Q-list, so you really ought to be in atten-  
18 dance at that meeting.

19 MS. CASEY: Well, the 20th would make it easy,  
20 because I'll be here for the 19th.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. The 20th would probably  
22 be a better time. Jerry, how about you? Is that okay with  
23 you? All right. Let's make it the 20th.

24 MR. HEAD: And that means we're going to get  
25 something to them in writing by the 6th? Next week?

1 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. The next meeting is the Generic  
2 meeting on the Exploratory Shaft Test Plans. We need some  
3 indication from you folks as to what the purpose, scope of  
4 this meeting would be. It's one you've put on, that we just  
5 talked very briefly, when the Nevada meeting was cancelled,  
6 on exploratory shaft. But we really have no idea what you'd  
7 like to cover in the generic meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Why don't I commit to send you  
9 over a letter describing that meeting and the topics  
10 we want to cover. Mark is putting together at this point  
11 a total outline of the issues that we would like to address  
12 at that kind of a meeting and he's working with the projects.  
13 So let's plan that by the end of next week I'll send you a  
14 letter telling you what it is that we would like to cover  
15 in that meeting and then propose a date in July for the  
16 meeting itself.

17 MR. MILLER: Just in general, is it essentially the  
18 topics that are identified in our letter to the projects on  
19 exploratory shaft issues, which are basically the question  
20 of sealing and also information gathering during?

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What we're trying to do is  
22 discuss such things, for example, licensing. What is it that  
23 we need to consider as far as the exploratory shaft whether  
24 should be or should not or does not have to be considered  
25 as a licensable facility, you know, what considerations should

1 we give to the exploratory shaft in that regard, for example.  
2 The information on construction, we're looking at the methods  
3 of construction, and what kind of specific information would  
4 you need.

5 For example, if we're using seals, that have  
6 proprietary information, how much of that proprietary  
7 information would you need. Do you want the chemical  
8 composition? Is it enough to talk about just the performance  
9 of it? General, general information related to all of the  
10 sites.

11 MR. MILLER: Those letters were pretty specific.  
12 But it sounds like what you want to do is walk through those  
13 items that are in that letter.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I have the letter. It's dated the  
15 24th. And we are using that letter as a guide to develop  
16 our presentations for the exploratory shafts.

17 MR. MILLER: This is a letter we sent about a year  
18 and a half ago.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes, but attached to the letter  
20 was the one that you had sent a year ago.

21 MR. MILLER: Which letter are you talking about?

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: There's a letter that's dated  
23 January 25th --

24 MR. MILLER: What year?

25 MR. HEAD: 1985.



1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And then there's another letter  
2 dated April 14th, 1983 to Don Veith --

3 MR. MILLER: That's the one I'm talking about.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And that has information  
5 considered necessary regarding exploratory shaft construction  
6 and sealing. And that has a whole list of items on there that  
7 we are using as a guide to preparing the presentation to  
8 you.

9 MR. MILLER: And it's your feeling that a number of  
10 the issues there, or questions there, are things that you  
11 need to take up on a generic basis?

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes.

13 MR. MILLER: Because in the final analysis, that's  
14 very site-specific.

15 MR. GREEVES: Yes. We sent a letter to each of  
16 the three projects, essentially the same type of a letter,  
17 structured for those projects, and BWIP responded to that  
18 letter some time ago, and we got back to BWIP. SALT  
19 responded to that letter and we got back to -- our response  
20 back to SALT relatively recently, a few months ago. And  
21 Nevada, to my knowledge, has not responded. So we have to  
22 factor all that in. What's important to us is the site  
23 specific question on whether you're going to compromise that  
24 site possibly by sinking this exploratory shaft or whether  
25 you're going to bypass any key opportunities to characterize

1 on the way down. So where I'm coming from is, I want to talk  
2 to you on a site-specific basis, and would be quite willing to  
3 talk to you on a generic basis if you have that need. But I  
4 feel a burden to answer questions we sent you on a site-  
5 specific basis. Are we talking the same story at this point?

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. In fact, if you look at the  
7 agenda, you'll see that Item 10 --

8 MR. GREEVES: Later meetings --

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- is Tuff ES Design, Item 12  
10 is BWIC ES Design and Item 13 is SRP ES Design. So it's  
11 site basis. But we believe that before we do that, we  
12 want to be sure that we understand exactly what it is that  
13 we need to put together in the way of a presentation and what  
14 we need to focus on as part of that presentation.

15 So let's plan that in a week I'll give you more  
16 specifics on that meeting and then we can go from there and  
17 develop our -- a date for the ES Test Plans.

18 MR. MILLER: Do we want to take an approach where  
19 we tentatively identify dates here? I'm kind of concerned  
20 that if we don't leave this meeting with as many dates picked  
21 it's always very hard for us and I'm sure it's hard for you,  
22 too --

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Hub, I'll be glad to pick dates,  
24 only as you recognize that I'm missing one of the site  
25 representatives, and it's hard for me to commit to a date for  
them.

1 MR. MILLER: We can't commit finally here, either.  
2 It's just that we, I find from our side that if we don't pick  
3 a date, the ball never seems to get rolling.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: But if Leslie is willing and Jerry  
5 is willing to commit to dates, even recognizing that we might  
6 change it, that's fine. I'd like to do that, as manyas we  
7 can. I'm even willing to stick my neck out and commit for  
8 BWIP, where I have some information. But where I don't have  
9 information, it's hard to commit for them.

10 So why don't we go down this list and see what we  
11 can do? I guess John has the lead.

12 MR. LINEHAN: Do you have a calendar?

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So we want to pick a day in July  
14 for number 4.

15 MR. GREEVES: 24th.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What did you say?

17 MR. GREEVES: The 24th.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Of July?

19 MR. GREEVES: It's a Wednesday.

20 MR. SZYWEUSKI: We do have a conflict, I believe.  
21 We do have the waste package meeting?

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm sorry, say that again, Jerry?

23 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Waste package meeting in San  
24 Francisco.

25 MR. GREEVES: Is that that week?

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Is that an NRC meeting? A waste  
2 package?

3 MR. LINEHAN: It isn't the same people.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And that's July what, Jerry?

5 MR. GREEVES: 24th.

6 MR. SZYWEUSKI: That is the 27th, 26th, I believe.

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: 26th is a Friday.

8 So Tuff Waste Package is 23, 24 and 25. Is that  
9 what you're say ing, Jerry?

10 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. Let's put that down for  
12 Item 7, 23, 24 and 25. Okay? Now don't pick the next week.

13 MR. GREEVES: I can't. We already have a Retrieva-  
14 bility meeting scheduled for the 31st, unless you want to  
15 change that. Number 9, we spoke to Mark Frye, and that's  
16 July 31st. While we're writing the ones that everybody  
17 knows --

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. So Retrievability Position  
19 is July 31st?

20 MR. GREEVES: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. That's fine.

22 MR. GREEVES: So I don't know what the conflict  
23 between Waste Package and Exploratory Shaft is. It isn't the  
24 same people. I think you're going to somewhere run into a  
25 situation where you have two meetings in the same week. But if

1 Jerry is responsible for both, I think we can decide to just  
2 move it up to the 17th.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Well, I want to make sure that on  
4 the 9th, and I think Mark has already checked it out -- I'm  
5 sorry, on Topic 9 -- that SALT is available, because when we  
6 talk about retrievability, it's very significant for SALT.  
7 So I want to make sure that --

8 MR. GREEVES: Mark's the one that set July 31st.

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let's assume that he has checked  
10 it through the projects.

11 MR. LINEHAN: Do you want to go for the 17th, then?

12 MR. GREEVES: My preference is the 24th, unless  
13 Jerry has -- is there a reason you need to be at both  
14 meetings, Jerry, or somebody?

15 MR. SZYWEUSKI: According to this, I would have to.  
16 The meetings for Tuff, it's site-specific, about the months  
17 later. I have to know what type of documents you will  
18 require two weeks in advance.

19 MR. GREEVES: Well, the best guides on what we're  
20 looking for is what's in the letter that we sent. This  
21 meeting is a meeting you all are calling -- so the 17th --

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What's wrong with the 17th?

23 MR. GREEVES: Is the previous week acceptable?

24 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Yes.

25 MR. GREEVES: Can we make it the 18th?

1 MR. MILLER: That's Number 4.

2 MS. CASEY: Are you saying that Number 4 is almost  
3 like a management meeting at the generic level to get ready  
4 for the site-specific meetings?

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. There will be management  
6 issues, but there will also be some technical discussions,  
7 too. It will be a combination of both.

8 MS. CASEY: Okay.

9 MR. LINEHAN: If we can go to Item 5 --

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So we have that down for the 18th?  
11 All right. BWIP Hydrology Workshop. Now, BWIP is looking at  
12 this meeting as a follow-on to their meeting last week. And  
13 I don't have a date for that time, unless you have had some  
14 discussions with BWIP on --

15 MR. LINEHAN: No, we haven't. We feel there's a  
16 need for a follow-on. There's no question. But we still need  
17 to receive data and information from them, and we'd say the  
18 September time frame is more reasonable than July.

19 MR. MILLER: Let's give them their schedule --

20 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, we learned last week that the  
21 large-scale pump tests will probably start November, December.  
22 And therefore, it allows a number of additional months for  
23 a baseline determination. We were thinking that, as John  
24 said, September, maybe even October may be appropriate. The  
25 ideal time for the next -- we haven't discussed this with

1 BWIP since last week's meeting, so I don't know entirely what's  
2 on their minds.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Why don't we just skip this one?

4 MR. WRIGHT: I think we agree a meeting is  
5 necessary. The timing we have to sort out --

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And let's change -- it's all right  
7 with me to change it, but why don't we call it tentative and  
8 then we can revisit this when we see what needs to be done.

9 MR. MILLER: Is this a date that BWIP gave to you?

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. I talked about all of these  
11 items with the projects.

12 MR. MILLER: And July is the time that they said they  
13 wanted it?

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's when they said --

15 MR. MILLER: So we would leave it tentative with  
16 maybe a parentheses, September-October, and a question mark.  
17 But the concept of a meeting is firm. It's the time.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. As far as I'm concerned,  
19 all these meetings are meetings that we would like to have.  
20 So I look at them as firm. The dates are what is tentative.

21 All right. The comment response, you heard on that.  
22 And he was talking of July but we wasn't prepared to give a  
23 date, Jerry Parker. So I have to --

24 MR. WRIGHT: -- meeting in August the way I heard --

25 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'd just like to leave it July and

1 firm, but I can't put a specific date on it.

2 Tuff Waste Package we got, don't we, John?

3 MR. LINEHAN: Yes. 23rd to the 25th.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: How about the BWIP Geology Data  
5 Review?

6 MR. LINEHAN: That particular meeting right there,  
7 we are not clear on what they're proposing in July. One of  
8 our people, Chris Westbrook, is out there now on an information  
9 gathering trip, where she is looking at data. What we had  
10 talked with the folks at BWIP about was a geology workshop,  
11 in the October-November time frame.

12 Do you have any other information?

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't have any more information  
14 than what you see here.

15 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. I think that again, we agree  
16 there needs to be a geology workshop. As far as the date,  
17 we're going to have to get back in touch with the folks out  
18 at BWIP to firm up a date.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let me do two things like I  
20 agreed to do on Topic 4, and that is to send you over a  
21 letter describing the meeting and proposing a date in the  
22 letter.

23 MR. MILLER: This is number 8?

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes.

25 MS. CASEY: I have a question about who takes the



1 lead in sending over the first agenda. Are these all to go  
2 through Headquarters to the NRC? I mean, you just promised  
3 a letter on a BWIP meeting. Would that come from BWIP or  
4 would that come from Headquarters?

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'll ask BWIP to send a letter.  
6 But what I want to do is I want to coordinate the meetings.  
7 I don't care if the letter goes from BWIP. I just want to be  
8 sure that the, that Headquarters coordinates the meetings with  
9 NRC.

10 MS. CASEY: I agree. I'm just looking --

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So the easiest thing to do is have  
12 BWIP send the letter directly and we'll get a copy of it that  
13 describes the meeting. It's a technical meeting, and I think  
14 that on technical meetings, the projects ought to take the lead  
15 on technical meetings and issues.

16 MR. LINEHAN: I think what's -- I agree with what  
17 you're proposing, to make sure this isn't something that  
18 bounces back and forth. I think if the folks at BWIP would  
19 contact Bob Wright, just to make sure that we agree on the  
20 basic agenda, so that something doesn't come in and, you know,  
21 we don't agree on the type of meeting we need. Just so they  
22 could understand what our needs are.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Would you prefer a phone call to  
24 Bob Wright on this, or do you want a letter then followed by  
25 a phone call?

1 MR. LINEHAN: I think we need a phone call, first.  
2 So there's some general agreement between the key actors as to  
3 what the agenda should be.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I thought what you wanted is a  
5 description of what the meeting is to entail. When you talk  
6 about an agenda, you're talking about that as a description.

7 MR. LINEHAN: As a description. Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. Okay. Would that then  
9 suffice as an agreed-to meeting, as a result of a phone  
10 call? In other words, if there were agreement on the phone  
11 call that the meeting was needed, the topic itself, and the  
12 date, would then that suffice or --

13 MR. LINEHAN: I think what we ought to do is after  
14 the phone call we ought to firm it up with a letter. Just to  
15 make sure that everyone understood.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Now, usually, it takes several phone  
17 conversations for there to be a complete understanding  
18 between the two, between the BWIP and ourselves as to what  
19 is to be covered at the meeting and how much time is to be  
20 devoted in principal to the different topics. Either they or  
21 we prepare a draft agenda that's sent out by Telefax and  
22 the other party responds, and it takes a number of  
23 communications, because the preparation of the agenda is one  
24 of the key elements in a successful meeting.

25 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. How about Item 5? Let's

1 handle that the same way as Item 8.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

3 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. Where are we? Retrievability.

4 We've agreed on the 31st.

5 MS. CASEY: So who would be the Headquarters  
6 coordinator on the agenda for that meeting?

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mark Fry.

8 Now, all these meetings, Leslie, for your  
9 information, the coordinator, the single point of contact is  
10 Charlie Head. He coordinates everything. But the specific  
11 team leader who has the responsibility, the one who does all  
12 the preparation, gets organized and actually conducts the  
13 meeting, or interfaces at the meetings with NRC.

14 Just like the -- John is interfacing on the NRC  
15 side, or separate projects would interface on a particular  
16 topic.

17 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. Moving on to Item 10, on the  
18 Tuff Exploratory Shaft Design. My notes are a little confusing  
19 here. Was it August when we wanted to --

20 MR. STABLEIN: This was the postponed meeting  
21 from June 11 and 12, and we don't have mutually-discussed  
22 dates for this one yet.

23 MR. SZYWEUSKI: We do have major problems, because  
24 we are getting several participants from the projects, and  
25 it is always a nightmare for me to get them lined up together.

1 So I would appreciate as much lead time as I can possibly  
2 get. It's just the mechanics of how to get them together  
3 into the same room.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Jerry, can we just get a date, can  
5 we just pick a date in August and shoot for that date?

6 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Yes. We can try 26th and 27th.  
7 But I cannot promise.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: How about the 27th and 28th?

9 MR. SZYWEUSKI: That's right.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Is that all right?

11 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Let me try. That's all I can --

12 MR. STABLINE: I haven't had a chance to work John  
13 Greeves into the planning. It's his people who are involved.  
14 The 27th or the 28th, John?

15 MR. GREEVES: I've got to start somewhere. So,  
16 yes. And my problem is, you're asking for three of these type  
17 meetings in August, so I was going to try and nudge you on  
18 one of the three.

19 I was going to try and ask you if you could move the  
20 SALT one out of August into September.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Sure. I think that's a good idea.

22 MS. CASEY: No problem.

23 MR. GREEVES: 27th, 28th for Nevada.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let's pick an earlier date in  
25 August for BWIP then.

1 MR. GREEVES: 13th, 14th?

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That sounds good.

3 MR. LINEHAN: So August 13, 14?

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: For BWIP, that's Item 12. And  
5 Leslie, how about Item 13? That'll be September something.

6 MS. CASEY: We have a number of conflicts with  
7 that, year-end type things. But --

8 MR. LINEHAN: Just keep it away from Labor Day.

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: How about the middle of September,  
10 then? There is not nearly the urgency that we have -- how  
11 about the 18th and 19th of September?

12 MR. GREEVES: Let me tell you what you're competing  
13 with. I think you wanted an in situ test plan in Nevada  
14 in September, you want a seismo-tectonic meeting in  
15 September and you're submitting a performance assessment plan  
16 meeting in September. So I'm willing to work whatever way you  
17 want, but that's the competition.

18 MS. CASEY: There is also potential for combination.  
19 We had SRP in situ testing, which isn't too unrelated to  
20 exploratory shaft design.

21 MR. MILLER: May I ask a question on that? There  
22 are a number of meetings here which sound like they're the  
23 same thing. There's one, Number 17 is the Exploratory Shaft  
24 Test Plan. Number 20 is In Situ Testing. And then there  
25 are the ES Design meetings. And I assume that the ES

1 Design meetings are those that address the points in that  
2 letter that you talked about, and that the Exploratory  
3 Shaft Test Plan is essentially the plans for the underground  
4 testing, not just what's in the bottom of the shaft, but  
5 the full suite of tests.

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. Okay. I propose that we  
7 make the SRP September/October and leave it tentative. There  
8 is not the same urgency on SALT ES as there is on the others.

9 MR. GREEVES: Okay. So Number 20, we're going to  
10 leave it just as --

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Well -- 13, just say 13. Let  
12 that be tentative and let 20 be tentative..

13 MR. JOHNSON: We were looking for a later date on  
14 the in situ testing -- let Leslie design one. That might  
15 be, it's also down here for September, for SRP, that's a  
16 possibility to include with the Exploratory Shaft Design.  
17 Although I don't know what you had in mind for the design  
18 meeting.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think that's biting off an  
20 awful lot. to have the underground testplan or in situ  
21 test plan at the same time at the exploratory shaft.

22 MR. JOHNSON: That's what I'm saying, too. We were  
23 looking for a meeting on in situ testing later, December,  
24 January time frame. So I agree with you. I think, though,  
25 if you want to collapse anything, I think maybe the design

1 and exploratory shaft.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: There's one that ought to be --

3 MR. LINEHAN: You're saying 13 and 19 would be  
4 combined?

5 MR. JOHNSON: 13 and 19, yes.

6 That's a possibility.

7 MR. MILLER: What is 19? Let me just ask that  
8 dumb question.

9 MS. CASEY: Well, that was actually more  
10 generic issues and we were looking for a way to combine that  
11 with other things, because we won't have site-specific infor-  
12 mation at that point. So it would be an appropriate one to  
13 collapse.

14 MR. MILLER: But what is the subject of Leslie's  
15 meeting? Repository design, is that going over -- issues  
16 such as what?

17 MS. CASEY: I would say that it is primarily  
18 thoughts on how conceptual design would be showing up in the  
19 SEP.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Would it also be a current status of  
21 your thinking on the design as it might be different than in  
22 the EA's so we could have a basis for kind of picturing it  
23 at this time to look at the exploratory shaft designs?

24 MR. MILLER: The reason why I'm asking the question  
25 is, you know, I'm a little bit like Ralph, concerned that we

1 not bite off too much, and if we're talking about collapsing  
2 these meetings let's make certain we know that we've got  
3 something that can be dealt with that way, if it's --

4 MS. CASEY: Well, the repository design meeting I  
5 think is more collapsible than most here, because it was  
6 intended to be more generic and I think it is not that firm on  
7 it, so --

8 MR. GREEVES: Collapse it with what?

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't think we want to collapse  
10 it. I think we just want to make September -- from  
11 listening to your conversation, I think that September ought  
12 to be later on and it ought to be tentative. Let's make it  
13 closer to the end of the year.

14 Knowing what the schedule is, Leslie,  
15 I can't see where we're going to gain much by having a  
16 September meeting on repository design at this point.

17 MR. GREEVES: 13 is the one you need to worry  
18 about.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I would leave 13 where it is,  
20 September/October, and let's just move that towards the end  
21 of the year, make it December and tentative. That will be  
22 19.

23 MR. JOHNSON: John? Both Johns. We were looking  
24 toward December, January for in situ testing.

25 MR. GREEVES: That's what you and Jerry had



1 discussed.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Rather than design.

3 MR. GREEVES: Design was a new topic. I think  
4 you were all saying look, that's far enough in advance, we  
5 shouldn't be looking at specific dates for it.

6 MR. JOHNSON: That's right.

7 MR. MILLER: I think what Robert is worried about  
8 is what time frame -- just to recap what I thought I heard,  
9 September for the first one, December for the second one,  
10 and December/January for the third.

11 MR. GREEVES: That's what I have donw.

12 MR. JOHNSON: All right. If that's comfortable  
13 with you --

14 MR. GREEVES: That was your understanding with  
15 Jerry?

16 MR. JOHNSON: Jerry wasn't putting in a design one  
17 right away. He was going with exploratory shaft design,  
18 then to in situ testing.

19 MR. GREEVES: And I think that's the way this is  
20 going. Exploratory shaft in September. That's the most firm  
21 of them all.

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We're talking about the SALT?  
23 Yes. Exploratory shaft I have down September/October.

24 MR. LINEHAN: 19 on the repository design, we're  
25 talking about December?

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: December/January. And make that  
2 a tentative. And then the SRP in situ testing --

3 MR. LINEHAN: We're proposing December/January as  
4 well.

5 MR. MILLER: That's what they wanted in the  
6 December/January time frame.

7 MS. CASEY: Well, that just means we'll probably  
8 mail you the information ahead of time.

9 MR. GREEVES: I was just getting ready to say,  
10 we've said this four-week situation, but it's my understanding  
11 that you're preparing a pretty substantial in situ testing  
12 plan with your contractors. If you give us two months instead  
13 of four weeks, the quality of the comments would be much  
14 higher.

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Or the quantity?

16 MR. GREEVES: It's kind of an investment, Ralph.  
17 So in some ways I think you ought to view it as being a  
18 positive step to give us more time and maybe that'll cut down  
19 on the iteration.

20 CHAIRMAN: I do view it as a positive step. The  
21 only problem that I have with in situ testing and ES designs,  
22 pushing them out, is that I would like to get feedback on those  
23 things as quickly as possible. For example, on the SALT, you  
24 have not seen anything on the exploratory shaft design. I  
25 don't know if --

1 MR. GREEVES: We got a package from SALT that we  
2 reviewed and sent back. Now that was on the exploratory  
3 shaft. Leslie; is that right?

4 MS. CASEY: It was on seals and leaks, the shaft in  
5 that sense.

6 MR. GREEVES: We haven't received anything on the  
7 testing.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We haven't seen anything on  
9 construction, I don't believe.

10 MR. MILLER: I think our letter sent back comments  
11 on something that was sent to us early last year or last  
12 year, and we commented in the letter that we recognized that  
13 in fact some changes had been made as we understood it, in  
14 your plans for a method of construction. So you're right.  
15 And we commented on what you had given us initially, but we  
16 know you've changed your plans, and so we're back, to some  
17 extent reviewing.

2B

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What I'm reacting to is an earlier  
19 discussion that I've had with Hub regarding trying to get  
20 our plans in to you as early as possible so that you could  
21 give us some feedback as to the approaches we're going to  
22 take, for example on construction. What is the technique of  
23 construction that we're planning? You know, if you're familiar  
24 with where we are in SALT and what we're planning on doing,  
25 that's fine. That's one of the reasons why I would like to

1 let you know what it is that we are planning on doing in  
2 constructing exploratory shafts.

3 MS. CASEY: Well, this makes Item 4 more important.  
4 And if we push out these site-specific meetings, then Item  
5 4 becomes more important in getting the question explained of  
6 what we're trying to communicate to you. Is that a help?  
7 Can we cover that in July?

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think that what NRC would like  
9 to hear is, they would like to hear site-specific information.  
10 They'll go ahead and participate in Item 4 discussion.  
11 They don't feel at least on the surface that it is as  
12 meaningful a discussion as the site-specific discussions.  
13 They would like to have that kind of discussion scheduled as  
14 early as possible.

15 MR. MILLER: I'm a little confused now. We talked  
16 about September/October for the ES meeting on SALT. I think  
17 I hear you saying you think that even possibly earlier  
18 than that?

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: No, not at all. I heard John  
20 say later. That's what I thought I heard him say. If you  
21 did, that's fine; then we're just circling, the discussion is  
22 becoming a big circle and we can proceed.

23 MR. JOHNSON: There are so many other things that  
24 we're proposing in SALT in October/November; September time  
25 frame is comfortable for us on exploratory shaft design.

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's fine.

2 MR. JOHNSON: . And our letter in response to SRP's  
3 information on construction was asking for new information  
4 on the current construction methods and all that, to prepare  
5 for the site-specific meeting. So we still need that material  
6 as part of the preparation for that meeting.

7 MR. MILLER: There are two kinds of things that you  
8 can talk about under this question of shaft construction  
9 and sealing and testing. One is the basic mode of shaft  
10 construction, whether you blind bore a shaft or whether you  
11 drill and blast and do it by conventional means. And I  
12 know there are long lead times for that kind of thing to get  
13 contracts in place and so on. Then there are a lot of details  
14 about how you seal it, once you go one way or the other.  
15 We're assuming that the September/October time frame is still  
16 early enough in the sense that you have not made any firm  
17 committment to go one way or the other. At least it appears to  
18 us desirable to have a situation where, before you've made  
19 committments, to have some discussion as opposed to --

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: In reality, Hub, you have to  
21 decide well in advance of the time you go out and hire a  
22 contractor to do work. You're talking about making decisions  
23 like that two or more years in advance of actually starting  
24 site work. You need to do that for a variety of reasons.

25 You do it for budget reasons. There's a considerable

1 difference in cost of sinking an exploratory shaft by  
2 blind boring as opposed to sinking it by conventional means.  
3 And that ties in to what the cost is on building a shaft that  
4 has a 10 foot finished diameter as opposed to one that has  
5 a 14 foot finished diameter. So you have to make these  
6 decisions at least tentatively, well in advance. And for  
7 SALT, we're at a point now where we have decided on which way  
8 to go. We haven't committed construction contracts, but we are  
9 prepared to tell you why we have gone a particular way and  
10 what the rationale is for going that way. But you can't come  
11 up just prior to the time that you go out and sign a contract  
12 with a construction manager to build a shaft. You need to do  
13 things well in advance. As I say, two years or more is not  
14 unreasonable lead time.

15 MR. MILLER: Ralph, this is precisely the point  
16 that we made in the letter we sent to you all in January.  
17 We recognize that point. And it is precisely this point  
18 that we feel we need to discuss in terms of looking at the  
19 program, looking at when you are planning to actually do things  
20 like construct shafts, construct bore holes and so on,  
21 recognizing that there's long lead times. Certain lead times  
22 are longer than others. And trying to have a situation where  
23 before you make decisions, that there's some opportunity to  
24 consult. Now, I know that you said that the decision on the  
25 shaft construction method in SALT is tentative. But in

1 effect, there is a certain amount of momentum put in place, I  
2 guess, when you make a decision like that. The thing that  
3 makes me nervous is to have us come in after the time that  
4 these decisions are made, significant decisions like that,  
5 and to be discussing the question of the mode of shaft  
6 construction, after these decisions have been made.

7 I think the whole process is going to be more  
8 credible, I guess, if we can have it clear that there is  
9 some consultation at a time when it's still possible for the  
10 DOE to go another way. Now -- and I know you can still go  
11 another way, theoretically. But I don't want to push this  
12 too hard. But I think that if you've made the decision, I'm  
13 wondering if we shouldn't even have an earlier meeting to  
14 review, if not the full suite of things that are in that  
15 letter that we sent, at least those things that are at  
16 issue when you consider going blind bore or drill and blast.  
17 You know, when you look at the alternatives modes. I think  
18 we've always said that that was the first decision that we  
19 thought we needed to take up. I think at BWIP we did that  
20 in 1981 or 1982. We did that well before we ever got around  
21 to talking about the details, and we documented our position  
22 of agreement with BWIP on their decision to go with a blind  
23 bore as opposed to a drill and blast.

24 I don't know. We think it's important to be taking  
25 these things up, that question of mode of shaft construction

1 early on.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: As I indicated in this meeting  
3 agenda, proposed meeting agenda, this is early. I'm telling  
4 you some of the reasons why we want to do it early, because  
5 we are moving ahead in a particular way. So as I say, the  
6 reality is that certain decisions that we make, you know, are  
7 tentative. They are decisions, but they can be changed. But  
8 nevertheless, you have to do it a long time in advance.  
9 You don't have, you know, you don't have a choice. You have  
10 to do plans, designs, make estimates of funding, you know.  
11 When you talk about funding, just funding alone, I can't  
12 go in with an 1986 budget in 1986. I have to make a 1986  
13 budget in 1984, just like we're working on the 1987 budget  
14 now. And it's in 1985. And that has to go through our  
15 Controller and the whole process. And it does have an  
16 impact on that 1987 budget, you know, the approach that we  
17 take.

18 MR. MILLER: I'm aware of that, and because we are  
19 aware of that, we're wondering whether or not we shouldn't  
20 even be taking up this question of the mode of shaft  
21 construction even earlier than the earlier things.

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We have to get our plans together.  
23 We have to do some planning. We have looked at different  
24 alternatives. And the fact is, we have gone full circle, if  
25 you will, to the approach that were going to take in SALT



1 on shaft sinking. You know, you start out one way and it  
2 looks like the way to go and you even go out perhaps and buy  
3 some equipment to support that. And subsequently, you find  
4 that you really ought to do something different.

5           And with SALT in particular, you have to decide on  
6 where you're going to do this construction. Sometimes you'll  
7 have a different approach, depending upon where you're  
8 located. And that does have an impact on the method that's  
9 selected.

10           MR. MILLER: My worst fear would be that we would  
11 have our technical people come in and say we just think  
12 you've gone 180 degrees from where you should be gone to.  
13 And the longer you let time go on that basic question of the  
14 mode of construction, the pressure is on us, frankly, the  
15 more difficult it is for you to change.

16           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I agree that we do need to get  
17 together as shortly as possible. Again, that's why I put  
18 down August as the time period when we want to talk about  
19 the exploratory shaft design. I would find it very  
20 surprising if the technical people were not in agreement  
21 after the discussion of the approach that is being planned  
22 for shaft sinking. You know, I would be very, very sur-  
23 prised. But nevertheless, surprised, but able to do something  
24 about it if we needed to do something about it, if you folks  
25 felt that there was a substantial reason why we should be

1 going a different way.

2 But the realities are that if you're going to do  
3 budgeting for 1987, you have to make decisions sometime early  
4 in 1985 in order to put together a 1987 budget.

5 MR. GREEVES: Can you just send us, in written  
6 format, as soon as you can, what your plans are on this,  
7 so that if we have some comments we can pass back to you,  
8 without even a meeting, we would do that.

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: But what would be wrong with  
10 holding a meeting on SALT ES Design in August as we had it  
11 down?

12 MR. GREEVES: We already have two in August at the  
13 other two sites. So we are holding meetings. Do you have a  
14 priority?

15 MR. MILLER: Let's talk a little bit more about  
16 this at lunchtime. I need to make a caucus a little bit on  
17 this whole idea of the timing of that particular meeting.  
18 You see what I'm asking. We recognize that you have to start  
19 the process of planning two years in advance just as we do,  
20 the same process you do for budget. We also know that you  
21 can reprogram. So we know those decisions that you make  
22 initially are not final and irrevocable. But there comes a  
23 point where things do begin to lock in, and I think the  
24 process just isn't well served if what we're doing is  
25 after they've pretty much locked in; it's very difficult to

1 change, for us to be consulting at that time. All I'm  
2 suggesting here is that possibly we might piecemeal this in  
3 the same way we did at BWIP. We're recognizing that the  
4 mode of construction was an issue that had to be resolved  
5 way before you actually begin to construct the shaft and  
6 that many of the other questions that we have about  
7 sealing and information gathering are more details that can  
8 come later. We took the mode of shaft construction issue up  
9 very early on, well before. We documented our agreement with  
10 what BWIP had decided in a set of meeting minutes, well  
11 before.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think when you look at BWIP, it's  
13 very difficult to construct a shaft any different than how  
14 those shafts are planned to be constructed. I mean the  
15 realities of the situation are you essentially blind bore.  
16 That's really how you have to construct that shaft. SALT  
17 and Tuff, you have other options. And the other options do  
18 have cost implications, construction implications. And you  
19 have to make some decisions on that early enough that you can  
20 meet the budget process, which is two years in advance.  
21 I think that everything that you said goes to being able to  
22 change that decision if it turns out to be a bad one, is  
23 available. No one is going to force you into a process, a  
24 construction mode just because you have costs in your budget  
25 that talk about one method when another method is better.

1 I think we're at a point now in our process where  
2 we are in the design stages that we feel that we can talk  
3 intelligently with information and details that you need to  
4 see how we're, how we arrived at the process in the position  
5 that we have arrived, and still receive the type of feedback  
6 that we would need from you regarding your method.

7 So I really don't think that we are behind. I  
8 think we're right where we should be in describing to you  
9 the design of each one of the exploratory shafts.

10 Now, we want to talk to you about the SALT, we  
11 want to talk to you in this time frame, August through  
12 October time frame, because it's an appropriate time to  
13 talk. And you know, SALT exploratory shaft is not going to be  
14 sunk for, how long, Leslie, another year? A year after,  
15 when does it start? What's the schedule now for that?  
16 Sometime in 1986 or so, 1987.

17 MR. MILLER: You haven't placed any contracts.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We haven't placed any contracts,  
19 have we?

20 MR. MILLER: We won't place contracts for some  
21 time and procurement documents and all that sort of thing.

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So you know, you're not in a  
23 position that you can't give us your advice, and your thoughts.

24 MR. MILLER: My only point is that the record will  
25 be much stronger -- and I'm thinking now of the record that

1 will be used in licensing. And I think we'll all feel more  
2 comfortable if we're in a position where it's not a  
3 situation where it's clear that there is a post hoc  
4 rationalization period, where the decisions are really made,  
5 and there's consultation after the decisions are really  
6 made, and it's clear that there's pressure on the  
7 individuals at the time to do that. What you're saying,  
8 Ralph, is that that's not really true, that you've made certain  
9 levels of decision for budgeting purposes, but it won't be  
10 academic to have folks getting together in this September/  
11 October time frame in SALT, and that's what I'm trying to --

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Not only budget purposes, but  
13 design purposes. But I think that you've characterized  
14 it correctly. It's not academic to get together to talk  
15 about -- I think it can and will be very productive, actually  
16 be very productive. And if some issue arises regarding the  
17 design, I think we'll have ample opportunity to respond to  
18 it.

19 MR. MILLER: We don't want to go to the meeting,  
20 and be surprised when John Greeves and his people start  
21 asking questions about why are you doing this versus that,  
22 and they're thinking my goshm they thought that was settled  
23 before.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We're not going to these meetings  
25 knowing that things are settled. The purpose of the meeting

1 is to describe to you what it is that we're doing and to  
2 answer your questions and get whatever feedback you can  
3 provide.

4           After all that, I still think that our  
5 initial position, September/October, is okay for that.  
6 Because I really do want to focus in in August on the Tuff  
7 and BWIP exploratory shaft design and I think the dates  
8 we have listed for those two meetings is appropriate.

9           MS. CASEY: So the date for Number 10 was what?

10           CHAIRMAN STEIN: 10 is August 27 and 28 and 12  
11 is August 13 and 14.

12           MS. CASEY: Is there a date for 11 yet?

13           CHAIRMAN STEIN: No. Not yet.

14           MR. GREEVES: 11?

15           CHAIRMAN STEIN: Hydrology and Geochemistry. Tuff  
16 Now there were previous dates that You folks, Jerry met  
17 with --

18           MR. SZWEUSKI: -- start preparing for these, in  
19 order to prepare on the technical basis. And I understand  
20 they are sending us a letter in which they would be suggesting  
21 September 19.

22           MR. STABLEIN: The date that will be suggested in  
23 the letter will be September 23 to 26.

24           CHAIRMAN STEIN: You hear that? On Item 11 your  
25 staff is suggesting --

1 MR. STABLEIN: September 23 to 26.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: September 23 -- that's Item 11.

3 MR. SZYWEUSKI: Firm.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: There are two other topics that  
5 I would like to make firm dates for. One is the Tuff  
6 Exploratory Shaft test plan and the other one is the BWIP  
7 Exploratory Shaft test plan. And both of those are related  
8 to the site characterization plan, and so I would like to  
9 firm those up.

10 Okay? Tuff wants to do theirs in September, and  
11 so we can pick a date.

12 MR. SZYWEUSKI: With the limitations we have.

13 MS. CASEY: The week of the 9th?

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay, we can do it the week of the  
15 9th or the week of the 16th.

16 MR. STABLEIN: John Greeves, is the week of the  
17 9th of September all right with you?

18 MR. GREEVES: You mentioned in the same sentence  
19 BWIP -- I only have one staff.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I would like to get that firmed up  
21 is what I said, John. And what I would do is pick one in  
22 September and pick the BWIP early in October. Okay? So you  
23 pick a date that you think --

24 MR. GREEVES: The 16th.

25 CHAIRMAN STEIN: 16th of September? That's not

1 good for me. But the 17th would be fine.

2 MR. GREEVES: The 17th we'll put down.

3 MS. CASEY: Which one is the 17th?

4 MR. GREEVES: 17. Number 17 starts on September  
5 17th.

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So why don't we just put two dates,  
7 17 and 18?

8 MR. GREEVES: Fine.

9 MR. LINEHAM: On the BWIP Exploratory Shaft test  
10 plan, there had already been dates of October 19th and  
11 20th, already been proposed.

12 VOICE: Dates proposed were what, John?

13 MR. LINEHAM: October 19 and 20.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's on Saturday and Sunday.

15 MS. CASEY: Yes, it is Saturday and Sunday.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: The 15th?

17 MS. CASEY: That's right after Columbus Day.  
18 16th and 17th?

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: 16th and 17th? So October 16 and  
20 17.

21 MS. CASEY: Now, the time frame, I'd like to talk  
22 about SRP Surface Based Test Plan, Number 28, it's here listed  
23 as October/November. However, we've had subsequent  
24 discussions back at the project and are interested in an  
25 earlier meeting. We were thinking August. But --



1 MR. LINEHAN: Leslie, what do you mean by a  
2 surface based test plan?

3 MS. CASEY: Well, it's particularly the field  
4 studies prior to the SEP. It's TSEP field work.

5 MR. LINEHAN: Those are the ones we're most  
6 interested in, too.

7 MS. CASEY: We can get you a more fleshed out plan,  
8 but we were thinking in terms of earlier feedback. But  
9 things are getting tight.

10 MR. JOHNSON: John, we were going to be proposing  
11 that briefing on other SALT programs in a July/August time  
12 frame. It's possible these two could be put back to  
13 back, one-day briefing on other SALT programs and then the  
14 surface based? It would be the same people that would be  
15 involved.

16 MS. CASEY: Other SALT programs? You mean --

17 MR. JOHNSON: The briefing that I was talking about  
18 on overview, the program overview -- what kinds of data  
19 will be used or how they would be used on there other programs.

20 MS. CASEY: Okay. Well, I haven't had a chance to  
21 discuss this with Ralph in proposing the WIP meetings.  
22 Let's talk about this when Ralph gets back.

23 MR. WRIGHT: Is this retrospective or looking  
24 toward the future?

25 MS. CASEY: Looking towards the future.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Toward the future. Between the time of  
2 the test plan and the --

3 MS. CASEY: Exploratory shaft, yes. There's some  
4 definitional difficulty in when the site characterizations  
5 start, and so we're talking about those things other than  
6 the exploratory shaft which could get an earlier start.

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm sorry. Where are we?

8 MS. CASEY: Okay. We were talking about moving  
9 forward the surface based test plan discussion, and Bob  
10 Johnson said that they, NRC was about to suggest an additional  
11 meeting on SALT, other SALT data, information, like WIP,  
12 Assay Mine, and that that would be a new meeting that then  
13 could be put back to back with this other meeting.

14 MR. LINEHAN: Ralph, in our correspondence with the  
15 projects, there are 11 meetings, about 11 meetings we've  
16 discussed with them that don't appear on this list. And one  
17 of them is the meeting we're talking about where we're trying  
18 to get an overview of the WIP Assay Strategic Petroleum  
19 Reserve, getting an overview of what data is there and how  
20 SALT is going to be using that data.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Petroleum Reserve?

22 MR. LINEHAN: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. I'm not sure what that is.

24 MR. LINEHAN: Strategic Petroleum Reserve --

25 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- I see. Okay.

1 MR. MILLER: I think the big thing here though, in a  
2 sense, is the -- the WIP studies that are going to go on,  
3 testing high level waste, I think that the way the WIP  
4 legislation in fact reads is that they would do  
5 testing for the purposes of furthering the licensing of the  
6 commercial repository, and in fact, I think there's an  
7 expressed provision in the WIP legislation that has them  
8 taking out any waste, removing it at the end of that test  
9 period. But the point is that they're doing tests as I read  
10 that act, the purpose of furthering the SALT commercial  
11 repository project licensing proceedings.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's not correct. The WIP is  
13 a defense facility for true waste and high level defense waste  
14 testing. The true waste may remain. A decision is made at  
15 some point after the true is placed whether that waste may  
16 remain permanently. The defense high-level waste would be  
17 renewed.

18 MR. MILLER: That's what I said.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: But there was nothing in the  
20 legislation that said that the testing of the high-level  
21 waste, defense high-level waste, would be in support of the  
22 commercial repository. In fact, there is complete separation  
23 of the WIP facility and the commercial repository.

24 MR. MILLER: That's not my understanding. My  
25 understanding is that what you said is right -- I didn't



1 aspects of that program that would be directly beneficial to  
2 the SALT program. And that's the current status.

3 MR. MILLER: All right. With our understanding  
4 that the only conceivable reason why they would be doing  
5 testing of high level waste is for the purposes of potential  
6 licensing and evaluation of high-level waste disposal in the  
7 SALT media, we would like, we are asking for some sort of  
8 a consultation with you -- it has to be with the commercial  
9 program, because we have no direct ties with the WIP project.  
10 But some consultation on that testing, and at least some  
11 information gathering on what testing is being done. And  
12 you're saying you don't see it that way. But I think we may need  
13 to take this up separately.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm not sure what you mean that I don't  
15 see it that way. I'm just trying to make sure that you  
16 understand where we are relative to WIP; where we are  
17 relative to WIP is that we have had an opportunity to  
18 review the WIP in situ test program, and that test program  
19 that WIP has developed is in strict compliance with the  
20 provisions of the law relative to WIP. And all we're doing is  
21 looking at that test program. We have not yet made any  
22 judgments, that is, the DOE has not made any judgments as to  
23 what if any of that program, that in situ program, is able to  
24 support the commercial programs. And until we do, and until  
25 there is some agreement between the civilian side and the

1 defense side as to just what our interaction is, the only  
2 thing I can say to you is what I've just told you.

3 MR. MILLER: I think this is something we're  
4 preparing a letter on. We'll send that letter to you. But  
5 it will basically say what I'm saying here.

6 MR. JOHNSON: In addition to any information that  
7 comes from in situ testing, just from a purely technical  
8 standpoint, there is probably data or, in addition to that,  
9 experiences with methods of data collection and all that  
10 that probably have been gained by the WIP program that may  
11 or may not be being used or might be used for the commercial  
12 side. It's also just experiences that we want to be aware of  
13 and there may be a lot of value in trying to transfer those  
14 experiences to people on the commercial side.

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I certainly understand what you're  
16 saying and I think that WIP is a unique facility and very  
17 good capabilities. They have a lot of experience and we would  
18 like to take advantage of those experiences that they have  
19 had and are having and would like to use those experiences  
20 as appropriate in the commercial program. But where we are  
21 now is as I just described it. We have looked at their  
22 in situ program. But DOE has not yet taken a position  
23 regarding how that program could be factored into the  
24 civilian program.

25 I wonder in the list, we said that we would try to

1 put dates on things for the next several months. From my  
2 point of view -- you may have other things you want to add on  
3 here -- but from my point of view, I was most anxious to  
4 get firm dates up through the Exploratory Shaft Test Plans,  
5 which we have for Tuff and for BWIP.

6 MR. LINEHAN: I think we just need to go through all  
7 of them.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I just wanted to tell you that  
9 those are the ones that I was most anxious to get the firm  
10 dates on.

11 MR. HEAD: Do you have a time limit for how long you  
12 can go in this meeting?

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes, I do. As I was telling Hub  
14 yesterday by phone, I would like to plan to, if we can,  
15 to bring the meeting to a conclusion about 2:00 O'clock  
16 today. Is that reasonable?

17 MR. MILLER: I think it is. There are some  
18 additional meetings we need to talk about here.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's fine.

20 MR. MILLER: The question is whether we want to try  
21 to go all the way through or take a quick lunch break?

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm prepared to say here and  
23 continue to talk about the agenda, unless somebody, other  
24 people don't have that same feeling, and have to take a lunch  
25 break. Why don't we see how far we can get until 1:00 O'clock?

1           MR. HEAD: The problem is I do have to leave  
2 shortly before 1:00, and although he's clearly the principal  
3 here, it would be good for follow-up if I hear as much of  
4 this as possible.

5           MR. MILLER: I think the one thing I want to do,  
6 what I had hoped we'd do at the lunch break is talk a bit  
7 about the problem of lead time. And maybe this is a good  
8 point to pursue that a little bit further, because what I --  
9 I need to ask some questions about your views about where in  
10 the process of planning, whether it's budget planning or  
11 planning in the sense of getting documents, called plans and  
12 procedures in place, the procurement or actual doing of  
13 work, where in that process you see it would be appropriate  
14 to be having consultation with us.

15           And in fact I've got a couple diagrams that I think  
16 would be -- this is in connection with things like this,  
17 like the meeting on the hydrology in Hanford that we talked  
18 about having, in connection with any of these meetings on  
19 exploratory shaft; in connection with really, you might say  
20 almost all of these meetings. I was looking for a convenient  
21 time. But I think right now is probably as good a time as  
22 any.

23           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I would like to finish up on this,  
24 on the agenda.

25           MR. MILLER: I'm having trouble getting a good



1 feeling that the times that we're picking here are right ones.  
2 I need to ask you some questions.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't believe we're going to be  
4 able to solve whether those times are the right ones or not  
5 by --

6 MR. MILLER: No, but I need to at least get some  
7 feeling for, from you on where in your internal process you  
8 think these things are occurring.

9 I mean, let me tell you where I am, where we are.  
10 We're in a position where we're being asked about the  
11 interactions and when they're occurring. Are they occurring  
12 at a time when there is effectively still opportunity to be  
13 changing things or are they being done at a time where it's  
14 effectively a committed decision or committed at a very high  
15 level or committed at a very low level. I don't know what  
16 to say. And I'm trying to get some feeling. The procedural  
17 agreement calls for the following. It calls for -- this  
18 is directly related to the agenda.

3A

19 The procedural agreement talks about, in the  
20 section on site investigation and site characterization data,  
21 for potential repository sites, it talks about the fact that  
22 the DOE will notify a site representative of the schedule of  
23 planned field and laboratory testing covering as long a  
24 period as practicable. And it also talks about maintaining a  
25 catalog of data. how data was collected and so on. And the

1 purpose for this whole section here was to allow us some  
2 basis upon which to be discussing with you, this is an  
3 appropriate time to be meeting; this time it's too late  
4 because this or that's already happened. And so it's in that  
5 light. It's in connection with trying to add some feeling  
6 of where in this process, your internal process, are we  
7 coming out in terms of the meetings that we're scheduling  
8 here.

9           Let me just -- and this is a very simple, very  
10 simplified illustration, and it basically conveys a very simple  
11 concept. But you do start with development of plans and  
12 procedures. And you can talk about many stages here,  
13 obviously. You've talked about budget as one of the early  
14 stages where you at least at a very broad level are  
15 identifying plans.

16           And then later on you've developed those plans in  
17 greater detail, go through various drafts, go through various  
18 reviews. There comes a point where you have procedures nailed  
19 down to the point where you have to have them before you can  
20 let out a contract, and finally, you go off and you do what-  
21 ever doing. And what this figure shows is, the illustration  
22 is the drilling of a bore hole. It could be an exploratory  
23 shaft.

24           And then you do testing in that shaft, and so on.  
25 And I think the question that I have is where in this process

1 do you think it's appropriate for the NRC to be having  
2 consultations with you?

3           Obviously, you're at the left hand side of this  
4 chart. Even though you've tentatively set out in a  
5 direction, it's less firm than it is as you proceed to the  
6 right. And as you get further and further to the right,  
7 you're more and more committed in a practical sense.

8           Where, from your perspective, should we be planning  
9 to be having consultation? Because what the site reps and  
10 the project managers are attempting to do is, consistent with  
11 the provisions in the agreement, to have information about  
12 when you are planning to do various things. They're  
13 attempting to get understanding of that and develop some  
14 idea of when before those tests, when before those things are  
15 actually carried out, would it be appropriate to be having  
16 some consultations.

17           But I think that instead of having everyone, all the  
18 projects each dealing with each other individually and in  
19 different manners, I'm looking for what your thoughts are,  
20 Ralph, on when in this kind of process is it appropriate to  
21 be talking about having some consultations?

22           CHAIRMAN STEIN: Hub, I think that anywhere along  
23 these lines is an appropriate time for us to have  
24 consultations. I think that what we tried to do is we tried  
25 to pick out topics and times that are consistent with our, in

1 our overall plan, to build a repository and have it operating  
2 in 1998. And with the short-term dates that we have  
3 identified, it leads us to there.

4 I think that having the site reps at each one of the  
5 sites gives you an opportunity to monitor, participate if you  
6 will, also, in the activities that we have underway, and to  
7 request at any time, if you see something occurring that,  
8 recognize something occurring, ask for a meeting to talk on  
9 that particular subject.

10 Now, we have two basic documents that the Act calls  
11 for. One of the documents is the Mission Plan, which is  
12 scheduled to come out in another two weeks or so. The other  
13 one is a Project Decisions Schedule, which lays out all the  
14 decisions that need to be made.

15 The Mission Plan will show those activities that the  
16 Department has projected that leads to a 1998 date for  
17 operation of the facility.

18 One significant activity is the start of the  
19 exploratory shafts. This program that you see laid out here,  
20 these meetings that we have, is focused to get your  
21 consultation on the key activities that will lead to the  
22 start of the exploratory shaft. I mean, that's what we're  
23 trying to focus in on. That's why I wanted to focus in on the  
24 exploratory shaft design and the underground testing, because  
25 I need that kind of information to support the site

1 characterization plan.

2 But I don't think that there is any specific data,  
3 other than what I just said, that is better than another.  
4 I think that issue activities can come up any time along  
5 these lines.

6 And we want to alert you, and I think that your  
7 on-site rep ought to be aware of these ongoing activities  
8 and also ought to be one that alerts you and us that this is  
9 an activity that needs to have consultation between us.

10 MR. MILLER: Where I'm coming from is that the  
11 Commission has given the staff very little guidance. But one  
12 of the few things that they have said to us, and this is in  
13 the guidance document that comes down from the Commission, is  
14 absent safety issues, stay off DOE's critical path.

15 Don't -- you know, where it's avoidable and there  
16 isn't any safety issue, be in a position where you're holding  
17 them up. What I'm doing, and I'm going to do it on a  
18 consistent basis, you'll hear me continue to do this as long  
19 as we are interacting, is to put a certain burden on you to  
20 tell us where in your process you feel things are becoming  
21 firm and more firm and more firm to the point where NRC, if  
22 you raise an issue now, if you disagree with us that this is  
23 the way to go, that we ought to go that way, it's going to  
24 cause a delay in our program.

25 In a sense, we are at your mercy as far as knowing

1 when you reach a stage where things are so well committed,  
2 so firmly committed that a disagreement will cause you to  
3 go in another direction and impact your schedule. We have to  
4 put that burden on you.

5 Now, to some extent, we share it, and as we can  
6 get information -- and one of the things, before we're done  
7 here today, I'd like to talk about some of the, where we think  
8 we stand in terms of actually implementing what's in the  
9 agreement as far as providing information to the site reps  
10 on what's happening when -- because there are some problems  
11 there. But we share somewhat of the burden. But it's only  
12 as we can get real good information on when the activities  
13 are going to occur.

14 With respect to the comment on the SEP, we agree  
15 that that's the key document, and the Mission Plan as well,  
16 the key documents that lay out what your plan and schedule  
17 is. But there are a lot of important things that are  
18 going to either occur before the SEP is out or are not  
19 covered by the Mission Plan that I think we do need to have  
20 some information on. And for example, in SALT I understand  
21 that one of the things, early activities, even before  
22 constructing the shaft, will be putting down some additional  
23 bore holes at whatever sites are chosen for characterization.

24 And that's something that's happening even before  
25 you leave an issue, the SEP. So I guess what I'm asking for

1 here is us to pursue, perhaps not in this meeting but  
2 following up to this meeting, getting nailed down as well as  
3 we can when these activities are going to occur, have you  
4 tell us where you can when in this process you think it's  
5 going to be late enough or it's going to be a point of  
6 causing delay if there's any disagreement, substantive  
7 disagreement on the approach you're taking.

8           What I hear you saying, Ralph, is that you think  
9 that this list right here is basically what you think will  
10 support you, that this is the list you think is reasonable  
11 in terms of lead time, and I'll have to accept that.

12           But what I guess we want to make sure of is that  
13 we're going to continue what we've had underway for some time  
14 now, and it's been a matter of weeks, trying to get as good  
15 an understanding as possible from the projects of where, just  
16 to quote the agreement, where, when field and lab testing  
17 will be taking place.

18           As I said, we will -- we're coming to agreement on  
19 the schedules of these meetings and I don't see that we're going  
20 to walk away coming back saying we're not going to support  
21 these; we're going to go through with this. But I think at  
22 the same time we need to make sure that we're getting as good  
23 a definition as possible towards when these activities are.

24           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't know of anything that we're  
25 doing now that we haven't already identified to you as

1 critical in the program and that would be covered by one of  
2 the topics on this list that we need to consult with you and  
3 get feedback from you.

4 I think that this list, as best as we can put it  
5 together, between Headquarters and the projects, represent  
6 those key items that identify the interactions that we need  
7 with NRC.

8 MS. CASEY: Yes. Hub, I think this was really  
9 put together with that in mind, and it will continually be  
10 refined. And one of those refinements does happen to be in  
11 the area of the surface based test plan for SALT. We are  
12 suggesting that if we bid it before October, your feedback  
13 would be of more benefit to us, and we are suggesting  
14 August there.

15 So we are very interested in the same early  
16 consultation that you're suggesting, and sensitive to that,  
17 and I think that's exactly what we're trying to work out here.

18 MR. MILLER: I trust that that's what's happening.  
19 All I'm saying is that to tell you the approach that we think  
20 we should be taking, what the mandate we live under over from  
21 our side and basically say we'd like to confirm that and  
22 we trust that what you're saying is true. And what I think  
23 the second page in this handout shows are some of the kinds  
24 of things that we're talking about. I assume we have full  
25 knowledge of when you're conducting major, when you're



1 planning to construct bore holes and do major geophysical  
2 testing and launch on major programs of laboratory testing.  
3 I understand that in terms of, in terms of -- I say that I'm  
4 not certain that we have really gotten to the point where we  
5 were actually getting what the agreement calls for and we  
6 need to work towards getting that.

7           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't know of any information  
8 that, technical information that we are developing that  
9 you folks don't have or know about and will have. The  
10 on-site reps are there, they see what we're doing, they  
11 participate in the majority of meetings that we have, or at  
12 least have the opportunity to participate in the majority of  
13 the meetings, and I think that they have the responsibility  
14 to stay alert to the programs that are underway in the sites  
15 and the project offices.

16           MR. LINEHAN: We've addressed this recently,  
17 Ralph, with the on-site reps. And they're having a big  
18 problem in general.

19           CHAIRMAN STEIN: Is this a new subject?

20           MR. LINEHAN: No, it's on the same subject.

21           MR. MILLER: It's on this trying to get an  
22 understanding of what's happening when --

23           MR. LINEHAN: What's going on and when.

24           MR. MILLER: So that we can know when to schedule  
25 meetings.

1           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm not sure where you're going  
2 with this.

3           MR. LINEHAN: They can get information very  
4 readily on your activities over the next couple of months,  
5 over the rest of the fiscal year. The problem we're having  
6 is trying to lay out at the sites exactly what your  
7 activities are going to be in the different areas where you're  
8 going to test. How these all fit together, what your mile-  
9 stones are for actual testing, what your milestones are for  
10 purchasing equipment, developing testing plans, developing  
11 the criteria that a contractor is going to have to use to  
12 come up with a test plan, trying to get everything laid out  
13 so that we've got a good picture of what's going to be going  
14 on at the site.

15           I think on most of these, it's over a period of  
16 more than a year, so that we know when we should be  
17 interacting.

18           The problem we're having on these right now is, I  
19 think, indeed, you are covering all the areas. But we can't  
20 get a good picture as to what is happening at the sites,  
21 what's the plan for the future, to know if we're interacting  
22 at the appropriate time with you folks. It's very difficult  
23 for us to propose specific meetings. We know we want something  
24 in hydrology, a meeting in geochemistry. But focusing  
25 on the scope and what the purpose should be is, it's very

1 difficult right now.

2           One of the things we've done is, we had our site  
3 reps back in Washington over a month ago, and asked them  
4 specifically to look into this. And in general, what we're  
5 finding is that at SALT there is a pretty good information  
6 base on ongoing and planned work. The catalog system that you  
7 folks have out there addresses work activities, reports and  
8 data.

9           At the other sites, though, it's very difficult to  
10 have anything like this we can go to. The site reps have  
11 discussed this with their contacts at the sites, and they're  
12 having a very difficult time coming up with this information.  
13 There's no good information on ongoing and planned work, you  
14 know, in each area, what your test plans are, what your  
15 schedule is, how one test plan fits in with another and  
16 what your milestones are. They're not illustrated on this  
17 chart.

18           And as a result, we just don't know where we  
19 should be interacting with you, what the important points  
20 are, where the key decision points are. And we feel in the  
21 dark as to when we should be setting up these interactions.

22           MR. MILLER: Essentially what we're doing here,  
23 Ralph, we're putting a caveat on our agreement to these  
24 meetings. We're going to go forward with these meetings.  
25 We're going to meet on the dates we're talking about. But

1 with respect to are we certain from our side -- you know,  
2 you're say ing you feel comfortable, you feel confident that  
3 these are happening on a timely basis. All we're say ing is  
4 that we take what you're saying. We'd also like to get a  
5 better feel for where these things fit in with the actual  
6 sequence of activities starting from the planning through the  
7 actual doing, all the way down to the actual doing on  
8 whatever the activity is.

9           And because we do feel a certain sense of  
10 responsibility ourselves of being attuned to where you are  
11 in your process. So that if we see a time where it looks to  
12 us like you are making a committment, we can speak up.  
13 And it's in connection with trying to schedule these  
14 meetings that we raise this.

15           And we'll perhaps just leave it right there. You  
16 know what we're trying to accomplish. We're trying to  
17 accomplish this through the sites, our project managers  
18 dealing with the people in the projects.

19           MR. WRIGHT: Being specific with respect to BWIP,  
20 a question that I'm going to raise as we get farther down the  
21 list is whether the suggested times for particular meetings  
22 tie in with development of test plans in those areas.

23           The first one that I would ask about would be  
24 Number 18, Waste Package, BWIP Waste Package. We had a  
25 meeting last May on the barrier materials -- at which time

1 we saw two of four parts to that plan.

2 We understood that the remaining parts -- one was  
3 performance assessment and I think the other was test plans.  
4 The other two parts were to be prepared and probably would be  
5 available for review in October of 1984.

6 It didn't materialize, and the question that I will  
7 ask is about a BWIP waste package workshop in September. Will  
8 this be the time when we can review the barrier materials  
9 test plan and discuss it at that meeting. I'll have the same  
10 question --

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Excuse me. Let me interject for a  
12 minute here.

13 We can get into the two things that you talked  
14 about and John talked about.

15 The purpose of this meeting is to go over this  
16 list, which we -- we have said to you that this is the list  
17 that we believe needs to be used to address the topics that  
18 are important to us to support our activities between now and  
19 the time that we issue the site characterization plan.

20 For each one of these topics, we will send you an  
21 agenda. We will, in addition to that, send you information  
22 that supports these meetings as early as we can within the  
23 framework of the discussion that we had earlier on the  
24 timing for these items.

25 If you want to talk about what will be

1 specifically in each package that will come to you in  
2 September, I think it would be better to wait and hold it off  
3 to a different meeting.

4 My purpose for this meeting is to identify for you  
5 those topics and the timing that we would like those topics  
6 covered.

7 Now, I ask you to address that and let us finish up  
8 on that particular scheduling of those topics. If you would  
9 like to cover other material, more specific material, I think  
10 that we can do that later. We can set up a different meeting  
11 and I could provide you with additional material, bring you,  
12 bring in the right people.

13 The purpose of this meeting is to cover the, this  
14 agenda and to cover these topics. Now --

15 MR. MILLER: I'm not going to argue with that,  
16 Ralph. And we can get into more what these meetings will  
17 entail in terms of specific documents to be exchanged and so  
18 on.

19 But it is essential that -- I tell you, especially  
20 as we start through this, and it's kind of as I expected,  
21 that we got into these things and we started talking about  
22 timing and asking questions, well, how does that fit in with  
23 when you're going to actually construct the shaft and so on,  
24 it's like I expected. We got into some discussion of that.  
25 Now what we're going to do in this meeting is we're going to

1 to take on the face, take on faith what you're saying about  
2 the, your belief that this is an appropriate timing, and we're  
3 going to operate on that basis. And we're going to commit to  
4 a waste package workshop on the basis that that's the time  
5 when you feel it's appropriate for you and your knowledge of  
6 your program. All I'm saying, and the reason for raising this  
7 whole subject is that, in direct connection with this, and  
8 it is as a caveat, essentially, that is stating that we  
9 have not independently made these determinations. We have not  
10 gone through and looked at your program, looked at the  
11 sequence that exists like this for all of your activities and  
12 we have not independently judged that that is an appropriate  
13 time.

14 We're effectively accepting your judgment on that.  
15 And that's the thing that I want to make certain is clear in  
16 this, because I've got a very strong charter that's laid down  
17 on me, and I'm kind of turning to you and effectively telling  
18 you what that charter is and telling you that if later pressed  
19 on whether I'm supporting your schedules or not, I'm going to  
20 have to say well, we believe we are, DOE told us that we are.  
21 That there's -- if there are substantive issues raised in  
22 these meetings, and if there's a problem of, that it causes  
23 impact on your schedule, well, you know, it's not something  
24 that we're going to be in a position to be able to account  
25 for. And I'm not suggesting that there are going to be big

1 problems, t hat we're going to find cases where we are  
2 effectively saying we think you ought to go a totally  
3 different direction, but it is important to us that this  
4 issue of supporting your schedule -- and all I'm trying to  
5 say is we have not independently made that kind of  
6 determination. So let's just proceed, I agree, let's  
7 proceed through this with that caveat and try to appreciate  
8 that.

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Did you want to take a lunch  
10 break now?

11 MR. MILLER: I don't know how much more time  
12 we --

13 MR. LINEHAN: We have about 20 more meetings to  
14 do. Why don't we go right through?

15 MR. MILLER: Let's keep going.

16 MR. LINEHAN: Why don't we go back to -- we got  
17 through Item 12 going down the list and everything was taken  
18 care of. On Item 13, the SRP ED Design, we had agreed on the  
19 September/October time frame. Tentative.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Item 14 I guess is more, is  
21 something that we'll talk about as Agenda Item 5.

22 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. And Item Number 15, the Tuff  
23 Seismo-Tectonics that you've proposed in August. We need  
24 some information from you on this. Originally, we were  
25 expecting an annotated outline from Tuff on this issue, and



1 had talked with them indeed about setting up a meeting.  
2 Since then, as we understand it, Headquarters is reviewing  
3 that position paper and we need some -- we need that result  
4 and we need something before we can get into any meeting,  
5 before we can commit to any meeting, and probably it would be  
6 appropriate to have a generic meeting before we go into a  
7 site meeting on this issue.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Why don't we scratch off Tuff and  
9 put Seismo-Tectonics and I'll provide you a paper on that  
10 topic. Let's see, we're -- I guess about the middle of June  
11 we ought to be ready to do that. It's July/August, that would  
12 be two months before that meeting. So we'll scratch off Tuff.

13 MR. LINEHAN: Do we want to scratch off the need  
14 for a specific meeting with Tuff?

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think it will cover it.

16 MR. SZYWEUSKI: We have agreed in our management  
17 meeting which we had in March this is one of the crucial  
18 things we would like to talk about. Right now we cannot do  
19 that because it's Headquarters' initiative on the issue.  
20 We just don't know what is going on with it.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Jerry, what's going on is that we  
22 wanted to put together a paper that represented a generic  
23 position. And that has been done. And what NRC is saying is  
24 that they would like to see that paper prior to the meeting.  
25 And I'm saying we'll send that paper to them by the middle

1 of June.

2 MR. SZYWEUSKI: We would still need, once we settle  
3 the generic issue, it would be in our interest, project  
4 interest, to have a site specific --

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Jerry, I think that the position  
6 would be covered at that same meeting.

7 MR. SZYWEUSKI: I see.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: The paper is essentially a Tuff  
9 paper. It was a question of whether or not there was anything  
10 that said in there, that was said in that paper that would  
11 cause a problem for the other sites. And that's why we  
12 structured, in order to get any input from the other site  
13 to see if there was any problem with it now.

14 So going into that meeting, if whatever we  
15 decide on that paper is going to be satisfactory for Tuff.  
16 So the August 19 day is a reasonable day to -- furthermore,  
17 I'd end up asking Don or one of his people to take the  
18 lead on that.

19 MR. WRIGHT: Now, from what I hear from this  
20 paper, I think Tuff has done us all a favor, because this  
21 is a matter of high interest certainly at BWIP, and if the  
22 paper delivers some ideas on this subject, it would be  
23 helpful certainly to BWIP.

24 MR. MILLER: In a sense it's hard to know what we're  
25 talking about here, because this is one of those that has some

1 generic aspects to it certainly, but it also is extremely  
2 site specific when you get down to the question of how you  
3 characterize false, how much information you need to have  
4 about faults, potential faults, and how you characterize  
5 those, how much is enough, if you will. And at Nevada, of  
6 course, that's an issue. I guess if we do make that a  
7 generic meeting in August, the question I guess I would have  
8 as well, I'd guess I'd ask King and others to offer an opinion,  
9 but does it strike you that there would still be a sizable  
10 amount that would be very site specific that should be taken  
11 up on a site specific basis?

12 MR. STABLEIN: We feel that there would be.  
13 I'm hearing different opinions from DOE, but I think Jerry  
14 feels there also would be quite a good site specific --  
15 could be build into this at this time at least tentatively  
16 a later site specific meeting?

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What I'm saying to you is that  
18 the paper that was prepared was Tuff-specific. It was  
19 circulated to the other projects to see if there was any  
20 impact on what it said if the paper was to be considered  
21 project specific at each place. The paper was virtually  
22 unchanged from its original form, which made it Tuff-specific.  
23 And it turns out that it was acceptable for the other sites  
24 also. So even though it would come to you without saying  
25 Tuff in there, that it would be very easy to focus in on

1 Tuff using that paper as the guiding document. And I don't  
2 think that there's a problem in calling this a Seismo-  
3 Tectonic meeting. And if need be we can stay over another  
4 day and talk specifically about Tuff. But the paper as it is  
5 is essentially a Tuff paper.

6 MR. SZYWEUSKI: What I think he's speaking about  
7 is that this position paper is geared up to fill more  
8 regulatory gap -- there's one side to the coin. There's  
9 another one of course, is once you have that gap filled,  
10 now, what kind of steps do you take in a site characterization.  
11 And that's what I think you're talking about.

12 In other words, you would have to take that and use  
13 this position paper. And I was thinking about the meetings and  
14 workshop, and reaching some kind of understanding; I was  
15 thinking about using the position paper and actually building  
16 the elements into the site characterization plan.

17 MR. MILLER: Here's where we're -- you know, it's  
18 hard to -- you know, we're not in a position to say here,  
19 gee, we absolutely have to have that Tuff Seismo-Tectonics  
20 meeting because we're not certain what's in that paper.  
21 If it is very broad and addresses the very general issues  
22 approach then it might seem as though it would be appropriate  
23 to have meetings on each of the sites. I believe there is a  
24 geology workshop at the other sites, isn't there?

25 MR. LINEHAN: Yes.

1 MR. MILLER: And in those geology workshops,  
2 perhaps the biggest issue is how you're going to be  
3 characterizing the seismicity and tectonics of the site, so  
4 on.

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let's leave the date as August  
6 19 and I'll commit to sending over that paper by the 21st of  
7 June.

8 MR. MILLER: What you're saying is at that we  
9 decide whether or not there is a need for an additional  
10 meeting that's a site-specific one?

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's right.

12 MR. MILLER: But let's leave open that possibility  
13 I guess is what I think we need to do.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. Okay.

15 MR. LINEHAN: Do you want that on the 19th? It's  
16 a Monday.

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: It's Nevada's date, not mine.  
18 Jerry, what do you say?

19 MR. SZYWEUSKI: This date is from our management  
20 meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Fine.

22 MR. STABLEIN: The date originally was chosen as  
23 Monday because the scope of this meeting, if it were Nevada-  
24 related, or specific, was going to be perhaps as much as  
25 four days, requiring most of the week. If it's a generic

1 meeting and if the scale is going to be more a two-day sort  
2 of thing, we might go Tuesday, Wednesday on it.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So you want to make it 20th,  
4 21st?

5 MR. STABLEIN: That would be my recommendation.

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Good.

7 Okay.

8 MR. MILLER: King, what we'll do is when we get that  
9 paper we'll take a quick look at it and determine whether  
10 or not another meeting is needed and possibly even leave open  
11 the opportunity of taking Ralph up on what he said of  
12 possibly staying over and putting on the back end of a meeting  
13 on generic issues the kind of thing that Jerry is talking  
14 about. So -- .

15 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. The next item, is one that you've  
16 proposed, Ralph, on a Subsystem Performance Allocation. And we  
17 have no problem with the September time frame. We'd like to  
18 know again fairly soon what you would like to cover in the  
19 meeting, what the purpose would be. Not a detailed agenda,  
20 but the purpose and scope that you foresee.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I thought you guys would just be  
22 jumpint up and down to see that topic in there.

23 VOICE: We are.

24 MR. MILLER: Had to pull myself up off the floor when  
25 Isaw that one in there, Ralph.

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Why don't we just leave it  
2 September and we'll send you over a package. I'm not sure when  
3 I can commit to sending over a description, but I, why don't  
4 we say TBD description of the subject.

5 MR. LINEHAM: Okay. The next item we've already  
6 agreed on, the Tuff Exploratory Shaft Test Plan, 17th and  
7 18th.

8 Number 18, BWIP Waste Package, is down for September.  
9 And also Item Number 26, the BWIP Waste Package Workshop.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Want to put them together?

11 MR. LINEHAM: Yes, as far as we're concerned. In  
12 fact, BWIP has suggested to us the date be October 7th.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. BWIP Waste Package -- why  
14 don't we call 18 and 26 together, call it October 7?

15 MR. LINEHAN: Okay.

16 MS. CASEY: October 7 or 27?

17 MR. LINEHAN: 7th.

18 MR. WRIGHT: We will be interested, as I mentioned,  
19 as to whether that includes progress on the varying materials  
20 test plans.

21 In a conversation last week, the, between the  
22 communicators, the BWIP team in NRC and the BWIP team out at  
23 Richland, it was thought that that wasge package get-together  
24 might include performance assessment with respect to the  
25 engineering barriers. I don't know whether that is of

1 particular importance right now --

2 MR. LINEHAN: I think in all of these the commitments  
3 we've made before the meetings, exchange information, the  
4 agendas and everything, we need to work all these out.

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay.

6 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. The next item, the SRP  
7 Repository Design -- December/January.

8 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And made it tentative. The October  
9 7 by the way is now a firm date; right?

10 MR. LINEHAN: Right.

11 The next one, the SRP In Situ Testing we had agreed  
12 December/January.

13 Okay. Well, I don't believe we discussed, the  
14 BWIP Repository Design Workshop, and Bob, if you could help  
15 me on that one, we were proposing November/December. Was  
16 that based on conversations with BWIP?

17 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I think that was what they  
18 proposed --

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: November/December? I want you to  
20 know that all these dates that you see down here were  
21 covered in discussion two days ago with the projects, but  
22 we'll -- I like November/December, because I think that things  
23 are piling up.

24 MR. WRIGHT: You may have more recent knowledge of  
25 what's on their mind.



1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: This is fine. November/December  
2 is okay. It's tentative, and we, if we have a big problem,  
3 we'll come back to you.

4 The point is that we have an SEP that we're trying  
5 to put together. And there's a lot of things that go into  
6 SEP's. Most everything that's here relates to the SEP.  
7 So we want to be sure that our timing is such that we get  
8 whatever feedback from you that we can get in a time frame  
9 that we can put it into the SEP.

10 MR. WRIGHT: I understand that, and that may  
11 account for the fact that when November/December was  
12 suggested in early April, --

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I know what their schedule is for  
14 the SEP conceptual design, and this is okay. It's okay.

15 MR. LINEHAM: Okay. And the next one on the BWIP  
16 Geochemistry Workshop, if we can come up with a firm date.

17 Bob, were there any specific dates discussed in  
18 September and October?

19 MR. WRIGHT: No.

20 3B Here again, not to belabor this point, but the last  
21 time we discussed geochemical laboratory -- which was May of  
22 last year, we pressed Rockwell and BWIP on the test plans for  
23 the work that was then in progress, and we were given a  
24 suggestion that these test plans were incorporated in  
25 certain documents available at Rockwell, but this turned

1 out to be a false lead. So our interests remain in what  
2 sort of plans govern the testing that has been going on for  
3 some time at BWIP, and we have not had a single slimmer of  
4 what those plans are like -- for this workshop, whether this  
5 is going to be the time for us to look at your test papers.

6 MR. LINEHAM: Bob, how many days would you think  
7 would be needed for that workshop?

8 Do we just want to schedule it for a week at this  
9 point?

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Do we want to schedule it? Or  
11 do you want to just leave it tentative?

12 I mean, that's where it is now and that's what  
13 BWIP had said to me two days ago.

14 MR. WRIGHT: I don't know what time might be  
15 preferable, either from our standpoint or yours.

16 MR. LINEHAN: It's fine to leave it like that, and  
17 we'll just have to get back.

18 MR. WRIGHT: We could set up a target date now and  
19 try for it.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: No, they didn't want to do that.  
21 SRP Waste Package. October is still a tentative date for  
22 SRP.

23 MR. LINEHAN: John, you had a concern on this  
24 because of the BWIP waste package.

25 And also you indicated you would like it moved up,

1 if possible, to August.

2 MR. GREEVES: I think the wisest thing is to leave  
3 the word tentative behind it. Leaving us in a position to  
4 move it around a little bit. In the crash of the last day I  
5 have not had a chance to understand what the Waste Package  
6 people want.

7 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. The Tuff Performance Assessment  
8 Plan, that meeting has been -- from 1 to 4 October.

9 On the next item, the BWIP Meterology Monitoring  
10 Workshop, when we talked to BWIP about this previously and  
11 really questioned whether there's a need for a site-specific  
12 workshop, you maybe there would be reason for a generic one,  
13 it didn't seem -- the questions they had, I'm not sure we  
14 couldn't handle over the phone. But they were questions that  
15 were more related to generic issues. What kind of net  
16 monitoring do you need, you know, how would it compare to  
17 what is required of reactors, things of this nature. And  
18 we just don't think there's a real need for a site-specific  
19 one at this point.

20 And I guess what I'd like to ask is that you folks  
21 consider that and let's get back on it and leave some inter-  
22 action on net monitoring for October tentatively.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So what you're suggesting is that  
24 we check on the need for this and get back to you as to whether  
25 or not we should go forward with this meeting?

1 MR. LINEHAN: Right. All of the things they  
2 identified to us were generic in nature, not site-specific.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. I'll do that.

4 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. On 27, as I have it, we  
5 agreed on October 16 and 17. Okay, and Leslie, we had  
6 started discussing the Surface Based Test Plan. And you were  
7 saying you wanted that moved up, was it?

8 MS. CASEY: Well, this --

9 MR. GREEVES: Who would that involve? I'm a little  
10 what kind of people are you bringing to the surface based  
11 test plan?

12 MS. CASEY: Predominantly geologists.

13 MR. JOHNSON: As opposed to the geophysical  
14 surveys --

15 MS. CASEY: Yes.

16 MR. LINEHAN: How would that fit in with the other  
17 commitments of our SALT geology people?

18 MR. JOHNSON: That would -- we would have to see  
19 about their availability. But I know they're all -- I've  
20 already talked with them. They're all interested in getting  
21 involved with this plan.

22 MR. LINEHAN: And would be ready in that time frame?

23 MR. JOHNSON: I think for a very early discussion  
24 on the things, they would like to be ready in that time frame.

25 MS. CASEY: So could we just leave it August and

1 then we'll send you a proposed agenda and we can work out a  
2 specific date from that?

3 MR. LINEHAN: That's fine.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So you're going to put together an  
5 agenda, proposed agenda and dates?

6 MS. CASEY: Yes.

7 MR. LINEHAN: Again, on Item 29, we're not sure  
8 exactly what you would like at that meeting.

9 MS. CASEY: That meeting pertains to the issues  
10 hierarchy for Chapter 8 of the SEP, and so we thought that  
11 would be the early time when you might have a listing of  
12 issues, from the issue hierarchy, and a proposed strategy.  
13 That is really early consultation on Chapter 8 of the SEP.

14 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. I'd ask, Ralph, on this one,  
15 I thought it was my understanding that Nevada pretty much  
16 was in the lead on this, just as an example, as to how this  
17 would be handled. And you know, I'm wondering if it wouldn't  
18 be better again, having a generic meeting or a meeting on the  
19 hierarchy --

20 MR. SZYWEUSKI: We would have a very strong  
21 interest in doing this. Actually, Max Blanchard talked to  
22 me to try to schedule this thing somewhere in September --

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: You know, I think that you're  
24 right, that we ought to have a meeting on Chapter 8 that  
25 would be a generic meeting on issues hierarchy. And that is

1 in Chapter 8. Why don't we just take off the SRP and just  
2 call it SCP Issue Resolution Strategy, Issues and Data Needs?  
3 I think that would be a very good time to do that, October/  
4 November period.

5 MR. LINEHAN: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And what we need to do is get back  
7 to you with an agenda. Okay, so --

8 MR. MILLER: -- let this issue, your letter on  
9 our issue site technical positions, and we still feel that  
10 there's a lot to discuss there. You'll be getting some sort  
11 of a letter from us sometime soon on what the fate of those  
12 documents will be. And there are some points where we  
13 think discussion is definitely needed. It might be that  
14 when you receive our letter responding to your letter, that  
15 you'll want to have a meeting sooner. But let's just see.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay.

17 MR. LINEHAN: Okay. And then on the next item, the  
18 BWIP QA --

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Shouldn't we make 29, since it's  
20 October/November, over a couple months period, shouldn't we  
21 call that tentative?

22 MR. LINEHAN: As far as the date.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I mean when it's a month, I guess  
24 we can say it's firm, but if --

25 MR. LINEHAN: The meeting is firm but not the specific

1 dates. Okay. The next item was BWIP QA Workshop. Before  
2 we get into that, though, one of the things Jim Kennedy had  
3 been talking to the site people about, and someone on your  
4 staff, I believe it was Charlie, or Carl Newton, was the  
5 need for a generic workshop. There had been a lot of items  
6 identified, as a result of the site visits that had already  
7 been performed, and Jim felt there was pretty general  
8 agreement that these needed to be discussed generically  
9 before we had workshops at the sites again. And what he is  
10 proposing is that there be a generic QA meeting in the June-  
11 July time frame. On that one we propose in the very near  
12 future to get back to you with the proposed agenda.

13 MR. MILLER: I think it's also in the June time  
14 frame that we were talking about finalizing on some positions  
15 that -- not finalizing, having developed to at least a  
16 draft stage that we can put out on the street, positions on a  
17 number of key issues that came up in those meetings. We also  
18 have a letter from the Nevada Project asking us for positions  
19 on a number of QA issues, and we expect to be getting that  
20 out hopefully in a couple of weeks time.

21 And I think those papers could be the basis for  
22 a meeting. Now, if we're going to live up to what we have  
23 asked you folks to try to meet, and that is four weeks, as a  
24 goal, we ought to try to schedule something oh, around about  
25 July, into July, for those meetings.

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Are you saying that you're going  
2 to get us a letter then on QA, a proposed meeting with the  
3 Department on Quality Assurance?

4 MR. MILLER: We can do that. What I'm saying is  
5 that beyond that we've got this letter which is going to be  
6 going back to Nevada on a list of questions that they left  
7 with us in those workshops, and I'm just guessing now that  
8 I hope that's going to be done in the next couple weeks and  
9 that even in the June time frame, we're scheduled to have  
10 completed our technical position on a number of generic issues  
11 that came up in those meetings.

12 So we'll hopefully have that material available.  
13 I would say that tentatively we ought to schedule something  
14 for July if it's possible, and we'll send you a letter which  
15 would firm up on that.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What do we call this meeting? I'll  
17 cross off this BWIP QA Workshop --

18 MR. MILLER: Well, I think we would like that,  
19 BWIP, and we would like to definitely have the meeting in  
20 November as a follow-up to the generic and in addition, to  
21 visit the sites again.

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Well, why don't we plan that, you  
23 know, sort of as a closing schedule to this July meeting,  
24 sort of plan the QA site visits, you know?

25 MR. MILLER: As much as anything I guess this is --



1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'm not sure what --

2 MR. MILLER: We'd like to carve out at least some  
3 time for here, the idea of having it. From what we gather,  
4 in the site visits, and from talking to the folks who are  
5 having to put together the QA plans for the SCP, it appears  
6 as if there is no way we're going to be able to cover all of  
7 the issues in a generic session, that get raised when you're  
8 actually implementing a program at a specific site. And I'm  
9 being told that this is greatly a function of the fact that  
10 there are significant differences between the organizations  
11 of the various projects. And so it is the feeling of the  
12 folks who are responsible in this area, with strong petition  
13 and feedback from the DOE people in this area, that they  
14 thought some workshops, some sessions would be needed. Now,  
15 apparently they've not fed that back to you --

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: No. I haven't gotten that back.  
17 Now we noted that we had committed to a series of QA visits,  
18 NRC QA visits. The first visit that you took to the sites  
19 was more to "get acquainted" type of visit, find out what  
20 people are doing, but not really even approach an audit type  
21 of visit. We said that our programs still needed to get in  
22 place. Now that a program is moving in place, we think  
23 that sometime in the future, near future, it would be  
24 appropriate for you to visit the sites and get into a lot more  
25 of the details that you haven't done before. I don't call

1 those workshops. Maybe that's the right word.

2 MR. MILLER: Well, I think in the sense that -- I  
3 don't see them as audits. I would see them more from what I  
4 understand is taking place, as more the sort of thing where  
5 you folks are having to write up specific implementing  
6 procedures for each of the sites. I'm told there are a lot  
7 of questions about well, you can go this way, you can go that  
8 way, NRC, what would be your position on this sort of thing.  
9 It's as much as anything a desire on the part of a lot of  
10 people to put these programs together. But apparently, they  
11 have not related that to you. This is the feedback I'm  
12 getting, that the QA people at the sites are asking for  
13 this.

14 My own feeling is that it will be a prudent thing  
15 to be scheduling at the end of this year.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I would suggest that maybe, as John  
17 was saying earlier, if you send over a letter that describes  
18 the meeting, this July meeting that Jim Kennedy is talking  
19 about, and provide an agenda to that meeting --

20 MR. MILLER: Let's put it down as July/August,  
21 and as a firm --

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Then we can use that as the  
23 vehicle for getting a better definition of the subsequent  
24 site visits. So I'm just going to take 30 out for the  
25 moment, you know, and just put down --

1 MR. MILLER: Put Generic QA meeting --

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Generic --

3 MR. MILLER: -- July/August?

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- QA.

5 MR. LINEHAN: The other item that has been firmed up  
6 in QA is the presentations by Bill Blend which are  
7 scheduled July 15 through 19. And Kennedy and Bill have been  
8 working with the sites and someone in your office, I don't  
9 know who.

10 Just to let you know, we had that done.

11 The other thing we had is there were some meetings  
12 at SALT that we haven't got to. We had proposed to the SALT  
13 office a data review at T-Bay, the areas of geology,  
14 hydrology, geochemistry. Basically, this would be to look at  
15 data we haven't had an opportunity to go over before. It  
16 would be to review the actual cause and cross-sections. And  
17 we had proposed a date to you of October for that meeting.

18 MS. CASEY: Who did you speak to about this?

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I had talked to him last Friday.

20 MS. CASEY: Okay. I haven't had a chance to  
21 coordinate that.

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: When was that proposed?

23 MR. LINEHAN: We'd like to propose it in October.

24 MS. CASEY: Is this related to some specific objec-  
25 tive?

1 MR. JOHNSON: It primarily supports a number of  
2 geological issues as well as repository design issues. So a  
3 number of geologists as well as rock mechanics people will be  
4 looking at the core, looking at cross-sections. Geophysical  
5 logs, other geophysical survey data.

6 MR. LINEHAN: What about 35? Is that something you  
7 also -- we had a few we added on last night based on  
8 conversations we've had.

9 MR. JOHNSON: 35 we already talked about earlier.  
10 And from the way the discussions went, 37 might still fall in  
11 the same category.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Let me make sure the T-Tag  
13 data review, Leslise needs to go back and check her office on  
14 that. So that's tentative for October but it won'd become  
15 firm until Lesie goes through the check that she needs to do.  
16 Okay?

17 MR. LINEHAN: And if I can just ask the project  
18 managers -- I believe we covered everything.

19 MR. STABLEIN: That's all of Nevada's that I can  
20 think of.

21 MR. MILLER: We've discussed the location of these  
22 meetings, and I think some of them, in the process of being  
23 set up, have already been identified, and that is, the location  
24 has been ident-ified. We haven't been talking about that here,  
25 and I don't propose that we go back and try to set the place

1 of all those meetings. I think that most of them are  
2 going to be here, I believe. I think what we ought to do is  
3 just leave it that we'll, the important thing was to get the  
4 time and establish the need for the meeting. We'll just to have  
5 followup between the appropriate parties firming up on where  
6 the meetings are.

7           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think that we need to of course  
8 establish where the meetings are. But if we went through  
9 it, at least in my thinking, I try to avoid Monday so that  
10 this would give the folks out in the field or us if we were  
11 to go out there, an opportunity for travel, one day of  
12 travel. We do have some Monday meetings or Friday meetings.  
13 If that's the right thing to do, you know, so be it. But I  
14 think there's enough flexibility in the dates so that if it's  
15 appropriate that the meeting is held in the field we can go  
16 ahead and plan accordingly.

17           MR. MILLER: We've got a very mundane, practical  
18 problem, and that is that -- and maybe you don't have it since  
19 you're funded by the fund, but we have severe constraints on  
20 travel right now. And that's impacting us very much, unlike  
21 any other year that I can remember, where we had almost no  
22 practical constraints.

23           MR. GREEVES: I'm assuming that all these meetings  
24 that I was addressing that aren't designated as being out there  
25 already, like the Waste Package one at Levermore, that they're

1 all here in the Washington area, because I've got just a  
2 series of back to back meetings based on what we've just done  
3 here, and I am in no way able to sign up to that kind of a  
4 week after week after week set of meetings unless they're in  
5 the Washington area.

6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Your preference is to have it here;  
7 is that right?

8 MR. GREEVES: That's behind the thinkins I was  
9 contributing to the last day and a half discussion of when we  
10 could have meetings.

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Well, I assumed, as I said, that  
12 the meetings would be held here, except that where it makes  
13 sense to hold it out in the field, let's push for a Tuesday  
14 instead of Monday, to give people a chance to travel.

15 MR. GREEVES: In some cases we're going to want to  
16 look at data -- good reasons why we need them there.

17 (Simultaneous voices)

18 MR. WRIGHT: You brought up the matter that this  
19 list is not to be inclusive of all data review?

20 MR. MILLER: Yes, yes. Right. Good point. We, when  
21 we went through this we were able to identify the fact that  
22 in some cases, and it's very difficult to predict it right  
23 now, but there will be a need for staff to be looking at  
24 the most recent of data that's been requested. In some cases  
25 you're not collecting any data and there's no more data

1 av-ailable now than there was the last time we were out looking  
2 at the sites. But what we did not attempt to do here is  
3 identify where staff, going to the site and looking at data,  
4 when those types of events might occur. And there may -- and  
5 I'd have to ask the folks on this side of the table, to  
6 give some examples, if you'd like some examples.

7           But I think there are some cases where it may be  
8 necessary to have folks look at data. We just could not  
9 book that into this meeting. Now, those kind of things are  
10 not meetings, and the kind of things that we're not asking  
11 for anybody to do anything more than just kind of allow  
12 staff to look at data.

13           CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't have any problems with those.  
14 I don't even think we need a schedule. We talked earlier on a  
15 couple of passouts.

16           I think that your on-site rep., if they see some  
17 information that's being developed or has been developed,  
18 data, and report back, want to look at it themselves, I think  
19 that you immediately have an opportunity to look at it.  
20 Whenever the data is available and you want to look at it I  
21 think that you should plan to do so.

22           Okay?

23           MR. MILLER: Let's see now. In connection with that  
24 item, well, let's go to the other items on the agenda. But  
25 there are a few other ones which I need to identify the need

1 to have a meeting on if we can't at least talk about them  
2 here, talk about when we can talk about them.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. The only other item  
4 on the agenda -- we're finished with Item 2; is that  
5 right? Okay. But before we move away from Item 2, this  
6 list which we have marked up so well, could you take the  
7 action of getting this let together and sending it back  
8 over?

9 MR. LINEHAN: Fine. Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I would appreciate it very much if  
11 you would.

12 MR. MILLER: We're trying to do it as a spread  
13 sheet. You know, I haven't talked to the guys about that  
14 yet, but I think it would be useful to see it by project and  
15 by month, and we can all get a glimpse of how much we're  
16 signing up to here.

17 I think we've been mentally trying to do that to  
18 avoid getting over-extended, but I know the fellow at my right  
19 here is particularly nervous about this. But we'll try to  
20 develop it in that way.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I would appreciate your having that  
22 as soon as possible so that we can get it back out to the  
23 field so people can start getting prepared. Now, I have  
24 some actions here, and I will -- wherever you have an action,  
25 if you note who has the action, that would be helpful,



1 too.

2 You're welcome to my markup.

3 MR. MILLER: We've got the record here.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: But it's going to take some time --  
5 how long does it take before we get that back?

6 REPORTER: It could be five to 20 days.

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Between five and 20 days.

8 MR. MILLER: One of the things we're going to do is  
9 try to come up with a list. In fact, I'd hoped we'd be  
10 able to do it here today, of the major action items that  
11 you have taken and we have taken out of this thing.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think we can do that pretty quick.

13 MR. MILLER: Maybe at the end we can quickly  
14 summarize that. And have it as a consolidated thing in the  
15 record.

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So Item 2 is finished. And you're  
17 going to take the action of putting an Item 2 list together?

18 MR. LINEHAN: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. Then Item 5, Identify  
20 Topics for Calendar Year 1986 Meetings. Are you prepared to  
21 do that or should we wait until later on to have a separate  
22 meeting on that? I would suggest we wait.

23 MR. MILLER: I agree.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right.

25 Do you have any other topics?

1 MR. MILLER: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right.

3 MR. MILLER: We're going to be sending you some  
4 statements of work for contracts that are going to be put  
5 in place in the licensing office and in office of research  
6 with the idea that you look at them to, please, if you will,  
7 give us some feedback on whether you think these things  
8 duplicate unneccssarily or inappropriately in some fashion,  
9 work that you are doing.

10 This is a point of assuring better government and  
11 not having taxpayers' money be spent twice.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. Two or three months ago  
13 you folks sent us over a stack of statement of work, or it probab  
14 had a different name, on work that was being done, contracted  
15 out from either your office or from research's office. And  
16 we looked at those and we provided our comments as to whether  
17 we thought that work was already underway on a particular  
18 topic. We avoided any comments on those things that, where  
19 you were overiewing activities. It may be the same thing  
20 that we're doing but it was meant to provide an overview to  
21 the Department's activities, so obviously, it didn't duplicate.  
22 But there was some research that we thought was duplicating  
23 some activities that we had underway, although it was hard  
24 to tell for sure, and that was passed back to your Research  
25 office. I'm trying to remember the person we passed it to.

1 MR. MILLER: Is there any way of reconstructing  
2 how that got passed back or who you talked to?

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Don Alexander was the one that  
4 called back.

5 So we'll look at what you send over.

6 MR. MILLER: I guess I also, maybe ought to go back  
7 to Research. If you could think to have Alexander give me a  
8 call, so that I can track back and see what, which contracts  
9 those were. I'm not sure. Maybe I just have a faulty memory  
10 and I was told by Research what contracts those were.  
11 I don't recall it. If you don't mind having Don give me a call.

12 The items we're going to send over to you are ones  
13 which are new starts, so I doubt if they're the ones that  
14 you've seen already. And the other point is that, just for the  
15 record, our conclusion is that none of these duplicate work  
16 that you're doing. On the face of it, they may seem like it,  
17 even the research activities, that they are all in the  
18 category we think of of confirmatory research or checking of  
19 things, an overview of your program. But we want to make  
20 certain. That's the reason for it.

21 The other item, we'd like to know when we can pursue  
22 and get some feedback from you on the status of several items  
23 in the Procedural Agreement. One item in particular is the  
24 item on the DOE providing a data catalog. Item 2 and 3(C) in  
25 the Agreement calls for the DOE to develop as soon as

1 practicable and thereafter maintain a catalog of data.  
2 This catalog will include descriptions of the data, at the  
3 time, the place, and method of acquisition and where it may  
4 be examined. The catalog will be updated and provided to NRC  
5 at least quarterly.

6 My understanding is that at some sites there is  
7 something approaching this. At no sites is there something  
8 that meets what this says. This and the other items I talked  
9 about previously, which is having documents which lay out  
10 what is planned in the way of field and laboratory testing  
11 covering as long a period as practicable. How do we pursue  
12 that, Ralph?

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'll have to check on that. I'll  
14 have to check and see what the status is of the catalog and  
15 get back to you and let you know what the current status is.

16 MR. MILLER: We're currently doing an audit, an  
17 internal audit, of where we stand on the procedural agreement.  
18 And that is where both we and you stand. And the possible  
19 coming out of that will be a letter or something which will  
20 identify areas where we don't think we are, either one or both  
21 of us are not fully implementing this. But I'm trying to  
22 identify these right now because I don't think we're  
23 following it, and if you'd get back to us on that I'd appreciate  
24 it.

25

CHAIRMAN STEIN: Sure.

1 MR. MILLER: I think that's it. Anybody else have  
2 anything?

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Dean, do you have anything?

4 MR. TOUSLEY: One comment. I was a little bit  
5 disturbed to hear you say, Ralph, that after two and a  
6 half years of working with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act,  
7 you haven't yet decided how to get information to the states  
8 and tribes. And I would just like to support what Hub said  
9 about all you have to do is have a mailing list. And  
10 basically, when you send stuff to them four weeks ahead of  
11 time, also send it to the affected states and Indian tribes  
12 for that particular site so that they can participate in  
13 these meetings with some semblance of preparation as well.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Dean, I appreciate your comment.  
15 And I think you might have misread what I was saying. What  
16 I was referring to at the time was trying to identify all the  
17 information that the states and tribes would like to have.  
18 For example, related to the site characterization plan.  
19 I'm sure you're aware that we sent out a letter and  
20 asked the states and tribes what it is that they would like  
21 in the way of information and how they would like to  
22 participate on that site characterization plan. It was feed-  
23 back from contacts like that that would focus the Department's  
24 efforts to be sure that the right information that the states  
25 would like to have did get to the states and the Indian  
tribes. That's what I was referring to.

1 MR. TOUSLEY: I'm just referring to documents that  
2 are the subjects of meetings. I mean, that was identified as  
3 a topic, because there hasn't been adequate proponents in  
4 some cases in the past, and it has been a problem for the  
5 Yakima project, not having access to documents which are  
6 the subject of the meeting. I think it was in that context  
7 that you made that comment. And I suggest that it's not  
8 difficult to resolve. That's all I have.

9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. MILLER: Do you want to try to recap what the  
11 action items are? We can go two ways. We can kind of rapidly  
12 do that --

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Why don't we quickly do that.  
14 Let me take the lead of going down my list. Interject if I  
15 skip over something, all right? And I'm going to go down  
16 item by item.

17 Item 1, no change. Item -- Topic 2, no change.  
18 Topic 3 --

19 MR. WRIGHT: DOE will provide a draft next week on  
20 Topic 2.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: You're right. That's an action.  
22 DOE will provide a letter on Appendix 7 to NRC early next  
23 week.

24 Topic 3, June 20th. On Topic 4, DOE agrees to  
25 send a description of the -- a description and agenda to

1 NRC and I guess we already set the date, didn't we? And the  
2 date is July 18th. So this would be a description of the  
3 meeting and an agenda. The end of next week.

4 MS. CASEY: I had an action item on the previous  
5 one that by the end of next week or June 6 DOE would get  
6 NRC the Q list.

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's right. It was June 6. Okay.  
8 Let's see. The topic 5, let's say, didn't we say that would  
9 be the same as --

10 MR. LINEHAN: It would be a telecon between BWIP  
11 and NRC to determine the agenda and the time.

12 CHAIRMAN STEIN: And that would be, it was  
13 tentative for September and October, that's Topic 5, and the  
14 same comment applies to Topic 8.

15 MR. LINEHAN: That's right. Proposed date, October/  
16 November.

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. 6 there's no change. 7,  
18 July 23, 24, 25. Topic 9, is July 31st, and the date is firm.  
19 Topic 10, August 27 and 28. Topic 11, September 23 to 26 and  
20 tentative becomes firm. 12, is August 13 and 14 and that's  
21 firm. 13 is September/October and the status is tentative,  
22 of the date.

23 14, DOE will send a paper on Seismo-Tectonics by  
24 6/21 or on 6/21 to NRC to support a meeting on August 20 and  
25 21st. Item 16, DOE will send to NRC a description of the meeting

1 and the date is to be determined. The date for the meeting is  
2 tentative for September.

3 17, September 17th and 18th. 18, October 7, and  
4 the date is firm. 19 is December/January. 20 is December/  
5 January. 21 is November/December. No change to 22; no change  
6 to 23. 24 is October 1 to 4, firm. 25, NRC believes this  
7 is unnecessary. We need to check on the, on this meeting, the  
8 purpose of the meeting, and we'll get back by phone as to  
9 whether --

10 MR. LINEHAN: Specifically, we don't think a site  
11 specific meeting is necessary here. Possibly a generic  
12 meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: All right. 26 is out. 27 is  
14 October 16 and 17 and it's firm. 28 is, SRP will develop  
15 a proposed agenda and date for a meeting in October -- I'm  
16 sorry, in August. 29, we need to deal with providing  
17 an agenda and this will be restructured to a generic  
18 discussion, and the date is tentative.

19 30 is renamed Generic QA Meeting and NRC will send  
20 us a proposed agenda and scope for a meeting in July/August.  
21 The date is tentative.

22 And there's another meeting that's scheduled,  
23 SRP TBEG Data Review for October and that's tentative.  
24 And Leslie Casey will check on that date. That's all I have.

25 MR. LINEHAN: That's everything I have.



1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay?

2 MR. MILLER: Can I recap a couple other points  
3 which I think are significant? One is that we've agreed that  
4 we would set as a goal exchanging documents, particularly if  
5 they're lengthy documents, four weeks in advance of the  
6 meetings, that we would exchange appropriate documents that  
7 would be subject of discussion in the meeting. That you will  
8 get back to us with some reaction to us and our position that  
9 we want to take with the states and tribes, which is that  
10 essentially we would provide them information and that we  
11 would arrange to have information provided to them at the  
12 same time we're exchanging it.

13 That's an important item, because we've got to get  
14 back to them with some answer, and we -- it depends partly  
15 on where you folks come out.

16 But you'll get back to us on that. Let me just  
17 ask, Ralph, any idea when you'll have some position on that?

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I don't have a date.

19 MR. MILLER: Days or weeks or what?

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Days to weeks.

21 MR. MILLER: I might continue tonight you on that,  
22 because we've got to make a decision at NRC on how we respond  
23 to the states on that, and it does involve you.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay.

25 MR. MILLER: And that we talked about, I guess we

1 just reiterated the ten-day or two-week advance notice,  
2 advance on firming up on agendas and that we affirmed that  
3 except where there is real good cause to not have meetings  
4 on shorter notice than that.

5           The only other thing I can think of, there are two  
6 other things that I think are important to summarize on, and  
7 one is the question of data reviews. The data reviews are not  
8 covered in that agenda, that list of meetings that we just  
9 went through. Those will be handled on a case by case basis  
10 as needed and that the only other thing is that a caveat that  
11 I thought so much about concerning it's really your call and  
12 your judgment right now, but these meetings are on a schedule  
13 which will support you and that will not lead to problems  
14 later on. But we will pursue subsequently these catalogs of  
15 testing plan and so on to try to develop a better sense our-  
16 selves of what your program schedules are. And if anything  
17 comes out of that, we'll of course get back to you. I think  
18 that's an important caveat, at least from my perspective, our  
19 perspective.

20           There is one other issue which relates to the WIP  
21 facility and interaction on WIP. And I think the way we  
22 left that is we're going to send you a letter outlining what  
23 we think our needs are, what we think is prudent and approp-  
24 riate for NRC and DOE to be doing in the way of consultation  
25 on that question.

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: What question is that?

2 MR. MILLER: This is the issue about WIP and  
3 consultation on information exchange on what is being done at  
4 WIP with respect to testing there. We'll be sending you a  
5 letter on that.

6 I think that covers the list that I had. Anything  
7 else?

8 MS. CASEY: Did you mention the data catalogs?

9 MR. MILLER: Yes. Ralph is going to get back to us.  
10 Ralph is going to get back to us on review of the status of  
11 the items in Section 3(C) of the Procedural Agreement on  
12 data catalog and listings of planned testing.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Anything else?

14 All right. Thank you very much.

15 (Whereupon, at 1:45 p.m. the meeting was  
16 adjourned.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the attached proceedings  
before the Department of Energy  
(Name of Agency)

in the matter of: Meeting to Review planned interactions  
between the Department of Energy And the  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the Reposit  
Docket Number: program  
Place: Washington, D.C.  
Date: May 30, 1985

were held as herein appears, and this is the original transcript  
thereof for the file of the Department or Commission.

  
S K S GROUP, LTD.  
Official Reporter