

Transmitted w/RIDS dtd. 94/11/03

ACNW-0087
PDR 10/24/95

MINUTES OF THE 67TH ACNW MEETING
SEPTEMBER 21-22, 1994

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

	<u>Page</u>
I. Chairman's Report (Open)	1
II. U.S. Department of Energy Proposed Program Approach to Site Characterization at Yucca Mountain (Open)	2
III. Substantially Complete Containment for a High-Level Radioactive Waste (HLW) Geologic Repository (Open)	5
IV. Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Land Ownership of LLW Disposal Facilities (Open)	8
V. Executive Session (Open/Closed)	11
A. Report	
General Comments on the Impact of the Department of Energy's Proposed Program Approach on the NRC's High-Level Radioactive Waste Licensing Activities	
B. NRC Staff Discussion of the NRC PRA Policy and Implementation Plan	
C. Reconciliation of ACNW Comments and Recommendations (Open)	
D. Trip Reports (Open)	
E. Anticipated ACNW Activities (Open)	
F. Future Meeting Agenda (Open)	

- APPENDICES -

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

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By EMB

oam-7-ACNW

R502²

CERTIFIED

Issued: November 3, 1994

MINUTES OF THE 67TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
SEPTEMBER 21-22, 1994
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The 67th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste was held at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday and Thursday, September 21-22, 1994. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate actions on the items listed in the attached agenda. The meeting was open to public attendance.

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

Dr. Martin J. Steindler, Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. and briefly reviewed the schedule for the meeting. He stated that the meeting was being conducted in conformance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. He stated that the Committee had not received any requests from persons or organizations desiring to make an oral statement during the meeting. However, he invited members of the public, who were present and had something to contribute, to let the ACNW staff know so that time could be allocated for them to make oral statements.

ACNW members, Drs. William J. Hinze and Paul W. Pomeroy were present. [For a list of attendees, see Appendix III.]

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Open)

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

Dr. Steindler identified a number of items that he believed to be of interest to the Committee, including:

- Candidates to fill the two open seats on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission were reported by The Washington Post to be Mr. Robert M. Sussman; Environmental Protection Agency Deputy Regional Administrator, and Ms. Shirley Jackson, MIT physicist.
- As part of the NRC streamlining efforts, the Office of Policy Planning will be abolished.

- Some ashed sewage sludge samples were reported in Pennsylvania that show low, but detectable, concentrations of uranium and thorium, as well as trace amounts of cobalt-16 and cesium-137.
- The most recent progress report from Yucca Mountain Project Office indicates that the start of the tunnel boring machine will be delayed.
- The last state program review for integrated performance evaluation was completed in New Hampshire. Previously, the Utah program was reviewed in June and the Illinois program was reviewed in July. The New Hampshire review team recommended a finding of adequacy for the program, but withheld the finding of compatibility due to the status of the state regulations, including the as yet not adopted correspondence to the 10 CFR Part 20.

II. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROPOSED PROGRAM APPROACH TO SITE CHARACTERIZATION AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN (Open)

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

The Committee was briefed by Dr. Stephen J. Brocoum, Assistant Manager Suitability and Licensing, DOE, on the proposed program approach (PPA).

The proposed program approach was developed because the existing program being used to determine the Yucca Mountain site suitability could not be accomplished within the current funding level. It was decided to streamline the program and show demonstrable progress at reduced cost.

Under the PPA, the schedule calls for a technical site suitability determination in 1998, a license application in 2001, and a license to receive waste in 2010. During this period, additional site data will be collected and the license application will be updated in 2008.

Dr. Brocoum discussed the basis for the PPA. It responds to Congressional expectations to show demonstrable progress at reduced cost. The approach is consistent with the original intent of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and 10 CFR Part 60 regarding the sequencing of DOE and NRC decisions. It reflects some recommendations of the National Academy of Science's report, "Rethinking High-Level Waste." The PPA also responds to suggestions from the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board and others regarding the need for effective management of a well focused technical program.

The planning assumptions behind the PPA were explained. The PPA assumes no changes to legislative and regulatory framework. A second assumption is increased funding in FY 1995 and assured funding in the out-years. Another PPA assumption is delivery of multipurpose containers to utilities starting in 1998. The site characterization program will be restructured to focus on the most significant issues for suitability and licensing. Retrieval of the waste will be maintained for up to 100 years.

The proposed top-level strategy for the repository entails making a formal suitability finding in a step wise manner. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review will begin as soon as possible. Scoping studies are planned for March 1995. By the year 2001, plans call for providing the NRC with sufficient information in the license application to support a reasonable assurance finding for construction authorization. The DOE plans to involve stakeholders and the public prior to making key decisions.

The proposed site suitability decision schedule was discussed. For each decision module, a report will be produced by the DOE. Current expectations are to have each report peer reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences. Finally, a regulatory assessment will be produced to determine if a higher level finding (that the site is suitable, and further analysis is highly unlikely to change this determination) is applicable. Individual assessments along with a total system performance assessment will be completed by the end of 1998.

Dr. Brocoum drew a distinction between the responsibility of DOE to determine site suitable under 10 CFR Part 960, and the licensing responsibility of NRC under 10 CFR Part 60. These activities are parallel but separate. The DOE expects the NRC staff to inform them, if the NRC believes that there is a lack of information for a license application. Between the present and 2001, the Yucca Mountain repository will be in the prelicensing phase. From 2001 until 2010, DOE will be involved with formal licensing interactions with the NRC.

As part of the PPA process, some studies that were planned under the former site characterization program will be either delayed, narrowed, or eliminated. The DOE will focus on substantial and complete containment in the waste package and safe repository operations first. Studies that deal with long-term performance over 10,000 years, e.g., flow and transport calculations, will be bounded by conservative calculations initially.

Currently the Yucca Mountain project is estimated to cost \$5 billion from the present until the license application phase. Nearly a billion dollars will be saved by the accelerated program. Much of the savings comes from eliminating the infrastructure

needed to run the program an additional five years. In addition the scope of the exploratory studies facility has been scaled back.

An overview of the PPA is contained in a soon-to-be-released 5 year plan for this project. The details of the studies are contained in technical implementation plans, these also will be available shortly. ACNW members requested copies of both documents.

Near term site characterization activities will include: excavation into potential host rock to support a suitability finding; a determination of the seismic design basis to support a suitability finding based on reasonable available technology; characterizing the near-field environment to gain sufficient understanding of coupled processes; and determining whether any potential fast flow paths through the Ghost Dance Fault exist.

Under the PPA, the focus on the Exploratory Studies Facility construction is twofold, (1) obtain access to the Ghost Dance Fault in the Topopah Spring Level, and (2) develop the heater test area in the North Ramp. The appropriate amount of Calico Hills exploration is dependent on what is found in the Topopah Spring Ghost Dance Fault accesses.

The DOE will use 10 CFR Part 960, as written, to determine the suitability of the site. It is the guidelines contained in Part 960 that will serve to measure suitability. DOE will develop and subject to external review technical basis reports developed to satisfy the guidelines. There will be a process to accept public comments and hold workshops prior to a DOE management decision on higher level findings. All the technical data developed for site suitability will form a portion of the license application submitted to the NRC.

By the end of September 1994, the NRC staff should receive Site Characterization Progress Report 10 from DOE. An upper level description of the PPA will be contained in this report. In January 1995 Site Characterization Progress Report 11 will contain more detailed description of program changes.

The DOE representatives believe that, although 10 CFR Part 960 was originally designed to be used to select among a number of potential sites, it is applicable to evaluating the suitability of a single site.

Dr. Pomeroy noted that a study has been scheduled for completion by the DOE on September 30, 1994, entitled "Retrievability Period Systems Study." He requested a copy for the Committee's use.

Dr. Steindler raised an issue, that it will be more difficult to quantify uncertainties (or use expert judgement) in the absence of

data, than if experimental or field data had been collected. There should be a planned protocol in place for the use of determining uncertainties.

Conclusions/Action Items

The Committee issued a report to Chairman Selin dated September 30, 1994, on this matter.

III. SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE CONTAINMENT FOR A HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE (HLW) GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY (Open)

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

Dr. Michael Bell, NMSS/DWM, Chief of the Engineering and Geosciences Branch, indicated that this briefing was to bring the Committee up-to-date on the status of DOE/NRC resolution of NRC staff comments and questions resulting from the Staff Characterization Analysis (SCA). The fundamental issue is what is meant by the performance objective for substantially complete containment (SCC) 10 CFR 60.113. There have been some recent exchanges of correspondence that appear to indicate progress in resolving this issue.

Dr. Bell discussed the evolution of the SCC provision in the regulation, noting that it had not been in the original configuration of the rule. It was the result of the public comment process. The language in the rule was that waste packages will contain all of the radionuclides for at least the first 1,000 years after permanent closure. The intent had been that the NRC wanted to ensure containment during the thermal/radiologically active period of the disposal life, because these periods were thought to embody the greatest uncertainty. The belief was that engineering could accomplish this. Originally, three periods were considered relevant to the waste package isolation:

- The initial period where, with engineering, the waste could be contained.
- When the containment barrier was breached, there was a second period whereby additional engineering, use of waste forms, backfills, buffer materials, etc., it would be possible, by engineering, to control the rate at which materials migrated out of the engineered system.
- Finally, the third period where reliance would be placed on the natural systems to provide the isolation.

Public comments led the NRC staff to reconsider the implications of the stringent containment period. In the final rule the NRC introduce the SCC provision with the performance period of 300 to 1000 years; the period would vary depending on the age of the waste, the burnup of the spent fuel, etc. The NRC staff characterized substantially complete containment as meaning that releases during this containment period would be a small fraction of the inventory present and that it was recognized that of the large number of packages, the statistical variations would result in some of those waste packages failing.

In response to Dr. Steindler's query, Dr. Bell indicated that -- during this initial period with the high heat generation -- there would be some uncertainty in modeling of the transport through the near field. If the waste could be contained for this period, there would then be much greater confidence in being able to isolate the waste successfully. Dr. Bell indicated that the time delimiters were more a function of the rapid dropoff of the radioactivity decay curves for spent fuel than a function of cesium/strontium toxicity.

In intermediate consultative documents, the DOE indicated that as many as 20 percent of the waste canisters might fail in the first 1000 years following closure. SCC would be satisfied by design to control the release rate. The NRC staff questioned whether this could be achieved.

In the final site characterization plan (SCP), DOE modified this criterion to one where the waste package failures and subsequent release rate from the EBS would not exceed 10^{-6} of the inventory for long-lived radionuclides and 10^{-5} of the inventory for short-lived radionuclides. This was DOE's interpretation of SCC, along with a reference waste package air outflow rate. The situation remained unresolved. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB) raised concerns regarding the lack of clarity in the SCC requirement.

Beginning in the spring of 1994, DOE and NRC exchanged correspondence regarding the SCC criterion. The DOE proposes a criterion of a mean waste package lifetime "well in excess" of 1000 years, with only a small fraction (approximately one percent) failing in this initial period. In response to Dr. Hinze's question on the demonstration strategy, Dr. Bell indicated that DOE would rely on statistical analyses and on the more robust multi-purpose container (MPC) designs.

In the ensuing discussions, it became apparent that the 20 percent failure rate had been a DOE quantitative interpretation of what SCC

meant; whereas, the one percent failure rate is an expectation of the performance of the robust package design.

Dr. Steindler expressed concerns that there seemed to be an impression that the one percent versus 20 percent failure in the first thousand years provided an improved modeling basis. He indicated that it was not clear whether this numerical criterion was directed at addressing model uncertainty or not; if the thermal pulse was driving the uncertainty, the mass-inventory limitation seemed irrelevant. Mr. Richard Weller, NMSS, indicated that the containment requirement was directed to making the consequences therefrom inconsequential. In response to Dr. Steindler's question on whether risk analyses had been performed with respect to SCC, the NRC staff indicated that a separate one had not been done.

Drs. Steindler and Bell discussed fractional failure rates and acceptable risk. Although a full performance assessment (PA) could be used to "back calculate" release tolerances from the waste package source term, one did not have to limit the criterion to a health-effects one; concentrations at the edge of the disturbed zone could be used. Dr. Steindler cautioned the NRC staff that mean lifetimes could have multi-modal distributions, which could contribute to significant health effects, despite declining probabilities at extreme end values.

Dr. Bell discussed some remaining SCA issues. These included:

- What constitutes a failure - one package total failure or a distribution of pin holes?
- How does DOE justify the applicability of the package leak rate from 10 CFR Part 71 to 10 CFR Part 60 disposal applications?
- What are the expected consequences of the expected waste package failures?

In response to Dr. Hinze's question, Dr. Bell indicated the SCC requirement only applied for anticipated processes and events (APEs); high fluorine contents associated with volcanic releases could cause enhanced corrosive impacts on canister welds.

Dr. Bell indicated some possible alternatives in considering containment; these include:

- Define any penetration -- even pinholes -- as loss of containment; gases would be released.
- Use of a deterministic safety factor to adjust mean and standard deviation to address uncertainties.

Conclusions/Action Items

The Committee asked to be kept notified with regard to the NRC staff's approach to resolving SCC issue.

This briefing was for information only. No Committee action was taken.

IV. ADVANCED NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING FOR LAND OWNERSHIP OF LLW DISPOSAL FACILITIES (Open)

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

After some general remarks, Dr. Pomeroy introduced Mr. Paul Lohaus, Deputy Director, Office of State Programs (OSP), who noted others from the NRC staff who would assist him in his presentation: Dr. Sher Bahadur, RES, and Mr. Dennis Sollenberger, OSP. Also in attendance were Messrs. Robert Nelson and Michael Weber, NMSS, DWM, and Mr. "Chip" Cameron, OGC.

Prior to addressing the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) for Land Ownership of LLW Disposal Facilities, Mr. Lohaus believed that it would be beneficial for the Committee to understand the background and genesis of the current land ownership situation in Utah, particularly insofar as the Envirocare LLW disposal facility. He noted that Utah became an Agreement State in 1984. Subsequently, in 1989, the state requested an amendment to their agreement to regulate the disposal of LLW, which was granted in May 1990. The license limits the maximum average concentration and limits the form to bulky soil or soil-like material and debris. The radioactive waste received under this license is considered low concentration, high volume material. Such LLW is intended to be differentiated from the wastes accepted by the Northwest Compact host state LLW disposal facility located on the Hanford reservation. In 1993 the NRC granted a license to Envirocare authorizing the disposal of 11 e.(2) byproduct material.

After discussing the relevant historical perspectives on land ownership, the rationale to exempt Utah from the Federal/state land ownership requirement was:

- Utah law did not provide for state ownership
- Utah Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Requirements allow private ownership
- State is ultimately responsible if public health problems occur
- Surety arrangement would provide for public health and safety

Each of these areas was discussed. It was noted that the states, by virtue of their police powers, have in the past seized and impounded radioactive materials, if deemed necessary to protect public health and safety. It was also pointed out that issuance of an exemption for an LLW disposal facility under Part 61 compatible regulations was not contrary to Federal law. The NRC review process was discussed, with particular emphasis on the ability of the state actions to provide adequate control in lieu of government ownership of the land. The significance of the restrictive covenants (proposed by the NRC, adopted by the State) placed upon the facility were also discussed at length.

The Part 61 land ownership rationale was presented, it being indicated that the government land ownership requirement is based on the likelihood government will outlast private entities in providing long-term control of the site, during both the active and passive institutional periods. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Part 61 identified three major mechanisms for maintaining long-term institutional control, viz.: control of the land by a governmental organization, land-use restrictions in the form of titles or deed, and assurance of a multiplicity of records.

Among the questions posed by the Committee were: what would happen if Envirocare went out of business (not necessarily via a declared bankruptcy)?; If Utah were not an Agreement State, and the same proposal was submitted to the NRC staff, would it be approved?; Is the surety fund sufficiently funded?; What are the advantages of private v. government ownership insofar as the operator-why would Envirocare want to own the land?; What public hearing requirements applied to the Envirocare licensing process? For many of these questions the answers were admittedly speculative due to detailed unfamiliarity with Utah law, while for others, such as the surety bond question, an affirmative answer could be provided. The staff agreed to research and provide a response to the question regarding the relevant state public hearing process requirements and actual events pertinent to the Envirocare facility.

Dr. Bahadur presented a brief background on the Land Ownership ANPR, describing the Commission SRM directing the issuance of the ANPR. He stated that although 12 questions were asked, they could perhaps be combined to three:

1. Would other states in addition to Utah use this option?;
2. Would this option adversely affect public health and safety or the environment?
3. Are there any overriding liability concerns that would make this option impractical?

Dr. Bahadur indicated that he understood there had been four or five responses to the ANPR to date, although the comment period

does not expire until the first week of October. He also stated that insofar as question #1 above, some states were quite firm in not wanting the ANPR to be issued. Although an aside, he observed that the EPA does not require government land ownership for hazardous waste disposal sites.

Dr. Bahadur also stated that U.S. Ecology (USE) had filed a petition with the NRC asking for review and suspension or revocation of Utah's Agreement State program for failure to require state or Federal site ownership at the Envirocare facility. He indicated that the responses to the ANPR also will be considered in responding to that USE petition.

In reply to Dr. Pomeroy's question regarding the public hearing requirements of other states for the siting of an LLW disposal facility, it was noted that a site such as Envirocare was not in accord with the LLWPAA and therefore the application need only be processed by the state in accordance with the requirements of Utah law. Dr. Steindler stated that in his judgment the two most important items relevant to land ownership were the long-term control of access to the site and the ability to remediate in the event of a loss of confinement capability. The staff agreed.

Dr. Bahadur opined that some issues raised by the Committee would be there whoever owns the land, and that if the conditions are correct, it would not matter who owns the site.

Dr. Steindler thanked the staff for their detailed explanations of the Envirocare situation. The Committee will be most interested in receiving the requested information and to hearing further discussion on this topic once the public comments have been received on the ANPR and the staff evaluation completed.

Conclusions/Action Items

This briefing was for background information that will be used in future deliberations to develop advice on the issue of Government v. private land ownership of low-level radioactive waste (LLW) disposal facility sites in response to a request from a Commissioner.

V. EXECUTIVE SESSION (Open)

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

A. Report

General Comments on the Impact of the Department of Energy's Proposed Program Approach on the NRC's High-Level Radioactive Waste Licensing Activities (Report to Chairman Selin from Martin J. Steindler, ACNW Chairman, dated September 30, 1994)

B. NRC Staff Discussion of the NRC PRA Policy and Implementation Plan

This session was postponed indefinitely.

C. Reconciliation of ACNW Comments and Recommendations (Open)

The response of the EDO to the comments and recommendations included in a previous ACNW report was discussed as follows:

- EDO letter dated September 13, 1994, responding to the ACNW report dated July 13, 1994, concerning Proposed Rulemaking on Design Basis Events for the Geologic Repository Operations Area.

Conclusion

The Committee decided to take no action related to the EDO's response at this time. The Committee agreed to consider this response further during the next full Committee meeting.

D. Trip Reports (Open)

Dr. Pomeroy and Mr. Howard Larson reported on the tour of the proposed LLW Disposal Site at Ward Valley, California, and a National Academy of Sciences Panel Meeting.

Ms. Deering reported on the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board meeting on groundwater travel time, held on September 12-13, 1994, in Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting addressed coupling between saturated and unsaturated zones. A written trip report will be provided to the members.

E. Anticipated ACNW Activities (Open)

The Committee discussed anticipated and proposed Committee activities, future meeting dates and agenda.

- The Committee recommended that Ms. Deering attend and participate in the NRC/DOE Technical Exchange Meeting on hydrology to be held on November 29-30, 1994, in Denver, Colorado.
- The Committee agreed to reschedule the NRC staff briefing on the use of Probabilistic Risk Assessment during the November meeting. The specific focus of this briefing is on a risk-based approach for licensing high- and low-level waste disposal facilities.
- The Committee agreed to schedule the 69th ACNW meeting on November 10-11, 1994. The ACNW meeting in December was cancelled.

F. Future Meeting Agenda (Open)

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the 68th ACNW Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 17-18, 1994, and future Working Group meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, September 22, 1994.

Contact person: Dr. Chalmers Sechrist,
Program Director, National Science
Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard,
Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone: (703) 306-
1667

Purpose of meeting: To provide advice and
recommendations concerning proposals
submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate
unsolicited proposals submitted to the Small
Business Innovation Research (SBIR)
Program Panel Meeting

Reason for Closing: The proposals being
reviewed include information of a
proprietary or confidential nature, including
technical information; financial data, such as
salaries; and personal information
concerning individuals associated with the
proposals. These matters are exempt under 5
U.S.C. 552 b. (c) (4) and (6) of the
Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 29, 1994.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 94-21603 Filed 8-31-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

Special Emphasis Panel in Undergraduate Education; Meeting

In accordance with the Federal
Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-
463, as amended), the National Science
Foundation announces the following
meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in
Undergraduate Education.

Dates and times: September 23, 1994: 8:30
a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; September 24, 1994: 8:00
a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Place: Key Bridge Marriott Hotel, 1401 Lee
Highway, Arlington, VA 22209.

Type of meeting: Closed.

Contact person: Dr. Elizabeth Teles,
Program Director, National Science
Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard,
Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone: (703) 306-
1667

Purpose of meeting: To provide advice and
recommendations concerning preliminary
proposals submitted to NSF for financial
support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate
unsolicited preliminary proposals submitted
to the Advanced Technological Education
(ATE) Program Panel Meeting.

Reason for Closing: The preliminary
proposals being reviewed include
information of a proprietary or confidential
nature, including technical information;
financial data, such as salaries; and personal
information concerning individuals
associated with the proposals. These matters
are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and
(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 29, 1994.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 94-21604 Filed 8-31-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

Special Emphasis Panel in Undergraduate Education; Meeting

In accordance with the Federal
Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-
463, as amended), the National Science
Foundation announces the following
meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Division
of Undergraduate Education

Dates and times: September 25, 1994: 7:30
p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

September 26, 1994: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

September 27, 1994: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

September 28, 1994: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

September 29, 1994: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201
Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va 22230.

Type of meeting: Closed

Contact person: Dr. Terry Woodin, Program
Director, National Science Foundation, 4201
Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230,
Telephone: (703) 306-1667.

Purpose of meeting: To provide advice and
recommendations concerning proposals
submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate
unsolicited proposals submitted to the
Collaborative for Excellence in Teacher
Preparation Reverse Site (CETPRS) Program
Panel Meeting

Reason for Closing: The proposals being
reviewed include information of a
proprietary or confidential nature, including
technical information; financial data, such as
salaries; and personal information
concerning individuals associated with the
proposals. These matters are exempt under 5
U.S.C. 552 b. (c)(4) and (6) of the Government
in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 29, 1994.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 94-21605 Filed 8-31-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear
Waste (ACNW) will hold its 67th
meeting on September 21 and 22, 1994,
in Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike,
Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to
public attendance, with the exception of

a portion that may be closed to discuss
information the release of which would
constitute a clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy pursuant to
5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

The agenda for the subject meeting
shall be as follows:

Wednesday, September 21, 1994—
8:30 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.

Thursday, September 22, 1994—8:30
a.m. until 6:00 p.m.

During this meeting the Committee
plans to consider the following:

A. *DOE's Proposed Program
Approach*—Discuss with
representatives of the DOE, the
Proposed Program Approach to
characterization of the proposed Yucca
Mountain high-level radioactive waste
repository.

B. *Substantially Complete
Containment*—Discuss with the NRC
staff the concept of a substantially
complete containment for a high-level
waste repository. Can trade-offs exist
between the engineered barrier system
and the geologic setting?

C. *Use of PRA in Waste
Management*—Hear presentations by the
NRC staff on the use of Probabilistic
Risk Assessment on an NRC-wide
implementation initiative. The specific
focus is a risk-based approach for
licensing high- and low-level waste
disposal facilities.

D. *Agreement State Program*—Hear an
update on the development of an
Agreement State Policy Statement by
the NRC staff concerning the adequacy
and compatibility of such programs.

E. *Government Land Ownership*—
Discuss with the NRC staff a proposed
amendment to 10 CFR Part 61 which
would allow private ownership of low-
level radioactive waste facility sites as
an alternative to the current requirement
for Federal or State ownership.

F. *Proposed Ward Valley, CA LLW
Site*—Discuss observations by an ACNW
member of a field trip to the proposed
Ward Valley, CA LLW disposal facility
site and attendance at an associated
National Academy of Sciences meeting.

G. *Preparation of ACNW Reports*—
Prepare ACNW reports on issues
considered during this and previous
meetings.

H. *Committee Activities/Future
Agenda*—Discuss topics proposed for
consideration by the full Committee and
working groups. Discuss organizational
and personnel matters related to ACNW
members and ACNW staff. A portion of
this session may be closed to public
attendance to discuss information the
release of which would constitute a
clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
552b(c)(6).

I. Miscellaneous—Discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the Federal Register on June 6, 1988 (53 FR 20699). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACNW Executive Director, Dr. John T. Larkins, as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting may be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the ACNW Executive Director prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACNW meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with the ACNW Executive Director if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the ACNW Executive Director, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone 301/415-7368, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. e.s.t.)

Dated: August 26, 1994.

John C. Hoyle,

Acting, Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 94-21586 Filed 8-31-94; 8:45 am; BILLING CODE 7899-01-M]

Pilot Program for NRC Recognition of Good Performance by Nuclear Power Plants; Request for Comment

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission requests public comment on the Pilot Program for NRC Recognition of Good Performance by Nuclear Power Plants. The relevant program information was provided to the Commission on March 18, 1994, and is available in Public Document Rooms under accession number 9403280344 (SECY-94-071). The NRC will consider comments received from interested parties in analyzing the pilot program prior to making a final recommendation to the Commission.

DATES: The comment period expires October 3, 1994. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except for comments received before this date.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: The Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Hand delivered comments may also be delivered to Room T-6 D69, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael T. Mackley, Operations Engineer, Inspection and Regulatory Criteria Branch, Program Management, Policy Development and Analysis Staff, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555; (301) 504-1611.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In March 1990, the Commission requested the staff develop a pilot program to recognize outstanding safety performance in the industry. In August 1990, the Commission approved a program proposed by the staff for trial implementation. At the January 1991 senior management meeting (SMM), senior managers discussed implementation of the Good Performer Program, and recommended several improvements to the process. The program was first used at the June 1991 SMM. Since June 1991, the NRC has recognized 18 nuclear power plants that have demonstrated outstanding performance.

The staff provided the Commission with an update on the status of the pilot program on March 18, 1994 (SECY-94-071). The current staff guidelines for the NRC Good Performer Program and the historic results are detailed in that paper.

During the Periodic Briefing on Operating Reactors and Fuel Facilities on June 23, 1994, the Commission

requested that the staff solicit industry and public comment on the Good Performer Program. The staff has developed a set of questions for the public to consider in reviewing the Good Performer Program. These questions are:

1. Should the NRC continue the Good Performer Program?
2. What changes, if any, would enhance the current program?
3. What attributes should the NRC consider in assessing licensees for Good Performer recognition?
4. What other programs can the NRC use to provide positive reinforcement or recognize good performance?
5. What other NRC programs should be modified to support the Good Performer Program?
6. Has the NRC's Good Performer Program selected the outstanding plants?
7. Do licensees consider recognition by the Good Performer Program as an organizational goal?
8. Are there any adverse effects, real or perceived, from being on the NRC's Good Performer list?
9. Are there any indications of "rising standards" for Good Performer recognition since 1991?
10. Has the industry benefited or been penalized from use of Good Performer Program results by external organizations?
11. What benefits, if any, have been realized by the licensees recognized for good performance?

Public comments are requested to assist the NRC in the analysis of the Good Performer Program. The program is described in SECY-94-071, "Update on the Status of Pilot Program for NRC Recognition of Good Performance by Nuclear Power Plants," which is available in NRC's Public Document Rooms under accession number 9403280344. In addition to comment on the technical and regulatory aspects, responses referenced to the specific questions listed above would be appreciated.

Subject

Pilot Program for NRC Recognition of Good Performer by Nuclear Power Plants; Request for Comment.

Dated: Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of August 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Anthony T. Gault,

Chief, Inspection and Regulatory Criteria Branch, Program Management, Policy Development and Analysis Staff, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94-21585 Filed 8-31-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7899-01-M



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

September 7, 1994

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
 67TH ACNW MEETING
 SEPTEMBER 21-22, 1994
 ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

Wednesday, September 21, 1994, Room T2B3, Two White Flint North, 11545
 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1) 8:30 - 8:⁴⁰45 A.M.</p> | <p><u>Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman (Open)</u>
 1.1) Opening Statement (MJS/RKM)
 1.2) Items of Current Interest (MJS/RKM)</p> |
| <p>2) 8:45 - ^{11:35}12:00 Noon
 (BREAK 10:30-10:⁵⁰45)</p> | <p><u>DOE Presentation on the Proposed Program
 Approach to Site Characterization at Yucca
 Mountain (Open) (MJS/RKM)</u>
 2.1) Introduction - M. Steindler
 2.2) Presentation - Steve Brocoum
 2.3) General Discussion
 2.4) Elements of a Letter to the NRC</p> |
| <p>^{11:35}
 12:00 - 1:00 P.M.</p> | <p>* * * * LUNCH * * * *</p> |
| <p>3) 1:00 - 2:00 P.M.</p> | <p><u>NRC Staff Discussion on the Current Status
 Substantially Complete Containment (SCC)
 for an HLW Geologic Repository (Open)
 (MJS/GNG)</u>
 3.1) Introduction - M. Steindler
 3.2) NRC Staff Presentation - M. Bell-NMSS
 3.3) General Discussion</p> |
| <p>4) 2:00 - 3:00 P.M.</p> | <p><u>NRC Staff Discussion of the NRC PRA Policy
 and Implementation Plan (Open) (BJG/GNG)</u>
 4.1) Introduction - R. J. Garrick
 4.2) Brief Overview - NRR/NMSS
 4.3) General Discussion <i>Postponed</i></p> |
| <p>2:00 ^{2:30}
 3:00 - 3:15 P.M.</p> | <p>* * * * BREAK * * * *</p> |
| <p>5) ^{2:30}3:15 - ¹⁵6:00 P.M.</p> | <p><u>Committee Activities/Future Agenda (Open/
 Closed) (MJS/RKM)</u>
 5.1) Set Agenda for October Full Committee
 Meeting
 5.2) Review Itinerary for Tour of Yucca
 Mountain Site
 5.3) Review Agenda for Groundwater Dating
 Working Group
 5.4) Review Items for the Out Months</p> |

[= Transcribed portion of meeting

5.5) Report on Tour of the Ward Valley, CA Proposed LLW Disposal Site and Associated Meeting of National Academy of Sciences Panel (PWP/HJL)

~~5.6) Discussion of ACNW Personnel and Organizational Matters (Closed)~~

(NOTE: A portion of this session may be closed to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of this advisory committee, and matters the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.)

¹⁵
6:00 P.M.

* * * * RECESS * * * *

Thursday, September 22, 1994, Room T2B3, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

²⁰
6) 8:30 - 10:00 A.M.

Background and Discussion on Recent Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Land Ownership of LLW Disposal Facilities (Open) (PWP/HJL)

- 6.1) Introduction - P. Pomeroy
- 6.2) Discussion by NRC Staff - R. Bangart/ P. Lohaus (OSP), S. Bahadur, (RES)
- 6.3) General Discussion

²⁰ 1:20 P
10:00 - 10:15 A.M.

* * * * BREAK * * * * Lunch

²⁰ 4:00
7) 10:15 - 12:45 P.M.

Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open) (MJS/RKM, et al)

- 7.1) ACNW Comments on the Proposed Program Approach
- 7.2) ACNW Comments on Substantially Complete Containment
- 7.3) ACNW Comments on Land Ownership
- 7.4) ACNW Comments on Agreement State Issues

~~12:45 - 1:45 P.M.~~

~~* * * * LUNCH * * * *~~

8) 1:45 - 2:45 P.M.

Miscellaneous (Open) (MJS/RKM)
Complete discussion of matters considered during this meeting and matters considered but not completed during previous meetings as time and availability of information permit.

9) ~~2:45 - 4:00~~ P.M.

Committee Activities/Future Agenda (Open/
Closed) (MJS/RKM)

- 9.1) Long Term Schedule
- 9.2) Future Working Group Topics
- 9.3) Other Planning

4:00 P.M.

* * * * ADJOURN * * * *

- NOTE:
- Presentation time should not exceed 50 percent of the total time allocated for a specific item. The remaining 50 percent of the time is reserved for discussion.
 - Number of copies of the presentation materials to be provided to the ACNW - 40

APPENDIX III: MEETING ATTENDEES

67TH ACNW MEETING
SEPTEMBER 21-22, 1994

<u>ACNW MEMBERS</u>	<u>1st Day</u>	<u>2nd Day</u>
Dr. Martin J. Steindler	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Dr. William J. Hinze	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Dr. B. John Garrick	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>

<u>ACNW STAFF</u>	<u>1st Day</u>	<u>2nd Day</u>
Ms. Lynn F. Deering	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Mr. Giorgio Gnugnoli	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Mr. Howard J. Larson	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Dr. John T. Larkins	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Mr. Richard K. Major	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Dr. Richard P. Savio	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>
Mr. H. Stanley Schofer	<u> X </u>	<u> X </u>

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

R. Auluck	RES
S. Bahadur	RES
D. Brooks	NMSS
M. Delligatti	NMSS
M. Haisfield	RES
J. Holonich	NMSS
B. Jagannath	NMSS
R. Johnson	NMSS
P. Justus	NMSS
P. Lohaus	SP
D. Loosley	NMSS
K. McConnell	OCM/IS
M. Nataraja	NMSS
B. Nelson	NMSS
J. Surmeier	NMSS
M. Weber	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

K. Asbell	EG&G Idaho
I. Auterman	NAS
L. Berkowitz	M&O
G. Bradley	EG&G
T. Cotton	M&O
J. Docka	Weston
D. Fehringer	NWTRB
D. Fenster	M&O
F. Galpin	Rogers & Associates Engineering
A. Gil	DOE
C. Hanlon	U.S. DOE
K. Hanson	ICF Kaiser for Martin Marietta
C. Henkel	NEI
P. Krishna	M&O
H. Lang	M&O
M. Lugo	M&O
B. Packer	M&O
W. Patrick	CNWRA
G. Roseboom	USGS
J. Russell	CNWRA
J. Schmitt	NEI
N. Stellavato	Nye County/WV
E. Taylor	M&O/TRW
E. Tiesenhausen	Clark County
R. Wallace, Jr.	U.S. Geological Survey
J. York	Weston
K. Younsh	Radioactive Exchange

APPENDIX IV: FUTURE AGENDA

68th ACNW Meeting, October 18-19, 1994, Las Vegas, Nevada. During this meeting, the Committee plans to consider the following:

Systems Prioritization Approach - Hear a report on a new approach adopted by the WIPP program to demonstrate compliance with the EPA Standards, which is redirecting performance assessment and data collection activities to provide greater confidence while minimizing associated costs.

Selection of High-Level Waste Research Topics - Selection of high-level waste (HLW) research topics for further review by the ACNW in the Committee's examination of NRC's high-level waste research program.

Accelerated Pneumatic Testing Program - Review details of the Department of Energy's accelerated program to collect baseline pneumatic data during Exploratory Studies Facility construction.

Implementation of the Proposed Program Approach (PPA) - Overview of saturated and unsaturated zone studies with emphasis on impacts from PPA.

Yucca Mountain Project - Comments by Interested Parties - Hear comments from and hold discussions with state, tribal, county, and local government officials. Representatives from other stakeholders in the proposed HLW repository effort may also present comments.

Preparation of ACNW Reports - Prepare ACNW reports on issues considered during this and previous meetings.

Committee Activities/Future Agenda - Discuss topics proposed for consideration by the full Committee and working groups. Discuss organizational and personnel matters related to ACNW members and ACNW staff. A portion of this session may be closed to public attendance to discuss information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

Miscellaneous - Discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Planned Working Group Meetings

Groundwater Dating Methods, October 21, 1994, Las Vegas, Nevada - The Working Group will discuss dating methods, the results of groundwater dating at the proposed Yucca Mountain site, and implications of the results on groundwater travel time and flow paths.

Multi-Purpose Canister Concept, (Date to be determined) - The Working Group will investigate issues related to the multi-purpose canister concept, including metallic corrosion research, potential chemical reactivity and release rates.

APPENDIX V
LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

[Note: Some documents listed below may have been provided or prepared for Committee use only. These documents must be reviewed prior to release to the public.]

MEETING HANDOUTS

AGENDA

DOCUMENTS

ITEM NO.

- 2 DOE Proposed Program Approach to Site Characterization at Yucca Mountain
 1. Memorandum to ACNW Members/Staff from Richard Major, Nuclear Waste Branch Chief, dated September 12, 1994, regarding September 9, 1994 Commission Meeting on HLW Issues by NWTRB, State of Nevada, Local Governments and Native Americans [Handout #1]
 2. Proposed Program Approach Presented by Stephen J. Brocoum, Assistant Manager, Suitability and Licensing, DOE, dated September 21, 1994 [Viewgraphs]

- 3 Substantially Complete Containment (SCC) for an HLW Geologic Repository
 3. Background on Substantially Complete Containment (SCC) for an HLW Geologic Repository [Handout #7]
 4. Letter to Chairman Selin from Daniel Dreyfus, Director, OCRWM, dated August 23, 1994, regarding the Multi-Purpose Canister-Based System, with attachment
 5. Substantially Complete Containment. 10 CFR 60.113(a)(1), dated September 21, 1994 [Viewgraphs]

- 4 NRC Staff Discussion of the NRC PRA Policy and Implementation Plan
 6. Guidance on PRA Terms and Methods, NUREG-1489, Revised April 1994 [Handout #3] [For Internal Use Only]
 7. Memorandum to Robert Johnson from Pauline Brooks, dated September 8, 1994, regarding Announcement of an NRC/DOE Technical Exchange on Total System Performance Assessment (TSPA) and Related Major Technical Issues [Handout #8]

- 5 Committee Activities/Future Agenda
 8. CNWRA Program Reviews - September 22-23, 1994 [Handout #5]
 9. Computer Codes and Foibles, dated September 21, 1994 [Handout #9]

- 6 Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Land Ownership of LLW Disposal Facilities
 10. Memorandum to ACNW Members from Howard Larson, dated September 16, 1994, with attachment [Handout #6]
 11. Background and Discussion on the Recent Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Land Ownership of LLW Disposal

Appendix V
67th ACNW Meeting

2

Facilities, by Paul H. Lohaus, Dennis M. Sollenberger and
Sher Bahadur, undated [Viewgraphs]

- 7 Preparation of ACNW Reports
12. ACNW Reports - Review of EDO Response to ACNW Reports
[Handout #2]

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Chairman's Report
 1. Introductory Statement by ACNW Chairman
 2. Items of Current Interest, undated

- 2 DOE Proposed Program Approach to Site Characterization at Yucca Mountain
 3. Table of Contents
 4. Status Report
 5. Letter to Martin Steindler, ACNW Chairman, from Chairman Selin, dated August 30, 1994, regarding High-Level Radioactive Waste Research Programs
 6. Federal Register Notice (FRN) dated August 4, 1994, regarding the Process for Evaluating the Suitability of the Yucca Mountain Site
 7. Memorandum to Martin Steindler, ACNW Chairman, from Richard Major, Nuclear Waste Branch Chief, dated August 26, 1994, regarding the August 4, 1994 FRN, Process for Evaluating the Suitability of the Yucca Mountain Site for Development as a Repository for High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel, with attachment.
 8. Letter to Dwight E. Shelor, Associate Director for Systems and Compliance, DOE, from Joseph Holonich, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch Chief, dated July 8, 1994, regarding Initial Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff Review of U.S. Department of Energy's Proposed Program Approach, with attachment
 9. 10 CFR Part 960, Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for the Nuclear Waste Repositories; Final Siting Guidelines

- 3 Substantially Complete Containment (SCC) for an HLW Geologic Repository
 10. Table of Contents
 11. Status Report
 12. 10 CFR 60.113, Performance of Particular Barriers After Permanent Closure
 13. Letter to Dwight Shelor, Associate Director for Systems and Compliance, DOE, from Joseph Holonich, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch Chief, NMSS, dated July 11, 1994, regarding Staff Evaluation of Open Item Responses on Substantially Complete Containment, with attachment [NUDOCS #9407260316]
 14. Letter to Joseph Holonich, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Project Branch Chief, from Dwight Shelor, Associate Director for Systems and Compliance, DOE, dated

- June 10, 1994, regarding Request for NRC Review of DOE Supplemental Responses to SCA Open Comments and Questions, with attachment [NUDOCS #9406140390]
15. Letter to Joseph Holonich, Director of Repository Licensing and Quality Assurance Project Directorate, from Dwight Shelor, Associate Director for Systems and Compliance, DOE, dated May 17, 1994, regarding SCA Open Items, with attachments [NUDOCS #9405260112]
 16. Letter to Joseph Holonich, Director of Repository Licensing and Quality Assurance Project Directorate, from Dwight Shelor, Associate Director for Systems and Compliance, DOE, dated March 30, 1994, regarding SCA Open Comment 80, with attachment [NUDOCS #9406060327]

4 NRC Staff Discussion of the NRC PRA Policy and Implementation Plan

17. Table of Contents
18. Status Report
19. Commission Briefing on Proposed Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Policy Statement and Implementation Plan, dated August 30, 1994 [Viewgraphs]
20. Transcript of the Commission Briefing on PRA Policy Statement and Action Plan, dated August 30, 1994
21. SECY-94-218, Proposed Policy Statement on the Use of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Methods in Nuclear Regulatory Activities, dated August 18, 1994
22. SECY-94-219, Proposed Agency-Wide Implementation Plan for Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA), dated August 19, 1994
23. Memorandum to Peter Davis, Chairman of ACRS PRA Subcommittee, from Dean Houston, Senior Staff Engineer, dated September 6, 1994, regarding Commission Meeting with the Staff Regarding the PRA Policy Statement and Implementation Plan, August 30, 1994, with attachments
24. Handout for the NRC Staff Presentation to the ACRS on PRA Implementation Plan, dated July 7, 1994 [Viewgraphs]
25. ACRS Report to James Taylor, EDO, dated May 11, 1994, regarding Draft Policy Statement on the Use of PRA Methods in Reactor Regulatory Activities

5 Committee Activities/Future Agenda

26. Proposed Agenda Items for October ACNW Meeting
27. Draft Agenda for Tour of Yucca Mountain Site
28. Draft Agenda for Groundwater Dating Working Group Meeting
29. Items for the Out Months
30. Trip Report on Tour of the Ward Valley, California, Proposed LLW Disposal Site and Associated Meeting of the National Academy of Sciences Panel
31. Calendar of Upcoming Events
32. Other Planning

6 Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Land Ownership of LLW Disposal Facilities

33. Table of Contents
34. Status Report
35. Memorandum to ACNW Members from H.J. Larson, Senior Staff Engineer, dated July 27, 1994, regarding Land Ownership Requirements for Low-Level Waste, with attachments
36. SECY-93-136, Update on the Resolution of the Utah Land Ownership Issue, dated May 18, 1994
37. Memorandum to James Taylor, EDO, from Samuel Chilk, Secretary, dated June 28, 1994, regarding SECY-93-136 - Update of the Resolution of the Utah Land Ownership Issue
38. Letter to Dianne Nielson, Executive Director, Department of Environmental Quality, from Carlton Kammerer, dated June 28, 1993
39. Letter to Carlton Kammerer, Office of State Programs, from Larry Anderson, Department of Environmental Quality, Utah, dated June 30, 1993, regarding Envirocare of Utah, with attachments
40. Letter to Charles Judd, Executive Vice President, Envirocare of Utah, from Joseph Holonich, Chief, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch, undated

7 Preparation of ACNW Reports

41. Status Report
42. Draft #4.3 ACNW Report to Chairman Selin, dated May 15, 1994, regarding Compatibility and Adequacy of Agreement States Programs (and related documents) [For Internal Use Only]