

614 4765916

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NPTS PROGRAM OFFICE
505 King Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Bob Johnson,

Please phone
your comments to
Ted Taylor or me.
Thank you. Leslie Casey
8/30/84

TELECOPIER

PANAFAX MV 1200

COMMERCIAL 614 424-4685
FTS 976-4685

COMMERCIAL 614 424-5916
FTS 976-5916

VERIFICATION

PLEASE TRANSMIT ON 4 OR 6 MINUTES

WM Record File

WM Project 16

106.1

Docket No.

PDR

LPDR

ATTN: _____

Distribution:

REB/mjr CR/HJM/JL
TOB/ISS/Dm RS/LW/KERR
(Return to WM, 623-SS)

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM IN INK, DO NOT USE PENCILS OR RED INK

TO: Robert Johnson

NRC
COMPANY

MD
STATE

FROM: Leslie Casey
NAME

DOE-SRPD
DEPARTMENT

FTS 976-591
PHONE NUMBER

NUMBER OF PAGES: 7 (EXCLUDING COVER SHEET)

TODAY'S DATE: 9/1/84 DATE RECEIVED: _____

NEEDS TO BE RESENT: _____

RECEIVED: _____

84 SEP -4 AM 0:39

WM DOCKET CONTROL CENTER

8409200314 840830
PDR WASTE
WM-16 PDR

00649

Bob,

Please add particularly the names of the draft reports you told us about at this meeting which you announced would soon be coming our way

MINUTES OF
MEETING WITH SALT STATE REPRESENTATIVES AND NRC
AUGUST 1-2, 1984

- i.e. EA Review plan
- QA review plan
- Modeling strategy
- STP,
- Generic TP on Accessing Assessments

August 1, 1984

A listing of attendees (Attachment 1) and the agenda (Attachment 2) are attached.

Thank you
Leslie
8/30/84

Ted Taylor opened the seventh Bimonthly Salt States Meeting and welcomed state and NRC representatives. ONWI's new Program Manager, Wayne Carbiener, was introduced. (New ONWI organization chart is Attachment 3.) Attendees from DOE-HQ were introduced. John Linehan, NRC, reviewed the new NRC/Division of Waste Management organization chart. (NRC organization charts are Attachment 4.) Ted Taylor introduced Bob Philpott, DOE-HQ, who coordinated the day's session on transportation issues. The topics had been suggested by states at the previous bimonthly meeting. Bob Philpott said that the session would be a status report for states and that DOE would continue to work with states in disseminating information.

Modeling and Analysis

Bob Philpott, DOE-HQ, discussed the transportation routing model and the proprietary rights of the developing contractor. He said the model contained general information only and using it required expensive equipment and highly trained analysts. He said DOE is investigating how to make the model available to and of use to the states. Questions included use of routing models in EAs, availability of usable models, use of state data, and whether there is a comparable rail model.

Reuben Peterson, ONWI, indicated time has (and will) be spent at each potential salt site to collect data for site specific analysis. Once data are collected, they will be shared with state officials. States raised questions concerning whether a workshop would be held when state data are available, the choice of routes not on the interstate highways, and factors measured to choose routes.

Bob Philpott mentioned two plans DOE is working on:

- (1) Routing Plan - will help answer states' questions and will be available in late September.
- (2) OCRMM Transportation Business Plan - which presents plans, options, and proposed activities for waste transportation systems.

These draft plans would be available before a transportation workshop, which may be held this fall.

Transportation Packages

Richard Cunningham, NRC, said that, in NRC's opinion, transportation routes designated now enhance safety and reduce environmental impacts. He discussed container safety and stated that NRC must certify containers. Containers must meet strict performance requirements and are certified based on engineering analysis. DOE will be developing new casks for the storage and transportation of nuclear waste and these will also be tested and certified by NRC. Questions were asked concerning how performance specifications are developed, cask durability, timetable for cask development, testing casks, and the licensability of a waste "depot."

Bob Philpott indicated that DOE plans a phased development of a full range of casks, including multipurpose casks for both truck and rail, to be available for the first repository. The new casks then will be submitted to the NRC for certification. The business plan addressing these procedures is expected to be released for public comment by mid-September. Questions covered production costs for casks, whether costs will be paid by private industry or utilities, availability of performance criteria for casks, and implications of possible defense waste shipments in cask design.

Bob Philpott briefly discussed the Programs Research and Development Announcement (PRDA), which is a solicitation from industry of ideas for new systems (casks, etc.) for transporting waste. (Handout is Attachment 5.)

Transportation: Institutional Issues

Elaine Economides, DOT, reviewed DOT regulations for transporting nuclear waste. Interstate highways are the preferred routes, except where states have

designated an alternate route. DOE is not required to indicate which interstate highway is the safest. State is the best source of location of links between components of the interstate highway system. Definite criteria have been established to determine which routes are used: (1) interstate highways, (2) designated state alternate, (3) follow safety criteria, which include time and distance. Questions were asked on means of selecting routes when interstate highways are not available and local routes must be used.

DOT also regulates shipments by rail. Much of the best and safest track available goes through cities where population is dense. With additional use of railroads for nuclear waste shipments, rail regulations will need to be reviewed and updated.

Disputes with states concerning DOT regulations are handled in order of (1) timeliness, and (2) degree integrity of national highway system is affected.

Bob Philpott discussed interagency agreements required by the NWPA. DOE plans quarterly meetings with NRC, to which DOT is invited. DOE is presently working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with DOT that would cover many of the issues being discussed at this meeting. Questions were raised on the process for developing the MOU and whether states and public would have an opportunity for input.

Ellen Livingston-Behan, Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB), explained that the WIEB was established among 16 western states in the 1970s to address energy issues and has a DOE contract to prepare a report on waste transportation. Board members are appointed by the governors. Issues to be covered in the report include: relationships of federal agencies, liability, routing, state and local statutes, emergency preparedness, cost and risk analysis (see Attachment 6). A meeting to review the first draft of the report will be held the end of September in San Diego. Interested parties are invited.

Vern Wingert, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), discussed funding for emergency preparedness. There are no direct funds available from FEMA; indirect funds are available from FEMA for hiring radiological officers and emergency

personnel and from other federal agencies for emergency response activities. Various training guides and courses are also available.

As a result of the court case in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, regarding transportation of spent fuel from West Valley back to origin points in midwestern states, FEMA is not obligated to provide across-the-board funding for emergency preparedness. (Handout is Attachment 7.)

A trend is emerging for levying user fees in some states; these funds in turn are used for emergency planning. FEMA has a training facility to which state emergency personnel can be sent for in-the-field training. FEMA pays the tuition; states must pay for the individual's travel. Discussion followed on FEMA's field organization, FEMA training, and FEMA's role in emergency response.

Questions were asked concerning other agencies' roles in emergency preparedness training. NRC does not duplicate training offered by FEMA, although they do have seminars on shipping information and emergency response training for fire and police personnel and state regulators. This training is available free, on request. DOT offers a one-week training course on enforcement of radioactive transportation regulations.

John Eaton, Radiological Officer, Ohio Disaster Services Agency (DSA), related state experiences in Ohio. He reviewed the organization of the DSA, county involvement, interstate agency agreements, and notification system in Ohio when a radioactive shipment is coming into the state. DSA conducts training for local emergency personnel. (J. Eaton's viewgraphs are Attachment 8.) (J. Eaton's handout is Attachment 9.)

August 2, 1984

Ted Taylor introduced new SRPO staff members and explained their functions. Jim Frloux distributed the new Louisiana organization chart (Attachment 10).

Leslie Casey, SRPO, reviewed status of the draft Mission Plan. DOE-HQ received approximately 90 sets of comments on the Mission Plan. There is no announced schedule for finalizing the Mission Plan, but HQ hopes to have it done by October. Roger Gale, DOE-HQ, indicated that the final draft, along with the response document, will probably not go to Congress until January.

Congress then has 30 days to review it and Congress will decide when (or if) hearings will be held. States indicated they would like to receive the October draft of the Mission Plan, and questioned whether they would have a chance to comment on the Mission Plan after DOE has incorporated comments in it from the comment period. States also questioned the timeframe for holding hearings on the Mission Plan.

Linda McClain, SRPO, presented an update on the final Siting Guidelines. NRC concurred on the Guidelines and published its concurrence in the Federal Register July 3, 1984. The Guidelines, incorporating final NRC comments, along with the preamble, should be on the Secretary's desk this week for signoff. The preamble contains a summary of the comments and rationale for how the department handled them. Discussion followed on material in the preamble, whether preamble is to be released to the public for comment and whether it contains comments on Utah's request for rulemaking. States requested a copy of the preamble before it is in the Federal Register. (See Attachment 11.)

Bob Wunderlich, SRPO, reported EAs will, hopefully, be going to HQ by second week of August. EAs could possibly be available to the public by late September or, after reviewing them, DOE-HQ could decide not to issue them at that time. EAs are being written on seven sites. Disqualifiers are being addressed in Chapter 6; a disqualifier report will not be written. Effort is being made to ensure EAs are consistent with the Guidelines. Discussion followed on transportation guidelines, use of models, inclusion of data on corridor states, and format for sending EAs and references to states (microfiche or hard copy). (B. Wunderlich's viewgraphs are Attachment 12.)

Ted Taylor, SRPO, stated a draft plan would be sent to the states for comment detailing proposed EA interaction with the states, number and location of EA hearings and other activities.

In discussing land acquisition, Ted indicated that draft Interagency Agreement is substantially the same as the Task Order. It is now being reviewed by HQ and the Corps of Engineers field offices. Once all comments are received, the revised draft will be sent to the states for comment. A meeting will be held to discuss issues that need to be resolved. There are still many opportunities for states to have input.