ACNW-0099

MINUTES OF THE 79TH ACNW MEETING
NOVEMBER 15-16, 1995

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

- APPENDICES -

130038

409.55

RSO 0/1

9603130268 951221
PDR ADVCM NACNUCLE
0099 PDR

Certified by: P. Pomeroy CERTIFIED Issued: 12/18/95
December 21, 1995

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
NOVEMBER 15-16, 1995
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The 79th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste was held at Two White Flint North Building, 11145 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, on November 15-16, 1995. 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 Neal R. Gross and Co. Inc., Court Reporters and Transcribers, 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.]

Dr. B. John Garrick, Committee Vice-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 Martin J. Steindler were present for the entire meeting. Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Committee Chairman, was present for all but a portion of the September 15, 1995 morning session. [For a list of other 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. Garrick opened the meeting by announcing that Richard K. Major, ACNW Nuclear Waste Branch Chief, would be attending a four-week management course at the Federal Executive Institute and would return on December 11, 1995.

II. Key Technical Uncertainty Integration and Resolution of Key Technical Issues (Open)

[Note: Dr. Andrew C. Campbell was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. Garrick convened the session and provided an overview of Key Technical Uncertainty (KTU) Integration and Resolution of Key Technical Issues (KTIs). He noted that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff completed a license application review plan for a geological repository for spent nuclear fuel and high level waste (HLW) in September, 1994. In developing that draft, the staff identified more than 50 KTUs that pose a high risk of noncompliance in demonstrating compliance with the 10 CFR Part 60 performance objectives. The overall focus of the briefing was on how the KTIs were developed, their relationship to the KTUs, their significance for licensing, and currently planned staff work to resolve these issues with DOE.

NRC Staff Presentation

Ms. Margaret Federline, Deputy Director of the Division of Waste Management (DWM), discussed budget-related changes in the NRC's HLW Program, since the September 1995 briefing of ACNW by DWM Staff, and the relationship between these changes and the identification and development of KTIs. She discussed previous activities that contributed to developing the 10 KTIs, including: the Systematic Regulatory Analysis; Iterative Performance Assessment - Phase 2 (IPA - 2); ACNW briefings; reviews of the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Total System Performance Assessment (TSPA) reports and site characterization activities. The KTIs may change due to dramatic changes in the DOE HLW Program, including: DOE's focus on an investment analysis in 1999 and significant delay in the development of a license application. Therefore, NRC must focus on developing comments on the investment analysis from a regulatory perspective and providing early feedback to DOE on vulnerabilities that should be considered in the investment analysis.

Ms. Federline also discussed implementation of the KTI and NRC staff's Vertical Slice Approach for Review of a License Application, including the creation of the multi-disciplinary KTI teams and of the HLW Management Review Board, and their associated activities. She noted that it is important to understand that a KTI encompasses all aspects of the problem, whereas the vertical slice would be selected as an audit approach to look within that KTI and try to identify vulnerabilities.

KTI prioritization was also discussed by Ms. Federline, including the following criteria used in developing these priorities: (1) the significance to performance; (2) the timing of the work to yield results that would be significant for NRC comments; (3) the chance that the work would be successful; and (4) return on investment. She also introduced the other NRC staff making presentations: Dr. Keith McConnell, Dr. Mike Bell, Mr. Dave Brooks, and Dr. Norman Eisenberg.

Dr. Keith McConnell discussed the overall aspects of the NRC KTI process, including: identifying the KTIs, identifying the issues, the correlation of KTIs with the KTUs, identifying the technical assistance and research needs, the preliminary prioritization of those needs, and the preliminary resource allocation that was done by the Management Review Board, and the final development of an implementation plan. He discussed how the KTI process is being used to focus NRC's HLW program in light of the current budget situation. He provided diagrams and examples of the focussing process from the Igneous Activity KTI activities and presented the resulting list of 3 priority levels for the NRC's KTIs.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

The Committee's comments and concerns (●) and the NRC Staff's responses (♦) are as follows:

- ● What was involved in determining the timeliness priority?
- ♦ Timeliness was determined by what could realistically be done by 1999. Staff also noted that DOE will not be doing High Level Findings, Technical Basis Reports, or Site Suitability Reports, and that the National Academy of Science will not be doing any further reviews of the DOE site characterization program. Staff will develop two types of reports within this framework: (1) Issue Resolution Reports (IRRs), which are interim reports that identify key issues that need to be resolved; and (2) Preliminary Evaluation Reports (PERs), which provide DOE with a status report on resolving a particular issue.

- ● What is the nature of DOE's "Investment Analysis?"
- ♦ The investment analysis is a determination of whether it is prudent to continue to develop an HLW repository at Yucca Mountain.

- ● What is the impact of downsizing on NRC/DOE technical exchanges?
- ♦ DOE/NRC interactions have been decreased by more than 50% because of the budget cuts.

- ● What was used to measure the consequence(s) of volcanic activity?
- ♦ Staff used qualitative judgments on consequences that might result from direct disruption of the repository by a volcanic event. Staff also considered consequences that might result from a near miss, such as changing the geochemistry of the site, hydrothermal effects from a near miss, and the waste package lifetime.

- ● Were coupled processes evaluated in the staff analysis?
- ♦ Staff described the multi-disciplinary teams and the approach used to ensure that coupled processes are considered.

- How does the Probabilistic Volcanic Hazard Evaluation and Elicitation fit with this approach?
- DOE intends to produce a final report on the results of that expert elicitation. Based on that report, NRC would revise the preliminary evaluation report or do an issue resolution report. This would form the basis for identifying NRC's technical assistance (TA) and confirmatory research needs.

- What is the basis for the "new" KTUs for the Igneous Activity KTI? What was the basis for giving this KTI a Priority One?
- These were identified from a Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis [CNWRA] activity to consolidate KTUs and the two new ones are focused on two fundamental issues: what are the probabilities and consequences of igneous activity? The other igneous KTUs are focussed on understanding processes. The Priority One rating for igneous activity was based on the judgment that direct disruption of the site by volcanic activity would have serious consequences for the site and repository.

NRC Staff Presentation (cont.)

Dr. Mike Bell, DWM, continued the Staff's presentation. He discussed four KTIs in his area: igneous activity; structural deformation and seismicity; container life and source term; and repository design and thermal-mechanical effects. He said that one of the key assumptions of DOE's waste isolation strategy is that the site is not disrupted; it is the basis for all the other analyses having some significance to performance over the long term. He said that a key assumption in the National Academy of Science - National Research Council (NAS/NRC) Report on the Yucca Mountain Standard is that the lack of site disruption allows meaningful predictions for a thousand years or a million years. He discussed why igneous activity can be considered disruptive and the range of uncertainties about repository performance affected by igneous activity. Dr. Bell also discussed future NRC and CNWRA activities and the refocusing of their efforts on bounding the probabilities and analyzing the consequences of igneous activity.

In the area of structural deformation and seismicity, Dr. Bell described the uncertainties and possible impacts on repository design and performance assessment. The NRC staff's concern is with the possible disruptive affects of tectonic activity. A significant amount of both DOE and NRC field work is being scaled back. There also has been a dramatic increased availability of DOE data to NRC and CNWRA. A number of activities will continue, including the seismic hazard topical report to be completed this fiscal year. NRC will also continue developing acceptance criteria for resolving KTUs in a license application.

Dr. Bell identified the Engineered Barrier System (EBS)as another area of important uncertainty. He noted that the DOE isolation demonstration strategy is concerned with a robust waste package that isolates the waste within the package for thousands of years. He discussed what the important technical issues are (e.g., waste package lifetimes and release rates after failure, effects of processes such as radiolysis, microbiological effects, the thermal and geochemical environment, and man-made materials that may be present) and the path for resolving these issues using sensitivity studies. He also discussed NRC review plans and activities in the EBS area, DOE activities, impacts of eliminating DOE's multi-purpose canister program, and the kind of information that NRC is seeking from DOE.

Dr. Bell discussed the repository design KTI and said that one area of particular concern is the possibility that the mechanical effect(s) in the host rock as a result of heating caused by the radioactive decay of the waste may affect the EBS waste isolation capabilities, the waste package design, and the long-term criticality issue. He discussed the high priority tasks and activities to resolve such outstanding issues as monitoring the tunnel boring machine progress and development of test alcoves, evaluating DOE quality assurance (QA) and design issues, continued review of DOE's seismic design topical report, and continued development of staff capability.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

The Committee's comments and concerns (●) and the NRC Staff's responses (♦) are as follows::

- ● Dr. Garrick stated that he was not sure that the NAS/NRC report said anything about making meaningful predictions on the order of one million years.
- ♦ Staff said that NAS/NRC suggested that one could do this for the undisturbed case. Disruptive scenarios include extreme erosion and seismic hazards, which are better understood over long time frames, than volcanic hazard, which is least well understood from the hazard perspective.

- ● What is the likelihood of an igneous event? What would its impact be on performance? Is the determination that it is a high priority problem based upon the chance of success in solving it or rather upon its probability and consequences? What is the CNWRA doing in this area?
- ♦ DOE has not truly bound the probability and consequences of the problem. This is a high priority item in part because it is possible to dissect the problem and analyze it. The NRC was originally concerned with developing an independent estimate of probability, but is now focusing on bounding the probabili-

ties and analyzing the consequences. The concern now is to determine how much it contributes to risk, rather than determining whether the probability is so low that it is not important. The path for resolving the problem includes the following: (1) NRC sensitivity analyses to determine significance; (2) DOE work on igneous activity including TSPA; (3) research and TA needs; and (4) acceptance criteria. A number of previously scheduled activities in the probability area are being scaled back or eliminated. No new models will be developed.

- What are NRC staff's concerns with unidentified issues in DOE's approach, and with the empirical data and fundamental understanding of processes? What is staff doing to extrapolate from short-term tests to long-term processes?
- The focus is on known phenomena, not on trying to force DOE to anticipate processes unknown to science at this time. Dr. Bell also discussed some of the NRC and CNWRA activities in the extrapolation of short-term data to long-term processes.

NRC Staff Presentation (cont.)

Mr. Dave Brooks discussed the four KTIs in his area, including: unsaturated and saturated flow under isothermal conditions; thermal effects on flow; evolution of the near-field environment; and radionuclide transport. He also described DOE's strategy for waste containment and isolation and its five key hypotheses: (1) low groundwater flux into the repository; (2) containment of waste for thousands of years; (3) low mobilization of waste from failed packages due to limited availability of water; (4) the capability of the engineered barrier to limit transport due to the limited availability of water; and (5) long transport times and significant dilution of concentrations of radionuclides in the saturated zone.

The KTI on unsaturated and saturated flow is concerned with water movement and is significant to performance because the water pathway is the most likely exposure route for radionuclides from the repository. Mr. Brooks stated that the path to resolution will focus on reviewing DOE's latest TSPA, evaluating conditions necessary for episodic fracture flow in the unsaturated zone, evaluating mechanisms controlling flux through the repository, evaluating dilution, and developing review procedures and acceptance criteria.

Mr. Brooks discussed the KTI on thermal effects on flow and DOE's proposed thermal loading scenarios to produce an extended dry out period for the repository. This is a significant issue because DOE believes that such conditions can be maintained for thousands of years. He also discussed the high priority tasks in this area

needed to resolve issues such as: review of DOE's TSPA, review of a peer review report on DOE thermal hydrology, evaluate the effect of heating on perched water and moisture moving through the repository, evaluate the evolution of the temperature field and water re-entry to the near field environment, and evaluate the efficiency of DOE's *in situ* heater test.

The next KTI discussed by Mr. Brooks was the geochemical evolution of the near-field environment, which affects input to evaluating DOE's containment and waste packages, eventual mobilization of radionuclides, and determining radionuclide concentrations entering the saturated zone. This issue is significant to performance because the ground water chemistry controls containment release and the transport of radionuclides.

Mr. Brooks stated that the high priority tasks in this area would be to compile Yucca Mountain data and analyze them for quality and significance, to evaluate the evolution of the near-field groundwater chemistry due to thermal effects, and to analyze the capability of modeling methodologies to represent thermal conditions at Yucca Mountain.

Mr. Brooks then discussed the KTI on radionuclide transport. This KTI focuses on evaluating processes and conditions affecting radionuclide transport and involves investigating and interpreting geochemical evidence for dilution, the effects of preferential pathways to the accessible environment on dilution, and issues related to geochemical aspects of dilution. One area of concern is how solubility affects the concentrations of radionuclides in the unsaturated and saturated zones. Adsorption has been given a low priority by DOE and NRC needs to evaluate DOE's testing strategy. He said that the path to resolution would be to review available data, conduct sensitivity studies, evaluate radionuclide concentrations in the saturated and unsaturated zones, review DOE's TSPA, develop review procedures and acceptance criteria, and compare results with DOE.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

- Will staff be able to perform the tasks necessary to resolve the unsaturated and saturated flow KTI?
- The management board has reviewed the plan and approved the approach. In addition, past interactions of this nature with DOE have been successful.

- Is staff going to do a separate compilation of Yucca Mountain data?
- Staff will not necessarily do the work but will get access to DOE's data and use it.

- Is DOE going to rely on dilution [in its compliance demonstration]?
  - Staff noted that DOE's new strategy was written with a revised dose standard in mind. This requires a knowledge of the concentrations in the unsaturated and saturated zones.

- How is staff dealing with the coupling between KTIs? How will critical data at the interfaces between processes be developed?
  - Staff discussed the team approach for integrating activities and resolving problems. In addition, the staff is developing a super technical exchange to discuss coupling of processes to prevent loss of information when the problem is broken down into disciplines. Staff intends to bring five or six different KTI groups together in the context of looking at the DOE program to make sure that the appropriate data is available and to discuss fundamental conceptual model issues.

NRC Staff Presentation (cont.)

Dr. Norman Eisenberg discussed two KTI areas: (1) the Total System Performance Assessment and technical integration; and (2) revisions of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Standard and the NRC HLW rule. He described two parts of this TSPA KTI, performance assessment and integration. Performance assessment is directed at obtaining a sufficiently robust quantitative process for estimating the total system performance measure, which is currently focused on risk. The other part is integration, which is concerned with the flow of information among the KTIs and the need to focus that information toward total system performance, including providing feedback on the significance of various KTIs.

Dr. Eisenberg stated that the regulatory significance of the KTI is that compliance with the bottom line standard is evaluated through the total system performance assessment. Staff must consider combinations of extreme events, coupling various processes, and the potential resulting changes to flow and transport. He noted that one cannot weigh these complexities through the lens of the subsystem process models, but they need to be evaluated from the total system perspective, which is the goal of this KTI. He discussed some of the activities to resolve these issues, including reviewing DOE's TSPA, modeling both the undisturbed and disturbed repository and performing an importance analysis for parameters, processes, KTUs and KTIs.

Dr. Eisenberg also discussed the KTI to support EPA in developing a revised HLW standard based on risk, as recommended in the NAS/NRC report on the Yucca Mountain Standard. Subsequently, NRC would need to revise its regulations to conform with the EPA standard. These changes will have a significant impact on how performance

assessment is done. He noted that, in particular, the focus on risk (or dose) rather than on a cumulative release standard will require calculating the concentration, which will involve looking at the plume geometry as a function of time as discussed in the NAS report. He stated that the exposure scenario will become very important and, to a lesser extent, so will the determination of the reference biosphere. He also noted the longer time frame of 10^6 years instead of 10^4 years being considered for the performance period. To resolve the issue, he noted five areas requiring technical analyses: dilution of the radionuclides when they move into the geosphere and the biosphere, exposure scenarios, peak dose calculations, the treatment of disruptive events, and the proposed stylized calculation of human intrusion.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

- Is the TSPA/Integration KTI more like a horizontal slice than a vertical slice?
- ♦ Staff described the vertical slice approach and noted that it is not a focused activity in a narrow area, but rather it is an activity to pull together elements from different technical issue areas and evaluate them in that overall context. Therefore, the TSPA/Integration KTI is well within the vertical slice paradigm.

- How is the EPA HLW Standard Revision KTI different from the others?
- ♦ Staff described the impetus as coming from the outside, not from the inside; it is really motivated largely by outside influences. Staff also cautioned not to get caught up in the terminology. For each of these broad issues, there are activities that cover the sphere of things that need to be done and within each issue, staff is attempting to define subsets of those activities that may be used to audit parts of the DOE program.

- What level of review for TSPA will be feasible given the effects of downsizing?
- ♦ Staff replied that they are intending to do the review with an interdisciplinary team involving not just the performance assessment staff, but the entire staff. They also said that they are committing resources to the review despite the cutbacks because of its importance.

- Will DOE continue to support TSPA?
- ♦ Staff replied that all indications are that DOE considers TSPA a high priority area, partly because it forms an important component of the investment analysis planned for 1999.

- The committee expressed an interest in reviewing and commenting on the KTIs as they develop.
- Staff said that they plan to continue working with ACNW and to put the KTIs on ACNW's schedule at some frequency to review the progress in individual areas.

CONCLUSIONS

- The Chairman and the Committee discussed various key issues that might form components of an ACNW letter to the Commission.

- It was noted by Dr. Steindler that staff might consider developing as generic an approach as possible, given the current uncertainties in the DOE program and budget. Staff should also be more focussed on licensing issues related to the application of empirical data and its extrapolation to long time frames, rather than fundamental model development and mechanistic understanding.

- Dr. Hinze noted the following: (1) the key priority issue is the performance of the repository; (2) the vertical slice teams need to direct attention to the need for additional work by DOE; and (3) the burden that is placed on NRC rather than DOE due to budget cuts. In addition, the staff needs to maintain flexibility in the process to encourage information exchange and resolution of issues. It was also noted that sensitivity analyses are very important and need to be done at all times.

- Another point raised by Dr. Garrick was a continued interest in and search for criteria by which issues can be removed from the list: when and how is it determined that an issue has been closed? There is also a mixing of administrative and management policy issues with technical issues that may lead to confusion with respect to prioritization.

- Ms. Federline replied that a management review of activities needed to include both policy and technical issues in the budget discussions.

III. Meeting with the Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS (Open)

[Note: Ms. Lynn Deering was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Chairman Pomeroy introduced Ms. Margaret Federline, Deputy Director, substituting for J. Greeves. Ms. Federline updated the Committee on the budget, impacts of the budget on the CNWRA, NRC's involvement with EPA on the EPA HLW standard, topics on the list

provided by the Executive Director for Operations, and site activities at Yucca Mountain. Mr. Wes Patrick, President of the CNWRA, also contributed to the discussion of budget cuts to the CNWRA. Highlights include:

The HLW budget was cut from 22 million to 11 million dollars, and the Division of Waste Management's staff was cut from 101 to 94. The Division believes the CNWRA is very important to support NRC staff. NRC may use carryover money to support the CNWRA in key areas, and perhaps use the clause that allows the CNWRA to perform work for others.

Mr. Patrick explained that carryover money is available from previous years when the CNWRA was not fully staffed. He also noted that there will be fewer staff available for using consultants and subcontractors, including peer review teams. He noted that Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) have restrictions and are exempt from competing for request for proposals (RFPs) from Federal agencies, unless certain provisions are invoked, like the industrial mobilization fund. NRC is currently trying to get such an exemption to enable the CNWRA to do work for others.

He noted that the CNWRA is free to compete for foreign government contracts and foreign and domestic commercial contracts, being limited only by conflict-of-interest restrictions.

Ms. Federline indicated that EPA plans to issue the proposed HLW rule to the Office of Management and Budget by January or February. She noted that NRC has formed a task force to interface with EPA and provide insights. She noted that staff hopes to brief the Commissioners' Technical Assistants by mid-December, and would like the ACNW to be involved, possibly at the December ACNW meeting.

Ms. Federline noted that they have listed candidate issues for ACNW's involvement, but that they can only support about one topic per month. She also noted that they would like to look at the ACNW's list of priorities to see where we can work together. She concluded by mentioning a technical December 12th DOE Briefing to the Commission and a technical exchange on KTIs on November 20th. She also noted that she and John Greeves support ACNW's pursuit of the State's input on the SECY 95-201 low-level waste issue.

Ms. Federline and Mr. John Thoma, NMSS, responded to several questions posed by the Committee. Mr. Thoma noted that DOE continues to lay off contractors, with a total of 800 expected. He noted that DOE is expected to take the Tunnel Boring Machine as far as they can past the Ghost Dance Fault. Operators are currently averaging about 30 meters per day. Ms. Federline noted that they expect an increased role for the on-site representatives, and their

support is being factored into vertical slice plans. In response to a question about plans for a rulemaking to revise 10 CFR 60, she responded that staff is working on a commission paper that includes comments on the EPA standard and a conceptual framework for staff's views of possible changes to 10 CFR 60. Ms. Federline concluded by saying again that the staff is under a great deal of stress due to the uncertainty and the work load, and she has never seen a finer group of people working under pressure.

Conclusions/Action Items

The Committee will hear a briefing from the staff on its input to EPA on the HLW standard. In addition, the ACNW will revise its priority list of issues and provide a copy of the list to the staff for its consideration.

IV. NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste (LLW) Management (Open)

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

Dr. Pomeroy introduced the session by indicating that this was a continuation of discussions on this topic, in accordance with the Commission's Staff Requirements Memorandum which directed the staff to seek ACNW guidance on the related SECY-95-201. He noted that there would be several presentations and that, due to the constraints on the Committee's schedule, it would be necessary to adhere rather closely to the proposed schedule.

The first speaker was R. L. Bangart, Director, Office of State Programs (OSP), who was accompanied by P. Lohaus, Deputy Director, K. Schneider, Project Manager, OSP, and R. Nelson, NMSS. Mr. Bangart discussed the different categories of state responsibilities under the Agreement State program, noting that generally there were two parts to most state programs insofar as LLW disposal--those functions associated with development and those associated with regulation. The NRC only looks at the regulatory aspect and has relinquished its regulatory oversight authority for Agreement States, intending to give the states maximum flexibility. He gave as examples the 1 mrem objective in Illinois and the Utah private land ownership situation.

Mr. Lohaus next discussed the guidelines for review of an Agreement State Radiation Control Program, noting the areas that were reviewed, such as the qualifications of the technical staff, licensing procedures, the technical quality of licensing actions, and the status of the inspection program. He also discussed the NRC Technical Assistance program, providing several recent examples where states had requested assistance from the NRC staff. After

responding to several related questions, he closed his formal presentation by noting that the staff intended to complete the Branch Technical Position on Performance Assessment but planned no further revisions.

Ms. K. Schneider summarized the Agreement State LLW program review findings using the revised 1992 policy statement, and then discussed several significant findings in various Agreement States (viz., Nebraska, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Utah and Washington). She noted, in response to a question, that Utah was consistent with its own state law. She then proceeded to discuss the five common Integrated Material Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) performance indicators (status of the materials inspection program, technical staffing and training, technical quality of licensing actions, technical quality of inspections, and response to incidents and allegations) that were common to all programs. She also noted that there were several non-common performance indicators, such as LLW, uranium mills, and sealed source and device programs, closing her remarks by indicating that the IMPEP is linked to the policy on adequacy and compatibility of Agreement State Programs.

Dr. Steindler asked whether the frequency of overexposures was considered a measure of the adequacy of the program from a health and safety perspective, and was told that a rate is not considered an indicator and trends, therefore, are not measured. It is believed that the current rate of incidence was so low as to be random in nature.

Mr. Bangart noted that state fees pay for Agreement State programs and that many states feel they receive little benefit. In the future, in order to keep the program costs down and thereby somewhat relieve the regulatory burden, the NRC has proposed to fund no further training and travel nor provide technical assistance without cost reimbursement. The states reacted strongly and the Commission chose not to act until the rebaselining and streamlining efforts currently in progress were completed. In response to a question from Dr. Pomeroy, the size of the program was described: 17 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in headquarters, 4 1/2 in the regions, with about $1 million/year spent on training-related activities.

DOE Presentation

P. Wheatley and T. Plummer, both Managers, DOE National LLW Management (NLLWM) Program, were the next presenters. They noted that this DOE program was established in 1982 to provide Congress with technical information, but was expanded in 1985 to provide technical assistance to the states, report to Congress, manage the surcharge rebate account, and have responsibility for the manage-

ment of greater-than-Class C waste. In addition to providing customized workshops and conferences, it functions as a communication nexus for state/Federal relationships and funds a library and the LLW Forum. It maintains a manifest information management system and provides technical assistance, principally on the development side of the LLW disposal issue - whereas the NRC is concerned solely with the regulatory aspects.

With respect to SECY-95-201, Mr. Plummer concluded his remarks by stating that insofar as the DOE NLLWM program, a "significant reduction of NRC presence and comment may affect state perceptions about the importance of the LLW issue." He also indicated that a proposed staff reduction to 4 FTEs appeared low; that although alternatives exist, states want to hear from the regulatory authority - the NRC; and that NRC participation in the DOE national program is valued.

Dr. Hinze queried whether in these days of restricted funding, there was overlap in the NRC and DOE programs. J. Greeves, Director, DWM, stated that there is a sincere and effective attempt to work together in a partnership relationship to minimize duplication. NRC participation in a peer review process was discussed, it being stated by Mr. Greeves that such participation was not considered likely due to possible future regulatory interactions. Involvement in the peer review process, it was postulated, could compromise the agency's independence.

Dr. Pomeroy asked about DOE LLW research and was told that while DOE does not generally sponsor LLW research, it did sponsor a specific program in Texas and has been most interested in NRC's ground cover test project at Beltsville.

State Comments

Mr. R. A. Nelson, NMSS, commented that a response to Michigan's comments on SECY-95-201 would be transmitted imminently. He stated that, in general, Michigan had indicated that a total of 4 FTEs was too low and that the NRC should continue with its LLW program. He also discussed some of the comments made at the All Agreement States meeting recently held in Chicago, namely:

1. any cost savings from a reduction in the program should be applied to training,
2. more than Option 2 was needed,
3. the revised SECY should discuss the contributions being made by the states,
4. the NRC should consider some growth in the program (Dr. Pomeroy asked why this comment was not discussed in the SECY paper and was told that it would be addressed in the revision), and

5. streamlining initiatives should be considered in a follow-up SECY.

Mr. Nelson said that the response to these comments would be included in a follow-up SECY, which was due in March, 1996.

J. Ringenberg and C. Rogers, Nebraska, were the next presenters. Mr. Ringenberg noted that Nebraska had been a host state since 1977. He discussed the organization of the Nebraska program and some of the relevant considerations of their earth-mounded bunker system, stating that although the state staff is small (nine persons), there were about 100 consultant reviewers representing 22 disciplines, which in the past five years had resulted in the payment of $12 million in fees.

Ms. Rogers stated that insofar as Nebraska is concerned, the NRC provides a regulatory framework and technical assistance that the state wants continued. She also briefly discussed the three instances in the past in which Nebraska had asked the NRC for technical assistance, and indicated that the NRC should continue to participate in workshops, provide training, and review topical reports. She stated that the NRC's special expertise in several areas is recognized by many states. Insofar as research needs are concerned, the states need all the help they can get in areas such as waste form, infiltration, et al. In addition, the states need to have a source for updating their knowledge in related LLW research, as it is too easy to get overwhelmed by the numerous documents available in this field.

Mr. Ringenberg stated that he had attempted to define essential/non-essential roles for the NRC in the LLW disposal area. For "essential" roles, he proposed that the government should set the regulations and standards, continue to provide regulatory guidance, and continue to respond to state technical assistance requests. He noted that, with respect to this latter comment, all of the disposal sites currently under consideration are different and, therefore, have individualized problems. He also indicated that if the NRC's role in future licensing actions decreases, such an NRC downsized program would lose credibility. He opined that if NRC were not actually involved in the facility-siting and licensing activity, it would fail to learn by doing. This failure would lessen its effectiveness by decreasing its ability to set a meaningful regulatory framework and provide substantive guidance. In response to a Member's question, he noted that Nebraska had "struck out" in getting DOE assistance.

Dr. P. Merges, Chief, New York State Bureau of Pesticides and Radiation and also Chair, Committee E-5, Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, was the next presenter.

He addressed the dual regulation of mixed waste, questioning how this issue would be solved if the NRC LLW program were reduced as proposed. He also stated his belief that SECY-95-201 inferred that the NRC is ignoring the health and safety of the public in favor of fiscal issues. Among the other relevant issues he addressed were the potential default to other agencies should the NRC shrink its LLW program; the potential impacts of downsizing the Agreement State program, and the needs of the non-Agreement States' LLW disposal programs; and the outstanding NRC commitments to the Agreement States in the present LLW program. He also discussed some of the past technical issues that received NRC professional guidance and topical review.

Dr. Merges took exception to the earlier statement that NRC licensees receive little benefit from the NRC's Agreement State program. He closed by noting that from the perspective of his own experience (in his opinion he inherited a marginal LLW program), it suggested to him that a revised SECY-95-201 should address increasing the NRC program, noting, as an example, that the safe handling of baghouse dust and concentration averaging are not, by nature, simple issues.

Industry Comments

D. Culberson, President, Fuel Cycle Facilities Forum (FCFF), was the last presenter. Accompanying him was H. Morton, a consultant, and L. Hendricks, from the Nuclear Energy Institute. He discussed the background of the FCFF, noting that it was started in 1988, meets 3-4 times per year at one of the members' sites, and that many of its members represent sites on the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Program listing. As an example of the importance of NRC's activities to his constituency, he discussed the problems associated with the currently proposed criteria for residual contamination levels. He estimated that currently 13.5 million cubic feet of soil would fall into the uranium/thorium contamination level specified, and that it would cost >$1 billion dollars to clean up. Cost/benefit considerations and implementation issues were also discussed and FCFF perceptions regarding fallacies in the staff's approach and the need for realistic considerations were presented. He indicated that many licensees were not equipped to resolve many of these issues and that, although much data has been gathered, a demonstration field test at a suitable site, in conjunction with the NRC, was encouraged. Lengthy interchanges took place on some of the data and underlying assumptions presented by Mr. Morton.

L. Hendricks summed up the presenters' position that there was a need for the NRC to continue staffing at least at the current level in order to resolve properly a typical issue such as this.

Conclusions/Action Items

The Committee will continue its deliberations and intends to finalize its report during its next meeting.

V. Meeting with the Commission (Open)

In preparation for the meeting with the NRC Commissioners, the Committee reviewed the areas of interest to be discussed. The Committee recessed at 1:45 pm and reconvened at 2:00 pm in the Commission Hearing Room, One White Flint North. The Committee discussed these items of mutual interest with the Commissioners:

- NAS Technical Report on Yucca Mountain Standards
- Residual Levels of Contamination for Decommissioning
- NRC LLW Program Options in SECY-95-201
- ACNW Priorities
- Lesson Learned from Ward Valley
- Hydrology Research and Groundwater Travel Time
- Regulatory Issues in LLW Performance Assessment

The latter three issues were the subject of ACNW reports to the Commission. The meeting with the Commissioners was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. by Chairman Jackson.

[In accordance with the Staff Requirements Memorandum to William C. Parler, OGC, from Samuel Chilk, SECY, dated June 9, 1989, the Office of the Secretary provides a transcript to the ACNW as the record for this portion of the meeting. [Attached as Appendix VI.]

Conclusions/Action Items

A Staff Memorandum listing the topics discussed at the meeting was issued on December 8, 1995.

VI. Executive Session (Open)

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

A. Future Meeting Agenda

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the 80th ACNW Meeting, Rockville, Maryland, December 19-21, 1995, and future Working Group meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, November 16, 1995.

- APPENDICES -

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) announces a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress. The committee advises NARA on the full range of programs, policies, and plans for the Center for Legislative Archives in the Office of Special and Regional Archives.

DATES: December 4, 1995, from 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

ADDRESSES: United States Capitol Building, LBJ Room (S-211).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael L. Gillette, Director, Center for Legislative Archives, (202) 501-5350.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

AGENDA

Updated Report on Five-Year Plan
Task Force on Videotaped Floor Proceedings
Task Force on Legislative Support Agencies
(a) OTA Records
(b) C.R.S. Records
(c) GAO Pilot Appraisal Project

The meeting is open to the public.

Dated: October 31, 1995.

John W. Carlin,

Archivist of the United States.

[FR Doc. 95-27539 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 79th meeting on November 15 and 16, 1995, in Room T-2B3 at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The entire meeting will be open to public attendance. The agenda for this meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, November 15, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

Thursday, November 16, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

During this meeting the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. *Key Technical Issues*—The Committee will discuss the development of Key Technical Issues (KTIs) with the NRC staff and how these issues will be used to solve licensing questions.

B. *Meeting with the Commission*—The Committee will meet with the Commissioners to discuss items of mutual interest.

C. *Reviewing NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management*—The Committee will continue to review alternatives to the future course of NRC's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program. Members of the NRC staff will participate, as well as representatives from other organizations.

D. *Preparation of ACNW Reports*—The Committee will discuss proposed reports, including comments on the NRC staff's low-level waste alternatives paper and the NRC staff's vertical slice approach and KTIs program.

E. *Meeting with the Director, NRC's Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards*—The Director will discuss items of current interest related to the Division of Waste Management programs.

F. *Committee Activities/Future Agenda*—The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will also discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members.

G. *Miscellaneous*—The Committee will 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 September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49924). 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 Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch, Mr. Richard K. Major, 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 Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch 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 Mr. Major 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 Mr. Richard K. Major, Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch (telephone 301/415-7366), between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. EST.

ACNW meeting notices, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are now available on FedWorld from the "NRC MAIN MENU." Direct Dial Access number to FedWorld is (800) 303-9672; the local direct dial number is 703-321-3339.

The ACNW meeting dates for Calendar Year 1996 are provided below:

ACNW meeting No.	1996 ACNW meeting dates
81	January 24-26, 1996.
82	March 27-29, 1996.
83	May 2-4 or May 15-17, 1996.
84	June 26-28, 1996.
85	August 21-23, 1996.
86	September 25-27, 1996.
87	October 22-23, 1996.
88	December 10-12, 1996.

Dated: November 1, 1995.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-27510 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[IA 95-055]

James L. Shelton; Order Prohibiting Involvement in NRC-Licensed Activities (Effective Immediately)

I

James L. Shelton is President and Radiation Safety Officer (RSO) of TESTCO, Inc. (TESTCO or Licensee) located in Greensboro, North Carolina. TESTCO holds byproduct materials License No. 041-0894-1 issued by the State of North Carolina under an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) or the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to subsection 274b of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended. The license authorizes the possession and use of byproduct material for industrial radiography activities in accordance with the conditions specified therein. Mr. Shelton, in addition to being President and RSO, has served as a radiographer from June 1990 to the present.

II

On September 9, 1992, while conducting an inspection of another NRC licensee, an NRC inspector obtained information which indicated that TESTCO had performed radiographic activities in areas under NRC jurisdiction. A review of NRC records revealed that TESTCO did not possess an NRC specific license

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

Revised: November 14, 1995

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
79TH ACNW MEETING
NOVEMBER 15-16, 1995

Wednesday, November 15, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room 2 B3
11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

1) 8:30 - 8:40 A.M.
Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman (Open)
1.1) Opening statement (PWP/HJL)
1.2) Items of Current Interest (PWP/HJL)

2) 8:40 - ~~10:30~~ 11:35 A.M.
Key Technical Uncertainty Integration and Resolution of Key Technical Issues (Open) (PWP/ACC)
2.1) NRC staff discussion of the development of KTI's from KTU's
2.2) Review Schedules and approach
2.3) General Discussion

10:~~30~~ 60 - ~~10:45~~ 11:00 A.M. * * * BREAK * * *

3) ~~10:45~~ 11:35 - 12:00 Noon
Meeting with the Deputy Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS (Open) (PWP/HJL/LGD)
3.1) A question and answer session with the Deputy Director, ~~John Greeves~~ Margaret Federline
3.2) Ms. ~~Greeves~~ Federline will discuss items of current interest such as updates on Yucca Mountain activities, Vertical Slice Approach, as well as current information on appropriations and possible reorganizations

12:00 - 1:~~00~~ 11 P.M. * * * LUNCH * * *

4) 1:~~00~~ 11 - 3:00 P.M.
Have to Item 5
Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)
4.1) LLW Alternatives (PWP/HJL)
4.2) Vertical Slice Approach/KTI (PWP/ACC)

3:00 - 3:15 P.M. * * * BREAK * * *

[TRANSCRIBED PORTIONS OF THE MEETING

5)	3:15 - 5:00 P.M.	Move to Item 4 Prepare for Meeting with the Commission (Open) (PWP/HJL) Discuss topics the Committee will present to the Commission on November 16, 1995 at 2:00 p.m. 5.1) HLW Research in Hydrology and Groundwater Travel Time (WJH/LGD) 5.2) LLW Performance Assessment (BJG/ACC) 5.3) Lessons Learned from Ward Valley (MJS/HJL) 5.4) Reviews in Progress: • ACNW priorities • National Research Council Report on the Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards • Residual Levels for Decommissioning • LLW Alternatives - SECY-95-201
6)	5:00 - 6:~~00~~ 40 P.M.	Committee Activities/Future Agenda (Open) (PWP/HJL) 6.1) Set agenda for 80th ACNW Meeting 6.2) Review Items for Out Months 6.3) Future Working Group Topics 6.4) Report on Outside Meetings 6.5) ACNW priorities 6.6) Calendar of upcoming events 6.7) Reconcile EDO response to ACNW letter
	6:~~00~~ 40	* * * RECESS * * *

Thursday, November 16, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room 2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD

7)	8:30 - 12:~~00~~ 35 Noon	NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management (Open) (PWP/HJL/ACC) 7.1) Discuss with NRC's Office of State Programs 7.2) Discuss with DOE Natl. LLRW Management Program (T. Plummer, DOE) 7.3) Discuss with various States (e.g., Nebraska and New York) as well as with other concerned parties (e.g., Fuel Cycle Facilities Forum representative) 7.4) General Discussion
	12:~~00~~ 35 - 1:00 P.M.	* * * LUNCH * * *

8) 1:00 - 2:00 P.M. Prepare for Meeting with the Commission (Open)
Continue discussions from item 5

9) 2:00 - 3:30 P.M. Meeting with the Commission (Open)
Meeting will be held in the Commissions Conference Room, OWFN. Topics are those listed in item 5

10) 3:30 - 4:00 P.M. Continue to Prepare ACNW Reports listed in item 4 (Open)

4:00 P.M. ADJOURN

- **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 - 35**

APPENDIX III: MEETING ATTENDEES

79TH ACNW MEETING
November 15-16, 1995

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

ACNW STAFF	1st Day	2nd Day
Dr. Andrew Campbell	X	X
Ms. Lynn F. Deering	X	X
Mr. Howard J. Larson	X	X
Dr. John T. Larkins	X	X
Dr. Richard P. Savio	X	X
Ms. Roxanne Summers	X	X

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Nov. 15, 1995

S. McDuffie	NMSS
M. Delligatti	NMSS
S. Wastler	NMSS
J. Spraul	NMSS
J. Trapp	NMSS
J. Thoma	NMSS
B. Ibrahim	NMSS
P. Justus	NMSS
M. Nataraja	NMSS
B. Jagannath	NMSS
S. Bahadur	RES
E. O'Donnell	RES
J. Bradbury	NMSS
N. Eisenberg	NMSS
D. Brooks	NMSS
R. Johnson	NMSS
J. Randall	RES

Nov. 16, 1995	
K. Schneider	OSP
R. Bangart	OSP
P. Lohaus	OSP
P. Reed	RES
J. Kane	NMSS
R. Nelson	NMSS
E. O'Donnell	RES
F. Ross	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

Nov. 15, 1995	
R. Wallace, Jr.	USGS
J. Russell	CNWRA
W. Patrick	CNWRA
P. Krishna	M&O/TRW
J. York	Weston
F. Rodgers	DOE
B. Sagar	CNWRA
G. Stirewalt	CNWRA
G. Roseboom	Self
L. Scheele	Afton
J. Meneley	Howard Stern Show
A. Huang	Golder Federal Serv. Inc.
J. Ringenberg	Nebraska Dept. Env.
C. Roger	Nebraska Dept. of Health
Nov. 16, 1995	
P. Wheatley	Natl. LLW Program
R. Wallace, Jr.	USGS
E. Regnier	DOE
P. Merges	NYS Dept. of Envircare/CRCPD
A. Huang	Golder Fed. Serv. Inc.
C. Rogers	Nebraska Dept. of Health
J. Ringenberg	Nebraska Dept. of Env. Quality
T. Plummer	DOE
D. Culberson	Fuel Cycle Facilities Forum
L. Scheele	Afton LLW Forum
G. Roseboom	USGS

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 ITEM NO.	DOCUMENTS
2	Key Technical Uncertainty Integration and Resolution of Key Technical Issues
	1. Correlation of NRC Key Technical Issues and Key Technical Uncertainties [Handout]
	2. Key Technical Issues - Identification and Implementation, Presented on November 15, 1995 by Margaret Federline, Keith McConnell, Michael Bell, David Brooks, and Norman Eisenberg, NMSS, undated [Viewgraphs]
5	Prepare for Meeting with the Commission
	3. ACRS Briefing for the Commission, dated November 16, 1995 [Draft Viewgraphs]
	4. Memorandum from Howard J. Larson, ACNW Staff, to ACNW Members, dated October 13, 1995: Transcript of the Commission Briefing by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) on its Recommendations for Technical Bases of Yucca Mountain Standards, October 3, 1995
6	Committee Activities/Future Agenda
	8.
7	NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management
	9. Briefing for Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste Agreement State Program: Low-Level Waste Issues, presented by R. Bangart, Office of State Programs, dated November 16, 1995 [Viewgraphs]
	10. Changes to the 1992 Policy Statement [Handout]
	11. NRC's Programmatic Approach to LLW Management [Handouts 7.1 and 7.2]
	12. NRC and National Low-Level Waste Management Program Work Together to Help States Manage LLW, presented by Terry Plummer, DOE-EM, on November 16, 1995 [Viewgraphs]

13. Obstacles to Implementing Proposed Radiological Criteria for Decommissioning [Handout]

14. Statements Regarding NRC Low-Level Radioactive Waste Program Termination or Reductions, by Paul J. Merges, dated November 16, 1995 [Handout]

15. Impact of Residual Contamination Criteria on NRC LLW Resource Needs, Presented on November 16, 1995, by David Culberson, President, Fuel Cycle Facilities Forum [Viewgraphs]

9 Meeting with the Commission

16. ACNW Briefing for the Commission, November 16, 1995 [Viewgraphs]

17. Memorandum to the Commission from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACNW: Briefing Package for the November 16, 1995 Briefing to the Commission by the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, dated November 9, 1995 [Handout at Commission briefing]

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

TAB NUMBER	DOCUMENTS
1	Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman
	1. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated November 15 1995
	2. Items of Current Interest, undated
	3. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated November 15, 1995
2	Key Technical Uncertainty Integration and Resolution of Key Technical Issues
	4. Table of Contents
	5. Status Report
	6. NRC Key Technical Issues
	7. License Application Review Plan, NUREG-1323, Rev. 0, published September 1994, Division of Waste Management, NMSS
	8. Letter from Joseph J. Holonich, Chief, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, NMSS, to Ronald A. Milner, Director for Program Management and Integration, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, U.S. Department of Energy: Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Vertical Slice Approach, dated September 1, 1995, with enclosure: Revised Prelicensing Program Strategy for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission High-Level Waste Repository Program ("Vertical Slice Approach"), September 1, 1995.
3	Meeting with the Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS
	9. Status Report
5.	Prepare for November Meeting with the Commission
	10. Status Report
	11. Memorandum from John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS/ACNW, to The Commission: Briefing Package for the November 16, 1995 Briefing to the Commission by the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, dated November 9, 1995
	12. ACNW Report to Ivan Selin, Chairman, NRC, dated April 28, 1995: The U.S. EPA Preproposal Draft of 40 CFR Part 193 and the NRC's Prposed Radiological Criteria for Decommissioning
	13. ACNW Report to Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, NRC, dated August 10, 1995: Lesson Learned from the Ward Valley,

California, Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Siting Process

14. ACNW Report to Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, NRC, dated November 6, 1995: Comments on the High-Level Radioactive Waste Research Program in Hydrology

15. ACNW Report to Ivan Selin, Chairman, NRC, dated May 25, 1995: Issues Related to Guidance on 10 CFR 60 Groundwater Travel Time Regulations

16. ACNW Report to Ivan Selin, Chairman, NRC, dated June 28, 1995: Regulatory Issues in Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Performance Assessment

17. Viewgraphs for the Commission Briefing November 16, 1995

6 Committee Activities\Future Agenda: EDO Responses to Committee Letters, Comments on Streamlining the SDMP Program and Lessons Learned from Ward Valley

18. ACNW Report to Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, NRC: Comments on Streamlining the Site Decommissioning Management Plan Program, dated September 28, 1995

19. Letter to ACNW from James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, dated October 26, 1995: Comments on Streamlining the Site Decommissioning Management Plan Program

20. Status Report: EDO Response to Committee Letter on Lessons Learned from Ward Valley

21. ACNW Report to Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, NRC, dated August 10, 1995: Lesson Learned from the Ward Valley, California, Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Siting Process

22. Article from September 1995 "LLW Forum Notes" entitled "Refining the Siting Process"

23. Letter to ACNW from James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, dated September 21, 1995: Lessons Learned from the Ward Valley, California, Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Siting Process

7 NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management

24. Table of Contents

25. Status Report

26. Memorandum to ACNW Members from H. J. Larson, ACNW Staff, dated August 4, 1995: SECY-95-201, "Alternatives to Terminating the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program," dated July 31, 1995

27. SECY-95-201, "Alternatives to Terminating the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program," dated July 31, 1995

28. Memorandum to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, and John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS/ACNW, from John C. Hoyle, Secretary: SECY-95-201, Alternatives to Terminating the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program

29. Memorandum to ACNW Members from Andy Campbell, ACNW Staff: Summary of Meeting with Seth Coplan, dated October 12, 1995 **[Prepared for Internal Committee Use Only: Not to be Released Without Prior Authorization]**

30. Memorandum to ACNW Members from Andy Campbell, ACNW Staff: Summary of Research and Technical Assistance Projects, dated October 11, 1995

31. Memorandum from Laura Scheele, LLW Forum Federal Liaison, to Forum Participants and Alternate Forum Participants, Federal Liaisons and Alternates, Re: ACNW to Discuss NRC's LLRW Program options: EPA Reopens Comment Period on Rescission of NESHAP's Subpart I, dated October 17, 1995

32. Letter to Mr. James Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, from Dennis L. Schornack, Commissioner, Department of Commerce, State of Michigan, dated October 11, 1995

33. Excerpts from Nuclear Waste News, October 26, 1995: Low-Level Waste: NRC Considers Reductions to LLW Program Activities

34. Memorandum from Martin Steindler, ACNW, dated November 2, 1995: Comments on the 1995 All Agreement States Meeting 10/30-11/1/95 **[Prepared for Internal Committee Use Only: Not to be Released Without Prior Authorization]**