

MINUTES OF THE 80TH ACNW MEETING
December 19-21, 1995

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

	<u>Page</u>
I. Chairman's Report (Open)	2
II. NAS Report - Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards (Open)	3
III. Meeting with the Acting Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS (Open)	7
IV. Meeting with the Director, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards (Open)	9
V. Task Action Plans (Open)	11
VI. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Presentation (Open)	12
VII. Executive Session (Open)	13
A. Future Meeting Agenda	

- 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

409.55

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By EMB

CERTIFIED BY
Paul W. Pomeroy
4/12/96

CERTIFIED

Issued: 2/28/96

MINUTES OF THE 80TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
DECEMBER 19-21, 1995
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The 80th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) was held at the Two White Flint North Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, on December 19-21, 1995. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate actions on the items listed in the attached agenda. The entire 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. Paul W. Pomeroy, 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. John B. Garrick and William J. Hinze were present. ACNW member, Dr. Martin J. Steindler did not attend this meeting. [For a list of other attendees, see Appendix III.]

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Open)

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

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

- Temporary organizational changes had been made in the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards.
- There had been no action on the nomination of Greta Dicus as the third NRC Commissioner, nor have there been any further nominations submitted by the President.
- The ACNW will next meet on January 24-26, 1996, but will not meet in February 1996. The Committee is not scheduled to meet in April 1996. All future ACNW meetings are currently scheduled for three days.
- Copies of the meeting notices, transcripts, and letter reports are now available on Fed World from the NRC main menu.

II. NAS REPORT - TECHNICAL BASES FOR YUCCA MOUNTAIN STANDARDS (Open)

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

Introduction

Dr. Garrick introduced the subject, noting the evolution of this effort from the Energy Policy Act of 1992 through the issuance of the National Research Council/National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report entitled, "Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards". He also mentioned the recent presentation to the Committee by Mr. Robert W. Fri, Chairman of that NAS/National Research Council committee, as well as a more recent presentation by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) indicating that the new standard (40 CFR Part 197) would be specifically for the proposed site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, rather than a generic standard such as the current 40 CFR Part 191. He then introduced the principal NRC staff presenter, Dr. Janet Kotra from the Division of Waste Management.

NRC STAFF PRESENTATION

Dr. Kotra indicated that the focus of her presentation would be on the staff strategy to provide comments to EPA prior to that agency's scheduled submission to OMB in the February-March 1996 time frame (which would be published in the Federal Register two months later). She stated that the staff was attempting to provide a meaningful response to EPA on the NAS key recommendations, which she specified as:

- Place a quantitative limit on individual risk provided there exists definition and acceptance of negligible individual risk;
- Limit risk to the average member of the critical group;

- Evaluate compliance at the time and place of greatest risk; no scientific basis for 10,000-year compliance period;
- Define reference biosphere by rule;
- Do not rely on institutional controls to prevent intrusion;
- Evaluate intrusion separately using a stylized scenario defined by rule; and
- Count on only total system performance; quantitative subsystem requirements may lead to suboptimal design.

Dr. Kotra then discussed the key aspects of the existing NRC regulatory structure, noting that it incorporated EPA standards limiting cumulative release as the overall performance measure; specified a 10,000 year compliance period; contained quantitative subsystem performance objectives; and treated the potential for intrusion as an "unanticipated process or event" subject to specified assumptions. (She stated that the NRC did not interpret the subsystem performance objective numbers as "hard and fast".)

Three implementation issues were discussed relevant to the NAS recommendations:

1. There would be a need for more data and assumptions prior to completing dose or risk calculations.
2. As for the compliance period, low probability events may become greater risk contributors over the time frame suggested. Also, the NAS position that there exists no

scientific basis for shorter periods does not preclude a regulatory or policy basis for a shorter time frame.

3. Elimination of quantitative requirements will not eliminate the need to characterize and understand the contribution of subsystem performance to the overall system performance.

In its preliminary position, the NRC staff believed that it could agree with a risk or dose standard if the reference biosphere can be specified by rule before licensing, that there may be regulatory or policy reasons for establishing a compliance period shorter than that recommended by the NAS, and that the NRC regulations should continue to address performance of subsystems to the extent that they contribute to, or detract from, overall system performance. However, they need not be quantitative.

Dr. Hinze asked whether the staff would accept tradeoffs and was informed that perhaps it was possible to address them in another manner. Dr. Garrick commented that the benefit from each subsystem should be known and understood, and that he still had a concern that concentrating on the subsystem standard could cause a loss of emphasis on the overall system performance.

Dr. Kotra continued by noting that the current staff position was that the NRC should promulgate new, simplified implementing regulations which pertain only to Yucca Mountain. In response to this statement, Dr. Garrick commented that he believed this provided the staff with two great opportunities: to be able to pioneer the application of risk-based regulation in the radwaste field, and to keep a focus on keeping the regulations simple. He hoped for a visionary and creative thinking format. He also stated, regarding risk calculations and the need for data, that there was a need to address the quantification of uncertainty, and that the data gathered should contribute to uncertainty reduction.

In response to Dr. Hinze's comment, Dr. Kotra agreed that the two primary areas for rulemaking were in the definition of the reference biosphere and the "stylized" human intrusion approach. Dr. Pomeroy asked whether there was a softening of the agency's defense-in-depth philosophy. Ms. Kotra responded by indicating that in its initial "statement of considerations," the Commission believed that the subsystem standards were not suboptimal. However, instructions were given to the staff to look at multiple barrier approaches.

The staff will:

- evaluate the ability to implement the NAS recommendations,
- actively cooperate with the staff of the EPA, and
- prepare a conceptual outline for development of new NRC regulations.

Dr. Pomeroy requested that the ACNW review the draft formal agency comments on the EPA proposed rule, and was assured that was certainly the staff's intention.

Dr. T. McCartin then discussed the joint NRC/EPA working group and reported on the general comments provided at the most recent meeting of the group. He noted that the NRC's comments were somewhat tentative, as they were the result of a rather short analysis period. He also indicated that EPA had little to provide at this last meeting, and was currently significantly slowed by the government shutdowns.

Dr. Garrick asked how the NRC would advise the EPA today based on its the most recent analyses. In response, Dr. McCartin stated that without much prior reflection on such a question, he would probably advise the EPA as follows:

1. it appears that the most important considerations are the designation of the critical group and the well withdrawal rate,
2. the "stylized" human intrusion scenario and the catchment area for the drill hole were also significant considerations, and
3. the treatment of disruptive events must be carefully considered.

Dr. Hinze asked if there were areas in the current analyses which should concern the ACNW. Dr. McCartin stated there was much more knowledge needed about the retardation qualities of the fractures and the concentrations in a saturated zone.

Dr. Pomeroy concluded this session, noting that the Committee would consider preparation of a letter report presenting its views thus far on what it has heard from NAS, EPA, and the staff. He noted that this topic was one that the Committee would closely follow through the entire regulatory evolution.

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

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

Ms. Margaret V. Federline covered four topics with the Committee: (1) an update on high-level waste (HLW) activities, (2) a discussion of a pilot test of a survey and statistical methodology for site decommissioning, (3) a status report on SECY-95-201, low-level waste (LLW) alternatives, and (4) a preview of issues before the staff in the coming months.

The NRC staff is working with the EPA on the development of new HLW standards. The NRC staff has met also with DOE in a technical exchange to clarify the intent of the key technical issues (KTIs) program. The scope and significance of each of the 10 KTIs was described along with a description of the path towards resolution. There is general agreement on eight of the ten issues. There are still differences on two issues: igneous activity and structural deformation. A January 1996 meeting between DOE and NRC management will emphasize a draft procedure for issue resolution. At the Yucca Mountain site, the tunnel boring machine is 11,000 feet from the north portal. The tunnel boring operation is ahead of schedule. However, funding is expected to end in March 1996.

Ms. Federline discussed a new survey and statistical methodology for site decommissioning. The proposed rule on radiological criteria for decommissioning proposes a 15 millirem dose limit. For soils that contain uranium and thorium, very low concentrations may result in a dose of 15 millirem. Currently NRC, DOE and EPA are jointly studying the use of "in situ" gamma spectrometry to measure as well as do statistical analysis to distinguish uranium and thorium contamination at low levels from background radiation.

Ms. Federline turned to the low-level waste alternatives paper (SECY-95-201). Over 400 copies were distributed to interested parties in December. The staff has requested comments by January 15, 1996. Most comments received to date generally recognize the need to continue NRC's role in the LLW program. While commenters recognize the need to streamline NRC's LLW involvement, they also believe NRC should be involved beyond just legislatively mandated activities (Option 2). Specifically, commenters are requesting that NRC continue its topical report reviews. The staff is currently scheduled to produce a package that analyzes comments and provides input to the strategic assessment process by March 1996.

Finally, Ms. Federline previewed two topics that will be brought to the Committee for review in January. The first is the design basis event for the geologic repository operations area. The public

comment period has ended and no major changes to the rule were made. The 5 rem accident dose design basis will remain. The staff will also present their technical analysis that supports their draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the Shieldalloy site. This site, located in Ohio, had 6 million cubic feet of slag from metal alloy production which was generated in the late 1950's through the early 1970's and contains uranium and thorium. The DEIS analyzes various decontamination alternatives. Shieldalloy has proposed stabilizing the slag in place at the facility. The staff will brief the ACNW on the site description and the nature and extent of the contamination, as well as proposed actions and alternatives. The staff will also discuss a performance assessment approach for evaluating alternatives and lessons learned.

IV. Meeting with the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) (Open)

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

Dr. Carl J. Paperiello requested time to talk with the Committee about recent cuts to the NMSS budget and the consequences of those cuts. Authorized funding for NRC support for DOE's high-level waste program has been cut in half from one year ago from \$22 million to \$11 million. There is some carry over money from previous years, but not enough to maintain the current HLW program and meet budget goals. People have already been moved from the HLW program to other program areas.

DOE's HLW program also contains much uncertainty. Final Congressional legislation remains uncertain. Dr. Paperiello believes that the current trend in Congress is towards interim storage, rather than disposal, because of the costs involved in disposal.

Dr. Paperiello does see an effort in the near term to revise NRC's HLW regulations. 10 CFR Part 60 must be revised, an addendum written, or a new regulation developed to specifically apply to Yucca Mountain.

Dr. Paperiello then reported on the low-level waste program. He stated that it is uncertain as to whether the NRC will ever be asked to license an LLW disposal facility. Questions are also being raised over how many LLW sites the country needs. If California, Texas, and South Carolina have disposal sites, should the compacts merge? There is not enough money to maintain a dedicated LLW disposal facility licensing staff based on just the prospect of receiving a license application for review.

However, NRC does maintain a very active LLW program. This includes the site decommissioning management plan sites and the licensing of new waste volume reduction technologies like compaction and incineration. Many of the skills needed for licensing an LLW facility are also associated with other LLW disposal activities. The staff could produce a team to license a LLW disposal facility if a license application were received.

During the question and answer session following his formal remarks, Dr. Paperiello mentioned that he was studying fuel burnup credit. Several members of his staff have been to France where credit is given for depletion of uranium in spent fuel. In France, since 1986, burnup credit has also been given for both the transportation and dissolution of spent fuel.

Conclusions/Action Items

This briefing was for information purposes only.

V. ACNW PRIORITIES AND TASK ACTION PLANS

[L. Deering was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee updated, revised, and made final the draft priorities letter and cover letter for transmittal to the Commission. The Committee intends to further update the priorities letter pending preparation of a more detailed description of two new potential topics -- Source Term and Effects of Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation. The ACNW staff will provide the detailed descriptions at the 81st meeting for the Committee's consideration and discussion.

After completing the priorities letter, the Committee discussed potential Working Group meetings to be held in 1996. The Committee suggested combining the topics of radionuclide transport, saturated zone hydrology/regional flow modeling, and revision of 10 CFR Part 60, for discussion at the meeting scheduled to be held in Las Vegas in May 1996. The Committee also suggested holding a Working Group meeting on time frame of performance in March 1996.

The Committee also agreed to participate in a joint Working Group meeting with ACRS in March 1996 on the effects of low-level radiation, spent fuel storage projects, and decommissioning.

VI. IAEA PRESENTATION (Open)

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

Dr. Pomeroy welcomed the presenter, Mr. Giorgio Gnugnoli (a former ACNW staff scientist), currently assigned in Vienna, Austria, as a radioactive waste specialist in the Division of Radiation Safety, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Mr. Gnugnoli presented the current structure of the IAEA radioactive waste safety and technical support organization. He noted that this organization was due to change in January 1996, which he believed was an attempt to separate the technical assistance and inspection activities from other activities that could perhaps be perceived as promotional.

He also discussed several of the recent radioactive waste activities in which he had personally actively participated. Of interest was his exposition on the potential value of several IAEA databases and how to obtain access to them. He noted particularly his agency's largest system, the INIS bibliographic database, which currently contains some 1.8 million records.

In response to a question from Dr. Garrick on the different exposure scenarios ("subsistence farmer" vs. "probabilistic risk group") in the NAS report entitled, "Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards," Mr. Gnugnoli noted that, to his knowledge, the former scenario was still the generally accepted one at the IAEA. He further stated that while probabilistic approaches to risk are becoming more accepted, deterministic approaches still appear to be the most common. Elaborating further, he noted that IAEA is an organization that bases its positions on consensus amongst its members, and for that reason, on occasion, has been slow in responding to change (unless previously adopted by other international agencies such as the International Committee on Radiation Protection.)

Conclusions/Action Items

This discussion was held to keep the ACNW abreast of international activities.

VII. EXECUTIVE SESSION (Open)

[Note: Mr. Richard K. Major 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 81st ACNW Meeting, Rockville, Maryland, January 24-26, 1996, and future Working Group meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m., Thursday, December 21, 1995.

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

the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L), Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, located in Brunswick County, North Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow the applicant to file a new application before the two-month waiting period required by 10 CFR 55.35(a) expires and, thereafter, to be re-administered a written examination during the week of December 18, 1995. In their written request, CP&L indicated that the applicant has entered a remediation process, and will be ready for re-examination the week of December 18, 1995.

The proposed action is in accordance with CP&L's request on behalf of its employee, the above-referenced applicant for a Senior Reactor Operator License, dated November 8, 1995, for an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 55.35(a).

The Need for the Proposed Action

The exemption requested would allow the applicant to be administered a written re-examination during the week of December 18, 1995. This re-examination would be scheduled to coincide with a previously scheduled NRC initial examination visit, and would provide for re-examination prior to the expiration of a two-month time period required by 10 CFR 55.35(a) before an applicant can file a new application in order to retake an initial examination.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the request. The proposed exemption does not change the knowledge and skills requirements for licensing operators, and because the applicant must pass a written examination to be licensed as a Senior Reactor Operator, this proposed exemption would not increase the risk of facility accidents. In addition, the formal action of licensing an operator does not authorize changes to the facility's existing safety limits, safety settings, power operations, or effluent limits.

Because no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure, the change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no

significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Regarding potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the application would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1 and 2 dated January 1974.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 27, 1995, the staff consulted with the North Carolina State official, Mr. Johnny James, of the Division of Radiation Protection, North Carolina Department of Environmental, Commerce, and Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's request on behalf of its employee for an exemption dated November 8, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the

University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of November, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Stuart A. Richards,

Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, Division of Reactor Controls and Human Factors, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

(FR Doc. 95-29658 Filed 12-5-95; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Joint Meeting of the Subcommittees on Individual Plant Examinations/Probabilistic Risk Assessment; Postponement

A joint meeting of the ACRS Subcommittees on Individual Plant Examinations (IPEs) and on Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) scheduled to be held on December 14 and 15, 1995, in Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland has been postponed due to the need for additional information from the NRC staff. Notice of this meeting was published in the Federal Register on Monday, November 27, 1995 (60 FR 58393). When the meeting is rescheduled, it will be announced in the Federal Register Notice.

For further information contact: Dr. Medhat El-Zehawy, the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, (telephone 301/415-6889) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EST).

Dated: November 28, 1995.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

(FR Doc. 95-29660 Filed 12-05-95; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 80th meeting on December 19, 20 and 21, 1995, 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:

Tuesday, December 19, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

Wednesday, December 20, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

Thursday, December 21, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

During this meeting the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. Review of NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management. The Committee will conclude its deliberations and issue a report on the alternatives to the future course of the NRC's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program.

B. National Research Council/National Academy of Science Committee Report on the Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards. The NRC staff will discuss with the Committee its insights on the subject report.

C. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Activities. The Committee will meet with a representative of the IAEA to discuss relevant waste-related activities.

D. 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. Among the topics to be discussed: pilot test of survey and statistical methodology for site decommissioning, status of HLW program, and public comment on program options for NRC's LLW program.

E. ACNW Priorities. The Committee will review Task Action Plans for the initial grouping of priority review issues identified by the Committee.

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. EDT.

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) 303-8672; the local direct dial number is 703-321-3339.

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

ACNW Meeting No. and 1996 ACNW Meeting Dates

- 81—January 24–26, 1996
- 82—March 27–29, 1996
- 83—May 2–4 or May 15–17, 1996 (TBD)
- 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 30, 1995.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-29661 Filed 12-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7560-01-P

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-416, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-416 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from November 10, 1995, through November 24, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on November 27, 1995 (60 FR 58395).

Notice Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, And Opportunity For A Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the



APPENDIX II

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

Revised: December 18, 1995

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
80TH ACNW MEETING
DECEMBER 19-21, 1995

Tuesday, December 19, 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/RKM)
 - 1.2) Items of Current Interest (PWP/RKM)
- 2) 8:40 - 10:20 A.M. NAS Report - Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards (Open) (MJS/BJG/HJL)
 - 2.1) NRC staff discussion of its programmatic plans for addressing NAS recommendations
 - 2.2) Review provisional approach for modifying regulations
 - 2.3) Brief description of technical issues
- 10:20 - 10:30 A.M. * * * BREAK * * *
- 3) 10:30 - 11:30 A.M. Meeting with the Acting Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS (Open) (PWP/RKM/LGD)
 - 3.1) A question and answer session with the Acting Director, Margaret Federline
 - 3.2) Ms. Federline will discuss items of current interest such as updates on the Pilot Test of Survey and Statistical Methodology for Site Decommissioning, Status of HLW Program including a summary of the KTI Technical Exchange, and Public Comment on SECY-95-201 - Program Options for NRC's LLW Program.
- 11:20 - 11:35am Break
- 11:30 - 12:00 Noon Individual Member Meetings: Discussion Preparation (Open)
- 12:00 - 1:00 P.M. * * * LUNCH * * *
- 4) 1:00 - 3:15 P.M. Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)
 - 4.1) Vertical Slice Approach/KTI (PWP/ACC)

[DENOTES TRANSCRIBED PORTIONS OF THE MEETING

- 4.2) NAS Report - Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards (MJS/HJL)
 - 4.3) LLW Alternatives (PWP/HJL)
 - 4.4) Discuss possible comments on draft Staff Technical Position on the use of Expert Judgement in the HLW Program (MJS/ACC)
- 2:55 - 3:35 P.M. ACNW Reports Continued
³⁵
 3:15 - 5:00 P.M. * * * BREAK * * *
 (Individual Member Meetings)
- 5) 5:00 - 6:00 P.M. ¹⁵ ACNW Reports (continued)
 7) Committee Activities/Future Agenda
 (Open) (PWP/RKM)
- 5.1) Set agenda for 81st ACNW Meeting
 - 5.2) Review Items for Out Months
 - 5.3) Future Working Group Topics
 - 5.4) Approval of Member Solicitation Notice
 - 5.5) Calendar of upcoming events
 - 5.6) Response to RSK invitation
 - 5.7) Reconcile EDO responses to ACNW letters
- Postponed to 3⁴⁰ - 4:12
 on 12-21-95
- 6:00 ¹⁵ * * * RECESS * * *

Wednesday, December 20, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room 2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD

- 6) 8:30 - 9:00 ²⁰ A.M. [Meeting with the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
 6.1) A question and answer session with the Director, Carl J. Paperiello
 BREAK
- 9:20 - 9:35
- 7) 9:00 - 10:00 A.M. [Task Action Plans (Open) (PWP/LGD)
 7.1) Priority Listing Update
 7.2) Task Action Plan Outline
 7.3) Review typical drafts (as available)
- Postponed to 5:30 pm
- 10:00 - 10:15 A.M. * * * BREAK * * *
- 8) 10:15 - ^{12:30} ~~11:30~~ A.M. Continue to prepare ACNW Reports listed in Item 4 (Open)
- 12:30
~~11:30~~ - 1:30 P.M. * * * LUNCH * * *
- 9) 1:30 ³² - 2:45 P.M. [IAEA Presentation (Open) (PWP/HJL)
 9.1) Presentation on recent relevant IAEA waste related activities

- 10) ⁵⁵ 2:45 - ^{5:30} ~~6:00~~ P.M. Continue to Prepare ACNW Reports listed in Item 4 (Open)
^{5:30} 5:30 - ^{6:00} 6:00 P.M. TASK ACTION PLAN
 * * * RECESS * * *

Thursday, December 21, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room 2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD

- 11) 8:30 - 10:00 A.M. Report on Outside Meetings (Open)
 (PWP/WJH/LGD/ACC)
 11.1) Volcanic Hazards (PWP/WJH)
 11.2) American Geophysical Union (WJH/LGD)
 11.3) Materials Research Society and DOE LLW Conference (ACC)
- 12) ^{11:05} ~~10:00~~ - ^{11:15} ~~10:15~~ * * * BREAK * * *
- 13) 10:15 - 12:00 Continue to Prepare ACNW Reports listed in Item 4 (Open)
- 12:00 - 1:00 P.M. * * * LUNCH * * *
- 14) 1:00 - ^{3:40} ~~4:00~~ P.M. Complete ACNW Reports (Open)
^{3:40} 3:40 - ^{4:12} 4:12 Committee Activities/Future Agenda
~~4:00~~ 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

**80TH ACNW MEETING
DECEMBER 19-21, 1995**

<u>ACNW MEMBERS</u>	<u>1st Day</u>	<u>2nd Day</u>	<u>3rd Day</u>
Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. William J. Hinze	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. B. John Garrick	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. Martin J. Steindler	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

<u>ACNW STAFF</u>	<u>1st Day</u>	<u>2nd Day</u>	<u>3rd Day</u>
Dr. Andrew Campbell	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Ms. Lynn F. Deering	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Mr. Howard J. Larson	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Mr. Richard K. Major	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. John T. Larkins	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. Richard P. Savio	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Ms. Roxanne Summers	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

December 19, 1995

R. Cady	RES
M. Lee	NMSS
B. Nelson	NMSS
E. O'Donnell	RES
R. Johnson	NMSS
R. Wescott	NMSS
J. Kotra	NMSS
M. Weber	NMSS
C. Lui	RES

December 20, 1995

M. Weber	NMSS
S. Hayes	OIP

December 21, 1995

R. Nelson	NMSS
M. Weber	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

December 19, 1995

R. Wallace, Jr.	USGS
C. Henkel	NEI
R. Andersen	NEI
J. Woodward	ICF Kaiser Eng.
P. Krishna	M&O/TRW
D. Fenster	M&O/WCFS
R. Gamble	CRWMS M&O/WCFS
D. Fehringer	NWTRB
F. Rodgers	DOE
G. Roseboom	USGS (retired)
B. Vocke	ERM
L. Hendricks	NEI
F. Galpin	Rogers & Assoc. Eng.
A. Huang	Golder Federal Services
J. Hawkins	Self
J. Russell	CNWRA
J. Wax	Radioactive Exchange

December 20, 1995

D. Fenster	DOE/OCRWM
G. Gnugnoli	IAEA
R. Andersen	NEI

APPENDIX IV: FUTURE AGENDA

The Committee agreed to consider the following during the 81st ACNW Meeting, January 24-26, 1995:

- Design Bases Events for Geologic Repository Operations Area - The Committee will hear a presentation by the staff on the proposed resolution of public comments on changes to Part 60 relevant to design basis events for a proposed geologic repository operations area.
- Meeting with the Executive Director for Operations - The Committee will meet with the Executive Director for Operations to discuss items of current interest, e.g., status of the Phase 1 rebaselining effort, anticipated impact of resource limitations, staff interactions with the ACNW, and recent Committee reports.
- Technical Training Center Developments - The Committee will hear a presentation by representatives of the Technical Training Center (TTC) on TTC programs relevant to the Committee's areas of priority.
- Facility Decommissioning - The Committee will hear a presentation by the NRC staff on the current status of a facility listed on the Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP). A proposal for permanent on-site disposal, as well as performance assessment considerations are among the relevant issues to be discussed.
- Residual Contamination Background Level Determination - The Committee will hear a report from the Office of Research on its recent field study demonstration project intended to verify the efficacy of the background level determination process proposed in the draft Residual Contamination Level for Decommissioning rule.
- High-Level Waste Source Term - The Committee will hear a presentation by one of its consultants on a high-level waste source term and the value of natural analogs.
- 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 Division of Waste Management programs. Among the topics which may be discussed are: a proposed high-level waste issue resolution process, an overview of a recent decommissioning exercise, and current activities related to the use of expert judgment in the licensing process.

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 NAS Report - Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards
1. Recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences: Implications for NRC Regulation of a Proposed Repository at Yucca Mountain, dated December 19, 1995, presented by Janet Kotra, NMSS [Viewgraphs]
 2. Technical Analyses related to NAS Recommendations, dated December 19, 1995, presented by Timothy J. McCartin, NMSS [Viewgraphs]
- 9 IAEA Presentation
3. The IAEA and United Nations, undated, presented on December 20, 1995, by Giorgio Gnugnoli, IAEA [Viewgraphs]
- 11 Report on Outside Meetings
4. Memorandum from W.J. Hinze to Paul W. Pomeroy, dated December 18, 1995: Yucca Mountain Site Geophysics Meeting [Handout]

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

1 Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman

1. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated December 19, 1995
2. Items of Current Interest, undated
3. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated December 20, 1995

2 NAS Report - Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards

4. Table of Contents
5. Status Report
6. Memo from Howard J. Larson, Senior Staff Engineer, ACNW, to ACNW Members: National Academy of Science (NAS) National Research Council NAS/NRC Press Release: Report of the Committee on the Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards, dated August 3, 1995 with enclosure: National Research Council, Commission on Geosciences, Environment, and Resources, Board on Radioactive Waste Management, Committee on the Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards: Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards, News Conference, August 1, 1995
7. Memorandum from Howard J. Larson, Senior Staff Engineer, ACNW, to ACNW Members: Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 1995
8. 40 CFR Part 197, Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Yucca Mountain, NV, Initial Status Report for the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, Presented on October 25, 1995, by Ray Clark, Project Leader for Part 197 [Viewgraphs]
9. Recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences and Current Legislative Proposals: Implications for NRC Regulation of a Proposed Repository at Yucca Mountain, by Janet Kotra, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, undated [Viewsgraphs] [Prepared for Internal Committee Use Only]

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB

NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

- 3 Meeting with the Acting Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS
- 10. Table of Contents
 - 11. Status Report
- 4.1 Letter on Vertical Slice Approach and Key Technical Issues (KTIs)
- 12. Table of Contents
 - 13. Status Report
 - 14. Memorandum from A. Campbell, Senior Staff Scientist, to ACNW Members: Meeting Report on NRC-DOE Technical Exchange on Key Issues for a Geological Repository at Yucca Mountain, Video-Conference: Washington, DC and Las Vegas, NV, November 17, 1995, December 8, 1995 with enclosures
 - 15. Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, Draft Meeting Minutes, Key Technical Uncertainty Integration and Resolution of Key Technical Issues, 79th ACNW Meeting, November 15, 1995 [Prepared for Internal Committee Use]
 - 16. Strategy for Waste Containment and Isolation for the Yucca Mountain Site, Preliminary YMSCO Review Draft, October 9, 1995, Prepared by TRW Environmental Safety Systems Inc.
 - 17. Letter from Joseph J. Holonich, Chief, High Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, NMSS, to Mr. Ronald A. Milner, Director for Program Management and Integration, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, DOE: Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Vertical Slice Approach, dated September 1, 1995 with enclosures
- 4.3 NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management
- 18. Table of Contents
 - 19. Status Report
 - 20. Memorandum from H. J. Larson, Senior Staff Engineer, ACNW, to ACNW Members: SECY-95-201, "Alternatives to Terminating the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program," dated July 31, 1995, dated August 4, 1995, with enclosure

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

21. Memorandum from John C. Hoyle, Secretary, Office of the Secretary, NRC to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations and John T. Larkins, Executive Director, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste: SECY-95-201 - Alternatives to Terminating the NRC's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program, dated September 14, 1995
22. Memorandum from Andy Campbell, Senior Staff Scientist, ACNW, to ACNW Members: Summary of Meeting with Seth Coplan, dated October 12, 1995 [Prepared for Internal Committee Use]
23. Memorandum from Andy Campbell, Senior Staff Scientist, ACNW, to ACNW Members: Summary of Research and Technical Assistance Projects, dated October 11, 1995, with attachments
24. Letter from Dennis L. Schornack, Commissioner, State of Michigan, Department of Commerce, to Mr. James Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC re State of Michigan's Perspective and Facility Development Plans, dated October 11, 1995
25. Letter from Carl J. Paperiello, Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, NRC, to Mr. Dennis L. Schornack, Commissioner, Michigan Department of Commerce, response to October 11, 1995 letter to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, - NRC, re Michigan's efforts to meet its responsibilities under the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act, as amended, dated November 9, 1995
26. Nuclear Waste News, "Funding cuts Deal a Death Blow to NRC's LLW Research Program" and "NRC Considers Reductions to LLW Program Activities," dated October 26, 1995, page 413
27. Letter from Ronald E. Gingerich, Director, Connecticut Low-Level Radioactive Waste Program, to Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, commenting on SECY-95-201, "Alternatives to Terminating the NRC's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program," dated November 9, 1995
28. Letter from Janice B. Deshais, Northeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Commission, to Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, commenting on SECY-95-201, "Alternatives to Terminating the NRC's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program", dated November 15, 1995

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

29. Letter from John R. Weingart, Executive Director, New Jersey Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facility Siting Board, to Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, commenting on SECY-95-201, "Alternatives to Terminating the NRC's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program," dated November 8, 1995
30. Letter from Greeg. S. Larson, Conveyer, LLW Forum, Executive Director, Midwest Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact Commission, to Shirley Jackson, Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, communicating concern regarding NRC staff participation in the activities of the LLW Forum, particularly the three yearly meetings, dated November 15, 1995
31. Letter from Mel Silberberg to Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, submitting additional comments on NRC's Programmatic Approach to Low-Level Waste Management, dated November 15, 1995
32. Letter from Carl W. Connell, Jr., to Howard Larson, Senior Engineer, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, regarding a viable LLRW program, dated November 22, 1995 [facsimile]
33. Letter from Mike Alissi, Nuclear Energy Institute, to Chairman Paul W. Pomeroy, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, regarding NRC's low-level radioactive waste regulatory program, dated November 15, 1995 with enclosures
36. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, Public Law 91-190, 83 Stat. 852, January 1, 1970
37. Memorandum from M. Steindler, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Distribution/ACNW: Straw-man Letter Regarding SECY-95-201, dated December 7, 1995 [Pre-decisional Draft, for Internal ACNW Use Only]
38. Memorandum from Paul Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Martin Steindler, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC: Comments on SECY-95-201 Response, dated November 17, 1995
39. Memorandum from B. John Garrick, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Martin Steindler, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC: Comments on SECY-95-201, dated November 20, 1995 [facsimile]

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

- 40. Memorandum from Bill Hinze, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Martin Steindler, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC: Pending ACNW Letter on SECY-95-201, dated December 3, 1995 [facsimile]
 - 41. Memorandum from Martin Steindler, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to ACNW Members, ACNW Staff: Comments on ACNW Actions Regarding SECY-95-201, dated October 23, 1995 [For Internal ACNW Use Only - Pre-decisional Draft]
 - 42. Report by Martin Steindler, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC: Elements of a Low-Level Waste Program, dated October 25, 1995 [Pre-decisional Draft - For Internal ACNW Use Only]
- 4.4 Comments on Draft Staff Technical Position on the Use of Expert Judgment in the High-Level Waste Program
- 43. Table of Contents
 - 44. Memorandum from Andy Campbell, Senior Staff Scientist, ACNW, to ACNW Members: Review Copy of Draft "Staff Technical Position on the Use of Expert Judgment in the High-Level Waste Program," dated November 22, 1995 with attachment [Draft - Predecisional]
- 5 Committee Activities/Future Agenda
- 45. Table of Contents
 - 46. Set Agenda for 81st ACNW Meeting, January 24-26, 1996, undated
 - 46. Review Items for the Out Months, undated
 - 47. Future Working Group Topics, undated
 - 48. ACNW Meeting Calendar for 1996
 - 49. Memorandum from James L. Blaha, Assistant for Operations, Office of the Executive Director for Operations, to John T. Larkins, Executive Director, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards: Proposed Agenda Items for the ACRS and the ACNW, dated December 6, 1995 with attachments
 - 50. CRWMS/M&O Meeting Status, dated November 27, 1995
 - 51. Draft Federal Register Notice, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Seeks Qualified Candidates for Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, dated December 1, 1995

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

52. Draft Press Release, NRC Seeks Qualified Candidates for Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, dated December 1, 1995
53. Memorandum from John C. Hoyle, Secretary, Office of the Secretary, NRC, to The Chairman et al: Staff Requirements Memorandum on COMSECY-95-019, "Appointment of ACNW Members," dated June 9, 1995
54. Letter from O. Prof. Dr.-Ing O. Natau, Chairman, Die Reaktor-Sicherheitskommission, to Prof. Dr. Paul Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, regarding recent meeting with the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste and invitation to their next meeting in Germany, dated September 7, 1995

5.7 EDO Responses To Committee Letters

• Streamlining The SDMP Program

55. Table of Contents
56. Status Report
57. Letter from Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Honorable Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Comments on Streamlining the Site Decommissioning Management plan Program, dated September 28, 1995
58. Letter from James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, to Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC: Comments on Streamling the Site Decommissioning Management Plan Program, dated October 26, 1995

• Lessons Learned From Ward Valley

59. Table of Contents
60. Status Report
61. Letter from Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Honorable Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Lesson Learned from the Ward Valley, California, Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Siting Process, dated August 10, 1995

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB
NUMBER

DOCUMENTS

62. Letter from James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC: Lessons Learned from the Ward Valley, California Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Siting Process

6 Task Action Plans

64. Table of Contents
65. Status Report
66. Memorandum from L. Deering, Senior Staff Scientist, Advisory Committee Nuclear Waste, NRC, to ACNW Members: Revision of ACNW Priority Issues and Draft Format for Task Action Plans, dated November 28, 1995 with enclosures
67. Memorandum from Bill J. Hinze, Member, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to Lynn Deering, Senior Staff Scientist commenting on facsimile of November 29, 1995 regarding Revision of Priorities, dated on December 1, 1995 [Facsimile]
68. Near-Term Hlw Repository Program Guidance, dated December 6, 1995
69. Schedule of Near-Term HLW Repository Activities
70. Memorandum from Richard Major, Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, NRC, to ACNW Members/Staff, providing viewgraphs by John Greeves, NMSS, on Yucca Mountain Project Planning Status for 78th ACNW Meeting, dated October 23, 1995
71. Proposed ACNW Working Groups for 1996
72. Memorandum from John C. Hoyle, Secretary, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC: Staff Requirements - SECY-95-249 - U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Risk Harmonization Issues and Recommendations