

ORIGINAL

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Agency: Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Title: LSSARP Meeting

Docket No.

LOCATION: Las Vegas, Nevada

DATE: Friday, April 15, 1994

PAGES: 147 - 221

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

1612 K St. N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

3
4 LSSARP MEETING

5

6
7 Department of Energy

8 101 Convention Center Dr.

9 Las Vegas, Nevada

10
11 Friday, April 15, 1994

12
13 The above-entitled meeting convened, pursuant to
14 adjournment, at 8:30 a.m.

15
16 BEFORE:

17 JOHN HOYLE,

18 NRC PANEL CHAIRMAN

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 APPEARANCES:

2 KIRK BALCOM, Nevada

3 MALACHY MURPHY, Nye County

4 BRAD METTAM, Inyo County

5 ROBERT HOLDEN, NCAI

6 DENNIS BECHTEL, Clark County

7 JAY SILBERG, Nuclear Energy Institute

8 CORINNE MACALUSO, DOE

9 DAN GRASER, DOE

10 JOHN HOYLE, NRC

11 ARNOLD MOE LEVIN, NRC

12 CHIP CAMERON, NRC

13 TERRY QUIGLEY, NCAI

14 HARRY SWAINSTON, Nevada

15 MARYANN JONES, DOE

16 DAVID DRAPKIN, NRC

17 TONY NEVILLE, Labat-Anderson

18 MIKE BAUGHMAN

19 VIRGIL ROCHESTER

20 SALLY LARIMORE, Clark Country

21 ARDYCE MILTON

22

23

24

25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 [8:30 a.m.]

3 MR. HOYLE: Good morning once again. Today's
4 schedule will start us off with a presentation by Dan Graser
5 talking about capture of DOE documents. We were
6 particularly interested in hearing how they're going to
7 capture non-archive documents, documents concerning the
8 waste program that are not originated in his office, and
9 status of InfoSTREAMS. So unless there are initial
10 comments, let's hear from Dan.

11 MR. GRASER: Okay. Before I get up and use the
12 overhead, we can address the issue of the waste acceptance,
13 waste materials that are coming into our program that Mal
14 raised at the last ARP meeting. We went off and put
15 together a response, and I believe a copy of that had been
16 sent to all the ARP members. Just to recap the contents of
17 that letter the -- you know, the issue of dealing with the
18 defense waste has been recognized within the Department of
19 Energy and across various other programs that have some
20 involvement. And what we've found and what we're able to
21 respond to is that, you know, from my perspective it looks
22 like things are fairly well under control. That letter,
23 just the highlights of it, you can certainly go back and
24 read through it if you choose, but that letter that I wrote
25 back to John basically outlined the fact that the program

1 does have a formal policy and requirements, documentation in
2 place. The document spells out the levels of treatment, the
3 types of documentation that would be required. So from that
4 perspective what we have is a documented approach to dealing
5 with the acceptance and the documentation of that material.

6 In terms of whether or not that is actually being
7 used or followed, we then went in and started looking at the
8 various record submissions that have come into our normal
9 records processing environment. And in fact we do have
10 submissions of materials coming in pursuant to that, you
11 know, to that requirements document. And in addition to the
12 fact that you have the documentation and things actually
13 happening according to that documentation, there is an
14 ongoing oversight group that includes all of the
15 organizations within the Department of Energy that have
16 involvement here, and that group has been meeting on a
17 regular basis.

18 So you know, I think to sum it up on the defense
19 waste issue, that is certainly, you know, from my
20 perspective fairly well under control. The other aspect of
21 the question that Mal asked was also in regards to materials
22 at the secretarial level. And there is a standing
23 correspondence management system within the Department of
24 Energy. It's run by a group called the executive
25 secretariat. And what the executive secretariat does is

1 screen and filter all of the incoming and outgoing
2 secretarial materials. Anything that relates to a specific
3 program is automatically copied to the program. So if it is
4 formally received and accepted at the secretary's office,
5 the operative program will always get a copy of that.
6 Sometimes for action, but at a minimum at least for
7 information. And when it comes through our mail room we
8 take that item, piece of correspondence, either incoming or
9 outgoing, and it then goes into our records system. I think
10 the only area where we have potentially a situation is where
11 something is not received through a normal correspondence
12 type mode -- specifically if somebody walked in the door and
13 handed something down to the secretary during the course of
14 a discussion, for example overheads or view charts or
15 something. I have reasonable faith, although, you know, one
16 never really knows for sure when you can't just go right up
17 and verify it. But I have reasonable belief that even those
18 materials are then grabbed by the people in the executive
19 secretariat and they are included as part of the chron
20 material in the secretary's office.
21 But I guess what I'm saying is that at least for
22 the formal correspondence level material the mechanism is in
23 place, has been in place even prior to Hazel O'Leary, to
24 have that sort of capture. And if anybody has any
25 additional questions I can go back and continue to check

1 things out.

2 MR. MURPHY: I've got a couple of questions, Dan.

3 MR. GRASER: Okay.

4 MR. MURPHY: On the defense waste site, your
5 February 1st letter in which you've just gone over here
6 details the kind of documents, the three categories of
7 documents that InfoSTREAMS is currently capturing, I guess.
8 Does that -- and record is sufficient to provide evidence of
9 activity subject to 2A requirements is pretty broad?

10 MR. GRASER: Yes.

11 MR. MURPHY: Almost everything.

12 MR. GRASER: Right.

13 MR. MURPHY: Theoretically. But have you checked
14 to see whether or not there is -- you're able to capture or
15 they're aware of the -- and I was looking for it and I'm
16 close to finding it in the rule and I haven't found it yet.
17 The -- remember our raw data debate during the -- what did
18 we call that stuff, graphic-oriented material? We handled
19 that separately --

20 MR. GRASER: Right.

21 MR. MURPHY: -- under the rule where you -- where
22 the people are required to submit a header --

23 MR. GRASER: Right.

24 MR. MURPHY: -- and a bibliographic index, I
25 guess. But the raw data -- as I call it raw data. I think

1 the rule calls it graphic-oriented material, can be kept
2 separate. Got to say where it is, you know, like the --

3 MR. GRASER: Uh-huh.

4 MR. MURPHY: -- field notebook --

5 MR. GRASER: Right.

6 MR. MURPHY: -- kind of stuff. Are we able to do
7 that in the defense waste program?

8 MR. GRASER: Again, I'll have to check down to
9 that level in terms of going through the, you know, exactly
10 what lies underneath these records.

11 MR. MURPHY: No. I think it's a different problem
12 because there's not field work being done out there. There
13 aren't well logs and --

14 MR. GRASER: Right.

15 MR. MURPHY: -- that are taken back to Golden,
16 Colorado or anything, but it's -- you might want to check on
17 that.

18 MR. GRASER: Okay. So it's the equivalent
19 underlying technical data associated with those activities.

20 MR. MURPHY: Right.

21 MR. GRASER: That's the status of that.

22 MR. MURPHY: That's right.

23 MR. GRASER: All right.

24 MR. MURPHY: And then secondly, with so far as the
25 secretarial level documents are concerned, are we able to

1 grab the circulated draft?

2 MR. GRASER: I'll have to check on that one as
3 well. The circulated drafts for controlled correspondence,
4 I'll have to check on that one as well. Typically that --
5 the correspondence control units when something is a piece
6 of controlled correspondence like that. They will track the
7 versions that have gone out to various Department of Energy
8 assistant secretaries. So if they are requesting a
9 concurrence activity, the controlled correspondence unit
10 will actually know that there are six copies out there
11 looking for concurrence and the action date is such and such
12 and this guy hasn't responded, and if he doesn't respond by
13 COD today he's got to stay until he's finished tonight. So
14 they do keep track of the control of the concurrence
15 material, and the status of it. But as to whether or not
16 there's a capture mechanism for those common materials, I'll
17 have to check on that.

18 MR. MURPHY: Yeah, that's what we would be
19 interested in.

20 MR. GRASER: Okay.

21 MR. HOYLE: Dan, can I ask a question? Do you
22 know where the responsible officer is going to be? Is it
23 going to be in that's going to be in archive or a higher
24 level? I mean that's the person that really has to certify
25 that all the documents are there.

1 MR. GRASER: I really don't know. I would -- I
2 don't even want to venture a guess. Okay. Can move right
3 along here, keep the airlines happy. This is a presentation
4 we've been giving again in the last few weeks and part of
5 the TRW team is out here in fact using this briefing for --
6 also for briefing the technical status to the Duck Mountain
7 site characterization staff out here as well. This
8 represents a current snapshot of our strategy on
9 InfoSTREAMs. The overheads that I'm going to be showing,
10 for those of you who have had presentations, for example,
11 from Barbara Cerney, some of this will be very familiar.
12 But since -- you know, since I've been the acting director
13 of the information management division since October, we
14 have changed somewhat our tactical implementation, although
15 the same basic philosophy is there. And what you will see
16 here is some elaboration on some of those changes that are
17 in process right now. This is our tactical deployment.
18 This is for InfoSTREAMs, our internal records management,
19 our internal document intake capabilities. And the thing I
20 do want to say about that is, again, we have been very aware
21 of the fact that there may be potential for reuse of our
22 InfoSTREAMs technologies, architectures, hardware and
23 software. So a lot of what we're seeing in the InfoSTREAMs
24 environment has, you know, a very good chance of
25 reusability. And whether or not saving the money is

1 perceived as being of value.

2 The first overhead we have here, just for those of
3 you who haven't seen InfoSTREAMS or licensing support
4 system, what we have here is just basically representation
5 of the sorts of things that the InfoSTREAMS strategy or
6 technology was intended to do. We have an environment where
7 people within the program, within the project are creating
8 documentation materials in support of license application or
9 characterization or scientific activities, whatever the case
10 may be. In InfoSTREAMS increment 2.0, which is undergoing
11 final acceptance testing as we speak, what is going to be
12 happening is that at that point of document creation not
13 only are we grabbing on to the document, we are also
14 creating a preliminary header that tells us we have
15 something here that is potentially record material. And
16 we're going to create a short header record for that, even
17 while the document may be in a developmental stage.

18 MR. SILBERG: Who creates that, the author?

19 MR. GRASER: The author. Right. While some of
20 it's machine-generated, too. For example, the date the
21 thing was launched, that's machine-generated. Who is the
22 user that's logged into the machine, that's
23 machine-generated. In our internal environment we do have a
24 situation where fairly large numbers of people are involved
25 in the review of a document. That can be technical review,

1 review for concurrence, supervisory approval and so forth
2 and so on. Well, the objective of the system is to get from
3 the point of authorship to a point where we have a mechanism
4 to capture the document itself, header material, comments,
5 review concurrence history. Again, a lot of this has to do
6 with setting ourselves up in a position to capture those
7 circulated but non-finalized draft materials. There could
8 be multiple iterations of a document process and as you come
9 out of the end of the drill you may have the final
10 circulated draft back here, which is the one that the LSS is
11 really interested in. You don't know how many iterations
12 you're going to go through before you get to the final
13 draft. That's one of the technical aspects that we've been
14 working with. The bottom line is that when we come out of
15 this whole process, we end up with what we're calling our
16 prerecords database because, again, from a federal records
17 perspective, you know, a piece of documentation is not a
18 federal record necessarily while it's perhaps in the
19 preliminary draft stage.

20 MR. BECHTEL: Who are the reviewers up on the top
21 there? Is that --

22 MR. GRASER: Well, the reviewers, I mean there
23 could be lots of different scenarios. This is kind of a
24 generic representation.

25 MR. BECHTEL: Uh-huh.

1 MR. GRASER: It depends, you know, depends on the
2 nature of the activity that they're involved in. The
3 software, for example, supports administrative functions --

4 MR. BECHTEL: Uh-huh.

5 MR. GRASER: -- and it could support actual
6 technical or scientific work teams off collaborating on
7 creating a document package or a records package or a
8 technical data package, whatever the case may be. So it's
9 fairly generic in that regard.

10 MR. SILBERG: The project procedures require that
11 all comments on all documents be on system as opposed to
12 handwritten notes in the margin or notes scribbled on paper
13 that go back to the author?

14 MR. GRASER: That's practically unenforceable.
15 There are situations where we don't have the entire
16 enterprise on the InfoSTREAMS environment. So there will
17 always be situations where we are working with a piece of
18 paper. It's not a totally electronic environment. So there
19 will always be situations where people will be involved in
20 doing a paper -- you know, a review on a piece of paper.
21 Now we've been moving and encouraging people more and more
22 to use automation to respond to materials. And in fact if
23 it is a QA-affecting activity, there are very specific
24 procedures in place as to how comments are made and
25 captured. But if it's a non-QA-type activity, you know,

1 correspondence, yes, there will still be situations where
2 people are doing mark up, but we've been encouraging that
3 people use the automation approach in making those comments.

4 MR. MURPHY: Don't we -- we capture the marginalia
5 anyway, don't we?

6 MR. GRASER: Yeah.

7 MR. SILBERG: It's going to be a much simpler
8 system if --

9 MR. MURPHY: Huh?

10 MR. SILBERG: -- everything is electronic and you
11 don't have to worry about handwritten notes, just going to
12 make life easier for everybody.

13 MR. GRASER: Right. It would be nice to be, but
14 you know, we are not there for General counsel procurement.

15 There are lots of activities outside of the archive program
16 that still get involved in the review of our materials.

17 Once we have this prerecords database environment,
18 we have a couple of situations. Yes indeed, the data is
19 available if the author fails to submit, and if it meets the
20 check that says this was a circulated draft that was
21 circulated for supervisory concurrence and approval. And

22 this is -- gives us a mechanism to grab those if they in
23 fact were done in the automated environment, then we already
24 have access to that.

25 This free record database environment exchange

1 right now is -- it -- you know, there are aspects of it that
2 are automated, but there are aspects of it that are still
3 manual, so it is not a total electronic environment. But
4 what we're trying to represent here is, you know, the fact
5 that we have from this prerecords database environment, we
6 have documents moving through and getting final closure and
7 we have the final package, records package of material. And
8 that material then comes into a formal, more formalized
9 records management environment. The records management
10 process, for example, is going to then go through the drill
11 of getting a bitmap image, scaling the document, doing text
12 conversion, doing our -- completing the records header that
13 was created up here because we now have a final piece of
14 material and a final document date and all the rest of those
15 goodies. So we complete -- this is our internal records
16 management header structure and this is the thing that we're
17 mapping directly onto the LSS header structure. And those
18 materials are stored in what we're calling -- this very
19 deliberately -- our licensing data management system. Not
20 to confuse it with LSS, but when you look at what this is
21 you will say, "Yes indeed, these look like the products
22 that we need to output to the licensing support system."
23 And yes indeed, that's what it is. And this is not quite as
24 simple as it looks. We have the situation of linking image
25 and text, synchronization, and the header record

1 representing all that. In addition to that, the system still accommodates
2 submission from external generation sources. And in fact
3 this next chart represents the -- some of the strategy that
4 we've been using for the intake process. And again, if you
5 look down the left side here you will recognize the sorts of
6 things in the LSS intake needed to accommodate. We have
7 paper coming in from some sources. We have perhaps file
8 transfers or people submitting material already on optical
9 disk, whatever the case may be. Well, the structure we are
10 at at this point is recognizing these various -- this is not
11 a satellite. It's from satellite data stores.

13 MR. MURPHY: Looks like a satellite to me.

14 MR. GRASER: It's a satellite. It's not a
15 satellite.

16 MR. SILBERG: That's known as iminal humor.

17 MR. GRASER: Iminal humor, that's right. The
18 thing I'd like to highlight here, though, is that we've got
19 here what we're calling an interface specification. And you
20 could conceive of, you know, or characterize that as a
21 passport. Basically what we're doing is, we're saying to
22 the members of our own organization, if you're doing records
23 submission we're going to give you a specification for how
24 that filter-up of information happens within our enterprise.
25 And that specification is not just format or media, it also

1 goes directly into quality, accuracy and a few other aspects
2 of the integrity of data coming into the system to process.
3 And again, this is just demonstrating that we have feeds
4 coming in in various ways and if they --

5 MR. SILBERG: Once something goes into this
6 licensing data management system, what happens to the
7 prerecords database? Does that stay in another part of the
8 system or does that disappear?

9 MR. GRASER: Archive. Yeah, it's archived.

10 MR. SILBERG: All of those early drafts, even
11 though they don't fit within the circulated draft
12 definition, remain somewhere in electronic --

13 MR. GRASER: Well, they remain in an electronic
14 environment, but what you're talking about -- what we're
15 talking about is, how long do you maintain that? Then that
16 starts to fall under normal federal records dispositioning
17 scheduling. What is this thing? Is this backup material,
18 how are you going to deal with it and so forth. So --
19 the -- once we --

20 MR. SILBERG: What is the normal total and broad
21 time frame for that kind of stuff?

22 MR. GRASER: That sort of stuff is probably on a
23 perhaps a five- or seven-year schedule. I would just treat
24 it as a normal federal record. In some cases it could be
25 three years. The disposition schedule for the archive

1 program is about that thick. It's a fairly substantial and
2 has really fine granularity to it.
3 Once we have information pumped into our licensing
4 data side of the shop, the story that we're telling here
5 with this particular view graph is that the system
6 capability has the ability to do full text search inquiry
7 results, presenting the images and presenting the
8 bibliographic header information. Again, this looks
9 amazingly like the LSS functionality. And that's why when
10 people were talking about the reusability of Infostreams,
11 this is where the map -- this is really where the relevant
12 piece of the LSS functionality is.

13 And in response to Kirk's question from yesterday,
14 you know, well, where do we stand on this? Well, let me
15 finish this first. Again, the -- what we're showing here in
16 terms of output is the flexibility in terms of the types of
17 output. Crank it out to paper. Crank it out to removable
18 media and perhaps use that as a delivery media to move
19 things into a licensing support system. Let's see here --
20 yeah, let me get --

21 MR. SILBERG: That part is up and running now?

22 MR. GRASER: Well, then -- I'll be getting to that.
23 That's really about --

24 MR. SILBERG: Okay, go ahead.

25 MR. GRASER: Two charts downstream. But in

1 response to Kirk's question from yesterday -- well, we'll
2 get that. It's two charts downstream. In terms of the
3 architectural approach we're taking with InfoSTREAMs, this
4 chart wants to emphasize the message that it's modular and
5 it's plug and play. And what that means for non-computer
6 techies, is that there are components of the system that --
7 not without cost, but there's nothing in the system that
8 wraps you up and puts a box around us and tells you you are
9 tied to a single vendor. Okay. So for example, you can go
10 in and look at the text engine that we're using on this, and
11 it's not a proprietary product that is embedded with a
12 certain piece of hardware that -- you know, you're not
13 buying a turnkey system from a single vendor, and that's
14 what this story tells. The text engine, for example, would
15 allow us to take our current basis plus product and
16 determine that there might be a better product, more
17 cost-effective product or newer technology. And we could
18 take the data and put it under a different text search
19 engine and continue to move forward. And again, it's not
20 without cost but it's not an impossibility. We haven't done
21 anything to lock us into single vendor, you know, single
22 vendor reliance. In terms of the architectural aspects,
23 everything we've been doing at InfoSTREAMs is a
24 client-server environment. Client environment is
25 represented by accessing a system through PCs based in

1 people's offices. And the server environment is, if you
2 will, the applications that are resident on a big vax
3 cluster sitting off in a computer center someplace dealing
4 with different sorts of applications within the InfoSTREAMS
5 environment. And again, a number of these have particular
6 relevance to meeting either the LSS input capability or
7 meeting specific things that we're very concerned about in
8 terms of auditability and traceability. The message for
9 this particular chart is that there is interchangeability,
10 interoperability within that architectural environment.
11 Wrong chart. There we go. The -- there is another aspect of the InfoSTREAMS
12 architecture that's fairly important, and it will have
13 importance for the licensing support system as well. It's a
14 piece of software that sits on our vax plus and it's called
15 a storage monitor. And essentially what it does is, it's a
16 setup software that provides mechanism to store a very large
17 number of objects, either images or text files or however
18 whatever you may be using, okay, image file or text file, a
19 database, whatever, the case may be. But in very large
20 volumes, these things, finding out where they're sitting in
21 storage requires some degree of sophistication. And the
22 product that will allow us to do that -- and this is a
23 product that allows us to be scalable from what our
24 InfoSTREAMS requirements is up to the ability to meet LSS

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 reusability. It's all hinging on that storage monitor
2 capability, the fact that it can handle extremely large
3 volumes of pointers to pieces of information scattered out
4 across a computer's memory.

5 The other thing that's important on this
6 particular chart is to recognize the role that we've been
7 playing, the attention we've been giving to establishing an
8 architecture that will allow us to have acceptable
9 performance, especially when you're starting to throw around
10 image files. Image files, very large, they're very -- you
11 know, telecommunication hogs if you will. Takes a long time
12 to squeeze them through a small pipeline. One of the things
13 that we've been focusing on is to make sure that we build in
14 and use that storage manager to identify the location of
15 where documents are sitting and to be able to identify which
16 documents are the most frequently used documents. And doing
17 that allows you to set up caches -- caches -- caches,
18 however you want to pronounce it, both for inputting. And
19 once you have started to use a document to start doing
20 retrieval process, wherever optical mediums may be stored,
21 and we have a distributed environment. We have optical
22 stores in Washington, we have them here, off in Las Vegas.
23 When a user starts to actively use a certain document
24 collection, if that document is being frequently called up,
25 instead of putting it all the way back the system will hold

1 it in ready -- kind of ready reserve. And typically what
2 that means is the first time you call a document up it may
3 take 18 seconds to get the image back on the screen. Second
4 time you call that document up you'll get it in two seconds.
5 That capability of that software to do that, that's a
6 performance issue as well, not just in terms of keeping
7 track of things in extremely large numbers, but also to make
8 sure that you get credible performance. Now for all the previous LSS presentations on what
9 we've been doing with InfoSTREAMS, those of you who have
10 heard Barbara's presentation should be fairly familiar with
11 this. Increment one was establishing standard office
12 automation suite, doing development and testing of the
13 capability to do electronic routing and review and to
14 establish standard e-mail and groupware suites that would be
15 used at least within the program. Increment two, and this
16 is the one that's in testing right now and we're getting
17 ready to do deployment of this functionality, was originally
18 intended to have a user interface shell that would make it
19 essentially very easy for somebody to flip through different
20 applications during creating a document package. They could
21 use Lotus and Word Perfect and whatever the case may be and
22 just basically be flipping in and out of applications
23 packages without having to exit one package and go into
24 another. It included the concept of pre-indexing, back into

1 optical storage, integration of document and review process
2 and back in storage and so forth, kind of laying the
3 foundation for records management activities.

4 Increment three was looking at automated records
5 indexing, relevancy review, retention, validation in terms
6 of RIDS dispositioning, depending on the content of the
7 document, was going to merge our internal records management
8 system with the new InfoSTREAMS data management structures.

9 And increment four was basically going to
10 image-enable that whole process so that the users would have
11 the opportunity to use imaging at their choice in
12 applications where they felt it would be helpful to them.

13 We are wrapping up increment two as I said, and
14 the most recent development that I can say is that we
15 recognized during increment two that there were pieces of
16 this functionality here that we had to have. We couldn't
17 wait for another year or another year-and-a-half for these
18 sorts of functionalities. So in the last six months of this
19 year we've been working on a plan that by the end of this
20 year what we have at the end of increment 2.0 is also going
21 to include operational demonstration capability for CD-Rom
22 input, file transfer input, paper input, transfers and
23 collection of material from our other sites and locations
24 and loading them into this LVMS which has, for all intents
25 and purposes, the LSS functionality. And that's why when

1 Kirk asked the question yesterday, you know, the back end of
2 this system still doesn't have optical and where's the text
3 retrieval; what we've done is we've juiced up the whole
4 process. It's not going to be totally operational, but it
5 is going to be the equivalent of a demonstration test of all
6 of those key functional capabilities for the LSS. Starting
7 next fiscal year we're going to be taking that and moving it
8 in, you know, out of that testing mode into, okay, let's
9 make it production now. And that will not be an overnight
10 drill, but I would say that, you know, probably by the end
11 of the year all of the elements that we would be using for
12 LSS would be reusable for LSS. We are going to be able to,
13 you know, operationally demonstrate those capabilities
14 within InfoSTREAMs.

15 So what essentially we have done, the analogy was
16 like building a ship. We've kind of taken some of these
17 pieces from here and included them in building the hull.
18 And what we have is the hull has been launched and it's
19 going down the ramp. The next row would be to do
20 superstructure-type types of activities and these will
21 represent those superstructure type of activities now that
22 the hull work is completed right down here. This hull work
23 represents the architecture.
24 So that's essentially where we stand with the
25 InfoSTREAMs development right now. We have that front end

1 suite. We have that office automation, the document
2 creation, the tracking, routing, concurrence capability,
3 although it is not, you know, it is not available to
4 participants outside of our program, DOE participants. But
5 in terms of recognizing the need to get these types of
6 capabilities out onto the street, we're fast-tracking some
7 of these aspects right here. And these are not low-hanging
8 fruit, these are in fact very critical capabilities for the
9 LSS.

10 That's essentially where we stand. Anybody has
11 any questions --

12 MR. MURPHY: Your satellite LDEMS, if I understand
13 it correctly, are your DOE contractors, for example?

14 MR. GRASER: Right.

15 MR. MURPHY: GS.

16 MR. GRASER: Well --

17 MR. MURPHY: Livermore, Los Alamos.

18 MR. GRASER: I would say that it's probably right
19 now fair to characterize the three vax installations that we
20 have and the document -- the central records facilities, and
21 we have a number of the central records facilities. We have
22 one in Dunloring, you know, we have another one out here in
23 Las Vegas. We have a quality records center down in the
24 Forrestal building. Those are the environments where we can
25 say in those vax environments we're going to be having these

1 technologies plugged in, the optical environment, the
2 document cataloging capability. In terms of the participant
3 organizations from the Yucca Mountain activity, for example
4 the Sandias, Los Alamos and so forth, we are still working
5 through the technical implementation, but we -- you know,
6 we're on the verge of putting out the initial intake and
7 cataloging of that material. And then passing that along to
8 have the remainder of the processing done in a centralized
9 location so that at least the initial up-front capture of
10 the document and the cataloging would be done down at that
11 level out there.

12 Will those people have CD-ROM output capabilities?

13 Yes, indeed. Some of them already do. And that's why we're
14 working on getting that CD-ROM as an input medium.

15 Will they have the ability to send us bitmap
16 images? Yes, indeed. Some of those people already have
17 very robust, mature document-scanning. You know, they can
18 scan documents in, give bitmap images and deliver images and
19 headers to us on a CD-ROM already. And that's why we were
20 recognizing these guys want to do it. So whether or not
21 they would have a local data store, and I think that's the
22 key that I'm kind of wavering about, whether they would have
23 a local data store with the full text retrieval capability
24 and all the rest of that, that's something we're still
25 working on the technical implementation of that.

1 We were hoping to have that wrapped this year. We
2 came into some issues over the telecommunications network
3 needed to support some of that approach that we were taking.
4 So we're reevaluating that right now. I expect that that is
5 probably going to have at least closure on the strategy
6 within the next couple of months and probably some direction
7 at that point in terms of how we're actually going to
8 implement it. So, it's the technical implementation. Some
9 of the details are still up in the air.

10 MR. MURPHY: Yeah. This has to do with the FDC
11 discussion I want to bring up later on, of course. But we
12 will, I take it then, you're saying be able, at some point
13 in time, to set up at our LSS -- sit down at our LSS
14 consoles and call up technical information that Lawrence
15 Livermore has generated with respect to the engineered
16 barrier system, just like we can call up --

17 MR. GRASER: Well, if it is --

18 MR. MURPHY: That's what the LSS is supposed to --

19 MR. GRASER: If it is LSS-relevant --

20 MR. MURPHY: Oh yeah.

21 MR. GRASER: -- that material is going to end up
22 on one of the three central vax clusters. If it is
23 LSS-relevant, it's going to come into that domain.

24 MR. MURPHY: Well, let's just assume that
25 everything they do with respect to the EBS, the engineered

1 barrier system is LSS-relevant.

2 MR. GRASER: Right. So you won't have to --

3 MR. MURPHY: We'd be able to find it in --

4 MR. GRASER: Right.

5 MR. BECHTEL: Dan, I'd like to introduce Sally
6 Larimore of Clark County staff. She's the system engineers
7 on staff and she's got several questions.

8 MR. GRASER: Okay.

9 MS. LARIMORE: Hi. I was at the October meeting
10 and a lot of my comments are kind of picking up from there
11 and also addressing your slides from today. We've been
12 asked to consider InfoSTREAMS as the engine for our system,
13 our licensing support system, but we have some concerns.
14 It's still a bit of a black box to us. In particular, it
15 sounds like functionally there's a lot of equivalency in
16 terms of the requirements. However, we haven't yet received
17 the detail requirements such that we can be sure that beyond
18 the surface similarities such as text input, text retrieval,
19 text output, and so forth that things such as throughput and
20 simultaneous access, and access to the system from various
21 platforms, will be achieved. So at the last meeting I asked
22 for that sort of information, particularly in the context of
23 the suggested rule change that would eliminate the modem
24 access and supplant that with a DOE backbone-type of access,
25 and we still haven't received a response from that October

1 meeting.

2 Our concern is that there could be indeed during
3 the licensing phase with so many different users needing to
4 access large volumes of data, indeed these text files could
5 be extremely large, that there could be performance problems
6 that could indeed seriously impeded timely discovery process
7 for some of the potential litigants. So I would like to get
8 some information. I think other members of the LSSARP would
9 like to know what your performance budget is in terms of
10 timing, throughput, what sort of studies that you're doing
11 to look at that, and if possible, to have that information
12 disclosed to us so that we can decide whether the
13 performance characteristics of the system will meet our need
14 for timely access, and that indeed all the potential
15 litigants will have access to the system without large
16 expenditures of money to buy compatible hardware. We need
17 to know what operating system you're going to be using.
18 This is an OSF1. Is it the LS? What communications
19 protocol and transports you're going to be using and so
20 forth, and all of that information hasn't been available to
21 date.

22 MR. GRASER: Let me just clarify, which system are
23 you really talking about? Are you talking about
24 InfoSTREAMs?

25 MS. LARIMORE: I'm talking about InfoSTREAMs.

1 MR. GRASER: "You having access to InfoSTREAMs?"

2 MS. LARIMORE: "If InfoSTREAMs is being used as the
3 LSS architecture --"

4 MR. GRASER: "It's under consideration."

5 MS. LARIMORE: "Right. And in order for us to
6 consider it as a viable candidate for our adoption as LSS,
7 we have to understand what the system is. And right now
8 we've seen a high-level, very coarse representation of the
9 system performance parameters and requirements. And they're
10 probably very good for your internal use, but what's not
11 clear to us is that it's going to meet the requirements of
12 this group."

13 MR. GRASER: "I guess I'll have to ask John how you
14 prefer to handle that. The information you are asking for
15 is not the sort of thing that you're going to get in a
16 half-an-hour briefing or maybe even a half-a-day briefing.
17 The InfoSTREAMs architecture and -- if InfoSTREAMs were used
18 as a foundation, if option three were in fact the foundation
19 for LSS, you know, you're --"

20 MR. MURPHY: "Option four."

21 MR. GRASER: "Option four?"

22 MR. CAMERON: "With InfoSTREAMs as the foundation."

23 MR. MURPHY: "There you go."

24 MR. CAMERON: "Option four."

25 MR. GRASER: "If -- you know, if in fact you want

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Court Reporters

1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 that level of information as to how -- you know, how would
2 this look in a much larger scale enterprise environment and
3 talk about performance issues and backbone and hardware and
4 software, we're probably talking probably one or two days.
5 And, you know, if you really want to get into the down and
6 dirty, you know, it is entirely appropriate that you be, you
7 know, an ADP expert.

8 MR. CAMERON: Well, I have a --

9 MR. GRASER: Professional anyhow.

10 MS. LARIMORE: -- I have a masters degree in
11 software engineering, so I think I could probably --

12 MR. GRASER: Right. I'm -- yeah. That's -- and
13 I'm not questioning that. I'm just saying --

14 MS. LARIMORE: -- follow it.

15 MR. GRASER: -- that if you want to get down into
16 that level, it takes that level of a person. If you're --

17 MS. LARIMORE: Right. Those are the nature of my
18 questions.

19 MR. GRASER: Okay. Right. Sure.

20 MS. LARIMORE: And also I imagine that you're
21 following some standard development methodology, perhaps
22 even an analog to DOD standard 2167A and 1521B, which would
23 be that you have some series of standard design reviews,
24 requirement reviews and so forth, and audits. And we would
25 like to have access to your critical design review

1 materials, if you have those available for all increments.

2 MR. GRASER: Well, again, you know, InfoSTREAMS

3 development has been going on since 1991. If you really

4 want to have access to it, there's about probably 21,000

5 pages of that documentation, because InfoSTREAMS is

6 developed as a Department of Energy internal records

7 management system, you know. We're doing a design based on

8 our requirements.

9 MS. LARIMORE: Right. That's exactly the nature

10 of our concern.

11 MR. GRASER: And in terms of the reusability and

12 those pieces of the InfoSTREAMS development that are

13 potentially reusable, there's a lot of documentation.

14 MR. SILBERG: Could I make a suggestion? It seems

15 to me that maybe there are a series of discrete questions

16 which if you can give to Dan in writing, write him a letter

17 and you can answer them in writing or if that's -- if you

18 can't answer them in writing, set up a tutorial and whoever

19 around this table wants to come --

20 MR. GRASER: Right.

21 MR. SILBERG: -- can come and whoever like --

22 MR. GRASER: Right.

23 MR. SILBERG: -- myself doesn't understand any of

24 these discussions --

25 MR. METTAM: Let me build on that a little,

1 because I think we're close to the same point. How external
2 parties can use and how they look at the system that you're
3 developing, I think is a very important issue, and my
4 suggestion was going to be, let's send her to you. I mean,
5 if you want to submit it in writing first that's fine, but
6 then she could translate it into English for those of us who
7 don't, you know, who don't follow the technical jargon. I
8 think an outside look at how an external organization would
9 react to the LSS components of InfoSTREAMs, and certainly
10 there are parts of InfoSTREAMs that will sluff off in the
11 process, and we don't really need to be concerned about
12 those. But the other portions, the portions that
13 conceivably will convert into an LSS system, might benefit
14 from an external look-at.

15 MR. CAMERON: Yeah. I think at some point
16 obviously we're going to have to take a look at layout, what
17 the LSS requirements are and see how InfoSTREAMs meets those
18 functionalities. And for most of us that could be done on a
19 very high level, but of course there needs to be the details
20 for people to evaluate that. But if we do something, if the
21 panel decides to do something like that, I think it should
22 be done in a systematic way so that there's not just a
23 series of, not random questions, but questions of -- that
24 you have concerns about, but it's undertaken systematically.

25 MR. GRASER: Right. I think what I was getting at

1 is, if you're really interested in the details of the
2 architecture and performance and all the rest of that,
3 that's not the sort of thing that's a snapshot drill, you
4 know, that's going to be -- it's going to require people who
5 really know their stuff and a commitment of an amount of
6 time to sit down and wade through it because it's a fairly
7 complex system architecture.

8 MR. SILBERG: Well, Chip, if you're worried about
9 a series of these kind of requests coming in seriatim, let
10 me suggest that any participant who has questions now funnel
11 them through John. John will pull them all together --

12 MR. GRASER: Well, either that or if the
13 participants who have a particular interest, let's identify
14 and get everybody together. And if we're going to do it
15 then we will do it, you know, in a form, in a time frame
16 that will be acceptable to people rather than one at a time.

17 MR. BECHTEL: Well, perhaps --

18 MR. CAMERON: What I would suggest is that maybe
19 the panel appoint a subcommittee of some of the --

20 MR. GRASER: ADP --

21 MR. CAMERON: -- the ADP people to maybe lay out a
22 comparative chart and then come in and talk to you and then
23 maybe give a report back to the full panel.

24 MR. GRASER: Sure so Dr. --

25 MR. CAMERON: But I think it should be more of

1 than -- I think that there's two or three at least that have
2 this capability to --

3 MR. GRASER: Right. I understand that.

4 MR. CAMERON: -- understand this.

5 MR. GRASER: And I think if it's going to be done
6 under the auspices of the ARP, then you probably ought to
7 treat it the same way we treat the header, the header
8 working group and that -- if somebody wants to come in --

9 MR. CAMERON: I think that's a good idea.

10 MR. GRASER: -- and take a focused look at
11 something, then let us do it in an established way.

12 MR. BECHTEL: Maybe this would lend itself to the
13 establishment of just another subcommittee. And perhaps
14 Sally can just write down her concerns. We had made a
15 request for a in-depth meeting after the last meeting, but
16 we thought we would wait and see -- you know, just get back
17 to the panel again. So maybe that would be one item we
18 could --

19 MS. LARIMORE: Yeah. My questions are related to
20 issues that have been brought up over the last day and a
21 half. Too, we've been asked to consider InfoSTREAMs because
22 it potentially offers us tremendous cost savings. However,
23 it's not a cost savings if it truly doesn't meet our
24 requirements, and we find out that when we get the system we
25 have to reengineer it so that it can do the -- meet the

1 performance requirements that we have and so forth. So it
2 could indeed be excellent for internal use within the DOE
3 because it was designed to your requirements and it's
4 tailored to your needs, but require so much reworking,
5 though it's modular, still having to reengineer the modules
6 that it would be not as effective as building our own.
7 The other thing that's related to it is a concern
8 that was brought up in the presentation on LSSA yesterday,
9 in that in talking about the audit program there were
10 statements made on charts on page 3, 4, 5, figure 3, page 28
11 of Mr. Drapkin's presentation in which they indicated that
12 the NRC would -- or the LSSA would make periodic audits of
13 the DOE LSS development. Well, this system's been ongoing
14 since June of '91. Have there been any audits to date?
15 Also in that same presentation on page 27, chart
16 27, the fourth bullet's contradicted all those statements
17 and said no actual auditing of DOE's activities until
18 implementation and design. Well, those of us who have been
19 in engineering disciplines with this software or any other
20 know that once you implement a design, it's far more costly
21 at that point in the development cycle to make a change than
22 it is during the requirements and design process. So I'd
23 like to, I guess, address this question to LSSA's
24 administrator and also the NRC, are you providing oversight
25 into the development or not?

1 MR. CAMERON: At this point, no. We are just in
2 the process of developing the audit program. The idea of
3 using InfoSTREAMs for the LSS is fairly new and we haven't.
4 But we have to. The LSSA has to certify that it does meet
5 the requirements. And I agree with you that it's very tough
6 after the system is -- has already been developed for a
7 certain period of time to go in and audit it and say, well,
8 this doesn't meet the requirements and you have to change
9 it, but that's what we'll have to do.

10 MS. LARIMORE: Well, see, that is another cost
11 impact potential because then at that point, of course, DOE
12 has developed their system and their contractor has met
13 those requirements for that system. But we're saying now
14 you don't meet our requirements and now we run the risk of
15 having a variant system. We have one that's the original
16 InfoSTREAMs and one that's the adjusted InfoSTREAMs system
17 to meet the problems that we've identified after the fact.

18 MR. CAMERON: Can I make a clarification here, and
19 Moe, correct me if I'm wrong on this, but I'd just like to
20 make a distinction between in audits and the LSSA's
21 consultation function basically. As I understood how the
22 design aspect of this was going to work that it wouldn't
23 necessarily be a "audit," but that the LSS administrators
24 people would be involved with Dan in the development of
25 InfoSTREAMs on the design. I think that there's an

1 important difference between consultation and audit in terms
2 of resources and some other things, but I think that your
3 concerns are valid and would be met by this consultation
4 aspect.

5 MR. DRAPKIN: Well, since this idea arose several
6 years ago, one of the things that I personally having been
7 doing and I know other people, has been to work with Dan's
8 group to see how good a fit this could be. So it's not as
9 if we're coming in cold all of a sudden, let us take a look
10 at a design that's two years old or three years old or four
11 years old. It's just not -- that's just not a clear picture
12 or an accurate picture of how things are going.

13 Furthermore my understanding, and Dan can correct
14 me if I'm wrong, is that he, from the beginning, knew that
15 he had to feed the LSS, including the original design. So
16 he designed it to his system, all of those capabilities or
17 capture capabilities that the LSS would need. And you
18 should also realize that most of the information in the LSS
19 comes from DOE. So it's not quite so far away as the
20 picture you're painting. I agree we need to take a look at
21 it, but it's not something that hasn't been thought of or
22 looked at before.

23 MS. LARIMORE: Well, I didn't want to indicate
24 that, but I don't believe that we're aware of the level of
25 insight that the LSS has and we certainly don't have the

1 same level of insight.

2 As far as "audit," the term "audit" was used in
3 the presentation that talked about the auditing capabilities
4 and the word "audit" was used four times in that
5 presentation, in those citations I just mentioned. So we
6 need to define our vocabulary then, because that's entirely
7 misleading.

8 The other thing I'm concerned about, I agree the
9 InfoSTREAMS -- this will be my final point. I realize all
10 the members want to get into these details. But the
11 InfoSTREAMS being a driver, certainly I agree, DOE will have
12 the preponderance of data that will be going into the
13 system. However, the environment that we just saw depicted
14 in these view graphs showing the author creating the
15 document and so forth, didn't seem to indicate any
16 timeliness requirement. So I imagine it's looking at a
17 normal operational office type of environment, and I was
18 concerned about simultaneous access to documents in a very
19 short critical time frame for all litigants to have fair and
20 free and equal access at the same time. You're looking at
21 authors working on documents at different times and so
22 forth. So those assumptions aren't the same, I imagine,
23 that DOE made in making their internal system to create
24 documents and track them as they are in terms of the LSS in
25 needing to have as close to near real time access to the

1 information as we can for all participants at the same time.

2 MR. MURPHY: You mean access to the information as
3 it's being generated?

4 MS. LARIMORE: No, as it is put into the LSS. So
5 once a document's inducted, I think the environment in which
6 the access of that document occurs is a more time-driven and
7 critical environment than the environment in which the
8 document was drafted.

9 MR. MURPHY: Well, 90 percent of the information
10 we're going to be interested in in licensing in the LSS will
11 have been generated some years -- and theoretically
12 implemented into the system -- some years prior to that.

13 MS. LARIMORE: Oh no, I -- once a document's
14 there, it's the latency in the system for you to get it at
15 the same time that another potential litigant would want to
16 access and retrieve that data. So imagine all these
17 different people dialed in at the same time.

18 MR. MURPHY: Everybody asking for the same
19 document. Okay.

20 MS. LARIMORE: That was the last of my comments.

21 MR. HOYLE: Did you have anything further?

22 MR. CAMERON: I just would say as a general
23 statement that we've been trying to figure out how we're
24 going to proceed with the LSS. And I think that now that we
25 perhaps have the management budget responsibility, the major

1 things perhaps worked out, that we have to lay out some of
2 the other interfaces that are going to happen between the
3 LSS administrator and DOE on design, development, et cetera.
4 And I think we can proceed to -- we should proceed to do
5 that.

6 MR. ARNOLD: I think probably the working group is
7 a good idea for pursuing this, because I agree with what you
8 say, we have to lay out the parameters for the system and
9 model it to make sure the system meets the parameters. And
10 to my understanding or to my knowledge those parameters have
11 not been defined yet. So I agree.

12 And as far as the word "audit," you're right, we
13 have to take a look at that. Maybe auditing wasn't the
14 correct word. Maybe it was a certification-type process,
15 certifying that the system meets -- can satisfy those
16 parameters. So the wording, we'll look at the wording.

17 MR. GRASER: Yeah. If -- in terms of the
18 licensing support system, the functional requirements in
19 terms of performance response time, types of access, all of
20 those issues, there has been documented and it's been
21 generally made available to people who have been around the
22 ARP for quite some time that from the LSS prototype and the
23 design work that was completed in 1990, there is a document
24 that's about yea-thick with the LSS requirements, functional
25 requirements. And, you know, so in fact the parameters, a

1 lot of the parameters of system performance, they are well
2 documented --

3 MR. ARNOLD: As far as simultaneous access?

4 MR. GRASER: Yes. Numbers of users, expected
5 response time and everything.

6 MR. HOYLE: Was that the SAIC work?

7 MR. GRASER: Yes. Yes. And that's only about
8 3,000 pages of documentation. But, you know, the particular
9 reports from a requirements perspective, we have a single
10 documentation that pulled the result of that three-year
11 project all together and we could certainly make that
12 available to you as well.

13 MS. LARIMORE: All right.

14 MR. GRASER: And that's --

15 MR. ARNOLD: That might be the basis for this
16 starting off this working group to start reviewing that.

17 MR. GRASER: Well sure. I mean you might want to
18 revalidate or get some education on how we came to define
19 those functional requirements, but it's well-documented and
20 it is available and we made it available to a number of
21 people. There's no problem giving any of that out.

22 MR. HOYLE: All right. Let me ask each of the
23 participants to let me know whether they want to participate
24 on this working group called technical working group or
25 something of that nature, and we'll set that up and get that

1 rolling. Do you have anything else?

2 MS. LARIMORE: No, thank you.

3 MR. HOYLE: Sally, thank you very much. It's
4 9:30. Why don't we give Kirk an opportunity to talk about
5 the work of the header subgroup?

6 MR. BALCOM: Well, I'm embarrassed to say that at
7 8:30 when the meeting started I was lollygagging around the
8 coffee shop thinking the meeting started at 9:00. So I'm
9 really sorry I missed your presentation, Dan. I'd like to
10 catch up with it. Maybe we could stay after.

11 MR. GRASER: For you I'll do it.

12 MR. BALCOM: Okay. Because it really looks --
13 we've come an awful long way on the implementation of some
14 of the concepts here in the last four or five years. I have
15 a handout. I'll have ten copies. Consists of two parts.
16 One is the -- well, let me tell you what this is all about
17 first. The header working group was constituted four years
18 ago to arrive at some consensus about how we would catalog
19 and index all the documents that will be coming in, based on
20 the theory that we would look for a multitude of ways to do
21 retrieval, one which is full text retrieval, that not being
22 good enough, to also have a rather elaborate cataloging and
23 indexing scheme so everybody could kind of put together
24 their own ideas about how they wanted to retrieve and
25 organize the materials. And the second of two handouts is

1 the old four-year-old historical representation of what the
2 header working group recommended and what this panel adopted
3 in, I think, 1990. I'll hand both of these out. The top
4 handout will be what we've just done recently. We met in
5 February. Representatives of of course the state of Nevada,
6 Department of Energy and their consultants, TRW. TRW did a
7 lot of work in putting together the most recent way that we
8 were going to show that these fields have been added to and
9 modified as changed. We had Nuclear Regulatory Commission
10 and their consultant, Labat-Anderson. Donna Minella, who
11 has a long history in preparing this, was there as a
12 representative of the Department of Energy. Clark County
13 sent us a series of materials by fax and we tried to take
14 all of this into account when we took a new look at this.
15 So what we've come up with is a list that's in
16 this first packet here, which has a series of numbers on the
17 front. Those are almost like footnotes or annotations as to
18 new fields and changes and modifications. If you get in on
19 page 4, there's a series of definitions. We made some minor
20 definitional changes. As the approach for the system has
21 changed somewhat in that our original concept was to have
22 capture stations and it was -- at that point it was intended
23 that an enormous amount of work in terms of doing -- trying
24 to make these fields accurate would be done there. Now a
25 lot of that burden has been shifted to the actual

1 participant submitters. And then we have a series of charts
2 represented by these boxes. In the first field we have in
3 the first set of boxes on the lefthand side we have the
4 original field names. And in some cases there will be an
5 asterisk in that field. That means that there is some new
6 material that's been -- that was suggested and, you know, of
7 course the header working group went over that in some
8 detail and we waived the merits and the pros and cons of
9 whether to include those fields and how they should work and
10 what they should be called and then arrive at consensus. So
11 this really is a full-consensus document at this point of
12 all of those representatives.

13 The second collection of fields says -- or names
14 -- says "LSS InfoSTREAMs field name." In other words, as
15 InfoSTREAMs was being developed it -- they were doing --
16 organizing their material in a similar fashion to the old
17 LSS design. And the goal of our working group was to meld
18 those and combine those together so that the LSS would be
19 able to take advantage of InfoSTREAMs technology and
20 actually some moves in technology. As we're moving now to
21 having more imaging at the Department of Energy and, you
22 know, the way the computer business is -- the direction in
23 which it's heading, you're going to see sound, simply a
24 piece of media, and film as a piece of media and -- or an
25 image. And so we're trying to incorporate all these new

1 concepts into what would ultimately be available and not
2 just stick to the printed page. So some of these changes
3 represent that. Now we can go over this field by field if
4 you'd like. Bear in mind that the working group has already
5 done that, or you can simply look at it and ask questions
6 and I leave it up to you as to how you want to proceed from
7 here.

8 MR. SILBERG: Would the difference -- you've
9 written in "mandatory" some places where it says "required."

10 MR. BALCOM: Right. The "mandatory" -- we had a
11 fairly lengthy, probably too long discussion about what
12 "mandatory" means. "Mandatory," a field that -- information
13 that is submitted by the participant which is this third
14 column over, we wrestled with whether information must be
15 submitted by the participant, and let's find an example in
16 here. And -- well, the number -- that doesn't make much
17 sense. Let's talk about the document date on page 6. "Data
18 submitted by participant, document date mandatory." If
19 there's no date on the document, for example, that's
20 apparent by looking at it, the participant must make a date
21 up, and that sounds a little strange. But what we're
22 suggesting is that you attempt to date some of these
23 documents and that if you can't date it at all, we'll have
24 some artificial scheme which will say, you know, a bunch of
25 zeroes or nines or something like that that will say that we

1 indeed don't -- can't figure out what the date for this is,
2 but that some data must go in this field, and we spent a
3 fair amount of time wrestling with this. So "mandatory"
4 means that some data must appear in this field, even if it
5 fits with some artificial scheme of some sort. And those
6 will be laid out in rules and guidelines which are yet to
7 come. We specifically didn't try and deal with that.

8 MR. BECHTEL: So there would be some notation,
9 though, that that would be an estimated date if you're --

10 MR. BALCOM: Yes.

11 MR. BECHTEL: -- actually inputting.

12 MR. BALCOM: Right. In "Document Date," for,
13 example it says "Document Date Flag," and over in the
14 comments on the righthand side indicates an estimated date.

15 MR. SILBERG: "Required" means it could be
16 estimated, "mandatory" means it has to be from the original
17 document?

18 MR. BALCOM: "Required," let me read the
19 definition on page 4. Okay. "Data submitted by
20 participant, mandatory, must be provided from each unit or
21 record; required, must be provided as applicable, optional,
22 provided at the discretion of the participant." So this is
23 a way to ensure that the onus is on the participant to
24 complete these materials.

25 MR. HOYLE: I'm prepared to accept the

1 recommendation for a subgroup. Are others prepared to do
2 that?

3 MR. BECHTEL: I haven't seen this. We just got
4 it.

5 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Maybe we should put that on
6 the --

7 MR. BECHTEL: I don't see any reason --

8 MR. HOYLE: -- agenda for the next meeting.

9 MR. SILBERG: I don't see any reason why we would
10 have a problem with it if everyone agrees with it but we
11 haven't looked at it.

12 MR. BALCOM: It's a bit of a moving target too.
13 At the end you'll see some fields that are about auditing
14 and housekeeping. That's intended to give us some room to
15 grow in the future.

16 MR. SILBERG: I assume NRC and DOE both believe
17 that this is eminently workable and if that's the case, I
18 certainly don't have a problem with it.

19 MR. HOYLE: I'm assuming that too, from the
20 standpoint of our participation with the group.

21 MR. BECHTEL: The document has been responsive to
22 Clark County's comments, so I think we find it acceptable.

23 MR. SILBERG: If it's okay with NRC and DOE, it's
24 okay with us.

25 MR. DRAPKIN: It's clear that the document is not,

1 however, complete. There are additions that have yet to be
2 made.

3 MR. BALCOM: So this represents where we are in
4 early 1994, and we fully expect that there will be
5 additional modifications.

6 MR. HOYLE: Let's leave it that we find no
7 objection or reason to change what's here. We'll talk about
8 it again at the next meeting to see if any additional
9 additions have been made by that time. The subgroup is
10 continuing in existence, and do you have a meeting date
11 planned for your next get together?

12 MR. BALCOM: No, no, we don't. We really want to
13 kind of see what needs to be done and see what comes up
14 that's new. And I think it takes some time for that to
15 happen. But we really have at this point no need to meet
16 again right now.

17 MR. SILBERG: What time does DOE start using this,
18 or are they using the earlier version of it? And what do
19 they do about stuff for which they've created headers under
20 prior direction?

21 MR. GRASER: We're already using an even larger
22 set, a super set, a much larger set than what you see here
23 for our own -- what we're calling our IRIS system, the
24 interim RIS system. The interim RIS header structure has,
25 you know, tracking right into this header structure all of

1 of the materials that we have, and we've got about a half a
2 million pages of material. In the current records
3 information system we have a header record and a microfilm
4 location for those documents. So we don't have -- you know,
5 we don't have full text for those materials. And the header
6 structure under the old records system doesn't reflect a lot
7 of this. In order to identify which of those old materials
8 need to go into the LSS, we have to look at them from a
9 screening perspective. We have information that is in that
10 record system that the cataloging needs to be enhanced to
11 bring it up to these standards. And if it is LSS-bound then
12 I need to get my text and so forth. So what we're going to
13 be doing is eventually having to be engaged in a rescreening
14 effort, and start decrementing our old system, identifying
15 the ones that need to go into the licensing support system
16 and put them into this new structure, get the headers, get
17 the text, get the images if they're LSS-bound. So we
18 recognize that there is a backfit drill that has to be done
19 and right now it's on a volume of about a half a million
20 records.

21 MR. SILBERG: Well, it seems to me very important
22 that in each step that there's an LSS header. You're on an
23 on-line basis generating documents. Those two need to be
24 brought together, otherwise we're going to be going through
25 a lot of wasted effort down the road.

1 MR. GRASER: The header structure that we have for
2 our federal records, you know, there are additional federal
3 records fields that we have in our own system requirement
4 that are not an LSS type requirement. But the
5 synchronization between the fields in InfoSTREAMs, the
6 interim RIS system and the licensing support system, we've
7 been keeping track and having those synchronized. We want
8 to avoid having to double-process those documents, believe
9 me.

10 MR. BECHTEL: Perhaps one additional task for the
11 subcommittee may be the -- considering the end user and how
12 to get the end user involved, maybe the planning stages of
13 that, yeah, the interface between the system and the end
14 user.

15 MR. BALCOM: Say that again. I'm not sure I
16 understood what the question is.

17 MR. BECHTEL: Perhaps the subcommittee now could
18 get involved with just beginning to think about an interface
19 between the end user and the system itself and --

20 MR. HOYLE: This would be the new subcommittee
21 we've talked about not --

22 MR. BECHTEL: No, no, no.

23 MR. HOYLE: Oh, the header --

24 MR. BECHTEL: Just the existing header
25 subcommittee.

1 MR. BALCOM: Well, yeah. I don't think we were
2 asked to do that but --

3 MR. GRASER: That's more of a systems
4 consideration, I think, than a header records structure
5 consideration, and if we're -- you know, if indeed we're
6 going to have a subcommittee on the technology aspects of
7 it, I think that's --

8 MR. BECHTEL: More appropriate to --

9 MR. GRASER: -- a better form for it. Sure.

10 MR. BECHTEL: Okay. That's fine.

11 MR. BALCOM: Some of the same people would
12 probably be on that anyway.

13 MR. HOYLE: Jay, following up on your line of
14 questioning there, do you think this committee should be
15 recommending to DOE specifically that it endorse and use the
16 headers that we have endorsed here?

17 MR. SILBERG: Well, it sounds like they're doing
18 that already.

19 MR. HOYLE: It sounds like they're doing it, but
20 do we -- maybe we should make a statement that we understand
21 that you are doing that in a letter.

22 MR. GRASER: You're welcome to write a letter. If
23 we're already doing it, it seems kind of superfluous but --

24 MR. HOYLE: Okay.

25 MR. GRASER: No.

1 MR. HOYLE: I'll put it in the record.

2 MR. SILBERG: Or you can just put it in your next
3 quarterly report, or however often the LSS reports come out,
4 on the next --

5 MR. HOYLE: Well, I'll put out a scenario of this
6 meeting and it will be included in there. Any more -- all
7 right. It's a little bit before 10:00. Should we take a
8 very quick break and then listen to Mal?

9 [Recess.]

10 MR. HOYLE: Okay. The panel's final presentation
11 on our agenda for this meeting is a discussion lead off by
12 Mal on the use of the LSS on a pilot project basis. He sent
13 me a letter of March the 30th on this subject and sent that
14 to other committee members. And I have some extra copies
15 here if a committee member needs one.

16 MR. METTAM: I've got some extras for you as well.

17 MR. HOYLE: Okay. So Mal, why don't you go ahead.

18 MR. MURPHY: Yeah. As John said, I wrote him a
19 letter on the 30th of March and the other members of the
20 panel should have received a copy. If not, we've got some
21 extra ones. Suggesting that we at least take a look at the
22 possibility of getting the LSS, and I think -- I did this on
23 the assumption that InfoSTREAMS would -- that we would
24 conclude that InfoSTREAMS was an appropriate vehicle for
25 developing the LSS, because if not, we had to build a new

1 system. I don't think this would probably be possible. But
2 at least take a strong look at the possibility of getting an
3 LSS system to that -- such a point the user on a pilot
4 project basis to -- was a learning experience and sort of
5 debut the system, trying to use it in the multi-purpose
6 canister certification proceedings that will be coming up in
7 the near future. And I cited 10CFR part 71. I think it's
8 actually -- DOE's actually going to have to ask for
9 certification under both 71 and 72, part 71 applying to
10 transportation and part 72 storage.
11 So that was an inadvertent error in the letter.
12 But that will not be -- those of you who are aware of NRC
13 proceedings, that will not be a licensing proceeding in the
14 same sense that the repository licensing proceedings will
15 be. It won't be a contested case hearing necessarily or any
16 of those things. It will be a much more simplified process,
17 but it seems to me in thinking about it that it might give
18 us an opportunity in a real regulatory context, not just in
19 you know, in talking about it, to use the system in a way
20 that would -- that wouldn't -- you know, that any errors or
21 bugs that we found in the system wouldn't impact -- wouldn't
22 affect negatively the certification process, wouldn't slow
23 it down or stop it for two years or anything like that. And
24 yet it would give us the opportunity to use the system in a
25 regulatory arena in a way which would be both beneficial to

1 us, help us be more effective in the certification process,
2 as well as allow us all to kind of perfect the LSS well in
3 advance of the actual repository licensing process.

4 Now as far as the timing is concerned, the last we
5 all heard, those of us who pay attention to the whole
6 program, is that the -- as many of you are aware, the
7 department has determined that they won't -- they're going
8 to go with a multi-purpose canister. Dreyfus has directed,
9 I guess the secretary has directed the program to seek
10 certification of the MPC under both part 71 and 72 and as I
11 understand it, postpone the decision about how they're going
12 to -- they will use the MPC in the ultimate repository if
13 it's ever built, until later, at least until after
14 certification is received. But it's our understanding that
15 they want -- the department wants to receive certification
16 for these MPCs in time to use them to start receiving spent
17 fuel from utilities by the 1998 date. So I'm not sure. I
18 think we've seen dates, as I recall. I should've brought
19 the MPC. I should've brought the MPC material I had with
20 me, but it seems to me that I recall they would have to ask
21 for certification sometime -- from the NRC sometime in the
22 1996 time frame, and receive that certification in '97 in
23 order to construct enough of these things to start receiving
24 spent fuel, taking title from spent fuel, from utilities at
25 reactor sites by 1998.

1 MR. SILBERG: Or at least delivering the MPCs
2 to --

3 MR. MURPHY: Delivering the MPCs to the utilities
4 by '98. And so I -- you know, I think we need to take a
5 look at the possibility of using this thing, getting it up
6 and running. And I gathered from what you were saying this
7 morning, Dan, that we can't get it to that point, at least
8 so that we can use it on a pilot project basis by 1996.

9 MR. GRASER: Well, that's kind of my question. I
10 was going to ask you to clarify or elaborate a little bit
11 further on what -- you know, what your objective is. Is it
12 to actually have the opportunity to test those LSS
13 functionalities or is it to test the LSS?

14 MR. MURPHY: What do you -- I don't understand
15 your distinction.

16 MR. GRASER: I think that had you made any
17 distinction, are you talking about having the LSS

18 MR. MURPHY: Oh, you mean --

19 MR. GRASER: -- the one we're going to use for a
20 repository, you know, are you -- once you're getting that,
21 having that available, and it will be the LSS, or do you
22 want to use the certification process as the testing
23 environment for testing the functional pieces of the system
24 to insure that it don't break?

25 MR. MURPHY: It's the latter. It's the latter

1 because I didn't envision the whole panoply of procedural
2 provisions in the LSS rule coming into play in time for the
3 MPC process, certification process, such as the prelicensing
4 application review board and you being required to get 100
5 percent certification from Moe prior to MPC that the LSS is
6 totally up and running. No. So it's the former.

7 MR. GRASER: Okay.

8 MR. MURPHY: Let's test the functionality.

9 MR. GRASER: It would be an opportunity to test
10 the pieces and components that we say we're going to rely
11 on --

12 MR. MURPHY: Right.

13 MR. GRASER: -- when we go into building the LSS.
14 Okay.

15 MR. MURPHY: And with a relatively limited amount
16 of documentation and data that you will need for that MPC
17 process. You're not going to need to look at -- to have all
18 the vulcanism documents loaded, you're not going to need to
19 have all of the ground water travel time documents loaded,
20 et cetera, et cetera.

21 MR. GRASER: Right.

22 MR. MURPHY: You'd be looking just at
23 multi-purpose canister design and development documents,
24 engineered barrier system documents, transportation
25 documents, et cetera. So you would have a much smaller

1 universe of documents you would have to get ready to deal
2 with. What it would require for us is prior to turning the
3 system over to the LSSA giving us access to the system
4 somehow.
5 MR. GRASER: Now I'm just wondering, are you
6 thinking along the lines that if you're characterizing one
7 of the engineered barrier system attributes of the canister,
8 does that imply that, you know, there's some sort of
9 recognition that there is a piece of repository licensing
10 activity that's happening now within this time frame?
11 MR. MURPHY: Yeah.
12 MR. GRASER: Because we're dealing with
13 certification issues and those are different.
14 MR. MURPHY: Well, we-- another purpose for the
15 letter, I suppose, was to put everybody on notice that we
16 intend to participate actively in the certification, in the
17 MPC certification process. I'm sure that's true of the
18 state. I assume it's true of the other local governments as
19 well and the tribes for a variety of reasons. The MPC is
20 going to be transported on the nation's highways and rail
21 systems. The MPC is going to be delivered to reactors at
22 various states and localities around the country. The MPC
23 is -- you know, there is a likelihood that the MPC, a lot of
24 them are going to be parked out there at the repository site
25 at Midway Valley for some time before they go underground, etc.

1 and ultimately the current design is that the MPCs will be
2 driven into the drifts in the repository, parked there. The
3 door will be closed and we'll walk away, and they will be
4 the disposal canisters. So we need to look, all of us in
5 our oversight responsibilities, need to watch very carefully
6 how that -- the integrity of the MPC is going to survive
7 this process. And in all of its aspects, transportation as
8 well as storage.

9 MR. GRASER: I think what I'm trying to nail down
10 from a technician's point of view is that if we followed
11 this drill, I wanted to know whether or not I'm building the
12 LSS. Because then we have to, you know, sit down and get
13 things cracking fairly quickly here, or if I'm using it to
14 test, you know, the technologies and, you know, we're going
15 to use that certification process, but I'm still --

16 MR. MURPHY: Well, you tell me. I don't know the
17 answer to that. You can't --

18 MR. GRASER: I think that's why this is in
19 discussion. Right.

20 MR. MURPHY: Can we test the functionalities
21 without you building the LSS?

22 MR. GRASER: And I'd just like to know if I am or
23 not. And I think that needs to be clarified.

24 MR. CAMERON: Are you using certification -- I
25 mean, Mal was using certification in the context of part 71,

1 72. Are you using certification in the context of the LSSA
2 administrator certification?

3 MR. GRASER: No, I'm following Mal. I understand
4 the distinction between certifying the canister. Right.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

6 MR. GRASER: It wasn't --

7 MR. MURPHY: I'm trying to give you a little help
8 too, Dan, so you can go up to Dreyfus and the secretary and
9 say, "Hey, these guys are making me -- we need the LSS by
10 the MPC certification process so you've got to give them the
11 money. -- No more arguments, give me the money."

12 MR. SILBERG: On your normal schedule, the
13 schedule you're on right now, where would you be with the
14 system by the time the certification process starts? Would
15 there be something that if you gave Nye County and Nevada
16 and NAI Thermals, they could tap into that database and use
17 it the way you've used the LSS when you get into the hearing
18 on the repository in the '96 time frame?

19 MR. GRASER: It depends. Very strong possibility.
20 Yes.

21 MR. SILBERG: I mean from our standpoint, assuming
22 that it doesn't seriously discombobulate the way this system
23 is being developed in an inefficient fashion, and assuming
24 it doesn't drive the costs up significantly, sounds like a
25 great idea.

1 MR. GRASER: But, you know, you're talking about
2 assuming it's based on the InfoSTREAMs --

3 MR. SILBERG: Yeah.

4 MR. GRASER: Right, right, right.

5 MR. MURPHY: Right. If it's not based on
6 InfoSTREAMs, then forget about this because --

7 MR. SILBERG: No hope.

8 MR. MURPHY: -- we can't get it done by then. The
9 whole thing is assuming that InfoSTREAMs is appropriate.

10 MR. GRASER: Well, again, if it's not based on
11 InfoSTREAMs I wouldn't necessarily make that comment,
12 because InfoSTREAMs is a bigger breadbox than what we may
13 need to support --

14 MR. GRASER: Well, again, if it's not based on
15 InfoSTREAMs I wouldn't necessarily make that comment,
16 because InfoSTREAMs is a bigger breadbox than what we may
17 need to support that, and we may use a strategy that's
18 easier and crisper and cleaner to meet the requirements
19 during the cache review process. So in fact, you know,
20 there's not a necessary linkage. It says if you don't use
21 option three, you can't be there in time to have some system
22 available for the certification process. But there's a
23 number of objectives here and the fact that it doesn't --
24 you don't get a lot out of one particular piece of the
25 objectives doesn't mean that it isn't a good idea. It would

1 test the functionality, but also I think that it would get
2 people used to using the system in a regulatory context.
3 And I still think that there's a lot of the regulatory --
4 the people involved in the regulatory process who the LSS is
5 sort of a figment of the imagination in a sense, and I guess
6 it is at this point, but that once they realize the
7 capabilities that the system has, that's going to be
8 important. People get used to using the system.

9 MR. GRASER: Jay, I think I need to just kind of
10 clarify or qualify that response I gave to you. You know,
11 we're kind of making a fairly large leap here and I think it
12 was brought out by the comments regarding the LSS
13 performance and InfoSTREAMS performance-type issues.
14 There's a fairly large leap from going to saying it is
15 feasible to reuse InfoSTREAMS as the LSS to actually putting
16 a plan in place that will get us from that "Yes, it is
17 feasible" to "Yes, it is happening." And, you know, what
18 it's going to take to turn a plan around to make InfoSTREAMS
19 become some piece of the LSS functionality. There's some
20 contingencies in there and you have to recognize that. So
21 would we have something available in the '96 time frame?
22 Well, if we can expeditiously work the plan how to do that,
23 but you have to come to agreement on whether or not option
24 three is the one that everybody wants to use.
25 MR. MURPHY: Four.

1 MR. GRASER: Four.

2 MR. MURPHY: Four.

3 MR. GRASER: Option X is the one that everybody
4 wants to use, and we would have to come to closure on that.
5 We would have to develop the plan to figure out how to make
6 all of that stuff happen before I could give you a flat
7 outright commitment that, yes, we could have terminals
8 hooked up by '97 or whenever it may be.

9 MR. MURPHY: Well, but you --

10 MR. GRASER: But it's not --

11 MR. MURPHY: -- you wouldn't reject it out of
12 hand.

13 MR. GRASER: No, I wouldn't reject it out of hand
14 at all.

15 MR. MURPHY: I didn't expect to get a --

16 MR. GRASER: It's not that far a stretch really,
17 but you just have to recognize that it's not an automatic
18 jump, I mean can't have --

19 MR. MURPHY: Oh, I understand that. You know, we
20 could get it -- we could use it even earlier. For example,
21 we're fairly close, I think, to DOE issuing a notice of
22 intent to contract for the MPC environmental impact
23 statement. And they expect to have -- I think they need to
24 have the environmental impact statement final and a record
25 of decision issued prior to seeking certification from the

1 NRC in 1996. So you know, we could -- one could say we
2 could use the LSS functionalities to track the EIS
3 development, the MPC EIS development within the next several
4 months. But I assume that we couldn't get it done that
5 quickly. Maybe I'm wrong. Maybe we can. Why don't you all
6 just give -- why don't you just give us all keys to the
7 InfoSTREAMs?

8 MR. SILBERG: That's why I made the comment about,
9 you know, we don't really want to cause total turmoil to
10 meet dates, which might be nice in the context of using it
11 in the MPC world. If we can do it, great, but if --

12 MR. MURPHY: Don't use "we" too loosely here.
13 Harry might want to speak for himself there.

14 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, I think that speaking for the
15 NRC, there's a lot of issues that we would have to go back
16 and discuss in terms of technical staff and talking with
17 commissioners and all of that. I guess one question I had
18 that either you, Mal, or Jay may be able to answer or
19 perhaps Ken Kalman out there from the technical staff, NRC
20 technical staff, to what extent in the certification process
21 for the MTC will the repository MPC interaction have to be
22 explored before certification? I mean, I would assume that
23 if it is going to be a multi-purpose cache, that before
24 certification we would have to be --

25 MR. HOYLE: No.

1 MR. CAMERON: No?

2 MR. MURPHY: No. They're only --

3 MR. SILBERG: It'll be certified for whatever they
4 ask certification for.

5 MR. CAMERON: So they're only going to ask for
6 certification for storage and transportation?

7 MR. MURPHY: Above-ground storage.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well that -- you know, one of
9 the issues that we need to explore in this, for a pilot
10 project doesn't need -- necessarily need to be a show
11 stopper, but we are putting transportation information in
12 the LSS, or will through the topical guidelines as part of
13 the environmental impact statement context. Okay. And, you
14 know, obviously the LSS was not meant to directly deal with
15 transportation issues or directly with monitored retrievable
16 storage issues.

17 MR. MURPHY: I'm not talking about transportation
18 issues in the sense of routing. I'm talking about
19 transportation in the sense of, the MPC is going to be --
20 DOE can demonstrate that when the MPC falls off the rail car
21 it won't crack open, that kind of transportation, not should
22 it go through dominion, all this kind of stuff.

23 MR. CAMERON: No, no, I realize that, but I think
24 that that's one issue that we need to explore, and as I said
25 before, it doesn't necessarily have to be any sort of a

1 show-stopper in terms of a pilot project.

2 MR. MURPHY: Right.

3 MR. SWAINSTON: Our fearless leader is leaving us.

4 MR. HOYLE: Yeah. I made a promise I'd have the
5 meeting almost wound up by 10:30. So -- reservation --

6 MR. METTAM: Well, we should just say that we're
7 in agreement to try to use it as a pilot project, direct --

8 MS. MACALUSO: We're agreeing to look at it.

9 MR. METTAM: Take a look at it. That's all I want
10 you to do today is say, yeah, we'll take a look at it.

11 MR. GRASER: The question is, once we've looked at
12 it what do we expect back as a panel. Is this a, you know,
13 come back to us and tell us, you know, is it feasible? What
14 would it take to make it happen? In what time frame? And
15 what is the potential cost? And do you have a mechanism for
16 funding that activity according to that schedule? And so
17 forth. So you know, I kind of need to know, you know,
18 what's expected to come back to the panel out of all of
19 this.

20 [Arnold Levin and David Drapkin left meeting.]

21 MR. MURPHY: You just said it.

22 MR. SILBERG: You did a very good job.

23 MR. GRASER: Well, that was a rhetorical question.

24 MR. HOYLE: You're talking about a certain number
25 of passwords into the system so a certain number of users

1 and that sort of thing.

2 MR. GRASER: Sure. Whatever it takes, and we can
3 set at our console and call up and say, give me all the
4 documents you have on --

5 MR. CAMERON: And once they --

6 MR. GRASER: -- a locality, or give me all the
7 documents you have on some stainless steel whatever.

8 MR. CAMERON: One of the things that will need to
9 be considered is that it is going to be a -- it's going to
10 be a certification proceeding that's going to be open to the
11 public generally. And we have to consider how we work the
12 ARP having access to a pilot set of documents --

13 MR. MURPHY: Well, that's why I'm saying we would
14 be --

15 MR. CAMERON: -- with the public too.

16 MR. MURPHY: No, that's why I'm saying we would be
17 doing this in order to test the system, that it wouldn't
18 be -- we wouldn't get ourselves into the box in saying as we
19 would in the licensing proceeding, if you don't participate
20 in the LSS, you can't participate in the MPA or the MPC
21 certification process. But by the same token, if we find
22 out that the process is -- that the system is full of
23 problems, the certification process doesn't have to stop
24 until the LSS is fixed, which would be the case in
25 licensing. The NRC and DOE can continue down that parallel

1 track and certify the MPC if we have to stop here and say,
2 "Oh geez, Graser screwed up, the system won't work." But if
3 we wait until licensing and get to that point, then we've
4 got a problem that's going to impact the timing of the
5 licensing process itself.

6 MR. CAMERON: No, I agree with that. I'm just
7 thinking about the fact that should there be a select -- if
8 there's a select group of people who are concerned about the
9 MPC who are going to be gaining the benefit of full text
10 access, et cetera, et cetera. Okay. And what does that
11 mean in terms of citizen groups, whatever, that are not on
12 the advisory review panel who want to use the pilot system?
13 So there's some issues like that that need to be worked out.

14 MR. MURPHY: Yeah, I see what you're saying.
15 You're going to have some people out there in the country
16 will be upset because they can't get into it.

17 MR. CAMERON: That's right.

18 MR. MURPHY: Because they can't use it.

19 MR. CAMERON: That's right.

20 MR. MURPHY: I think the answer to that, the
21 answer in my mind at least is that we're testing this
22 system. We're not using it as a required tool in licensing.
23 We're using it. We're using this pilot project to test to
24 see whether the system is going to work the way we want it
25 to.

1 MR. SILBERG: And depending on how many terminals
2 this pilot system could have, it might be available to other
3 people as well.

4 MR. MURPHY: Sure.

5 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think that's an issue --

6 MR. MURPHY: Sure.

7 MR. CAMERON: -- we need to consider, is making it
8 available through a public document room or whatever, or
9 generally for remote access, but that gets in terms -- that
10 gets into the issues of what kind of stress it's going to
11 put on the capabilities of InfoSTREAMS at that time, et
12 cetera, et cetera. But that's a big policy issue that I
13 think plays into the technical aspects of it that we need to
14 really try to figure out up front.

15 MR. HOLDEN: But I guess the concern is over, you
16 know, public and other users having access to the
17 information and to the system itself. The people around the
18 state do have some sort of status other than those other
19 potential stakeholders or interested parties. And along
20 with that, just make sure that you keep half-a-dozen
21 terminals available to try, because there's about nine
22 tribes that are seeking effective status, and hopefully
23 they'll have that within the year. So --

24 MR. CAMERON: Absolutely. Need to think about
25 that.

1 MR. SWAINSTON: I'm just wondering what kind of
2 authorization, either for DOE or NRC, would be necessary to
3 use this system. My understanding is the LSS system is
4 basically an NRC system. Is there some authorization that
5 has to come from the commission for them to use it in this
6 purpose?

7 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think that the commission
8 would have to -- obviously would have to agree that the
9 pilot project was a good idea. I mean, we wouldn't go
10 forward unless the commission approved it and they'd have to
11 consider the issues that -- some of the issues that we've
12 been talking about. But --

13 MR. SILBERG: It doesn't have to be an NRC system
14 at that point. This would be prior to --

15 MR. MURPHY: This would be prior to turning --

16 MR. SILBERG: Solely within DOE.

17 MR. SWAINSTON: Well, in that case does Secretary
18 of Energy have to okay this or -- I'm just --

19 MR. GRASER: Well, I would certainly like to
20 have -- I'd like to have some management, upper level
21 management check on this as well, you know. I -- you know,
22 my objective is to figure out how to make things work, not
23 to figure out ways to say it can't be done. If it is a
24 worthy cause, there are ways that we can set it up that
25 would have minimal or no impact on people accessing

1 InfoSTREAMs, when what they're talking about is just
2 accessing my internal records system right now. Well, we
3 can still do that demonstration. We could still, you know,
4 build a Chinese wall around the technology such that we
5 could have the technology in place, that there was no, you
6 know, no problem at all with people coming into that over
7 phones or anything. It didn't pose any sort of a risk to
8 the rest of the information system, and validly demonstrates
9 that technology, and to give people access to that
10 information which is the side benefit.

11 So you know, what -- there are ways that things
12 can be done. But as I said, I would certainly like to have
13 the opportunity to go back and have all of the effective
14 management involved in that, give it the buy-in before I
15 committed to it.

16 MR. CAMERON: One other aspect of this is that the
17 panel is going to have to deal with in the future is, we've
18 talked a little bit in the past about the priority loading
19 schedule for the LSS; in other words, trying to load
20 documents that are going to give LSS users the most benefit
21 early on. And I think that dealing with a single topic is a
22 good way to do that, so that this is sort of a beginning on
23 that. But that overall issue of priority loading is going
24 to have to be addressed.

25 MR. MURPHY: But those are for backlogged

1 documents. These documents should be in the system, in the
2 InfoSTREAMS system right now. I mean, the MPC is a
3 relatively new concept. It's only been around out there for
4 couple of years or --

5 MR. SILBERG: And since it's a pilot, if we miss
6 documents or, you know, the fact you've backlogged --

7 MR. MURPHY: You miss documents, it doesn't
8 matter.

9 MR. SILBERG: -- is it in there, it's not in
10 there.

11 MR. MURPHY: Exactly. But I would think that
12 virtually all of the MPC, the important MPC documents are in
13 InfoSTREAMS right now.

14 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, well that's -- no, I mean
15 that's great. I'm just saying that the concept supports an
16 important, more general concept.

17 MR. MURPHY: I don't know. Jay's point is right
18 on the money, is that's what we're -- that's what we'd be
19 able to find out hopefully.

20 MR. METTAM: And obviously the opening screen
21 would say something: "This is a pilot program and may not
22 include all documents."

23 MR. MURPHY: Yeah, there you go.

24 MR. SILBERG: In the event this were a real LSS
25 you would --

1 MR. CAMERON: Just have one question for you. So
2 what gives you the idea? In your opening remarks you were
3 talking about the high level waste licensing proceeding. I
4 wondered what gives you the idea that it's going to be a
5 contested proceeding? Are you just feeling pessimistic
6 today or what? Get up on the wrong side of the bed?

7 MR. MURPHY: What time did you get to bed last
8 night? No, probably not. All the issues will be resolved
9 by that time. I would suspect that this would be -- yeah,
10 that the repository licensing proceeding summarily decided.
11 Sure, Jim. Yeah.

12 MR. HOYLE: Any serious or otherwise comments?
13 Okay. We ought to talk a little bit about what's next for
14 ourselves. I had been kind of thinking that it would be
15 timely to pull ourselves together again in about the July
16 time frame back from Washington, you know, as we were into
17 our earlier schedules over the last couple of years. We'd
18 have a meeting out here in the west and then one in the east
19 and so forth. I'd like to get back to that. We've -- let's
20 see, I'll prepare a summary, of course, of what we've
21 discussed the last couple of days. NRC and DOE have to
22 follow through on the COTR proposal. There's some followup
23 items from this meeting. We need to set up a technical
24 working group and Dan, of course, is going to check on the
25 pilot program. But I think as we sift through those items,

1 maybe by July we would be able to have the technical working
2 group give us some preliminary report on what it has been
3 able to do. Another update from the licensing support
4 system administrator's office -- this of course is all
5 assuming that the COTR activity can get worked out. Maybe
6 DOE can report back on the pilot project status if we
7 haven't already heard from them. And I don't know that
8 there would be any more on the topical guidelines at that
9 time, but if there were we could have a report from the NRC
10 on that.

11 Are there other activities that we should be
12 talking about as a group that are on your minds that we
13 haven't brought up? What does July sound like for another
14 meeting?

15 MR. SILBERG: That sounds a little early to me.

16 MR. HOYLE: Early?

17 MR. SILBERG: That's just my opinion.

18 MR. SWAINSTON: It's a little hot in Washington.

19 MR. HOYLE: We weren't going to share that with
20 you.

21 MR. MURPHY: We've got a TRB meeting in Denver on
22 the 12th, 13th, or 13th, 14th, something like that. We've
23 got -- we're holding time -- the week of the 25th we're
24 holding to schedule a technical exchange land management
25 meeting-type stuff in DOE and NRC.

1 MR. SILBERG: Out here?

2 MR. MURPHY: I don't know. Just in the six months
3 interactions scheduling process we take -- we schedule
4 meetings for six months and then we hold blocks of time for
5 the following six months, during which we schedule meetings.
6 So the week of the 25th of July is --

7 MR. SILBERG: Well, do you think that's too soon
8 or about right?

9 MR. MURPHY: I think it may be too soon. I think
10 you're probably right. What four months?

11 MR. SWAINSTON: Why don't we make it September?

12 MR. MURPHY: Yeah, September probably -- six
13 months probably sounds a little better, I would think.

14 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Do you have anything on your
15 schedule blocked out yet in the September time frame?

16 MR. MURPHY: September 13, 14 and 15 is being held
17 for the interactions process. That's it for that month I
18 think. Oh, I've got a trial coming up at the end of the
19 month too. The first three weeks -- within the first three
20 weeks, 13th, 14th and 15th are the only things blocked out.

21 MR. HOYLE: Okay. I will look seriously then at
22 the early part of September and be back with you. And I'll
23 work out an agenda with you.

24 Is there anything else, any other new business we
25 ought to talk about? Is there any member of the audience

1 that would like to make any comments? I think we should
2 stand adjourned, then, till the next meeting early
3 September. Thank you very much.

4 [Whereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the meeting was
5 concluded.]

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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

**This is to certify that the attached proceedings
before the United States Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
in the matter of:**

NAME OF PROCEEDING: LSSARP Meeting

DOCKET NUMBER:

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: Las Vegas NV

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Bexanne Krause
Official Reporter
Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.