

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

BRIEFING ON OFFICE OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS SAFETY AND
SAFEGUARDS (NMSS) PROGRAMS, PERFORMANCE, AND PLANS --

WASTE SAFETY

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 14, 2006

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at 2:00 p.m., Nils J. Diaz, Chairman,
presiding.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION:

NILS J. DIAZ, CHAIRMAN.

EDWARD MCGAFFIGAN, JR., COMMISSIONER

JEFFERY S. MERRIFIELD, COMMISSIONER

GREGORY B. JACZKO, COMMISSIONER

PETER B. LYONS, COMMISSIONER

1 PRESENT:

2 LUIS REYES, EDO

3 MARGARET FEDERLINE, DDIR NMSS

4 LARRY CAMPER, DIR. WMEP, NMSS

5 BILL BRACH, DIR., SFPO, NMSS

6 BILL REAMER, DIR, HLW, NMSS

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Good afternoon. The Commission meets
3 today to hear from the members of the Office of Nuclear Materials and
4 Safeguards on the status of the recent activities and planned activities
5 I'm sure related to waste safety.

6 The meeting is one of the periodic meetings we conduct
7 essentially every Spring to bring the Commission up to date and the
8 public up-to-date and have the opportunity to make sure that the staff
9 knows what we should know and we know what we believe the staff is
10 doing, whatever that means.

11 I think things will look always back a little bit. There has been a
12 significant movement in a series of areas since last year.

13 I'm sure you have some areas in which you would like to have
14 more certainty and we also would like to be able to have more
15 certainty.

16 But sometimes the NRC needs to proceed with what we have
17 on our plate and I think we are very proud of the fact that whatever the
18 issues are, we manage to accommodate and go forth.

19 With that, my fellow Commissioners, any comments?

20 If not, Mr. Reyes?

21 MR. REYES: Chairman, Commissioners, the staff from the
22 Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards are prepared to
23 brief the Commission today.

24 This is the second of a two part briefing. On February 8th, we
25 briefed the Commission on the Materials Safety Program.

26 Today we will be covering the Waste Safety Program. Just like

1 we did in the previous one, we are going to mention our
2 accomplishments very, very briefly and concentrate on our challenges
3 and how we are getting ready to face those challenges in the future.

4 With that, Margaret.

5 MS. FEDERLINE: Thank you, Luis. Chairman, Commissioners,
6 it is a pleasure to be here with you today to talk about the Waste
7 Safety Program. With me at the table are Bill Reamer, who's director
8 of the Division of High Level Waste Repository Safety, Larry Camper,
9 who's Director of the Division of Waste Management and
10 Environmental Protection. And Bill Brock who is Director of our Spent
11 Fuel Project Office. Also in the well today are Steve Reynolds from
12 Region 3 and Bruce Mallett from Region 4 as well as representatives
13 from the Offices of State and Tribal Programs, Research, the General
14 Counsel and Nuclear Security and Incident Response.

15 We appreciate being here today to update you on our
16 significant accomplishments in the Waste Safety Program and to
17 describe our planning for future success.

18 Jack and other managers from NMSS met with you on February
19 8th, and provided a similar briefing on the Materials Program. They
20 discussed in detail our process for planning for success. We plan for
21 this brief to complement that information.

22 May I have slide 2?

23 During the briefing today, we plan to touch on several of our
24 major accomplishments. In support of this briefing, we have provided
25 you with more extensive discussion of our accomplishments, activities
26 and their status and products which you will see over the next 12 to 18

1 months.

2 Now, I don't plan to go into a lot of detail on these during the
3 briefing, but of course, we will be happy to answer any questions you
4 have on these topics or others at the completion of the briefing.

5 The major focus of our briefing today will be on discussing how
6 we are planning for success.

7 Jack provided some detail on our process for evaluating future
8 challenges and how best to prepare for them.

9 I'll just briefly touch upon our use of the organizational capacity
10 model and then, Bill and Larry and Bill will discuss the results of its
11 application in the Waste Program.

12 At the end, I'll summarize our conclusions about how we can
13 best prepare for the future for both the Waste and Materials Program.

14 I'm going to be focusing on some of the cross-cutting attributes
15 which we feel will best leverage the number of scenarios across the
16 office.

17 The next five slides highlight some of our most significant
18 accomplishments from the Waste Safety Program. These have
19 contributions from Spent Fuel Project Office, Division of High Level
20 Waste Repository Safety and Division of Waste Management and
21 Environmental Protection.

22 As I said, our partners are here with us and significantly
23 contributed to all of these accomplishments.

24 Slide 3 please: Slides 3 and 4 highlight the high level waste
25 accomplishments. As you are looking at these slides, I just want to
26 emphasize the team work which has been instrumental in these

1 accomplishments. For example in order to make revisions to Part 63
2 available for public comment consistent with the time frame of
3 revisions from the Environmental Protection Agency, a team
4 composed of High Level Waste, our Division of Industrial and Medical
5 Nuclear Safety, the Office of Administration and OGC successfully
6 worked to a very tight schedule to meet the Commission's
7 expectations.

8 Also, we have a core group in the high level waste area which
9 has worked very effectively in our planning and budgeting activity.

10 So moving to slide 5, slide 5 and 6 note accomplishments in
11 decommissioning low-level waste and environmental protection.

12 These involve many routine actions which by themselves can
13 go easily unrecognized.

14 For example, confirmatory surveys and reviews of our license
15 termination plans are critical to our safety mission and provide the
16 basis which enables us to make decisions about license termination
17 following decommissioning.

18 Now, during 2005 we made 8 license terminations which is a
19 significant increase over previous years. Therefore, I want to
20 emphasize the importance of this core work and note that it's been
21 instrumental in achieving efficiency in our goals.

22 Turning to slides 7 and 8, slide 7 and 8 summarize our spent
23 fuel storage and transportation accomplishments. There have been
24 many technical accomplishments in these areas including security
25 assessment. But I particularly want to acknowledge the contributions
26 of the CFO, Research, NSIR, the regions and SFPO in achieving an

1 effective rating in the Spent Fuel and Transportation Program review
2 by OMB.

3 This is the highest rating that OMB gives in the PART Program
4 and we are extremely proud to have achieved it.

5 Turning to slide 9, this completes our brief overview of our
6 accomplishments.

7 At this point, I want to acknowledge the tremendous
8 contributions of the NMSS staff who have made these and many more
9 accomplishments possible.

10 Now, I would like to turn in our briefing to discussing preparing
11 for success.

12 Slide 9 introduces our premise in preparing for success. Now
13 as you can see from the many diverse accomplishments, NMSS faces
14 many potential challenges, some which we can easily anticipate and
15 some which emerge with little advance notice.

16 Flexibility in our planning is key. For example, we believe that
17 preparing for a specific scenario in any program area may not lead to
18 success. We need to anticipate and plan more broadly, building
19 organizational capacity to leverage success for a range of reasonable
20 scenarios.

21 Turning to Slide 9, future challenges: Future challenges come
22 from a variety of sources and may in fact involve different regulatory
23 responses. New legislation can have significant impacts on our
24 programs. For example, the National Defense Authorization Act of
25 2005 directs a consultation role for NRC for DOE's waste incidental to
26 reprocessing determinations.

1 The Act which addresses Savannah River and Idaho National
2 Laboratory determinations, envisions a long term role for NRC in
3 consultation with DOE.

4 Another big challenge comes in the form of uncertainty in the
5 timing and availability of low-level waste and high level waste disposal
6 capacity.

7 For example, Barnwell may close to many generators in 2008
8 and it's difficult to predict whether other capacity will be available.

9 In another example, DOE has not provided a firm date for the
10 submittal of the high level waste license application. Many factors
11 have contributed to this uncertainty, but NRC needs to ensure that
12 waste can be safely stored until disposal is available and participate in
13 any changing national solutions consistent with our regulatory role.

14 Now, as you heard in the materials briefing, evolving national
15 spent fuel policy poses an additional challenge. We need to continue
16 to monitor that development of national policy and ensure that our
17 programs benefit from any lessons learned in the past.

18 NRC needs to be prepared to fill any regulatory responsibilities
19 and support the Commission as national policy is formulated.

20 Also, in our spent fuel management and decommissioning
21 programs, licensees are expressing a desire for flexibility. Licensees
22 are urging NRC to adopt flexible regulatory approaches which will
23 maintain safety, yet, will facilitate the use of new technology and
24 information.

25 Our resource challenges come in terms of both human
26 resources and program support.

1 With work emerging across our programs, we are challenged to
2 address competing priorities by using our resources in the most
3 efficient and effective way. We must anticipate and ensure availability
4 of the right skills and be prepared to move resources to ensure their
5 most effective use.

6 Our vision in NMSS is to maintain an environment in which
7 every one feels empowered and challenged to make changes to
8 increase organizational capacity.

9 To achieve this, we are pursuing continuous improvement which
10 means we are adopting new ways of doing business and eliminating or
11 modifying approaches which are less efficient or effective.

12 As Jack discussed in the materials briefing, we are using an
13 organizational capacity model to systematically evaluate a range of
14 realistic future scenarios. In this model an organization's capacity to
15 deal with new challenges and effectively accomplish its mission,
16 depends on a number of elements that I have listed here on this slide.

17 Jack went into these in detail and I will only mention a couple of
18 these before passing it to my colleagues.

19 I want to particularly mention aspirations. It is important to have
20 a clear vision and common sense of purpose and goals. And we feel
21 the connectivity with the Commission has been particularly significant
22 in this regard.

23 We have been working with you closely as we formulate project
24 plans, gaining early alignment and understanding of your views and
25 wishes.

26 And this has helped us greatly as we've interacted with external

1 stakeholders.

2 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Does this also connect with
3 the vision state in the Strategic Plan?

4 MS. FEDERLINE: Yes, it does. I should have noted that.

5 Our organizational skills, this means our ability to plan, and to
6 manage resources and to measure performance. We particularly
7 need to improve in the area of establishing more robust performance
8 measures. And we are working on that. And I think you will see that
9 as part of the '08 budget process.

10 Finally, I wanted to mention systems and infrastructure. These
11 are very important factors, administrative information technology and
12 physical assets. These make it possible for the staff to do its job.

13 For example, in the information technology area, using the LSN
14 in the high level waste program has facilitated our work. And of course
15 space is one of the biggest challenges that the agency faces right now
16 and NMSS feels that challenge as well.

17 We have examined the scenarios against each of these
18 elements to determine what actions may leverage success for the
19 broadest range of scenarios.

20 This provides a systematic basis for planning which we think is
21 extremely important. Now with this as background, I want to turn it
22 over to Bill Reamer, Larry Camper and Bill Brock to discuss challenges
23 in their areas and our planning for success considerations. Bill?

24 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Mr. Chairman, this may go
25 out of the staff's plan or they may need to come back to it, but on the
26 slides for slides 5 and 6, we talked about the 14 high priority

1 decommissioning actions and the four complex environmental impact
2 statements.

3 Perhaps, there is a bit more that can be said about to give a
4 little bit of the flavor of what has occurred because I think there is a lot
5 of progress that the staff has made and I think although I appreciate
6 the desire to make sure you hit the colored light, I think the brevity
7 didn't give the fullness of the flavor of what the staff has accomplished.
8 And I would suggest that perhaps either Margaret could go into that
9 briefly now or come back to it at the end.

10 It doesn't matter to me but I think there is additional material
11 that might be able to be touched on to give that fullness.

12 MS. FEDERLINE: If we can just take with two minutes, let me
13 just start and I will hand it off to Larry.

14 Commissioner Merrifield is exactly right. This is an area that
15 illustrates what we've done in organizational capacity and looking at
16 the wide range of challenges.

17 Larry has developed a plan which really has systematically dealt
18 with efficiencies and effectiveness and has put in place some new
19 ways of doing business that has allowed us to achieve those
20 terminations and environmental impact statements.

21 So Larry, why don't you describe the work that you've have
22 done.

23 MR. CAMPER: Commissioner, thank you for recognizing that.
24 First, quickly, history is a good place to start. There was a time when
25 we had sites going back ten, fifteen years and we were having a lot of
26 trouble making progress.

1 This is an end-of-cycle cost for many licensees and site owners
2 and we were having difficulty.

3 What we did several years ago now, staff undertook a
4 rebaselining of the entire decommissioning program, which meant that
5 we went and really looked at where each one of these sites stood at
6 the time, what it was going to take to get to closure. We then did a
7 program evaluation, and subsequently a license termination rule
8 analysis. And what we did was frankly was to devote a lot of
9 resources. With the Commission's support, put a lot of resources into
10 improving the efficiency in the effectiveness of the program. For
11 example, we put in place a 90 day acceptance review, a much more
12 detailed acceptance review in which we took a look at some of the
13 health physics issues, the ground water hydrology issues and we
14 made a determination as to whether or not a license termination plan
15 or decommissioning plan was really worthy of continuing an in-depth
16 technical review.

17 So we tried to make decisions much earlier in the process for
18 one thing.

19 This past year, 8 completions as Margaret pointed out. This
20 year, we are anticipating another 8, and as many as 10 next year.

21 And what that really represents and I really do thank you,
22 Commissioner Merrifield for pointing this out, is a culmination of many
23 years of hard work, support by the Commission and yes, an
24 investment, we made an investment in the chain of efficiencies in
25 doing things differently.

26 MS. FEDERLINE: And we are not finished.

1 You will hear later in the briefing that our goal in this area is to
2 increase the timeliness of reactor licensing reviews by 30 percent over
3 three years.

4 So we still are continuing to set robust goals for ourselves to
5 continue the systematic upgrades in this area. So thank you very
6 much.

7 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: If I may underscore that ever
8 so briefly. I think in particularly as it relates to license termination plan
9 approvals, I think it is noteworthy that we went through both Big Rock
10 Point and Yankee Rowe last year in terms of terminations, both Main
11 Yankee and Trojan as well as six others for decommissioning plan
12 approvals, some historic legacy issues we had to deal with, particularly
13 with some of our members of the Federal family and the Pathfinder
14 site in South Dakota, Elgin Air Force Base, and surprisingly too, I'm
15 sure to a lot of folks at Fort Belvoir, which is in the D.C. area which did
16 have a power reactor. And then four complex environmental impact
17 statements, the MOX final EIS, the LES final EIS, the USEC draft EIS
18 and then of course, draft generic EIS for disposition of solid materials.
19 Mr. Chairman, that is a solid amount of accomplishment. I think the
20 staff should be congratulated for that. I think it is because of the
21 attention the Commission encouraged the staff to give this in years
22 past and I'm happy to see you are going to continue with that level of
23 pacing this fiscal year and the next.

24 I will let them get back to their presentation but I think it is
25 important to underscore that for the public who may not be aware of
26 what you actually have done.

1 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right,

2 MR. REAMER: If we could turn to slide 12 then looking into the
3 future with respect to the High Level Waste Repository Program.
4 We've identified the 3 challenges that are on this slide. And with
5 respect to the first challenge, timely input to a changing Department of
6 Energy Program, we know in October, of 2005 DOE announced a new
7 program approach to handle mainly, spent fuel and canisters from the
8 reactor to the repository.

9 And the DOE changes will involve new performance
10 specifications, new supporting analysis for the transportation, aging
11 and disposal activities, raising cross cutting issues for the NRC.

12 The Department is also making other changes to its total
13 system performance assessment model, the model that governs the
14 repository post closure performance period. And it is supplementing
15 its data in the infiltration area as well, that area where they been
16 potentially affected by the allegations of USGS falsification of quality
17 assurance documents.

18 We have computed, based on a preliminary look, that up to 25
19 percent of our key technical issue agreements could be impacted by
20 changes that I have mentioned as well as potential changes to meet a
21 new EPA standard.

22 Success for the NRC has meant keeping pace with the
23 Department of Energy program changes, to assure that issues are
24 identified early so that the Commission can be in a position to be able
25 to complete its license application review in the statutory period.

26 The second challenge, preparing for licensing in an uncertain

1 environment. We know the Department is continuing to actively
2 pursue a license application, supported by budgets in 2006 and budget
3 request in 2007 to do so, aimed at preparing an application and
4 completing supporting documentation.

5 Yet, there continues to be major uncertainties, uncertainties that
6 impact our ability to prepare for conducting a licensing review in the
7 proceeding. The Department has not identified as Margaret
8 mentioned, the date for the license application nor have they identified
9 a date by which they would be certifying the completeness of their
10 document collection for the Licensing Support Network.

11 Also, the Environmental Protection Agency is in the process of
12 finalizing changes to their standard to adopt a 1,000 year compliance
13 period. And the NRC will need to complete its own rulemaking to
14 amend 10 CFR Part 63 to make changes there. And also, to update
15 its guidance and tools to address that regulation.

16 And the final EPA standard may also result in the Department
17 making significant changes to its performance assessment post
18 closure that I mentioned earlier, changes that we have not yet and
19 won't have had an opportunity to have reviewed and evaluated. Yet,
20 notwithstanding these uncertainties, the public will expect that the NRC
21 is ready to properly carry out its responsibilities to implement the
22 licensing standards and conduct the licensing proceeding when and if
23 there is a license application.

24 And the Repository Construction Authorization decision as we
25 have mentioned in the past in addition to being under a very stringent
26 schedule from the Congress, is also likely to be highly contested. It is

1 not a project that we have carried out before.

2 And lastly, as a challenge in this area, we have identified the
3 evolving national policy on spent fuel management. We know the
4 Administration's policy on management is undergoing change,
5 particularly in the area of the potential for reprocessing. And this is a
6 key uncertainty that we need to factor into our planning.

7 If we can move on, then, to the actions we will be taking to
8 enhance our capability to be able to be ready to address these
9 challenges.

10 Of course, our strategy is to maintain a readiness for the
11 Commission to be able to complete its statutory responsibilities. But in
12 the face of the change and uncertainty, we need to redouble our
13 efforts to do this by assuring that our programs are well aimed at the
14 DOE program and the DOE approach and that they are well integrated
15 as well.

16 This requires active monitoring on our part and anticipating
17 where the Department is going in a proactive manner.

18 Also in the resources area, we need to achieve and maintain
19 that balance, that right balance between on the one hand, staff
20 continuity that a project of this sort requires, but also, enhancing our
21 ability to adapt and be ready to anticipate and meet new and diverse
22 challenges.

23 We provide staff the diverse knowledge and experience they
24 need in other programs and we also do this by maintaining and using
25 the Licensing Support Network, the reservoir of information that
26 includes the staff documents relevant information for this project. We

1 also need to continue to support maximum flexibility for managing
2 human resources at our Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis
3 in San Antonio, our contractor in this matter.

4 And this includes fostering the placement of work at the Center
5 to maintain those core skills that the Center has and must maintain to
6 be able to support us in our mission.

7 Also, with respect to infrastructure, it is important to our success
8 that we complete the changes to the infrastructure, to be ready for the
9 future licensing proceeding. This means completing Part 63 and the
10 associated guidance to meet the revised EPA standard. Also
11 developing guidance for the transportation, aging and storage canister,
12 updating our review plan to address facility design changes,
13 maintaining the courtroom and supporting information management
14 systems in a ready state, and modifying our analytical tools as well. Of
15 course the change to 10 CFR Part 63 will involve a Commission paper
16 and a Commission decision.

17 And in the organizational structure area, we have warned our
18 teams with our colleagues in spent fuel storage and also in the reactor
19 area to foster an integrated regulatory framework approach to deal
20 with the DOE proposed transportation, aging and disposal canister.

21 And we want to also continue to maintain and enhance our
22 integration across our technical teams.

23 And in the culture area, adaptability to change is now part of
24 our life in high level waste. And we also made great strides and
25 continue to foster teamwork and communication which are the tools
26 we use among the staff to deal with the uncertainty in change.

1 If there are no questions for me at this point, I will turn it over
2 the Larry.

3 MR. CAMPER: Thank you Bill. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners,
4 slide 15.

5 At this point, case work is reasonably predictable within my
6 division as compared to other NMSS programs. However, there are a
7 number of uncertainties, especially as related to the low-level waste
8 area and to the environment. Let me talk first about decommissioning.
9 In past years during our discussions with the Commission, the primary
10 challenge has been how to reduce the number of complex sites.

11 We still face that challenge but we are making considerable
12 progress. Now, we face an equally complicated challenge of capturing
13 our lessons learned in order to reduce or eliminate many of the
14 problems we have encountered for contaminated sites thus far.

15 The application of our lessons learned applies not only to a
16 generation of power reactors entering decommissioning, but also for
17 our complex sites.

18 It also has applications for emerging technologies such as
19 uranium enrichment and fuel reprocessing which Bob Pierson
20 discussed with you last week during the Materials Briefing.

21 Capturing and applying lessons learned in a effective manner
22 while balancing sites management, and knowledge management
23 under resource constraints will indeed prove challenging.

24 In terms of case work of the decommissioning program, power
25 reactors remain steady over the next 3 years with receipt of the license
26 termination plans Rancho Seco and Fermi 1 and completion of the

1 decommissioning for Big Rock Point, Connecticut Yankee and Yankee
2 Rowe. Then, it decreases and is followed by a long term hiatus.
3 Complex sites continue, although the number of sites steadily
4 decreases while generating an estimated two new sites per year.

5 For low level waste, in this area, we have a paradox. On one
6 hand, industry has been following a pragmatic approach in managing
7 and reducing the volume of waste.

8 On the other hand, we see an increasing interest by other
9 stakeholders. For example, the General Accountability Office, NEI,
10 EPRI, The National Academy of Science, our Advisory Committee on
11 Nuclear Waste and yes, Congress to modify or further improve,
12 meaning the consistency, the reliability, the flexibility and further
13 risk-informing the management of low-level waste.

14 In addition, if we consider the potential for new fuel cycle
15 facilities, or a nuclear renaissance in general, then, we can anticipate
16 the generation of much more low level waste in the future.

17 We must be alert to this changing environment and develop a
18 strategy effectively to utilize our very limited resources in this area of
19 our program.

20 In terms of case work, we do plan for the closure, for the
21 Barnwell site in 2008, which will impact 36 states, with regard to
22 disposing of class B and class C waste. The Texas licensing and
23 excess of the Waste Control Specialist Site is uncertain as we speak.
24 Congressional interest and other stakeholder interest, as I said, in our
25 nation's low-level Waste Program remains high.

26 Waste Determination. Activities are forecast to continue well

1 into the future. Thus, we must continue to create an infrastructure
2 that ensures a stable and consistent process for the review of waste
3 determinations and monitoring of DOE activities when indicated.

4 We must continue to complete complex waste determination
5 reviews in a highly efficient open manner while cooperating with the
6 States of South Carolina and Idaho. For case work, we will continue to
7 receive terminations from The Department of Energy pursuant to the
8 National Defense Authorization Act of 2005 throughout the planning
9 period in the foreseeable future for that matter, resulting in 3 to 4
10 waste determinations annually.

11 Staff is being requested to complete similar reviews for the
12 Hanford Site, and the possibly the West Valley Site.

13 We will also conduct monitoring activity based upon our
14 technical evaluation report findings and understandings reached with
15 the Department of Energy and the affected states.

16 Environmental Reviews. The challenge is to continue to
17 produce high quality and effective environmental reviews under
18 intense time lines for emerging technologies and highly visible
19 licensing actions such as the Louisiana Energy Services application.

20 Challenge is exasperated by the need to simultaneously support
21 other less complicated but important licensing actions throughout
22 NMSS and by the competing needs for environmental analyses on the
23 reactor side which may impact our existing talented resources.

24 In terms of case work, we do expect an increase in the support
25 of fuel facilities licensing and rulemaking activities. Significant work is
26 also expected to support our agency's West Valley review, review of

1 the Department of Energy's greater than class C waste Environmental
2 Impact Statement and other materials decommissioning reviews.

3 Slide 16. Thinking in terms of the organizational capacity model
4 again to address these various challenges which I just cited. We need
5 to focus on certain key functions.

6 Strategies. We need to continue to utilize a risk-informed
7 performance based approach, while focusing upon openness and
8 internal, external relationships. For example, our work on the low-level
9 waste front will involve interactions with the Advisory Committee on
10 Nuclear Waste and industry in one or more workshops to develop an
11 overall strategy.

12 Similarly, the integrated decommissioning improvement
13 program, IDIP, lessons learned for decommissioning and waste
14 incidental to reprocessing, WIR, and the WIR standard review plan will
15 be key factors in this strategy.

16 Skills. We will develop and maintain critical skills such as
17 health physics, ground water hydrology and environmental science,
18 and assure knowledge management especially regarding
19 decommissioning lessons learned.

20 Resources. We will cross train staff to enhance fungibility and
21 to provide flexibility and prioritize and stage our work to incorporate the
22 use of critical skills as needed.

23 For infrastructure. It will be necessary to maximize our use of
24 technology, including our website, and pursue close coordination with
25 the Office of Research involving the development or improvement of
26 analytical tools for performance assessment and dose modeling to

1 support licensing actions.

2 For our organizational structure. We will continue to ensure that
3 we have a highly competent staff and our culture will be adaptive to
4 change. For example, we will adjust our structure to accommodate
5 emerging needs such as consolidation of decommissioning functions
6 to create an agency center of excellence for this important function.

7 To assist the staff in achieving these objectives, the
8 Commission will clearly play an integral role. They will see a number
9 of key Commission papers in the near term.

10 For example, you will see the decommissioning consolidation
11 paper. You will see our prevention of legacy sites rulemaking which
12 grew out of our license termination rule analysis. You will see our
13 Commission paper dealing with a strategy for low-level waste program.
14 And you will see our draft final waste incidental to reprocessing
15 standards review plan. This concludes my remarks.

16 I look forward to your questions and our discussion. Mr. Brach.

17 MR. BRACH: Good afternoon, Chairman, Commissioners. We
18 will now discuss some of the challenges facing the spent fuel storage
19 and transportation program and our strategies to meet these
20 challenges.

21 Nuclear power plants continue to need to increase their spent
22 fuel storage capacity to support plant operations. In many cases, this
23 requires movement of spent fuel through dry cask storage to maintain
24 operational capability in a spent fuel pool, including for example to
25 maintain full core offload capability.

26 There are currently, 38 licensed or operating independent spent

1 fuel storage installations. We expect in the next few years that there
2 will be over 50 storage facilities in the United States.

3 The growth in storage facilities and the need for nuclear power
4 plants to store more fuel is also bringing technical challenges in areas
5 such as high burn-up fuel, burn-up credit and storage term.

6 We have a number of collaborative efforts underway with the
7 Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, the industry, Electric Power
8 Research Institute, and Nuclear Energy Institute and others to address
9 these challenges.

10 We have and continue to experience an increase in stakeholder
11 interest in spent fuel storage and transportation at the National, State
12 and local levels.

13 As greater attention is focused on Yucca Mountain
14 considerations, the planned Private Fuel Storage facility, along with the
15 increase in the number of storage facilities across the United States,
16 we anticipate this high level of interest to continue to grow.

17 The recent DOE decision to pursue a standardized canister
18 design clearly has implications for the NRC. The new DOE direction
19 brings a need for close coordination between the Spent Fuel Project
20 Office and Bill Reamer's division, the High Level Waste Repository
21 Safety Division and other NRC offices who assure a coordinated
22 seamless review by our organizations of the multiple components of a
23 transport, aging and disposal canister system.

24 Changes in the national strategy approach to spent fuel
25 management may impact the spent fuel storage and transportation
26 program. Activities such as recycling, reprocessing, may result in an

1 increase in transportation activities.

2 In addition, increased spent fuel storage either at existing sites
3 or away from reactor sites may increase demands for storage and or
4 transportation.

5 Continued monitoring of these activities and outcomes will help
6 us position our program and anticipate the demands for future work.

7 Slide 19. Given the challenge, let me discuss now, a few of our
8 strategies and considerations for building our organizational capacity
9 to meet the program needs.

10 Our first strategy is to be innovative by using risk-informed
11 performance based approaches and establishing challenging
12 performance measures to assure a safe, sound, efficient and effective
13 regulatory program. The key to our program and our success is our
14 staff.

15 Maintaining our skill, our staff, our resource competency and
16 capability is critical. Expertise in technical areas such as criticality,
17 materials and transportation are important, yet, sometimes hard to find
18 expertise.

19 Based on our understanding and anticipation of the future
20 industry needs, we have reviewed our resources to align our structure
21 with these industry needs. We also augment our program with
22 support, for example, from Research and contractors as needed.

23 To enhance our infrastructure, we are striving to engage both
24 domestically and internationally in storage and transportation activities
25 to leverage the experiences and knowledge gained by others.

26 Based on our experience in reviewing the first dry cask storage

1 license renewal and subsequent Commission direction, we are
2 reassessing the license terms for both storage facilities and cask
3 certificates. We will provide the Commission a paper on this topic in
4 June of this year.

5 We are continuing to improve our infrastructure through
6 advances in our rules of engagement, interim staff guidance
7 development process, and response to industry feedback.

8 We also now are initiating work on risk informing the storage
9 standard review plan.

10 The High Level Waste Repository Safety Division and Spent
11 Fuel Project Office staff have already begun management and staff
12 level interactions on 10 CFR Part 71, transportation, Part 72, storage,
13 and Part 63, disposal requirements and review process for the DOE
14 transport, aging and disposal canister design review.

15 And we plan to expand this activity to other offices as
16 appropriate. We continue to monitor DOE's progress on this new
17 program development.

18 The Spent Fuel Project Office has a team of highly technical
19 staff engaged in resolving important and complex technical issues. My
20 challenge, my staff's challenge, is clearly to continue this effort while at
21 the same time, questioning and seeking novel approaches to problem
22 resolution and finding more efficient and effective ways to implement
23 our program. Thank you. Margaret.

24 MS. FEDERLINE: Thank you very much, Bill and other
25 colleagues. In hearing our presentation in February, 8th on the
26 Materials Program and our presentation on the Waste Program today,

1 we hope it has provided you with a view of just how diverse our
2 programs are in NMSS. But I think the key that we would like to
3 present to you today is that we must systematically look at these
4 challenges and even though the challenges themselves very different,
5 we must have a systematic approach to ensure that we tackle the
6 challenges across the office.

7 Now, as in the materials area, many scenarios are possible
8 presenting significant challenges. As we've described, they can arise
9 from many areas, legislation, industry needs and other things. We
10 believe that preparing for a specific scenario to the exclusion of others,
11 will not lead to success.

12 As a result, we've used the organizational capacity model as a
13 systematic tool to look across the possible challenges that may come
14 our way and to define common strategies and attributes that could
15 contribute to our success under more than one scenario.

16 As you would expect, there are a number of cross cutting
17 elements which if leveraged, can enhance our success. I only have
18 time to touch upon three of those today, strategies, resources and
19 infrastructure.

20 Now, a common strategy in the Waste and Materials Program is
21 the use of risk-informed and performance based approaches,
22 innovative approaches in doing our work differently to increase
23 efficiency and effectiveness.

24 In the High Level Waste Program, of course we pioneered the
25 use of risk-informed, performance-based approaches through the
26 development of Part 63. And we are using this approach to focus our

1 pre-licensing interactions with DOE.

2 Risk-informed, performance based thinking in the
3 decommissioning program as was discussed earlier in the
4 presentation, has allowed us to address more realistic exposure
5 scenarios for decision-making.

6 In the Spent Fuel Program, we are initiating efforts to risk-inform
7 the Standard Review Plan to ensure safety while increasing efficiency
8 and effectiveness. And of course as I mentioned earlier, across all of
9 our programs, our goal is to set more robust performance measures as
10 goals in our program and as I mentioned in our decommissioning
11 program, we have set a goal of increasing timeliness of reactor license
12 termination reviews of 30% over 3 years. And in fact, our staff is
13 achieving those through systematic changes to the program.

14 Another key strategy which is resulting in improved connectivity
15 in the Materials Program as well as in the Waste Program is to
16 increase interaction with our stakeholders to better understand their
17 concerns and the concerns of the public and to anticipate the needs of
18 licensees and stakeholders.

19 For example, in both spent fuel and the decommissioning
20 areas, we have conducted what we believe to be very effective
21 licensee interactions. We are listening closely to what our licensees
22 tell us and we have systematically incorporated suggestions into our
23 program as Larry discussed in the decommissioning area.

24 We have enhanced outreach to the medical community and
25 transportation stakeholders, in particular, and this is improving our
26 coordination and we are reaping the benefits of that.

1 We are also working proactively with our local, state and
2 Federal partners, particularly EPA and DOE, to establish networks at
3 all levels and to lay the groundwork for effective issue resolution
4 before issues develop.

5 These networks have been particularly valuable in the removal
6 of radioactive materials from Safety Light and achieving agreement on
7 a common approach to Federal guidance. Now, the key to success in
8 our programs now and in the future is our staff.

9 Many NMSS challenges require expertise which is extremely
10 hard to recruit at competitive salaries. As we look ahead, we must
11 employ innovative strategies for developing and retaining a balance of
12 experience while learning and maintaining core skills.

13 Cross training is an important strategy and I will just mention
14 that one of our best ground water hydrologists has become one of our
15 best fire protection engineers. And under this effective cross-training
16 strategy, both the challenging work and the benefit to the agency have
17 accrued. We must also locate and retain other critical skills such as
18 plutonium chemistry, materials science, health physics and
19 performance assessment.

20 Our senior executives service recruitment champion is using
21 innovative strategies to obtain these skills working with all the tools
22 that the Office of Human Resources has provided us.

23 We are finding however, though, that the skills are not the only
24 important thing. We are finding that we must look for inquisitive,
25 intelligent, curious people who are eager for new challenges and
26 welcome and are stimulated by change.

1 Our performance assessment groups have created such an
2 environment. And I meet with each of these young people as they
3 come into the agency and work with the group. And they are
4 extremely attracted by the stimulating environment they work in.

5 Now, given the resource fluctuations, we need to also ensure
6 that the Center skills and capabilities are maintained and used
7 throughout the agency. And the Center is in fact in this week meeting
8 with various parts of the agency.

9 Finally, I want to touch on the importance of knowledge
10 management and maintaining our infrastructure including the
11 framework, the regulatory framework and review tools.

12 A systematic process of knowledge management may take
13 different forms and it is really important to assess the most effective
14 means of knowledge management for each program.

15 For example, as Larry mentioned in our decommissioning
16 program, we are developing lessons learned, working very
17 cooperatively with the industry and other stakeholders and this
18 information will be very valuable not only to our own staff, but also to
19 the next generation of decommissioning plans.

20 In the High Level Waste Repository Safety Program, we are
21 systematically documenting our work to address key technical issues.
22 A program such as high level waste with a horizon on the order of tens
23 of years as opposed to years must have an effective tool to retain the
24 knowledge as staff enter the program and then, eventually retire.

25 Resource constraints limit our ability to invest in the
26 infrastructure and review tools. But we have reversed this trend and

1 believe it is extremely important to invest in the infrastructure. This is
2 particularly critical at a time when many of our senior technical experts
3 are nearing retirement.

4 So as you can see, we are identifying cross cutting actions to
5 take across the office to leverage across the scenarios that we are
6 working on.

7 Time does not allow us to go into all of these today but we hope
8 we have illustrated the process that we're using and we hope that our
9 presentation has provided a view of how NMSS is adopting to a
10 diverse set of challenges. Our goal is learn from the past, employ
11 creative solutions for today's issues and be flexible for the future.

12 This completes our remarks and we'd be very happy to answer
13 any questions you may have.

14 MR. REYES: Chairman and Commissioners, that completes
15 our prepared remarks. We are now available for questions.

16 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you very much. Commissioner
17 Merrifield.

18 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: I appreciate all the time and
19 efforts that goes into makes these presentations. And I know the staff
20 works very hard on it.

21 NMSS is a part of our agency which has a wide diversity in
22 flavor of issues that it grapples with. And I hope next year when we
23 have this briefing, we can get beyond the process issues.

24 We spent a lot of time here talking about process and it has to
25 be talked about at an appropriate point, but I think more of a flavor for
26 the work that's going on and the real details to help the Commission

1 get a flavor for what we are going to have on our plate coming forward.

2 In that regard, in the High Level Waste Program, the staff has
3 identified and addressed a path forward for 256 of the 293 key
4 technical issues.

5 Now, the 37 key issues left, 8 are associated with resolving
6 issues with the USGS survey and 29 are waiting on additional
7 information from the Department of Energy.

8 Recognizing that not all key technical issues are the same,
9 some being more complicated than the others, of the remaining 37,
10 are there any that are of greater concern to the staff than others? And
11 additionally, do we have a path forward to resolving these?

12 MR. REAMER: Commissioner, the remaining KTIs, involve 29
13 key technical issue agreements where we've asked the Department for
14 additional information.

15 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Department of Energy?

16 MR. REAMER: Yes. Of those 29, we have rated 8 of them as
17 of high significance to repository performance.

18 We have identified 12 as being of medium significance and 9 as
19 being low. Now, of course that's based on a 10,000 year compliance
20 period.

21 With respect to the additional 8 that are on hold because of the
22 USGS email issue. None of those we have ranked as of high
23 significance. Five of them, we believe are of medium significance and
24 three would be low.

25 Path forward, with respect to that latter group, is to review the
26 Department's technical analysis when that document is made available

1 we hope in the near future and then understand the path forward
2 based on that.

3 With respect to the additional information, all that's really in the
4 Department's court to pick those up if they desire in advance of the
5 license application, come back with some additional information, but
6 they do have the option of addressing it in the license application, it's
7 their judgment.

8 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Mr. Chairman can I ask a
9 clarifying question? They said during the presentation, 25 percent of
10 the agreements, I assume that 25 percent of 293 is potentially affected
11 by the USGS potential falsification.

12 And so, you just said is accurate with regard to everything but
13 the USGS falsification. But if 25, 75 agreements are reopened and
14 have to be reassessed, then there's more work to be done, right?

15 MR. REAMER: There is potentially more work to be done. The
16 assessment that up to 25% of a our agreements may need to be
17 re-assessed is really based on a more broader set of considerations
18 than just the USGS infiltration issue.

19 It's also impacted potentially by the canister approach, the
20 changes to the design, that that will involve for example, the waste
21 package. And also, the one million year compliance period that the
22 EPA standard based on the proposed rule would come forward.

23 What we've done Commissioner, is say, based on all of those
24 changes, and looking at the total universe of 293, our preliminary
25 assessment is to up to 25 percent, we would need to go back and
26 reassess and take another look at it.

1 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: On some of the backup slides
2 you have given us not that they will be provided generally, but under
3 the decommissioning low-level waste project summaries on page 8,
4 deals with work we are conducting for incidental waste consults, waste
5 reprocessing relative to INEEL, the Idaho National Engineering and
6 Environmental Laboratory and Savannah River. How is that going,
7 and are there any issues that you believe have arisen that are going to
8 need Commission attention at this time, or in the near future?

9 MR. CAMPER: I think the waste incidental to reprocessing
10 issue, whether it be for Savannah River site tank 18 and tank 19 which
11 is ongoing now or at Idaho National Lab, which is the entire tank farm
12 or the one tank performance assessment we are doing in Hanford. I
13 think they are all going very well at this point.

14 I think what we see is a very rapid rise on the learning curve by
15 DOE in terms of the types of analyses and questions that they can
16 expect from our agency.

17 I think in all fairness to them, when they first went into this
18 process, they were not accustomed to dealing with an independent
19 regulatory agency of our type.

20 I think they have worked diligently though, to address our
21 request for additional information. And we see improvement now as
22 we explore those submittals.

23 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: These are important issues
24 for the respective states. They are important issues for us to resolve
25 as a Nation and I think the work we do needs to be timely and needs
26 to be effective, it needs to be efficient and it needs to meet our

1 strategic goals. But I think there is true value we can add and I look
2 forward to the work the staff has done in that regard.

3 MR. CAMPER: Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: On the issue of
5 decommissioning problematic sites which is slide six of your
6 decommissioning backup slides, some of the issues we have in front
7 of us are the Fansteel Site, which obviously has a lot of challenges,
8 Safety Light which has made its way onto the Super Fund. And some
9 of the unlicensed sites which we are grappling with right now and there
10 are financial issues or ownership issues. I'm wondering how that is all
11 going and if you can just touch quite briefly as well in terms of our
12 decommissioning and Memorandum of Understanding with EPA and
13 how that factors into all of this?

14 MR. CAMPER: Yes, with regard to Fansteel, in fact, we are
15 meeting with them this week. They have changed their
16 decommissioning approach a number of times, gone through
17 bankruptcy, reorganization, and so forth. And that has caused delays.

18 I think at this point, my discussion with the staff would lead me
19 to believe that we are making progress. It is still some lifting at that
20 site. we are making progress. Safety Light of course is on-going with
21 EPA and running its course.

22 Salmon River, you mentioned has been a challenge for us.
23 This is a site where we were able to reach the current site owner who
24 bought the land at a very reduced price and planned to build there.

25 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: A dollar, wasn't it?

26 MR. CAMPER: Yeah, exactly. All of a sudden, the Federal

1 Government shows up and wants him to decommission the site. We
2 have communicated with EPA. We are working with them in their
3 process to see if how the site will score. I don't think the site will score,
4 the qualification on the MPF but we shall see.

5 We are briefing very shortly, Senator Craig's staff on this site so
6 there is an awareness. In fact, you had an interest in that
7 Commissioner.

8 The idea behind that briefing is to make sure that the Senator
9 understands the status of the site and the efforts we are making to try
10 to work with the EPA to make something happen, but that may not
11 work.

12 AAR, we continue to work on. You might require that AAR is
13 the site that the Commission had a lot of interest in as a pilot if you will,
14 for a phased approach to institutional controls.

15 Some of their dose analysis work required several rounds but
16 we are working with them to get to those technical issues. We still
17 believe that site will work out for institutional control, and under a
18 phased approach, or a reduced approach. But we've got to work
19 through the technical assessment issues first.

20 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Well, Mr. Chairman, these are
21 difficult sites and in some cases, we have the capability to do some
22 work on them and others may well be beyond our capability and
23 financial capability to resolve them. We may need to seek additional
24 attention from Congress to help us out. But I do again, appreciate the
25 staff's attention to these.

26 These are part of our legacy and I think we have done a good

1 job moving forward in addressing them. If I may make one last
2 comment. Mr. Chairman, I may have to leave some what early today.
3 As you know, this is always one of my most favorite meetings every
4 year. So I regret having to pop out before it comes to a conclusion but
5 that is obviously not to be taken as any indicator other than I have
6 something else going on. So thank you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Commissioner Jaczko.

8 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: I wanted to start a little bit with
9 some of the points that Commissioner Merrifield raised with regard to
10 the waste incidental to reprocessing. Seems like there is a lot of work
11 on that particular plate, one of which is the development of the
12 standard review plan for this review and in the backup slides or the
13 presentation, one of the things you indicated was that the plan was to
14 provide a draft of the standard review plan to the Commission, first
15 quarter of 2007 so sometime end of this year. It will take some time,
16 certainly for the Commission to review and get that finalized.

17 Also, you indicated we were doing about 3 to 4 of these reviews
18 a year. So by the time we've got a standard review plan, potentially,
19 we could have any where from maybe five reviews already done,
20 which in my mind raises some concern about the kind of the order of
21 that effort. If the goal of the standard review plan is to have a process
22 in place so that it's clear and understandable how we doing these
23 reviews, we might want to try and reverse that. So maybe you could
24 comment, are there any ways we can accelerate getting the review
25 plan done before we actually do some of the reviews?

26 MR. CAMPER: Well, that is a very challenging and very astute

1 question that we asked ourselves when the 2005 Defense
2 Authorization Act came along. And literally, we had hit the deck
3 running right away. The reason that we were able to proceed and do
4 the reviews that we've done and the ones we have ongoing while
5 developing the standard review plan, frankly is because we had done
6 four consultations historically with the Department of Energy.

7 And so, we knew how to conduct these waste determinations
8 and we had technical staff and excellent technical staff, actually, on
9 board that allowed us to get moving.

10 Remember that the schedule for these determinations is driven
11 principally by the Department of Energy as a result of its Federal
12 Facilities Agreement that exists between the Department of Energy
13 and the State of South Carolina. And the State of South Carolina is
14 clearly interested in as they have made it extremely clear in all of their
15 meetings with us, expediency, expediency, expediency. They have
16 expressed trouble, concern about the length of our reviews already but
17 we believe that the time that we now take, about nine months is a
18 reasonable time given the nature of the reviews that we are
19 conducting. It's down from 15 months historically by the way. So we
20 had to hit the deck running.

21 We are developing the Standard Review Plan. We are
22 incorporating the knowledge that we had before, plus what we gain as
23 we go now, as we conduct these reviews. The draft SRP will be
24 published in our current schedule in May, the draft RSP for comment.
25 And then the Commission will receive the draft final -- that's an
26 oxymoron -- but a draft final SRP.

1 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: Are you anticipating -- are some of
2 the approaches that we are taking right now with the reviews going to
3 be invalidated by changes in the SRP?

4 MR. CAMPER: No, we don't think so, no.

5 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: Will it largely follow what we are
6 doing?

7 MR. CAMPER: It will follow what we are doing. Based upon our
8 historical experience --

9 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: And you are getting that sense
10 that we are not going to get public comment that tells us this approach
11 is going --

12 MR. CAMPER: Well, I think we will get public -- for example,
13 we decided to publish a few months ago, our updated concentration
14 averaging guidance which was built upon our previous Branch
15 technical position, so that the Department of Energy would have an
16 adequate amount of information to make a determination as to
17 whether or the waste in these tanks is in fact class C or greater than
18 class C.

19 We received a number of comments, for example, from NRDC,
20 and we are meeting with NRDC later this month. They took exception
21 to the staff's position on concentration averaging in that guidance.
22 They actually asked to withdraw it. But so there will be comments on
23 the process. But, I still believe -- we still believe that our historical
24 experience, the capability of our staff, the experience we are gaining
25 currently, will continue to demonstrate that our review process is
26 appropriate.

1 What is important about the standard review plan –

2 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: I'm going to cut you off right there.

3 I want to get in one more question. I appreciate the answer. I think
4 that is helpful.

5 This question on the high level waste issue, right now, we don't
6 have a time or deadline or a date certain for a license submission from
7 the Department of Energy.

8 But I guess I'm wondering, do we have a date when we might
9 have a date. Have they given us any indication when they are going to
10 give us that information?

11 MR. REAMER: I think our sense is late spring, summer,
12 potentially. When you look -- they are completing a process that's
13 ongoing to make the critical decision which probably won't be complete
14 until May and their belief that they really need to complete that in order
15 to be able to lay out the plan of work to complete the application,
16 you're looking late spring, summer.

17 MS. FEDERLINE: They have embarked on a very systemic
18 process which I believe we think is a good process which unites their
19 planning, their budgeting and their technical work.

20 And their decision on, they call it concept design one, will be
21 later in the spring or early in the summer and it will be the result of a
22 thoughtful process of going through that. So I think we are feeling
23 positive about that rather than just another date.

24 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER LYONS: Well, Luis, Margaret, I want to start
26 by complimenting you and your fine staff on just the most impressive

1 range of accomplishments in the last year. I appreciate that
2 Commissioner Merrifield stopped for a particular focus on the
3 decommissioning activities just very, very impressive.

4 I was going to just highlight things like Trojan, Main Yankee, the
5 work that you are doing on WIR, waste incidental reprocessing, I think
6 is truly commendable.

7 Your work on the Baltimore fire, tunnel fire, very, very important.
8 And the success -- I guess that's what we call it -- at least completion
9 of the PFS process is also most commendable.

10 By way of, I guess first question, Bill, you talked about the
11 Center and its importance in the High Level Waste Program. And I
12 very much agree with you. I was most impressed with the work being
13 done at the Center. Is there anything that the Commission could be or
14 should be doing to help in your quest to maintain the health of that
15 Center?

16 MR. REAMER: I would like to come back to you perhaps with
17 an answer. At this point, I would say no additional actions or policy
18 issues that I see for the Center to take on.

19 You made it very clear as a Commission, as a body that you
20 want me, as the manager of the Center's work here, to be looking at
21 that. Center representatives are here for this meeting today. They are
22 meeting tomorrow with representatives from Nuclear Reactor
23 Regulation. They also already have contacts with the Office of
24 Research. So I think we are actively working it. But if issues come up,
25 we will bring them back forward to you.

26 COMMISSIONER LYONS: I would like to mention one point

1 that I picked up in reading the background on the Center and at least
2 flag it for your discussions with folks from the Center because it did
3 concern me. And that was the trend over years as we move toward
4 the future, to have more small projects.

5 I would like to make the observation and just going back to the
6 only experience I have of Las Alamos that I worry very much when I
7 see a trend towards a lot of small projects, at least in the case of
8 experience that I have had. That can very easily lead to if you will,
9 almost micro management of large numbers of small projects with very
10 tight deliverables. And in my experience, it makes it much harder for
11 high quality technical staff to really become engaged in the broad
12 technical aspects of key issues.

13 So, at least, take my concern that as we move to too many
14 small projects, we may be undermining the effectiveness of the
15 Center. And if you find I'm wrong, fine, but at least, I would hope that
16 would be explored.

17 I wanted to ask a little bit about the -- for just a few comments
18 on the National Academy Spent Fuel Study, Transportation Study that
19 was just released. I've been on travel. I have not actually seen the
20 study. I have seen our press release. I seen a number of newspaper
21 articles.

22 I actually was in meetings at Keystone over the weekend with
23 folks who served on that study.

24 They seemed to be very surprised by some of the newspaper
25 comments, particularly in the San Francisco paper. And I'd just be
26 curious, these are people who were on the study who didn't know

1 where the San Francisco report was coming from.

2 Can you comment a little bit about your perceptions of that
3 report and perhaps the accuracy of some of the newspaper reports?

4 Mr. BRACH Yes, Commissioner, let me try. One, the National
5 Academy Science Study you are making reference to was released
6 last week. It is almost a 3 year study that they completed as they
7 examined the safety and security of the transport of spent fuel.

8 This is a study that was supported in part by NRC as well as
9 other Federal agencies, DOT, DOE and I believe EPRI.

10 The National Academy of Science concluded and I have some
11 of the phraseology in front of me because I think it is important to be
12 sure to summarize it correctly. They concluded there were no
13 fundamental technical barriers to the safe transport of spent nuclear
14 fuel and high level radioactive waste in the United States. They also
15 concluded that there is a low radiological risk activity with regard to this
16 transportation.

17 That is the underlying, if you will, conclusion, finding of the study
18 and it's one that quite frankly, I believe myself and staff as well believe,
19 that the programs that are currently in place, both the NRC and sister
20 agencies, DOT that are involved in regulation of transport of spent fuel,
21 have a program that provides for the safe and secure transport of
22 radioactive materials, both today and I think the Academy study is
23 looking into the future as well. I believe the study recommendations
24 confirm our position in that regard.

25 There were a few other recommendations and findings that the
26 Academy had directed to NRC. One, for example, is the

1 recommendation to consider longer duration engulfing fires as a
2 potential severe accident consideration would note that the
3 Commission to the staff with regard to plans for the package
4 performance study has also asked staff to consider such a scenario in
5 full-scale accident testing.

6 The reference to the article in the San Francisco paper over the
7 weekend, I believe is in reference to one of the recommendations that
8 the Academy had. And that was to conduct an independent review of
9 transportation security. A couple of comments I would like to make in
10 that regard.

11 One, the study when it began was focused principally and solely
12 on the safety of transport. And as the study was underway, they
13 recognized that security of transportation was as an important element
14 as well. And that was an activity that later on in the study, they started
15 pursuing.

16 The Academy Committee had some cleared members and
17 some members of the committee that were not cleared. For those
18 members of the committee that had appropriate clearances, we, the
19 staff, did provide to those members an overview of the studies,
20 security assessments and evaluations that we, the staff, have been
21 carrying out in the post 911 era.

22 The Academy recognizing that some of those committee
23 members were cleared and some uncleared, were not able to share
24 with the other members the information that we were able to impart to
25 a few of the committee members.

26 That led in part, I believe, in discussions with the Committee led

1 in part to their recommendation that since the entire Committee did not
2 have full access to the information with regard to security, that
3 recommendation on their part that perhaps a study to focus on security
4 by appropriately cleared individuals may be a consideration.

5 The transportation -- excuse me, the San Francisco article over
6 the weekend, I believe was characterizing a statement that the
7 Academy was restricted from or not allowed access to information with
8 regard to security. From my understanding that is not correct.

9 But I believe that was perhaps the reporter's reading of the
10 background information.

11 There is one other point I would like to add as well. You may
12 recall the National Academy completed a study on spent fuel storage
13 last year. They addressed as well spent fuel pool, but also dry cask
14 storage.

15 We did have with that committee, very detailed classified
16 discussions with regard to the security assessments and evaluations
17 that we, the staff, were carrying out as it relates to dry cask storage.

18 I just want to mention that many of the analytical models and
19 techniques that we, the staff, were using in our security assessment
20 for spent fuel storage, were the same modeling analysis and
21 techniques and actually the same staff performing these analysis as
22 we were carrying out with regard to transportation consideration. So in
23 that regard, I'm confident, Sir, with regard to the basis and
24 recommendations on our part with regard to the safe and secure
25 transportation.

26 COMMISSIONER LYONS: I appreciate that clarification very

1 much. And to add to and reinforce that, I'm sorry, I'm over time a bit
2 but I think it is a important point. I received email over the weekend
3 from the staff director at National Academy expressing great concern
4 that that article in the San Francisco paper misinterpreted comments
5 and in fact was commending the staff of the Commission for sharing
6 as much as possible with the suitably cleared members. And then just
7 in the last day and a half, I had been at a conference where, I can
8 describe in a number of ways, Dick Meserve, who has many titles
9 including the head of the National Academy Organization to which that
10 study report was also very concerned about the characterization in the
11 San Francisco paper. So I appreciate your clarification and it is
12 certainly consistent with what I heard from the National Academy.

13 MR. BRACH: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you Commissioner Lyons. I don't
15 know, let's see, one of the things I mentioned when this meeting
16 begun is the fact that we have a certain amount of uncertainty in the
17 type of things that NMSS waste arena is going to be facing. And I
18 understand that the staff is making significant efforts in trying to
19 address this. But still, the reality is that we don't know.

20 And I think it is important that you keep trying to address these
21 issues. At the same time, life keeps going on. And we need to keep
22 moving ahead.

23 In this regard with the issues of the high-level waste, Bill, what's
24 happening to the technical expertise in the high-level waste arena?

25 Are we able to be fungible with the staff that we have? Are we
26 going to be able to maintain the capabilities that we need two years

1 from now?

2 Is this being really, you know, planned with flexibility but at the
3 same time, we need to be able to discharge those responsibilities
4 when the time comes?

5 MR. REAMER: Yes, sir, and I spoke in my remarks about that
6 important balance between maintaining the continuity but also training
7 our people in other areas. And we have had success in doing that
8 through rotations, for example, and details of people into Nuclear
9 Reactor Regulation or into other aspects of NMSS.

10 Also, making performance assessment expertise available for
11 case work in the waste incidental to reprocessing area.

12 So I think we are being successful in maintaining that balance
13 and we are maintaining our core capability, technical capability
14 because the work is still there in the high-level, and it's very interesting
15 and very attractive to people.

16 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Could you tie this in to the issues of
17 environmental reviews and the capability to conduct environmental
18 reviews or comment on the environmental reviews that we might be,
19 you know, facing in the new nuclear reactor arena?

20 MR. REAMER: We do have a limited amount of environmental
21 expertise and we have made that available within NMSS. And I think
22 we've offered to Nuclear Reactor Regulation as well that we have that
23 capability both here and also at our Center for Nuclear Waste
24 Regulatory Analysis which has given us a lot of environmental support
25 in this spent fuel storage area. So we are working that.

26 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Is this an area where we need to actually

1 position ourselves better, have better resources to conduct
2 environmental reviews in a timely manner?

3 MR. REAMER: Within NMSS, I believe the answer is we are
4 carrying out our responsibilities and we are capable of doing that.

5 MS. FEDERLINE: Bill, if I could just add for a moment: I think
6 the important thing that we are trying to do is prepare the fundamental
7 skills and to answer Commissioner Jaczko, even though we don't have
8 a standard review plan for WIR, we have the fundamental technical
9 guidance on the review of performance assessments.

10 So everyone who needs to conduct a performance assessment
11 has that fundamental technical guidance and environmental reviews
12 can be conducted for high-level waste or decommissioning or reactor
13 reviews. So our focus is on developing the fundamental skills and
14 guidance which can then be applied across the agency.

15 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Let me go to the decommissioning
16 area. And I kind of heard two different messages that no doubt we
17 have done very, very, well and we have taken a series of complex
18 problems and been able to achieve resolution.

19 At the same time, after we make all these decommissioning
20 plans and our preparations and so forth, I heard that we still have
21 significant challenges. I thought we had already gone past the peak of
22 the significant challenges, that we now have a simple problem in front
23 of us and I get concerned when we keep piling challenges upon
24 something that I thought you had been very successful at.

25 MR. CAMPER: Well, thank you again for the compliment of
26 success. We have been, but no, there are a number of those sites that

1 are out there that are still very challenging.

2 All the complex material sites for example each of them is
3 unique. Almost every one of them has ground water contamination,
4 sub-surface soil contamination, site characterization is always a
5 problem.

6 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: But we know how to handle them.

7 MR. CAMPER: Of course. Absolutely.

8 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So the way of dealing with them is already
9 very well set and we know how to deal with them.

10 MR. CAMPER: Yes, it is.

11 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So it is not a big challenge but a minor
12 challenge.

13 MR. CAMPER: It is a minor challenge.

14 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I'll go with that. One of my pet peeves, I
15 can't help it, it has been several years is burn-up credit:

16 MR. REYES: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: When is the direct final rule.
18 That's a separate issue.

19 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: When are we going to be able to say, yes,
20 there is a physical reality and we are going to be able to give burn-up
21 credit where it's due?

22 MR. BRACH I wish I could give a specific date but I cannot. But
23 on a positive note, we have discussed burn-up credit for some time.

24 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I know, I been here for 10 years.

25 MR. BRACH I do feel more positive at this point in time that we
26 have had a success path forward.

1 I mentioned briefly in my opening comments that I offered on
2 the spent fuel project program that we have an effort underway with
3 DOE, EPRI and Research right now and we are actually successful in
4 this past year acquiring some burn-up data from a foreign country.
5 And there is additional data that we are in the process of obtaining.
6 You may recall previous discussions -- we all have the objective and
7 the goal of burn-up credit but what's been holding us back, holding
8 industry back, is the lack of technical data that would support our
9 ability to allow burn-up credit.

10 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: How about the French data?

11 MR. CAMPER: That is the data I'm making reference to, yes,
12 sir. That data is being acquired, and some of the fission product data
13 has yet to be acquired.

14 But we have broad based collaborative effort to analyze that
15 data, to develop the technical base. We have talked on previous
16 occasions on our interest and effort to obtain that data. We are now in
17 the process -- we have some of that date and more to come. I think
18 we are I want to say a success path forward. I don't have a specific
19 date to give you. It's not going to be this year. It's going to be
20 probably the next two years.

21 We will be in a position --.

22 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Well, I don't know. See, Madam Secretary
23 over there, she told me that when I know when I'm leaving, which I
24 don't know, she said give me a list of things that you want to resolve
25 and she will take care of it.

26 She told me that and so, burn-up credit, Madam Secretary, is

1 on that list.

2 MR. REYES: Chairman, we have paid our colleague from the
3 other country, the money has exchanged. We are getting the data so I
4 think the staff has a clear path to resolve that on the technical issues.

5 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: The Executive Director for Operations will
6 note that now that the Secretary of the Commission has an action
7 item.

8 Mr. REYES: I got it.

9 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Let me just follow along on
10 one other item that should take about a nano second, maybe a little
11 longer to write to paperwork. But you are supposed to give us a direct
12 final rule fairly soon to resolve the NRR, NMSS dispute over criticality
13 of spent fuel pools. Is that going to get to us soon?

14 MR. REYES: Let me look to the staff for a schedule.

15 MR. BRACH: We're working closely with NRR. The answer is
16 yes, it's being worked on collaboratively with our two offices. We are
17 developing the basis now with regard to supporting a rulemaking to
18 bring closure to the criticality issues.

19 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: We look silly in that area to
20 be honest with you. Every time I have a -- usually, it's been Dyer,
21 because he just happens to have his periodic just after the latest
22 article comes out in "Nuclear Fuels" or "Inside NRC" and they always
23 blame lawyers, so you should not laugh too much. But hopefully, we
24 can get that one behind us. And I'll be here for a while. So if you
25 don't, I'll keep bugging you. Although I would like it to be on the
26 Chairman's list.

1 Next item, the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis, I
2 agree with – I have not been in FFRDC but I understand exactly what
3 Commissioner Lyons is talking about.

4 But I would also point out there are legal issues we have to be
5 very aware of in trying to give extra work to the Center, that we sold
6 the Center to the OMB, on one ground and we can't have them
7 working on something else. There are laws, OMB Circulars, and we
8 just have to be very careful as we try to give them work and I'll just
9 leave it at that.

10 As long as it is within the law, I'm willing to try to give them
11 some work. It would be better if it were more substantial as
12 Commissioner Lyons said than a bunch of small projects.

13 Low-level waste, I'll just say in passing, I don't think it is our
14 regulatory responsibility but I hope somebody is looking at the
15 anti-trust implications of the various transactions that Envirocare,
16 whatever it's going to be called at the end of this process is involved in.
17 I worry about a situation where they sit abreast of low-level capacity for
18 most of the country -- and that's something for the Justice Department
19 or the Federal Trade Commission, whoever looks at anti trust matters
20 to do. That is not a message to the staff. That's a message to
21 whoever is listening. But that definitely unless Texas comes on board,
22 we are going to have a single entity controlling, have a monopoly
23 position and monopolies tend to maximize profits the last time I took
24 an economics course. And I think this particular entity would do that.

25 The TAD program, could you tell me what -- this is the old
26 multi-purpose, canister program. What is the impact?

1 I asked this repeatedly, before, what is the impact at Trojan,
2 Main Yankee, Yankee Rowe, Hadam Neck, Big Rock et cetera, et
3 cetera, Rancho Seco, where stuff is already in dual purpose NRC
4 canisters. And they don't have a spent fuel pool any more to muck
5 around and transfer into a new package. I hear DOE saying that they
6 want to make use of what is already there and they not going to
7 re-invent things.

8 Is one of the things they are not going to reinvent, the stuff
9 that's already in NRC certified, dual purpose canisters?

10 MS. FEDERLINE: Commissioner McGaffigan, we asking the
11 same questions of DOE.

12 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Do we know the answer?

13 MS. FEDERLINE: They have not told us the answer yet but we
14 are continuing to ask the questions. it is important that they address
15 this as an integrated national program, not as a repository program.
16 We need to understand --

17 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I think it would be a safety
18 disaster let alone a economic disaster to go and take the stuff out of
19 NRC certified dual purpose casks and ask people to take it
20 somewhere, put it in a spent fuel pool, put it in the new cask because it
21 is now the newest swellest thing and send it off to the repository if it
22 ever opens. I hope that this TAD program turns out to be some sort of
23 over pack on what we've already approved rather than something new.

24 MR. REYES: We are waiting for the answer.

25 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: I'm sending another
26 message in case anybody is listening.

1 The QA issue at Livermore which was discussed in a recent
2 trade press publication, one of the people quoted in that article said
3 this is actually worse than the USGS falsification issue.

4 What is the path forward for discussing the Livermore QA
5 issues on which we disagree with Bechtel, SAIC, and I guess with
6 DOE? And how important is the research that we are calling into
7 question because of the lack of a QA program?

8 Could you add a sentence to help those of us that don't know
9 what you are talking.

10 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay, there was an article in
11 the trade press and apparently, the staff has sent a letter to BSC
12 saying that as a result of an audit last year, in which the staff
13 participated, they have come to a different conclusion from DOE's
14 contractor as to the quality assurance of some Livermore work done at
15 the repository. And as I said, the press article indicated that this could
16 be a bigger deal than the USGS falsification, in view of this one
17 unnamed observer because some of this Livermore work is pretty
18 fundamental to the case that DOE may ultimately be making at the
19 repository.

20 So if it is more background, please provide it in your answer but
21 it sounded like a big deal.

22 MR. REAMER: It involved an instrument that clearly was not
23 calibrated for the use to which it was being put.

24 The contractors knew that and went ahead and used the
25 instrument as well. Then an audit was conducted by the Department
26 and we identified this issues for them in that audit. Our observers

1 identified it for them and they did not really respond in a way that we
2 thought flagged it as an important issue. So there were two
3 dimensions to what we covered in our letter.

4 I think the ball is in the Department's court. They clearly know
5 that this is a potentially significant issue, they are looking at it and they
6 need to respond.

7 I can't really get to your point of whether data might be
8 invalidated or work that is fundamental to the application. I think we
9 need to see how the Department responds to our letter.

10 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: But this was over a long time
11 period, no calibration of moisture humidity measurement?

12 MR. REAMER: And I think again, even the dimensions.

13 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: This is Lawrence Livermore
14 National Laboratory, as the contractor, just to be clear as to what we're
15 talking about.

16 MR. REAMER: Yes. I think again, I have to say that the
17 Department needs to look at our letter, look at the issues and come
18 back to us.

19 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: What is the time period for
20 that?

21 MR. REAMER: I don't have a specific date from the
22 Department that they intend to provide us their response.

23 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Is there going to be a second
24 quick round?

25 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: If you want to have a quick second go
26 around. Go ahead.

1 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I'll take my turn. It's Greg's
2 turn.

3 COMMISSIONER JACKZO: I'll take a quick second round.
4 Back on the issue of waste incidental to reprocessing: One of the
5 recent salt waste determinations, one of the key elements of that was
6 the NRC indicated there is an important need for monitoring in order to
7 validate some of the analysis that was done, that goes into the report.

8 Can you just comment a little bit on how the staff intends to do
9 that and how to fulfill those responsibilities for the monitoring program?

10 MR. CAMPER: Yes, we have a monitoring responsibility under
11 the Act of course. We identified several technical issues requiring
12 monitoring to verify assumptions that have been made by the
13 Department of Energy.

14 We indicated in our letter going back to the Department of
15 Energy at the end of December that these are the issues. We are
16 trying to follow, a risk-informed approach, performance based
17 approach whereby DOE will identify the monitoring techniques to be
18 used.

19 That information will be coordinated with the State of South
20 Carolina. We will be involved in those discussions. A monitoring plan
21 will be created and then, we will monitor the monitoring plan over time,
22 will develop inspection like procedures, not inspections per se because
23 it is a consultation, but inspection like procedures where we will be
24 looking at these activities over a long period of time. Monitoring is
25 designed to determine if in fact, all of the performance objectives in
26 Part 61 are being met.

1 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: What happens if we find that
2 some of these performance objectives are not being met?

3 MR. CAMPER: We are required to provide a notification report to the
4 Department of Energy, to the State of South Carolina, and in the case of the
5 salt stone, or Idaho or whoever is out there and to Congress.

6 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: Under the Act, is there any further
7 mechanism then for any one to take action based on that?

8 MR. CAMPER: No, it is not articulated in the Act.

9 MS. FEDERLINE: If we find out that their assumptions are not
10 valid, in other words if the work does not hold up under the monitoring,
11 they will be required to come back to us with an analysis that
12 demonstrates how it does meet the performance objectives.

13 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: What if it doesn't at that point?
14 What ultimately -- let's say we get to a point where we find that the
15 analysis is invalid. What happens at that point?

16 MS. FEDERLINE: Well, the assumptions that I think are really
17 are critical are to the waste form and the integrity of the waste form.
18 So, it's possible that if they can't demonstrate the integrity of the waste
19 form, that some changes would need to be made.

20 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: Who would have those changes?

21 MS. FEDERLINE: The Department of Energy.

22 In other words, they would have to resubmit an analysis that
23 would demonstrate the performance to us using a new set of
24 assumptions for the waste form.

25 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. Commissioner Lyons.

26 COMMISSIONER LYONS: In one of the backup slides, there

1 was reference to on-site representative at Yucca Mountain. I honestly
2 hadn't realized we had on-site representatives there. And I was just
3 curious if you could discuss a little bit about their function in the overall
4 program. I assume it's related to our assessment of the quality of the
5 license application?

6 MR. REAMER: That's one element. I think conceptually they
7 are our eyes and ears very close to where a lot of the work is being
8 done. They provide a contact for us when we are looking for
9 information, maintain an awareness of the work that's ongoing. But
10 also, they are quality trained as well and can provide feedback on
11 quality issues.

12 MR. REYES: It is parallel to a resident inspector office. We
13 have a field office, staff with two very high quality technical people,
14 some administrative support. They are there. They can go anywhere,
15 they can look at anything. It is the same concept.

16 COMMISSIONER LYONS: Very good. These are actually out
17 at the mountain.

18 MR. REAMER: In Las Vegas near the Department's offices
19 where the Department and the contractor –

20 COMMISSIONER LYONS: They also have access to the
21 mountain as needed.

22 MR. REAMER: Yes, they do.

23 COMMISSIONER LYONS: A question probably for Larry on
24 WIR and certainly you've heard several other Commissioners express
25 interest in that program as Commissioner Jackzo and others have.
26 And I, too, am very interested in that very high visibility program.

1 I was just curious: Where we have a situation where South
2 Carolina and Idaho, we have statutory responsibilities but we have
3 requests from the DOE at Hanford, potentially West Valley, do we
4 have enough resources to cover the range of requests, or I'm
5 assuming if we have to prioritize, I would assume we have to take the
6 statutory responsibilities, first. But I'm just curious if we are getting into
7 a situation where we have to prioritize among the different WIR
8 requirements based on resources?

9 MR. CAMPER: We do have adequate resources.

10 The WIR program is an appropriated budget item starting this
11 current fiscal year.

12 We are working for example, at the Hanford site under an
13 inner-agency agreement. And in our discussion with DOE,
14 continuously revisit in periodic meetings with them, their prioritization
15 scheme. And there is an integrated prioritization scheme provided to
16 us from DOE for all activities.

17 We have not yet nor do we forecast a conflict between
18 prioritization under the Act verses something done under interagency
19 agreement.

20 If you saw any conflict like that coming, I'd hope you let the
21 Commission know because again, these are very visible, very
22 important.

23 MR. CAMPER: Any hiccups in WIR, we intend to keep your
24 fully advised.

25 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Is this prioritization scheme
26 public?

1 MR. CAMPER: No, not necessarily. I don't believe that it is.
2 Scott are you here? But the meetings we have with DOE in which
3 these schedules are discussed are Government to Government closed
4 meetings.

5 They have a federal facilities agreement between the State of
6 South Carolina and DOE in which those closure schedules are public.
7 But the prioritization scheme itself, Scott, that's is -- I don't believe that
8 is a matter of public record.

9 MR. FLANDERS: Scott Flanders. No , the prioritization
10 schemes are not made public.

11 DOE, as Larry said, we have a Government to Government
12 meetings and they continue to reassess their priorities at all the sites
13 and consultation and coordination with the states as well. So at this
14 point, those priority schedules have not been made public.

15 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I will give a hint to any
16 member of Congress listening that they may want to take a look at the
17 prioritization schemes and it just strikes me that those not being public
18 isn't a swell idea.

19 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, thank you. Another one of our favorite
20 subjects is the package performance study.

21 Now, we have had a breather, both technically and because we
22 had told Senator, I think who was the Senator from out west that was
23 very pointed, when are we going do these things. And Commissioner
24 McGaffigan and I were there.

25 But 2008 seems to be an appropriate time in which we would
26 conduct these studies. And there are technical issues that are going

1 to be coming from our interactions with Germany, with BAM. Just want
2 to know whether the staff is preparing properly to have the right
3 foundation, right data, the right structure so when the time comes and
4 we really put that money to use for the package performance study,
5 that we can go ahead with them.

6 MR. BRACH: I believe the short answer to the your question is
7 yes, we are. I would note that the NRC Office of Research has lead
8 with very close support from our office as well.

9 What you've mentioned, the effort to negotiate the agreement
10 with BAM to exchange technical data on physical testing, that's in
11 process. I will mention as well that the Office of Research has a paper
12 coming to the Commission in the near future laying out plans and
13 considerations for the package performance study in response to the
14 earlier SRMs.

15 I would note as well, we discussed a couple of times already
16 this afternoon, DOE consideration of the new TAD Canister System
17 and the earlier Commission direction in the package performance
18 study to consider testing a transport package that would have a fairly
19 high likelihood of being used for transport to the repository.

20 So we are looking at the DOE consideration, the German
21 activities as well as looking in the context of what would be the most
22 appropriate time for conduct of the testing –

23 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: The Commission will need to know early if
24 2008 is the appropriate time.

25 MR. REYES: You will see it in the budget.

26 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It looks like we will see a lot things in the

1 budget. Commissioner McGaffigan.

2 MR. REYES: Yes, you are going to see a lot of things in the
3 budget.

4 COMMISSIONER JACZKO: We're going to be dazzled, I believe
5 was the –

6 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: That was only on
7 performance indicators.

8 MR. REYES: You got it. The budget I think you are going to
9 faint.

10 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Some of us are used to DOD
11 numbers and we're still going to be rounding errors in DOD space.
12 Okay, Secretary Bodman yesterday apparently talked about the fact
13 that they are going to a cold repository less than boiling point of water
14 repository as if it were well-known. Is that well-known?

15 Or was he essentially announcing it yesterday? Has that been
16 communicated publicly before?

17 MR. REAMER: It's not been communicated directly to us. And
18 at least, formerly, it has not been communicated.

19 COMMISSIONER McGaffigan: I welcome it to be honest with
20 you because the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board and John
21 Garrick who was then at ACNW and is now at the Nuclear Waste
22 Technical Review Board, were very clear that they thought that would
23 reduce licensing issues significantly. And another issue that they are
24 doing I think that will also reduce licensing issues significantly if it
25 proves to be true for spent fuel pools for any fuel handling they have to
26 handle at the site rather than dry transfer facilities. I think that will be a

1 step forward.

2 The issue of -- which of these do I go at -- the issue of igneous
3 activity. You all sent a letter last week to the ACNW saying you
4 disagree with ACNW on several matters. I honestly hope ACNW
5 fights back and you have a good technical discussion.

6 I know our staffs had a briefing last week and the heart of it is,
7 you all envision the magna sort of exploding up through the area at a
8 very high speed, exploding through the drifts at a very high speed and
9 getting thermal equilibrium very, very rapidly, and adversely for the
10 casks.

11 I can imagine -- I'm not a geologist but I don't know that that is
12 the only way that nature is going to occur and I still like what Mr. Hinze
13 in the ACNW did but it is something to be disputed. It's something for
14 you all to argue about. I welcome the argument.

15 The last item I'll raise is first, I want to praise Earl Easton for his
16 National Public Radio interview last week on the spent fuel study. I
17 thought he did a very, very good job on all things considered and I
18 enjoyed listening to it, as it was rebroadcast. I didn't hear the original.
19 But the second item, and this came up I think at that same hearing,
20 Chairman Diaz mentioned, this notion that on security issues that the
21 transportation has to be perfect, and some stakeholders piling on
22 mentioned TOW missiles, the former Attorney General of Nevada
23 implied that we needed to protect spent fuel in this country in a petition
24 for rulemaking that I believe is still pending. That we needed to
25 provide fighter air cover should foreign fighter planes choose to strafe.
26 And I think there is a rule of reason here. If we really are worried

1 about foreign fighter planes strafing spent fuel pool trains or casks,
2 we've got other problems.

3 And if you really think that TOW missiles which are military
4 weapons, not RPGs that are used against our troops everyday but,
5 you know, the TOW missiles and God knows we could have depleted
6 uranium tank rounds and whatever. If terrorists get their hands on
7 these things, unless they first went to anti-nuclear zealot school before
8 they went to terrorism school, they are probably going to use them
9 somewhere else first. And I hope and pray they don't get their hands
10 on these sorts of things. So if we go down -- I believe that our security
11 arrangements for spent fuel on which there is an additional order post
12 9-11, are very, very adequate or more than adequate for any
13 reasonable threat. But if I pose unreasonable threats, you know, then,
14 as I say, we have other problems in this country and I would
15 respectfully suggest that we decouple the anti nuclear zealot schools
16 from the terrorism schools in the caves of Afghanistan or wherever
17 they have gone to if we can possibly do that.

18 But I don't think actually that they have an anti-nuclear zealot
19 precourse for the terrorism course.

20 I will leave it at that. That was a statement and there is no
21 answer that I'm looking for.

22 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We did notice it was a statement. Thank you
23 very much. And I appreciate the staff bringing the Commission up to
24 where we are in these issues. We do know that you have a very
25 diverse portfolio and that there are uncertainties in that portfolio.

26 We keep looking forward to working with you to make sure that

1 the agency can continue to discharge their responsibilities. And with
2 that, we are adjourned.

3 (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned)