UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 8, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: ACNW Members
ACNW Staff

FROM: Michele S. Kelton
Technical Secretary, ACNW

SUBJECT: CERTIFIED MINUTES OF THE 152ND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW) JULY 20-22, 2004

The proposed minutes of the subject meeting have been certified as the official record of the proceedings for that meeting.

Attachment:
Certified Minutes of the152nd
Meeting, July 20–22, 2004

cc: J. Larkins, ACRS/ACNW
H. Larson, ACNW/ACNW
A. Bates, SECY (O-16C1)
S. Jones, NMSS (T-8A23)
J. Dixon-Herrity, EDO (O-16E15)

MEMORANDUM TO: Michele S. Kelton, Technical Secretary
Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

FROM: Michael T. Ryan, Chairman
Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

SUBJECT: PROPOSED MINUTES OF THE 152ND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW) JULY 20–22, 2004

I certify that, based on my review of these minutes[1], and to the best of my knowledge and belief, I have observed no substantive errors or omissions in the record of this proceeding subject to the comments noted below

Comments:

B. John Garrick, Chairman

11/5/04
Date

(1) Minutes of 152nd meeting held on July 20–22, 2004, dated November 3, 2004.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 3, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael T. Ryan, Chairman,
Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

FROM: Michele S. Kelton, Technical Secretary
Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

SUBJECT: PROPOSED MINUTES OF THE 152ND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW) JULY 20–22, 2004

Enclosed are the proposed minutes of the 152nd meeting of the ACNW. This draft is being provided to give you an opportunity to review the record of this meeting and provide comments. Your comments will be incorporated into the final certified set of minutes as appropriate. Please provide your corrections and comments to me.

Please note that these minutes are being issued in two parts: (1) main body (working copy form) and (2) appendices. The appendices are being sent only to those members who have requested them.

A copy of the certified minutes with appendices will be forwarded to each member.

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/o Encl. 2: ACNW Members
ACNW Staff
J. Larkins, ACRS/ACNW

CONTENTS

APPENDICES

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 3, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael T. Ryan, Chairman,
Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

FROM: Michele S. Kelton, Technical Secretary
Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

SUBJECT: PROPOSED MINUTES OF THE 152ND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW) JULY 20–22, 2004

Enclosed are the proposed minutes of the 152nd meeting of the ACNW. This draft is being provided to give you an opportunity to review the record of this meeting and provide comments. Your comments will be incorporated into the final certified set of minutes as appropriate. Please provide your corrections and comments to me.

Please note that these minutes are being issued in two parts: (1) main body (working copy form) and (2) appendices. The appendices are being sent only to those members who have requested them.

A copy of the certified minutes with appendices will be forwarded to each member.

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/o Encl. 2: ACNW Members
ACNW Staff
J. Larkins, ACRS/ACNW

CERTIFIED **Issued: 11/3 /04**

11/05/2004
By MICHAEL T. RYAN for
B. JOHN GARRICK

CERTIFIED MINUTES OF THE 152ND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE JULY 20–22, 2004

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW or the Committee) held its 152nd meeting on July 20–22, 2004, at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The ACNW published a notice of this meeting in the *Federal Register* on July 14, 2004 (69 FR 42219) (Appendix A). This meeting served as a forum for attendees to discuss and take appropriate action on the items listed in the agenda (Appendix B). The entire meeting was open to public attendance.

A transcript of selected portions of the meeting is available in the NRC's Public Document Room at One White Flint North, Room 1F19, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. Copies of the transcript are available for purchase from Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc., 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20005. Transcripts may also be downloaded from, or reviewed on, the Internet at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/acnw/tr/ at no cost.

ACNW Members B. John Garrick, ACNW Chairman, Michael T. Ryan, Vice Chairman, George M. Hornberger, and Ruth F. Weiner attended this meeting. For a list of other attendees, see Appendix C.

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (OPEN)

[Dr. John Larkins was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. B. John Garrick, ACNW Chairman, convened the meeting at 10 a.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda. He also stated that the meeting was being conducted in conformance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. In addition, Dr. Garrick asked members of the public who were present and had something to contribute to the meeting to inform the ACNW staff so that time could be allocated for them to speak. He concluded his report by noting the following items of interest.

- Neil Coleman, ACNW staff, Bruce Marsh, ACNW Consultant, and Lee Abramson, NRC Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research Scientist, submitted an abstract titled, "Testing Claims About Volcanic Disruption of a Potential Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada" to the Geological Society of America for presentation at the November 7-10, 2004, meeting in Denver, Colorado. The same authors have also submitted an article with the same title to the American Geophysical Union for publication in *Geophysical Research Letters*.

- On June 30, 2004, the Department of Energy (DOE) certified that roughly 1.2 million documents supporting a Yucca Mountain license application (LA) were now publicly available on the Internet. Such a certification is necessary at least 6 months before the LA is sent to the NRC. Ms. Sue Gagner, an NRC spokesperson, stated that approximately 700,000 more documents were to come from DOE (NRC can index approximately 150,000 documents per week). NRC would now appoint a pre-LA presiding officer who will address challenges and issues. (Judge Paul G. Bollwerk of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel was subsequently appointed to that position). The State of Nevada has 90 days to post and certify documents on the licensing support network (LSN).

- The French National Evaluation Committee recently stated that unless new information arises from ongoing research, the French Parliament should face "no obstacle" in deciding in principle in 2006, on a repository for long-lived nuclear waste at the Bure site in eastern France (the ACNW visited this site several years ago during the initial exploratory efforts). The planned facility is in a homogenous clay foundation and is planned to accommodate essentially the same 70,000 MTU of spent fuel as Yucca Mountain.

II. PACKAGE PERFORMANCE STUDY

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

This briefing was designed to bring the Committee up to date with current and planned activities associated with the Package Performance Study (PPS). Mr. Bret Tegeler, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, reviewed the history of demonstration testing of casks. This history includes scale modeling, and full-scale testing of truck and railcar casks using high-velocity impacts at Sandia Laboratories in the late 70s and early 80s. Testing was also done in the United Kingdom as part of Operation Smash Hit in the mid-80s. In general, the full-scale and scale model tests compared favorably.

Mr. Tegeler reviewed the hypothetical accident conditions in NRC's current regulations for shipping casks (10 CFR Part 71.73). The conditions include—

- a free drop of the cask from 30 ft. onto an unyielding surface
- a puncture test where the cask is dropped 40 in. onto a solid cylinder of mild steel
- a thermal test that exposes the cask to a fully engulfing fire of 800 °C for 30 minutes
- an immersion test under a 50-ft head. of water

The goal of the current PPS program is to demonstrate the inherent robustness of full-scale spent nuclear fuel transportation casks by conducting confirmatory research with enhanced public participation. The staff has already conducted a number of public outreach meetings and requested public comments on the test protocols. The comments had four main themes. Some members of the public wished to see full-scale testing to regulatory limits. Some even suggested that casks be tested to failure. Some suggested that insults caused by terrorism be

addressed by the PPS (terrorism is being addressed separately). Others suggested conducting a realistic demonstration test based on realistic accident scenarios.

The NRC staff considered a number of options for PPS testing. The options were testing beyond regulatory requirements, regulatory requirement testing, and demonstration testing (less severe than regulatory requirements). Both truck and rail casks were advanced for testing purposes. Four proposed combinations of tests were sent to the Commission.

In May 2004 the Commission approved the testing of a full-scale, NRC-certified rail transportation cask. The crash testing would take place under realistically conservative conditions. The Commission stated that there should be sufficient instrumentation during the test to collect data for validating analytical methods, including scaling. The cask would be subjected to a fully engulfing fire. The NRC staff would submit a test plan of a realistically conservative demonstration test to the Commission for approval. The staff would submit predictions of cask performance 6 months after the test plan was approved. The staff would interact with the DOE concerning potential funding for the PPS and the potential use of a rail for the PPS.

The staff believes a demonstration test can accomplish a number of goals. It can demonstrate the robustness of a rail transportation cask. (ACNW Members noted the test could demonstrate the weakness of the cask). If provided with sufficient instrumentation, the demonstration can be used for analytical comparison. The demonstration can highlight the ability of analytical methods to predict cask response in complex accident scenarios.

The staff is currently developing a test plan proposal for Commission approval. It was explained that cask transportation accidents are low-probability events. Using data compiled by the Department of Transportation, events with the highest conditional probabilities are train derailments resulting in impacts or collisions with soil, roadbeds, rocks, structures, railcars, or locomotives. The staff is focusing on an event that is realistic but at the upper end of what could be considered credible (or realistically conservative). The staff is considering several hypothetical cask and rail car accident derailment scenarios. Currently the favored scenario is the collision of a locomotive and a cask (attached to a railcar). The staff believes a collision with a locomotive has the potential to demonstrate a conservative challenge to the cask.

The staff enumerated the challenges presented by the demonstration test plan. For example, a fully engulfing fire may not be realistic based on observations from accidents. The staff has considered options such as a tanker car fire to improve the realism of the fire test. The staff also described the difficulties of validating the scaling methodology. For an engineering analysis, validation involves the comparison of analysis results with well-defined experiments (i.e., experiments with controlled boundary conditions. A demonstration test will not have controlled boundary conditions. A demonstration test will have uncertainties (nonlinear nature of the collision, the plasticity of the impact surface, railcar behavior, cask tiedowns, and friction).

The staff expects to send a demonstration test plan proposal to the Commission in late July 2004. The test location has yet to be decided. The staff is continuing interactions with DOE regarding contribution of funds and possible expansion of the PPS to include a truck cask.

During a discussion period, the following questions were asked:

- What new information does the staff expect to get from the current PPS test? The staff will look at more complex finite element codes to ensure the analytical models are current. The staff hopes to find nothing new, but may uncover some weaknesses in the cask design.

- What is being demonstrated in the PPS test and to whom? The test will demonstrate modern three-dimensional finite element analysis for the staff's benefit and address public concerns over transportation safety.

Several Committee Members urged the staff to carefully define success and failure before the test. The staff was asked to explain to the public in plain language what the tests would and would not demonstrate and how the demonstration test would relate to regulatory requirements testing. The staff was also urged to create a data bank for the shipping campaign to the proposed HLW repository to record the frequency and severity of transportation events.

III. LICENSE TERMINATION RULE ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF INTENTIONAL MIXING OF CONTAMINATED SOIL

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

Dr. Michael Ryan introduced Mr. Derek Widmayer, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS), who gave some background on the topic and then discussed the current recommendations provided to the Commission as well as stakeholder considerations.

He said the basic issue was "Should intentional mixing of contaminated soil for meeting the release criteria of the License Termination Rule (LTR) be allowed?"

After a complete survey of a wide range of NRC regulations and guidance, the staff concluded that dilution was not forbidden in the regulations, that mixing and dilution had been addressed many times (in various applications with various conclusions) and it had not been addressed in the general environmental impact statement (GEIS) supporting the LTR. A similar detailed review of DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and international documents related to the topic reached similar conclusions.

Although dilution is not addressed in any DOE rule, it is discussed in DOE's guidance documents. At the Nevada Test Site Disposal facility, the waste acceptance criterion is flexible on waste characterization and dilution is recognized as part of processing. EPA says that dilution is forbidden as the sole remedy for certain wastes and to avoid treatment. International top-level guidance says that dilution for the purpose of circumventing regulatory requirements is inappropriate and regulatory agencies should approve any uses of dilution.

The staff proposal to the Commission had five options. Option 3 (as approved by the Commission) recommended that the current practice be continued and allow limited (case-by-case) use of intentional mixing to meet the LTR release criteria. The staff proposal states that:

> The resultant footprint would be equal or smaller than the footprint present before decommissioning work begins, and Clean soil, from outside the footprint, should not be mixed to lower concentrations.

The staff has solicited comments and guidance on eight issues. Comments from two licensees have already been received. One of the licensees requested authority to crush and blend slag material to reduce source concentration in meeting the waste acceptance criterion for the facility, while the other licensee wanted to determine whether mixing is feasible. The second licensee's site is an Site Decommissioning Management Plan site and will probably not meet the LTR requirements. The final draft of the document is scheduled for issuance in September 2005.

The Committee asked about whether the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) experience applies, what constitutes acceptable waste (e.g., waste contaminated by hazardous materials), whether analyses of radionuclides are site-specific, and whether stakeholder input is valuable. The Committee was also interested as to whether the waste acceptance criterion being used could result in a change of the waste classification.

IV. RISK-INFORMING YUCCA MOUNTAIN INSPECTION SYSTEM

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

The purpose of this presentation was to report on the status of the development of the Yucca Mountain inspection program. The inspection program will be a joint effort of NRC headquarters staff, Region IV staff, the Yucca Mountain onsite representatives, and the staff from the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses. The staff is currently developing manual chapters and inspection procedures for inspectors. These documents will be based on the Yucca Mountain Review Plan, NRC's high-level waste regulations (Part 63), and quality assurance procedures developed by DOE.

The inspection program has two phases. Phase 1 consists of field reviews during the license review process. The field reviews will assess the validity of the data in DOE's technical documents. The data sets to be examined are selected on the basis of risk insights. The Phase 1 inspections are designed to evaluate the traceability and/or validity of data for technical documents under review. In general, Phase 1 will ensure that good scientific practices were used to develop technical reports for the Yucca Mountain LA.

The Phase 2 inspections will focus on pre-construction design and procurement activities for hardware components important to the safety of the repository (e.g., the waste canister fabrication process).

The inspection process will use various procedural tools: a master inspection plan, field reviews, inspection entrance and exit meetings with the licenses, and documentation reports on the inspections.

The Yucca Mountain inspection program will rely on risk information such as NMSS's Risk Insights Baseline Report to implement a risk-informed assessment process, i.e., an inspection process focused on risk significance. The inspection program will start when NRC receives the LA.

V. INTEGRATED SAFETY ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND BRIEFING

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

Ms. Sharon Steele, NMSS, presented background and status information on Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA) requirements for fuel cycle facilities that fall under Part 70. Ms. Steele gained familiarity with the new Part 70, Subpart H rule as a fire safety reviewer for the proposed Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility. The presentation was three-fold. It provided background information, an example of a recent ISA submittal, and recent developments in response to ISA feedback. Staff guidance to Subpart H is provided by the standard review plan (NUREG-1520), guidance on ISA methods (NUREG-1513), and NUREG-6410 which provides methods for performing accident analyses.

By October 2004, licensees are required to complete a site-wide ISA, correct all unacceptable performance deficiencies, and submit a site-wide ISA summary for NRC approval. Subpart H applies to nuclear fabrication facilities and any new enrichment facilities. The rule requires that all licensees complete their site-wide ISA, and correct all unacceptable performance deficiencies identified through the ISA.

The regulatory concept for Part 70 Subpart H consists of performance requirements, items relied on for safety, and management measures. The ISA requires that the applicant or licensee use an integrated safety approach to identify accident sequences, determine their likelihoods, and estimate the consequences. The applicant would identify items relied on for safety (IROFS) and establish management measures for the IROFS in order to comply with the Part 70 performance requirements. Accidents estimated to be of intermediate (or medium) consequence must be made unlikely. Parameters of high and medium consequence accidents were indicated in the risk matrix.

The rule does not require likelihood evaluation to be quantitative. However, the applicant must establish clear objective criteria that could differentiate between a highly unlikely and a likely accident. Basically, IROFS must have qualities that demonstrate reliability and availability such as: large margin of safety, redundancy, diversity, and low failure rate.

Ms. Steele discussed the license amendment application for a new process at an existing fuel fabrication facility. She also discussed the licensee's overall ISA process, hazard identification methodologies, potential accident sequences, accident consequences, and the binning of credible accidents sequences according to the performance criteria. The chart below illustrates the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the ISA process.

Finally, Ms. Steele identified recent developments such as the status of current licensee ISA summaries, interim staff guidance and the outcomes of the July 2004 Workshop. As of July 2004, NRC received three project ISA summaries, was in the process of reviewing summaries for four facilities, and was awaiting site-wide and balance-of plant summaries from four sites. The staff is developing nine interim staff guidance documents on issues such as nuclear criticality safety performance requirements, clarification of baseline design criteria, and rules of engagement. At the July 2004 Workshop, topics of discussion included upcoming interim safety guidance and topics such as backfit guidance, addressing natural phenomena, initiating event frequency, and inspection planning.

At the conclusion of the presentation, the members asked several questions. Dr. Garrick stated that he was familiar with the process hazard analysis approach used by the chemical industry and others. He expressed his preference for more of a quantitative approach, since it appeared that just as much work was involved. He stated that the ACRS/ACNW position was that the new requirement would allow the option for a probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) format. He thought it would be useful for the Committee to hear from an applicant or licensee in the future. Dr. Garrick wanted to know if conversion facilities would be required to perform an ISA.

The staff responded that the conversion facility in Metropolis, Illinois, is regulated by Part 40 and, as such, is not required to perform an ISA. The staff indicated that the rule does not preclude the use of a PRA, and that if the process were complex enough, that NUREG-1520 would guide the user to more sophisticated methods. The staff also indicated that Louisiana Energy Services (LES) had submitted its ISA summary.

The ACRS/ACNW Office Director informed the Members that either LES or the U.S. Enrichment Corporation was currently scheduled to brief the Committee in October 2004.

VI. HEALTH PHYSICS ISSUES

[Mr. Neil Coleman was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

Dr. Donald Cool, NMSS, gave an overview of the draft recommendations from the International Commission on Radiation Protection (ICRP). The staff is currently reviewing these recommendations and intends to respond formally to the ICRP in December. Dr. Cool summarized the

	Highly Unlikely	Unlikely	Not unlikely
High Consequence Publ Dose > 25 rem Worker Dose > 100 rem	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Medium Consequence Publ Dose 5 - 25 rem Worker Dose 25 -100 rem Env releases > 5000 Tbl 2	Acceptable	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Low Consequence Publ Dose < 5 rem Worker Dose < 25 rem	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable

history of NRC's basic standards for radiation protection embodied in 10 CFR Part 20. That rule was published in 1991 after a rulemaking process that took 12 years. The rule was implemented in 1994. In 1991, the ICRP published a revised set of recommendations, Report 60. That report was not available to the staff when Part 20 was promulgated, so the NRC regulations are based on the older set of ICRP recommendations in Publication 26 and on the metabolic models in ICRP Publication 30. The staff has taken a case-by-case look at various licensees' proposals to use updated models and to use effective dose from external exposure and the other concepts that have been proposed over the last 15 years (some of which have been approved on a case-by-case basis). It is particularly useful for those who are dealing with uranium or thorium and other isotopes for which the more recent metabolic models indicate a lower risk per unit of intake activity than had previously been modeled. The staff is waiting for the latest ICRP recommendations to come out formally before starting a new rulemaking process.

Dr. Cool noted that the Commission has requested proposals for a more robust materials program (i.e., for byproduct and source material and other areas). The staff has sent to the Commission a paper on how to evaluate scientific recommendations relating to health effects in radiation biology. With the Commission's approval, the staff is pursuing a more aggressive and proactive approach. The staff is also looking at the ongoing BEIR VII work (radiation risk relationship), DOE's low-dose studies, and the updated dosimetry from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The staff has aggressively pursued opportunities to interact with the ICRP, and has participated in almost every opportunity to attend international and national forums on health physics issues. ICRP 21 has been engaged in this development cycle for about 5 years.

ICRP has formally placed the draft of its recommendations on the ICRP Website, www.icrp.org. ICRP will accept comments through the end of 2004. The NRC staff intends to provide comments before then.

Dr. Cool summarized the draft IRCP recommendations as follows:

1 The dose constraints should quantify the fundamental levels of protection for workers and the public from single sources of radiation in all situations.

2. Maintain the Publication 60 limits for the combined dose from all regulated sources as the most that regulatory authorities will accept in normal situations.

3. Maximum constraints for a single source: 100 mSv (emergency situations), 20 mSv (occupational exposure), 1 mSv (public exposure), 0.01 mSv (minimum constraint).

4. Complement the constraints and limits with the requirement for optimizing protection from a source.

5. Determine who is responsible for justifying the introduction of a new practice.

6. Update the effective dose radiation- and tissue-weighting factors. The tissue-weighting factors should be substantially revised. The weighting factor for the breast would

increase to 0.12, to indicate the increased risk of irradiation of the breast. The lung factor remains the same. Bone marrow is 0.12. The gonads go down to 0.05 from 0.25.

7. The fatal cancer risk coefficient increases, but the total detriment risk coefficient decreases.

8. Emphasize that patient dose should be commensurate with the clinical benefit expected from a justified diagnostic or therapeutic procedure.

9. Include a policy for radiological protection of nonhuman species.

Dr. Cool stated that the Commission continues to have deep misgivings about the need to develop a separate standard for protection of nonhuman species. ICRP representatives have offered to meet with NRC staff, other Federal agency representatives, and members of the public. He said ICRP representatives would visit NRC headquarters in September 2004.

VII. SITE VISIT AND IGNEOUS ACTIVITY WORKING GROUP

[Mr. Michael Lee was the Designated Federal Official for this portion of the meeting.]

The Committee intends to hold a working group meeting in September 2004 (153rd meeting) on the treatment of disruptive igneous events in a Yucca Mountain performance assessment. Three issues would be explored during the meeting: (1) the probability of a disruptive igneous event; (2) the better modeling of magma-repository interactions to predict the consequences, should a disruptive event occur; and (3) the evaluation of key dose-modeling issues after the possible release of radioactive volcanic ash. It was noted that the Committee had contacted all invited speakers and invited experts for this meeting and discussed scopes of their respective participation. It was also noted that DOE would attend the meeting and participate in the discussions, but would not make presentations to the Committee. It was noted that the State of Nevada would be represented by Dr. Gene Smith from the Department of Geosciences at the University of Nevada (Las Vegas). Representatives of the Electric Power Research Institute would present their recent 2004 independent analysis of the consequences of a potential disruptive igneous event. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (and its consultants) also intend to present at the meeting. The ACNW staff noted that it was still attempting to find one speaker for the planned session on the recommendations of the DOE 2003 Igneous Consequences Peer Review Panel.

Dr. Garrick said that Dr. Stan Kaplan of Bayesian Systems, Inc. (California), had agreed to serve as a keynote speaker for the meeting and discuss the application of the "risk triplet" concept to the evaluation and treatment of igneous activity in Yucca Mountain performance assessments. Dr. Garrick also asked that the cognizant staff engineer for this meeting (M. Lee) distribute background materials as soon as practical to the Members, their consultants, and outside invited working group experts.

The ACNW staff noted that attempts were underway to identify an alternative leader for the proposed field trip to examine the Crater Flats volcanic field.

VIII. COMMITTEE RETREAT

On July 22, the ACNW members and staff held a brainstorming meeting in preparation for the ACNW retreat in September 2004. Sharon Steele facilitated the meeting. The desired outcomes of the meeting were to:

- clarify the goals and objectives of the retreat
- obtain feedback on the proposed activities
- revise the proposed retreat plans and agenda
- get the Committee's approval to continue with planning activities
- discuss the next steps

The Committee members decided that the goal of the retreat was to review, discuss, and prioritize a long list of current and emerging topics related to waste and/or other applicable fuel cycle issues.

In addition, the staff gave the members a preliminary list of topics: the DOE LA, non-HLW issues such as transportation, low-level waste, and fuel fabrication/enrichment facilities. Several other issues were suggested as potential topics: waste incident to reprocessing (WIR), biological radiological assessment, and advanced reactor activities. Administrative issues such as the use of planning and procedure time, the commitment tracking system, the rolling calendar, and interactions with the office of EDO were also suggested. Committee members and staff assigned themselves and staff to specific topics.

The Committee's Executive Director, Dr. John Larkins, proposed a "business development" plan for interacting with the NMSS staff and for ensuring that Committee members were involved in NMSS LA reviews.

The staff agreed to compile source material regarding each proposed topic and to provide a priority ranking (and the basis for the ranking) of each proposed topic. The source materials and prioritization will be provided to the members on a compact disc by the first week of September. Further, to gather potential topics, staff agreed to look at resources such as the NMSS operating plan, meetings with the Executive Team, the SECY list of topics, EDO topics, and the Commission strategic plan.

(slip op. at 2–4), this proceeding concerns matters relating to the Licensing Support Network (LSN) arising during the pre-license application phase prior to the filing of a license application by the United States Department of Energy seeking authorization to construct a high-level radioactive waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.*

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

Thomas S. Moore, Chair, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Alex S. Karlin, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Alan S. Rosenthal, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

All correspondence, documents, and other materials shall be filed with the administrative judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.1010(d).

Issued in Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of July 2004.

G. Paul Bollwerk, III.

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 04–15820 Filed 7–13–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 03004532]

Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for License Amendment for U.S. Department of the Army's Facility in Fort Detrick, Frederick County, MD

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John D. Kinneman, Nuclear Materials Safety Branch 2, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406, telephone (610) 337–5252, fax (610) 337–5269; or by e-mail: *jdk@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuing a license amendment to the U.S. Department of the Army (Army) for Materials License No. 19–01151–02, to terminate the license and authorize release of its facilities at the U.S. Army Garrison in Fort Detrick, Frederick County, Maryland for unrestricted use. NRC has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) in support of this action in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR part 51. Based on the EA, the NRC has concluded that a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is appropriate. The Army's request for the proposed action was previously noticed in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 2003 (68 FR 23163), along with a notice of an opportunity to request a hearing. The amendment will be issued following the publication of this notice.

II. EA Summary

The purpose of the proposed action is to terminate Byproduct Materials License No. 19–01151–02 and release the licensee's Fort Detrick facility for unrestricted use. The Army was authorized by NRC since 1954 to use radioactive materials for research and development purposes and for collection, storage, and disposal of radioactive wastes from tenant facilities at the site. On March 26, 2004, the Army provided the results of the final task in the decommissioning of the facility and requested that NRC release the Fort Detrick facility for unrestricted use. The Army has conducted surveys of the Fort Detrick facility and determined that the facility meets the license termination criteria in subpart E of 10 CFR part 20. The NRC staff has prepared an EA in support of the proposed license amendment.

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

The staff has prepared the EA (summarized above) in support of the proposed license amendment to terminate the license and release the facility for unrestricted use. The NRC staff has evaluated the Army's request and the results of the surveys and has concluded that the completed action complies with the criteria in subpart E of 10 CFR part 20. The staff has found that the environmental impacts from the proposed action are bounded by the impacts evaluated by the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Facilities" (NUREG–1496). The staff has also found that the non-radiological impacts are not significant. On the basis of the EA, the NRC has concluded that the environmental impacts from the proposed action are expected to be insignificant and has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

IV. Further Information

The EA and the documents related to this proposed action, including the application for the license amendment and supporting documentation, are available for inspection at NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html* (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML023380577, ML023500461, ML030840097, ML030900332, ML041630081, ML031350586, ML032260400, ML032680361, ML041630070, ML032830344, ML041030414 and ML041880474. The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee. These documents are also available for inspection and copying for a fee at the Region I Office, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209 or (301) 415–4737, or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov.*

Dated in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania this 7th day of June 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John D. Kinneman,

Chief, Nuclear Materials Safety Branch 2, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region I.

[FR Doc. 04–15918 Filed 7–13–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 152nd meeting on July 20–22, 2004, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance except for portions that will be closed to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of the ACNW, information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and information the premature disclosure of which would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of a proposed

* Unless and until additional licensing boards or other presiding officers are appointed to rule on individual pre-license application phase issues, or classes of issues, relating to the LSN, all requests for Pre-License Application Presiding Officer consideration of LSN-related problems should be submitted to the Licensing Board constituted by this issuance.

agency action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(2), (6) and (9)(B).

The schedule for this meeting is as follows:

Tuesday, July 20, 2004

10 a.m.–10:10 a.m.: Opening Statement (Open)—The Chairman will open the meeting with brief opening remarks, outline the topics to be discussed, and indicate items of interest.

10:10 a.m.–11:30 a.m.: Package Performance Study (PPS) (Open)—The Committee will hear a report from representatives of the NRC staff on the proposed package performance study which will demonstrate the resistance to impact and fire of a spent nuclear fuel rail shipping cask.

11:45 a.m.–12:45 p.m.: License Termination Rule (LTR) Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with a representative of the NRC staff regarding SECY–04–0035—the LTR analysis of the use of intentional mixing of contaminated soil.

1:45 p.m.–2:45 p.m.: Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection Systems (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with a representative of the NRC staff regarding the status of plans to risk-inform the inspection system at Yucca Mountain.

2:45 p.m.–3:15 p.m.: Japan Trip (Open)—The Committee will be briefed by a Japanese exchange engineer on its August 2004 visit to Japanese waste management facilities. Member presentations during the visit will be discussed.

3:15 p.m.–5 p.m.: Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACNW reports on matters considered during this and prior meetings regarding reports on Geosphere Transport Working Group, Treatment of Uncertainties in Hydrologic Models, License Termination Rule Analysis of Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil, Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection System and Package Performance Study.

5:15 p.m.–6:30 p.m.: Preparation for Meeting with the NRC Commissioners (Open)—The Committee will meet with the NRC Commissioners at 10 a.m. in the Commissioners' Conference Room, One White Flint North on July 21, 2004. The Committee will review its presentations.

Wednesday, July 21, 2004

8:30 a.m.–8:35 a.m.: Opening Statement (Open)—The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.

8:35 a.m.–9:15 a.m.: Preparation for Meeting with the NRC Commissioners (Continued) (Open)—The Committee will discuss the following topics scheduled for the Committee meeting with the NRC Commissioners:

(1) Overview
(2) Risk Insights Activities
(3) ACNW Working Group Sessions
—Biosphere (MTR)
—Geosphere (GMH)
(4) Other Committee Activities
—NRC/CNWRA Research
—NMSS Decommissioning Programs
(5) Closing Comments

9:30 a.m.–11:30 a.m.: Meeting with the NRC Commissioners, Commissioners' Conference Room, One White Flint North (Open)—The Committee will meet with the NRC Commissioners to discuss items noted above.

1 p.m.–2:15 p.m.: Integrated Safety Assessment (ISA) Background Briefing (Open)—The Committee will receive a background briefing by a member of its staff on the general ISA approach, examples of its use and lessons learned thus far.

2:15 p.m.–3:15 p.m.: Health Physics (HP) Issues (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with a representative of the NRC staff regarding activities for the ICRP recommendations review, and an overview of those recommendations.

3:30 p.m.–4 p.m.: Site Visit and Igneous Activity Working Group (Open)—The Committee will finalize its proposed activities for the September Nevada field trip and the agenda for the Working Group in Las Vegas, NV during the 153rd ACNW Meeting, September 22–24, 2004.

4 p.m.–4:30 p.m.: Committee Retreat (Open/Closed)—The Committee will discuss its plans on technical topics it intends to examine over the next 12 to 18 months and ACNW activities and related matters as it integrates recently approved activities into its action plan. The retreat is currently scheduled for September 24, 2004.

[Note: This session may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b (c) (2), (6) and (9) (B) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of the ACNW; information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and information the premature disclosure of which would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of a proposed agency action.]

4:45 p.m.–6:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACNW reports on matters considered during this meeting.

Thursday, July 22, 2004

8:30 a.m.–8:35 a.m.: Opening Statement (Open)—The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.

8:35 a.m.–11:45 a.m.: Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)—The Committee will continue its discussion of the proposed ACNW letter reports.

11:45 a.m.–12 Noon: Miscellaneous (Open)—The Committee will discuss matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 16, 2003 (68 FR 59643). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify Mr. Howard J. Larson, Assistant Director for ACNW/Team Leader (Telephone 301/415–6805), between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m. e.t., as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to schedule the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting will be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for taking pictures may be obtained by contacting the ACNW office prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACNW meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should notify Mr. Howard J. Larson as to their particular needs.

In accordance with subsection 10(d) Pub. L. 92–463, I have determined that it is necessary to close portions of this meeting noted above to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of the ACNW; information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and information the premature disclosure of which would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of a proposed

agency action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(2), (6) and (9)(B).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefore can be obtained by contacting Mr. Howard J. Larson.

ACNW meeting agenda, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are available through the NRC Public Document Room at *pdr@nrc.gov*, or by calling the PDR at 1–800–397–4209, or from the Publicly Available Records System (PARS) component of NRC's document system(ADAMS) which is accessible from the NRC Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html* or *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/* (ACRS & ACNW Mtg schedules/agendas).

Videoteleconferencing service is available for observing open sessions of ACNW meetings. Those wishing to use this service for observing ACNW meetings should contact Mr. Theron Brown, ACNW Audiovisual Technician (301/415–8066), between 7:30 a.m. and 3:45 p.m. e.t., at least 10 days before the meeting to ensure the availability of this service. Individuals or organizations requesting this service will be responsible for telephone line charges and for providing the equipment and facilities that they use to establish the video teleconferencing link. The availability of video teleconferencing services is not guaranteed.

Dated: July 8, 2004.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–15919 Filed 7–13–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

POSTAL SERVICE

Privacy Act of 1974, System of Records

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Notice of new system of records.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service proposes a new Privacy Act system of records. The system of records will apply to a name and address directory that the Postal Service plans to license from a commercial source, in order to improve the proper barcoding and delivery of mail.

DATES: Any interested party may submit written comments on the proposed system of records. This proposal will become effective without further notice on August 23, 2004, unless comments received on or before that date result in a contrary determination.

ADDRESSES: Please address your comments to the Privacy Office, United States Postal Service, 475 L' Enfant Plaza, SW, Room 10433, Washington, DC 20260–2200. Copies of all written comments will be available at this address for public inspection and photocopying between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Privacy Office, United States Postal Service, Room 10433, Washington, DC 20260–2200. Phone: 202–268–5959.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

This document publishes notice of a new system of records for the Postal Service, USPS 500.100, Address Matching for Mail Processing. The new system of records supports a Postal Service program, called the Distribution Quality Improvement (DQI) Program, which will use a commercially available name and address directory to improve mail processing. The purpose of the DQI program is to increase the ability of the Postal Service to barcode mail properly in order to ensure delivery to the intended address. The Postal Service plans to pilot test the program in New York State from September 2004 to Spring 2005, then, if successful, deploy the program nationally in or after May 2005.

Described below are: (I) The need for and benefits of the DQI program; (II) how the pilot test and national deployment will be conducted; and (III) the extensive privacy and security controls that have been put in place, including how the directory will and will not be used. The Postal Service does not anticipate adverse effects on the privacy rights of customers resulting from operation of the DQI program.

I. Rationale for the DQI Program

Background—Privacy and Technology

Mail has always been one of the most valuable, effective, and trusted means of communication. For more than two centuries, the mission of the Postal Service has been the prompt, reliable, and efficient delivery of personal and business mail to all communities in the nation. As the delivery network has developed and expanded, the Postal Service has continuously adapted every major innovation in technology, transportation, and communication to provide enhanced service to its customers. From the early transportation improvements provided by railway Post Offices, to today's technology applications such as USPS.com, the Postal Service has a long history of pursuing continual improvements to the speed, accuracy, and certainty of mail delivery.

Today, the Postal Service delivers more than 200 billion pieces of mail each year to more than 140 million addresses, serving every household and business in the country. Every year, approximately 1.9 million addresses—equivalent in size to the city of Chicago—are added to the delivery network. In order to accomplish its mission of universal service, the Postal Service operates some of the most complex systems and equipment ever developed. The Postal Service delivers more mail to more locations, and at a lower price, than any other post or delivery network in the world.

The privacy and security of mail are also at the core of the Postal Service brand. Over the course of its history, the Postal Service has built a trusted brand with the public. New technology and processes continue to be developed that bring added value and customer service to the network. As always, the Postal Service will only use technology or adapt that technology, in a way that ensures that the privacy and security of the mail and its customers are maintained at the highest levels. The current proposal is no exception. The Postal Service has carefully analyzed the need, usage, and benefits of the DQI program, while establishing procedures that would properly address privacy and security needs.

Mail Processing—USPS Databases, Barcodes, and Finest Depth-of-Sort (FDOS)

In order to ensure that the billions of mailpieces it processes are delivered accurately, promptly, and cost effectively, the Postal Service has developed a sophisticated network and state-of-the-art systems to process mail. This section describes the information the Postal Service uses, including databases, ZIP Codes™, and barcodes. The next section describes mail processing systems, including automation equipment.

To facilitate accurate delivery, the Postal Service maintains a database of addresses known as the USPS Address Management System (AMS). AMS contains valid addresses that receive postal delivery. For each address, the AMS database includes the following elements: carrier number; ZIP Code; city and state; street name; primary address (such as house number); and secondary address information (such as apartment or suite number), if applicable. Names of large firms are included. Names of individuals are not included, except for

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

July 7, 2004

AGENDA
152nd ACNW MEETING
JULY 20-22, 2004

TUESDAY, JULY 20, 2004, CONFERENCE ROOM T-2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

1)	10:00 - 10:10 A.M.	Opening Statement (Open) (BJG/JTL) The Chairman will open the meeting with brief opening remarks, outline the topics to be discussed, and indicate items of interest.
2)	10:10 - 11:30 A.M.	Package Performance Study (PPS) (Open) (RFW/RKM) The Committee will receive a report from representatives of the NRC staff on the proposed package performance study which will demonstrate the resistance to impact and fire of a spent nuclear fuel rail shipping cask.
	11:15 11:40 **~~11:30~~ - ~~11:45~~ A.M.**	*****BREAK*****
3)	11:~~45~~ - 12:45 P.M. 11:40	License Termination Rule (LTR) Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil (Open) (RFW/MTR/HJL) The Committee will hear from a representative of the NRC staff regarding SECY-04-0035 - the LTR analysis of the use of intentional mixing of contaminated soil.
	12:40 **~~12:45~~ - 1:45 P.M.**	*****LUNCH*****
4)	1:45 - ~~2:45~~ P.M. 2:15	Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection System (Open) (BJG/RKM) The Committee will hear from a representative of the NRC staff regarding the status of plans to risk-inform the inspection system at Yucca Mountain.
5)	2:45 - 3:15 P.M.	Japan Trip (Open) (BJG/RKM/NMC) The Committee will be briefed by a Japanese exchange engineer on its August 2004 visit to Japanese waste management facilities. Member presentations during the visit will be discussed.
	3:15 3:30	BREAK
6)	3:15 - 5:00 P.M.	Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open) (All) The Committee will discuss potential reports on: 6.1) Geosphere Transport Working Group (GMH/NMC) 6.2) Treatment of Uncertainties in Hydrologic Models (GMH/NMC) 6.3) License Termination Rule Analysis of Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil (RFW/MTR/HJL)
	3:45 - 5:00	11 for each perspective on the "[illegible]" HLW"

6.4) Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection System (BJG/RKM) (tentative) N/O

6.5) Package Performance Study (RFW/RKM)

~~5:00 - 5:15 P.M.~~ *****BREAK*****

7) 5:15 - 6:30 P.M. 5:50 — Preparation for Meeting with the NRC Commissioners (Open) (BJG/JTL)
The next meeting with the NRC Commissioners is scheduled to be held at 10:00 a.m. in the Commissioners' Conference Room, One White Flint North on July 21, 2004. The Committee will review its presentations.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2004, CONFERENCE ROOM T- 2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

8) 8:30 - 8:35 A.M. — Opening Remarks by the ACNW Chairman (BJG/HJL)
The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.

9) 8:35 - 9:15 A.M. — Preparation for Meeting with the NRC Commissioners (continued) (Open) (BJG, et.al/JTL, et.al)
Discussion of the following topics scheduled for the Committee meeting with the NRC Commissioners:

a) Overview (BJG)
b) Risk Insights Activities (BJG)
c) ACNW Working Group Sessions
-Biosphere (MTR)
-Geosphere (GMH)
d) Other Committee Activities
-NRC/CNWRA Research (RFW)
-West Valley Site (MTR)
e) Closing Comments (BJG)

9:15 - 9:30 A.M. *****BREAK*****

10) ~~9:30~~ - ~~11:30~~ A.M. 9:37 - 11:10 — Meeting with the NRC Commissioners, Commissioners' Conference Room, One White Flint North (Open) (BJG, et.al/JTL, et.al)
Meeting with the NRC Commissioners to discuss the topics listed under item 9.

11:30 - 1:00 P.M. *****LUNCH*****

11) 1:00 - ~~2:15~~ P.M. 1:37 — Integrated Safety Assessment (ISA) Background Briefing (Open) (BJG/SAS)
The Committee will receive a background briefing by a member of its staff on the general ISA approach, examples of its use and lessons learned thus far.

1:40 - 2:20

12) ~~2:15~~ - ~~3:15~~ P.M. Health Physics (HP) Issues (Open) (MTR/NMC)
The Committee will hear from a representative of the NRC staff regarding activities for the ICRP recommendations review, and an overview of those recommendations.

2:20 - 2:45

~~3:15~~ - 3:30 P.M. *****BREAK*****

13) ~~3:30~~ - 4:00 P.M. Site Visit and Igneous Activity Working Group (Open) (BJG/MPL)
2:45 - 3:20
The Committee will finalize its proposed activities for the September Nevada field trip and the agenda for the Working Group in Las Vegas, NV during the 153rd ACNW Meeting, September 22-24, 2004.

14) 4:00 - 4:30 P.M. Committee Retreat (Open/Closed) (BJG/JTL/SAS)
The Committee will discuss personnel matters and its plans regarding technical topics it intends to examine over the next 12 to 18 months and ACNW activities and related matters as it integrates recently approved activities into its action plan. The retreat is currently scheduled for September 24, 2004.

[NOTE: This session may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b (c) (2), (6) and (9) (B) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of the ACNW; information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and information the premature disclosure of which would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of a proposed agency action.]

4:30 - 4:45 P.M. *****BREAK*****

15) ~~4:45~~ - 6:30 P.M. Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open) (All)
3:20
The Committee will discuss potential reports on:

15.1) Geosphere Transport Working Group (GMH/NMC)
15.2) Treatment of Uncertainties in Hydrologic Models (GMH/NMC)
15.3) LTR Analysis of Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil (RFW/MTR/HJL)
15.4) Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection Systems (BJG/RKM) (tentative)
15.5) HP Issues (MTR/NMC) (tentative)
15.6) Package Performance Study (RFW/RKM)

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 2004, CONFERENCE ROOM T-2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

16) 8:30 - 8:35 A.M. Opening Statement (Open) (BJG/JTL)
The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.

17) 8:35 - ~~11:45~~ A.M. 11:20

Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open) (BJG/All)

The Committee will continue its discussion of potential reports:

17.1) Geosphere Transport Working Group (GMH/NMC)

17.2) Treatment of Uncertainties in Hydrologic Models (GMH/NMC)

17.3) LTR Analysis of Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil (RFW/MTR/HJL)

17.4) Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection Systems (BJG/RKM) (tentative)

17.5) HP Issues (MTR/NMC) (tentative)

17.6) Package Performance Study (RFW/RKM)

18) 11:45 - 12:00 Noon

Miscellaneous (Open)

The Committee will discuss matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

11:20 ADJOURN

NOTE:

- Presentation time should not exceed 50 percent of the total time allocated for a specific item. The remaining 50 percent of the time is reserved for discussion.

- **Thirty-Five (35) hard copies and one (1) electronic copy of the presentation materials should be provided to the ACNW.**

- ACNW meeting schedules are subject to change. Presentations may be canceled or rescheduled to another day. If such a change would result in significant inconvenience or hardship, be sure to verify the schedule with Mr. Howard J. Larson at 301-415-6805 between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. prior to the meeting.

APPENDIX C: MEETING ATTENDEES

152ND ACNW MEETING
JULY 20–22, 2004

ACNW STAFF

John Larkins
Neil Coleman
Latif Hamdan
Michele Kelton
Howard Larson
Michael Lee
Richard Major
Richard Savio
Sharon Steel (Rotation)

CONSULTANT

James Clarke

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

JULY 20, 2004

B. Tegeler	RES
C. Greene	OGC
A. Snyder	NMSS
D. Carlson	RES
R. Lewis	NMSS
A. H-Hsia	RES
V. Thomas	RES
M. Evans	RES
J. Rubenstone	NMSS
T. Bloomer	OCM/NJD
D. Widmayer	NMSS
R. Johnson	NMSS
K. Shepherd	NMSS
G. Gnugnoli	NMSS
T. Carter	NMSS
S. Murata	NMSS
B. Leslie	NMSS
M. Rock	NRR
F. Brown	NMSS
T. Kobetz	NMSS
B. Ibrahim	NMSS

APPENDIX C
152nd ACNW Meeting
JULY 20-22, 2004

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (CONT'D)

JULY 21, 2004

E. Thompson	NMSS
Y. Faraz	NMSS
R. Wescott	NMSS
T. Johnson	NMSS
D. Cool	NMSS
J. Mitchell	RES
T. McCartin	NMSS
J. Rubenstone	NMSS

JULY 22, 2004

G. Gnugnoli	NMSS
R. Johnson	NMSS
A. Snyder	NMSS
B. Tegeler	RES

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

JULY 20, 2004

E. von Tiesenhausen	Clark County
G. Thomason	BAH
T. Meade	ERI
T. Fabian	NucNet
N. Henderson	BSC
J. Russell	Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses (CNWRA)
M. O'Mealia	Nevada
S. Goldraick	Exchange Monitor Publications
J. Shaffner	PARALLAX
B. Stump	Precision Components
P. LaPlante	CNWRA
R. McCullen	Nuclear Energy Institute

APPENDIX C
152nd ACNW Meeting
JULY 20-22, 2004

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC (CONT'D)

JULY 21, 2004

E. von Tiesenhausen	Clark County
G. Thomason	BAH
N. Henderson	BSC
M. Knapp	Self
J. Russell	CNWRA

JULY 22, 2004

E. von Tiesenhausen	Clark County
N. Henderson	BSC

APPENDIX D: FUTURE AGENDA

The Committee agreed to hold a 2-day Working Group on the Evaluation of Igneous Activity and Its Consequences at a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, during its 153rd meeting, scheduled for September 22--23, 2004.

APPENDIX E
LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

[Note: Some documents listed below may have been provided or prepared for Committee use only. These documents must be reviewed prior to release to the public.]

MEETING HANDOUTS

AGENDA ITEM NO.	DOCUMENTS
2	**Package Performance Study (PPS)**
	1. Current Developments of the USNRC Package Performance Study, presented by Bret Tegeler, RES **[Viewgraphs]**
3	**License Termination Rule (LTR) Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil**
	2. Results of LTR Analysis - Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil, presented by Derek Widmayer, NMSS **[Viewgraphs]**
4	**Risk Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection Systems**
	3. Status of Yucca Mountain Inspection Program Development, presented by Ted Carter, NMSS **[Viewgraphs]**
11	**Integrated Safety Assessment (ISA) Background Briefing**
	4. Integrated Safety Analysis, presented by Sharon Steel, ACRS/ACNW **[Viewgraphs]**
12	**Health Physics (HP) Issues**
	5. Overview of Draft ICRP Recommendations, presented by Don Cool, NMSS **[Viewgraphs]**

APPENDIX E
152nd ACNW Meeting
July 20-22, 2004

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

TAB NUMBER	DOCUMENTS
	1. Agenda,152nd ACNW Meeting, July 20--22, 2004, dated July , 2004
	2. Color Code - 152nd ACNW Meeting, dated July 7, 2004
	3. Introductory Statement by ACNW Chairman, Tuesday, July 20, 2004, undated
	4. Items of Interest for 152nd ACNW Meeting, undated
	5. Introductory Statement by ACNW Chairman, Wednesday, July 21, 2004, undated
	6. Introductory Statement by ACNW Chairman, Thursday, July 22, 2004, undated
2	**Package Performance Study**
	7. Table of Contents
	8. Schedule
	9. Status Report
	10 Memorandum dated May 11, 2004, from Annette L. Vietti-Cook, Secretary, NRC, to William D. Travers, Executive Director, Subject: Staff Requirements - SECY-04-0029 - Options for Full-Scale Spent Nuclear Fuel Transportation Cask Testing Under the Package Performance Study (Revised)
	11. Early draft of SECY Paper: Demonstration Test Plan for Full-Scale Spent Nuclear Rail Transportation Cask Testing Under the Package Performance Study **(Undated)** ***PREDECISIONAL – NOT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE***
	12. Slides used to brief the Commissioners' Technical Assistants, Proposed Package Performance Study Rail Cask Demonstration Test, June 29, 2004 ***PREDECISIONAL – NOT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE***
3	**License Termination Rule (LTR) Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil**
	13. Table of Contents
	14 Status Report
	15. Memo dated April 9, 2004, 2004, from H. J. Larson, ACNW, to ACNW members re "SECY-04-0035, 'Results of the License Termination Rule Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil," dated March 1, 2004

APPENDIX E
152nd ACNW Meeting
July 20-22, 2004

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB NUMBER	DOCUMENTS
3 (cont'd)	**License Termination Rule (LTR) Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil**
	16. Memo dated May 11, 2004, from Annette L. Vietti-Cook, Secretary, NRC, to William D. Travers, Edo, NRC, Subject: Staff Requirements - SECY-04-0035 - Results of the License Termination Rule Analysis of the Use of Intentional Mixing of Contaminated Soil
4	**Risk-Informing Yucca Mountain Inspection System**
	17. Table of Contents 18. Schedule 19. Status Report 20. ACNW Briefing Notes
5	**Japan Visit**
	21. Table of Contents 22. Map of Japan 23. Justification for Trip and Talks by Members 24. Itinerary for Visit 25. Introduction by Mr. Shinichi Murata
11	**Integrated Safety Assessment (ISA) Background Briefing**
	26. Table of Contents 27. Status Report 28. Meeting Notice and Agenda for the NRC Integrated Safety Analysis Workshop 29. 10 CFR Part 70, "Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material," Subpart H

APPENDIX E
152nd ACNW Meeting
July 20-22, 2004

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS (CONT'D)

TAB NUMBER	DOCUMENTS
12	**Health Physics**
	30. Status Report
14	**Committee Retreat**
	31. Paper by Roger H. Clarke, Chairman, ICRP, "The evolution of the system of radiological protection: ICRP recommendations