



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

March 2, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: ACNW Members
ACNW Staff

FROM:

Michele S. Kelton
Michele S. Kelton
Technical Secretary, ACNW

SUBJECT:

CERTIFIED MINUTES OF THE 167TH MEETING OF THE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW), JANUARY 10-12, 2006

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

Attachment:

Certified Minutes of the 167th Meeting
January 10-12, 2006

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



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

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael Lee, Acting Team Leader
ACRS/ACNW

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

SUBJECT: PROPOSED MINUTES OF THE 167TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW)
JANUARY 10-12, 2006

I certify that, based on my review of these minutes¹, 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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael T. Ryan".

Michael T. Ryan, Chairman

3/2/06

Date

¹ Minutes of the 167th Meeting of the ACNW held January 10-12, 2006, dated March 1, 2006.



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

March 1, 2006

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 167TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW)
JANUARY 10-12, 2006

Enclosed are the proposed minutes of the 167th 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

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Chairman's Report (Open)	1
II. Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application (Open)	1
III. Fabrication of PWR Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package (Open)	4
IV. Spent Fuel Transportation Package Response to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire Scenario (NUREG/CR-6886) (Open)	6
V. White Paper on Transportation (Open)	7
VI. Source Characterization (Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance Code) (Open)	7
VII. Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel (Open)	8

APPENDICES

A	<i>Federal Register</i> Notice
B	Meeting Agenda
C	Meeting Attendees
D	Future Agenda
E	List of Documents Provided to the Committee and Meeting Notebook Contents

CERTIFIED

Issued: 3/1/06

3/2/06

By MICHAEL T. RYAN

**CERTIFIED MINUTES OF THE 167TH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
JANUARY 10-12, 2006**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW or the Committee) held its 167th meeting on January 10-12, 2006, at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The ACNW published a notice of this meeting in the *Federal Register* on December 29, 2005 (70 FR 77197) (see Appendix A of these minutes). This meeting served as a forum for attendees to discuss and take appropriate action on the items in the agenda (see Appendix B of these minutes). The entire meeting was open to the public.

A transcript of selected parts 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 Company, 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, Michael T. Ryan (ACNW Chairman), Allen G. Croff (ACNW Vice Chairman), James H. Clarke, William J. Hinze, and Ruth Weiner attended this meeting. For a list of other attendees, see Appendix C of these minutes.

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (OPEN)

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

Dr. Ryan, ACNW Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda. He noted that the meeting was being conducted in conformance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Dr. Ryan asked members of the public who were present and wished to address the Committee to inform the ACNW staff so that time could be allocated for them to speak.

II. STATUS OF RISK-INFORMED DECISIONMAKING FOR NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND WASTE APPLICATION (OPEN)

[John Flack was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

The purpose of this meeting was to review NMSS initiatives to risk-inform its activities and to review the associated guidance document on risk-informed decisionmaking for nuclear materials and waste applications. Dr. James Clark introduced the speaker, Dennis Damon from NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) Spent Fuel Projects Office (SFPO) Technical Review Directorate, and Mr. Damon introduced his supervisor

Wayne Hodges, the Director of the Directorate, as the champion (advocate) for risk-informing office activities.

Mr. Damon briefly summarized SECY-04-0182 entitled, "Status of Risk-Informed Regulation in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards," and the related staff requirements memorandum (SRM) (SRM-SECY-04-0182) that approved, with several cautionary statements, the staff's risk-informed approach. The SRM, however, directed that Appendix F of the guidance document (which relates to risk-informed inspections) be removed and that the staff only use the guidance when deciding what to inspect, and not to assess inspection findings or compliance issues. Mr. Damon noted that the guidance document focused on accident risk; existing guidance on how to risk-inform chronic dose, occupational exposure, and other areas is already given in 10 CFR Part 20.

Mr. Damon said NMSS had developed a four-step approach to risk-informing nuclear materials and waste, and that the second step was key, i.e., deciding whether to risk inform the activity or regulation. He described three risk regions of interest: (1) very high or unacceptable region, (2) a tolerable region, and (3) a region of negligible risk. Quantitative guidelines to address the boundary between the negligible and tolerable levels of risk were developed into quantitative health guidelines (QHG), analogous to the quantitative health objectives (QHOs) for nuclear power reactors. Mr. Damon said that although the concept of "negligibility" could be used to show that the risk of a relaxation or backfit is small, new regulatory requirements might be imposed anyway to address defense-in-depth, security, or environmental protection or to provide confidence. He also said that guidance on how to risk inform a licensing review would still need to be developed and that defense-in-depth and safety margins must be considered to address uncertainties and provide confidence.

Three options for draft risk guidelines were introduced. The first option allocates the risk (or dose) across a broad frequency range, and employs a dose-versus-frequency curve for decisionmaking. If the dose fall below the curve, for example, it is considered negligible. Mr. Damon said that this option is constraining if all the risk is associated with one frequency interval. The second option used a single expected value as a guide. Doses across all the accident scenarios would be summed and compared to a single value. To utilize this option, acute fatalities would need to be converted into dose in order to calculate the cumulative dose. A third option would keep deterministic effects and stochastic effects separate; i.e., use dose for latent effects, and treat acute fatalities separately in terms of likelihood per year.

Mr. Damon said that there had been a number of pilot risk studies and cases where worker and public risk went in opposite directions. In these cases, a value-impact assessment was found useful in identifying risk tradeoffs. He also identified cases where risk became too difficult to quantify and defense-in-depth became the driving factor. He discussed potential future initiatives and said the guidance document only provided decision algorithms for the two cases: (1) adding requirements and (2) relaxing requirements. He said sharing experience and learning from one's experiences in a risk-informed application was equally important. Mr. Damon concluded saying that the guidance document is intended to be a living document and is expected to change after trial applications.

Mr. Damon then responded to a number of questions and comments from Committee members and staff. The following points are noteworthy:

- Although the Risk Task Force has been disbanded, past members are available, if needed, to assist in risk-informing new office activities.
- There are cases where NMSS would benefit from risk-informed applications, specifically cases involving decommissioning where tradeoffs between worker and public risk could become important.
- Users of the document would treat fatal exposure to radiation as an industrial accident.
- It would be of interest to compare the Option 1 histogram (doses versus frequency) to actual occupational radiation exposure.
- NMSS would support a document that captures lessons learned from applications, but there is no separate funding for such an effort at this time.
- There should be criteria for imposing defense-in-depth.
- A short training pamphlet that offered risk insights is a good idea.

Dr. Hinze asked about the use of cost information in the process and Mr. Damon said cost was considered in two of the steps, first in the screening process in terms of availability of time, people, and resources to do the risk assessment, and then again in deciding whether the assessment was worth doing. The second step would require some knowledge of the risk beforehand, and that in itself could preclude using a risk-informed approach. Mr. Damon said one would have to gather some risk information and some cost information, and then decide whether to go further. Dr. Hinze asked whether Option 2 (single expectation value of annual dose for worker and public) might be the right choice, but Dr. Ryan said that as-low-as-reasonably achievable principles would also need to be considered.

Dr. Weiner asked how one would respond to the public on low-probability, high-consequence events. Mr. Damon said he would not rely on the number alone (e.g., low probability); he would assure himself that the analysis was thorough and had a strong basis, and he would use the risk assessment to determine the level of defense-in-depth. Dr. Larkins asked whether guidance on quality was needed and whether integrated safety assessments (ISAs) would be good enough for the mixed-oxide fuel facility. Mr. Damon said the ISAs were "pretty good" in identifying what could go wrong, and applicants were thinking about doing quantitative assessment for offsite doses but not for worker doses. He also said it would be a good idea to have a quality standard.

Mr. Thadani asked whether there were champions within divisions to move risk-informing initiatives forward. Mr. Damon said it varied; those involved in the Yucca Mountain geologic repository project would be more interested in risk than others. He said that he intended to expose the staff to the guidance document and that he proposed writing a short and simple document on risk-informing NMSS with specific situations that would benefit from a risk-informed approach. Dr. Ryan said that would be a great idea.

Dr. Clarke said that he believed the flow chart in the guidance document is misleading and that the question is not whether to risk inform, but whether a risk-informed approach has merit. He said additional guidance on pros and cons would be of value, and would allow a better appreciation of the usefulness of a risk assessment.

To help "keep that flame alive," the Committee decided that they would write a letter and provide recommendations to the Commission on the application of risk-insights to NMSS activities. Draft input will be presented and discussed at the ACNW's next meeting (168th). However, the Committee decided that a working group meeting on risk-informing materials and waste should be scheduled at a later date after the staff had some experience with the guidance document.

III. FABRICATION OF PWR UNCANISTERED FUEL WASTE PACKAGE (OPEN)

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

Dr. Aladar Csontos (NMSS staff) gave a presentation on "Waste Package Fabrication: Process and Effects." He summarized the staff's current understanding of the design, fabrication, and assembly of the prototype 21-PWR uncanistered fuel waste package to be used at a proposed Yucca Mountain repository. He also discussed the potential effects of welding on the phase stability and mechanical and corrosion behaviors of Alloy 22.

The Joseph Oat Corporation, Inc., won the initial contract to fabricate the first full-scale 21-PWR UCF prototype waste package with basket assembly. The NRC staff has observed some of the fabrication activities to better understand the process and the potential implications for waste package post-closure performance.

Independent NRC studies have examined the effects of fabrication processes on corrosion. Specifically, fabrication reduces the localized corrosion resistance of Alloy 22 welds. On the other hand, solution annealing improves the localized corrosion resistance of the welds. Welded and solution-annealed Alloy 22 retains significant ductility and toughness. Fabrication processes do not change the overall mechanical behavior of Alloy 22 from ductile failure to brittle fracture.

This was an informational briefing to update the ACNW about NRC staff activities in monitoring the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) work on waste package fabrication. No ACNW letter is being prepared at this time because on October 25, 2005, DOE announced plans to design a standardized canister for shipment of spent nuclear fuel (SNF). The Committee will request future briefings from both DOE and the NRC when more information becomes available about this new canister design and the programmatic effects of the change.

Dr. Hinze asked about the relative strength of the materials in the waste package: inner stainless steel versus outer Alloy 22. Dr. Csontos replied that the stainless steel has a lower yield strength than Alloy 22. However, there would be 2 inches of the stainless steel versus 3/4 of an inch of Alloy 22. Alloy 22 has tremendous ductility and toughness. But the bottom line is that the 2 inches of stainless steel will provide the primary strength to resist, impact, or dynamic rock fall.

Dr. Hinze asked whether the welds represent strong or weak points in the structural strength of the waste package. Dr. Csontos said the strength of the weld is usually much greater than the strength of the base materials. These high-strength areas create certain types of stress patterns (triaxial) because of the transition from high-strength to lower strength materials. Then there are long-term degradation processes on top of that. For Yucca Mountain there's a million years of degradation to consider. So far what the staff has seen regarding stress corrosion cracking regarding Alloy 22 is looking pretty good (i.e., minimal).

Dr. Hinze asked about waste package heat treatment and quenching: How is one assured that constant temperature was maintained throughout the canister, without hot spots or cold spots? Dr. Csontos said the NRC staff is unclear at this time how DOE will perform solution annealing. There are various methods that could be used, such as chemicals with temperature-sensitive colors and the use of thermal sensors.

Dr. Hinze asked what kinds of generic testing have been done on the prototype canister. Dr. Csontos said only nondestructive testing has been done on welds. Dr. Hinze asked what will NRC be doing in the way of generic testing and also specific testing. Dr. Csontos said NRC is comparing a Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses (CNWRA) weld to DOE's weld. Test are being conducted to determine what the post-closure performance will be. But NRC and the CNWRA don't have the capability to make a waste package mockup. What has been done is to take two plates from a fabricator and weld them together using the procedures described by DOE. There is no formal protocol in place at this time for the generic testing of waste packages. NRC is trying to stay up to speed with the knowledge base, but doesn't want to get out ahead of DOE.

Dr. Hinze asked about waste package fabrication defects. Dr. Csontos said that in total system performance assessment the staff accounts for a certain number of early failures. There is also a report from the CNWRA where early failures were evaluated through the use of welding statistics from other industries. A methodology was developed to determine how many early waste package failures from flaws might occur from welding and fabrication. The NRC staff is trying to get an industry-based database on welding, but there is no database available for Alloy 22 welding. Dr. Ryan said the risk insights that were described, the statistical analysis from other industries, would be very interesting to the Committee and that it would be interesting for ACNW to see how this information has been translated into performance assessments. "That would be a great next step."

IV. SPENT FUEL TRANSPORTATION PACKAGE RESPONSE TO THE BALTIMORE TUNNEL FIRE SCENARIO (NUREG/CR-6886) (OPEN)

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

During its 138th meeting in November 2002, the ACNW conducted a working group meeting on the transportation of SNF to the proposed Yucca Mountain repository. Among the items discussed at that meeting was a review of the hypothetical performance of an NRC-certified Holtec HI-STAR transportation cask in the railroad fire in the July 2001 Howard Street Tunnel in Baltimore, Maryland. The NRC staff in the Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO) contracted with the National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST) to use a fire dynamics simulator (FDS) code¹ to recreate the fire conditions in the tunnel on that date and perform an initial evaluation of how the Holtec HI-STAR transportation cask would perform during that design basis fire. The results of initial analysis said there would be no radioactive releases from the Holtec HI-STAR cask under a fire scenario similar to the July 2001 Howard Street tunnel fire. The briefing was conducted by Chris Bajwa (SFPO) and was documented in the ACNW's meeting proceedings in NUREG/CP-0182 (Kobetz, 2003²).

In September 2005, the SFPO staff announced in the *Federal Register* the availability of a Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNL) report on an updated, three-dimensional analysis of the 2002 Howard Street tunnel fire scenario but now using three NRC-certified cask designs.³ The report was published as NUREG/CR-6886 (Adkins and others, 2005⁴) and was prepared with the assistance of NIST and the CNWRA.

During this meeting, Mr. Earl Easton, representing SFPO, discussed the modeling construct and key assumptions, conservatisms, and results of the NUREG/CR-6886 tunnel fire analysis using the FDS code. Citing from the staff's report,

¹FDS is a computational fluid dynamics computer code than models combustion and flow of hot gas in fire environments. This computer code was developed by NIST.

²Kobetz, T.J. (ed.), "Proceedings of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste Transportation Working Group," U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CP-0182, September 2003.

³They were the Holtec Hi-STAR-100, the TransNuclear-88, and the NAC International Model LWT transportation casks. These three models were selected for analysis because they were already certified by the NRC and it was expected that any of the three designs would be used shortly in conjunction with the operation of the private fuel storage facility in Utah.

⁴Adkins, H.E., J.M. Cuta, and B.J. Koepfel, "Spent Fuel Transportation Package Response to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire Scenario – Draft Report for Comment," U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-6886, November 2005.

Mr. Easton said the likelihood of such an event occurring and including a SNF transportation cask was very low, estimated in NUREG/CR6722⁵ to be on the order of 1.3×10^{-6} events per shipping campaign. Moreover, if such a rare event occurred, and if there were releases of radioactive material, the releases themselves were estimated by the staff to be extremely small and would pose no significant danger to the public or first responders. In light of these findings, Mr. Easton said the staff did not believe any regulatory action was necessary. Specifically, he said that the NUREG/CR-6886 case study indicates that NRC's transportation regulations are adequate. Mr. Easton also summarized the public comments received on the tunnel fire analysis. These included comments from the Northeast High-Level Radioactive Waste Transportation Project, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and the State of Nevada. He said that the SFPO staff intends to finalize NUREG/CR-6886 later this fiscal year after considering the public comments on the draft report. Mr. Easton agreed to brief the Committee on the disposition of public comments as part of the tunnel fire analysis documentation process.

Following questions and comments from the ACNW members and staff, Mr. Bob Halstead, representing the State of Nevada, gave the State's perspective on the NUREG/CR-6886 study. His comments were drawn in part from earlier comments provided by the State on the public comment version of NUREG/CR-6886. The most recent set of State of Nevada comments, dated December 30, 2005, was distributed at the meeting and has been included in the ACNW meeting record. Mr. Halstead noted that the State was attempting to independently reproduce the NUREG/CR-6886 study results.

V. WHITE PAPER ON TRANSPORTATION (OPEN)

[Richard Savio was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

The Commission has asked the ACNW to review the NRC staff plans for the structural testing of an SNF transportation cask. In preparing for this review, the ACNW will write a white paper on the subject of transportation, focused on issues that will assist the Committee in this task. The Committee will discuss this work during the March 22–24, 2006, meeting. A summary of the content of past Committee memorandums and reports on transportation cask testing issues and an annotated outline for the planned white paper will be prepared to facilitate the March ACNW meeting discussions.

VI. SOURCE CHARACTERIZATION (SPATIAL ANALYSIS AND DECISION ASSISTANCE CODE) (OPEN)

[Michael Scott was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

The Committee discussed the features of the Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance (SADA) model with representatives of the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) staff. SADA is being used to design a site-monitoring network that will make the most efficient use of monitoring resources. SADA is a Microsoft Windows-based freeware program. Development of the coding and the model has been supported by DOE, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

⁵Sprung, J.L., and others, "Reexamination of Spent Fuel Shipment Risk Estimates," U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-6672, 2 vols., March 2000. [Study prepared by the Sandia National Laboratories reexamines the earlier NUREG-0170 and Modal Study.]

and the NRC. SADA can be obtained from the Institute for Environmental Modeling at the University of Tennessee. SADA has integrated modules for visualization, geospatial analysis, statistical analysis, human health risk assessment, ecological risk assessment, cost/benefit analysis, sampling design, and decision analysis.

The SADA code has been widely used in the design and optimization of sampling and analysis. Examples are contaminated sites at Sandia National Laboratories and the Kirtland Air Force base and the Fernald, Painesville, and Ashland sites. Substantial savings were achieved in all of these applications. The code uses advanced statistical methods to facilitate more efficient use of existing data and sampling networks and can be used in designing efficient sampling processes. The RES representatives discussed selected applications that illustrated the utility of features of the SADA code.

VII. USE OF DEDICATED TRAINS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL (OPEN)

[Latif Hamdan was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Michele Sampson, representing the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), briefed the Committee on the results of an FRA study concerning the use of dedicated trains for transportation of high-level radioactive waste (HLW) and SNF. Ms. Sampson discussed the background, methodology, and findings of this study, including possible future steps that may be taken by the FRA based on the findings.

Ms. Sampson said the study was mandated by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 and conducted over many years by the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center (Research and Innovative Technologies Administration at DOT), under contract to the FRA. She said the study involved a workshop and other coordination activities with key stakeholders, including DOE and NRC. Comparative analyses were conducted of three train services (regular trains, key trains, and dedicated trains), considering a standardized cask prototype and representative rail routes. The analyses considered the risk of latent cancer fatalities associated with the dose from incident-free transportation and accident conditions, as well as operational safety. The study found that nonincident risk from the entire shipping campaign would be very low (less than one latent cancer fatality), regardless of the type of the transportation service used. The operational and escort labor costs of dedicated train shipments are essentially equal to or less than for the other rail shipment services considered in the study. The study identified followup actions to determine if a rulemaking based on the study findings is warranted and to review and update the FRA Safety Compliance Oversight Plan.

Ms. Sampson responded to questions by the Committee members, ACNW staff, and members of the public. Committee members questioned the use of collective dose to calculate the fatal cancer risk and the use of four significant figures to characterize the dose because this would misrepresent the level of certainty. Other issues discussed included population density along the transportation routes, whether the accident analysis was done deterministically or probabilistically, and whether economics played a role in the analysis.

Two members of the public, representing the State of Nevada, provided additional questions and comments. Ms. Sampson responded to questions by one such member on the presumed rail corridor between the existing lines and Yucca Mountain and the elimination of Category 4

accidents based on probability rather than risk considerations. The other member of the public representing the State of Nevada said that Nevada endorses the conclusion of the report in favor of dedicated trains and that Nevada had participated in the study workshop and most stakeholders favored the inclusion of Category 4 accidents. He also said that there isn't any good way to quantify the risk from accidents, and that the State of Nevada has had a petition for a rulemaking before the NRC for 7 years arguing that use of dedicated trains would be a good idea for security reasons. He said Congress ordered the U.S. General Accountability Office in 2003 to assess security issues. He said Nevada is also sensitive to the safety of train crews, and given the concerns on the part of the railroad unions, it probably would be a good idea to determine the expected train crew rotations and the maximum annual doses to particular crew or particular workers.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m. on Thursday, January 12, 2006.

**APPENDIX A
FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE**

Federal Register / Vol. 70, No. 249 / Thursday, December 29, 2005 / Notices

77197

each category into which the requester/petitioner asserts the contention belongs with a separate designation for that category.

Requesters/petitioners should, when possible, consult with each other in preparing contentions and combine similar subject matter concerns into a joint contention, for which one of the co-sponsoring requesters/petitioners is designated the lead representative. Further, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f)(3), any requester/petitioner that wishes to adopt a contention proposed by another requester/petitioner must do

so in writing within ten days of the date the contention is filed, and designate a representative who shall have the authority to act for the requester/petitioner.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(g), a request for hearing and/or petition for leave to intervene may also address the selection of the hearing procedures, taking into account the provisions of 10 CFR 2.310.

III. Further Information

Documents related to this action, including the application for

amendment and supporting documentation, are available electronically at the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. From this site, you can access the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. The ADAMS accession numbers for the documents related to this notice are:

Document	ADAMS Accession No.	Date
Transmittal letter	ML052790078	09/29/2005
License renewal application public version	ML052990073	09/29/2005
Renewal application references	ML053250289	10/05/2005
NRC acceptance letter	ML052980594	11/02/2005
Environmental Report	ML052790081	12/2004

If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

These documents may also be viewed electronically on the public computers located at the NRC's PDR, O-1-F-21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of December, 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Gary Janosko,

Chief, Fuel Cycle Facilities Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, Office of Nuclear Material Safety And Safeguards,

[FR Doc. E5-8062 Filed 12-28-05; 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 167th meeting on January 10-12, 2006, Room T-2B3, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The schedule for this meeting is as follows:

Tuesday, January 10, 2006

8:30 a.m.-8:45 a.m.: Opening Statement (Open)—The ACNW Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.

8:45 a.m.-10:15 a.m.: Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding draft staff guidance on the application of risk insights in the waste and materials areas.

10:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.: Fabrication of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding fabrication of a pressurized water reactor uncanistered fuel waste package prototype for the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.

1 p.m.-2 p.m.: Spent Fuel Transportation Package Response to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire Scenario (NUREG/CR-6886) (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding a study involving the 2001 Baltimore tunnel fire. The study involves the 3-dimensional modeling of the behavior of three different transportation cask types under thermal conditions similar to those that existed in the Baltimore tunnel fire event. The staff will also summarize comments received from the public on NUREG/CR-6886.

2 p.m.-3 p.m.: White Paper on Transportation (Open)—The Committee will discuss a proposed white paper on transportation of nuclear waste.

3:15 p.m.-5:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACNW Reports/Letters (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed

ACNW reports on matters considered during this and/or previous meetings.

Wednesday, January 11, 2006

9:30 a.m.-9:35 a.m.: Opening Statement (Open)—The ACNW Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.

9:35 a.m.-10:30 a.m.: Source Characterization (Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance Code) (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the capabilities of Version 4.1 of the Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance (SADA) Bayesian subsurface analysis code.

10:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.: Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with a representative of the Federal Railroad Administration regarding their study on the use of dedicated trains for transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel to the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.

1 p.m.-2 p.m.: Preparation for Commission Briefing (Open)—The Committee will review the final presentations in preparation for the Commission briefing on January 11, 2006.

2 p.m.-4 p.m.: Meeting with the NRC Commissioners, Commissioners' Conference Room, One White Flint North, Rockville, MD (Open)—The Committee will meet with the NRC

Commissioners to discuss recent and planned activities.

4:15 p.m.-5:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACNW Reports/Letters (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACNW reports on matters considered during this and/or previous meetings.

Thursday, January 12, 2006

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

8:35 a.m.-11:45 a.m.: Discussion of ACNW Reports/Letters (Open)—The Committee will discuss prepared draft letters and determine whether letters would be written on topics discussed during the meeting.

11:45 a.m.-12:45 p.m.: Miscellaneous (Open)—The Committee will discuss matters related to the conduct of ACNW activities, and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit. Discussions may include future Committee Meetings.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 11, 2005 (70 FR 59081). 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. Michael P. Lee (Telephone 301-415-6887), between 8:15 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, 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. Lee as to their particular needs.

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. Lee.

ACNW meeting agenda, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are

available through the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) at pdri@nrc.gov, or by calling the PDR at 1-800-397-4209, or from the Publicly Available Records System 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).

Video Teleconferencing 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. ET, 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: December 22, 2005.

Andrew L. Bates,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. E5-8088 Filed 12-28-05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on January 26-27, 2006, Bethesda North Marriott Hotel & Conference Center, Oakley Room, 5701 Marinelli Road, North Bethesda, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of certain portions that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b (c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Thursday, January 26, 2006-8:30 a.m. Until the Conclusion of Business

The Subcommittee will discuss ACRS business processes, anticipated workload, future technical expertise needed on the ACRS, strategy for

handling anticipated heavy workload, proactive initiatives, knowledge management, ACRS subcommittee structure, and other activities related to the conduct of ACRS business.

Friday, January 27, 2006-8:30 a.m. Until 1 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss stakeholders' comments received during ACRS self-assessment survey, significant technical challenges in certain areas, including advanced reactor designs, early site permits, extended power uprates, and risk-informing 10 CFR part 50, and other activities related to the conduct of ACRS business.

The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee. Members of the public desiring to provide oral statements and/or written comments should notify the Designated Federal Official, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301-415-7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (ET) five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public.

Further information regarding this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Official between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (ET). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual at least two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes in the agenda.

Dated: December 22, 2005

Michael L. Scott,
Branch Chief, ACRS/ACNW.
[FR Doc. E5-8090 Filed 12-28-05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Submission of Information Collection for OMB Review; Comment Request; Survey of Nonparticipating Single Premium Group Annuity Rates

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of request for extension of OMB approval.

SUMMARY: The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation ("PBGC") is requesting that the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") extend approval, under the Paperwork Reduction Act, of a collection of information (OMB control



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

December 21, 2005

AGENDA
167th ACNW MEETING
JANUARY 10-12, 2006

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2006, CONFERENCE ROOM T-2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH,
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 8:30 8:35
1) ~~8:30 - 8:45~~ A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACNW Chairman (Open) (MTR/JTL)
The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.
- 8:36 10:07
2) 8:45 - 10:15 A.M. Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application (Open) (JHC/JHF) *Damon*
The Committee will receive an information briefing by the NRC staff on draft staff guidance on the application of risk insights in the waste and materials areas. *(see memo 1/10/06 w/ INWRA)*
- 10:07
10:15 - 10:30 A.M. *****BREAK*****
- 3) 10:30 - 11:30 A.M. Fabrication of PWR Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package (Open) (WJH/NMC) *CSOR + 05*
Representatives from the NRC staff will brief the Committee on the fabrication of a pressurized water reactor uncanistered fuel waste package prototype for the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.
- 11:30 - 1:00 P.M. *****LUNCH*****
- 4) 1:00 - ~~2:00~~ P.M. Spent Fuel Transportation Package Response to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire Scenario (NUREG/CR-6886) (Open) (RFW/MPL) *Easton*
Representatives from the NRC staff will update the Committee on a study involving the 2001 Baltimore tunnel fire. The study involves the 3-dimensional modeling of the behavior of three different transportation cask types under thermal conditions similar to those that existed in the Baltimore tunnel fire event. The staff will also summarize comments received from the public on NUREG/CR-6886.
- 2:00 2:25
5) ~~2:00 - 3:00~~ P.M. White Paper on Transportation (Open) (RFW/RPS) *BFCAL*
The Committee will discuss its plans for a white paper on transportation. *(see reports)*
- ~~3:00 - 3:15 P.M. *****BREAK*****~~

- 6) ~~3:15 - 5:30 P.M.~~ ^{5:00} Discussion of Draft Letters and Reports (Open) (All)
 Discussion of proposed ACNW reports on:
 6.1) Implementation of Revised Part 63 (WJH/NMC)
 6.2) Baltimore Tunnel Fire Study (RFW/MPL)

^{5:00}
~~5:30 P.M.~~ **Adjourn**

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2006, CONFERENCE ROOM T-2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 7) 9:30 - 9:35 A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACNW Chairman (Open) (MTR/JTL)
 The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.
- 8) 9:35 - 10:30 A.M. Source Characterization (Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance Code) (Open) (RFW/RPS) *MLS*
 Representatives from the NRC staff will brief the Committee on the capabilities of Version 4.1 of the Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance (SADA) Bayesian subsurface analysis code.
- 9) 10:30 - 11:30 A.M. ⁴⁰ Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel (Open) (RFW/LSH)
 A representative from the Federal Railroad Administration will discuss their study on the use of dedicated trains for transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel to the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.
- 11:30 - 1:00 P.M. *****LUNCH*****
- 10) 1:00 - ~~2:00~~ ^{1:45} P.M. Preparation for Commission Briefing (Open) (MTR/JTL)
 The Committee will review final preparations for the Commission briefing on January 11, 2006.

ONE WHITE FLINT NORTH COMMISSIONERS' CONFERENCE ROOM (O-1G16), ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 11) 2:00 - 4:00 P.M. Commission Briefing (Open) (MTR/JTL)
 The Committee will brief the Commission on recent and planned activities.

CONFERENCE ROOM T-2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 4:00 - 4:15 P.M. *****BREAK*****
 4:15 - 4:30 P.M. *4:15 - 4:30*
 12) ~~4:15 - 5:00 P.M.~~ *4:30 - 4:50* *Break*
 Discussion of Draft and Possible Letters and Reports (Open) (All)
 Discussion of proposed ACNW reports on:
 12.1) Implementation of Revised Part 63 (WJH/NMC)
 12.2) Fabrication of PWR Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package (WJH/NMC)
 12.3) Federal Rail Administration Dedicated Train Study (RFW/LSH)
 12.4) Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application (JHC/JHF)
 12.5) Baltimore Tunnel Fire Study (RFW/MPL)
 12.6) Source Characterization (Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance Code) (RFW/RPS)
 4:50
~~5:00 P.M.~~ **Adjourn**

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2006, CONFERENCE ROOM T-2B3, TWO WHITE FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

- 13) 8:30 - 8:35 A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACNW Chairman (Open) (MTR/JTL)
 The Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of today's sessions.
8:30 - 8:35 *BREAK*
- 14) 8:35 - 11:45 A.M. Discussion of Draft and Possible Letters and Reports (Open) (All)
 Discussion of proposed ACNW reports on:
 14.1) Implementation of Revised Part 63 (WJH/NMC) *8:35 - 9:40*
 14.2) Fabrication of PWR Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package (WJH/NMC) *No*
 14.3) Federal Rail Administration Dedicated Train Study (RFW/LSH) *No*
 14.4) Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application (JHC/JHF) *No*
 14.5) Baltimore Tunnel Fire Study (RFW/MPL) *No*
 14.6) Source Characterization (Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance Code) (RFW/RPS) *No*
Transportation White Paper 8:35 - 10:15
- 15) ~~11:45 - 12:45 P.M.~~ Miscellaneous (Open)
 The Committee will discuss matters related to the conduct of ACNW activities and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit. Discussions may include future Committee Meetings.
~~12:45 P.M.~~ **Adjourn**
10:15 A.M.

NOTES:

- 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.
- **Fifty (50) 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. Mike Lee at 301-415-6887 between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. prior to the meeting.

APPENDIX C: MEETING ATTENDEES

**167TH ACNW MEETING
JANUARY 10-12, 2006**

ACNW MEMBERS

Michael Ryan, Chairman
Allen Croff, Vice Chairman
James Clarke
William Hinze
Ruth Weiner

ACNW STAFF

John Larkins
Ashok Thadani
Neil Coleman
John Flack
Latif Hamdan
Michele Kelton
Michael Lee
Richard Major
Richard Savio
Michael Scott

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

JANUARY 10, 2006

D. Damon	NMSS
M. O'Mealia	Nevada
W. Hodges	NMSS
P. Reed	NMSS
S. Helton	NMSS
A. Fetter	NMSS
S. Baggett	NMSS
E. Chow	RES
E. Shaffner	NMSS
T. Brock	STP
A. Csontos	NMSS
T. Ahn	NMSS
M. Bailey	NMSS
C. Grossman	NMSS
J. Rubenstone	NMSS
B. Hill	NMSS
L. Kokajko	NMSS
A. Campbell	NMSS
E. Easton	NMSS
C. Bajwa	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (CONT'D)

JANUARY 11, 2006

G. Powers	RES
B. Ott	RES
D. Lewis	RES
A. Schwartzman	RES
C. Lui	RES
E. O'Donnell	RES
M. Young	OGC
B. Meck	RES
C. Feldman	RES
S. Baggett	NMSS
S. Bush-Goddard	RES
B. Herring	NEI
D. Damon	NMSS
B. Hill	NMSS
J. Shaffner	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

JANUARY 10, 2006

E. v. Tiesenhausen	Clark County
A. Clarke	ANC Associates, Inc.
K. Harshaw	Hunton & Williams
L. Fairbent	AAPM
N. Henderson	Bechtel SAIC Co.
D. Fehringer	Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
M. Dresser	Baltimore Sun
J. Wallace	Alaron Corp.
P. Davis	PRD Consulting
L. Barrett	Self
R. Mccullum	NEI
B. herring	NEI
Y. Pan	CNWRA
X. He	CNWRA
J. Hall	State of Nevada
B. Halstead	State of Nevada
J. Pericola	State of Nevada

**APPENDIX C
167TH ACNW MEETING
JANUARY 10-12, 2006**

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

CNWRA via Video-Teleconference

V. Jain	
C. FitzPatrick	State of Nevada
A. Chowdhury	
B. Sagar	
E. Peary	
G. Wittmeyer	
W. Patrick	
S. Mohanty	
D. Dunn	
O. Pensado	

JANUARY 11, 2006

K. Harshaw	Hunton & Williams
N. Henderson	Bechtel SAIC Co.
M. O'Mealia	Nevada
M. Malsch	EFM&C
D. Fehringer	Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
J. Wallace	Alaron Corp.
J. Russell	CNWRA

APPENDIX D: FUTURE AGENDA

The Committee approved the following topics for discussion during its 168th meeting, scheduled for March 22–24, 2006:

- Department of Energy's Office of Science and Technology and International Waste-Safety Related Research
- Update on DOE Site Activities at Yucca Mountain
- Working Group Meeting on Draft Final Guidance to Implement the License Termination Rule
- Review of an NRC-sponsored journal paper entitled "Dynamic Controls on Summit and Flank Eruptions of Basalt"
- Electric Power Research Institute Report on "Potential Igneous Processes Relevant to the Yucca Mountain Repository: Intrusive Release Scenario"
- Review of an NRC-sponsored journal paper entitled "Modeling the Long-Term Fluvial Redistribution of Tephra in Forty Mile Wash, Yucca Mountain"
- Annual Briefing by the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research Director
- Highlights of the National Academy of Sciences Committee Meeting on Assessing the Performance of Surface and Subsurface Engineering Barriers
- ACNW White Paper on HLW Transportation
- Discussion of Draft and Possible Letters and Reports on the following:
 - Enhancements to the Consequence Modeling of Igneous Activity (working title)
 - Department of Energy's Office of Science and Technology and International Waste-Safety Related Research
 - Working Group Meeting on Draft Final Guidance to Implement the License Termination Rule
 - Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research Director Briefing

**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

<u>AGENDA ITEM NO.</u>	<u>DOCUMENTS</u>
2	<p><u>Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Status of Risk-informed Regulation in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, presentation by Dennis Damon, NMSS [Viewgraphs]
3	<p><u>Fabrication of PWR Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Waste Package Fabrication: Process and Effects, presented by Aladar Csontos, NMSS [Viewgraphs]
4	<p><u>Spent Fuel Transportation Package Response to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire Scenario (NUREG/CR-6886)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Performance of Spent Fuel Transportation Casks in Environments Similar to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire [Viewgraphs]4. Letter dated December 30, 2005, from Robert R. Loux, Executive Director, Office of the Governor, Agency for Nuclear Projects, to Chief, rules Review and Directives Branch, NRC, re Comments on Draft Report, Spent fuel Transportation Package Response to the Baltimore Tunnel Fire Scenario (NUREG/CR-6886, PNNL-15313) [Handout]
8	<p><u>Source Characterization (Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance [SADA]) Code</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Spatial Analysis and Decision Assistance (SADA) Version 4.1, presented by George Powers, RES [Viewgraphs]
9	<p><u>Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel, Report to Congress [Handout]

**APPENDIX E
167TH ACNW MEETING
JANUARY 10-12, 2006**

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

**TAB
NUMBER (S)**

DOCUMENTS

Agenda, 167th ACNW Meeting, January 10–12, 2006, dated December 21, 2005

Color Code - 167th ACNW Meeting, dated December 27, 2005

2 Status of Risk-Informed Decisionmaking for Nuclear Materials and Waste Application

1. Schedule
2. Status Report
3. Risk-Informed Decision-Making for Nuclear Material and Waste Applications, Draft for Trial Use, dated May 11, 2005
4. Memorandum dated October 7, 2004, from Luis A. Reyes, EDO, NRC, to The Commissioners, Subject: Status of Risk-Informed Regulation in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Secy-04-0182 [**Policy Issue Notation Vote**]
5. Memorandum dated January 18, 2005, from Annette L. Vietti-Cook, Secretary, NRC, to Luis A. Reyes, EDO, Subject: Staff Requirements - SECY-04-0182 - Status of Risk-Informed Regulation in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

3 Fabrication of PWR Uncanistered Fuel Waste Package

6. Coleman Input for 166th ACNW Summary

9 Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel

7. Status Report
8. Use of Dedicated Trains for Transportation of High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel, Report to Congress, March 2005