

9.7

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

---

IN THE MATTER OF:

PUBLIC MEETING  
BUDGET PRESENTATION

Place - Washington, D. C.

Date - Monday, 30 July 1979

Pages 1 - 103

7908090583

Telephone:  
(202) 347-3700

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

444 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D.C. 20001

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE - DAILY

610 103

CR6200

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on Monday, 30 July 1979 in the Commission's offices at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determinations or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of or addressed to any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

610 104

CR6200

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING  
BUDGET PRESENTATION

Room 1130  
1717 H Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.  
Monday, 30 July 1979

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 2:05 p.m.

BEFORE:

DR. JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, Chairman  
JOHN F. AHEARNE, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

Messrs. Chilk, Dircks, Gossick, Donoghue, Englehardt,  
Barry, Haller, Cunningham, Burnett, and Martin.

610 105

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If we could come to order,  
3 the Commission meets this afternoon to hear from the Office  
4 of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards as to budget  
5 requests, supplemental for '80, budget for '81.

6 I think we're it for this afternoon, John.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Vic isn't coming?

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: No.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Great. I'll move over to  
10 this side.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It certainly will give us  
12 lots of room.

13 Well, when we went to those long sheets, why  
14 they're incompatible with the space available for a full  
15 Commission sitting.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I keep flipping my off-page  
18 over Vic's on-page.

19 (Laughter.)

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I thought that was deliberate.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You thought that was deliberate?

22 (Laughter.)

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay, Lee, kick it off.

24 MR. GOSSICK: Okay, sir, we're set here today to  
25 consider the requests by NMSS. They briefed Commissioners



1 Gilinsky and Bradford, as you know, last week, since they  
2 couldn't be here today.

3 Bill, go ahead.

4 MR. DIRCKS: At the outset, I want to make it  
5 clear --

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I might comment, Bill, that  
7 I thought it was a pretty good move, putting the Agency seal  
8 on the first page of the briefing package.

9 What do you think, John? That ought to be worth  
10 two slots.

11 (Laughter.)

12 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: And a million dollars, anyway.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's if you like to see  
14 it.

15 MR. DIRCKS: It's our test pattern.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You couldn't get it in color?

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. DIRCKS: We put it up there as a test signal.

19 We're not making an appeal against EDO's wallet  
20 today. We're here basically to defend what the EDO has given  
21 us, and we are also making an attempt to present a recommended  
22 FY 1980 supplemental at the same time as the '81 presentation.

23 The supplemental would add a total of 23 additional  
24 staff and \$2.2 million to the FY '80 budget, making a total  
25 '80 program of 320 people and \$18 million in program dollars.

1           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Now you make a point, do you  
2 not, taking exception to the EDO mark. Is that both in the  
3 '81 and the supplemental?

4           MR. DIRCKS: We're not taking -- we're not  
5 contesting anything the EDO has given us in the '80-'81 budget  
6 except for one minor little thing, which we regard as a  
7 definition of "setasides," and I think we've discussed this  
8 point once before -- one area.

9           They thought a "setaside" was a drop off of the  
10 resources they gave us in '80. They gave us the special  
11 supplemental in '80. They thought that was a one-time  
12 injection of work, and that it would no longer be around.  
13 Our view is it's a continuation of that program.

14           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But in general you aren't  
15 taking exception to the dollar reduction in supplemental?

16           MR. DIRCKS: We're not taking an exception.

17           The '81 budget request is for 337 people and  
18 \$23 million in program support dollars. When we get into  
19 it, we would like to see that 7 setaside in the '81 budget,  
20 what we call a "contingency planning category" be made part  
21 of the base '81 program.

22           The increase in resources that we're asking for  
23 today reflects where we're placing our priorities in '80 and  
24 '81, and I think you can see that quite clearly. The waste  
25 management program is recommended to increase by 59 people

1 between fiscal '79 and fiscal '81. The increase of program  
2 support funds for the waste management program would be about  
3 \$9.5 million during that same period.

4 Offsetting that increase in people in the waste  
5 management program is the decrease that you see in the  
6 safeguards program, which is slated to go down by 14 slots  
7 between '79 and '81.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What are you at at the  
9 present time?

10 MR. DIRCKS: In safeguards, we're at 107 people  
11 in safeguards. We want that -- we're asking --

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, I can see that that's  
13 the FY '79 current, but do you mean as of today?

14 MR. DIRCKS: In terms of people on board?

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

16 MR. DIRCKS: No. We've been holding that down,  
17 in view of the '80.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That was my question.

19 MR. DIRCKS: I think we're about 99, 98. Is that  
20 right, Bob?

21 MR. BURNETT: About 95 to 97, somewhere in that  
22 area.

23 MR. DIRCKS: 95 to 97, in terms of people actually  
24 on the rolls. We have vacancies, but we're not filling  
25 them.

1 (Slide.)

2 The Fuel Cycle Division remains essentially  
3 stable in terms of numbers, except for this supplemental  
4 increase of 7 positions in fiscal '80, which we'd like to  
5 see continued in fiscal '81.

6 The Fuel Cycle Division, although it's stable in  
7 terms of numbers, we are making some program adjustments  
8 within that program, which we'll get to --

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, let's see now. Let  
10 me ask you a question on that. You say you'd like to see the  
11 increase of 7 continued into '81. So what is the number  
12 that you're really looking for?

13 MR. DIRCKS: We're looking for, in '81, 111 people.'

14 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Where was this?

15 MR. DIRCKS: This is in the Fuel Cycle Division.  
16 We're at 103 now. We could go up to 110. With the supplement  
17 in fiscal '80, we'd like to keep that program at 111 in  
18 fiscal '81.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's the exception you  
20 meant?

21 MR. DIRCKS: Yes. And that's been carried as a  
22 setaside in your books up to now. We'd like to see it pulled  
23 out of setaside.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, it's not listed as a  
25 setaside there.

1 MR. DIRCKS: It really is.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Let's see --

3 MR. DIRCKS: It's in the -- see the 22 positions  
4 in Fuel Cycle Division? It's in that 22 in fiscal '81, the  
5 last column; it's in there.

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So that -- but that is, or  
7 is not, the 7 that's listed in the '80 supplemental?

8 MR. DIRCKS: We've got --

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: In the FY '80 supplemental,  
10 you've got 7 people.

11 MR. DIRCKS: Sure. What we want to do is to  
12 continue that increase over into fiscal '81.

13 MR. GOSSICK: And those 7 are in the 22.

14 MR. DIRCKS: They are in the 22. We want them  
15 pulled out of the setaside and put in the increase we're  
16 asking for.

17 And I don't think we made our case that clearly  
18 to the BRG the first time around. I think in subsequent  
19 discussions I think we're coming -- we're getting better.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Okay.

21 MR. DIRCKS: What I'd like to do now is to go  
22 into each program. I'll do it briefly by giving an overview  
23 of the program and looking at each decision unit, highlighting  
24 any problems we think where any special problems may exist.  
25 Then I'll address the setaside. And then I'll show you overall

1 what the whole program can accomplish or cannot accomplish  
2 within the mark, and then make a special pitch for the  
3 setasides.

4 As I go through it, I'll have each of the  
5 program directors sitting up next to me here. Dick Cunningham  
6 is the first.

7 (Slide.)

8 The first chart is the Fuel Cycle Program. There  
9 are three decision units in that program.

10 The Fuel Cycle Program is the basic licensing  
11 program within the Office of NMSS. During the past year, we  
12 transferred the Uranium Mill Licensing Program from the Fuel  
13 Cycle Program over to the Waste Management Division. So in  
14 the area of Uranium Fuel Cycle, when we get to Waste  
15 Management, Jack and I will cover that point.

16 Here is the area we're asking for this supplemental  
17 increase of 7 people and \$400,000 in fiscal '80. This would  
18 give us an '80 program of 110 people, and the program support  
19 funds of about \$3.3 million.

20 The '81 program approved by the EDO is for 104  
21 people and \$3.9 million. The EDO setaside, as I mentioned,  
22 has 22 people and \$680,000 in it awaiting your policy  
23 decisions. We're requesting that we take those 7 people out  
24 of the 22, and I'll make a special pitch for that.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Just as a matter -- and I

1 realize they are small numbers, but I would like to try to  
2 keep track of them. You have just identified the 7 as being  
3 the setaside that you had hoped to continue on, and as part  
4 of the 22. But if I look across that line, I find that the  
5 7 has 5 set aside and not 7.

6 MR. DIRCKS: In the Fuel Cycle Licensing, when we  
7 get to it, there are actually 3 in the special 7 setaside.  
8 There are 3 in Fuel Cycle Licensing, 1 in Transportation  
9 Certification, and 3 in Radioisotopes. What happened there  
10 is the 7 in '80 was lumped all against the Fuel Cycle  
11 Licensing --

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Although they should be?

13 MR. DIRCKS: They shouldn't be. Essentially, they  
14 shouldn't be. And what we did in '81 is to put them back into  
15 the three decision units.

16 Now the argument can be made on the other side.  
17 The '80 effort is really sort of looking at the program  
18 across the board, looking at contingency planning, and I like  
19 to call it "emergency hazards evaluation" during the licensing  
20 process.

21 The '80 effort is to gather up our efforts and  
22 lay out a logical program. What we want to do then is to take  
23 these 7 people and spread them into the licensing efforts of  
24 each of these three decision units.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: In the '79, did you have

1 Uranium Licensing included in your '79 current?

2 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So the 45 includes Uranium  
4 Licensing.

5 MR. DIRCKS: Oh, wait a minute. No, I'm sorry.  
6 No. Uranium Licensing has been taken out and put back into  
7 the Uranium program.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It has been taken out.

9 MR. DIRCKS: Yes. I'm sorry.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Okay.

11 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, could I have the next slide.

12 (Slide.)

13 This is the Fuel Cycle Licensing effort. It just  
14 lays out the basic principal activities of this decision  
15 unit, and again lays out what we've asked for, and where we  
16 want the setasides.

17 As we go through this, you'll see "develop  
18 radiological contingency plans," and that will be almost in  
19 every one of the three decision units I'm talking about.

20 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Does the office request then  
21 now stand at 43 -- 47?

22 MR. DIRCKS: It stands at 44 plus 3, which is  
23 47. Yes, sir. For this decision unit.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes.

25 MR. DIRCKS: The Transportation program would be for



1 17 plus 1, being 18; and for the radioisotopes licensing  
2 we're asking for 46.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: In your base.

4 MR. DIRCKS: In the base.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is this for S-3?

6 MR. DIRCKS: This is in -- the next slide, please.

7 (Slide.)

8 What we've done -- and we may be throwing too  
9 much detail at you than you want, but we've taken each one  
10 of these decision units, shown the major objective and  
11 planned accomplishment, and the resources we intend to put  
12 against that accomplishment; and also what the technical  
13 assistance money would be used for.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Your major licensing  
15 actions in this area would be what?

16 MR. DIRCKS: These are fuel cycle plants, fuel  
17 fabrication plants.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But are they new plants  
19 coming on?

20 MR. DIRCKS: No, they're basically --

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Or renewal of licenses?

22 MR. DIRCKS: Renewal -- I think there's only one  
23 major new plant coming on line; that's the Westinghouse plant  
24 in Alabama, but essentially this is all renewal work --

25 MR. CUNNINGHAM: And major amendments. 610 115

1 MR. DIRCKS: And major amendments, right.

2 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Substantial plant expansions.

3 MR. DIRCKS: Included in that first one, "Casework  
4 Licensing," we have West Valley, which includes about 6 people  
5 in that area. And those people are being used right now to  
6 review the existing facility up there, carry out specific  
7 safety studies, and we're assuming in the '81 program, the  
8 beginning of a licensing action, either to terminate the  
9 license that's in effect up there, or to participate in a  
10 licensing of any cleanup activities that DOE may be authorized  
11 to carry out.

12 Just to give you some idea of what the '80 program  
13 with the supplement is, in '80 we had about 23-1/2 people  
14 budgeted against this figure, which is now going up to 27.  
15 The bulk of that increase is in the West Valley area; and  
16 secondly in what we call increasing the depth of the licensing  
17 review.

18 I want to mention this one as a specific point.  
19 What we are intending to do is to look with much more care  
20 at establishing -- I hope, Dick, this is right -- quantitative  
21 numerical limits on our various fuel cycle licensees. We want  
22 to do that here, and in the radioisotope area.

23 Number two, or major objective two, "Studies on  
24 Specific Problems," that's where the S-3 issue comes in. I  
25 was surprised to see S-3 continuing through '81. I didn't

1 know it was going to last that long, but it's still with us.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I thought it was a  
3 continuous --

4 MR. DIRCKS: It's an ever-running show, I guess.

5 We had about 8 people in this area under number two  
6 in fiscal '80. With the supplement that's going down to  
7 5-1/2. The "2" people in parentheses there are listed on the  
8 chart for the setaside item, which is the start of generic  
9 environmental impact statement on alternate fuel cycles.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That would be assuming that  
11 we choose some alternative fuel cycles? Or NSJ, or NASAP.

12 MR. DIRCKS: Coming out of interest in NASAP, DOE  
13 initiatives, is some attempt to develop a variation on the  
14 lightwater reactor fuel cycle.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: A variation other than the  
16 ones that, for example, the gas reactor?

17 MR. DIRCKS: That's right.

18 And when we get the setasides -- I'm not ... ing  
19 a big pitch for this thing one way or the other -- that's just  
20 identified in case you feel as though such activities would  
21 be likely to be needed.

22 The three and four are related, in a sense. One  
23 is on activities looking at the old docket files, licensee  
24 files, looking at surveying them, and then coming up for  
25 additional sites for evaluation. And I think you're aware

1 of many of these sites which we're uncovering almost on a  
2 day-by-day basis.

3 The "DOE Remedial Actions," this is the beginning  
4 of that 22-site cleanup program. We intend to take on 5 sites  
5 in fiscal '81 and start the review.

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: None of these are mill  
7 sites, or at least not ours?

8 MR. DIRCKS: No, they're not ours. These are under  
9 the Uranium Mill Tailings Act.

10 The "Implementation of New Regulations," we have  
11 1-1/2 people set against that goal in '81; we have the same  
12 number in '80. The principal activity there would be the  
13 beginning, I guess, of the incorporation of the various EPA  
14 regs into our own regulation format, and the transferral of  
15 such regulations into the licensing process.

16 Major Objective six is the "Technical Base  
17 Refinement," and this is standards research and revision of  
18 regulations.

19 Dick, you might want to mention what we have in  
20 mind for the revision of regulations. We've talked about that,  
21 but I think you have a clearer idea of what's involved there.

22 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, in a very broad context,  
23 the existing regulations have their origin back in the early  
24 '50s, maybe even the '40s, and the distinction made in 30,  
25 40, and 70 licenses was strictly a legal distinction of source

1 material, special nuclear material. Basically we feel we  
2 should be going forward with regulation --

3 MR. DIRCKS: Dick, we can't hear you. Is your  
4 mike on?

5 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, I think so.

6 Basically we feel that we should be looking at  
7 regulations in terms of the categorizing of regulations in  
8 terms of types of hazards you would find in plants, and you  
9 could recategorize the regulations to deal with plants of  
10 similar hazards.

11 Now there are a lot of ways to slice that --  
12 whether it's off-gas treatment systems, total plants, or  
13 what have you -- but there is a better technical way to do  
14 this.

15 In addition to that -- that's a very broad  
16 context -- we're trying to get some handle on that. It needs  
17 to be done sometime. There are a lot of things coming up  
18 that we've got to deal with on a day-by-day basis.

19 For example, the quality factors for alpha emitters  
20 are changing by a factor of 2. Well, while the limits for  
21 doses off-site might remain the same if you change the quality  
22 factor by 2, you're really cutting in half the amount of  
23 radioactive materials you can release to get the same dose.  
24 There are problems like that that we need to deal with every  
25 day.

1 Another example of this type of thing is the use  
2 of new lung models for dose determination. We've got to take  
3 into account new solubility data, which can change the dose  
4 factors to something between 2 and 20.

5 We've got to go into -- we're breaking down now  
6 doses. Before we used to just consider dose to a man or a  
7 person, now we'll have to -- we're considering dividing it  
8 into adults, to teenagers, to children, to infants, just  
9 based on different metabolic rates.

10 All these things need to be incorporated into the  
11 regulations and treated. So there is just a broad base of  
12 activity that needs to be undertaken.

13 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, the major objective number  
14 seven, "Radiological Contingency Planning," this is essentially  
15 the item where we had 7 in the '80 supplement. We'd like that  
16 program to continue in '81.

17 Essentially we've identified it here separately,  
18 but in '81, if the Commission approves it, in the following  
19 years I'll throw that back into Major Casework Licensing  
20 because it really is a deepening of the licensing review  
21 process and a separate line item.

22 The origins of what we call this "radiological  
23 contingency planning" -- and we have a contest on now for  
24 another title -- is, I guess, what we regard as some of the  
25 lessons learned from Three Mile Island. Everyone is learning

1 lessons, I think. We're going back and reviewing where we  
2 could tighten up things a bit. This is to take a look at  
3 each one of the major fuel cycle plants and radioisotope plants  
4 and reviewing those plants from the point of view of what  
5 would our reaction be if there were a major accident at those  
6 plants today?

7           The problem is, there's a variety of materials  
8 being run through those plants. There are a number of  
9 processes being used in those plants. The combination of  
10 processes and material gives us some severe problems in  
11 coping with various types of emergencies when they arise --  
12 fires, criticality accidents, and so forth.

13           What we want to do is establish essentially a base  
14 file on each one of those plants, keep it up to date, review  
15 the license each year from the point of view of what's going  
16 on in those plants, and be prepared to cope with people and  
17 resources in case there were accidents or major hazards in  
18 those areas. We just have a pretty shaky idea today of what  
19 to do, and we hope to get our act pulled together starting  
20 now and continuing in '80 and make it a regular part of the  
21 licensing process in '81.

22           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Before you leave that,  
23 let me ask you about number three. About how many sites?  
24 There's 22, you say?

25           MR. DIRCKS: There are Part 30 sites and Part -- Oh,

1 you're talking about "former licensing sites"?

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

3 MR. DIRCKS: We're looking -- let's see. We have  
4 reviewed 9500 Part 40 and 70 docket files to date. Is that  
5 right, Dick?

6 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

7 MR. DIRCKS: And we've identified 225 sites for  
8 further sort of field evaluation. We have reviewed 5000  
9 Part 30 docket files -- no, we have yet to review the 5000  
10 Part 30 docket files, to identify sites for further future  
11 field evaluation.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is one person and \$400,000  
13 really enough to do a survey of all those sites that you have  
14 now identified?

15 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I guess I'm sort of at fault  
16 for keeping the numbers down. Dick pleaded for more, but --  
17 Dick, do you want to plead for more here today?

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, let me see if I can't  
19 get the question focused.

20 I would think that we either say: Here is what  
21 we have to do, and here's the amount of people to do it. Or  
22 else we say: We don't think that's really worth doing.

23 I'm just wondering whether this is a token coverage  
24 of that.

25 MR. DIRCKS: No, I think it's not token. We've



1 done a lot of it already. The real consumer of resources will  
2 be once we go out for the field evaluation.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Right. And it sounds like  
4 you have one person and \$400,000 to do that.

5 MR. DIRCKS: It's true, we're tight. We're  
6 usually behind the eight ball. We've been hauled up to  
7 Congress many times to explain to the various people up  
8 there why we're not moving faster.

9 I think all we've done here -- it's not token.  
10 We think it's needed, but we've just sort of got a lid on  
11 things, if we haven't confirmed more resources.

12 MR. GOSSICK: Do the I&E people help you out on  
13 this front, Bill?

14 MR. DIRCKS: These are former licenses. So they're  
15 not involved, I don't think, Dick, in this operation?

16 MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, they aren't.

17 MR. DIRCKS: We're just going back to old  
18 licenses.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: They've got 146 more?

20 MR. DIRCKS: Well, we'd like to make an unsolicited  
21 pitch for I&E and their materials licensing program. They're  
22 spread very thin even with the current licenses. I guess  
23 I've talked to most of the Commissioners on that.

24 In the area of mills, they're very short-handed  
25 to do all inspections. In the area of looking at hospitals

1 and waste generators, they're very short-handed. They  
2 don't have -- even with their great new budget initiatives,  
3 they're not really putting a lot of resources into straight  
4 materials licensing.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes. Which, as an aside,  
6 could you give me -- what is your assessment. They have  
7 resident inspectors at two field facilities.

8 MR. DIRCKS: They are basically safeguards  
9 inspectors; they're not health and safety inspectors.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Should they be?

11 MR. DIRCKS: For health and safety of fuel cycle  
12 licensees, I don't think you need resident inspectors at the  
13 plant, but I do think you need more inspection. I've talked  
14 to Dick on this, and he knows the problems, and he's working  
15 on it and developing it, but in reviewing the I&E portion of  
16 the budget that you have, they're coming in for an increase  
17 in materials licensing -- materials inspection, but I think  
18 that a lot of that materials inspection is devoted toward  
19 health physics work at reactors.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It is.

21 MR. DIRCKS: It's not helping us that much. We're  
22 getting to be rather an unwelcome guest pounding on I&E's  
23 door saying, "go for more, and we'll support you for more,  
24 whatever good our support will do," but we think they should  
25 get some more help on the materials side.

1 (Slide.)

2 The next slide, please, is the Transportation  
3 Certification Decision Unit. The principal activities are  
4 listed there.

5 We're asking for an increase in this area of  
6 17 -- 3 additional over the '80 program; 2 additional over  
7 the '79 program; and we're asking for some increase in dollars.

8 This is another area in '81 where we are asking  
9 that one of those setasides be pulled up and treated as a  
10 base, part of the base. So in the EDO recommendation of 17 --

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's, again, the  
12 contingency plan?

13 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

14 (Slide.)

15 Could I have the decision-unit slide, please.

16 In this area, some explanation is needed of  
17 particularly the titles.

18 When we look at "Package Certification," we have  
19 also in our agenda for '81 some review of not just the  
20 packages that we certify today, but we do want to take a  
21 look to see if we can to improve some of the areas of say  
22 materials being shipped in Type A LSA containers, and maybe  
23 review the design -- and maybe this is something between a  
24 Type A LSA package and a Type B type of container. We want  
25 to get involved in that area. We think the traffic is going

1 to increase tremendously in succeeding years, and we do want  
2 to be sort of on top of that area.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What impact, if the Schmitt  
bill were to pass?

4 MR. DIRCKS: Well, the impact would be I guess  
5 we would have to back away, to some extent, and negotiate  
6 with DOT on how we handle this.

7 As you know, DOT is agreeable to taking DOT  
8 regulations and incorporating them into our --

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, I understand that,  
10 but my question --

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think it would depend very  
12 much, John, on whether -- you know, DOT in their comments  
13 has suggested that if you want to go ahead, the central  
14 thrust of the Schmitt bill would be helpful if there was some  
15 language in there that would allow the Secretary to carry out  
16 his responsibilities in effect using NRC -- not using those  
17 words. And then we might end up agreeing with Jim Palmer and  
18 company to keep on doing the number of things we're doing.

19 But without that language, it would be much less  
20 clear that there was a statutory basis for them to bring us  
21 in to do some of the things we're doing. And indeed, of  
22 course if there were any inclination on their part to strike  
23 for a staff of their own to do it, why we would have no leg  
24 to stand on; we'd be backed out of it.  
25

1 MR. DIRCKS: The first item, "Package Certification"  
2 is basically a workload item, but we did want to mention that  
3 we would try, within this workload item, to look at this issue  
4 of something less than Type B containers.

5 Under "Special Projects," there's one point I  
6 wanted to mention, and that's that Modal Study. We have one  
7 manyear assigned to it. The dollars for that project are  
8 essentially in Research's program, under an agreement I think  
9 last year was it, Learned, the research would be carried out  
10 by Research, but we would carry one person here because we're  
11 concerned about getting the results of that study and  
12 incorporating them into the program.

13 Saul will be making a pitch for that one, but I  
14 do want to add some words in support of it. The basic design  
15 criteria for many of these packages were for highway and rail  
16 transportation and were made back in the late '50s, with  
17 much input coming from IAEA, a lot of health physics input.

18 We think that the whole thing should be rechecked  
19 again. Not that we're saying that there are any great  
20 deficiencies, but we would feel more comfortable if we took  
21 these things -- highway movement, rail movement of the casks,  
22 and subjected them to another review.

23 The Modal Study has been carried on the books as a  
24 proposal for a number of years, and it has yet to get off the  
25 ground. We would like to see it get moving in '81.

1           The item number three, "Develop Radiological  
2 Contingency Plan," that shows one person there as a setaside,  
3 and that's the one we're asking for.

4           The "Space Mission" work is carried as a setaside,  
5 and I'll sum up on all the setasides when we get to the bottom  
6 of the list.

7           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I do want to ask a question,  
8 though.

9           MR. DIRCKS: Sure.

10          COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Your description, both here  
11 and then in the BRG, is to conduct independent evaluations.

12          Joe, I know I agreed with you, and I thought  
13 Bud Kennedy also did -- I thought we agreed as sort of a  
14 Commission decision not to go for that independent review.

15          CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes.

16          COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So I'm a little confused as  
17 to why --

18          MR. DIRCKS: I think the budget was put together  
19 before the agreements had been reached. I know I've seen the  
20 notes passed back and forth. I've thrown that in there --  
21 it's been carried, and I'm just throwing it in for the  
22 Commission's views.

23          COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But you see my question  
24 would be: If, as I think we have, already reached a decision  
25 as to how it ought to be done, then what would be the many years

1 appropriate to that decision? As opposed to having us look  
2 again at the issue which we've already looked at?

3 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I think in coming up with an  
4 estimate of 2 and \$320,000, we were not -- when we're looking  
5 at an independent review, we're looking at an independent  
6 review, we certainly weren't going to talk about a full-scale  
7 licensing review.

8 I think what we're talking about is having the  
9 people sort of take documentation, review it, subject it to  
10 some technical assistance --

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, Bill, but I think what  
12 I'm really asking is: Since we had a proposal phrased just  
13 like that, to which the Commission said, "no, we don't want  
14 to do that," there are some smaller number of people that  
15 would then track with what the Commission said they were  
16 going to do, and do you wish it to be zero, or something non-  
17 zero?

18 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I --

19 MR. GOSSICK: Less than one.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. DIRCKS: You can see I'm not making a big  
22 pitch for it, one way or the other. I'm not quite sure what  
23 emphasis or effort you want to put into it, and anything you  
24 want to throw in there, why take it.

25 (Laughter.)

610 129

1 MR. GOSSICK: What he's saying is, he'll do it  
2 out of his skin if the memo that we've seen prevails. We  
3 don't have any direction on the staff.

4 MR. DIRCKS: But in the order of where it falls,  
5 I think they have -- they do have some experts over there  
6 in those agencies already. I'm trying to figure out what  
7 exactly the product we could deliver is.

8 (Slide.)

9 This is the Radioisotope Decision Unit. It's  
10 highly manpower intensive. We asked for -- We have a base  
11 program for '79 of 43. '80 is 43. There was a request of  
12 61 in the '81 program, but of that increase of going from  
13 43 to 61, 14 of those slots were in -- 11 was in the  
14 regionalization program, which was a Commission initiative,  
15 and that's a setaside.

16 In addition to that, in that 14 setaside slots  
17 are these 3 positions that we're asking for for the  
18 radiological contingency planning for radioisotope plant  
19 facilities.

20 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I'm lost.

21 MR. DIRCKS: Let me -- I can go back and --

22 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If I take Lee's -- I'm sorry.  
23 I'll lose it if I don't go back to transportation. I'm having  
24 a slow start this afternoon. 610 130

25 If I take the EDO's 17 manyears, you want to add 1 to



1 that.

2 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: For what?

4 MR. DIRCKS: That's contingency planning.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Contingency planning. The  
6 space nuclear stuff was on the setaside, in any event?

7 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Now the dollar setaside in  
9 fact corresponds to the -- the \$320 million appears above  
10 and appears below, but the 2 people above became 3 below.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Because there's 1 above.  
12 Right above that.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Oh, yes. Okay. Good. That's  
14 the one.

15 MR. DIRCKS: Now we --

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's the number three  
17 that you were really asking be included in the base.

18 MR. DIRCKS: That's right.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay. Sorry. Onward. Back  
20 to radioisotopes.

21 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, this is -- unfortunately, we've  
22 got nine major objectives on this, so it spills over into  
23 two charts.

24 Of the 43 positions -- actually 43, plus 4, 47  
25 that we're asking for --

1 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I thought it was 46.

2 MR. DIRCKS: Oh, 46. I'm sorry. I was trying to  
3 cheat you out of one there. It's 46.

4 (Laughter.)

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You've got to watch them like a  
6 hawk. They slide them by ones and twos and the first thing  
7 you know --

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. DIRCKS: Again, this is the licensing effort.  
10 This is where we have the masses in licenses actions. The  
11 objective and the accomplishment is to review the approximately  
12 4800 material license applications and make some decisions on  
13 them during this fiscal year '81.

14 I might add, our goal is to get the turnaround time  
15 down to 30 or 45 days.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: For which?

17 MR. DIRCKS: On the review of the material license  
18 applications. It's approximately 60 days now.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Since you raised that data,  
20 in reviewing the operating plant, I note that it takes  
21 approximately 150 days to process a license renewal, and  
22 45 to 60 days to process a new application.

23 MR. DIRCKS: Well, the reason --

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Which suggests that the way to  
25 make a big saving is not to have renewable licenses.

1 (Laughter.)

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is this the timely renewal  
3 issue?

4 MR. DIRCKS: It's the timely renewal issue.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So that you don't -- the  
6 people doing the renewals, because that stays in effect.

7 MR. DIRCKS: Given a stable man policy of increasing  
8 licensing -- timely renewals is something we're going to get  
9 to.

10 Now many of those timely renewals, when you throw  
11 them into that category, you're dealing with very small-scale  
12 materials licenses. We don't intend to have any timely  
13 renewals -- I think this is Dick's policy, too -- dealing with  
14 facilities and plants.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What would happen if the  
16 Congress of the Commission were to pass a law or a regulation  
17 that there be no more timely renewals?

18 MR. DIRCKS: What we'd do then is just to put the  
19 emphasis on the ongoing licenses, and let the people who want  
20 new licenses wait on line.

21 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, except that if you did away  
22 with the timely renewals, you mean the license would expire  
23 if it weren't renewed.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

25 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That means one of two things:

1 The license people would not be able to use licenses if they  
2 sent in a renewal and it wasn't issued, which could severely  
3 impact hospitals and what have you, unless we had the  
4 resources to --

5 MR. DIRCKS: No, no, Dick, I think the thing is  
6 that for people who have licenses who are already operating,  
7 they'd get on ahead first in the line. Those people who are  
8 newcomers to the line would get on the end of the line.

9 I think that's woven through a lot of the ways  
10 we're treating some of the other licensing agents. Operating  
11 mills get first attention. New mills get on the end of the  
12 line, and we'll see that when we get to Jack's program.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let's see. Do I remember  
14 correctly. Is the timely renewal in the Atomic Energy Act?  
15 Or is that elsewhere in the structure?

16 MR. DIRCKS: It's in the regulation.

17 MR. ENGLEHARDT: It's in the regulation.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It is Commission Regulation?

19 MR. ENGLEHARDT: Yes.

20 MR. CUNNINGHAM: We did send to the Commission  
21 about last March or so a study on the timely renewals, or  
22 the renewal time period --

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

24 MR. CUNNINGHAM: -- and explored the reasons for --

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Some of them were very long.

1 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

2 MR. DIRCKS: The only other items I wanted to  
3 raise, as you can see, most of this is base program level  
4 of effort.

5 The regionalization program, which is a setaside,  
6 there's a big number there, 11. It's the increment to the  
7 existing program. If the Commission wanted a regionalization  
8 program, we would move some existing people out of headquarters  
9 to the regions. This is essentially the additional staff it  
10 would take to broaden the program.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Your conclusion is, that  
12 to go to the regionalization program for those three regions,  
13 I, II, and III, it would take 11 people in addition to all  
14 the people that are now --

15 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So that you could continue  
17 the current program, and I assume you're saying there would  
18 be no significant difference in the responsiveness of the  
19 program?

20 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I think there may be some  
21 qualitative improvements to the program by region, and we've  
22 found that out in the operation of the program thus far, and  
23 I think the productivity increases somewhat because when you  
24 transfer people to regional offices to work on licenses,  
25 that's what they work on.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How many people would you  
2 have in the headquarters working on it?

3 MR. DIRCKS: I think --

4 MR. CUNNINGHAM: It seems to me -- I'm trying to  
5 recall the numbers -- we have about 13 reviewers in head-  
6 quarters now, and we would transfer out something like 7 to 10,  
7 so there would be maybe 3 or 4 at headquarters to handle  
8 specialized cases.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: If you'd transfer out 7 to  
10 10 -- how many do you have in Region III now?

11 MR. CUNNINGHAM: 3 technical people.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: 3?

13 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And transfer out 7 to 10 --

15 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Somewhere in that -- it depends  
16 on the --

17 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And hire 11 people more of  
18 which 8 would be reviewers?

19 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Clerical.

20 MR. DIRCKS: You see, right now we're living off  
21 I&E's clerical support. If you wanted to go to a regional  
22 program, I don't think I&E would be that tolerant of taking  
23 the administrative clerical support out of their hide. They  
24 would want some support in that program from here.

25 MR. CUNNINGHAM: You see, there are certain

1 functions when you go to regions, that you have to do, no  
2 matter how big or how small the program is. You need certain  
3 base technical support for files, secretaries --

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But you're saying these  
5 ll would not primarily be technical?

6 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's correct. The technical  
7 people that are doing the licensing casework would be the  
8 ones transferred.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The ones transferred.

10 All right, how many clerical people do you reduce  
11 in headquarters?

12 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That would take about the same  
13 number of people. I think you would reduce one or two. I  
14 don't have that number in my head, now.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I mean there has to be,  
16 at some point where -- what's astonishing about the number,  
17 that there doesn't seem to be any give.

18 MR. DIRCKS: I think we could give you some more  
19 information -- you see, the headquarters also operates the  
20 complete docket file for the whole outfit. I'm sure we're  
21 going to have to maintain those files here, as well as in the  
22 region, so there's going to be duplication of clerical work  
23 not only here in this area, but in the technical work, too.  
24 So there's duplication of resources and that's what you  
25 usually find when you regionalize a program.

1           It comes at a cost because of this duplicative  
2 factor. It comes with some benefits, too, but I'm not quite  
3 sure what they would cost.

4           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Could you quantify the  
5 benefits?

6           CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, go ahead and do that.

7           MR. DIRCKS: I think we have found out -- and I  
8 don't know whether we have the numbers -- that the productivity  
9 is probably higher for people out there writing licenses than  
10 it is back here. One of the reasons is that's all they do.

11           If they're here in headquarters, they get stuck  
12 with other jobs. They get pulled off some licensing actions.  
13 They're asked to write responses to Congress, and consti-  
14 tuents, and so on. There's a net gain because you're putting  
15 people on specializing in licenses.

16           Do you have those numbers?

17           MR. CUNNINGHAM: I don't have those numbers here.

18           MR. DIRCKS: I think we can get them.

19           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But if you're transferring  
20 the technical people out, it doesn't sound like you're -- you're  
21 either then working off the backlog faster, or you're not  
22 counting on the productivity gain. It's just puzzling.

23           MR. DIRCKS: Well, you have to have a set of  
24 certain --

25           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Because clearly we've seen



1 this. You did provide an interim report. We saw that. It  
2 was a very positive report, but it was more subjective.

3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: We have an outline now to try to  
4 make it more quantitative for the final report. We are trying  
5 to make it quantitative. I think that, as near as we can tell  
6 right now, if you separate out the types of things we have to  
7 do in headquarters you don't have to do in the field -- the  
8 letters, the special studies -- the actual time it takes to  
9 get out a license is about the same, the same type of  
10 license. There is some advantage -- there are tradeoffs --  
11 there is some advantage to being near where some of the  
12 licensees are, especially if the bulk of the licenses are  
13 concentrated in the metropolitan center like Chicago, where  
14 the licensee can drop by the office fairly easily. That has  
15 some benefit.

16 There are other benefits, of being near the  
17 inspection group, I think, just in talking to the inspectors,  
18 just being closer to the inspection part.

19 You're trading that off against all the administra-  
20 tive overhead you have of running the program in the fields.  
21 There's duplication of effort in the sense that you have to  
22 keep licensing files at headquarters, plus licensing files  
23 in the field; you have to have computer terminals here and  
24 there; you have to have a certain amount of supervisory  
25 overhead that will take up a disproportionate share of the

1 people if you have supervisors in the field and supervisors  
2 here.

3 So it's a question of economies of scale.

4 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, would you put the next one on,  
5 please.

6 (Slide.)

7 What we have done here is to take the fuel cycle  
8 program across the board, and list essentially the major  
9 accomplishments that we intend to carry out through the EDO  
10 mark in a summary fashion. I think we've covered most of  
11 those items during the review of the decision units themselves.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you assume that DOE will  
13 take over West Valley in your budget?

14 MR. DIRCKS: We're assuming that the Lundine bill  
15 will pass, which embarks the Federal Government on a program  
16 to do something with West Valley and solidify the waste, get  
17 more off the site eventually, decontaminate the structures,  
18 probably looking at such things as the spent fuel pool,  
19 low-level waste burial grounds. So there will be a number of  
20 actions there that we're assuming we'll be involved in.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And do you assume that you  
22 will have some AFRs to license?

23 MR. DIRCKS: Yes, we are. We've built that in,  
24 because that's the general -- I think we're working on the  
25 possibility of one AFR in 1981. Is that right, Dick?

1 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

2 (Slide.)

3 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, the next slide is the principal  
4 impacts of the EDO mark, and here is just a general slicing  
5 off of some of the nice-to-do things. We're not making any  
6 bitter cries here.

7 (Slide.)

8 The next slide is the setasides.

9 I've covered the "radiological contingency planning"  
10 thing. I guess I've beaten that one down into the ground.  
11 I don't think I need to do anymore.

12 "GEIS for alternate fuel cycles," that one is  
13 really tossed over to the Commission.

14 The two -- the space shots, I don't know what to  
15 say.

16 And finally, the regionalization.

17 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I noticed that.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, there's some guidance  
20 around on the space shots of at least a technical nature.  
21 We haven't, I would say, come final on the Commission decision,  
22 but it's clear that at least as it stands now the majority of  
23 the Commissioners think a sort of reduced scope that I've  
24 outlined in my memorandum awhile back was the appropriate  
25 level.

1           The alternate fuel cycles, I am hesitant at this  
2 point.

#2  
3           And the regionalization continues to puzzle me  
4 because there is less of a conservation of mass and energy  
5 than I would have guessed. Granted even a certain amount of  
6 duplication and so on, limited regionalized is a head-  
7 scratcher.

8           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I imagine that some -- you  
9 can even crack back at some point in history and find that  
10 some of that stuff was being done in the region, and that  
11 there was a saving in headquarters. There may be a hysteresis  
12 effect, though, I'm not sure.

13           MR. GOSSICK: Were they were down in the field,  
14 Dick?

15           MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I don't think so.

16           MR. DIRCKS: I don't know on that.

17           MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, the licensing was never done  
18 in the field.

19           MR. GOSSICK: Wasn't it done at Oak Ridge at one  
20 time?

21           MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, but that was the whole  
22 licensing program. They brought it up as a unit. That's  
23 correct. Well, it's correct in the sense it was once  
24 located at Oak Ridge, but it was never regionalized. It  
25 was brought up as a unit.

1 MR. DIRCKS: The point I'm making on the setasides,  
2 the one I'm making a strong pitch for is the 7 people and  
3 dollars for the radiological contingency planning.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Why should that be viewed  
5 differently than the other emergency --

6 MR. DIRCKS: Well, if you go along with the  
7 supplement '80, that blip is not going to go away in '81. We  
8 want to continue the program. We want to deepen the licensing  
9 review process to take into account these factors which we  
10 think have not been adequately covered up to now.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Aren't those the same words  
12 that NRR will use, for example, for its emergency planning?

13 MR. DIRCKS: Well, but this is not -- I don't know  
14 what NRR is doing. This is not connected with the Carter  
15 Task Force. This is not connected with the states partici-  
16 pating in this. This is really taking a look at those plants  
17 as public health and safety.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But I think that's in general  
19 what the people who are reviewing the reactors are doing, also,  
20 so it still seems to be the same character.

21 MR. DIRCKS: It might be. I'll say quite honestly  
22 what we will do, because we consider this one as such a  
23 high priority item, and I really think it belongs in the  
24 licensing review work that we're doing, we'll probably fold  
25 it in there one way or the other.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Good enough.

2 MR. DIRCKS: And we'll skimp back somewhere else.  
3 We may take a little longer to review the licenses. We may  
4 drop certain other activities off the list.

5 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. There's a little bit of a  
6 semantics problem here, also. I think we think of "emergency  
7 planning" as mainly coordination with the states' evacuation  
8 plans and this sort of thing.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, part of it.

10 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's part of it. But what we're  
11 mainly using these people for is technical evaluations in  
12 plant that have to do with what goes wrong; if something  
13 goes wrong, what can be done about it from within the plant,  
14 and that's where we need our strongest data base. And this  
15 will become part of the licensing process.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm not taking exception to  
17 it, it just still sounds a great deal like the same kind of  
18 things that are being done by others.

19 MR. DIRCKS: I think we've identified it as some-  
20 thing this office has not done. I think we've learned some  
21 lessons about what role the NRC properly should play in one  
22 of these accidents. Our concern is, given what we know about  
23 some of these facilities, we don't want to play until we've  
24 found out more about what the ground rules are, where the  
25 baseline is.

1 (Slide.)

2 The next program area is the Safeguards Program.

3 And if Bob Burnett will join me up here, the program is  
4 107 people and \$2.3 million in '79; going down to 95 people  
5 and \$2.5 million in '80; and going down to 93 people and  
6 \$1.8 million in '81.

7 While the total program is going down, we are  
8 making adjustments to put some priorities where I think they  
9 should be put in the areas of materials control and  
10 accounting areas, and I'll cover that when we get into the  
11 decisions.

12 Generally, physical security, I feel as though we  
13 have overcome many of the challenges in that area. We're  
14 getting our regulations in place. Now we have to take a very  
15 hard look at materials control and accounting.

16 We are less than fully equipped to deal with the  
17 problems at hand today.

18 We have two decision units in this area: Material  
19 Control and Accounting; and Physical Security.

20 In '79 we have 40 people in this area, and in  
21 '81 we want to go up to 44 people. The dollars will decrease  
22 over the number of years, but the people will increase.

23 (Slide.)

24 Could I have the next slide, please. There's a  
25 point I want to mention in the safeguards unit as a whole.

1 I think you've dealt with it, or you've heard it mentioned  
2 many times. On the safeguards side of NRC, especially in the  
3 Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, you can  
4 take the 90-some-odd people that we have employed, divide  
5 them by 12 fuel cycle plants, and you'll wind up with,  
6 God knows, you've got 7 people in each plant or something  
7 like that.

8 As I get into this -- and I want to pass out a  
9 sheet which will show that we do far more than look at the  
10 11 or 12 fuel cycle plants.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I thought you were going  
12 to show a new map.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. DIRCKS: No. New ways of doing it.

15 The first slide, though, does give you some idea  
16 of the accomplishment base that we're doing in the licensing  
17 reviews across the board, we do have quite a few actions that  
18 we are forced to look at.

19 Would you change that slide please, Dave? 16.

20 (Slide.)

21 Here's another one that continues onto two pages.  
22 The area that has picked up some work in the material control  
23 and accounting area is in the international safeguards side  
24 of that house. In fiscal '80, we have 11.5 people on major  
25 objective two -- no, I'm sorry, 6.6 people, and that's gone



1 up to 11.5. So there's been an increase in manpower in this  
2 particular area.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How much of that is  
4 associated with the assumption that the United States/IAEA  
5 Agreement will be passed?

6 MR. BURNETT: About all of it.

7 MR. DIRCKS: Bob says, just about all of it.  
8 We're counting on about 90 reviews of the Part 75 facility  
9 attachment that's listed here.

10 The only -- I wouldn't say "all" --

11 MR. BURNETT: No, there's two in the import-  
12 export.

13 MR. DIRCKS: Two people we use in import-export  
14 reviews.

15 The item number three I think is an area we're  
16 putting some emphasis on, although it doesn't really show  
17 up in people, or changes in people. We -- neither Bob nor  
18 I are satisfied that we're getting accurate, timely, and  
19 complete information on inventories and materials in process.  
20 I think we have to do a lot more in this area.

21 Material Control and Accounting Task Force made  
22 a whole series of recommendations. Much of our program in  
23 this area is dedicated to getting out the Material Control  
24 and Accounting Upgrade Rule. In the meantime, we're putting  
25 extra emphasis on field visits and field evaluation of

1 facilities.

2 The situation is not encouraging. We've got one  
3 or two plants that we just can't seem to get a handle on.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes. And that brings you  
5 back to the question -- I'm surprised to hear you say that  
6 you, however, believe that having someone there full-time  
7 would not be a help.

8 MR. DIRCKS: Oh, no, I meant in the health and  
9 safety side, I'm sorry. I think we should have somebody  
10 there on the safeguards sides at these fuel cycle facilities.  
11 Safeguards. They're there now. I think it's important to  
12 keep them there.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: All right, you would then --  
14 you would not have I&E doing the safeguards function?

15 MR. DIRCKS: No, I think the inspector full-time  
16 resident on the scene at one or two of these plants is  
17 important, and I'd support it.

18 I'm looking from the point of view of making  
19 visits from our outfit to these facilities as a continuation  
20 of the comprehensive evaluation.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, for example, and  
22 without getting into which sites, it appears to me that just  
23 as Vic Stello described, that on the reactor side there are  
24 problems sites.

25 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

1           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And they have concluded  
2 that on a problem site, they really have to have someone there.  
3 It appears that you've got some sites which are problem sites.  
4 And I would have thought that you would therefore conclude  
5 that you've really got to have someone there all the time.

6           MR. DIRCKS: We think I&E should be there.

7           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Oh, no, I'm not saying  
8 "you," NMSS, I mean, "you," saying I&E ought to have someone.

9           MR. DIRCKS: We'd very strongly -- I&E ought to  
10 have somebody there.

11           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Okay, you realize they're  
12 proposing zero?

13           MR. DIRCKS: I didn't realize that.

14           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

15           MR. BURNETT: That's news to me, also.

16           MR. DIRCKS: So I would recommend against that.  
17 I think they should have someone there. I think this  
18 represents the next thing we have to worry about.

19           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You might correspond to --

20           MR. BURNETT: I'd be delighted to.

21           MR. DIRCKS: Yes, would you --

22           MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. I was unaware of that.

23           MR. GOSSICK: Would you say that again? They're  
24 proposing to go to zero?

25           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: On the people at the site.

1 MR. GOSSICK: They've got two there now, and  
2 they're proposing to take them out?

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

4 MR. GOSSICK: It's as submitted, or revised?

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, as submitted.

6 MR. GOSSICK: I didn't list them as fuel cycles.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It's 2, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, this was in their handout.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No, it was in -- yes, it's  
10 in their budget.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, but it's not in the  
12 commitment.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm not sure. I didn't see  
14 it in there.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I didn't see anything in the  
16 decision unit discussion summary.

17 MR. DIRCKS: We've listed almost everything we  
18 have --

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Are you going to talk about  
20 ISIS now, later?

21 MR. DIRCKS: Let me mention ISIS. That's a  
22 setaside in the budget of ADNU, but it's for our use. And  
23 we very strongly support what we had with ISIS. The current  
24 NMSS program that we're using at Oak Ridge, we've been having  
25 not a very satisfactory experience with NMSS.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Why don't you move your mike  
2 up a little bit, or talk a little louder.

3 MR. DIRCKS: Let me hold the microphone.

4 NMS has not performed well for us. It's constantly  
5 trying to gerrybuild the thing back up to meet our needs.  
6 The data is not designed for what we want, and we're not  
7 getting the information when we want it.

8 The ISIS program is designed to accomplish our  
9 needs. It would be -- true, if under our control it would  
10 make it easier to deal with, but looking at it from the cost  
11 side, NMS keeps escalating in cost. We keep getting charged  
12 more and more for that system, and we're getting less and  
13 less out of it. So that's why we've advocated going to ISIS.

14 Bob, do you want to pick up anything else?

15 MR. BURNETT: I don't know what else I could say.  
16 I would support Mr. Dircks totally. It's gone up 400 percent  
17 in 4 years. I'm utilizing it very heavily right now in the  
18 spent fuel arena, because people are always asking: How many  
19 spent fuel movements have gone through my state, my county,  
20 everything?

21 A typical one, I got asked: How many spent fuels  
22 had gone through North Carolina? I am not entering my second-  
23 and-a-half week to answer that little, and I haven't got it  
24 yet, and that is typical.

610 151

25 They're just not programmed to handle what I think

1 are pragmatic questions.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Lee, why was it set aside?

3 MR. GOSSICK: It's in front of the Commission for  
4 a decision.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I see.

6 MR. GOSSICK: It was put in last year in the '80  
7 budget as a plug, \$600,000 pending Commission approval, and  
8 Commissioner Gilinsky had a question and that's been answered,  
9 and it's out here now awaiting your approval or action.

10 MR. BARRY: If we don't start it in '81, you're  
11 not going to have an ISIS on line in '83. That's how far down-  
12 stream you are. If you start it somehow in '80, we could have  
13 at least the first modules ready to go probably by the  
14 beginning of '82.

15 MR. DIRCKS: I might mention there's also one  
16 setaside in here which we're not making a huge pitch for,  
17 but it's the EDIS on alternate fuel cycles, the safeguards  
18 portion of it.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's the same?

20 MR. DIRCKS: Yes, the same thing.

21 If there are no questions on that area --

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, the ISIS, I think the  
23 issue really is at the moment having the Commission address  
24 it?

25 MR. DIRCKS: Yes, that is the issue. The paper is

1 down here. I think it has the full support of the complete  
2 staff.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE. I guess from my own point  
4 of view, I have been in favor of going out with it, but I  
5 still have some questions about the costing side. It still  
6 doesn't seem to me to make sense why it wouldn't end up being  
7 cheaper for us to end up doing it than to do it with DOE.

8 I can recognize the problem of working with DOE  
9 and the emphasis on that, but having a cheaper --

10 MR. DIRCKS: Well, wasn't one part of this the  
11 fact that DOE is pushing us to pay full cost?

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: To pay full cost.

13 MR. DIRCKS: We're essentially going to pay for  
14 the thing one way or the other.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, so you'll pay full  
16 cost for something that you rent from another government  
17 agency, if there is anything to do with economy of scale  
18 which we've just been hearing about, if it works in one area,  
19 it ought to work in another area.

20 I can remember being in an organization in which  
21 we were using someone else's computer, and having extensive  
22 studies done for us to show why it would be always so much  
23 cheaper, and much more responsive, to have our own computer.  
24 We ended up that one out of two wasn't bad.

1 MR. DIRCKS: Well, we -- Do you have anymore?

2 MR. BURNETT: Well, I can't explain it all,  
3 except that, you know, when the NMS people decide to buy a  
4 new piece of equipment, it may<sup>f</sup> or may not have anything to  
5 do with our area, and we have to carry our fair share of that  
6 baggage. And then they have 40 people down there to run it,  
7 which may or may not be equitable, shall we say.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes. I hear you, Bob, I've  
9 just been in at least three different organizations where the  
10 same cycle has occurred, and it always ends up costing more,  
11 at least the three experiences I have had where this has been  
12 done.

13 MR. DIRCKS: This would be the exception.

14 (Laughter.)

15 (Slide.)

16 The next slide is the physical security decision  
17 unit. We are recommending the staffing of 49 people, and about  
18 \$1 million. That's a decrease from 67 to 49 from fiscal '79  
19 through '81. There is a decrease in program here, and I think  
20 the basic reason for the decrease is that we're moving away  
21 from developing a regulatory program to implementing the  
22 regulatory program and it's taking fewer people and fewer  
23 dollars.

24 The physical security program in '81 will  
25 continue what we call vulnerability assessments, which is



1 the descendant of the old comprehensive evaluation program.

2 I think that program has proved beneficial, and  
3 I would like to continue it. We've built into this budget  
4 a continuation of that in slightly a modified form.

5 The sort of a summary sheet I'd like to pass out  
6 called "Major Accomplishments within the" --

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Don't -- I want to ask a  
8 question about that.

9 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You've got in your program  
11 plan something, a modification here. Your program plans you  
12 were talking about conducting visits to 12 and 40 countries,  
13 and here you have foreign country evaluations.

14 Are these in country evaluations you've got  
15 listed there, actually you were going to send a team to the  
16 country?

17 MR. DIRCKS: This physical security evaluation  
18 program that we've been undertaking with DOE. DOE and State  
19 makes a tour of countries. They invite us to go along.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But it's not a separate  
21 evaluation?

22 MR. DIRCKS: No. It's a member of the team.

23 MR. BURNETT: And it's a single member from my  
24 office, no more than two.

610 155

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So it's at State's or DOE's

1 initiation?

2 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

3 MR. BURNETT: And they have the lead on it.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, this has been the pattern  
5 for --

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, that one I'm familiar  
7 with. I wondered what this was, if it was different.

8 MR. DIRCKS: Establishing touring groups.

9 (Slide.)

10 The next one is a summary sheet of major  
11 accomplishments within the EDO mark. I would like to just  
12 give you a sort of a supplement to that, which is  
13 essentially those 10 items, but we've put some manyears  
14 against them. I guess what we're trying to do here is to  
15 show that we're just not looking at the 12 fuel cycle  
16 facilities. We've tried to spread the manpower across the  
17 board to give you an idea of the number of activities that  
18 bring together all the other units that we've talked about.

19 (Pause.)

20 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: By the way, while we're in this  
21 area, how's the Upgrade Rule coming?

22 MR. BURNETT: That piece of paper that we were  
23 asked to come back to you on on the changes with a statement  
24 of consideration, that piece of paper has been around to the  
25 offices, and we are putting it in final memorandum form from

1 either Mr. Dircks or Mr. Gossick, directed individually to  
2 each of the Commissioners, saying: Here is the change. We  
3 think this is all right. Can you get back to us by a specific  
4 time? I am assuming that that will be out next week, or  
5 it will be moving. It won't be on the street, of course,  
6 by next week. You know it takes quite awhile to do that.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Bill, could you tell me  
8 what difference it would make in your manpower estimates here  
9 under one or two cases -- and unless you know them, you don't  
10 have to give them to me off the top of your head, but I'd  
11 like to know by Wednesday -- and the cases would be: If  
12 NMSS picked up the safeguards functions of NRR, how many  
13 additional people would you need?

14 And the second case would be if NRR picked up the  
15 safeguards function of NMSS, how many fewer people would you  
16 need?

17 MR. BURNETT: (Coughing) What was that last one?

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. DIRCKS: Well, my own view is --

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, if you think about  
21 it, there is a relationship.

22 MR. DIRCKS: If I promote the '80-'81 --

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Don't commit yourself.

24 MR. DIRCKS: We could get that for you.

25 The next -- if you go down to 23, this is the

1 principal impacts of the things that will be delayed,  
2 deferred, or just dropped. Most of these will be deferred.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Explain number two, please.

4 MR. DIRCKS: "Will not participate in U.S.  
5 action plans for strengthening International Safeguards," I  
6 think that's a little bit too strongly worded.

7 (Laughter.)

8 We will participate to the extent that we can.  
9 It is not exactly a high -- we'll do the other things, first.  
10 When we can manage it, we will do this.

11 I tried to screen out all things like "will not  
12 participate." We'll spread it thin.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How many people do you now  
14 have participating in the action plan?

15 MR. DIRCKS: I think we have estimated about  
16 2- to 2-1/2 people.

17 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Right now.

18 MR. DIRCKS: Well, what's the participation?

19 MR. BURNETT: About 1-1/2 to 2.

20 MR. DIRCKS: 1-1/2 to 2.

21 MR. BURNETT: We asked for 2, and they gave us .5.

22 MR. DIRCKS: So there would be a modest  
23 participation. Most of these are deferrals, delays.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: When you say the update of  
25 the agencywide safeguards program, is that -- by "agencywide,"

1 do you mean including research in NRR?

2 MR. DIRCKS: Yes, yes. That's being worked on.  
3 It hasn't progressed very rapidly, but -- where does it stand  
4 now?

5 MR. BURNETT: Well, we put out the first report,  
6 as you know, about eight or nine months ago. The maintenance  
7 of that, putting in the changes, kind of like a five-year  
8 plan, takes about a half a manyear. We did not get resources  
9 for that this year. So there would be no, or little updating  
10 done in this budget, and it would go on to the following year.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I&E has -- I guess at the  
12 I&E briefing -- mentioned that if the low-level -- I guess  
13 that would be a question that would come up later.

14 The route surveys you're talking about are strictly  
15 the spent fuel surveys?

16 MR. DIRCKS: Spent fuel. And it's laying up the  
17 preapproval.

18 (Slide.)

19 The next chart, briefly, is the ISIS item, which  
20 we've covered in the safeguards portion of EDIS, and I think  
21 all the issues there. So that completes the safeguards  
22 portion of the presentation, and now we get to the heavy  
23 headerup. Jack?

24 This is a program again that shows the most  
25 significant increases certainly that have been made in '79.

1 We're asking for a supplement in fiscal '80, and a continua-  
2 tion of the growth in fiscal '81.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How many people do you have  
4 up there?

5 MR. MARTIN: At this precise moment -- it's  
6 changing every day -- I think, counting people on-board, plus  
7 people who will be coming on-board in the next couple or  
8 three weeks, it's like 71.

9 MR. DIRCKS: We've been authorized to go up to our  
10 Presidential ceiling of '80. So Jack's not over.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No, no, I was just  
12 wondering how difficult it's going to be to get to 121 by  
13 the end of '81, which is the additional 50 people.

14 MR. MARTIN: Well, you might notice that I've  
15 structured this, that it's about 20 percent a year, which,  
16 let's see, if we're hiring right now against the fiscal '80  
17 ceiling, and we're like, by the end of this fiscal year, I'm  
18 hoping to be at the '81, we've structured this at about a  
19 20 percent increase because -- and I'm concerned with that,  
20 too. That even if you can hire them, I can't integrate them  
21 and manage them properly.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: At the end of '80, you'll  
23 be at '81?

24 MR. MARTIN: In that -- yes.

25 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Unless the supplement goes.

1 MR. GOSSICK: Yes, and it would be 97.

2 MR. DIRCKS: We're not counting on the supplements  
3 right away; we're counting on the '81 Presidential -- the  
4 '80 Presidential.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But you're really hoping to  
6 get to be at the '80 Presidential ceiling at the beginning of  
7 '80.

8 MR. MARTIN: Right. That's what I'm moving against  
9 right at this point.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I see.

11 MR. GOSSICK: Well, it's actually mid-year.

12 MR. DIRCKS: For the supplement.

13 MR. GOSSICK: For the supplement.

14 MR. MARTIN: And then during the year --

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Hoping to get to the 97.

16 MR. MARTIN: Right, during fiscal '80, during that  
17 year.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So you're really hoping to  
19 be at that at the end of '80.

20 MR. MARTIN: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: To be at the 97.

22 MR. MARTIN: Well, I'd like to get as much use out  
23 of it, of '80, as possible, but that's about as fast as you  
24 can hire and train the people.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It's a very rapid rate of

1 expansion. Do you think you'll be able to handle that?

2 MR. MARTIN: 20 percent I think it manageable.

3 That's what I've used to basically limit the program. We've  
4 of course made a case that you would really need more than that  
5 to keep pace, but you just can't use it.

6 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, I think -- well, we'll go  
7 through this again by decision unit. I'll just point out we  
8 have only one setaside here. That's 3 people and \$200,000,  
9 in the '80 supplement for the low-level program, and that's  
10 on the DOE cooperative consultant program.

11 MR. MARTIN: Right.

12 MR. DIRCKS: And we've labeled that as a setaside.

13 (Slide.) --

14 How about the first decision unit, which is the  
15 "High-Level Waste Program."

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Is that a Congressional -- well,  
17 we'll get to the setaside in due time.

18 Go ahead.

19 MR. DIRCKS: The program here is really budgeted  
20 to go from 28 people in fiscal '79 up to 61 people in '81.  
21 That is a substantial growth, but as Jack pointed out, we  
22 want to program that through the '80 supplement.

23 The same thing goes for the dollar requirement,  
24 \$4.3 million in '79 up to \$13.4 million in '81, again using  
25 the '80 supplement as a branch to get there.



1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Now if I were -- Jack, if  
2 I were to apply your rule-of-thumb that 20 percent per year  
3 is about the most you can really handle. --

4 MR. MARTIN: You would do the same in dollars, too.  
5 Now this is a little misleading in that we have --

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: This would give you a lot  
7 more than 20 percent.

8 MR. MARTIN: Well, let me explain that. We have --  
9 this is in budget terms, and maybe Len can help me out.  
10 During fiscal '79, we are actually spending like \$8.065 million  
11 that we scraped up internally, or got reprogrammed from  
12 fiscal '78 that we got at the very end of the year. So if  
13 I were to look at what am I actually spending in '79, it's  
14 like \$8 million.

15 Likewise, if I look at 1980, it's like \$10 million.  
16 You know, the \$6 and the -- If I count what we expect to get  
17 reprogrammed, plus the \$1.8 million of the EDO recommendation,  
18 it comes out \$10.15 million and that's roughly 20 percent or  
19 so.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No, I was more looking at  
21 people, and your -- applying your rule-of-thumb of 20 percent  
22 a year.

23 MR. MARTIN: That will be a bigger jump during  
24 1980. During 1980, that's a bigger jump.

25 MR. DIRCKS: That's at 16 people.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm not saying it isn't  
2 needed --

3 MR. DIRCKS: But then if you defer it, and you  
4 say we need it, and we pick it up in '81 which would be a  
5 pretty massive jump in '81.

6 (Slide.)

7 May I have the next slide, Dave. Again,  
8 unfortunately this is two pages.

9 MR. MARTIN: I would like to make one comment on  
10 that. On the President's budget of 33, we're really like at  
11 40. I have taken people from the Low-Level Decision Unit  
12 this fiscal year and stuck them in there to get a running  
13 start, but I have to then give back next year -- in terms of  
14 real people being managed among these High-Level Waste  
15 Branches, it's like 39, which is still more than 20 percent.

16 MR. DIRCKS: The problem is that we have to pay  
17 back the low-level, because we're seeing some other problems  
18 in that area. I think the emphasis in this decision unit  
19 is -- we've gone through this, I guess, with all of the  
20 Commissioners now. The emphasis we're putting on regulations  
21 and the criteria, and to the extent we can we would not defer  
22 any work that we're doing in developing licensing review  
23 capabilities or licensing capabilities. We just feel  
24 as though we have to get up ahead and get the criteria and  
25 standards out. We're seeing this pressure build up each day,

1 and I think both Jack and I are concerned about it, that our  
2 program may in effect be looked upon as delaying a part of  
3 the whole national program.

4 So we're looking at, in fiscal '81, putting 22  
5 people to the regulatory guidance program. That's an  
6 increase of 4 or 5 people over '80, the supplemented '80.

7 We are also looking to put 4 people into the  
8 assessment of the DOE program, and I think we've discussed  
9 with you the concepts we have in looking at the site  
10 characterization program that DOE will be getting into. It  
11 is our feeling that if they go through an extensive site  
12 characterization program, looking at the test drilling, test  
13 shafts, that we ought to have people in very close contact,  
14 very close touch with that program, even to the extent of  
15 maybe putting some people on site and providing day-to-day  
16 guidance of what we think we need in the licensing process,  
17 so we won't be pulling any surprises on anyone during the  
18 course of these licensing actions.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: This might be as good a time  
20 as any to ask a couple of questions about what kinds of  
21 assumptions you have in here.

22 Do you have any manyears dedicated in an '81 or in  
23 an '80 supplemental to the waste management proceedings that  
24 the Commission is about to embark on?

25 MR. DIRCKS: Not built into this one. Depending on

1 the scope and form and how you get into it, what we're going  
2 to have to do is look around in the existing program and --

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But the answer is there  
4 is nothing here.

5 MR. DIRCKS: The answer is "no," there's nothing  
6 in here.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you have an assumption  
8 about when the DOE might be submitting a license application  
9 for a high-level site?

10 MR. DIRCKS: We're looking at the Presidential  
11 decision memorandum, the last version we saw, looking at the  
12 '85-'86 time frame.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's what underlies the  
14 program buildup here, or it would be consistent with --

15 MR. MARTIN: It turns out it doesn't make any  
16 difference. I mean, either assumption you make, towards the  
17 tailend of '81 you -- if you went with the earlier assumption,  
18 you would start building up a licensing review team. However,  
19 if you went to the later assumption, you would be using that  
20 same buildup to look at the multiple site characterization.

21 In '81, it doesn't seem to make that much different.  
22 In '82 it starts to make a difference.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So as far as '81 is  
24 concerned, it's independent of DOE's license application.

25 MR. MARTIN: Pretty much, yes. Towards the end,

1 it would start --

2 MR. DIRCKS: I think we're working -- we haven't  
3 developed this program taking the prospective DOE date as the  
4 goal to which we're shooting. We're trying to build up the  
5 program.

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What would happen to the  
7 program if the President doesn't make a choice?

8 MR. MARTIN: Nothing. We would continue to work  
9 on the criteria as quickly as we could.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So the program is also  
11 then independent of the options in the IRG memorandum?

12 MR. MARTIN: That's right. If they picked the --  
13 Well, if they picked no option.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What I'm really asking is,  
15 let's suppose that the President comes up with a whole new  
16 option that's not in that memorandum. What I'm really asking,  
17 is this program attempt to fit with the IRG recommendations?

18 MR. DIRCKS: No, it's not.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Oh, I see. It's relatively  
20 independent.

21 MR. MARTIN: Yes. The only association is the  
22 idea that we will develop criteria ahead of developing sites.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

24 MR. DIRCKS: Well, to that extent --

25 MR. MARTIN: Which is a fundamental change.

1 MR. DIRCKS: But that underlies the IRG report,  
2 too, I think; the fact that criteria and standards must be  
3 developed and should precede the actual application.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Okay, then, speaking about  
5 sites, what assumption does it make about WIPP?

6 MR. MARTIN: Nothing. WIPP does not come in.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So that it does not have  
8 any resources allocated to the licensing of WIPP, a review  
9 of WIPP.

10 MR. DIRCKS: We would look on WIPP -- and I think  
11 all along we've been looking on WIPP as a site that if they  
12 wanted to they could characterize as one of the 3 to 5 that  
13 could eventually become commercial depositories.

14 MR. MARTIN: Certainly in this criteria development  
15 we are looking at bedded salt.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It would be -- yes, but as  
17 far as many years devoted to reviewing a WIPP application,  
18 this wouldn't be in there.

19 Okay, the last question relates to a comment that  
20 Lee made in his mark letter of July 23rd, and its NRR support  
21 of NMSS. Are you familiar with that?

22 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: First I just wanted to ask,  
24 Lee, the way I read it was that NRR has the resources which  
25 were available for you through NMSS but weren't fully

1 utilized.

2 MR. GOSSICK: Well, I think there's a question  
3 as to the extent that they're utilized, and then also the  
4 request by NRR for the amount of resources, the 26 total  
5 numbers, in the consideration of their work at the moment,  
6 I think created the question that BRG brought up as to, you  
7 know, perhaps this isn't the best place to have these people  
8 located. And also the question of how much this kind of  
help is required and used by NMSS.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But the issue that I'm  
11 trying to get at -- whether there is the implication there  
12 that NMSS is not fully utilizing the resources that NRR has  
13 available in this area.

14 MR. GOSSICK: I think to some extent that was --

15 MR. DONOGHUE: I think it's more that the resources  
16 that NRR has is not being made available to NMSS on the basis  
17 on which they need it, and not the implication that it's  
18 there but they're not drawing on it.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, so you're saying that  
20 you did not in your review find that they were not using  
21 what was available -- rather it wasn't available?

22 MR. DONOGHUE: It's correct. It was not  
23 available on a dependable, reliable basis.

24 MR. DIPCKS: I think that's the issue. I think,  
25 Jack, you might want to discuss this memorandum that you've

1 sent over there to NRR. We have asked for 13 -- the equivalent  
2 of 13 manyears.

3 MR. MARTIN: Yes, if I -- in May, as part of the  
4 overall budget program plan, I think I laid out where I thought  
5 for the whole waste management effort for fiscal '80 and '81  
6 we would need like 14 manyears per year in all areas, half  
7 of which is in low-level waste.

8 So I broke it down in terms of high-level, low-level,  
9 and mill tailings, and I frankly don't know where the 26 came  
10 from. I think that's for all of NMSS, not just waste  
11 management. I was never able to resolve that, and we've been  
12 through the research and the standards, but I haven't been  
13 able to resolve the NRR part of it.

14 Now in this memo I sent over, it assumed that we  
15 would be getting an application in '82. So there were a  
16 couple of people in there towards the end of '81, a buildup  
17 for a license review.

18 So if I were to look at it again today, I would  
19 see it as about 12 people I would need from NRR, and 7 of  
20 which is in low-level, and primarily in the surface water  
21 hydrology geotechnical, aquatic biology, socioeconomic, all  
22 the sorts of things that they're good at doing.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And five of them in high  
24 level?

25 MR. MARTIN: Right.



1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Now is your --

2 MR. MARTIN: And mill tailings.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: -- plan in the proposal  
4 that you have here, is that based upon the assumption that  
5 you will or will not get those people?

6 MR. MARTIN: Yes, sir, I will get them.

7 Now these are the kinds of people that you can  
8 also contract for. They're not unique things, and I think as  
9 Dan pointed out, my experience in the three years that I've  
10 been here is that it's a very unreliable commodity.

11 When they're there, they're good. When they're  
12 not there, we wind up contracting for them anyway. And I  
13 just don't know what to assume, whether they'll be there or  
14 not.

15 The arrangement I had made with NRR is that all  
16 the surface type things that they could do, and all the  
17 geological questions that relate to underground mining and  
18 that sort of thing, we would acquire those skills since they  
19 aren't readily available.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But where it stands now,  
21 neither the money to contract nor the people in your NMSS are  
22 included.

23 MR. MARTIN: No.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And the assumption is that  
25 that effort will come out of NRR.

1 MR. MARTIN: That's right.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you know whether NRR's  
3 budget makes a similar assumption?

4 MR. MARTIN: Well, their budget, as far as I can  
5 tell -- this is the thing I wasn't able to resolve -- assumed  
6 that they would have like 18 people in fiscal '81. It was  
7 in the crosscut. They had it like 18 people, instead of the  
8 14 I had asked for, and I was never able to ferret that out.

9 In fiscal '80 they had 27 --

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, it's obvious though  
11 that 18 people though are to support your request. "Spent  
12 fuel" may be called "high-level waste."

13 MR. MARTIN: I just haven't been able to resolve  
14 that.

15 MR. DIRCKS: Part of that is the support of what  
16 work we may want to do in high-level waste area. Does  
17 somebody want to comment on that?

18 MR. HALLER: My understanding of the NRR budget  
19 is that of the 26 people in FY '81, they have 22 for NMSS  
20 support. That's based on a factor of about 1.4 multiplied  
21 times approximately 16 or 17 people, and that 16 or 17 is  
22 the base number that Jack was talking about. Around 3 of those  
23 are for fuel cycle, and the other 13 or 14 are for the waste  
24 management part of the thing.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So you're saying it is

1 incorporated in NRR's budget.

2 MR. HALLER: Yes. And there's about 4 more people  
3 that NRR would use for other purposes.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Thank you.

5 (Slide.)

6 MR. DIRCKS: The next area is low-level.

7 Jack, in '79, this is where you borrowed people  
8 from low level?

9 MR. MARTIN: Right, 5 of them -- no, 7 of them.

10 MR. DIRCKS: And we're looking for a pay-back in  
11 '80.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: In other words, you have  
13 about 9 people working now.

14 MR. DIRCKS: We have 9 people in low level.

15 MR. MARTIN: No, it's about --

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You have 16 listed.

17 MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry, I borrowed 7 against the  
18 '80 budget, which is what we're working towards. So it's  
19 like I've got like 18 actually on board working.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Out of curiosity, in your  
21 hiring, are you bringing people up to strength against the  
22 FY '80, and the FY '79?

23 MR. DIRCKS: We are. The '80, without the  
24 supplement.

25 MR. DONOGHUE: In the waste management area, I

1 think they're overhiring, or they have stopped, or ceased  
2 hiring in some of the other areas. So as an office they  
3 are not -- they are still well below their ceiling.

4 MR. DIRCKS: Remember, we're not --

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: In order to get waste division  
6 up cracking, one of the things we finally did after a lot  
7 of grunting and groaning was to uncork the recruiting there  
8 and tell them to go to the '80 levels and we would eat the  
9 slots elsewhere until October 1st.

10 MR. DIRCKS: Well, in the low-level area, I think  
11 we might as well turn to chart 30.

12 (Slide.)

13 This lays out the four basic major objectives.  
14 We're anticipating one application for low-level waste  
15 burial site, using that --

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Is that sort of a hypothetical  
17 one?

18 MR. DIRCKS: It's hypothetical.

19 MR. MARTIN: Well, we've had some feelers from  
20 like TVA. I suspect there will be one in that time frame.

21 MR. DIRCKS: And there are some rumblings in one  
22 of the Agreement States that we would be heavily involved --  
23 not as a full licenser, but as a carrying horse for the  
24 technical burden, I would imagine.

25 The development of regulations is an area that we

1 have recognized needs some push. We're sort of dependent now.  
2 We don't have a good comprehensive set of low-level waste  
3 regulations. I think the governors have pointed that out to  
4 us. Jack has gotten steam under that program. He's going  
5 to have some draft regs out -- when, the beginning of next  
6 year, Jack? -- and then we hope to finalize --

7 MR. MARTIN: The middle of next year.

8 MR. DIRCKS: The middle of next year.

9 The fiscal '80 program I guess with the supplemental  
10 is 25, and we're looking for a total staffing of 27.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Would you say a few words  
12 about the consultative pilot program? I was surprised to  
13 find it listed as a DOE low-level waste disposal facility  
14 consultative program focused on. I tried to go back over my  
15 memory, and I couldn't find that as being the focus of the  
16 consultative program before.

17 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I think for -- correct me if  
18 I'm wrong -- I think we just assumed that -- there's several  
19 parts to that program. There's the consultative program.  
20 There's I guess the assumption that we would be licensin; any  
21 new DOE disposal activities.

22 I think what we've done is lump the two things  
23 together.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, except the phrase,  
25 "consultative pilot program" has a certain character to it

1 that reflects back to the scope of licensing studies. And I  
2 was wondering where the decision had been made, or where even  
3 the issue had been raised, that it was going to focus upon a  
4 major DOE low-level waste disposal facility.

5 MR. DIRCKS: Jack, do you want to bring me up-to-  
6 date on that one? I just assumed --

7 MR. MARTIN: I wasn't a party to those. I was told  
8 that was the agreement.

9 MR. DIRCKS: I think we've mistitled the thing.  
10 It really is a --

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: May I ask, Jack, you were  
12 told that the agreement was a major DOE low-level waste  
13 facility?

14 MR. MARTIN: This was in the licensing study  
15 which I didn't do. The assumption that I was given to  
16 understand was that it would be some sort of a -- either low-  
17 level, or not intimately connected with the defense effort,  
18 like something at Brookhaven or Argon.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Right. I think the decision  
20 was for a nondefense DOE waste facility.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Wait. Is this part of the 34-A  
22 package?

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yep. That's what this is.  
24 And that's why I was kind of surprised to see it.

25 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Wait. This is the setaside?

1 MR. MARTIN: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm quoting the BRG  
3 description, "was a major DOE low-level waste disposal  
4 facility."

5 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I think in the -- I don't know  
6 how we -- did we call it that? Or did we call it "pilot  
7 program to assess DOE low-level disposal facilities"?

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It wasn't exactly "low-level" --

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That I can recall. In fact,  
11 I think you --

12 MR. DIRCKS: But I thought in the IRG report it  
13 said "low-level sites."

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: All I'm saying is the  
15 phrase "a pilot program, consultative pilot program" in our  
16 NRC budget ought to track to the big study --

17 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: The 34-A recommendation.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And there was a lot of  
19 debate, and a lot of work, on what ought that consultative  
20 pilot program be. And those words don't track to it.

21 MR. DIRCKS: Okay, well, I don't know whether I've  
22 seen the final product of the Commission's recommendation, but  
23 I thought there was a three-part --

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: They keep talking about a pilot  
25 program to assist DOE LLW disposal.

1 MR. DIRCKS: Right.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And I don't recall that.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: And if what that means is the  
4 pilot program, consultative pilot program under the 34-A  
5 report, why that's kind of a misnomer.

6 MR. MARTIN: I think that's what it means. Now  
7 maybe we just assumed, and we should go back and conform  
8 that.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, I would think it would  
10 be good.

11 MR. DIRCKS: But I don't -- Well, have we seen the  
12 final version of that? We've been getting communiques, but  
13 we haven't seen --

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But I think you've probably  
15 seen the version where there is a -- three people on one  
16 side, and two on another.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And I guess I would like  
20 this Board to correspond to what the three decided.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. DIRCKS: Well, this is not --

23 MR. MARTIN: But don't --

24 MR. DIRCKS: I think all we --

25 MR. MARTIN: We didn't take that into account.



1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. DIRCKS: I guess -- maybe I'm getting -- I've  
3 seen the daily give-and-take, but I thought in the --

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's settled down fairly  
5 well.

6 MR. DIRCKS: Well, let me go back to what I thought  
7 everyone was agreeing on, and that was the major thrust of the  
8 IRG report, that any future DOE low-level waste disposal  
9 activities would be --

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's "future." This is a  
11 consultative pilot program. It's entirely different. The  
12 scope of licensing issue was: To what extent ought the NRC's  
13 regulation extend into the DOE facilities?

14 And we reached the conclusion that we would go for  
15 a consultative pilot program.

16 MR. DIRCKS: Which would be consult on low-level  
17 waste disposal.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No.

19 MR. DIRCKS: No low-level?

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It was not on low-level.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It was across the board.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

23 MR. DIRCKS: Oh. I would include low-level waste.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It was to pick up a couple of  
25 DOE facilities.

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

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right.

MR. DIRCKS: Concentrating on --

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: And leap right in there.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Facilities, across the board, whatever they were there, because the issue was whether we could work out some sort of arrangement that would enable us and DOE to develop a method of approach that would not jeopardize national security information. And that was the issue. And this phraseology isn't going to track.

MR. DIRCKS: Well, I guess we'll go back and change it. I thought low-level waste disposal was an integral part of whatever consultative agreement you were coming to agree on.

nd #2  
BLANCH:mte  
#3 fols

CR 6200  
BEACH  
t-3 mte 1

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: In fact, one of the strong points  
2 that was made was that one has to be very careful about  
3 low-level waste disposal, because there are certain low-level  
4 waste facilities, major low-level waste facilities under DOE,  
5 which are very obviously security sites.

6 MR. DIRCKS: But even Deutch was saying that --

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And those were the ones he  
8 said you had to stay away from.

9 MR. DIRCKS: Commercial low level wastes.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right, commercial.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Non-defense low-level wastes.  
12 Actually, the set-aside here sounds like something else. But  
13 it was intended to be the consultative pilot program of 34-A.

14 MR. DIRCKS: Yeah. And I think what we ought to  
15 realize.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Excuse me for getting intense  
17 about it.

18 MR. DIRCKS: That's fine. No offense intended.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You develop a mother's fondness  
20 for these.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. DIRCKS: Well, whatever it is --

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It was a wayward child I just  
24 found.

25 MR. DIRCKS: I think we just stumbled over our own.

1 Whatever it is, it's what you had in mind.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, since --

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That raises a question. If it  
5 isn't very clear what we had in mind, we couldn't get the name  
6 right, do the resources have any relationship? Now we have  
7 the name right; what about the numbers?

8 MR. DIRCKS: That's why it was a set-aside.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Thank goodness.

11 MR. DIRCKS: Well, we've gone through that one.

12 Jack--Dave, if you could move on to uranium.

13 (Slide.)

14 Uranium recovery licensing. I think the point here is t  
15 this is almost a straight workload item. We've taken license  
16 applications, notify them by the workload factor to get  
17 licenses out. Essentially, this is what we've come up with.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What assumption have you made  
19 with regard to the concurrent jurisdiction?

20 MR. DIRCKS: That is not built into this. That is  
21 not built into this budget --

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Which is not?

23 MR. DIRCKS: -- proposal. That we have concurrent  
24 or joint jurisdiction.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So the assumption is we do

1 not?

2 MR. DIRCKS: We do not.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: During this period.

4 MR. DIRCKS: We do not.

5 Now, I think that this provides an entre, though,  
6 to a point I'd like to make. If anything happens on the  
7 fragile course of this thing through the legislative process  
8 and it drops by the wayside and we are forced to pick up  
9 concurrent jurisdiction, we have not built resources into any  
10 package that we have either now or pending before anybody.  
11 This is -- we're going to have to eat it and we're going to  
12 have --

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Would it be possible to get  
14 a rough estimate?

15 MR. DIRCKS: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I mean, we really should at  
17 least be going over to OMB with a number, with two sets of  
18 numbers, at best.

19 MR. DIRCKS: We have all those sets of numbers and  
20 we'll get them to you by Wednesday.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It ought to be in the form of an  
22 '80 supplement increment which would be necessary if we are  
23 going to in fact have to license those darn things.

24 MR. GOSSICK: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- the tailing piles for three  
2 years. The '81 budget is far enough away so that the resources  
3 you get in '81 --

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, right.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- you're going to be dead before  
6 then, if we have to do it.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right, yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: What's the present level on  
9 uranium recovery? Is the 18 a fair number?

10 MR. MARTIN: Well, here again it's up, the fiscal  
11 '80 level.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Is it more like 23?

13 MR. MARTIN: Yes. We're at the ceiling now.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How much technical assistance  
15 do you plan on providing to the Agreement States as they go  
16 down their track of trying to respond to the mill tailings  
17 issue?

18 MR. DIRCKS: We have built into this thing, the  
19 second page of that -- the next page -- I think we're antici-  
20 pating the 13 projects completion in fiscal '81. In that  
21 area of technical assistance to Agreement States --

22 (Slides.)

23 -- the '80 budget has about 3-1/2, 3.2 man-years  
24 assigned to it, and we're budgeting 6.3 in this.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And you have not put in a

610 184

1 supplemental at all for that?

2 MR. DIRCKS: No.

3 MR. MARTIN: We think we're going to get five more.

4 MR. DIRCKS: Yes, we have asked for -- we have  
5 not requested it in the supplemental, but it's in the '80  
6 budget.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And that will pick up --

8 MR. MARTIN: They added five more just before.

9 MR. DIRCKS: Now, we might -- while you're in a  
10 listening mood, on the other subject of the concurrent juris-  
11 diction, you might say that we have gotten a more than enthu-  
12 siastic response from the states for technical assistance  
13 help. It's more than what we originally budgeted for. And I  
14 think in this paper coming down Wednesday, we'll throw that in  
15 there, too.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Separately, though.

17 MR. DIRCKS: Separately; two parts of the paper.

18 I also might mention that we have the SECY 79-413  
19 pending before the Commission, that lays out how we want to  
20 approach the whole licensing process, including the general  
21 license and so on, and if you have time --

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I've asked for a briefing.

23 MR. DIRCKS: Yes, okay.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'll holler, and if any of  
25 my fellows --

1 MR. DIRCKS: That essentially is the major --

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How do you, in the Agreement  
3 State assistance, enter -- and I'm sorry, this question may  
4 not be asked the right way, because I'm having difficulty  
5 dashing from one book to another to another. But in the BRG  
6 book they had listed you at 5-1/2 man-years for Agreement  
7 State assistance. Is this the technical assistance you were  
8 just talking about?

9 MR. DIRCKS: For the whole uranium recovery  
10 licensee?

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

12 MR. DIRCKS: That's dealing with '81, fiscal '81?

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, it's '81, '82, '83.

14 MR. DIRCKS: We were estimating 6.3, which is about  
15 .8 man-year. We were estimating 6.3 in this area.

16 (Pause.)

17 MR. DIRCKS: Somehow or another another .8 got in  
18 there. But essentially, 6.3.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: How do you coordinate that  
20 with state programs or Agreement States?

21 MR. DIRCKS: I guess technically the request for  
22 assistance would come through the Agreement States office.  
23 They'd come over to us and they'd ask. Practically speaking,  
24 I guess Jack's people have established a whole network of  
25 working arrangements with the Agreement States. People would



1 be coming in directly and we'd be informing the state office  
2 when these requests come in.

3 MR. MARTIN: We've worked out draft agreements with  
4 both Colorado and New Mexico that never actually got signed  
5 because of this jurisdictional thing. Well, it was one thing  
6 and another -- elections, then this jurisdictional thing. And  
7 they've never actually been signed by the governor, but they're  
8 working, in a way. And we just work directly with the state  
9 people on whatever appears to be the most urgent thing to do.  
10 And it's been working quite well.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I never did call Lamb, by the way.  
12 I ran down on calling governors.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. MARTIN: We may have a whole new set of subjects.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We've had a new set of subjects,  
16 and I think we're about to go around again.

17 We had a report from Beatty.

18 MR. MARTIN: From who?

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Beatty.

20 They hauled a truck in from Texas with some liquid.

21 MR. MARTIN: Another one?

22 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That's what I hear.

23 MR. DIRCKS: What kind of waste?

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Low-level.

25 MR. GOSSICK: Was it leaking?

610 187

1 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Of course. They always leak.

2 (Laughter.)

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Have we sent any extensive  
4 notices to our licensees?

5 MR. DIRCKS: Notice is due to go out today.

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: We haven't yet?

7 MR. DIRCKS: What we want to do is not only send a  
8 notice out, but we want to send out -- the notice is due to  
9 go out --we have a due date, I think August 6th. But we can  
10 get it out today. We want to send out a bulletin, too, which  
11 would go under I&E's auspices.

12 We've been having some discussions with I&E about  
13 the amount of resources we can devote to this that will make  
14 it somewhat similar to the commitments that the Commission had  
15 made to the three governors. They have some real resource  
16 problems, that they complain that we've overcommitted them in  
17 the letter to the three governors.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Who's overcommitted?

19 MR. DIRCKS: I&E claims that they can't do it, that  
20 they just don't have the resources. And I think what the delay  
21 has been is we've been trying to encourage them to kind of go  
22 to the pole. But the notice will go out this week.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Because at some stage -- you  
24 know, if I were governor, I would be asking if you guys ever  
25 told the licensees this just isn't going to be tolerated.

1 MR. DIRCKS: Well, we've committed to do that and  
 2 the action plan commits us to do that by August the 6th. But  
 3 we will get it out this week.

4 The real issue that we wanted to get down to you on  
 5 is the letter that we would like you to sign off on by  
 6 August 1 sending out this action plan. We've assigned certain  
 7 dates and coverage that we'll be doing, and I&E has committed  
 8 itself to do certain things, and the sooner we can sign them  
 9 up the better off we'll be. And that should be down here  
 10 this afternoon, this action plan going out to the governors.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Find out what's going on out  
 12 West.

13 MR. DIRCKS: All right.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We may not want to send that  
 15 letter until we get a better handle on this thing out there,  
 16 because we're just likely to have a --

17 MR. DIRCKS: When did this occur?

18 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I just got word on the way into  
 19 this room, early warning.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: On the other cases where there  
 21 was stuff leaking, were any penalties, fines, assessed against  
 22 the shippers?

23 MR. DIRCKS: In the sweep that DOT and NRC made,  
 24 NRC confined itself to its own licensee states. DOD and some  
 25 of the Agreement States went out to the Agreement States. DOT,

1 I think, covered something like four -- they made four inspec-  
2 tions, I think, and they found four violations, and they're in  
- the stage of bringing some sort of fine enforcement.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But the two previous problems  
5 of leaking, were they --

6 MR. DIRCKS: In our case, there's a truck that  
7 caught fire, and there was no -- nothing, no action taken.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Wait a minute. There was no  
9 action taken?

10 MR. DIRCKS: No.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Was it our licensee?

12 MR. DIRCKS: It was an Agreement State licensee from  
13 California.

14 There was the case of the dewatered waste coming  
15 down from Palisades that were found leaking. I think there  
16 were two deficiencies and something found, and I gather I&E is  
17 still investigating whether they should levy a fine.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It doesn't seem to come up to the  
19 threshold.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: The problem is people are going  
22 to keep -- be allowed to keep that stuff on the home sites if  
23 it keeps going.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right.

25 MR. DIRCKS: The governor, I guess, expects heavy

1 fines and punishment.

2 The next chart -- Dave, I guess it's 34.

3 (Slide.)

4 -- basically sums up the waste management program  
5 issues. I think we've covered -- these are the problem areas  
6 that you may want to keep with you as part of the waste manage-  
7 ment troubles, troubles and issues. And I think we've talked  
8 about them.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Before you get off the program  
10 issues, the point paper that you submitted to the BRG seemed to  
11 focus upon a lack of coordination, or at least there was a fair  
12 amount of lack of coordination. Maybe you didn't submit it,  
13 but it was prepared: waste management program, BRG.

14 MR. DIRCKS: I don't know whether I've seen that.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: There was stress upon a lack  
16 of coordination.

17 MR. MARTIN: You mean among offices?

18 MR. DIRCKS: Among offices?

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

20 MR. DIRCKS: I don't know. I guess that paper might  
21 have said it, but I guess there may be something coming it from  
22 the ACRS which again says a lack of coordination is hampering  
23 them.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Will you speak to that?

25 MR. DIRCKS: I think the next -- that issue -- it was

610 191

1 in the waste management research area. I said the next time  
2 that came up, I'd like Sol to talk about it. But since I  
3 discussed it the last time before the hearing, Congressional  
4 hearing: We're -- I thought we're making progress along this  
5 line. I've talked to Sol lately and he thinks we have, too.

6 In the program plan, we have very intimately integrated  
7 OSD into the plan. I mean, they are side by side partners on  
8 the waste management program plan. We're heavily dependent on  
9 them. They're heavily committed to meeting our dates and  
10 schedules, and they're doing it. We review what work they want  
11 done. They sort of lay out a schedule in which they want to do  
12 it, and then we go ahead and incorporate the plan.

13 We have made the sort of same approach to Research,  
14 and I think we've got a general commitment that they're going  
15 to do this and they're working toward that goal. Now, I guess  
16 when the ACRS takes a look at it, they still don't think that  
17 we have -- that everything's working toward the same goal.  
18 Now, it takes a little longer with Research than it does with  
19 Standards. But I thought we were working along the same lines.

20 I have got to see why the ACRS came up with that  
21 conclusion. I know that Sol and I have talked about it, and  
22 we're sort of puzzled.

23 Jack, do you have --

24 MR. MARTIN: I think that reflects our priorities.

25 I mean, my first priority is to look at the standards and reg

1 effort we put together, and we've spent an enormous amount of  
2 time in the last four or five months coming up with some sort  
3 of integrated program, and I fully support the research -- I  
4 mean the Standards program as submitted, and through that agree  
5 with it, and have the whole thing lined up in great detail.

6 I haven't been able to do the same thing with the  
7 Research program, for a number of reasons. Time is one of  
8 them. Secondly, it's very difficult to have a closely inte-  
9 grated research program if we're not clear yet on what we want  
10 to do, and that's starting to emerge.

11 I've been meeting with Arsenault and his people for  
12 the last several weeks to line that whole thing out in a  
13 framework that makes some sense. I expect it'll be another  
14 several months before we're really satisfied with that. Based  
15 on what I've seen to date, I don't see that any of the ongoing  
16 work is -- are things that shouldn't be done. But is there  
17 some sort of a document or a presentation we can give that  
18 maybe puts it all in a comprehensible whole? No, and that's our  
19 our next order of business.

20 MR. DIRCKS: I think close in we've got something  
21 going. We've got this Waste Management Review Group, that  
22 goes at it on a -- sort of on an imminent contract by contract  
23 basis. And I think that's working out.

24 The further out you go, where they want to initiate  
25 research on a longer time horizon, I think I keep pointing out

1 it hasn't really gotten into that, nor have they gotten their  
2 longer-term research folded into it relative to mid to short-  
3 term licensing goals. We've got to do more.

4 But I don't agree that the program is severely  
5 hampered because we have an uncoordinated, haphazard program.  
6 I think the program is pulling its socks up. I think we've  
7 established certain key dates. I think we've gotten OS --  
8 Standards Development completely in line with it, much as a  
9 project team.

10 I think Research is in line close-in. I think the  
11 further out you go, I think they're in some more. But I think  
12 on far-out research, that may be the nature of the beast.  
13 You've got to let that thing roam out in the field a little  
14 bit, rather than send people in, where people think you should,  
15 and other people think you should let it go further out.

16 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But you are satisfied?

17 MR. MARTIN: Well, I'm satisfied it's converging,  
18 but not satisfied.

19 MR. DIRCKS: We haven't got the answers, but I think  
20 we've got the right direction. And I think what we want to do  
21 is to use OSD and Research as multipliers to this work. We are  
22 not all convinced that we need those two.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Okay.

24 MR. DIRCKS: We've hit most of these issues that  
25 we've gone through. And Mike mentioned the licensing casework



backlog, the unacceptable increase in covered backlog.

(Slide.)

We thought that the '81 backlog of casework would be around 34. It's gone up, almost doubled. The casework backlog in '81 will probably be 66 instead of the 34.

The next slide --

(Slide.)

-- is basically what we intend to do under the '80 supplement. We tried to quantify this as much as we can. I hope we make all these accomplishments. Again, the program is sort of settling down, and we are working towards some goals. But even here, I'm not quite sure we're going to pull off everything.

(Slide.)

MR. DIRCKS: The next slide is the major accomplishments within the '81 EDO mark. And the last -- next to last item is the impact of the EDO mark. And again, we're -- it's a certain slippage in programs, and we're not contesting that. It's very hard to predict when these things are going to come out. When we talk about '82 and '83, it's years and we just can't prepare. So there's no impacts that are critical there.

We will change the title on the next slide and we will fix up the words. We'll cross that out --

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: "Waste management program"

is no problem.

wb 78

1 MR. DIRCKS: We will cross that out.

2 MR. MARTIN: You have to fix up that parc.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: This is the "consultative" --

4 MR. DIRCKS: "Consultative program," however it  
5 comes out.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: To --

7 MR. DIRCKS: And however you feel it should come  
8 out, whatever resources you can give -- resources you  
9 can give to help us.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: What do I do about the -- that  
11 setaside? I don't know whether the 3 manyears and \$200K is  
12 the right number, and I don't know whether it ought to be in  
13 low-level waste.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm not sure what block it  
15 would go into.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, a piece goes into each  
17 one. They're going to be high and low, one hopes.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It's just hard to -- I  
19 guess in the decision unit structure, you don't have -- well,  
20 let's see. Maybe management direction support, special  
21 independent technical and management evaluation.

22 MR. MARTIN: Well, we could put it there in the  
23 high-level waste. I have a decision unit there for special  
24 studies, and that sort of thing.

25 MR. DIRCKS: It could go in there.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That would seem to be a --  
2 rather than trying to figure out it's X percent here.

3 MR. DIRCKS: That completes the runthrough. We  
4 tried to stay within the decision unit.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Hang on. What happened to  
6 the "Management Direction" et cetera, et cetera, down here,  
7 now?

8 MR. DIRCKS: There I think there was -- there was  
9 another case of the numbers going a bit awry.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Oh, we haven't gotten there,  
11 yet.

12 MR. DIRCKS: Well, we --

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We're about to get there.

14 MR. DIRCKS: Well, I can mention that. I wasn't  
15 going to cover it. We're decreasing that management direction  
16 and support from 22 in '79 down to 19 in fiscal '80, and  
17 continuing it in the out years as 19. I don't know whether  
18 you picked that up in your chart --

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Except he's got it coming down  
20 from 39 to 19.

21 MR. DIRCKS: Well, 39, I think there was --

22 MR. MARTIN: I don't know where the 39 came from.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, we had the waste  
24 division in there.

25 MR. DIRCKS: Len, I think that 39 never existed in

1 Management Direction and Support in Washington. I don't  
2 think we've ever carried it as -- I think 19 has been the  
3 number.

4 MR. MARTIN: It's probably just a typo.

5 MR. DIRCKS: I think it might have been a typo,  
6 because all -- we had 22, we're taking it down to 19.

7 MR. BARRY: I think it was a typo.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I have to put an asterisk up  
9 here now and say "add" -- I don't know what kind of --

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Three probably is reasonable.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Do we --

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No, we never had an  
13 estimate.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We never had an estimate on the  
15 kind of program we're talking about, and the estimates that  
16 were in there were so far out that they aren't going to be  
17 very helpful there.

18 (Pause.)

19 MR. BARRY: Bill, you were going to contemplate  
20 putting some of that A-1 into supplemental? Or you were  
21 going to address the supplemental?

22 MR. DIRCKS: For '81? You mean the backlog problem?

23 MR. BARRY: Yes. Wasn't that one of the issues  
24 that they talked about here?

25 MR. DIRCKS: No, we talked about the '80, the

1 '80 supplement.

2 MR. BARRY: That's what I'm saying. Moving --  
3 either accelerating some of that into -- from '81 into '80.

4 MR. DIRCKS: Well, we've had two assignments.  
5 One, we point out what the impact of the concurrent jurisdic-  
6 tion --

7 MR. BARRY: Right.

8 MR. DIRCKS: -- workload would be if we are  
9 saddled with that thing.

10 MR. BARRY: Right.

11 MR. DIRCKS: The second thing we're going to do --  
12 and we offered, gratuitously -- to say what our problems are  
13 in the underestimation of the technical assistance request  
14 for getting states, which adds to our backlog. So we're doing  
15 a two-part piece of paper on that.

16 MR. ENGLEHARDT: There was a loose end that was  
17 left in the safeguards discussion with respect to the number  
18 of resident inspectors that I&E proposed. They proposed to  
19 have fuel -- their charts that they presented last week  
20 indicated that they would have fuel facility inspectors in  
21 residence, two of them in '79, '80, and '81, but they would  
22 drop back to zero in '81 and '83, because they found that the  
23 resident inspector was not as efficient as the maintenance of  
24 a regionally based group, of which they have over 30.

25 COMMISSIONER AHLARNE: But, Tom, they never asked

1 NMSS. I checked that again today.

2 MR. ENGLEHARDT: I didn't realize that, but I did  
3 want to clarify that particular point.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let's see, the total office  
5 listing then would come out 344.

6 MR. DIRCKS: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Asterisk, add salt and pepper  
8 to suit for the consultative pilot program.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: And that would compare with  
11 an '80 budget level of 297.

12 MR. DIRCKS: Plus a supplement.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: The supplement --

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: 26.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: The supplement has yet to be  
16 sought for, so it has the same character as the 344. Those  
17 are druthers. Our 297 -- is it 297? Or is it getting --  
18 no it isn't 297, it's 294.

19 MR. BARRY: It's going to be 294.

20 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, the '80 appropriation is  
21 coming down the line pretty well along says forget those --

22 MR. DIRCKS: 294, right.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: So the current estimated  
24 without supplement is not 297, it's 294. Is the 15,779  
25 good? It can't be.

1 MR. BARRY: No, that's going to be about 12, 6 or  
2 8. It's going to be in program support about 12. It's going  
3 to be --

4 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Out of the 363, 340 total?

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, but this 15,779, did  
6 it make any assumption on the reprogram?

7 MR. DONOGHUE: It assumed --

8 MR. BARRY: No reprogramming.

9 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It assumed that the '79  
10 programming would be successful.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Be successful.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: And I believe it is.

13 MR. BARRY: Yes, the '79 figure here of 12 --  
14 whatever it is -- 12,995, you have to increase that by 2.1  
15 because that reprogramming will be forthcoming shortly.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Now the '80 -- a projected '80  
17 program support number, without the supplement -- this is  
18 presupplement, and based on the Appropriation bill of about  
19 17.6, is again pre-whatever reprogramming we might judge to  
20 do, but it's just based on a cut.

21 Well, the Appropriations bill comes down -- NMSS  
22 at 25.943. I need some way to sort out of that the people  
23 and nonprogram support.

24 MR. BARRY: In program support they'll be at about  
25 12.2 in '80.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Based on 25.943, for the  
2 office.

3 That's almost consistent. Our budget request was  
4 29.605 in the office, and the Appropriations Act will be  
5 coming in at 29.543. So it's down a little less than \$4 million.

6 MR. BARRY: Down \$3.7.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. But then we will see --  
8 you know, we'll see what happens with the supplement, and  
9 what reprogramming.

10 So the delta then is 50 and people not adding  
11 whatever the pilot program might think appropriate, and  
12 about \$11 million in program support, a little less than that.

13 Questions? Comments?

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No. Very interesting.

15 (Laughter.)

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You just made me think of that  
17 guy who used to rise up with the German helmet on and said,  
18 "Veeery interesting!"

19 (Laughter.)

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I know it's not a safeguards  
21 question, and you just gave a list --

22 MR. DIRCKS: We'll get you that.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Listen, I found the format,  
24 and Lee and Len, please take note, I found the format very  
25 useful here.

610 202



1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It starts with the office, and  
3 takes a major division at a time, but then it turns very  
4 rapidly to a decision unit page, backup sheet or two under  
5 the decision unit, next decision unit, and I find that very  
6 helpful. Because one of the difficulties that I do have in  
7 the office briefing is a little more freer flowing in making  
8 a connection to the damn decision unit lines in which these  
9 things are laid out. And I think this is about as handy in  
10 terms of a briefing document and a supplement to the summary  
11 decision unit sheets.

12 So I compliment you on that orderly presentation  
13 here.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That was the first one of  
15 these that I felt I could really track.

16 MR. GOSSICK: We would be very happy to standardize  
17 this next year, if we're still around.

18 (Laughter.)

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It all depends on whether  
20 decisions units are on here.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, the first thing is how  
22 useful the decision unit is.

23 Well, no, wait a minute. We'll be doing next  
24 year's budget before the Administration is --

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The decision units have

1 to be the way the budget has to be presented. It's not  
2 obvious for our use whether that's the best approach.

3 MR. GOSSICK: Well, if you like this, though,  
4 unless --

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: There's some advantage to  
6 approaching it by program that helps me think about it a  
7 lot more. My own personal preference is a program approach.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, but then if you have to  
9 make the budget presentation, and you're dealing from then  
10 on with OMB on the decision-unit basis, you've got the  
11 conversion.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, I have great confi-  
13 dence that the comptroller can do that transition.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Never mind the controller, I  
15 have to go argue for this thing. It's not the controller I'm  
16 worried about, it's the Chairman.

17 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, I have great confidence  
18 also in your ability.

19 MR. GOSSICK: Is the Congress now asking for it in  
20 the decision unit rackup?

21 MR. BARRY: They have not specifically asked for  
22 it by decision unit, but last year when we submitted the  
23 green books which are more akin to programming, they said,  
24 well, we really would like more detail, so also send us your  
25 decision unit breakdown, which we did. So they got both.

1           And we still haven't gotten a reading out of them  
2 for next January, whether they want both, or each.

3           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Of course there is also  
4 the -- the closer you can make decision units track program.

5           MR. BARRY: Yes.

6           CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. I think some effort to  
7 converge the systems.

8           MR. BARRY: We tried to put the decision units  
9 in the programs.

10          CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: But in dealing with the decision  
11 unit base summary document, why I found this format for  
12 the briefing an exceptionally clear one, which has allowed  
13 things to go through. So I compliment you on that.

14          If we continue to have to review in terms of  
15 decision units, why I think it would be worthwhile for people  
16 thinking about something close to this as a format, because it  
17 does make it easy to move it into the decision unit -- onto  
18 the decision.

19          All right --

20          COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Lee, are you getting those  
21 cross-cuts?

22          MR. GOSSICK: Yes, Norm, do you have anything on  
23 those cross-cuts? By tomorrow, as we promised?

24          MR. HALLER: We're shooting to be finished by  
25 tomorrow night, and depending on how fast we can get them

1 out, it will be probably Wednesday when they get to the  
2 Commissioners.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Very good.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Thank you, very much.

5 (Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the meeting was  
6 adjourned.)

7 \* \* \*

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**OFFICE OF  
NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFETY  
AND SAFEGUARDS**

COMMISSION BRIEFING

FY 1981 BUDGET



610 207

NMSS FY81 BUDGET  
OFFICE RESOURCE SUMMARY

PROGRAM	FY79		FY80		FY80 SUPPLEMENTAL				FY81		SET ASIDES			
	CURRENT		PRES		NMSS		EDO		NMSS		EDO		SET ASIDES	
	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K
FUEL CYCLE	103	2975	102	2954	7	400	7	400	134	4700	104	3950	(22)	(680)
SAFEGUARDS	107	2340	95	2530	-	-	-	-	109	2355*	93	1810	(1)	(150)
WASTE MGT	62	7680	81	10135	19	4450	16	1800 (3)	130	18310	121	17185	(3)	(200)
MD&S	22	0	19	160	-	--	-	--	19	100	19	100	0	0
TOTAL	294	12995	297	15779	26	4850	23	2200 (3)	392	25465	337	23045	(26)	(1030)

( ) = EDO Set Aside

\*The NMSS request was for \$5055K which included \$2700K for ISIS which has been transferred to ADM budget and set aside by the EDO.

610 208

NMSS FY81 BUDGET  
FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM RESOURCE SUMMARY

PROGRAM	FY79		FY80		FY80 SUPPLEMENTAL				FY81					
	CURRENT		PRES		NMSS		EDO		NMSS		EDO		SET ASIDES	
	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K
FUEL CYCLE LICENSING	45	2465	45	2365	7	400	7	400	53	3725	44	3295	(5)	(360)
TRANSPORTATION CERTIFICATION	15	210	14	275	-	-	-	-	20	625	17	305	(3)	(320)
RADIOISOTOPES LICENSING	43	300	43	314	-	-	-	-	61	350	43	350	(14)	-
TOTAL	103	2975	102	2954	7	400	7	400	134	4700	104	3950	(22)	(680)

( ) = EDO Set Aside

610  
209

FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM  
FUEL CYCLE LICENSING DECISION UNIT

07/26/79, R-3

BASIC MISSION

- o LICENSE AND REGULATE URANIUM FUEL FABRICATION PLANTS, URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE PLANTS, INTERIM SPENT FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES AND ADVANCED FUEL R&D PLANTS.

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o PERFORM HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS FOR FUEL CYCLE PLANTS AND FACILITIES
- o PERFORM STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF RULEMAKING PROCEEDINGS
- o SURVEY FORMER LICENSEE SITES
- o REVIEW DOE PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTIONS FOR FORMER AEC INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTOR SITES
- o DEVELOP NRC REGULATIONS FOR NEW ENVIRONMENTAL LIMITS
- o FORMULATE AND COORDINATE STANDARDS AND REGULATORY RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS
- o DEVELOP RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANS

Decision Unit	FY 1979	FY 1980			FY1981 Estimate		
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(45)	(45)	(45)	( 7)	( 7)	(53)	(44)
PS . . . . .	\$2,465	\$2,365	\$2,365	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ 3,725	\$ 3,295
(Set Asides) . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(5)
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(360)
TOTALS . . . . .	\$2,465	\$2,365	\$2,365	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ 3,725	\$ 3,295

610  
210



DECISION UNIT: FUEL CYCLE LICENSING

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
1. CASEWORK LICENSING	16 MAJOR AND 95 MINOR LICENSING ACTIONS	27	1830	SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS
2. STUDIES ON SPECIFIC PROBLEMS	COMPLETE S-3 AND UFC UPDATE; START REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE FUEL CYCLE AT LOW LEVEL; OTHER SUPPORT EFFORTS	5.5 +	515 +	ESTIMATION OF FC COSTS AND ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES
3. FORMER LICENSEE SITES	COMPLETE PROGRAM IN FY83	1.0	400	RADIOLOGICAL SURVEYS AND ASSESSMENTS
4. DOE REMEDIAL ACTIONS	REVIEW 5 SITES	1.0	300	RADIOLOGICAL ASSISTANCE
5. IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW REGULATIONS	TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION	1.5	100	DETAILED ANALYSIS OF NEW ENVIRONMENTAL RADIOACTIVITY LIMITS AND PERSONNEL EXPOSURE REQUIREMENTS
6. TECHNICAL BASE REFINEMENT	COORDINATION OF STANDARDS, RESEARCH, AND REVISION OF REGULATIONS	4.0	150	REVIEW OF CURRENT NRC REGULATIONS
7. RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANNING	ONGOING REVIEW AND PLANNING	(3.0)	(110)	RADIOLOGICAL ASSISTANCE
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT		<u>4.0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	EDO MARK	44.0	3,295	
SET ASIDES		(5.0)	(360)	

610-211

FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM  
TRANSPORTATION CERTIFICATION DECISION UNIT

07/26/79, P.-2

BASIC MISSION

- o REGULATE DESIGN, FABRICATION AND USE OF PACKAGES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o REVIEW PACKAGE DESIGNS FOR SHIPMENT OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS
- o DEVELOP, MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE PACKAGE ANALYSIS METHODS
- o PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO RES FOR MODAL STUDY
- o DEVELOP RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANS
- o CONDUCT SAFETY EVALUATIONS FOR GALILEO AND SOLAR POLAR SPACE MISSIONS

610 212

Decision Unit	FY 1979	FY 1980				FY1981 Estimate	
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(15)	(14)	(14)	( - )	( - )	(20)	(17)
PS . . . . .	\$ 210	\$ 275	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 625	\$ 305
(Set Asides) . . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(3)
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(320)
TOTALS . . . . .	\$ 210	\$ 275	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 625	\$ 305

NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: TRANSPORTATION CERTIFICATION

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
1. PACKAGE CERTIFICATION	COMPLETE SAFETY REVIEWS FOR 56 APPLICATION REQUESTS	13.7	0	
2. SPECIAL PROJECTS	CONTINUAL MAINTENANCE OF HEAT TRANSFER, SHIELDING AND CRITICALITY CODES	0.3	305	EXPERT ENGINEERING ASSISTANCE AS REQUIRED
	INCLUDING MODAL STUDY	1.0	0	
3. DEVELOP RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLAN	TO BE DEFINED AT VARIOUS UPDATE POINTS	(1.0)	0	
4. GALILEO SPACE MISSION	CONDUCT INDEPENDENT NUCLEAR SAFETY EVALUATIONS	(2.0)	(320)	EXPERT ENGINEERING ASSISTANCE AS REQUIRED
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT		<u>2.0</u>	<u>    </u>	
TOTAL	EDO MARK	17.0	305	
SET ASIDES		(3.0)	(320)	

610  
213

FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM  
RADIOISOTOPES LICENSING DECISION UNIT

07/27/79,R-2

BASIC MISSION

- o PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BY LICENSING BYPRODUCT, SOURCE AND SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o PERFORM TIMELY SAFETY EVALUATIONS FOR MATERIALS LICENSING
- o EVALUATE AND CERTIFY SEALED SOURCES AND DEVICES
- o PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES
- o DEVELOP, REVIEW AND REVISE LICENSING GUIDES, REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS
- o CONDUCT GENERIC STUDIES
- o CONDUCT POST-LICENSING EVALUATIONS
- o EXPAND REGIONALIZATION PROGRAM
- o DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN LICENSING INFORMATION PROGRAM AND STANDARD REVIEW PLANS
- o DEVELOP RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANS

Decision Unit	FY 1979	FY 1980			FY1981 Estimate		
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(43)	(43)	(43)	( - )	( - )	(61)	(43)
PS . . . . .	\$ 300	\$ 314	\$ 314	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 350
(Set Asides) . . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(14)
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS . . . . .	\$ 300	\$ 314	\$ 314	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 350

610  
214

NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: RADIOISOTOPES LICENSING

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
1. MATERIALS LICENSING	REVIEW 4,820 MATERIAL LICENSE APPLICATIONS.	21.0	0	
	REVIEW 200 SEALED SOURCES AND DEVICES.	0.5	0	
	PROVIDE LICENSE PROCESSING AND FILING AND DATA SERVICES.	11.0	0	
2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES	PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES AND TRAINING OF AGREEMENT STATE PERSONNEL.	1.0	0	
3. DEVELOP & REVISE GUIDES, STANDARDS, AND REGULATIONS	DEVELOP NEW LICENSING GUIDES AS NECESSARY; REVIEW AND REVISE LICENSING GUIDES, REGULATIONS, AND STANDARDS.	1.5	0	
4. GENERIC STUDIES: CONSUMER PRODUCTS	DEVELOP POLICY ON CONSUMER PRODUCTS CONTAINING RADIO-ACTIVE MATERIAL.	0.5	50	DEVELOP GEIS FOR CONSUMER PRODUCTS
GENERAL LICENSES	CONFIRM VALIDITY & SUITABILITY OF USE OF GENERAL LICENSE.	0.5	150	REEXAMINE USE OF THE GENERAL LICENSE
	EXAMINE POSSIBILITIES FOR EXPANDING USE OF GENERAL LICENSES.			

610 215

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: RADIOISOTOPES LICENSING (CONTINUED)

	<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
			<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
5.	POST-LICENSING EVALUATIONS	CONDUCT APPROXIMATELY 70 POST-LICENSING EVALUATIONS.	1.0	0	
6.	LICENSING REGIONALIZATION PROGRAM	CONTINUE LICENSING REGIONALIZATION PROGRAM IN REGION III	0.5	0	
		BROADEN REGIONALIZATION IN REGION III & EXPAND PROGRAM TO INCLUDE REGIONS I AND II	(11.0)	0	
7.	LICENSING INFORMATION PROGRAM	SUPPLEMENT LICENSE APPLICATION GUIDES WITH INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS.	0.5	150	DEVELOP INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS.
8.	STANDARD LICENSE REVIEW PLANS	DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN STANDARD LICENSE REVIEW PLANS TO FACILITATE INTERNAL REVIEW OF PROCESS BY END OF FY81.	1.0	0	
9.	DEVELOP RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANS	DEVELOP RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANS	(3.0)	0	
	MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT		<u>4.0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	TOTAL	EDO MARK	43.0	350	
	SET ASIDES		(14.0)	0	

## FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM

## MAJOR PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITHIN EDO MARK

1. COMPLETE ALL PLANNED LICENSING REVIEWS.
  - o MAINTAIN AVERAGE TURNAROUND TIME FOR RADIOISOTOPE LICENSES AT 30-45 DAYS WHILE BACKLOG REMAINS AT 500 CASES.
  - o CONTINUE ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY STATUS OF NFS WEST VALLEY WASTE SYSTEMS. PROVIDE TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF DOE ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR WASTE SOLIDIFICATION IN PREPARATION FOR LICENSING. ASSESS DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING REQUIREMENTS FOR OTHER PLANT SITE FACILITIES.
  - o DEVELOP NEW CRITERIA TO IMPROVE DESIGN OF LSA AND TYPE A TRANSPORTATION PACKAGES.
  - o ASSESS EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENT REGULATIONS FOR SEVERE TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT ENVIRONMENTS.
  - o LICENSE AWAY FROM REACTOR (AFR) STORAGE.
2. COMPLETE THE URANIUM FUEL CYCLE SURVEY AND TABLE S-3 UPDATE.
3. BROADEN LICENSING REQUIREMENTS TO INCLUDE ALARA OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE LEVELS AND OTHER EXPOSURE STANDARDS.
  - o RADIOISOTOPE LICENSEE EMPLOYEES REPRESENT LARGEST GROUP OF RADIATION WORKERS (SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND): ALL CLASSES OF LICENSES WILL BE EVALUATED FOR ALARA.
  - o REFINE EXISTING ALARA PROGRAMS FOR FUEL CYCLE LICENSEES BY IMPOSING MORE QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW AND RENEWAL LICENSE APPLICATIONS.
  - o OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING RADIATION EXPOSURE LEVELS:
    - CLEAN AIR ACT - 40 CFR 190
    - CHANGING HUMAN DOSE MODELS
4. SURVEY FORMER LICENSEE SITES AND BURIAL GROUNDS (LICENSED AND UNLICENSED) AND EVALUATE REMEDIAL ACTIONS.
  - o 9500 PARTS 40 AND 70 DOCKET FILES REVIEWED WITH 225 SITES IDENTIFIED FOR FURTHER EVALUATION
  - o 5000 PART 30 DOCKET FILES TO BE REVIEWED

IN ADDITION, WE ANTICIPATE HAVING TO REVIEW DOE PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION FOR FIVE FORMER AEC INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTOR SITES IN FY81.

610 217

FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM

PRINCIPAL IMPACTS OF EDO MARK

INTERFACE EFFORTS WITH OSD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LICENSING GUIDES, REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS WILL BE REDUCED. ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH RESULTS AND IMPLEMENTATION INTO THE LICENSING PROCESS WILL BE DELAYED. TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO NRR IN REACTOR HEARINGS WILL BE REDUCED.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE LICENSING PROCESS THROUGH PRE AND POST LICENSING ACTIVITIES AND THE RADIOISOTOPES LICENSING INFORMATION PROGRAM WILL BE REDUCED.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES (APPROXIMATELY \$50K) FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF AN AUTOMATED FILING SYSTEM WILL BE REQUIRED TO OFFSET THE REDUCTION IN MANPOWER FOR LICENSE PROCESSING AND FILING.

610 218



7/24/79, R-1

FUEL CYCLE PROGRAM

EDO FY81 SET ASIDES

RADIOLOGICAL CONTINGENCY PLANNING (7MY, \$110K)

GEIS FOR ALTERNATE FUEL CYCLES (2 MY, \$250K)

EVALUATIONS OF GALILEO AND SOLAR POLAR PROGRAMS (2 MY, \$320K)

RADIOISOTOPES REGIONALIZATION (11 MY)

610 219

NMSS FY81 BUDGET  
SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM RESOURCE SUMMARY

PROGRAM	FY79		FY80		FY80 SUPPLEMENTAL				FY81		SET ASIDES			
	CURRENT		PRES		NMSS		EDO		NMSS		EDO			
	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K
MC&A	40	1118	39	1650	-	-	-	-	52	1180*	44	735	(1)	(150) (2700 ADM)*
PHYSICAL SECURITY	67	1222	56	880	-	-	-	-	57	1175	49	1075	-	-
TOTAL	107	2340	95	2530	-	-	-	-	109	2355	93	1810	(1)	(150)

\*The NMSS request was for \$3880K which included \$2700K for ISIS which has been transferred to ADM budget and set aside by the EDO.

( ) = EDO Set Aside

610  
220

SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM  
MATERIAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING DECISION UNIT

07/27/79, R-2

BASIC MISSION

- o PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BY MC&A LICENSING PROGRAMS AT FUEL FACILITIES
- o CONTRIBUTE TO INTERNATIONAL SAFEGUARDS AND NON-PROLIFERATION OBJECTIVES

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o ESTABLISH A SOUND TECHNICAL BASIS FOR NEW AND REVISED REGULATIONS
- o IDENTIFY AND RESOLVE GENERIC REGULATORY ISSUES
- o FORMULATE COST-EFFECTIVE MC&A REQUIREMENTS
- o PERFORM ADEQUACY ASSESSMENTS OF MC&A EFFECTIVENESS
- o COORDINATE IMPLEMENTATION OF US/IAEA SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT
- o EVALUATE ADEQUACY OF IAEA SAFEGUARDS FOR EXPORT/IMPORT

Decision Unit	FY 1979	F Y 1 9 8 0			FY1981 Estimate		
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est. w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(40)	(39)	(38)	( - )	( - )	(52)	(44)
PS . . . . .	\$1,118	\$1,650	\$1,650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,180	\$ 735
(Set Asides) . . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(1)
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	(150)
TOTALS . . . . .	\$1,118	\$1,650	\$1,650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,180	\$ 735

610 221

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: MATERIAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING

MAJOR OBJECTIVE	PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT	RESOURCES		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
		MY	\$K	
1. DOMESTIC LICENSING CASEWORK	- 10 MAJOR AMENDMENTS	10.6		
	- 80 MINOR AMENDMENTS			
	- 20 REMEDIAL LICENSING ACTIONS			
	<u>110 TOTAL AMENDMENTS</u>			
2. INTERNATIONAL SAFEGUARDS AND LICENSING		11.5		
	- 90 REVIEWS OF PART 75 FACILITY ATTACHMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE US/IAEA SAFEGUARDS AGRMT.	<del>13.0</del>	180	BROOKHAVEN NATL. LAB. IAEA TECH. OBJECTIVES
	-220 REVIEWS FOR EXPORT/IMPORT LICENSES			100 - TECH. ASSISTANCE IN IMPLEMENTING AGREEMENT
	-220 EVALUATIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF IAEA SAFEGUARDS			80 ASSISTANCE IN ADDRESSING TECH. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE U.S. ACTION PLAN
	- FORMULATE POLICY ALTERNATIVES FOR EXPORT/IMPORT APPLICATIONS			
	- STRENGTHEN INT'L. SAFEGUARDS VIA U.S. ACTION PLAN			
	<u>530 TOTAL REVIEWS &amp; EVALUATIONS</u>			
3. EVALUATION OF MC&A SYSTEMS	- CONDUCT FIELD ASSESSMENTS AT 2 FACILITIES	7.5	150 + (2700 ADM)	
	- ANALYZE ACCT. DATA FOR SAFEGUARDS IMPLICATIONS AT 3 FACILITIES	<del>9.5</del>	<del>2850</del>	RFP PROCUREMENT
	- MAINTAIN & IMPROVE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR DOMESTIC & INT'L. SAFEGUARDS			150 MC&A DATA ANALYSIS
	- COMPLETE PROCESSING OF ALL NMSS TRANSACTION REPORTS			2700 DEVELOP. OF ISIS
	- ELIMINATE BACKLOG OF INFORMATION REQUESTS AND IAEA REPORTS			

DECISION UNIT: MATERIAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
4. DEVELOP BASIS FOR REGULATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FORMULATE 6 NMSS MC&amp;A RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS, PLAN AND MANAGE RES &amp; TA PROGRAMS, AND CONDUCT USER TESTS</li> <li>- STAR ACTIVITIES &amp; INTERAGENCY COORDINATION (50 PROJECTS)</li> <li>- PERFORM PROGRAM PLANNING FOR PROGRAM PLANNING FOR SAFE-GUARDS TA PROGRAM (10 PROGRAMS)</li> <li>- PERFORM 3 APPLICATIONS OF ANALYTICAL TOOLS FOR ASSESSING SAFEGAURDS EFFECTIVENESS</li> <li>- ENSURE DISSEMINATION OF MC&amp;A TECHNOLOGY FOR USE BY NRC AND LICENSEES</li> <li>- UNDERTAKE TA PROGRAMS NEEDED BECAUSE OF TECHNOLOGICAL &amp; INDUSTRIAL CHANGES</li> <li>- PERFORM INTEROFFICE USE ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS</li> <li>- DEVELOP EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROPOSALS TO USE PROCESS MONITORING FOR SAFEGUARDS PURPOSES</li> </ul>	<p>3.0</p> <p><del>5.8</del></p>	<p>155</p> <p><del>600</del></p>	<p>NATIONAL LAB. RFP PROCUREMENT</p> <p>275 - SAFEGUARDS NEEDS ANALYSIS</p> <p>245 - BULK MATERIAL CONTROL PHASE III</p> <p>80 - PROCESS MONITORING ASSURANCE</p>
5. DEVELOP IMPROVED REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- COMPLETE THE MC&amp;A UPGRADE RULE WITH VALUE/IMPACT ANALYSIS &amp; IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE</li> <li>- COMPLETE A MAJOR GENERIC REGULATORY ISSUE PAPER</li> <li>- COMPLETE 4 MINOR GENERIC REGULATORY ISSUE PAPERS</li> <li>- COMPLETE 2 MINOR MC&amp;A REGULATORY AMENDMENTS WITH VALUE/IMPACT ANALYSIS &amp; IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE</li> </ul>	<p>8.1</p> <p><del>10.1</del></p>	<p>250</p>	<p>NATIONAL LAB. RFP PROCUREMENT</p> <p>50 - TECH. ASSISTANCE IN GRADED SAFEGUARDS</p> <p>100 - MC&amp;A UPGRADE RULE VALUE/IMPACT</p> <p>100 - MC&amp;A UPGRADE RULE IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE</p>
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT TOTAL		<p>3.0</p> <p>44 <del>52.0</del></p>	<p>735</p> <p><del>1,180</del></p>	<p>SET ASIDES (1) (150)</p>

610 225

SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM  
PHYSICAL SECURITY DECISION UNIT

07/27/79, R-2

BASIC MISSION

- o PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BY EFFECTIVE PHYSICAL SECURITY LICENSING PROGRAMS AT FUEL FACILITIES AND DURING SNM SHIPMENTS
- o CONTRIBUTE TO INTERNATIONAL SAFEGUARDS AND NON-PROLIFERATION OBJECTIVES

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o ESTABLISH SOUND TECHNICAL BASIS FOR NEW AND REVISED REGULATIONS
- o IDENTIFY AND RESOLVE GENERIC REGULATORY ISSUES
- o FORMULATE COST-EFFECTIVE PHYSICAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS
- o PERFORM ADEQUACY ASSESSMENTS OF LICENSEE PS PROGRAM
- o CONDUCT LICENSING REVIEWS OF LICENSEE SECURITY AND ISSUE LICENSE AMENDMENTS
- o ASSURE THAT CONTINGENCY PLANNING FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS ARE EFFECTIVE
- o EVALUATE AND MONITOR THREAT FOR CHANCE EVENTS

610 224

Decision Unit	FY 1979	F 1 9 8 0			FY1981 Estimate		
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(67)	(56)	(57)	( - )	( - )	(57)	(49)
PS . . . . .	\$1,222	\$ 880	\$ 880	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,175	\$ 1,075
(Set Asides) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS . . . . .	\$1,222	\$ 880	\$ 880	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,175	\$ 1,075

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: PHYSICAL SECURITY

MAJOR OBJECTIVE	PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT	RESOURCES		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
		MY	\$K	
		<u>21.5</u>		
1. DOMESTIC LICENSING CASEWORK	- 46 MAJOR AMENDMENTS -105 MINOR AMENDMENTS INCLUDING AMENDMENTS FROM VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS - 24 PLAN REVIEWS/AMENDMENTS FOR NRR -300 REVIEWS OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL SHIPMENTS <u>-475</u> TOTAL AMENDMENTS	<del>22.0</del>		
2. INTERNATIONAL PHYSICAL PROTECTION LICENSING	-220 REVIEWS FOR EXPORT/IMPORT LICENSES - 4 FOREIGN IN-COUNTRY EVALUATIONS - 12 COUNTRY ANALYSES RPTS. <u>236</u> TOTAL ACTIONS	2.2		
3. THREAT ASSESSMENT AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING	- CONTINGENCY PLANNING w/180 LLEA COVERING OVER 5400 ROAD MILES - NATIONAL SAFEGUARDS READINESS AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING w/14 FEDERAL AGENCIES - NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS & PLANNING & EXERCISES - MAINTAIN THREAT DATA BASE - ASSESS 300 NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS EVENTS	<u>5.5</u> <del>8.0</del>	<u>200</u> <del>300</del>	SUPPORT OF CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM IN COOPERATION w/DOE AND THE FBI.

610 225

DECISION UNIT: PHYSICAL SECURITY

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
		7.5		
4. EVALUATION OF PROTECTION SYSTEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 FACILITY VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS</li> <li>- 6 TRANSPORTATION VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS</li> <li>- TEST COMPONENTS/SYSTEMS</li> <li>- APPLY NEW EVALUATION TOOLS</li> </ul>	<del>8.5</del>	305	TEST AND EVALUATION OF SELECTED SAFEGUARDS COMPONENTS & SYSTEMS ASSOCIATED W/SPENT FUEL TRANSPORTATION & SUPPORT IN FIELD VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT PROVIDED BY THE US ARMY JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER.
		3.5		
5. DEVELOP TECHNICAL BASIS FOR REGULATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PLAN &amp; MANAGE 6 RES AND 11 TA PROGRAMS &amp; CONDUCT 9 USER APPLICATIONS</li> <li>- STAR ACTIVITIES &amp; INTERAGENCY COORDINATION (50 PROJECTS)</li> <li>- UPDATE INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM PLAN</li> </ul>	<del>5.0</del>	270	ANALYSIS OF SAFEGUARDS NEEDS & CONDUCT USER APPLICATION STUDIES.
		6.2		
6. DEVELOP IMPROVED REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PUBLISH PROPOSED FINAL REGULATION FOR PHYSICAL PROTECTION SPENT FUEL SHIPMENTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT</li> <li>- COMPLETE FOUR MINOR REGULATORY AMENDMENTS, VALUE/IMPACT ANALYSES, &amp; IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE PACKAGES FOR INCREASED LEVELS OF PROTECTION FOR CAT. II/III MATERIALS</li> <li>- COMPLETE TWO SELF-TEST GUIDANCE PKGS. FOR PHYSICAL PROTECTION SUBSYSTEMS.</li> <li>- COMPLETE SEVEN MINOR GENERIC ISSUE PAPERS.</li> </ul>	<del>8.3</del>	300	VALUE/IMPACT JR SPENT FUEL SHIPMENTS, IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR SPENT FUEL SHIPMENTS, LICENSEE SELF-TEST PKGS. & TECHNICAL INPUT ON GENERIC REGULATORY ISSUES.

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

3.0

TOTAL

EDO MARK 49 ~~57.0~~ ~~\$1,175~~ 1,075

610 226



## SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM

## MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH EDO MARK

1. COMPLETE ALL PLANNED LICENSING REVIEWS.
  - o THESE LICENSING ACTIONS WOULD INCLUDE REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY AND ROUTING, FIXED FACILITIES (FROM MC&A AND PHYSICAL SECURITY STANDPOINT), IMPORT/EXPORT APPLICATIONS, AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING TO ASSURE ADEQUATE PRECAUTIONS FOR PROTECTION OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.
2. COMPLETE MC&A UPGRADE RULE.
  - o RULE INCREASES MC&A REQUIREMENTS TO AID NRC IN DETERMINING CONCLUSIVELY THAT IDS ARE NOT THEFT OF SNM AND TO INCREASE CONFIDENCE IN THE MC&A SYSTEM.
3. PERFORM VULNERABILITY AND THREAT ASSESSMENTS.
  - o TO CONDUCT VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS OF SAFEGUARDS SYSTEMS, AS IMPLEMENTED, TO ASSURE PROTECTION AGAINST EXISTING THREAT LEVELS WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO CONTINUING EVALUATION.
4. IMPLEMENT US/IAEA SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT.
  - o ACCOMPLISH NECESSARY SUPPORT OF NONPROLIFERATION OBJECTIVES.
5. MC&A PROGRAM EVALUATIONS AND TREND ANALYSES.
  - o MONITOR MC&A SYSTEMS AND DATA TO ASSURE THAT LICENSEE REPORTS ARE CONSISTENT AND THAT SNM IS ONLY IN AUTHORIZED LOCATIONS.
6. PUBLISH PROPOSED REGULATIONS FOR PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF SPENT FUEL SHIPMENT.
  - o REQUIREMENT TO BE FINALIZED BY RESULTS OF CURRENT RESEARCH EFFORTS.

SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM  
MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH EDO MARK

(Continued)

7. COORDINATE NRC SAFEGUARDS RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS THROUGH STAR GROUP.
  - o PREVENT UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF EFFORT IN NRC-WIDE SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM AND ASSURE RELEVANCE.
8. COMPLETE REGULATORY AMENDMENTS, VALUE/IMPACT ANALYSES, AND IMPLEMENT GUIDANCE FOR INCREASED PROTECTION FOR CATEGORY II/III MATERIAL.
  - o VALUE IMPACT ANALYSES REQUIRED TO ASSURE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES ARE EMPLOYED FOR INCREASED PROTECTION OF CATEGORY II/III FACILITIES.
9. ENSURE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY TO THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY PROCESS.
  - o TRANSFER OF MC&A AND PHYSICAL SECURITY EVALUATIVE METHODOLOGY STUDIES FOR USE IN THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY PROCESS FOR CONTROL OF SNM.
10. OPERATE NMMSS TO SUPPORT DOMESTIC SAFEGUARDS ACTIVITIES.
  - o PRESENT DOE-SPONSORED SYSTEM IS NOT ADEQUATE TO MEET NRC NEEDS.

SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM  
PRINCIPAL IMPACTS OF EDO MARK

1. IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR MC&A UPGRADE RULE WILL BE DELAYED ONE YEAR, FROM FY81 TO FY82.
2. WILL NOT PARTICIPATE IN U.S. ACTION PLAN FOR STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL SAFEGUARDS.
3. STUDIES TO DEFINE SAFEGUARDS NEEDS IN THE AREAS OF INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES, SOURCE MATERIALS, BYPRODUCT MATERIALS, CERTAIN FORMS AND MIXTURES OF SSNM, AND ALTERNATE FUEL CYCLES WILL BE SUBSTANTIALLY DELAYED AND IMPACTED.
4. UPDATE OF THE AGENCY-WIDE LONG-RANGE INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM PLAN WILL BE DELAYED.
5. THE NUMBER OF ROUTE, FACILITY, AND SHIPMENT VULNERABILITY SURVEYS WILL BE REDUCED FROM ELEVEN TO FIVE.
6. THE BACKLOG OF PHYSICAL SECURITY MAJOR CASES WILL NOT BE REDUCED.
7. PROCESS/QC/PRODUCTION DATA WILL NOT BE EXAMINED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE AS A TIMELY THEFT INDICATOR.

610 229

7/24/79

SAFEGUARDS PROGRAM

EDO FY81 SET ASIDES

ISIS (\$2700K/ADM)

SG GEIS FOR ALTERNATE FUEL CYCLES (1 MY, \$150K)

610 230

NMSS FY81 BUDGET  
WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM RESOURCE SUMMARY

PROGRAM	FY79		FY80		FY80 SUPPLEMENTAL				FY81					
	CURRENT		PRES		NMSS		ED0		NMSS		ED0		SET ASIDE	
	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K	MY	\$K
HIGH LEVEL WASTE MGT	28	4315	33	6250	16	4250	16	1800	61	13390	59	12940	-	-
LOW LEVEL WASTE MGT	16	1800	25	2425	3	200	(3)	(200)	34	2500	27	1975	(3)	(200)
URANIUM RECOVERY LICENSING	18	1565	23	1460	-	--	-	--	35	2420	35	2270	-	-
TOTAL	62	7680	81	10135	19	4450	16	1800 (3)	130	18310	121	17185	(3)	(200)

( ) = EDO Set Aside

610 231

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
HIGH-LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT DECISION UNIT

07/27/79, R-2

BASIC MISSION

- o PROVIDE ASSURANCE TO THE PUBLIC THAT DOE REPOSITORIES ACCEPTING COMMERCIAL HIGH-LEVEL WASTE ARE PROPERLY SITED, DESIGNED, OPERATED, AND CLOSED IN TERMS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY.

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o DEVELOP APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE
- o PERFORM INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF DOE'S HIGH-LEVEL WASTE PROGRAM
- o MAINTAIN COGNIZANCE OF STATE, FEDERAL AND INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR WASTE ACTIVITIES
- o PROVIDE POLICY AND PLANNING SUPPORT FOR THE ENTIRE NRC WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Decision Unit	FY 1979	F Y 1 9 8 0			FY1981 Estimate		
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(28)	(33)	(33)	(16)	(16)	(61)	(59)
PS . . . . .	\$4,315	\$6,250	\$6,250	\$4,250	\$1,800	\$13,390	\$12,940
(Set Asides) . . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS . . . . .	\$4,315	\$6,250	\$6,250	\$4,250	\$1,800	\$13,390	\$12,940

610  
232

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: HIGH-LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
1. DEVELOP REGULATIONS FOR DISPOSAL OF HIGH-LEVEL WASTE	PUBLISH 10 CFR 60 BASIC RULE, COMPLETE EIS, PUBLISH 10 CFR 60 PART B	4.0	3200	CONTRACTOR DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION
2. DEVELOP REGULATORY GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT REGULATION	COMPLETE THE SITE CHARACTERIZATION REPORT GUIDE, ENVIRONMENTAL GUIDE, & SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT GUIDE  CONTINUE SITE CHARACTERIZATION WORK IN SUPPORT OF PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEWS IN DOMED SALT, BASALT AND BEGIN WORK ON SHALE AND GRANITE  COMPLETE WASTE FORM CHARACTERIZATION CRITERIA FOR THREE DISPOSAL MEDIA  COMPLETE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NECESSARY FOR NRC CAPABILITY TO CONDUCT CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION REVIEW IN BEDDED SALT  BEGIN ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL STUDIES	22.0	4650	CONTRACTOR DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION
3. DEVELOP LICENSE REVIEW CAPABILITY	COMPLETE ANALYTIC MODELS TO PROVIDE ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY FOR BEDDED SALT.  DEVELOP LICENSING REVIEW TEAM	4.5	3600	CONTRACTOR MODEL DEVELOPMENT
4. LICENSE REVIEWS	ASSESS DOE GEOLOGIC INVESTIGATION AND DATA-GATHERING ACTIVITIES	7.5	450	REVIEW PRELIMINARY SITE REPORT

610  
233

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: HIGH-LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
5. ASSESSMENT OF DOE PROGRAM	COMPLETE PHASE II OF DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF DOE  FIELD ASSESSMENT OF DOE GENERIC IN-SITU TESTS  COMPLETE REVIEW OF FINAL GEIS	9.0	500	
6. PROGRAM COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION	PROGRAM PLANS; WM REVIEW GROUP, INTEGRATION AND CONTROL OF NRC WM PROGRAM	8.5	540	LLL ASSISTANCE
7. POLICY ANALYSIS	LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS, ASSESS DOE POLICY, PUBLIC & PEER REVIEW, IDENTIFY & EVALUATE NRC ISSUES	1.5	0	
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT		2.0		
TOTAL EDO MARK		59.0	12,940	



WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
 LOW-LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT DECISION UNIT

07/27/79, R-2

BASIC MISSION

- o PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BY PERFORMING SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS REQUIRED FOR LICENSING AND REGULATING LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o LICENSE AND REGULATE LOW-LEVEL WASTE DISPOSAL OPERATIONS
- o PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES
- o IMPLEMENT NEW RULES, STANDARDS, AND REGULATORY GUIDES
- o PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO NMSS AND OTHER NRC OFFICES ON DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING

Decision Unit	FY 1979	FY 1980				FY1981 Estimate	
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(16)	(25)	(25)	( 3)	( )	(34)	(27)
PS . . . . .	\$1,800	\$2,425	\$2,425	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,975
(Set Asides) . . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	(3)	-	(3)
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	(200)	-	(200)
TOTALS . . . . .	\$1,800	\$2,425	\$2,425	\$ 200	\$ (200)	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,975

610 236

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: LOW LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>FY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
1. CONDUCT HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS OF LOW-LEVEL WASTE DISPOSAL ACTIVITIES	BEGIN ONE NEW APPLICATION, TWO REASSESSMENTS AGAINST 10 CFR 61 AND COMPLETE SIX AMENDMENTS. PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR AGREEMENT STATE SITES IN NEVADA AND NEW YORK.	4	600	HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS
2. LLW REGULATION DEVELOPMENT	COMPLETE 10 CFR 61 BY FY82. COMPLETE DRAFT APPENDIX TO LLW REGULATION (10 CFR 61) FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHODS BY EARLY FY83.	11	1025	FINAL EIS AND HEARING FOR LLW REGULATION, TECHNICAL REQUIREMENT FOR SLB, AND WASTE CLASSIFICATION REGULATIONS. DRAFT EIS FOR ALTERNATIVE METHOD.
3. LICENSING PROCESS	DEVELOP TECHNICAL CRITERIA FOR SLB AND FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHODS IN FY82. PREPARE SET OF LLW REVIEW PROCEDURES.	8	250	ASSESS ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHOD TECHNIQUE & OPERATING PROCEDURES
4. D/D WASTE	TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF LLW FROM D/D ACTIVITIES	2	100	CHARACTERIZATION & CLASSIFICATION OF D/D WASTE
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT		2		
TOTAL EDO MARK		27	1975	

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
URANIUM RECOVERY LICENSING DECISION UNIT

07/26/79, R-1

BASIC MISSION

- o PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BY PERFORMING SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS REQUIRED FOR LICENSING AND REGULATING URANIUM MILLS AND OTHER URANIUM RECOVERY FACILITIES

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o LICENSE AND REGULATE URANIUM RECOVERY OPERATIONS
- o PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES
- o IMPLEMENT NEW RULES, STANDARDS, AND REGULATORY GUIDES
- o EVALUATE DOE REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS

Decision Unit	FY 1979	FY 1980			FY1981 Estimate		
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est. w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(18)	(23)	(23)	( - )	( - )	(35)	(35)
PS . . . . .	\$1,565	\$1,460	\$1,460	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,420	\$ 2,270
(Set Asides) . . . . .							
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS . . . . .	\$1,565	\$1,460	\$1,460	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,420	\$ 2,270

610  
237

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: URANIUM RECOVERY LICENSING

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
1. LICENSE AMENDMENTS RESULTING FROM EPA STANDARDS & URANIUM MILLING REGS. (GEIS)	COMPLETE NINE AMENDMENTS	2.7	180	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
2. LICENSE AMENDMENTS RESULTING FROM PROPOSED FACILITY MODIFICATIONS	COMPLETE 16 MAJOR AMENDMENTS AND 72 MINOR AMENDMENTS	6	250	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
3. LICENSE AMENDMENTS RESULTING FROM NRC REVIEW OF OPERATING DATA & INSPECTION REPORTS	COMPLETE 10 MAJOR AMENDMENTS	3	100	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
4. LICENSE RENEWALS	COMPLETE THREE RENEWALS	1	100	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
5. REVIEW ACTIVITIES RELATED TO DOE REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM, PUBLIC LAW 95-604 TITLE I	COMPLETE SIX CASES	4	120	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
6. LICENSE NEW FACILITIES	COMPLETE 14 LICENSING ACTIONS FOR NEW FACILITIES	10.0	1260	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

510  
238

## NMSS FY 1981 BUDGET

DECISION UNIT: URANIUM RECOVERY LICENSING (CONT'D)

<u>MAJOR OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT</u>	<u>RESOURCES</u>		<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</u>
		<u>MY</u>	<u>\$K</u>	
7. PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES IN SUPPORT OF LICENSING ACTIONS	COMPLETE 13 PROJECTS	6.3	260	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT		2.0		
TOTAL EDO MARK		35.0	2270	

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ISSUES

NRC IS ON CRITICAL PATH FOR HLW REPOSITORY DEVELOPMENT

- o A NEW REGULATION IS NEEDED
- o TECHNICAL POSITIONS AND GUIDANCE ARE REQUIRED FOR DOE SITE AND WASTE FORM CHARACTERIZATION ACTIVITIES

NO REGULATIONS OR CRITERIA FOR LLW MANAGEMENT

- o LACK OF REGS IS INHIBITING DEVELOPMENT OF NEW LLW CAPACITY

CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF LLW DISPOSAL CAPACITY

- o HALF OF THE LLW BURIAL GROUNDS HAVE CLOSED
- o REMAINING CAPACITY IS NOT WELL DISTRIBUTED

NO ALTERNATIVES TO SHALLOW LAND BURIAL

- o IMPROVED METHODS ARE NEEDED FOR HANDLING CERTAIN WASTES

UNACCEPTABLE INCREASE IN URANIUM RECOVERY BACKLOG

- o LICENSING CASEWORK WAS UNDERESTIMATED
- o TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES WAS UNDERESTIMATED

610 240

7/24/79, R-3

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
HIGH-LEVEL WASTE DECISION UNIT  
FY80 SUPPLEMENTAL PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. PROVIDE ACCELERATED REGULATORY GUIDANCE TO DOE:
  - A. BEDDED SALT - 1 YEAR FROM FY83 TO FY82
  - B. DOMED SALT/BASALT - 2 YEARS FROM FY85 TO FY83
  - C. GRANITE/SHALE/VADOSE - 6 MONTHS, LATE FY86 TO EARLY FY86
2. PROVIDE AN EVALUATION OF THE LABORATORY ASSESSMENT PART OF THE DOE WM PROGRAM
3. PROVIDE A MORE DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF THE EARTH SCIENCES PART OF THE DOE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
4. THE CAPABILITY TO RUN MODELS NEEDED TO EVALUATE SITE CHARACTERIZATION USING NRC STAFF WILL BE ACCELERATED ONE YEAR FROM FY83 TO FY82.
5. THE LICENSE REVIEW PLAN FOR REVIEW OF DOE SITE CHARACTERIZATION REPORTS REVIEW WILL BE ACCELERATED TWO YEARS FROM FY82 TO FY80.
6. ACCELERATE COMPLETION OF SITE CHARACTERIZATION REVIEWS FOR THE FIRST SITE FROM FY83 TO FY82.

610  
241

## WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITHIN FY81 EDO MARK

1. COMPLETE LICENSING CASEWORK NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN ACCEPTABLE BACKLOG
2. MAINTAIN SCHEDULE FOR PUBLISHING FINAL LLW REGULATION (10CFR61) FOR SHALLOW LAND BURIAL IN FY82
3. PUBLISH HLW REGULATION (10 CFR 60)
4. START DEVELOPMENT OF APPENDIX TO LOW-LEVEL WASTE REGULATIONS FOR THE DISPOSAL OF LLW BY ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHODS TO BE PUBLISHED IN DRAFT FORM IN EARLY FY83
5. ASSESS SPECIAL LLW DISPOSAL PROBLEMS (E.G., TMI CLEANUP)
6. REVIEW EARLY SITE CHARACTERIZATION PLAN FOR FIRST COMMERCIAL REPOSITORY
7. COMPLETE TECHNICAL WORK IN SUPPORT OF A SITE CHARACTERIZATION REVIEW IN BEDDED SALT AND DOMED SALT OR BASALT. START SIMILAR WORK FOR GRANITE AND SHALE
8. COMPLETE WASTE FORM CHARACTERIZATION CRITERIA AND REPOSITORY DESIGN PERFORMANCE TECHNICAL WORK IN THREE MEDIA
9. MAINTAIN SCHEDULE FOR PUBLISHING FINAL STAFF POSITIONS, REG GUIDES, AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SHALLOW LAND BURIAL IN FY82
10. COMPLETE ANALYTICAL MODELS FOR ASSESSING HLW REPOSITORIES IN BEDDED SALT AND COMPLETE 60% OF MODELS FOR ASSESSING REPOSITORIES IN DOMED SALT OR BASALT
11. PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO AGREEMENT STATES

610  
242



WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

IMPACT OF EDO MARK

1. DELAY DRAFT APPENDIX TO LLW REGULATION ON ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHODS FROM MID FY82 TO EARLY FY83
2. DELAY DRAFT STAFF POSITIONS, REG GUIDES, AND REVIEW PROCEDURES ON LLW ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHODS FROM EARLY FY82 TO LATE FY82

610  
243

16/A-20

7/24/79, R-1

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

EDO FY80/FY81 SET ASIDES

PILOT PROGRAM TO ASSESS DOE LLW DISPOSAL FACILITIES (3 MY; \$200K EACH YEAR)

610 244

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT DECISION UNIT

07/27/79,R-1

BASIC MISSION

- o ENSURE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF NMSS PROGRAMS

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

- o PROVIDE OVERALL MANAGEMENT DIRECTION AND POLICY GUIDANCE FOR NMSS PROGRAMS
- o CONDUCT SPECIAL INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT EVALUATIONS
- o MANAGE NMSS PROGRAM PLANNING AND STATUS ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
- o PROVIDE ADMINISTRATIVE AND PERSONNEL SERVICES

Decision Unit	FY 1979	FY 1980				FY1981 Estimate	
	Current Est.	Pres. Budget	Current Est.w/o Suppl.	Ofc. Req. Suppl.	EDO Recom. On Suppl.	Office Request	EDO Recom.
(People) . . . . .	(22)	(19)	(19)	( - )	( - )	(19)	(19)
PS . . . . .	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 100
(Set Asides) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(People) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(PS) . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS . . . . .	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 100

610 245