MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING
OF THE ACRS SUBCOMMITTEES ON
RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION
NOVEMBER 12-13, 1982
WASHINGTON, DC

CERTIFIED COPY
DATE ISSUED: JAN. 10, 1983

A joint meeting was held by the ACRS Subcommittees on Reactor Radiological Effects and Site Evaluation in Room 1046, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The purposes of the meeting were to review NRC proposed revisions to 10 CFR Part 20 (Standards for Protection Against Radiation), Part 50 (ALARA Rule for Nuclear Power Plants), and Part 140 (Criteria for Determining Extraordinary Nuclear Occurrences); review FEMA's draft Federal Policy Statement on Potassium Iodide (KI); discuss NRC Staff's position on consideration of seismic events in nuclear power plant emergency planning; review status of de minimis rulemaking. Notice of the meeting was published in the Federal Register on October 25, 1982, and then amended on November 8, 1982 (Attachments A1 and A2). The schedule of the items covered at the meeting is in Attachment B. The list of attendees is in Attachment C. Attachment D is a list of the meeting handouts which are contained in the ACRS office files. R. C. Tang was the Designated Federal Employee for this meeting.

Opening Statement

Subcommittee Chairman D. Moeller opened the meeting with a statement on the objectives of the meeting. He said that the Subcommittees were there to be briefed and updated on the above subjects and that, where warranted, written comments would be developed and later be discussed during the December ACRS meeting for possible submission to the NRC Commissioners or the NRC Staff. Dr. Moeller mentioned the receipt of a written statement, submitted by Mr. Russell M. Bimber, which contains comments on the proposed Part 20, Part 140, and the draft policy statement on KI. A copy of the statement is in Attachment E.

1. 10 CFR Part 20

W. Mills (RES) gave a status report on the proposed rule. He said that since the 6/23/82 briefing for the Subcommittees, the Part 20 revision task group had met on several occasions with the Edison Electric Institute, the Atomic Industrial Forum, the NRC Regional Offices I (Philadelphia) and II (Atlanta), Westinghouse, the Department of Energy (DOE), the Natural Resources Defense Council, and hospital physicists to discuss their comments and concerns regarding practical problems in implementing the proposed rule. Mills said that some changes had been made to the proposed rule as a result of these meetings. One of the changes to the 3/82 version, he said, was that the International System of Units (SI) is kept only in the Definitions section of the rule. He said that this would eliminate problems for licensees in having to make conversions to the new units in preparing reports. Mills added that in fear of possible misuses of the reports on the planned special exposures (e.g., by the news media), the task group might modify the reporting requirements such that licensees would not need to file detailed reports, and that the exposure records would be kept by the licensees and be made available during inspections.

Representatives from DOE and DOE contractor laboratories presented comments on the proposed rule and pointed out that the ICRP 26 methodology, as adopted in the proposed rule, is only suitable for prospective purposes, i.e., planning

and control of worker exposures, and not for retrospective application as appeared to have been done in the proposed rule. They mentioned some apparent shortcomings in the proposed rule. For instance, the proposed rule incorporates the 50-year committed dose equivalent concept. Thus, when an intake of a long-lived, well-retained radionuclide occurs, recording a corresponding 50-year committed dose would mean assigning to the first year a dose the major portion of which will not occur for some years. Regarding the proposed rule, E. Vallario (DOE) stated that the minimum detection capabilities of current measurement systems for internal exposures (e.g., air sampling, in vivo and in vitro assessment) are not adequate for measuring the very small increments of intake that are associated with the Annual Limits of Intake (ALIs). Using data such as those from air sampling to infer how much material is in the body would produce estimates much higher than the actual uptake. As a result, licensees would face the problem of technically having overexposures even though the true exposures are low. Further, he felt that the incorporation of 50-year committed dose equivalent, and the accompanying requirement of not monitoring effective dose equivalent unless it exceeds 500 mrem per year, external, or 30% of the maximum dose limit, internal, would invite litigation problems when workers attempt to recover for alleged radiation-induced cancers or other injuries. The NRC and DOE staff plan to meet again on 11/23, to hopefully resolve the major areas of disagreement. The Subcommittees believe that the NRC Staff would be wise to await the new NCRP report on basic radiation protection criteria, and recommended that the proposed rule not be published for public comment until this report is completed.

G. Sjoblom and A. Richardson (EPA) discussed the EPA-proposed changes to the Federal Radiation Guidance (FRG) issued by the Federal Radiation Council (FRC) in 1960. In 1970, the FRC functions were transferred to EPA, and the FRC was abolished. Since EPA has the statutory authority to recommend to Federal agencies basic radiation protection standards and exposure limits, and since the current Part 20 derived from the original FRG, an impact of the new FRG on Part 20 is expected. Richardson mentioned that EPA plans to reconvene an interagency working group to finalize the new FRG, probably in several months.

Written comments by Dr. John Healy (ACRS consultant) on the proposed Part 20 are in Attachment F.

2. Federal Policy Statement on KI

This portion of the meeting was one hour behind schedule. R. Krimm (FEMA) could not stay to give the presentation but asked that a copy of the draft Statement be placed in the meeting transcript. FEMA's 8/82 draft Federal Policy Statement on KI recommends that the decision to stockpile and distribute KI to the population during a radiation accident be left to State and local authorities and that, in making this decision, they should consider problems that may be encountered in implementing the program. Dr. Moeller commented that little guidance was provided in this Policy Statement and that appropriate federal guidance should be developed to aid the State and local officials in deciding when and how to distribute KI, and under what circumstances to recommend its use. B. Grimes (NRC/IE)

briefly presented the NRC Staff's position regarding this issue. He said that, after the draft policy statement was forwarded in SECY 82-396 (9/27/82) for the Commission's review, the NRC's Office of Research indicated its belief that, in light of the information available on behavior of radioiodine during accidents, perhaps the distribution of KI to the general public would not be as cost-beneficial as previously assumed. The Staff (NRC/IE) therefore withdrew SECY 82-396 by issuing SECY 82-396A (10/15/82), pending more research study which was expected by January 1983. The Subcommittees questioned the Staff's decision based on incomplete research information, and recommended supporting the Federal Policy Statement unless future research information regarding the behavior of radioiodine during reactor accidents suggests otherwise.

One other significant question raised was the shelf-life of KI. B. Shleien (FDA) made the remark that FDA neither sets, nor is in the position to set, the shelf-life for KI. It is up to the manufacturers of KI and they thus far have submitted material that would support setting a three-year shelf-life on KI. Shleien stated that FDA has no control over this, nor does it have any data beyond what the manufacturers submit. It was agreed that this represents a significant problem and that the determination and/or extension of the shelf-life must be accomplished prior to selecting a specific form of iodine for stockpiling, distribution, and possible use.

3. 10 CFR Part 140

H. Peterson (NRC/RES) said that an Extraordinary Nuclear Occurrence (ENO), as defined in the Atomic Energy Act, is any event that causes a release of radioactive material from its intended place of confinement or produces radiation in amounts or radiation levels offsite, which the Commission determines to be substantial and which the Commission determines has resulted or probably will result in substantial damages to persons or property offsite. Existing Sections 140.84 and 140.85 of Part 140 contain Criteria I and II, respectively, that the Commission would use in determining whether an ENO has occurred. In order that an accident be declared an ENO, both Criteria must be satisfied.

According to Peterson, subsequent to the TMI accident (which was determined by the Commission not to be an ENO), the NRC Staff uncovered problems in applying the existing ENO Criteria to a nuclear accident. For instance, the dose levels in Criterion I (Sec. 140.84) are higher than the Protective Action Guides (PAGs) proposed by EPA and FDA. Further, Criterion II (Sec. 140.85) contains factors of personal injury and property loss that are difficult to estimate and quantify. The new Criterion I is now proposed to be numerically equivalent to the PAGs, and the new Criterion II as proposed contains a range of doses and would require consideration of loss of employment and/or total evacuation (both in person-days) in determining an ENO.

The Subcommittees felt that the proposed revisions appeared to be workable and would provide improved guidance for designating ENOs. However, the different levels of effective dose equivalent in the proposed Criteria would

be calculated using the ICRP-26 methodology. Because of the controversies with regard to Part 20 (see item 1 above), the Subcommittees suggested that the proposed Part 140 either be issued after Part 20 is revised and approved, or be rewritten to exclude the ICRP-26 organ weighting factors.

4. De Minimis Level

The purpose of this session was to brief the Subcommittees on the current status of de minimis rulemaking. The staff of NRC, EPA, and representatives from the Oak Ridge National Laboratories and the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) made presentations regarding this concept. J. Becker (NRC/ELD) said that de minimis, in legal language, means that the law does not concern itself with trifles. She emphasized that this concept does not have the same legal connotations as a license exemption or a general license since they recognize the existence of radioactivity and usually qualify the exempt quantity or generally licensed activity to particular uses or characteristics. Nor is the de minimis concept the same as the ALARA concept, she said, adding that ALARA quantities or concentrations in releases are not necessarily at or below a de minimis level. She pointed out that, incorporating the de minimis concept, the regulatory scheme would have an upper limit above which the calculated health risk is unacceptable, and a lower limit below which the implication is that they are acceptable. In between these two limits, regulatory requirements would be based on the ALARA concept, and any risk would be judged on the basis of health risk, social and economic factors. Becker said that if the Commission adopts the de minimis concept in Part 20, NRC would be relieved of the burden of licensing,

inspection and enforcement activities relating to release and disposal of de minimis quantities of radioactive materials. J. Davis (EEI) spoke of the feasibility of establishing a de minimis level of radiation dose and a regulatory cut-off for nuclear regulation. She said that the determination of de minimis levels based on comparison with natural background radiation levels is feasible, and would be appropriate for use in setting regulatory cut-off levels for radiation exposures. De minimis levels for controlling exposures to members of the public have been added to the proposed Part 20. Davis described the potential problems and benefits of the regulatory cut-off, policy, and suggested that it be applied to radioactive effluents, waste, disposal, release and/or transfer of scrap materials, etc.

F. Galpin (EPA) described the EPA activities regarding this concept, or what EPA calls levels "below regulatory concern." He said that present EPA activities in this area, although restricted to low-level radioactive waste, would have implications for setting standards for decontamination and decommissioning, as well as setting protective action guides for reentry into an area contaminated by an accident. Galpin stated that de minimis levels in all these cases could show differences since their cost-effectiveness would be different. He added that, before EPA can make a decision on the levels "below regulatory concern," it must consider whether adequate analysis exists for describing the population and individual impact, and whether by establishing these levels other viable options will be ruled out. NRC and EPA will coordinate their efforts in setting the regulatory cut-off levels, regardless of what they will be called.

5. Impact of Seismic Events on Nuclear Power Plant Emergency Planning

B. Grimes (NRC/IE) mentioned a 3/82 memo in which the Commission requested the Staff to consider whether the effects of a very large earthquake should be considered in NRC licensees' emergency plans; and, if it is to be considered, what criteria should be applied in evaluating the adequacy of such plans.

He said that the NRC Staff position is that, except for nuclear power plant sites in California and other high seismic areas, earthquakes need not be explicitly considered for emergency planning because of the low probability that an earthquake, severe enough to cause a reactor accident, would occur. The need for explicit planning for very large earthquakes is ruled out since building earthquake-proof bridges and housing is infeasible, and many other things needed during such events (e.g., backup communications capabilities) would have been put in place already. In high seismic areas such as California, the frequency of below-design-basis (moderate) earthquakes is relatively high. While these events may not necessarily be disruptive to the plant itself, they would be disruptive to the surrounding communities. Grimes indicated that some thought needs to be given to what one should do in response to such an emergency situation, e.g., restoring disrupted power supplies, transporting personnel to and from the site when roadways are disrupted, etc. Grimes stated that the Staff's current review criteria for evaluating plans in this respect are adequate. The Subcommittees pointed out research needs pertaining to the effects of other natural extreme phenomena, such as blizzards, floods, hurricanes, etc., on nuclear emergency planning, and plan to make such recommendations to the ACRS Extreme External Phenomena Subcommittee.

6. CFR Part 50 (ALARA Rule)

R. Alexander (NRC/RES) said that, back in 1974, the Commission's Director of Inspection and Enforcement wrote to the Director of Standards Development (now RES), pointing out the difficulties in enforcing the ALARA concept. In 1978, the Staff received a directive from the Commission regarding occupational exposure ALARA, e.g., taking a qualitative approach to ALARA in the regulation, requiring that power plant licensees establish occupational collective dose objectives, and requiring a prior review of very high man-rem tasks by the NRC Staff, etc. Alexander said that the proposed ALARA rule is the Staff's response to the above Commission directive. Currently, licensees are required by regulations to provide radiation protection to workers, and are required under technical specifications to develop and implement radiation protection procedures. Present rules do not require an integrated radiation protection program or a program description. The proposed revision to Part 50 would require the development, implementation and maintenance of an occupational exposure ALARA program at operating nuclear power plants. Alexander said that the Staff is considering implementing this approach through a cooperative effort with the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO). After a trial period of two years, depending on the success of INPO's effort, the NRC may directly review each operating licensee's ALARA plan, and may also issue a regulatory guide to clarify the regulatory requirements. The Subcommittees endorsed the Staff's plan to coordinate its effort with INPO, and to postpone the publication of a regulatory guide on the subject. It

was recommended that formal mechanisms be established for NRC to evaluate INPO's progress in implementing this program, and that the NRC Staff continue to develop applicable information and guidance for use by INPO and the utilities in addressing these problems.

7. Conclusion

During the Executive sessions on both November 12 and 13, the Subcommittee members and the consultants discussed presentations made regarding the above items, and drafted written comments on items 1. (Part 20), 2. (KI), 3. (Part 140), 5. (Seismic Events), and 6. (Part 50). These will be considered by the full Committee during its December meeting for possible submission to the Commission or the NRC Staff.

* * * * * * *

NOTE: A complete transcript of the meeting is available in the NRC's Public Document Room at 1717 H St., N.W., Washington, DC, 20555, or can be obtained at cost from Alderson Reporting, 400 Virginia Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C., (202) 554-2345.

Revision

• Bureau of Justice Statistics
Department of Justice
National Prisoner Statistics
Annually
State or local governments
State Departments of Corrections, State Parole Authorities: 133 responses; 3353 hours; not applicable under 3504(h).
Andy Uscher—395–4814.

Larry E. Miesse,

Department Clearance Officer, Systems Policy Staff, Office of Information Technology, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 82-28799 Filed 10-22-82; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

National Commission on Social Security Reform; Meeting

AGENCY: National Commission on Social Security Reform.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forth-coming meeting of the National Commission on Social Security Reform. this notice also describes the functions of the Commission. Notice of this meeting is required under Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This document is intended to notify the general public of their opportunity to attend.

DATE: November 11, 12, & 13, 1982, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESS: Ramada Inn, Old Towne, 901 N. Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert J. Myers, Executive Director, 736 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, DC 20503, Telephone—(202)395–5132.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Commission on Social Security Reform is established by Executive Order No. 12335 dated December 16, 1981 to provide appropriate recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the President, and the Congress on long-term reforms to put Social Security back on a sound financial footing.

The meeting of the Commission is open to the public. The proposed agenda includes:

Review of relevant analyses of the current and long-term financial condition of the Social Security trust funds; identify problems that may threaten the long-term solvency of such funds; analyze potential solutions to such problems that will both assure the financial integrity of the Social Security system and the provision of appropriate benefits.

Records are kept of all Commission proceedings, and are available for public inspection at the Office of The Executive Director, National Commission on Social Security Reform, 736 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, DC 20503.

Robert J. Myers,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 82-28827 Filed 10-22-82; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3110-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards

Combined Subcommittees on Reactor Radiological Effects and Site Evaluation; Meeting

The ACRS Combined Subcommittees on Reactor Radiological Effects and Site Evaluation will hold a meeting on November 12 and 13, 1982 in Room 1046, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC. The Subcommittees will: (1) review and comment on Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) draft Federal Policy Statement on the use of potassium iodide (KI) as a thyroid blocking agent in the event of a radiation accident; (2) discuss consideration of seismic events in nuclear power plant emergency planning; (3) review and comment on NRC proposed revision to 10 CFR Part 20 (Standards for Protection Against Radiation); (4) be briefed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on proposed Federal Radiation Protection Guidance for Occupational Exposure; (5) be briefed by the Department of Energy (DOE) on its comments on NRC's proposed revision to Part 20; (6) review and comment on NRC proposed amendment to 10 CFR Part 50 (ALARA Rule for Nuclear Power Plants); and (7) review and comment on NRC proposed 10 CFR Part 140 (Criteria for Extraordinary Nuclear Occurrences).

In accordance with the procedures outlined in the Federal Register on October 1, 1982 (47 FR 43474), oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and Staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Designated Federal Employee as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for subject meeting shall be as follows:

Friday, November 12, 1982—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business
Saturday, November 13, 1982—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittees, along with any of their consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittees will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC Staff, their consultants, industry and other interested persons.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the cognizant Designated Federal Employee, Ms. R. C. Tang (telephone 202/634–1414) between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., EDT.

Dated: October 20, 1982.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 82-28241 Filed 10-22-82; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

The National Reliability Evaluation Program (NREP) Procedures Guide Issuance, Availability, and Comments

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Availability, of the Draft of the NREP Procedures Guide (NUREG/CR–2815) for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued for public comment a draft of the NREP Procedures Guide (NUREG/CR–2815). The guide's intent is to provide technical structure of a risk study of nuclear power plants to be performed under the National Reliability Evaluation Program (NREP). In response to Item II.C.2, the "TMI–2 Action Plan" (NUREG–0660). The basic goal of this program is to develop a plant-specific risk profile to be used to identify the strengths and weaknesses in design and operation, and as the cornerstone for implementing an

ATTACHMENT A1

authorization to use the Certificate of Registration issued to the hospital, and invocation of such other civil, criminal and administrative remedies available to the United States. The Acting Administrator further finds that the parties have stipulated that Respondent will notify DEA immediately of any change of status at Buffalo Columbus Hospital or affiliation with any other hospital.

The Acting Administrator finds that the agreement is an appropriate resolution of the issues raised in the Order to Show Cause and incorporates the agreement into the final disposition of this case. 21 CFR 1301.76(a) provides that a "registrant shall not employ as an agent or an employee who has access to controlled substances any person who has had * * * his registration revoked at any time." The Acting Administrator finds that the employment of Respondent as a consultant to Buffalo Columbus Hospital is in the public interest, and that the public interest will be served if Respondent is permitted to handle controlled substances according to the terms of the agreement. Accordingly, the Acting Administrator waives the prohibition of 21 CFR 1301.76(a) with respect to the employment of Frank T. Riforgiato, M.D. as a consultant to Buffalo Columbus Hospital. See *Anthony Di Flumeri, M.D.*, Docket No. 82-9, 47 FR 30123 (1982); *Joseph Bruce Friedman, M.D.*, Docket No. 81-17, 46 FR 58621 (1981); *David Frank Micci, M.D.*, 45 FR 71448 (1980) and 45 FR 74795 (1980) and *Charles J. Burks, M.D.*, Docket No. 79-4, 44 FR 61406 (1979) where the Administrator has waived application of 21 CFR 1301.76(a) in similar cases. The Acting Administrator further waives as much of 21 CFR 1301.24(c) for Buffalo Columbus Hospital to permit Respondent to use the hospital's DEA Certificate of Registration as a consultant rather than as an intern, resident or foreign-trained physician as contemplated by the regulation.

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Attorney General by Sections 303 and 304 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824, and redelegated to Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Acting Administrator orders that DEA Certificate of Registration AR0487303 issued to Frank T. Riforgiato, M.D. be revoked and an application for registration as practitioner executed March 27, 1982, be denied. The Acting Administrator further orders the waiver of 21 CFR 1301.76(a) for Buffalo Columbus Hospital to hire Respondent as a consultant, and the waiver of as much of 21 CFR 1301.24(c) for Buffalo Columbus Hospital to permit Respondent to use the hospital's DEA Certificate of Registration as a consultant rather that as an intern, resident or foreign-trained physician as contemplated by the regulation, said denial and revocation and waivers to be effective immediately.

Dated: October 20, 1982.

Francis M. Mullen, Jr.,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 82-30134 Filed 11-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

MOTOR CARRIER RATEMAKING STUDY COMMISSION

Public Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, November 23, 1982.

PLACE: Russell Senate Office Building, Room 235, Constitution Avenue and First Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20510.

TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PURPOSE: The Motor Carrier Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-296, as amended by the Bus Regulatory Reform Act of 1982, directs the Motor Carrier Ratemaking Study Commission (Study Commission) to make a full and complete investigation and study of the collective ratemaking process for all rates of motor common carriers of property and of the need or lack of need for continued antitrust immunity thereof. The Study Commission is specifically directed to estimate the impact of the elimination of such immunity upon the rate levels and rate structures and to describe the impact of such on the Interstate Commerce Commission and its staff. Also, the Study Commission has been directed to give special consideration to the impact of the elimination of such immunity upon rural areas and small communities. The Study Commission shall, not later than January 1, 1983, submit to the President and the Congress its final report including its findings and recommendations.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide the opportunity for the Study Commission to discuss and consider the draft report, findings, and recommendations; to direct issuance of the final document with its findings and recommendations to the Congress and President; and to consider other business as appropriate.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: NAME: J. Kent Jarrell, TITLE: General Counsel, PHONE NO.: (202) 724-9600

Submitted this, the 3rd day of November 1982.

Larry F. Darby,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 82-30814 Filed 11-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-80-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Subcommittees on Reactor Radiological Effects and Site Evaluation; Addition to Agenda

The additional agenda item to be discussed by the ACRS Subcommittees on Reactor Radiological Effects and Site Evaluation on November 12 and 13, 1982 in Room 1046, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, DC includes the following:

Review of status of De Minimis rulemaking.

All other items regarding this meeting remain the same as announced in the Federal Register published Monday, October 25, 1982 (47 FR 47343).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the cognizant Designated Federal Employee, Ms. R. C. Tang (telephone 202/634-1414) between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., e.s.t.

Dated: November 3, 1982.

John C. Hoyle,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 82-30840 Filed 11-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Subcommittee on Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit No. 3; Meeting Location Change

The ACRS Subcommittee on Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit No. 3 scheduled for November 9, 1982 at ARNAUD'S, 813 Bienville Street, has been relocated to The International Hotel, 300 Canal Street, New Orleans, LA.

All other items regarding this meeting remain the same as announced in the Federal Register published Tuesday, October 19, 1982 (47 FR 46604).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to

ATTACHMENT A2.

REVISED

JOINT MEETING OF THE ACRS SUBCOMMITTEES
ON REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION
NOVEMBER 12-13, 1982
ROOM 1046, 1717 H ST., N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1982

Time	Topic	Speaker/ Organization
8:30 - 8:45 A.M.	Opening Remarks	D. Moeller, Chairman
8:45 - 9:15 A.M.	Current Status of NRC Proposed Revision to 10 CFR Part 20	W. Mills, R. Baker, M. Cool (NRC/RES)
9:15 - 10:00 A.M.	DOE Position on NRC Proposed Revision to 10 CFR Part 20	E. Vallario (DOE),
10:00 -10:15 A.M.	**** BREAK ****	
10:15 - 11:15 A.M.	User laboratories' experiences with 10 CFR Part 20	R. Yoder (Rocky Flats), R. Hall (DuPont), J. Corley (LASL), K. Heid (Battelle), J. Selby (Battelle)
11:15 - 12:00 Noon	EPA Proposed Revision to Federal Radiation Guidance on Occupational Exposure	A. Richardson, G. Sjoblom (EPA)
12:00 Noon - 1:00 P.M.	**** LUNCH ****	
1:00 - 2:00 P.M.	Draft Federal Policy Statement on Distribution and Use of KI for Thyroid Blocking in the Event of a Radiation Accident	R. Krimm (FEMA)
2:00 - 2:30 P.M.	NRC's Views and Position on the Draft Federal Policy Statement on KI	B. Grimes (NRC/IE/DEP)
2:30 - 3:00 P.M.	Proposed 10 CFR Part 140, Criteria for Extraordinary Nuclear Occurrences	H. Peterson, F. Arsenault (NRC/RES)
3:00 - 3:15 P.M.	**** BREAK ****	
3:15 - 4:00 P.M.	The De Minimis Concept from a Regulatory Standpoint	G. Cunningham (NRC/ELD), W. Mills (NRC/RES)
4:00 - 4:30 P.M.	EPA Program to Develop Standards for "Below Regulatory Concern" Levels	F. Galpin (EPA)
4:30 - 5:15 P.M.	Feasibility and Methodology for Establishing de minimis levels	J. Davis (Consultant)
5:15 - 5:45 P.M.	De minimis from a Health Physics' Point of View	J. Auxier (ORNL)
5:45 P.M.	ADJOURN	

ATTACHMENT B

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1982

Time	Topic	Speaker/ Organization
8:30 - 9:30 A.M.	Proposed Amendment to 10 CFR Part 50 (ALARA Rule for Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licensees)	R. Alexander, J. Bell (NRC/RES)
9:30 - 10:30 A.M.	Consideration of Seismic Events in Nuclear Power Plant Emergency Planning	B. Grimes (NRC/IE/DEP)
10:30 - 10:45 A.M.	**** BREAK ****	
10:45 - 1:30 P.M.	Subcommittee Discussion and Preparation of comments on proposed revision to Parts 20, 50 and 140; NRC Staff position re consideration of seismic events in nuclear power plant emergency planning; draft Federal Policy Statement on KI; and de minimis rulemaking.	
1:30 P.M.	ADJOURN	

MEETING DATE: NOVEMBER 12-13, 1982

R. C. TANG

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING: REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION

LOCATION: ROOM, 1046, 1717 H St. NW, Washington, D.C.

Attachment C

ATTENDANCE LIST

PLEASE PRINT

	NAME	AFFILIATION
1.	D Moeller	ACRS Member
2.	J Ray	" "
3.	R Axtmann	" "
4.	R Muller	ACRS Consultant
5.	R.L. Kathren	" "
6.	H.M. Parker	" "
7.	J Shapiro	" "
8.	R C Tang	ACRS Staff
9.	J McKinley	" "
10.	T McKone	" Fellow
11.	W. Mills	NRC/RES
12.	R BAKER	NRC/Res
13.	Walter L Cox	" "
14.	FRANK J ARSENAULT	NRC/RES
15.	THOMAS DECKER	NRC/NMSS
16.	Harold J Peterson Jr.	NRC/RES
17.	Diane L. Flack	NRC/RES
18.	A Bice	ACRS staff
19.	R M Hall	DuPont - SRP
20.	B.J. Murphy	Battelle
21.	P.E. Yoder	Rockwell/DOE
22.	J. M. SELBY	BATTELLE
23.	K R Heid	BNW
24.	E.J Vallario	DOE

ATTACHMENT C

MEETING DATE: NOVEMBER 12-13, 1982

R. C. TANG

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING: REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION

LOCATION: ROOM, 1046, 1717 H St. NW, Washington, D.C.

ATTENDANCE LIST

PLEASE PRINT

	NAME	AFFILIATION
1.	KENNETH TRAVIS	EEI
2.	ANDY SABO	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC
3.	J.P. CORLEY	BATTELLE-NORTHWEST
4.	L.J. DEAL	Dept Energy
5.	R.W. Davies	DOE/HQ
6.	J.R. Maher	DOE/HQ
7.	JOANNA BECKER	NRC/OELD
8.	A Richardson	EPA
9.	G Sjoblom	"
10.	D. Nelson	"
11.	B Shlejen	FDA
12.	E Williams	NRC/IE
13.	B Grimes	" "
14.	J Davis	General Physics
15.	R Alexander	
16.	J Bell	
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		

R. TANG

MEETING ROOM: 1046

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS MEETING
ON
REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION

NOVEMBER 12 1982, WASHINGTON, D.C.

ATTENDEES PLEASE SIGN BELOW

PLEASE PRINT

	NAME	AFFILIATION
1.	BERNARD SHLEIEN	BRH/FDA
2.	L. Connor	NRC Connor
3.	R Kriman	ACRS
4.	L. Knudsen	EGI
5.	P DOCHERTY	W
6.	J. Auxier	ORNL
7.	John Hoff	
8.	S.P. Davis	General Physics Corp.
9.	F. L. Galpin	USEPA
10.	K.J. Rebeck	General Physics Corp
11.	E.D. Harward	AIF
33.	L. Knudsen	EGI

C-3

R. TANG

MEETING ROOM: 1046

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS MEETING
ON
REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION

NOVEMBER 12 1982, WASHINGTON, D.C.

ATTENDEES PLEASE SIGN BELOW

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	BADGE NO.	AFFILIATION
H. M. PARKER		ACRS Consultant
R MULLER		" "
J. MAHER		DOE
F. LOBBIN		CONSOLTANT
J SELBY		Visit
E VALLARIO		DOE
K. R. Heid		Visitor
B.L. Murphy		visitor
R E Yarden		VISITOR
[illegible]		ACRS consultant
[illegible]		ARC
R L Kathren		Consultant
[illegible]		Du Pont + SRP
[illegible]		Battelle
R.W. Davis		DOE
KL [illegible]		ERT
[illegible]		Dept Energy
Hedy Sabo		ACRS
A R. Richardson		EPA
Jane Beach		Aldrich
L. Cowan		NRC Calendar
[illegible] Howard Cyr		Nat Cntr Devices + Rad. Health

R. TANG

MEETING ROOM: 1046

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS MEETING
ON
REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION

NOVEMBER 13, 1982 WASHINGTON, D.C.

PLEASE PRINT

ATTENDEES PLEASE SIGN BELOW

NAME	BADGE NO.	AFFILIATION
Ragnwald Muller		Consultant, ACRS
Dade W. Moeller		Member, ACRS
H. M. Parker		Consultant, ACRS
Jack M. Bell		NRC
R. C. Axtmann		Member, ACRS
R. E. Alexander		NRC
R. L. Kathren		ACRS Consultant
T. McKone		ACRS Fellow
J. Shapiro		ACRS Consultant
9.		
10.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
23.		

LIST OF HANDOUTS
JOINT MEETING OF THE ACRS SUBCOMMITTEES ON
REACTOR RADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SITE EVALUATION, NOVEMBER 12-13, 1982

"U.S. Department of Energy Position, 10 CFR Part 20 Revision" - E. J. Vallario

"Impact of Draft 10 CFR Part 20 on the Savannah River Plant" - R. Hall

"Summary of Proposed Changes in Occupational Radiation Protection Guidance" - Alan Richardson

"Radiation Protection Standards in Nuclear Fuel Manufacturing" - J. Selby

"ENO Definition" - H. Petersen

"U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Program to Develop Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Standards" - Floyd Galpin

"Comments on the 'DeMinimis' Concept Presented in Proposed Revised 10 CFR Part 20" - J. P. Davis

"A Viewpoint on Proposed Radiation Protection Standards" - J. A. Auxier

Attachment D

RUSSELL M. BIMBER
9871 Prouty Road
PAINESVILLE, OHIO

 Nov. 4, 1982

Ms. R. C. Tang
Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
NRC
Washington, D. C. 20555

The Combined Subcommittees on Reactor Radiological Effects and Site Evaluation will meet Nov. 12, per 47 FR 47343. I wish to comment on the agenda items Nos. 1, 3, and 7.

I'm a chemist with more than thirty years of industrial experience, including some work with radioactive materials. In addition to my regular job, I'm helping Lake County draft its Radiation Emergency Plan, related to the Perry Nuclear Power Plant.

1. I haven't seen FEMA's draft policy on potassium iodide as a thyroid blocker. But the FDA advice, that KI be used when the projected dose exceeds 25 rem, (47 FR 28158-9; 6/29/82) sounds reasonable; I urge that it be adopted as Federal Policy.

3. Please do not increase the permissible levels of radiation, especially for unrestricted areas (10 CFR 20.105). Although the higher Protective Action Guides of EPA 52./1-75-001, cited in NUREG 0654 FEMA-REP-1, Rev.1 may be acceptable for incidents occurring no more than once a decade, their justification has not been properly documented. See the enclosed three pages of my communications with EPA on this subject.

7. I haven't seen NRC's proposed 10 CFR 140, but urge that the requirements for declaring an Extraordinary Nuclear Occurrence be reduced. For example, an ENO might be declared whenever radiation from a nuclear power plant exceeds 10 CFR 20.105 levels offsite, or whenever EPA's PACs lead to recommendations for offsite protective action. I understand the courts have declared that state and local government can't get reimbursement for their part in the TMI incident. I believe non-governmental agencies, such as the Red Cross, who are expected to participate in radiation emergency response, should be assured of reimbursement, preferably from the nuclear plant responsible. Making it easier to declare an ENO may make such agencies more cooperative.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on these vital topics; I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Russell M. Bimber

encl: 3 pp

ATTACHMENT E

(716 area code) (or M-F, 9-5) 357-3137

RUSSELL M. BIMBER
9671 Priory Road
PAINESVILLE, OHIO 44077

July 15, 1982

David Rosenbaum, Dep. Asst. Admin. for Radiation Programs
EPA
401 M St., SW
Washington, D. C. 20460

I'm a scientist-volunteer helping Lake County, Ohio draft its Radiation Emergency Plan for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, which is to operate the Plant, says it must comply with 10 CFR 20.105 which sets a limit of 0.1 rem/week for whole body radiation exposure in unrestricted areas. This appears to conflict with CEI's proposed adoption of Protective Action Guides of 1-5rem/incident W.B., based ultimately on EPA 520/1-75-001, Sept. 1975.

The EPA sent me a copy of that document in October, 1979, including Chapter 5, revised 6/79, and Appendix D (Jan. 1979), yet Chapters 6,7,& 8, and Appendices A, B, and C were still "to be developed". I think Appendix C is the most important part of the entire document because it was to summarize the technical bases for the numerical values of the PAGs.

If Appendix C has been developed, I would like to have a copy, along with any other help you may be able to provide, or direct me to, for understanding why a PAG in excess of 0.1 rem may be acceptable.*

Sincerely,

Russell M. Bimber

Russell M. Bimber (MS, chemistry)

* P. S. I have NUREG -0396, EPA 520/1-78-016 (Dec. 1978) and NUREG -0610 (Sept. 1979) which both cite the earlier EPA 520 Document as the authority for the numerical values of the PAGs.

(encl as #1 of 3 with 11/4/82 letter)

RUSSELL M. BIMBER
10471 Priority Road
PAINESVILLE, OHIO 44077

July 30, 1982

To: A. Stewart, Lake BSA
W. Kulash, PEC Voorhees

EPA Response on Protective Action Guides

Harry Calley (spelling?) of the EPA phoned today in response to my letter to David Rosenbaum, 7/15/82, which I copied you on.

He said 10 CFR 20.105 applies only to routine operation of nuclear power plants, not to accidents.

10 CFR 20 does not explicitly exempt accidents, but 20.501 does allow the NRC to grant exemptions. But the Draft Environmental Statement on PWPP, NUREG 0884 (March, 1982) implies that its accidents are not exempt; page 5-16 says, "even under unusual operating conditions which may temporarily result in releases higher than (normal) but still well within the limits specified in 10 CFR 20.....". It goes on to state additional requirements of 10 CFR 51 and 40 CFR 190. (But again and again, the NRC can make exceptions, which are not mentioned in the DES.)

Appendix C of EPA 520/1-75-001, which was to summarize the technical bases for PAGs of 1-5 rem, still has not been developed. Mr. Calley agrees that Appendix C is the most important part of the entire Document, and personally would place a high priority on getting it done. But EPA has received few questions about it and does not even have a target date for getting it done. In 1975, EPA used three rationales for the PAGs:

1. PAGs should not allow anyone to get a dose large enough to produce an acute effect, manifested within 30 days, or perhaps even out to one year.
2. PAGs should limit long term injuries to an acceptable range. EPA still has no exact definition of what an acceptable range is.
3. EPA would not make recommendations that could not be implemented. EPA was asked by many people to consider lower PAGs, and did consider 0.1 rem. This would lead to recommendations to evacuate unmanageably large areas.

I cited CEI's adoption of a 5 rem PAG without saying why they didn't adopt the 1 rem favored by EPA 520/1-75-001. Mr. Calley said this conflicts with EPA's intent, and that we should challenge CEI's interpretation of PAGs and make them change to 1 rem, unless they provide convincing arguments.

I mentioned densely populated North Madison, only four miles downwind, and generally with low radiation protection factor housing. He said a lower PAG may be appropriate for special situations like this; the risks of evacuation are low relative to certain radiation injuries in part of the exposed population.

Mr. Calley welcomes phone calls (703-557-7390) in preference to letters, but will follow up this call with a letter, and I'll copy you when I get it. This should contain the same information, probably in more detail than this letter.

Sincerely,

Russ