

From: Darrel G. Wiedeman (DGW)
To: MFW
Date: Wednesday, December 30, 1992 10:10 am
Subject: EPR WORKSHOPS (REGIONAL UPDATE)

Mike: This is to inform you that there has been a change in the Regional representation at the Dry-Run Workshop. Pat Loudon and I will not be at the dry-run workshop in Bethesda; however, our Division Director Chuck Norelius will attend this workshop. Pat and I are still planning to attend the Chicago workshop. I passed all of the information and background material that you e-mailed to me to Mr. Norelius.

CC: CEN

9406170315 930728
PDR FOIA
HUGHES93-64 PDR

Release

12-3

315 E-3

NRC SITE CLEANUP CRITERIA WORKSHOP
Draft Agenda
January 6, 1993

Day 1

9:00 Coffee

9:30 Welcome and Background

Enhanced Participatory Rulemaking and the Establishment of Site Cleanup
Criteria -- Chip Cameron, NRC

EPA →

- What is the Enhanced Participatory Rulemaking Process and why has NRC selected it?
- Why does NRC want to develop cleanup criteria?

9:50 Workshop Format -- Michael Lesnick, Barbara Stinson and Connie Lewis,
The Keystone Center

- What are the goals and objectives?
- What is the agenda?
- What are the groundrules for conducting the workshop and what is the role of the facilitators?

10:00 Participant Introductions

- Name, affiliation, and location
- Two important issues for discussion in the workshop

10:45 Break

11:00 Brief Review of the Issues Paper and International Standards --
Don Cool, NRC

- What are the issues?
- What decommissioning approaches are other countries using?

11:30 Decommissioning Process and Case Studies -- Michael Weber, NRC

- What is decommissioning?
- What practical lessons has NRC learned?

12:00 Break

E-4

12:15 Working Lunch Introductory Discussion

- The Rulemaking Issues Paper identifies four possible fundamental objectives which could serve as the basis for a regulatory approach to site cleanup standards. In terms of the alternative regulatory approaches reflected in the four fundamental objectives, what are the relative advantages and disadvantages of developing and using generic site cleanup standards as opposed to using site-specific approaches?

Should this rule making be cost/benefit criteria or establish new standards

1:15 Cross-Cutting Issues Discussion - A discussion of the cross-cutting issues that can be used to compare and contrast the alternative regulatory approaches for developing cleanup standards

- To what extent do ~~the~~ alternative regulatory approaches protect human health and the environment?

-- What population(s) should be protected, in what locations, and over what timeframe? What are the relative merits of each alternative regulatory approach?

-- What level(s) ^{does it want to achieve} ~~is sufficient~~ to ensure protection of individuals and population(s)? What are the relative merits of each alternative regulatory approach in terms of achieving this level?

-- Should ^{we} human standards ~~be used to~~ protect natural systems? [?]

3:00 Public comment

3:15 Break

3:30 Cross-Cutting Issues Discussion (Continued)

- ~~How~~ should cost and other ^{practical implementation} ~~practical~~ considerations be considered in selecting a regulatory approach for the standards?

-- What are the cost and practical considerations that relate to each of the alternative regulatory approaches?

-- What weight should be given to these considerations in selecting a regulatory approach?

-- How do each of the alternative regulatory approaches affect the types and distributions of costs and benefits?

-- If a cost-benefit approach is used, what costs and benefits should be considered? Should individual or population (or both) doses be considered? If costs are balanced against dose averted, what value should be used in evaluating the ratio *(e.g. \$1000 per person year)*?

5:15 Public comment
5:30 Summary and Adjournment

Day 2

8:00 Coffee
8:30 Cross-Cutting Issues Discussion (Continued)

- What technologies are necessary and available for use of each of the alternative regulatory approaches?

What are the alternative approaches?

-- *Clean up technology for land water and* approaches
What capabilities would be needed to implement the standards (e.g., remediation, modelling, site characterization, regulatory review, licensee demonstration, monitoring)?

-- Are they currently available? Are they expected and, if so, when?

-- To what extent do the technologies transfer the hazard to another medium or other populations? Is the net benefit positive (e.g., producing a smaller volume of hazardous waste to reduce a larger volume radioactive waste)?

-- *groundwater remediation technology*

10:00 Public comment

10:15 Break

10:30 Cross-Cutting Issues Discussion (Continued)

Need an introduction to this section

Superfund vs NRC approach

- To what extent are the alternative regulatory approaches compatible with existing regulatory structures?

-- Do they need to be compatible? What are the advantages and disadvantages?

-- To what extent do the alternative regulatory approaches achieve long-term, regulatory stability? *as applied to previously decommissioning site*

-- Does each alternative regulatory approach promote regulatory compliance? Does each provide sufficient incentives for timely and effective decommissioning?

-- How *and should* easy can the alternative regulatory approach be integrated with the existing ~~nuclear~~ regulatory framework *for decommissioning* other relevant federal and state legislation and regulations?

12:00 Public Comment

12:15 Break

12:30 Working Lunch - Cross-Cutting Issues Discussion (Continued)

- What are the waste management implications of each alternative regulatory approach?
 - How do each of the alternative regulatory approaches relate to the quantity and types of wastes produced? ~~Is sufficient capacity available or expected to be available?~~
 - To what extent does each alternative regulatory approach ~~merely~~ transfer the risk to another population?
 - How should each alternative regulatory approach apply to former waste disposals, ^{in addition} ~~under 10 CFR 20.304 and 302?~~
 - To what extent does each alternative regulatory approach address other options for waste management, including recycling and reuse?

2:15 Public Comment

2:30 Break

2:45 Other Key Issues (Remainder of issues not already covered)

- ^{How} Should the standards consider the effects of radon releases? ~~If so, how should this be done?~~
- Should criteria be established for protecting specific pathways or resources (e.g., groundwater)?
- Will there be cases where release for "unrestricted use" may not be feasible? How should these situations be addressed?

3:45 Public Comment

4:00 Summary of Workshop Issues

4:30 Adjourn

NRC Radiological Criteria Workshop
Preparatory Meeting Agenda
January 11, 1993

- I. Welcome, Introduction, and Overview - Chip Cameron
- II. Preparatory Meeting Goals and Agenda Review - Michael Lesnick and Barbara Stinson, The Keystone Center
- III. Overview of Key Workshop Components - Lesnick and Stinson
 - A. Review of Discussion of Overall Workshop Goals
 - B. Workshop Schedule and General Design
 - C. Types of Participants (including NRC, EPA, other agencies)
 - D. Role of The Keystone Center
 - E. ^{at table} Role of NRC, ³ EPA and ² other agencies ^{DOE}
 - F. Workshop Summaries
 - G. Participant Support and Interviews
 - H. Public Attendance and Comment
 - I. Hotel Logistics and Food Arrangements ^{Lunch for participants only}
- IV. Discussion of NRC and EPA Participants' Roles - Lesnick and Stinson
 - A. Role of NRC participants (those "at the table" and those attending as observers)
 - B. Role of EPA participants (those "at the table" and those attending as observers)
- V. Detailed, Item-by-Item Review and Discussion of Draft Workshop Agenda - Lesnick, Stinson and presenters
 - A. Discussion of content, style, and tone of all presentations
 - B. Critical analysis of issues to anticipate, responses to issues, and agency staff likely to respond for the interactive agenda items
- VI. Discussion of Next Steps
 - A. Prior to Chicago meeting
 - B. During Chicago meeting
 - C. Between meetings
 - D. At conclusion of all meetings

*Promote discussion
of people at the table
staff make self available*

- national only at table

Lunch for participants only

E-5

Enhanced Participatory Rulemaking
Simulation Workshop
January 11 - 12, 1993

| Name | Affiliation | Phone |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Barbara Stinson | The Keystone Center | (303) 468-5822 |
| Michael Lesnick | " | " |
| Donald A. Coe | NRC / RCS / DRA / RPER | (301) 492-3785 |
| CHIP CAMERON | NRC / OGC | 301 504 1642 |
| DEBORAH MICHAELS | NRC / OGC | 301-504-1630 |
| Marty Valski | NRC / OGC | 301-504-1740 |
| * Kelly Hill | NRC / R-IV | (817) 866-8198 |
| * DEAN KUNITZ | NRC / R-V | 510-9750225 |
| * THOMAS DECKER | NRC / RII | 414 574 331 2559 |
| L. C. ... | NRC / RRR | 301-504-1686 |
| J. ... | NRC / DRA | 301-492-2114 |
| Debbie Sellenberger | NRC / CSP | 301-504-2819 |
| Eric A. ... | NRC / RCS | 301 492 3737 |
| * Charles L. ... | NRC / R-III | (713) 710-5510 |
| Bill ... | NRC / NMS / LLWM | (301) 504-2517 |
| * JEROME ROTH | NRC / R-I | 215-337-5205 |
| David Goldin | SCA | 301 840-2836 |
| HUGH THOMPSON | NRC / EDO | 301-504-1713 |
| LOWELL BAUSTON | SC+A, INC. / FOR EPA | (703) 848-6600 |
| NICK LAITAS | EPA / ORIA / RSD | 202 233 9350 |
| Barbara Hestage | EPA / ORIA / RSD | 202-233-9485 |
| Lanika Russell | EPA / ORIA / RSD | 202-233-9434 |
| Alice Richardson | EPA / ORIA / RSD | 202-233-9213 |
| MICHAEL WEBER | NRC / NMS / LLWM | (301) 504-1298 |
| Bill M. ... | NRC / RCS | (301) 492-3750 |