ACNW-0096

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH ACNW MEETING
July 26-28, 1995

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

- APPENDICES -

130035

R502 0/1

9603130250 950909
PDR ADVCM NACNUCLE
0096 PDR

CERTIFIED

Issued: 09/09/95

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
JULY 26-28, 1995
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The 76th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste was held at Two White Flint North Building, 11145 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, July 26-28, 1995. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate actions on the items listed in the attached agenda. The meeting was open to public attendance, except a portion that was closed to discuss matters pertaining to a foreign government.

A transcript of selected portions of the meeting was kept and is available in the NRC Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. [Copies of the transcript are available for purchase from Neal R. Gross and Co. Inc., Court Reporters and Transcribers, 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.]

Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. and briefly reviewed the schedule for the meeting. He stated that the meeting was being conducted in conformance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. He stated that the Committee had not received any requests from persons or organizations desiring to make an oral statement during the meeting. However, he invited members of the public, who were present and had something to contribute, to let the ACNW staff know so that time could be allocated for them to make oral statements.

ACNW members, Drs. John B. Garrick, William J. Hinze and Martin J. Steindler were present. [For a list of other attendees, see Appendix III.]

I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Open)

[Note: Mr. Richard K. Major was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. Pomeroy identified a number of items that he believed to be of interest to the Committee, including:

- Introduction of new staff members;
- Supreme Court refusal to hear an appeal against on-site storage casks for Palisades nuclear fuel;
- Signature of a contract for a combined dry storage and transportation system for Dresden-1;
- Nomination as NRC Commissioner of Ms. Greta Dicus, Director of the Division of Radiation Control and

Emergency Management at the Arkansas Department of Health;

- Scheduled release of the National Academy of Sciences report providing advice to the Environmental Protection Agency on the technical bases for the public health standards that the agency must develop for the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain.
- Notification that the New York State Low-Level Waste Siting Commission will cease to operate on August 11, 1995, due to a cut in funding.

II. INTEGRATION OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE)/U.S. GEOLOGIC SURVEY (USGS) ACTIVITIES IN HYDROLOGY, GEOCHEMISTRY, AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (Open)

[Note: Ms. Lynn Deering was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. W. J. Hinze introduced the topic and noted that the purpose of the meeting was to hear a briefing on DOE's approach to integrating its hydrology programs as well as the integration of these programs with geochemistry, geology, and performance assessment. Dr. Hinze quoted previous ACNW material that cites perceived problems with DOE program integration, such as an appearance that integration is ad hoc, and that there is no top down approach to integration. Dr. Hinze identified a series of questions for DOE on integration of its program for the consideration of the first presenter, Russ Patterson, Yucca Mountain Hydrology Team Leader. Dr. Patterson, in turn, introduced Sheryl Morris, Work Breakdown Structure Manager for Climate, and Dr. Abraham Van Luik, Technical Synthesis Team Leader, DOE.

Ms. Sheryl Morris, DOE, Climate Integration

Ms. Morris described regulatory catalysts for the climate program, the climate program's overall strategy, internal integration within the climate program, and external integration; i.e., climate inputs for activities outside the climate program. She noted that the climate program is designed to look at today's climate and what it was in the past, and to merge that with possible future scenarios. Areas of focus include effects of increased infiltration and increased percolation, among others.

The overall program strategy includes compiling the paleoclimate and paleohydrology, comparing this to the current climate, building climate states producing paleo situations, and using this information to look at future climate for additional bounding conditions.

Internal integration of the climate program includes paleoclimate synthesis, which is a compilation of paleoclimate and paleohy-

drology, including paleoclimate of lakes, precipitation, terrestrial signals, surface hydrology, and subsurface hydrology, each of which is a separate study plan being carried out by USGS. These are synthesized and provided to external users. Paleoclimate synthesis is expected to be completed in August, 1996. Ms. Morris discussed in more detail each of the study plans noted above and indicated external integration links for each, where present.

For future climate scenarios, the synthesis of past climate provides a benchmark for comparing numerical climate model results to observational interpretations of past climate data, thereby building confidence in model performance, and it serves as a useful starting point for the modeling of potential future climates that could stress potential repository integrity. Starting from the understanding of past climates, possible future climate scenarios that may negatively impact the repository performance are selected for modeling. Scenarios include some that have not been identified in the past, but may occur in the future. The future regional climate study uses numerical climate models to evaluate regional climate conditions under potential future climate states, including several greenhouse states, and several glaciation states.

The Committee members asked a number of questions. Drs. Garrick and Steindler questioned the relative importance of the future scenarios; i.e., whether any one is more important than another with respect to performance. Dr. Garrick asked whether the scenarios are treated probabilistically. Ms. Morris responded that they are not. Mr. Joe Schelling, Sandia National Laboratories, tried to respond to this. He noted that it is difficult to assign likelihood to a future scenario when it did not necessarily occur in the past, but performance assessment (PA) analysts do try to do this. Dr. Garrick cautioned that the climate experts should play a major in role in this activity, as opposed to the PA analysts, who are not experts in climate.

Dr. Hinze asked what is understood regarding whether today's conditions are really a reflection of a past climate, and how studies of the subsurface are being integrated with the paleo regime. Ms. Morris replied that this is done under paleosynthesis.

Dr. Hinze asked what impact budget cuts have had on the climate studies. Ms. Morris indicated that they are focusing their efforts on bounding conditions; i.e., the conditions most threatening to the repository, rather than the entire paleoclimate. Dr. Hinze asked how they know they are looking at a bounding condition when they do not really know what the actual conditions are.

As clarification, Ms. Heidi Lohn, Project Management Organization team, stated that, rather than looking only at some worst case scenarios, the program collects all the data it can; the scenarios

and the scale of interest remain the same, simply less data are available overall. Data is prioritized by balancing the needs of the many customers. Thus the Technical Site Suitability (TSS) decision will be made with less confidence because of the lack of data overall.

Dr. Garrick expressed concern over the approach of simply collecting all the data that they can, without linking data collection to performance. Dr. Patterson clarified that they do receive feedback from performance assessment; however, they never ask for less data, always more. Dr. Patterson deferred discussed of the way data is prioritized until after Dr. Van Luik's presentation.

Ms. Lohn noted that they are often asked how much data are enough. Dr. Pomeroy asked whether this was a subjective decision. Dr. Patterson responded that it was. This decision is made at his level, as DOE Team Leader. The next level of management makes decisions across various programs.

Russ Patterson, DOE, Hydrology Program Integration

Dr. Patterson described how integration occurs within the hydrology program as well as between the hydrology program and other programs. Hydrology consists of unsaturated zone and saturated zone studies, and modeling and synthesis efforts. Programs feeding into hydrology include climate, geology, and environmental studies. Hydrology studies feed into performance assessment, geochemistry, environmental studies, climate, and geology.

Dr. Hinze asked what was the impact of the hydrology program upon thermal loading studies. Dr. Patterson explained that heater tests are now on the critical path. A white paper is due soon from the Thermal Hydrologic Review Evaluation Team.

Dr. Patterson reviewed each of the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) elements (study plans) in hydrology, and the key data feeds. He noted that there is no set procedure for integration, and that each Team Leader is responsible for ensuring that they are acting as a team. Dr. Garrick questioned whether there was anyone in charge of overall integration. Dr. Patterson noted that there is an integration team, but that each WBS manager is in charge of integration. They know it is working when the customers, such as performance assessment, etc., say they are getting what they need. Dr. Patterson noted that data collection is guided by the Site Characterization Plan (SCP); however, deviations from this due to budget cuts, or customer feedback, are identified in the semi-annual progress reports. Carol Hanlon, DOE, noted that Report 12, forthcoming, contains a matrix of changes in the status of all site characterization activities.

Dr. Hinze asked a specific question about how the isotopic studies Principal Investigator (PI) receives information from the hydrology program on how to interpret the isotopic results, and knows what additional data to collect, based on hydrology constraints. Dr. Patterson responded that many informal meetings are held between the PIs, and that these meetings are considered milestones and deliverables in the program. Specifically, the Hydrology Integration Task Force, headed by Dwight Hoxie, USGS, is responsible for ensuring these meetings are held on a regular basis.

Dr. Patterson noted that the majority of studies under the hydrology program feed directly or indirectly into two key areas: site scale unsaturated zone modeling and synthesis, and saturated zone hydrologic system synthesis and modeling. The models and synthesized data are then fed into other program elements.

Dr. Patterson noted that actual integration efforts are coming together but are not perfectly linked together yet. Recent changes in the program plan, coupled with uncertain funding levels, have led to the need for a reevaluation of the amount, type, and degree of certainty of the data being collected.

Dr. Patterson provided an example of progress in integration under the unsaturated zone infiltration study. He noted that not much integration occurred between this study and other parts of the program prior to mid-1994; however, this has changed due to collaboration by representatives from DOE, EPA, EG&G, LANL, LBL, and USGS, allowing for more and better information coming into the infiltration project from various sources.

Abraham Van Luik, DOE, Performance Assessment Integration with the Site Engineering Programs Within the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project

Dr. Van Luik described the site program's role as interpreting data and creating the first tier of process level models, while the PA program creates and integrates system level models by feeding site data, site understanding, and process level model results into the system models. The PA program also feeds the results of sensitivity analyses and uncertainty analyses back into the site program. He expressed frustration with the fact that under DOE's organization of the program, PA is not responsible for process level modeling, which is the level at which data can be collected and prioritized based on feedback from the models. PA is at a more generalized level and is dependent upon the process level modeling done at the PI level. Thus PA cannot fulfill the expectation that PA can be used to drive data collection; i.e., where to put the next hole.

Dr. Van Luik emphasized that the process level models should be supported by field, lab, and natural analog tests to independently corroborate the model predictions, prior to providing the models to PA. PA takes the models and tests them in terms of performance measures. Then PA feeds back to the model developers where the model is weak or needs more testing, based on sensitivity analyses. PA uses the process models to conduct sensitivity analyses with respect to various measures of performance or surrogate measures of performance.

Dr. Van Luik noted that, to avoid a previous problem where data collectors would stand up at meetings and disagree with PA people on data or assumptions used, they now go to the data collectors and discuss exactly what data distributions they plan to use, etc., and whether this is acceptable in their judgment.

Dr. Van Luik described how, rather than collecting all the data and then synthesizing it, they are now synthesizing and modeling as they go along. Snapshots of the modeling are needed to feed Technical Site Suitability (TSS), the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and the license application. He noted that the license application and the final EIS will be based on Total System Performance Assessment (TSPA) 99, while the TSS and the draft EIS will be based on TSPA 97. He noted that TSPA 97 will be the first iteration to reflect a direct link to what the site and engineering process level models show. He expressed concern that, until now, the program postponed the testing of the process or more detailed models, while using these models to determine what goes into the system models.

Dr. Garrick asked why the program does not take the climate scenarios that are of concern and plug them into the earlier TSPA 93 to get an early reading on whether they require further consideration, and why the TSPAs must be so discreet; i.e., 91, 93, 95, etc. Dr. Van Luik described addenda made to all the TSPAs after the fact, due to complaints from outsiders and the Pis. He noted that TSPA 93 considered a full pluvial cycle, and that, precipitation, assuming that it translates directly into increased infiltration, is the number one problem for the site.

He noted, however, that they have not yet integrated into TSPA the work of Dr. A. Flint, who suggests there is buffering capacity in the top one hundred meters of the site, depending on the degree of soil cover. Dr. Hinze asked whether it would be a problem to interface the process level models with the TSPA models. Dr. Van Luik agreed that this would take a lot of work, and that the TSPA models would not use the process models directly. A program called RIP is used to mimic the process models, and then feed into the system models, which is the abstraction process.

Dr. Garrick expressed concern that the PA modelers and data collectors still are not communicating the way they should to ensure that PA models represent the state-of-knowledge.

Mr. Steve Hanauer, DOE, was asked to comment on the status of a thermal hydrology report. He noted that a peer review was being conducted of thermal hydraulic modeling, headed by Mr. Paul Witherspoon. A white paper prepared by DOE staff on the status of the thermal hydraulics modeling will be issued in the next month or so. The peer review report is due toward the end of this year.

Dr. Hinze asked Dr. Van Luik how the problems related to scale are being addressed by PA. He replied that there is a project at Sandia to measure parameters in tuff at different spacial scales using instruments of different sizes. He noted that the process level modeler is responsible for ensuring that the model is defensible and has a basis.

Russ Patterson, DOE, Yucca Mountain Hydrology Prioritization

Mr. Patterson described the approach used to set priorities within the hydrology program. He outlined a five-step process: identify program questions that hydrology must answer, identify studies required to answer questions, identify customers of the data, identify customers' data priorities (i.e., is the data essential), and apply weighing criteria.

The program questions were identified based on TSPA 91 and 93, the Early Site Suitability Evaluation, and the License Application Review Plan, guidance for Scenario A, and 10 CFR Parts 60 and 960. To identify studies required to answer the questions, an internal review was made of the hydrology studies, such as past funding levels, the amount of data collected to date, past deliverables and milestones, and the Program Plan guidance (Scenario A) was reviewed.

Internal and external customers of the data were identified. Internal customers include hydrology models and other hydrology Work Breakdown Structure elements. External customers include performance assessment, geochemistry, environmental programs, engineering, geology, and climatology.

Customers' data priorities are identified by reviewing feedback from PA, PA listing of process models needed and expectations, environmental requirements and expectations, and geochemistry needs. Finally, individual studies are weighed considering the highest customer priorities, largest number of customers, and least amount of data to meet the needs of the customer. The highest priority is given to those studies or activities that fill critical needs for multiple users.

Dr. Garrick expressed concern that PA was treated as just another customer similar to the science programs. He noted that PA is information processing against performance measures and cannot be viewed as an equivalent customer. Mr. Patterson disagreed, indicating that he sees PA as a major customer for the process models. Dr. Garrick noted that a root problem seems to be that PA is not properly functioning as the information processor for the program, and it should not be advertised as such if it is not really so. Dr. Hinze noted that integration takes place between the various elements of the hydrology program, and then these are integrated with other programs, and finally, the ultimate integrator is performance assessment. Dr. Van Luik explained that the unsaturated zone hydrology models are one of the hydrology program's biggest customers, but PA is, in turn, its most demanding customer, and thus it is shown as an equivalent customer to the "ologies."

Dr. Hinze questioned whether this data would be collected and integrated with PA in time to be incorporated into the Technical Basis Reports. DOE shared this concern.

Dr. Garrick added a concern that the weighting criteria were soft, and the customer's needs were not necessarily equated to risk.

Dr. Hinze asked whether QA slowed down or impeded the availability of data and data sharing between the elements of the hydrology program. Dr. Paterson responded that the internal USGS process could slow up data availability between PIs. He noted that he encourages PIs to release data as quickly as possible by stamping it draft or pre-decisional. Dr. Van Luik noted that Wesley Barnes, Yucca Mountain Project Office Project Manger, is also concerned about this problem.

III. NRC STAFF PRESENTATION/UPDATE ON SITE DECOMMISSIONING MANAGEMENT PLAN (SDMP) STREAMLINING ACTIVITIES (Open)

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

Dr. Pomeroy stated in his opening remarks that, in addition to the staff volunteering to brief the Committee on this topic, the Commission had solicited a review by the ACNW of the proposed streamlining of the current eight-step process.

Mr. M. Weber, the cognizant NMSS Branch Chief, introduced Mr. D. Fauver, the Senior Project Manager responsible for the SDMP. He noted that the SDMP program was initiated in response to a 1989 General Accounting Office report on the NRC's decommissioning program. That report resulted in a hearing before the House

Subcommittee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources. Several commitments were made at that meeting, one of the most significant being that sites released in the past would be reexamined, those requiring further cleanup identified, and a priority listing of sites to be cleaned up formulated. The SDMP was first issued in 1990, updated annually, and issued as a NUREG in 1993.

Although the program initially focused on complicated, non-routine, problematic sites such as those with groundwater contamination and sites with very large volumes of thorium and uranium contamination, as the program matured, the staff realized the general lack of a consistent decommissioning program throughout the NRC.

The current SDMP process leading to license termination and site release, which consists of essentially eight steps, was discussed in some detail by Mr. Fauver. In response to questions from the Members, the average duration for each of the current steps and the progress on the removal of sites from the list, etc., was provided. The staff also noted that, although initially there was a numerical ranking system for site cleanup prioritization, such a system is no longer used. Rather, based on past experience, a priority is assigned, reviewed by NRC management, and the resultant priorities are implicit in the annual SDMP updates to the Commission.

In the proposed streamlined approach, the staff is considering two major areas for reduction:

1. The review of the characterization plans and reports. The proposal is for the licensee to submit the characterization data concurrently with the decommissioning plan.

   The recognized - but believed acceptable - related risk is that this approach may result in reducing the opportunity to identify characterization issues early.

2. The scope of the NRC confirmatory survey. The proposal is to place greater reliance on licensee quality assurance and quality control programs, thereby permitting the NRC to inspect the licensee's survey while it in progress rather than conducting its own post-survey confirmation. It was noted that all sites would receive at least a limited NRC closeout survey. Guidance on the data quality objectives is being developed in a document called the Multi-Agency Radiation Site Investigation Manual (MARSIM), which is to be issued in November by the Office of Research. (This joint NRC - EPA document is based on the experience gained from looking at prior site releases and is intended to be a fully defensible legal document.) Two additional supporting NUREGs are also to be issued in support of the MARSIM.

The recognized - but believed acceptable - related risk is that this approach may increase the potential for releasing sites with "hot-spots" ("hot-spot" factors are being reviewed and the possibility of raising their values is under consideration). Criticism from the public may also be incurred should the public believe the NRC's interest in the quality of the resultant cleanup is lessened.

The staff also plans to adjust the level of regulatory review based on licensee performance. Such a rating would be based on licensee technical capabilities and overall performance. For poor performers, however, the plan is to conduct the full complement of reviews. (In response to a question, Mr. Weber noted that about one-third of licensees would currently be classed as "poor performers".)

Mr. Weber stressed that, although the staff was looking at the optimum utilization of both in-house and out-of-house resources, none of the sites posed an imminent risk to the public.

The current SDMP program recognizes the need for public information and interactions with the states as well as with other interested parties. The program attempts to obtain their ground floor involvement.

There was much discussion on several aspects of the proposed program with Members indicating that they believed the risks associated with the proposed streamlining represented areas that perhaps could be contested in the decommissioning process. The use of concentration averaging was discussed as was the potential for using certified radio-analytical laboratories. The division of responsibility between headquarters and the Regions for oversight of the SDMP site cleanups was also described.

Dr. Garrick noted that many of the SDMP sites were located in Ohio and Pennsylvania. He wondered whether there was knowledge that had been gained in these states that might not only permit these states to be more efficient in the decontamination of sites within those two states, but also to share any such knowledge with others. It was pointed out that there is a Memorandum of Understanding with Pennsylvania, which it is believed will be an asset.

In response to the staff's request, the Committee indicated that it would consider the preparation of a letter report. In the interim, prior to the Committee issuance of such a report, the staff could review the transcript.

IV. MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT, NMSS (Open)

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

Mr. John Greeves, Director, Division of Waste Management, discussed the current budget proposals being considered by Congress. Current House budget proposals have restored about half the agency's waste management budget from the cuts proposed one month ago. A cut of $11 million is the current proposal. This number could change again depending on proposals from the Senate and possible action by a House and Senate conference committee.

Mr. Greeves turned to the NRC staff's vertical slice approach, an in-depth review of DOE site characterization studies. The objective of the vertical slice review is to ensure DOE has adequate information for a license application. There are currently eleven such studies planned, and a study on integration was recently added. Margaret Federline is heading this effort. The staff is preparing written documentation of the details of the vertical slice approach. There will also be a review board, composed of NRC managers and a representative from the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses, to ensure the adequacy of the vertical slice reviews.

Mr. Greeves spoke about a recent IAEA waste management convention he attended in Vienna, Austria. It was the first formal meeting of this international group. The goal is to create an incentive to manage nuclear waste in a safe manner across the international community. There will be reporting requirements and a peer review process.

Mr. Greeves mentioned that the National Academy of Sciences report on the Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards would be made available to the public on August 1, 1995.

The high level findings by the National Academy of Sciences on DOE's technical bases reports was the next topic. The first meeting on surficial processes was recently held. Staff presented the results of previous reviews, but did not instigate new reviews as input to this process. The staff will convey the opinions of the ACNW to the National Academy peer review panels based on the Committee's reports. Chairman Pomeroy expressed the hope that the Committee would have the opportunity to comment on positions the staff may take with regard to this peer review process.

Mr. Greeves turned to Dr. Michael Bell of his staff for an update on progress at the Yucca Mountain Exploratory Studies Facility. The tunnel boring machine (TBM) has passed through the Bow Ridge

Fault and is about 1,200 meters into the mountain. A conveyor system to remove the mined rock has been installed. The conveyor is a kilometer long. The TBM has encountered an altered zone in its present position. The rock in this zone is believed to have been altered by outgassing; as the tuff was laid down by volcanic action and cooled, gas pockets chemically changed the nature of the tuff.

In response to a question, Mr. Greeves said the staff is in the process of writing "Preliminary Evaluation Reports". Some drafts have been prepared, but they have not yet been reviewed. The object of these reports is to provide feedback to DOE. They will be issued on a periodic basis and document the NRC staff's concerns at a particular point in time. The staff will discuss this process in more detail in September. Dr. Pomeroy also asked for an update on progress in producing the Branch Technical Position on Low-Level Waste Performance Assessment.

CLOSED PORTIONS OF THE MEETING

The Committee held two closed sessions during its 76th meeting.

The first was a 5-minute closed session to consider an individual for a consulting position with the ACNW.

V. MEETING WITH THE REAKTOR-SICHERSHEITKOMMISSION (Closed)

The second was Session V.: Meeting with the Reaktor-Sichersheitkommission (Reactor Safety Commission, Germany). This half-day session was an exchange of information on the national waste programs of the United States and Germany, with particular focus on the low- and high-level waste programs. This portion of the meeting was closed to discuss information provided in confidence by a foreign source pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (4). Detailed minutes are available in the supplement to these Minutes.

[SUPPLEMENT REMOVED - FOIA EX(b)(4)]

VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION (Open/Closed)

[Note: Mr. Richard K. Major was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

A. Reports, Letters, and Memoranda

Regulations Pertaining to Contaminated Steel-Smelting Facilities and Disposal of Contaminated Baghouse Dust (Report to Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, NRC, from Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, ACNW, dated August 10, 1995)

Lesson Learned from the Ward Valley, California, Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Siting Process (Report to Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman, NRC, from Paul W. Pomeroy, Chairman, ACNW, dated August 10, 1995)

B. ACNW Retreat

Preliminary plans were discussed for the annual ACNW Retreat.

C. Final Arrangements for Meeting with Reaktor-Sichersheit-kommission (Reactor Safety Commission, Germany)

Final arrangements were discussed for the ACNW presentations to the members of the German RSK Committee who participated in a joint session with the ACNW on July 28, 1995.

D. Future Meeting Agenda

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the 77th ACNW Meeting, Rockville, Maryland, September 20-21, 1995, and future Working Group meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m., Friday, July 28, 1995.

RESTRICTED ACCESS: MINUTES OF A CLOSED MEETING

SUPPLEMENT TO THE MINUTES OF THE 76TH ACNW MEETING
JULY 26-28, 1995

DELETION
FOIA EX(b)(4)

PAGES 14 THRU 21

- APPENDICES -

I. Federal Register Notice
II. Meeting Schedule and Outline
III. Meeting Attendees
IV. Future Agenda and Working Group Activities
V. List of Documents Provided to the Committee

APPENDIX I

RS

licensee's application of April 28, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 18 months from the October 1995 refueling outage to the February 1997 refueling outage would be granted.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the type A test from the October 1995 refueling outage to the February 1997 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating the test period from the critical path time of the outage.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically have been shown to be the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. It is also noted that the licensee, as a condition of the proposed exemption, will perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. The NRC staff also notes that the containment is maintained at a subatmospheric pressure which provides a means for continuously monitoring potential containment leakage paths during power operation. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Surry Power Station, Unit No. 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 16, 1995 the NRC staff consulted with the Virginia State official, L. Foldesi of the State Health Department, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of no Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated April 28, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

David B. Matthews,

Director, Project Directorate II-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-16694 Filed 7-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 76th meeting on July 26, 27 and 28, 1995, in Room T-2B3, at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of portions that may be closed to discuss information provided in confidence by a foreign source (Germany) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4).

The agenda for this meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, July 26, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

Thursday, July 27, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.

Friday, July 28, 1995—8:30 A.M. until 1:00 P.M.

During this meeting the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. *Meeting with the RSK*—The Committee will meet with members of Germany's Reaktor—Sicherheciokommission (RSK) to discuss the disposal of radioactive waste in both the U.S. and Germany. Portions of this session may be closed to discuss information provided in confidence by a foreign source pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4).

B. *Meeting with the Director, NRC's Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards*—The Director will discuss items of current interest related to the Division of Waste Management programs.

C. *SDMP Streamlining*—The NRC staff will update the Committee on efforts to streamline the Site Decommissioning Management Plan program process.

D. *Integration of Hydrology, Geochemistry and Performance Assessment*—The Committee will be briefed by representatives of the Department of Energy on efforts to integrate investigations into hydrology, geology, geochemistry and performance assessment for the Yucca Mountain site.

E. *Preparation of ACNW Reports*—The Committee will discuss proposed reports including lessons learned from licensing activities at proposed low-level waste sites. Additional topics will be considered as time permits.

F. *Ethics Training*—The Committee will receive its annual ethics training from a representative of the Office of the General Council.

G. *Committee Activities/Future Agenda*—The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will also discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members.

H. *Miscellaneous*—The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were

published in the **Federal Register** on October 7, 1994 (59 FR 51219). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch, Mr. Richard K. Major, as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting may be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACNW meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with Mr. Major if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

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 contacting Mr. Richard K. Major, Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch (telephone 301/415–7366), between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. EDT.

ACNW meeting notices, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are now available on FedWorld from the "NRC MAIN MENU." Direct Dial Access number to FedWorld is (800) 303–9672; the local direct dial number is 703–321–3339.

Dated: June 30, 1995.

John C. Hoyle,

Acting Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–16695 Filed 7–6–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Draft Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued for public comment a draft of a guide planned for its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

The draft guide, temporarily identified by its task number, DG-1040 (which should be mentioned in correspondence concerning this draft guide), is titled "Time Response Design Criteria for Safety-Related Operator Actions." The guide will be in Division 1, "Power Reactors." This regulatory guide is being developed to provide methods acceptable to the NRC staff for developing and applying timing criteria for safety-related operator actions. This guide endorses the American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society standard ANSI/ANS–58.8–1994, "Time Response Design Criteria for Safety-Related Operator Actions."

The draft guide has not received complete staff review and does not represent an official NRC staff position.

Public comments are being solicited on the guide. Comments should be accompanied by supporting data. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Comments will be most helpful if received by August 31, 1995.

Although a time limit is given for comments on this draft guide, comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time.

Comments may be submitted electronically, in either ASCII text or Wordperfect format (version 5.1 or later), by calling the NRC Electronic Bulletin Board on FedWorld. The bulletin board may be accessed using a personal computer, a modem, and one of the commonly available communications software packages, or directly via Internet.

If using a personal computer and modem, the NRC subsystem on FedWorld can be accessed directly by dialing the toll free number: 1–800–303–9672. Communication software parameters should be set as follows: Parity to none, data bits to 8, and stop bits to 1 (N,8,1). Using ANSI or VT–100 terminal emulation, the NRC NUREGs and RegGuides for Comment subsystem can then be accessed by selecting the "Rules Menu" option from the "NRC Main Menu." For further information about options available for NRC at FedWorld, consult the "Help/Information Center" from the "NRC Main Menu." Users will find the "FedWorld Online User's Guides" particularly helpful. Many NRC subsystems and data bases also have a "Help/Information Center" option that is tailored to the particular subsystem.

The NRC subsystem on FedWorld can also be accessed by a direct dial phone number for the main FedWorld BBS, 703–321–3339, or by using Telnet via Internet, fedworld.gov. If using 703–321–3339 to contact FedWorld, the NRC subsystem will be accessed from the main FedWorld menu by selecting the "Regulatory, Government Administration and State Systems," then selecting "Regulatory Information Mall." At that point, a menu will be displayed that has an option "U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission" that will take you to the NRC Online main menu. The NRC Online area also can be accessed directly by typing "/go nrc" at a FedWorld command line. If you access NRC from FedWorld's main menu, you may return to FedWorld by selecting the "Return to FedWorld" option from the NRC Online Main Menu. However, if you access NRC at FedWorld by using NRC's toll-free number, you will have full access to all NRC systems but you will not have access to the main FedWorld system.

If you contact FedWorld using Telnet, you will see the NRC area and menus, including the Rules menu. Although you will be able to download documents and leave messages, you will not be able to write comments or upload files (comments). If you contact FedWorld using FTP, all files can be accessed and downloaded but uploads are not allowed; all you will see is a list of files without descriptions (normal Gopher look). An index file listing all files within a subdirectory, with descriptions, is included. There is a 15-minute time limit for FTP access.

Although FedWorld can be accessed through the World Wide Web, like FTP that mode only provides access for downloading files and does not display the NRC Rules menu.

For more information on NRC bulletin boards call Mr. Arthur Davis, System Integration and Development Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301) 415–5780; e-mail AXD3@nrc.gov. For more information on this draft regulatory guide, contact J.J. Kramer at the NRC, telephone (301) 415–5891; e-mail JJK1@nrc.gov.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Requests for single copies of draft or final guides (which may be reproduced) or for placement on an automatic distribution list for single copies of future draft guides in specific divisions should be made in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Distribution and Mail Services Section; or by fax at (301) 415–2260. Telephone requests cannot be

APPENDIX II

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

Draft 4: July 19, 1995

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION
76TH ACNW MEETING
JULY 26-28, 1995

Wednesday, July 26, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room T-2 B3
11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

1) 8:30 - 8:40 A.M. — Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman (Open)
1.1) Opening statement (PWP/RKM)
1.2) Items of Current Interest (PWP/RKM)

2) 8:40 - ~~11:15~~ 12:10 A.M. (Break ~~10:30~~ 10:26 10:43) — Integration of DOE/USGS Activities in Hydrology, Geochemistry, and Performance Assessment (Open) (WJH/LGD)
TAB 2----------
2.1) Presentation on Status of Integration Techniques by Russ Patterson, DOE
2.2) Roundtable discussion

~~3) 11:15 - 12:15 P.M.~~ Committee Activities/Future Agenda (Open) (PWP/RKM)
TAB 3----------
3.1) Set agenda for 77th full Committee Meeting, September 20-21, 1995
3.2) Review items for the Out Months (details of Yucca Mountain visit in October)
3.3) Future Working Group Topics
3.4) Other Outside Meetings
3.5) Report on Outside Meetings Attended by Members and Staff
3.6) Reconciliation of NRC Staff Response to Recent ACNW Letters

12:~~15~~10 - 1:~~15~~15 P.M. Lunch

1:15 - 2:3~~0~~5 P.M. ~~Continue~~ Committee Activities/Future Agenda

4) 2:3~~0~~5 - 3:30 P.M. Ethics Training for Members and Staff (Open)
TAB 1---------
Members and staff will receive annual ethics training from NRC's Office of the General Council (PWP/RKM)

3:30 - 3:4~~5~~0 P.M. Break

[Portions of the meeting that were transcribed.

5) 3:45 - 5:~~00~~ 31 P.M. Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)
Discuss proposed reports on:
TAB 5---------
5.1) Lessons Learned from Licensing Activities at Proposed LLW Sites (MJS/HJL)
5.2) Additional topics will be considered as time permits

5:~~00~~ 31 P.M. Recess

Thursday, July 27, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

6) 8:30 - 10:3~~0~~ 5 A.M. NRC Staff Presentation/Update on Site Decommissioning Management Plan Streamlining Activities (Open) (PWP/HJL)
TAB 6-----------

10:3~~0~~ 5 - 10:45 A.M. Break

7) 10:45 - ~~12:00~~ 11:51 Noon Meeting with the Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS (Open)
TAB 7-----------
7.1) A question and answer session with the Director, Division of Waste Management, John Greeves (PWP/RKM)
7.2) The Director will discuss items of current interest and foreshadow upcoming staff activities

~~12:00~~ 11:51 - 1:00 P.M. Lunch

8) 1:00 - 2:~~00~~ 45 P.M. Prepare for Visit with RSK (Open) (PWP/RKM)

2:45 - 3:15 P.M. BREAK

9) ~~2:00~~ 3:15 - 5:~~00~~ 30 P.M. Continue Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)
Continue preparation of reports listed in Item 6

5:~~00~~ 30 P.M. Adjourn

Friday, July 28, 1995, Two White Flint North, Room T-2B3
11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

10) 8:3~~0~~ 9 - 1:~~00~~ 25 P.M. RSK/ACNW Meeting (Closed)
TAB 10

Portions will be closed to discuss information provided in confidence by a foreign source (Germany) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4).

8:30 - 8:45 A.M.	Welcoming Remarks 10.1 Dr. Paul Pomeroy, Chairman, ACNW 10.2 Prof. Dr. Otfried Natau, Chairman, RSK Committee on Final Disposal
8:45 - 9:45 A.M.	Overview of Waste Disposal Activities Basis and Conceptual Principles for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste: 10.3 In the U.S. - Dr. Martin J. Steindler, ACNW 10.4 In Germany - Dr. Arnulf Matting, BMU
9:45 - 11:00 A.M.	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal 10.5 In the U.S. - Dr. Paul Pomeroy, ACNW (Past and current experience with LLW disposal, safety regulation and guidance, performance assessment, time frames, retrievability, etc.) 10.6 In Germany - Prof. Dr. Otfried Natau, RSK Dr. Paul-Heinz Brücher (RSK recommendations from 1994 on planned final waste repository Konrad, experiences with the repository in Morsbelen)
11:~~00~~ 10 - 11:~~15~~ 30 A.M.	Break
11:~~15~~ 30 - ~~12:30~~ 1:25 P.M.	Issues Concerning High Level Radioactive Waste Management (Development on safety principles and safety guides, e.g., time frame, long-term storage, research, site characterization program, performance assessment, retrievability, environmental impact assessment, etc.) 10.7 In the U.S. - Dr. William J. Hinze, ACNW Member

	Dr. B. John Garrick, Vice-Chairman, ACNW
	10.8 In Germany - Prof. Dr. Klaus Kühn, RSK
~~12:30~~ 1:15 - 1:~~00~~ 25 P.M.	Meeting summary and plans for future activities - Dr. Paul Pomeroy, ACNW Prof. Dr. Otfried Natau, RSK
1:~~00~~ 25 P.M.	ACNW hosted luncheon for RSK Commission Dining Room OWFN 18th floor

Note, for Staff and DOE Presenters:

- **Presentation time should not exceed 50 percent of the total time allocated for a specific item. The remaining 50 percent of the time is reserved for discussion.**
- **Number of copies of the presentation materials to be provided to the ACNW - 35**

APPENDIX III: MEETING ATTENDEES

76TH ACNW MEETING
July 26-28, 1995

ACNW MEMBERS	1st Day	2nd Day
Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy	X	X
Dr. B. John Garrick	X	X
Dr. William J. Hinze	X	X
Dr. Martin J. Steindler	X	X

ACNW STAFF	1st Day	2nd Day
Dr. Andrew Campbell	X	X
Ms. Lynn F. Deering	X	X
Mr. Howard J. Larson	X	X
Mr. Richard K. Major	X	X
Dr. John T. Larkins	X	X
Dr. Richard P. Savio	X	X
Ms. Roxanne Summers	X	X

ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

July 26, 1995

J. Austin	NMSS
J. Bradbury	NMSS
M. Rose Byrne	NMSS
R. Cady	RES
R. Codell	NMSS
N. Coleman	NMSS
T. Nicholson	RES

July 27, 1995

H. Faulkner	OIP
J. Holonich	NMSS
J. Kane	NMSS
D. Moser	NMSS
B. Nelson	NMSS
J. Park	NRR
F. Ross	NMSS

S. Wastler	NMSS
M. Weber	NMSS

ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

July 26, 1995

J. Cowles	TRW
B. Gamble	CRWMS M&O/WCFS
M. Haghi	CRWMS M&O Duke
C. Hanlon	USGS
S. Hauauer	DOE
V. Lewis Killpack	TRW
H. Lang	M&O R&L
H. Lohr	SAIC
A. Luik	DOE
S. Morris	DOE
R. Patterson	DOE
F. Rodgers	DOE
J. Russell	CNWRA
J. Schelling	Sandia Nat'l Labs
J. Schmitt	NET
J. Steckel	Golder Federal Services
E. Tiesenhausen	Clark County
R. Wallace	USGS
J. Woodward	ICF Kaiser Engineers

July 27, 1995

C. Hanlon	USGS
V. Lewis Killpack	TRW
S. Morris	DOE
G. Roseboom	Self
J. Russell	CNWRA
J. Schelling	Sandia Nat'l Labs
R. Wallace	USGS
J. York	Weston

APPENDIX IV: FUTURE AGENDA

The Committee agreed to consider the following during the 77th ACNW Meeting, September 20-21, 1995:

A. Meeting with the Director, NRC's Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards - The Director will discuss items of current interest related to the Division of Waste Management programs. Examples of issues include preliminary evaluation reports on Department of Energy studies.

B. Meeting with NRC's General Counsel - The General Counsel will discuss items of interest with the Committee. Items might include: the use of expert elicitation in a licensing hearing, the nature of federal rules of evidence, and the nature of organizational conflicts of interest.

C. Meeting with the Director, NRC's Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research - The Director will discuss items of interest with the Committee. Items might include: an overview of high- and low-level waste disposal research and a discussion of the role of the Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee.

D. The Vertical Slice Approach - Representatives of NRC's Division of Waste Management will brief the Committee on plans for selected in-depth review (vertical slices) of DOE's site characterization program.

E. Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards - The ACNW will be briefed by a member of the National Research Council's Committee on the Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards. The topic will be the recently issued report on Yucca Mountain.

F. Hydrology Research Program - The ACNW will review the NRC staff hydrology research program, including the Apache Leap Test Site investigations.

G. Natural Analog Workshop - The NRC staff will report on a workshop held last year. Attempts to integrate natural analog studies and performance assessment will be highlighted.

H. Preparation of ACNW Report - The Committee will discuss proposed reports, including comments on NRC's Site Decommissioning Management Plan streamlining activities. Additional topics will be considered as time permits.

I. Committee Activities/Future Agenda - The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will also discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members.

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

APPENDIX V
LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

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

MEETING HANDOUTS

AGENDA ITEM NO. | DOCUMENTS

2) Integration of DOE/USGS Activities in Hydrology, Geochemistry, and Performance Assessment

1. ACNW Meeting: Integration, Presented by Sheryl A. Morris, Russell L. Patterson, and Abe Van Luik, Department of Energy (DOE), dated July 26, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

2. Yucca Mountain Hydrology Integration, Presented by Russell L. Patterson, DOE, dated July 26, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

3. Performance Assessment Integration with the Site and Engineering Programs within the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project, Presented by Dr. Abraham Van Luik, DOE, dated July 26, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

4. Yucca Mountain Hydrology Prioritization, Presented by Russell L. Patterson, DOE, dated July 26, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

3) Committee Activities/Future Agenda

5. Topics for the ACNW Retreat: September 21-22, 1995, dated July 20, 1995. [Handout 3.1/2]

6. Trip Report on NWTRB on July 11-12, 1995, by Dr. William Hinze to Dr. Paul Pomeroy, dated July 17, 1995. [Handout 3.5/1]

7. NRC Presentation to NAS on Extreme Erosion, dated July 7, 1995. [Handout 3.5]

8. Letter from E. Ramona Trovato, Director, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, to Senator Alan K. Simpson, dated June 21, 1995; and Memorandum from Andrew L. Bates, Acting Secretary, NRC, to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, Subject: SECY-95-084 - Assessment of the NRC Enforcement Program, Proposed Revision to the General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions, and removal of Policy from 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, dated June 16, 1995. [Handout 3.6/1]

6) NRC Staff Presentation/Update on Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) Streamlining Activities

9. Streamlining NRC Oversight of Decommissioning, Presented by David Fauver and Michael Weber, NRC, dated July 27, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

10. SRM (Staff Requirements Memorandum) on SDMP (Site Decommissioning Management Plan), attaching SRM M950519 from John C. Hoyle, Secretary, NRC, to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, NRC, dated May 30, 1995. [Handout 6/1]

10) Meeting with the Reaktor-Sichersheitkommission (Reactor Safety Commission, Germany)

11. Overview of Waste Disposal Activities in the United States, Presented by Dr. Martin J. Steindler, dated July 28, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

12. Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal in the United States, Presented by Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, dated July 28, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

13. The U.S. High-Level Radioactive Waste Management Program, RSK/ACNW Meeting, Presented by Dr. William J. Hinze, dated July 28, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

14. Repository Performance Assessment, Presented at Meeting with German RSK's Committee on Final Waste Disposal, by Dr. B. John Garrick, dated July 28, 1995. [Viewgraphs]

15. Directions in Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management: A Brief History of Commercial Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal, DOE/LLW-103, Rev. 1, dated August 1994. [Handout]

16. Radioactive Waste; Status of Commercial Low-Level Waste Facilities, Report of the General Accounting Office, GAO/RCED-95-67, dated May 5, 1995. [Handout]

17. Review Process for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal License Application Under Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act, NUREG-1274, C.L. Pittiglio, Jr., dated August 1987.

18. Federal Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy: Slow but Sound, Statement of Phillip R. Clark, President and CEO, GPU Nuclear Corporation, Presented before the National Research Council, Board on Radioactive Waste Management

Meeting, March 31, 1995. [Handout]

19. Article entitled Perspective 3: The Low-Level Radioactive Waste Situation: Storage or Disposal?, by Fred A. Donath, GSA Institute for Environmental Education, published in GSA Today, dated May 1995. [Handout]

20. Information from Cal Rad Forum, Ward Valley Licensing, Litigation, and Land Sale, May 1993 to March 1995: Avoiding Decisions by Changing the Rules, published by California Radioactive Materials Management Forum, dated March 1995. [Handout]

21. Straight Talk about Low-Level Radioactive Waste, January 1995 issue; Vol. 4, No. 1. [Handout]

22. Disposing of Low-Level Radioactive Waste in California: A Guidebook for Citizen Participation; Mini-Update, Ward Valley Project, dated June 1990. [Handout]

MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS

TAB NUMBER — DOCUMENTS

1 Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman
1. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated July 26, 1995
2. Items of Current Interest, undated
3. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated July 27, 1995
4. Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, dated July 27, 1995

2 Integration of DOE/USGS Activities in Hydrology, Geochemistry, and Performance Assessment
5. Table of Contents, dated July 26, 1995
6. Status Report, dated July 26, 1995
7. Memorandum from Dr. William Hinze, ACNW, to Dr. Martin J. Steindler, Chairman, ACNW: Overview of the ACNW working group meeting on Unsaturated Zone Flow at the Potential Yucca Mountain HLW Repository Site, dated 03/10/94.
8. Consultant Report, dated March 15, 1994 addressed to Lynn Deering, ACNW Staff from Paul A. Davis, Manager, WIPP Technical Integration and Compliance Department 6307: Consultant Report on the Yucca Mountain High Level Waste Repository Site Characterization Meeting Held by the ACNW in Las Vegas, Nevada on December 14, 1993.
9. Memorandum to Dr. Martin J. Steindler, Chairman, ACNW, from L. Deering, ACNW Staff: Impressions and Conclusions of the ACNW Working Group Meeting on Use of Isotopic Methods to Date Groundwater at the Proposed Yucca Mountain Site, dated March 6, 1995, with Attachments.
10. Impressions of the Yucca Mountain Project and in Particular the Isotopic Investigations as Presented at the ACNW Working Group Meeting on Groundwater Dating Methods, October 20-21, 1994, by Stephen Conrad, dated January 16, 1995.
11. List of NRC Key Technical Issues, dated June 1, 1995.

3 Committee Activities/Future Agenda
12. Table of Contents, dated July 26, 1995.
13. Suggested Agenda Items for the 77th ACNW Meeting, September 20-21, 1995.
14. Agenda for the 78th ACNW Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada (October 24-26, 1995)
15. Agenda for the 79th ACNW Meeting, November 15-16, 1995.
16. Strategic Planning Topics beyond the 3-month horizon.

17. Trip Report by L. Deering: June 26-27, 1995 NWTRB Meeting of the Panel of Hydrology and Geochemistry: Fracture Flow and Transport in Arid Regions, dated July 6, 1995.
18. List of EDO Responses to Committee Letters, dated July 26, 1995, and attachments.
19. Memorandum to John T. Larkins, Executive Director, ACRS, from James L. Blaha, Office of the EDO: Proposed Agenda Items for the ACRS and ACNW, dated July 11, 1995, with attached list.

6 NRC Staff Presentation/Update on Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) Streamlining Activities

20. Table of Contents
21. Status Report
22. Memorandum to ACNW Members from H.J. Larson "Site Decommissioning Management Plan," dated May 24, 1995.
23. Memorandum to ACNW Members from H.J. Larson "GAO/RCED-95-95, Nuclear Regulation: Slow Progress in Identifying and Cleaning Up NRC's Licensees' Contaminated Sites, April 1995," dated May 15, 1995.
24. Letter from Ivan Selin, Chairman, NRC, to Senator John Glenn, dated June 22, 1995, on "GAO/RCED-95-95, Nuclear Regulation: Slow Progress in Identifying and Cleaning Up NRC's Licensees' Contaminated Sites, April 1995.
25. Revised Response to Inquiries on the June 22, 1995 letter to Senator John Glenn, dated June 26, 1995.

7 Meeting with the Director, Division of Waste Management, NMSS

26. Status Report, dated July 26, 1995.
27. Email messages to ACNW Members from Richard Major, ACNW Staff, dated July 12, 1995, re: National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Peer Review Panels.
28. Meeting Schedule for First NAS Peer Review Panel on Surface Characteristics, Meeting #1, July 19-21, 1995.

10. Meeting with the Reaktor-Sichersheitkommission (RSK) (Reactor Safety Commission, Germany)

29. Status report, dated July 28, 1995.
30. List of RSK Participants with Affiliation, dated June 26, 1995 (Fax Message from Hans J. Broich, RSK, to Roxanne Summers, ACNW Staff.
31. ACNW Papers Prepared for RSK Meeting (See Meeting Handouts)
32. List of Abbreviations for RSK Reports, dated April 22, 1995
33. RSK/SSK Recommendation, sent as a fax dated April 26, 1995, Relating to the Construction and the Operation of the Konrad Repository, Enclosure 1 to the Minutes of the

287th RSK Meeting on September 14, 1994.
34. Position Paper of the RSK: Plutonium - Recycling and Direct Disposal, 281st Meeting, December 8, 1993.
35. Background Information on German Nuclear Waste Disposal, prepared by Bonnie Guo, ACNW Staff, undated.