

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

LICENSING SUPPORT SYSTEM
ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL
(LSSARP)

+ + + + +

Thursday

July 6, 1995

+ + + + +

GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN

+ + + + +

The Licensing Support System Advisory

Review Panel met at the Radisson Inn Green Bay, 2040

Airport Drive, at 8:30 a.m., John Hoyle, Chairman,
presiding.

PANEL MEMBERS:

JOHN C. HOYLE, Chairman, NRC
KIRK BALCOM, State of Nevada
DENNIS BECHTEL, Clark County
CHIP CAMERON, NRC
ARNOLD (MOE) LEVIN, LSS Administrator, NRC
BRAD METTAM, Inyo County, California
LLOYD MITCHELL, NCAI
CLAUDIA NEWBURY, DOE
JAY SILBERG, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
HARRY SWAINSTON, State of Nevada
ENGELBRECHT VON TIESENHAUSEN, Clark County

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction by John Hoyle	3
Update on Congressional Activity	9
Status of Draft Initial NRC/DOE Memorandum of Understanding (NRC/DOE)	75
Report of Technical Working Group on Review of LSS Level II Requirements	112

1 MR. HOYLE: Okay, thank you. I didn't get an opportunity myself to
2 thank Mark Powless, the elder who spoke so sagely and challenging to us this
3 morning, but this is quite a start for a meeting, so let's get under way.

4 This is a meeting of the Licensing Support System Advisory Review
5 Panel, it's a Federal Advisory Committee. We're meeting under the Federal Advisory
6 Committee Act Provisions. The meeting was noticed in the Federal Register earlier
7 and members of the public are welcome.

8 We are very pleased to accept the kind invitation of the United
9 Nation put forth by Lloyd Mitchell who represents the National Congress of American
10 Indians, to conduct our meeting here in these beautiful facilities. We greatly
11 appreciate all the hospitality we're being shown, Lloyd. We were very honored last
12 evening at the reception with which Lloyd hosted and received several gifts from Lloyd
13 and from Loretta Metoxen, the Vice Chairman of the United Nation. I'm sure we will all
14 cherish these gifts, I know I will, along with lasting memories of our visit here.

15 Before asking Lloyd to tell us of events yet to come, I would like to
16 introduce those at the table today, as we usually do at our meetings. I think this time I
17 would like each of us to say on the record, not only what our name is and where we're
18 from, but what is our other life? What is our regular job, this is a part-time job being on
19 an Advisory Review Panel and I would like to hear for the record, just what the job is.
20 I'm going to start with Lloyd and go around this way. Lloyd?

21 MR. MITCHELL: Lloyd Mitchell, representing National Congress of
22 American Indians. I work here in Oneida and also attend school at Oregon State
23 University and commute back and forth. So, that's my other side and that's it.

24 MS. NEWBURY: I'm Claudia Newbury, the U.S. Department of
25 Energy Yucca Mountain Project. In addition to being the LSS person, I am the

1 technical data manager for the Yucca Mountain Project and act as liaison to the
2 Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. So, between the three jobs, I keep myself
3 busy.

4 MR. BECHTEL: My name is Dennis Bechtel, I'm the coordinator for
5 the Clark County Nevada Department of Conference and Planning and my civilian
6 duties are totally Yucca Mountain related.

7 MR. VONTIESENHAUSEN: I'm Engelbrecht VonTiesenhausen, I do
8 whatever Dennis tells me to do. I also work on the Yucca Mountain Program on the
9 technical issues.

10 MR. HOYLE: We welcome Engelbrecht who is replacing Roger
11 Hartwig, who had done a lot of hard work for us and for Dennis I'm sure. Welcome
12 Engelbrecht.

13 MR. SILBERG: I'm Jay Silberg with the Washington law firm of
14 Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge. I'm here representing the Nuclear Energy
15 Institute, the nuclear industry. My other life, I was going to say I don't have another
16 life. I practice nuclear law full time, representing nuclear utilities, nuclear vendors. We
17 also help out representing various governmental entities priveledged to be involved
18 with the State Department on North Korea Reactor projects, we help out -- labs on
19 license renewal, anything nuclear we do, but my real life really is raising three children
20 and a wife.

21 MR. SWAINSTON: My name is Harry Swainston, I'm a Deputy
22 Attorney General for the State of Nevada. I anticipate at some point in time, I'll be, if I
23 live long enough, I might have a chance to use some of the product that the LSS
24 system might generate.

25 MR. BALCOM: And your other life is laying it down?

1 MR. SWAINSTON: Yes, my other life.

2 MR. BALCOM: Kirk Balcom and I'm a consultant to the State of
3 Nevada and I'm actually in a career transition, so it looks like I'm going to have to
4 come out of the closet here. I worked 25 years on retrieval systems as a computer
5 person with a legal background and the recently have started working as a therapist in
6 a psychiatric hospital, believe it or not.

7 MR. SWAINSTON: Is there a connection?

8 MR. METTAM: My name is Brad Mettam, I'm with Inyo County of
9 California and one of the ten affected units of local government. I'm project
10 coordinator for the County's Yucca Mountain Depository Assessment Office.

11 MR. LEVIN: I'm Moe Levin from the Nuclear Regulatory
12 Commission, being a licensing support system administrator is a part-time job for me.
13 My full-time job is Deputy Director for IRM at NRC.

14 MR. CAMERON: I'm Chip Cameron, I'm from the NRC's office of
15 General Counsel and I provide legal counsel to Moe and John on the LSS and I'm also
16 a special counsel for public liaison in agreement state programs at the NRC and in the
17 role I design and implement public involvement programs in the commissions
18 regulatory activity.

19 MR. HOYLE: Thank you. My name is John Hoyle, I'm the Secretary
20 to the Commission, so being the Chairman of this panel is certainly a part-time job for
21 me. I assist the Commission in determining what should be on their agenda for
22 Commission meetings. Collect their votes and when they vote on decision papers and
23 prepare the decisions and issue those to the staff.

1 I appreciate hearing all this from all of you. I knew you all had other
2 lives and I knew a little bit about them myself, but I think I'm pleased we got that on the
3 record.

4 Advisory Committee members helping the Government Advisory
5 Committees are a great resource of talent and skill and knowledge, and I'm glad we're
6 able to tap those on this panel, for their knowledge and skill. I think at this point, I
7 would return to Lloyd to give us some more information, administrative housekeeping
8 information, so Lloyd, it's yours.

9 MR. MITCHELL: Thanks John. Well, basically just should have a
10 couple things that would have been given to you. One is a business card holder and
11 as Mark Powless, elder said, it's important for us to make contacts, so this is to use
12 with their compliments. If you don't have one we have more back here. Also, most of
13 you should have one of these types of notebooks, if you don't see me later and we'll
14 get you one.

15 Just two housekeeping notes is, because we didn't expect, perhaps
16 sometimes our restaurant next door gets busy during lunch, we do have other
17 restaurants here. If I have an idea of how many people want to attend lunch or go to
18 lunch at the restaurant next door, Shenandoah, then I can call it over and get an area
19 arranged. So right now if I could just have a show of hands of about how many people
20 are thinking about going to the Shenandoah, then that will help our end out a little bit.

21 MR. HOYLE: Well, what are our choices? Shenandoah or Three
22 Sisters?

23 MR. MITCHELL: There are 4 restaurants here, a couple snack bars,
24 a couple snack bars in the casino, there's Three Sisters which is around the corner
25 down here, which is more of a buffet type style, I think it's \$7.95. Right next door to

1 Shenandoah is, I think it's \$8.95 or something, \$8.99, whatever, and then around the
2 corner in the older type casino bingo hall is a restaurant, with like ala carte choice.
3 They range from \$1.00 to 3 or \$4.00, so.

4 MR. HOYLE: Okay.

5 MR. MITCHELL: Now I understand that we want to be, want to have
6 a fairly quick lunch.

7 MR. HOYLE: All right, I'm on the Shenandoah list.

8 MR. MITCHELL: Okay, great, thanks. And also a head count for
9 those you who might be interested in going on the tour this afternoon, about, we'll give
10 you a few minutes after the meeting to go change or whatever, get your cameras,
11 whatever, but we need to know how many so we can get the appropriate bus size.

12 MR. MITCHELL: Everybody. Okay, great.

13 MR. HOYLE: That would be about a 45 minute tour --

14 MR. MITCHELL: I would estimate it can be any length of time. As
15 you know, some of us might like to talk a lot so, it can be, if you want it 20 minutes, we
16 can give you a 20 minute one, 45 minutes, whatever you think would be appropriate at
17 the time, say 45 minutes if you think that would --

18 MR. HOYLE: How about 45 minutes?

19 MR. MITCHELL: And you might have to remind the driver that you
20 have to be back, so keep that in mind.

21 Other than that, that's just about all that I have. If anybody needs
22 anything, contact Jeff or Jake in the back, Jeff Smith and Jake Schmidt. That's it.

23 MR. HOYLE: Okay, thank you very much. The next item that I
24 would like to do is go over the meeting agenda very quickly with Moe and Claudia, to
25 see if the order of things is about right and if we can get this much done before lunch

1 and that much before supper and that sort of thing. So, are there any comments from

2 --

3 MS. NEWBURY: I think it's reasonable.

4 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Well, it's almost break time.

5 Let's start then. The first item that I have, my introduction is
6 completed so I'm going to turn to Fielden Dickerson to give us an update on the
7 Congressional activity back in Washington. Fielden?

8 MR. DICKERSON: I'm Fielden Dickerson with the management
9 operating contractor for DOE. And the members should have a handout of the
10 snapshot of the Congressional actions and there are many more over here along the
11 wall if you don't have one. At the May meeting in Washington, the panel requested to
12 give a summary of Congressional actions and I volunteered to do that and it's proved
13 to be a bit of a challenge.

14 One is, just the sheer volume of material, I'll try to get my arms
15 around it, and the other is somebody described something as hurting cats to me, and
16 this is much like that, in that it's very dynamic and is moving rapidly, so what I have is
17 put together a summary, called it a snapshot and it's a snapshot that's surfaced 10
18 days ago and I do not have detailed knowledge of these particular elements that go
19 into this and so you can ask questions very readily, if I can't answer, I'm hopeful that
20 there will be somebody in the audience here who can answer those first questions, so
21 please feel free to volunteer your views or comments and so forth.

22 And then what I've done is started out in giving you a list of what I
23 call the comprehensive proposals that are before Congress and I've identified four of
24 those and then I have another seven or eight of them that are limited purposes and I
25 just wanted to start out giving you a little bit of athumbnail sketch of each of those and

1 then in the later portion of this I have some comparisons of those comprehensive
2 ones. Again, a very much of a summary sort of thing.

3 The Johnston Bill directs the Secretary to construct and operate as
4 an interim storage facility and it has a, it mandates a license of 100 years renewal. In
5 terms of permanent storage, it directs the Yucca Mountain site characterization to be
6 carried on but it eliminates much of what was in the original Nuclear Waste Policy Act,
7 in terms of approval cycle and recommendations to the President to --

8 In terms of budget and funding, it specifies budget priorities as
9 follows: Highest priority is interim storage facility, next highest priority is railroad to the
10 interim storage facility and the lowest priority is the repository.

11 Now the Upton Bill 1020, is one that a lot of attention's been paid to.
12 It obligates the DOE to, prevents acceptance of spent fuel and waste no later than
13 January 31, 1998 and it directs the Secretary to construct an interim storage facility in
14 area 25 with Nevada test site and in terms of permanent storage, directs the Secretary
15 to conduct site characterization activities, gets rid of Part 960 and it again, modifies
16 some of the steps in terms of the approval process.

17 The third one that I listed here, Common Sense Nuclear Waste
18 Disposal Act of 1995 is one that, it just hit the streets last week, and I have very limited
19 information on that. But it directs the Secretary of Energy shall accept, spent nuclear
20 fuel at high level radioactive waste beginning not later than January 31, 1998 and
21 directs the Secretary to design, construct and operate facilities for interim storage and
22 it directs that these be at Savannah River and the Hanford nuclear site.

23 Now I have no information from that one in terms of what was, what
24 it was proposing in terms of disposal, or any funding ramifications that were associated
25 with it. And then I had put in the one here that, the Domenici Bill is one that people

1 keep talking about is going to appear. This was a draft that was in May and again, it
2 starts out, and it says, accept fuel for interim storage in January 31, 1998, interim
3 storage at the Nevada test site. It has a 20 year license, rather than a 100 year
4 license. It disposes of the MPC and it calls upon the utilities to supply their own
5 transportation and containers and it has disposal continuing but there's no deadline
6 associated with the underground repository.

7 And in terms of it's funding priorities, it has storage facility first,
8 realigned to storage second, and repository third.

9 Now those are the major ones that I have listed here and then in
10 terms of limited purpose, I think there are seven of them listed and you can, on page 5
11 you can see this. The first one, the Independent Fuel Storage Act, provides for credits
12 against utility fee payments. Second one has to do with beginning waste acceptance
13 in January of 1998.

14 On the next page, Page 6, by the way Mr. Wellstone is from
15 Minnesota not Nevada, our error, it's a typo not an error I hope, prohibits use of any
16 nuclear power reactors until there's a licensed facility made permanent waste storage.
17 Then a nuclear waste independent review is just, review the nuclear waster policy and
18 report out in two years and nothing's to be licensed during that time period of the
19 study. This is, you know, these are very narrow statements having to do with the
20 action.

21 And finally on Page 7, again we have the Nuclear Waste Policy
22 Assessment Act, which is a study and it pushes the waste assessment deadline back
23 to 2003. Now each of this special bills also in some way, tend to address rate payers
24 and so on. The final one that I have listed there is just a parallel to the Record
25 Consumers Environmental Protection Act that you've already seen.

1 Now, let me, this is, no, I guess this is the final one over on Page 8.
2 Specified amounts of proceeds from a sale of the U.S. Richmond Corporation for the
3 nuclear waste company to have.

4 And then a comparison that's going on starting on Page 9, lists the
5 Johnston Bill, the Upton one and the draft for Domenici, it has the House concurrent
6 resolution. Now, last Thursday there was a joint concurrent resolution passed and I
7 have been running the traps trying to find out what that said about this program. My
8 understanding is that joint resolution was silent on this program. So, but this has in the
9 House resolution, language that was clearly overtaken by the committee, reconciliation
10 between the House and the Senate, but it did not show up in the joint resolution. I left
11 it in here so that we can at least look at the comparison of it.

12 So I'd like to compare five elements for these things. I'd like to
13 compare waste acceptance, interim storage, geological disposal, MPC, multi purpose
14 canister, and finally financing.

15 And the first one on Page 10, you see the waste acceptance
16 statement, NWPA, accept waste expeditiously that due by 1/31/98, has been the
17 evolved date that came out of that. Johnston Bill says as early as practicable and then
18 we get into the Upton Bill, we have January '98. Domenici also has that and the big
19 issue in terms of this original House resolution, remember it's overtaken, was primarily
20 a scheduled issue but it's beginning in 1998, but that was all happening for waste
21 acceptance.

22 So what we're seeing there is a lot of push for waste acceptance in
23 January of '98.

24 Now federal interim storage, you all recall the NWPA having a sort of
25 interlock language between the MRS and the repository and the issues that go on from

1 time to time in terms of that interlocking. What we're seeing in terms of these other
2 bills, is a breaking of that interlocking and they're simply calling up the fact of doing
3 these things and doing them quickly.

4 Where it says under the Johnston Bill, Yucca Mountain site and
5 railroad withdrawn from waste management purposes, everything's withdrawn from
6 public plans from the Bureau of Land Management. And the rest of it is just very brief
7 thumbnail sketch of what's being said there, interim storage is showing up.

8 Geological disposal on page 12 -- yes, sir?

9 MR. BECHTEL: I have a draft of what I thought was Domenici's Bill,
10 I don't know what the date is but it had a blank for a site.

11 MR. DICKERSON: I'm sorry, say again?

12 MR. BECHTEL: It didn't specify any site. I don't know if that's, I just
13 got it after, you know, when Mirkowski had made statement about --

14 MR. DICKERSON: I don't know, Dennis, whether's there more than
15 one site or more than one draft floating around or not, because this is a summary I
16 pulled down and so it may very well be either in error or been overtaken. Clearly, this
17 is all dynamic and it's moving.

18 Page 12 spells out geological disposal and the thing that I'd like to
19 bring to your attention is that disposal's required under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act
20 and it's required under the Upton Bill, but under Johnston and Domenici it's not
21 explicitly required and the site characterization is going on but there isn't a then move
22 on and do disposal sort of thing.

23 And under the, that House resolution that originally was floated, that
24 was the one that discontinued the disposal activities with Yucca Mountain totally. Then
25 on Page 13 you are seeing the MPC action and Domenici as I indicated to you, was

1 the utilities will procure certified storage and transportation systems as contrasted to
2 the Upton Bill, where DOE will provide multi purpose canisters. And under the original
3 House resolution, all of that was canceled and the utilities were responsible for doing
4 this themselves.

5 Now, I have a final page there, something on financing of
6 management and you know, from the program perspective, clearly the original House
7 resolution got everyone's attention with the \$130,000,000 for the program. As I've
8 indicated to you, my belief is that the joint resolution that we're seeing now is silent.
9 You see funding priorities associated there and you see some of these bills play
10 games in terms of doing away with the funding for the utilities and making this a
11 funding from general revenues.

12 Now, I have some view graphs I wanted to show us, simply that I
13 thought sort of tied some of this together. Can we just show this against this wall?

14 It always pays to read the Washington Post, given in May it posed a
15 very nice little summary of the congressional budget process and time line and I guess
16 simply couldn't capture it all, but I wanted to go through it in pieces. And one of the
17 things that I had started out trying to understand, is how these resolutions fed into the
18 funding bills and what my understanding has become as I talked to people, is that as
19 we see these resolutions appear, it's really Congress's way of talking to itself in that
20 Congress is saying, this a philosophy that we're setting up, this is a method to scheme
21 up for operation and we're going to use these constraints or this overall structure in
22 terms of doing anything.

23 But in no way are they passing a law. Now, this started out, I have
24 just taken the Washington Post and plagiarized from it and it gives a time line in that
25 February the President's sent his budget for '96 to the Congress. Then we have the

1 House and the Senate acting in terms of budget resolutions and they separately
2 generated resolutions. And they went into conference committee, that committee
3 reported out and we saw votes then occurring in terms of those things. And we wound
4 up down here where the current resolution from the Congress, that was last Thursday.

5 Now, not statutory, not signed by the President, the Congress is
6 simply saying this is the way we intend to do business in terms of our overall funding
7 and they're now going to turn back to their normal process of doing this and they're
8 normal process is turning back to their appropriations committees and so I out of those
9 appropriations committees, we're going to see 13 Bills coming out of the House and 13
10 Bills coming out of the Senate. We're going to see 13 conference committees going
11 on and we're ultimately going to wind up with some sort of 13 Bills for appropriations.

12 Parallel, the authorizing committees are doing resolution, all of these
13 people are building off of a congressional resolution of -- so we get down here, the
14 President had an opportunity to veto these 13 Bills or not. We have reconciliation
15 between authorization and appropriations, two Houses have voted again, the President
16 has another shot at it.

17 Now, in terms of the time associated with this, right about here is
18 where September starts, so that according to the Washington Post at least, they
19 believe that even in September, all of this is going to come to a close in terms of what
20 we might expect relative to program and dollars and impact and so on. That's what
21 I've got, John.

22 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Any comment on?

23 MR. SILBERG: I have a question. The Department I know is talking
24 about drafting it's own legislative proposal and I'm wondering whether anybody here
25 has any clue as to what the status of that is or what it might affect?

1 MS. NEWBURY: Actually, no, I don't, have a clue. I've heard
2 something about DOE putting something together but I have not seen it.

3 MR. SILBERG: Well, I have told that they were operating on a June
4 30 goal or deadline, according to -- Congress is in recess now.

5 MS. NEWBURY: Right.

6 MR. HOYLE: Okay, thank you Fielden. The next item on our
7 schedule is LSS Administrator's Activity Report, so let me turn to Moe Levin.

8 MR. LEVIN: Not that we know exactly what Congress is going to do,
9 I guess we can go ahead and make any plans for the LSS. But, the first thing I want to
10 report on is the activities of the LSS senior management team and one of the first
11 things we were supposed to do was take a fresh look at the LSS or revalidate its
12 objective and revalidate whether we were on the right path.

13 And along the way as part of the discussions in doing this, one point
14 was brought up that we're just starting to look at internally. And that is that, when the
15 LSS was first proposed back in 1988 or 1989, the computer industry was a lot
16 different, things were different then. Computers were not as presage, everybody didn't
17 have one. With the advent of less expensive systems, micro computers and
18 everything, now it seems like everybody has computers, it's a way of life, it's a way of
19 doing business, you can't survive without it.

20 The feeling is that if we were just starting to look at the LSS right
21 now, if we were just starting, if this were 1988 right now, we might be looking at things
22 a little differently. Do we need one big system to do the LSS or is it possible that
23 everybody would have their own systems now, given the technology and the data
24 would be that maybe we could tap into different systems.

1 This is something we were just starting to look at but as a part of this
2 review in which culminated in a commission paper, that the MSP sent to the NRC
3 commission, we didn't take into account any of those kind of factors, we also didn't
4 take into account or try to take into account, anything that Congress may or may not
5 be doing. We just looked at the situation as we knew it, right now, the givens not the
6 maybes.

7 I think everybody on the panel has sent an advanced copy of the
8 paper, correct, the commission paper. The title of the paper was the Licensing
9 Support System Senior Management Team Recommendations on direction of the
10 licensing support system. I'm not going to go into the paper in detail, I just wanted to
11 kind of get some of the highlights of it.

12 The first thing we did in the paper was to review their original
13 objectives of the LSS as we understood them. And that came down to basically three
14 primary objectives. The first objective was to provide for an efficient hearing
15 schedule. The second objective was to provide for a timely and thorough licensing
16 review. And the third objective was to provide for a single non duplicated and timely
17 source of data for all parties to access. Those are what we saw as the three original
18 objectives, primary original objectives of the LSS.

19 Then we looked at current factors that may affect the objectives,
20 current factors that we know. The DOE knew high level waste program approach.
21 The impact of this would be that the LSS would have to be maintained over a longer
22 period of time and might have to handle smaller views of data at any given time,
23 because they're now being spread out over more years and we've given an even
24 smaller chunks and a flow.

1 Another factor is the one we've talked about before which is the
2 institutional history decision documentation issue and that was an issue of, there was
3 an assumption when I guess, when the LSS was first proposed. That is part of the
4 LSS, there would be things built into the LSS that would capture how, the steps that
5 led up to making any particular decision, you'd be able to go to the LSS and file those
6 steps.

7 Now, there's not a question of whether of that actually is embodied in
8 the LSS, and if there aren't other mechanisms to do this, it may mean that we will have
9 to spend a greater effort during the hearing process, to reconstruct what actually led
10 up to the decision.

11 The third thing that may affect the objectives, was the sure volume
12 and amount of data that is now projected to be under the LSS. And the impact of this
13 would be that the more documents in the system, the bigger the system, the more
14 expensive the system, and there's a question of is it going to be hard to zero in on any
15 particular document that somebody may be looking for will be harder to find, to do
16 searches on such a large database.

17 So, looking at all that we came up with some conclusions. I don't
18 think any of these are necessarily earth shaking or surprises. Conclusions were that
19 the NRC and their licensing support system, administrate a need to provide stronger
20 direction for the LSS, along with commission level interactions with the DOE and this is
21 basically in line with the NRC/IG -- through the LSS recommendation.

22 We concluded that it's important that DOE establish a position whose
23 primary responsibility is to focus on the LSS, somebody to make sure that everything is
24 moving on schedule, whose primary responsibility is in fact to worry about the LSS.
25 Another conclusion was that we have to lock down the agreements between NRC and

1 DOE for whose responsible for what and that we should do this via memorandums of
2 understanding.

3 We should also aggressively attempt to reduce the number of
4 documents in LSS, by looking at relevancy criteria, working with DOE to figure out how
5 we can limit the amount of documents or minimize the number of documents.

6 We should also establish controls to ensure that this decision making
7 process is captured and available for people when they need to reconstruct how a
8 decision was made.

9 And the final conclusion was that we should start a pilot project. I
10 wish Mal was here so he could applaud this. We concluded that we should do a pilot
11 and the pilot is to focus not on piloting the hardware and software of the system, which
12 we think would be almost impossible to do now, given the track that DOE is on for
13 procurement or in the making versus by decisions of the LSS. We just don't have the
14 time or ability to prototype or to pilot our software. But the pilot will focus more
15 procedural type things, things we might learn by using an LSS like resource and the
16 types of things we might learn are the usability. How usable is such a concept, I
17 mean, would it really facilitate things? What are the benefits of having a system, a
18 shared system, where everybody is accessing the same data at the same time?

19 We might get some insight into the costs of the LSS, by doing some
20 kind of a piloting. We will also might be able to flush out this issue of how we can, how
21 easily it will be for us to reconstruct the decision making process. And the last thing
22 we might be able to learn from a pilot is, ways to reduce the number of documents in
23 the system.

24 Based on those conclusions, we may have recommendations to the
25 commission and these recommendations are basically a locked step with the

1 conclusions, they are that we should, the commission should oversee and continue to
2 meet with daily on LSS activities, should encourage daily to appoint an LSS project
3 manager whose primary responsibility is the LSS. The commission should endorse
4 the development of the MOUs between NRC and DOE. That the commission needs to
5 support the senior, the LSS senior management team efforts to ensure that the LSS
6 meets the needs of trial lawyers and that the commission should support the
7 development of a pilot project for the LSS.

8 And the SNT in the paper committed to the commission to develop
9 and submit a scoping plan, kind of an outline of what the pilot would be, how we would
10 conduct it and the particulars of the pilot. We would have that by September of this
11 year.

12 The commission response to the paper was basically none of the
13 commissioners had any objections. Two commissioners, Commissioner Solomon and
14 Commissioner Jackson had some comments. Commissioner Solomon's comments
15 were that the SNT should report to the commission prior to finalizing the MOUs or
16 preceding with the pilot or making final decisions on document inclusion criteria. And
17 also Chairman Solomon recommended that we revise Recommendation 5 that said
18 that the LSS should support the needs of the trial lawyers, to also include that the LSS
19 should support the needs of the technical review, so that was a minor editorial change.

20 Commissioner Jackson's only comment was that this was all fine, but
21 of course we have to look at what Congress is going to do and all our plans and all our
22 recommendations would have to be reviewed whenever it becomes known what
23 Congress is going to do.

24 Those are the highlights of the papers, are there any questions on
25 the paper, any comments?

1 MR. HOYLE: Let me make a comment, not really on the papers, as
2 you probably know, Chairman Solomon completed the portion of his term that he
3 wanted to complete on the 2nd of, the 1st of July and as of now, Commissioner,
4 former Commissioner Jackson, is now the Chairman. And we have only one other
5 Commissioner aboard right now, and that's Commissioner Rogers.

6 So, the commission is operating under a delegation authority which
7 was actually made a year ago when we had four commissioners including
8 Commissioner Redmon which delegates authority under the reorganization plan
9 number one of 1980, from the commission to the Chairman. So the Chairman has all
10 the authority of the commission right now, and that's Chairman Jackson and she needs
11 to consult with Commissioner Rogers before taking any action.

12 So that's the mode we're in, we're expecting to hear nominations at
13 any time and go on from there. But we haven't turned out the lights or anything like
14 that at the NRC. We're operating with -- commissioners.

15 MR. METTAM: Two quick questions on the report and if I'm getting
16 too detailed into it, let me know and I'll refer these to another time.

17 One of this, in the discussion of the -- of the system, it describes a
18 situation where LSS users could be easily kept abreast of newly available material
19 provided to the database. But I don't see that in any of the functional part of
20 instructions I was reviewing currently for this. Is that something that we should, that
21 should be considered as a functional requirement?

22 MR. HOYLE: Moe?

23 MR. LEVIN: Yeah, I'm trying to remember. Did we have something
24 in the Level 1 or Level 2 functional requirement, something about when somebody

1 signs on to the LSS or they could do a query to find new added material? I thought
2 there was some kind of a functional requirement.

3 MR. METTAM: I may have missed it, but I didn't see it.

4 MR. LEVIN: Preston?

5 MR. JUNKIN: Not explicitly -- there is also a timing stream
6 requirement that explicitly states that at any of the LSS locations, that newly added
7 material in the system will be available to all users within 24 hours.

8 MR. CAMERON: Is there a broad enough functional requirement in
9 there that would deal with, this is an aid to users and there's a whole lot of things, I
10 don't know if they fall under the gewy acronym or not, but there much be a whole
11 bunch of those things that you might not see as a specific functional requirement, but
12 might fall, or a specific detail requirement, but might fall a broad functional
13 requirement?

14 MR. JUNKIN: I'm not sure I quite understood.

15 MR. CAMERON: Well what I'm saying is, is that the functional, you
16 may not see that detailed of a requirement in the functional requirements because it
17 would be broadly stated and it there would be a whole lot of system design items that
18 could be filled in under that.

19 MR. JUNKIN: Yeah, absolutely. The basic functional requirements
20 document is intended to be a requirements document not a design document and
21 there are certainly details that are worked out with the design that will not be captured
22 there. We have to try very hard not to make the design document because that would
23 ultimately strain the options for procurement that deal with that. Going back to the
24 original question, there certainly is as specified now we either could -- the system for --

25 MR. METTAM: Okay, so there's a way to do that?

1 MR. BALCOM: It's, we'll get to this later, the level three
2 requirements that --

3 MR. METTAM: There's no sense in getting into them, there's no
4 sense in getting into it now. One other quick --

5 MR. BALCOM: Let me just comment on Chip's question, because I
6 think when, just ask a question and you know, as you think of them and we'll try and
7 figure out whether they've been included in that. I'm going to guess that they have
8 been, you know, deals with the specifics and the group that, the technical working
9 group should be able to say, you know, yes or no on page such and such, it's covered.

10 MR. SILBERG: I have one question. One of the major special
11 discussion forms on the second page of this meeting, control the numbers of
12 documents. When I think back to the early discussions on how many documents we
13 were talking about in the system, I don't remember those numbers were substantially
14 less than the numbers you're now talking about. In fact, I think they were certainly
15 higher.

16 And given there are great improvements in computer technology
17 over that period of time and a decrease in cost of memory, why is it so important that
18 we worry about reducing the number of documents when the technology should allow
19 us the ability to increase the number of documents at a lower cost?

20 MR. HOYLE: I think we need a technical response to that.

21 MR. LEVIN: Well I think it's not so much a technical response --

22 MR. HOYLE: Well I think of it as time to search. Even though
23 technology is advancing very quickly, but isn't there still a point in which too much
24 information in the system will bog it down?

1 MR. LEVIN: It's a cost trade off, I mean, certainly with enough
2 money, with the capability of computers now you could, virtually on a limited database,
3 research very quickly. You go to massively paralleled computers and a lot of memory
4 and there are a lot of techniques. But what it comes down to is really a cost issue, I
5 guess, more than anything else. Can we afford to create a system, is it worth creating
6 a system for that?

7 In other words, if we can cut the documents in half, then we could
8 get by with a lot of less expensive of a system design, is that worth doing? I think
9 that's the basic issue. It's not that the computer capability isn't there to be able to
10 handle it nowadays, because it is, it's cost.

11 MR. CAMERON: I think that the report is recommending that there
12 be a more systematic look at some of the trade offs between how easy it would be to
13 retrieve documents from a system of a certain size. Whether there would be any
14 substantial storage costs, weigh that against any new exclusion criteria that might be
15 hard to administer, as we discussed at the last meeting and I don't that there's been
16 any conclusion at the commission on this, but I think that what was recommended in
17 the paper, is that there be a systematic study that examines these specific issues and
18 that the recommendation be made on that and that the advisory review panel weigh in
19 with what their feelings are.

20 It may be that the panel's recommendation is that the cost savings or
21 the increase in retrieval or a never no mind, that no, we shouldn't worry about trying to
22 establish additional exclusionary category.

23 MR. METTAM: Just one other, well, I guess in response to that, give
24 it one other point. I think that the whole discussion of document inclusion, raised its
25 ugly head again when we basically made the comment that it's cheaper to put them all

1 in the system, then to try to decide which ones are relevant or not. That's what the
2 concern was, was that the system would just normally, a mass of documents, which
3 may or may not be relevant, because it was easier to do that than to have somebody
4 decide which was were and which ones weren't, that's why we should readdress the
5 categorical exclusions than to narrow the number down.

6 My other question on the paper, is that there's a comment on the
7 pilot project, that says the developing pilot program will not affect DOE procurement
8 schedule, functional requirements, or acquisition specifications and I'm not certain that
9 there's not some benefit to being able to adjust functional requirements as we do a
10 pilot project. It seems to me to be part of the plan of doing a pilot project is to say, gee
11 here's something that the system really needs to do that we didn't think of when we
12 were doing it in theory, when we were sort of theorizing what the system should look
13 like.

14 But when in practice we worked the system in the pilot and say, you
15 know, it has to do this if it's really going to be effective, well that's going to change
16 some functional requirement or I think it has to.

17 MR. LEVIN: Yeah, I agree with that. The point there is that, if
18 anything comes up as a result of the pilot, that would affect it, that is really a major
19 requirement, functional requirement, we'd have to look to see if we can incorporate it in
20 the LSS.

21 However, for making plans for schedules and everything, we don't
22 want to wait for the pilot.

23 MR. METTAM: Agree.

24 MR. LEVIN: And whenever a new functional requirement may be
25 proposed or may be apparent, we're going to have to look at that and see what impact

1 it would have on the cost, the schedule and everything else for the LSS. It's not, I
2 don't think that we would intend to ignore anything that came up as a result of the pilot
3 but it wouldn't be an automatic, automatically adopted functional requirement, we'd
4 have to look at it.

5 MR. METTAM: Okay.

6 MR. LEVIN: Is anybody who is involved with this --

7 MS. NEWBURY: I have another question for you. Originally, or at
8 the last meeting, you had been talking about TDOCS as a pilot, but it's not mentioned
9 specifically. I wondered where you're going with that if anywhere, and how it fits in with
10 the pilot program.

11 MR. LEVIN: Okay, what is that on the, well, that's the next thing. I
12 can go right into the pilot right now then, if there aren't any more non-pilot questions.
13 Dennis?

14 MR. BECHTEL: I thought that the paper made a very eloquent case
15 for, you know, institutional history and you know, not turning loose, especially if this
16 repository opening date proceeds too far in the future, and in your conclusions you
17 noted that potential loss for -- institutional history could be potentially fatal to the review
18 process, yet there's really nothing in the recommendations that captures that and, that
19 I saw, and I think that is a very good point and I wonder if the NRC recommendations
20 has done all -- to entertain that institutional history?

21 MR. LEVIN: You're right, it isn't explicitly in there. It's a good point.

22 MS. NEWBURY: But you know, we've often talked about the fact
23 that that's almost independent of the LSS, that as we're putting together the
24 administrative record for any decision process, whether we have an LSS or not, it
25 should be adequately captured. So I think that that's really a question that's

1 independent of how you develop an LSS, it's how you put together your records for the
2 system.

3 MR. BECHTEL: I think the thing that struck me was yeah, the part
4 about the administrative reference or --I wasn't real sure of the text or how you were
5 going to do that, I mean, whether it's part of the LSS, and I'm sure it is, but, you know.

6 MR. LEVIN: There may be an adjunct to the LSS, the administrative
7 records.

8 MR. BECHTEL: That seems to be important if you --

9 MS. NEWBURY: When we talk after the break, I've got an example
10 of how we're going to put together a package that would show him what will be in it
11 and how you can use that so that it's not an issue of how I search an LSS, but that I've
12 put together in my record package properly, that it includes everything you need to
13 know about that particular issue and how the question was addressed.

14 MR. LEVIN: And although we didn't expressly make it a
15 recommendation in the paper, the SNT is planning to follow up on this. One of things
16 we're trying to schedule is a visit to DOE facilities in Dunloring, the records center
17 there and in Las Vegas, the senior management team is going to visit in the near
18 future, to actually go in and look at some of the documents and pick out the
19 documents and see how easily it would be to reconstruct how the decision that the
20 document portrays was developed and also to look at the documents and see if, how
21 the relevancy criteria would be applied against them and see how many documents
22 would be included and excluded. So we are actively following up on that, we just didn't
23 put it in the recommendation.

24 MR. CAMERON: And I think that part of the idea behind the pilot is
25 to perhaps test out how the institutional memory aspect could be better built in or could

1 be supplemented and also test out what the, whether it might give you any ideas for
2 some new exclusionary criteria, making a distinction perhaps between the broad
3 relevancy term that's used in discovery and might universe the documents that are,
4 these are really the important documents that people are going to want to be using.

5 But I think that the pilot is supposed to give us a test of that.

6 MR. BECHTEL: I think the intent is good, I think you need to make a
7 statement that kind of memorialized that in some way.

8 MS. NEWBURY: That raises an interesting follow up question
9 though, in terms of the increase and exclusion and the senior management team
10 review. Are we going to see some more inclusion exclusion criteria or proposed
11 criteria after the senior management team reviews the daily records?

12 MR. LEVIN: That's possible, like I say, we, that's one of the things
13 we're just going to start looking at and see if we can develop some. That is a
14 possibility that we have.

15 MS. NEWBURY: And then they'd come back to the LSSARP --

16 MR. LEVIN: Sure.

17 MS. NEWBURY: -- with the recommendations because --

18 MR. LEVIN: Absolutely, absolutely.

19 MR. SWAINSTON: Will this committee have any input as to pilot
20 program, as to the subject matter?

21 MR. LEVIN: Let me describe, let me describe as, of our thinking on
22 that today and then we can talk about that after I describe it, if you still have the
23 question.

24 Are there any more questions on the paper?

1 MR. BALCOM: I have one, the senior management is you and Bill
2 Olmstead and?

3 MR. LEVIN: Mel Knapp.

4 MR. BECHTEL: This sort of relates to your follow up topic but I'm
5 not an attorney, so why did you select the analysis that meets the needs of a trial
6 attorney?

7 MR. LEVIN: Well, let me talk to my attorney.

8 (Laughter.) I'm not an attorney.

9 MR. CAMERON: I think that the commission gave us a good
10 reminder of the fact that whatever the distinction is between the needs of the trial
11 attorney and the needs of the technical reviewer in terms of using a full text system,
12 but it's not just a system that is for the litigation attorneys, but it's a system so that the
13 technical and policy people of the parties can also do their work.

14 I might ask Jay, if he sees any significant differences between what
15 capabilities a litigation attorney might want to see in the system versus a technical
16 reviewer. In other words, can the same system, an interface, satisfy and documents
17 that are included satisfy everybody or are there different requirements involved.

18 I think the commission reminded us that, you know, we're not just
19 looking at this from the trial attorney's standpoint, but from the technical reviewer's
20 standpoint. I can't answer why the senior management team chose to focus on the
21 trial attorney aspect.

22 MR. LEVIN: You throwing that back to me?

23 MR. CAMERON: I'll just look at you.

24 MR. HOYLE: Maybe the attorney of the SMT influences.

1 MR. LEVIN: Might have something to do with it. I though you spoke
2 as the representative of the attorney on the SMT.

3 MR. CAMERON: Since he's not here, I guess I can say that I did. I
4 think maybe the important point is that, if, can we identify any differences in the needs
5 of the trial attorney versus the technical reviewer in the design of the system? Or can
6 it be basically the same design satisfying the needs of both of those people?

7 MR. SILBERG: My guess is that the needs for both of them must
8 change over time. For instance the needs of the system attorney hearing the case,
9 may be different than it is during the review case. During the hearing case things are
10 likely to be happening in a real time. If you're actually in a hearing, you want to be able
11 to punch up something while the guy's on the stand and you're response time is
12 maybe, they need to be much faster then if you're sitting back in your office writing a
13 report over a lengthy period of time. You may not need a lot of the extraordinary
14 response time capabilities during a review process. I'm not sure that that's a
15 difference between the needs of the reviewer and lawyer, more so it's the needs at
16 different phases of the program.

17 One of the things for instance, I noticed when we were talking about
18 24 hour access of the document in the system, during a hearing you may need that
19 document much quicker than 24 hours. Prior, during the review process, you might be
20 able to have a much slower time for the document to get into the system. So I can see
21 that the capabilities might need to change over time, but you can't do that, and maybe
22 you have to take a compromise middle capability that all the, not quite as much as we
23 really would like in a hearing case, but more than we need during a review case, and
24 that's just a technical issue as to whether you can put that on a greater capability or on

1 some later stage in the process and when we're starting up the system, we can make
2 do with a lot slower system that we could do later on.

3 MS. NEWBURY: Also, I might point out that a technical review is
4 going on now. There is an interactive relationship between the DOE and NRC and
5 NRC is proposing vertical slices to look at the technical program, they're involved in the
6 technical reviews of the design process. So most of those people are going to be
7 intimately familiar with the program, they're not going to using the LSS as much in the
8 technical review areas as they would be during the licensing process with the licensing
9 process, the licensingpeople.

10 MR. HOYLE: Comment from Stan Echols.

11 MR. ECHOLS: Just to pick up on what Jay was saying, in the earlier
12 negotiated role making, and one thing that was brought out was that during the
13 hearing process itself, you need almost instantaneous access, for instance, the
14 transcript for that day's proceedings, to review that evening, you can't have 24 hour
15 access because you really do need it instantaneously.

16 The other was that if there were multiple users and the system
17 started getting jammed up, taking into technology at that time, everyone gets thrown
18 off the system with the lawyer taking priority because of the hearing.

19 The other is that about a year ago, what would seem to be more on
20 image, getting up a picture of the text as opposed to a full text capability and of course
21 the lawyers need the full text search, you don't need to page and try to hunt within the
22 page, where's that part that you're looking for or you pull up the document and you
23 say, well where is that document, the part that I'm looking for, the salient phrase. And
24 so things got shifted back a little bit. I think the emphasis going back to the full text
25 search, which is the more, the litigation tool than it might be the technical tool, since

1 the technical erson needs to find the document, the attorney might need to find a key
2 phrase within a rather large document and then went back to focus on full text search,
3 that became more heightened in the last year or so.

4 I think that might highlight the difference between the two on its use.
5 Because the lawyers going to have an awful lot of documents using key phrases to
6 hone in on what might be the salient part to build his case.

7 MR. CAMERON: There's a, I would ask Dan Graser or Ken Kalman
8 from the NRC, and also of course Moe, to provide some clarification on this, but this
9 recommendation Number 5, although it doesn't explicitly come out and say it, may tie
10 into Dennis's point also in that it may be a veiled way of talking about the institutional
11 memory component. In other words, what did the NRC or the DOE decision maker
12 have in mind when they made a particular decision? What was the basis for the
13 decision?

14 That's the only thing that I can figure out in regard to Number 5, but
15 I'm not positive about that.

16 MR. LEVIN: And I don't remember the conversations on that, Dan,
17 Ken, do you?

18 MR. KALMAN: -- with Bill Olmstead, his attitude was that the LSS
19 was a litigation support system and as for how that particular phrase had gotten into
20 the paper, once of the commissioners looked at this as a way out, only our technical
21 staff looked at this -- really something that's --

22 MR. GRASER: I'm Dan Graser, also I think one of things we were
23 looking at is that the response to the concern about preserving institutional history is
24 perhaps better served by getting a system up and one of the things that we recognized
25 was that, it was the 6 years stretched back and the 6 years stretched forward, we were

1 looking at that caused us to have a concern, in the fact that if we had had an LSS at
2 this point in time, the 12 year stretch would have been much less of an issue.

3 And if we had access to the licensing support system, and for
4 example, having access to a prototype to test whether or not the collection of records
5 is sufficient. You know, that whole issue there of getting the early prototype and some
6 early access and moving on and proceeding with building what the system would
7 address the concern about whether or not we are both losing the institutional history.

8 MR. CAMERON: So then indeed that recommendation 5 is tied to
9 the point of the institutional memory and the 12 year stretch problem that you
10 characterized.

11 MR. GRASER: I think it did, in an indirect way it answers the
12 question you asked.

13 MR. ECHOLS: It's a question a little bit of relevance, that's the
14 biggest part we tackled, for instance, it gives the institutional history on some of the
15 design. A meeting or two ago they were talking about shafts versus ramps and how
16 maybe that could be eliminated and then the State of Nevada indicated that there may
17 indeed be something relative in the old shaft information.

18 So that looked like a clear cut piece that might be discarded because
19 although it's part of the record, if you want to define the record, had it -- someone
20 wanted to move the shaft because there was a potential for flooding. Then there was
21 an outside review group that was very much a proponent of ramps. Upon a review
22 they went to ramp. The slope of the ramp changed because of the weight or the
23 potential weight of cast.

24 Ultimately you get to a design that the NRC has to say do I have
25 reasonable assurance that public health and safety is adequately protected if as built,

1 this thing was put into operation. Does the fact that the shaft at one point was moved
2 a little bit to avoid some flooding, really relevant as part of the institutional history of
3 how we got to where we are?

4 But that's part of what I guess you all will have to deal with on the
5 relevance issue. How much of this traditional history do you want? Where is this
6 relevance cut off to the final agency decision on the public health and safety finally.

7 MR. SILBERG: Well first is if you move the shaft or if you move the
8 ramp because, out of concern that there was a fault line running through there.

9 MR. ECHOLS: Exactly.

10 MR. SILBERG: It would still be quite relevant even though it has,
11 you know, you don't care where the ramp is at this point. I think it becomes a fairly
12 sophisticated analysis as to whether any particular collection of data is or isn't still
13 relevant and that may get back to the question of how much does it cost to go through
14 this relevance examination and are we really saving anything?

15 MR. ECHOLS: Now you're talking about throwing it all in.

16 MR. LEVIN: I understand, but we just want to reconstruct the logic
17 and revalidate it and look at it in contexts of cost.

18 One thing though about the response time issue, about the needs
19 varying, depending where we are in the process for response time. This is something
20 we discussed at the technical working group and if I remember correctly, we had
21 decided to ask the ARP for input on the response time issue. What's an appropriate
22 response time when.

23 So this is an issue that we still have to, we want to address here.
24 Isn't that correct, isn't that what we discussed?

1 MR. DICKERSON: That would be part of our presentation this
2 afternoon, is to address the answers.

3 MR. LEVIN: So we will get back to that. Anymore on the
4 commission paper?

5 One thing I do want to say very quickly, before we get into the pilot
6 project, in the pilot project we're a little behind schedule, did you want to take a break
7 and then get into pilot project or?

8 MR. DICKERSON: Is there interest in the panel to take a break at
9 this point?

10 MS. NEWBURY: That's fine.

11 MR. LEVIN: Let me just say very quickly then, the senior
12 management team, it has been decided that the senior management team will be in
13 place as long as there's an LSS to direct internal focus on the LSS within NRC and to
14 handle any issues that may come up.

15 One of the things, and I've kind of learned two hats when it comes to
16 LSS now, as the LSS administrator, it's my job to do whatever I can to make it happen,
17 to make sure we have an LSS on time, that everybody is following the rules, that it
18 fulfills the requirements, the functional requirements that have been laid down for the
19 LSS.

20 That's what I do as the LSS administrator. As a member of the LSS
21 management, senior management team however, one of the things we will continually
22 do is continually look at the assumptions that we made on the LSS to see if events and
23 things have changed the way we might be proceeding and so in effect, the SMT team
24 may be in a position to second guess some of the decisions that had been made
25 previously by the LSS administrator and others.

1 But the senior management team is going to be here as far we can
2 see.

3 MR. SILBERG: Job security.

4 MR. LEVIN: Well actually, that's also part-time too, I have three jobs
5 now and the others have multiple jobs, SNT is just one of those.

6 MR. HOYLE Well, let's take a break, 15 minutes please.

7 (Whereupon a short break was taken.)

8 MR. HOYLE: I'd like to get restarted please so, Moe why don't you
9 proceed?

10 MR. LEVIN: Okay, to give you a, I'd like to give you an update on
11 our thinking about the pilot project for the LSS.

12 Right now we're looking at using the license application for the multi
13 purpose canister as a vehicle for the pilot. Using an in house system in our office of
14 NMSS called TDOCS, as the electronic support system, kind of a mini LSS. The
15 concept we have, and we haven't totally flushed this out by any means, that's what we
16 plan to do next and the senior management team. And like I said before, we want to
17 have our initial plan together by September.

18 But the idea would be to use the MPC license application, to use
19 TDOCs as a, kind of an LSS, but the key thing would be that the license application for
20 the MPC would not hinge on the use of the TDOCS. We would use it as convenient,
21 we try to use it as much as possible, we would try to pilot some of the issues, some of
22 the procedures that we envisioned being used in the LSS.

23 But it would be kind of a, something that would facilitate the license
24 application, but would not hold the license application up or the license application

1 would in no way depend on the use of this system. We don't feel we can tie it to the
2 pilot.

3 Basically, that's as far as our thinking has gone on the pilot, except
4 one other thing. We wouldn't necessarily limit the pilot just to one thing. We want to
5 pilot a lot of different things. If there's some things that we can pilot using DOE's
6 currently available facilities, we'd do that. We don't have, we're not going, we don't
7 envision piloting everything in one, using one vehicle. We may use several different
8 vehicles, but pilot different facets of the LSS.

9 The only one that we kind of were concentrating on right now though,
10 is the MPC using TDOCS. And we are prepared to give a very very brief overview of
11 what TDOCs is, if you're interested.

12 MS. NEWBURY: I'd like to hear it.

13 MR. LEVIN: Okay. Ken Kalman is prepared to do that, I believe

14 MR. KALMAN: Basically, I'm going to make some available to you.

15 As far as using TDOCS, or looking for a cannister certification, but we are looking at
16 some of the applications with the, provide this type of access to archiving and editing
17 documents, but would give us the full text search and retrieval just what we're trying to
18 get with the LSS. We'd also have the ability to track issues and also to generate
19 status reports.

20 Right now we have some preliminary thinking on this and what we're
21 looking at is, without having to go into any sort of double shifts, we think they have the
22 capability to load somewhere between 3000 to 5000 pages per month. This is working
23 from hard copy. We have a grey scale scanner, which we see ourselves with that will
24 be used for loading documents and we also had a high resolution color scanner for
25 colored images.

1 Now again, I said 3000 to 5000 pages, that's working from hard
2 copy, but anything is provided in electronic form, of course that would go a lot quicker.

3 Now, you know, facing some of these preliminary assumptions, we
4 think that we would be able to get all the information loaded into the system within
5 about 6-8 weeks. And right now, we've been having a little bit of difficulty with
6 procuring software and setting up the fireball that we need to run the system between
7 the NRC Headquarters and the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis in San
8 Antonio, Texas. And all of that stuff is getting pretty well ironed out as we speak. We
9 expect that by August, by mid August of this year, the system will be up and running.
10 So, at best, figure the system will be up and running by mid August and then if we
11 were to start immediately loading MPC, you know, another 6-8 weeks after that, we
12 have your MPC ready to go.

13 And another spot I wanted to show you is this one here is, we keep
14 talking about TDOCS and eventually you're probably going to hear some talk about
15 CDOCS. So that's just why I'm giving you, you know, just a quick overview of what
16 that's all about.

17 Originally we had two systems, the first was TDOCS, which was the
18 technical reference document system and at the present that incorporates some
19 hydrology technical document database and NIST materials and technical document
20 database. Then we have another system called the repository program database and
21 the open item tracking system. What that contains is, we've got our license application
22 review plans. Back when NRC reviewed DOE's site characterization plan and the site
23 character analysis, site characterization analysis the NRC did, they identified to us
24 200 issues and comments that were waiting for DOE to resolve, so those are all being
25 tracked in the open end tracking system.

1 In addition to that, as we review study plans the DOE produces,
2 we've also come up with other open items, so these are all, I guess, tracked in the
3 open on tracking system portion of the system.

4 Now as to what's come up more recently, is the idea of consolidating
5 TDOCS and RPD points, into the consolidated technical document system and their
6 rationale for doing that is it would create a greater efficiency in managing and
7 maintaining the system. It would allow users to search across a broad range of both
8 technical and regulatory documents and you know, to make the system a little bit more
9 efficient for the users, that there would be user defined preferences, so that the users
10 would only get them access to the specific documents they really need or the specific
11 portions of the system that they need.

12 Over here, the key thing I wanted to bring out here was when this
13 system we will have -- capability, which, that's the one that impresses me the most, --
14 as using the TDOCS or consolidated document system, you know, if they see a
15 reference to a document, all they have to do is move the cursor around you know,
16 push it up and reference document pops up. So, that's one thing I'm particularly happy
17 about

18 And the last five that I wanted to get into and please don't ask me a
19 lot of questions about this, because I'm not all that well versed in the hardware. This is
20 just to give you a rough idea of what's in TDOCS right now as far as the program
21 architecture goes. And as far as the software portion what we're using right now, is
22 TOPIC software, which gives us the capability for indexing and search and retrieval.

23 We've got the Oracle software, which is the database itself, there's a
24 graphic user interface and then there's also been a lot of programming that the Center

1 for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis has been working on in the city to develop Mac
2 menus and screens to interface, you know, among all the software.

3 So that's really all I have to talk about right now. If there any
4 questions I'll try to answer them, if not, I can take notes and get them back to you.

5 MR. SILBERG: Is the system intended to be used only by NRC? In
6 this pilot program, who would get to use that system?

7 MR. KALMAN: Well, for the pilot program, that's something that we
8 probably have to discuss, on how you want to handle it. Right now, I think it would be
9 primarily for NRC.

10 MR. LEVIN: We did discuss the need for it truly to be a pilot
11 program, we'd have to allow some access from the outside and I think the discussion
12 was that we were going back to the Center for Nuclear Waste Research and ask them
13 what we can do to accommodate this.

14 But obviously for a pilot to be very productive, we'd have to have
15 access from outside.

16 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, and I think that that's true, that you would
17 want to have access by external parties. The question would come up, as it did
18 originally when we brought the pilot using the MPC before we focused on TDOCS, is
19 that how would you limit, who would you limit access to to the database and for a pilot
20 also to be worthwhile, particularly in terms of checking out procedures, should we limit
21 it to NRC documents? I mean, does that make any sense, as opposed to having a
22 pilot for LSS, which would be the documents of all of the participants and I think that
23 these, for an outline of the procedures that we're going to use for the pilot, I mean,
24 that's something that we have to develop and bring to the panel for a review. And

1 we're not, we're at the conceptual stage at this point, and we haven't really developed
2 any of the procedures. And I take it Ken, that the MPC would be like one library --

3 MR. KALMAN: Right.

4 MR. CAMERON: -- in TDOCS and there would be a hell of a lot of
5 other material on other issues on there and would people have access, or in other
6 words, or we going to open up access to all that, everybody or just the MPCs?

7 MR. KALMAN: Yeah, because right now TDOCS was conceived not
8 specifically for and not always successfully -- documents as well, so, you know, once
9 we have TDOCS in place then we can put other subject matter into it.

10 MR. HOYLE: Ken, is there image in the system as well or is it just a,
11 there is image as well?

12 MR. KALMAN: Yes.

13 MR. BALCOM: Would the headers conform to LSS?

14 MR. KALMAN: They're not the same, but it would be a fairly easy
15 matter to convert them over -- programming could do that.

16 MS. NEWBURY: My upper management would immediately ask if
17 you have all this, why are we developing an LSS?

18 MR. LEVIN: That's a question we've also asked ourselves, but
19 looking at the system as it stands right now it does not match the functional
20 requirement for LSS, that isn't to say that maybe it could be made a match, we don't
21 know, we haven't looked at it. Right now it would not support the LSS as it was
22 originally designed.

23 MR. SILBERG: What are some of the quick differences?

24 MR. LEVIN: Dan, do you remember?

1 MR. GRASER: For example, the header structure in TDOCS is not
2 currently sense structured, although it could be made to structure. It does not currently
3 have a structure to support document record packages, with multiple documents as
4 part of the package.

5 That was one of the very first things that I looked at that caused a
6 little hiccup when I looked at the system. I haven't got a chance to explore other
7 technical aspects of the system in that much detail. That was one of the first things
8 that jumped out at me.

9 MR. LEVIN: I don't believe the facility is there for the controlled
10 receipt of information from external sources and the tracking of that and the response
11 to that.

12 MR. GRASER: EMAIL, electronic submission, that's another aspect
13 of that system although again, within a network environment you need to emulate that
14 capability. -- by establishing a Post Office box that would let you
15 put --

16 MR. LEVIN: There's also issues of scalability, we don't know, we
17 may scale very nicely up to the LSS volumes, we don't know because it wasn't scoped
18 out for those volumes. There's a lot of unknowns but, that might, I probably have said,
19 that's a question we've kind of asked ourselves too and the response right now was,
20 well there wasn't, the specifications were not, it wasn't specked to the LSS. That is
21 something we can look at.

22 MR. MITCHELL: Is there a document that lists the differences, the
23 main differences between TDOCS and LSS or can one be of one sheet, quick
24 reference sheet be made up.

1 MR. KALMAN: I could probably take care of that when we get back
2 to the office , right now we don't have anything like that.

3 MR. LEVIN: I think Ken, if you took the Level II functional
4 requirements and tried to match them against TDOCS design specifications, that
5 would end up developing your list.

6 MR. KALMAN: Okay.

7 MR. LEVIN: Stan?

8 MR. ECHOLS: One question, when you talked about the prototype
9 being for MPC certification, I think you said linking to the Center. So linking to the
10 Center, to address hardware software issues or if you're -- more sensitive role?

11 MR. KALMAN: Right now it's just the hardware software. The way
12 we have the system developed right now, is part of the system resides both at NRC
13 Headquarters and at the Center. The idea would be that the Center is going to be
14 doing actual loading on to the system, where as we'd be doing, you know, the retrieval,
15 so you don't want to have the line tied up.

16 MR. ECHOLS: Is that part of the MPC certification process?

17 MR. KALMAN: Right, no, I don't believe they are but as far as
18 loading software on to TDOCS, that they would come into play then.

19 MR. VONTIESENHAUSEN: And unless this is addressed more to
20 Moe, one major difference between TDOCS and the LSS is TDOCS has color
21 capability and the LSS as presently configured does not yet. Another issue if some of
22 these bills in Congress go through and the MPC becomes the thing of the past so to
23 speak, do you have any contingency plans for another reasonably major system you
24 could look at that to test this?

1 MR. LEVIN: At this point in time, no, that's something, that's a good
2 point, I'm glad you brought that up, we're going to have to look at that. That's a good
3 point.

4 MR. SWAINSTON: Can I interrupt at this point?

5 MR. LEVIN: Sure.

6 MR. SWAINSTON: Yeah, you know, in order to have a pilot program
7 that's dynamic and as meaningful to both participants in it. I think we need to have a
8 program that involves a real issue that involves Yucca Mountain. And there is one out
9 there and it's one that the DOE has taken a position on. That has to do with whether
10 these calcite silica deposits in the mountain and in trench 14 and every place else, are
11 caused by surface waters infiltrating down or by hydro thermally driven waters coming
12 up from underneath?

13 This is a very real, potentially significant issue, it's one that the State
14 of Nevada could participate in in a dynamic way where we could actually get some
15 advocacy and some real participation on.

16 You know, the MPC thing is kind of a ho hum non-issue like
17 Engelbrecht suggested that may go away all together. And I'm not even sure how
18 much participation the State or the local governments in Nevada or the Indian tribes or
19 anybody else could really provide for that type of a pilot project.

20 The one that I would suggest, I was suggesting, I think it is one
21 where we could have a meaningful pilot project and get some very robust participation.

22 MR. LEVIN: How can we go about that, exploring that idea, what
23 would be the best way?

24 MR. SWAINSTON: Well, the documentation I think for the most
25 part, is already out there. The Department of Energy has very substantial reports and

1 so forth and peer reviews and expert judgement an opinion that's supports their
2 decision for instance, to close the date of collection and analysis on just the one item
3 in Trench 14, calcite silica causes. They've got a whole database out there that
4 supposedly supports that. The State of Nevada has its own database.

5 The documents that would go into this pilot project, would have to do
6 with that particular issue. We could develop it from the, from the ground up but still
7 requiring the State to do a certification as a participant and to start loading whatever,
8 or providing them documents it intends to provide.

9 The DOE on the other hand, could come in as a participant and
10 unload whatever documents it intends to provide to this issue and everyone could start
11 using it.

12 MS. NEWBURY: What would be the outcome of that, would the
13 NRC be willing to make a finding on a topical report or what would be the, and you
14 would exercise a system in the MPC certification to certify an MPC, what would you get
15 out of this?

16 MR. SWAINSTON: Well, we could go so far as to have a mock trial.
17 You know, we could actually gather together and see how it works. Put on witnesses
18 and call up documents and, we wouldn't be, it wouldn't mean anything but for the pilot
19 project it's not supposed to.

20 Nevertheless, it's something that if we generated enough interest,
21 enough enthusiasm to provide some kind of a meaningful project.

22 MR. CAMERON: I think that Moe's question was how might we
23 arrive at a consensus of the panel, in terms of what the best issue or possible issues
24 would be and, which include a consideration of, as Claudia points out with the MPC,
25 there's a decision, a certification decision to be made.

1 It doesn't mean that you couldn't do something that was more open
2 than that or try to take an issue that had something other than a certification involved.
3 But we originally had gotten a proposal from a, I guess it was -- from, and I would be
4 interested in hearing what the other participants think about the MPC issue in response
5 to Harry's statement, that there might, there just might not be enough interest in it. Is
6 there any way that we can somewhere arrive at a possible slate of candidates for the
7 topic for recommendations to the NRC and to DOE on this?

8 MR. SILBERG: You said Mel had a recommendation?

9 MS. NEWBURY: Yes, that was the MPC.

10 MR. CAMERON: I have Mel's original letter with me, if people are
11 interested in seeing it.

12 MR. SILBERG: That was Mel Murphy?

13 MR. CAMERON: No, no, no, Mel Murphy.

14 MR. BALCOM: My recollection is that we did discuss that as in issue
15 and it didn't get very far on it.

16 MR. CAMERON: Because DOE and the NRC at the time, were not
17 very enthusiastic.

18 MS. NEWBURY: I think there were several reasons. One was, well,
19 DOE isn't certifying the MPC, the contractor is and the second one was, we were
20 looking at a system, a prototype LSS instead of TDOCS.

21 MR. CAMERON: One big issue.

22 MS. NEWBURY: So the timing issue was critical and the way you've
23 proposed using TDOCS for multiple purpose canister, I think is a good idea.

24 Harry, I'm concerned about spending a lot of money to go through an
25 exercise that doesn't come up with an answer and if we could tie an issue to a topical

1 report or an issue resolution report, or something where we get something out of it, I
2 would be much more amenable to something other than MPC, but if we're just going to
3 do this because we want to do it, I won't have the extra money.

4 MR. SILBERG: Well I could have a mock trial, sounds like fun for
5 the trial lawyers and, you know, certainly get a lot interest. The question is whether it
6 would be useful, you know, and it would probably be a way to prove out the system but
7 I think that would take on a life of its own and with it not being tied into the program, I
8 think a lot of people would say that that would be a diversion and reviewing tons that
9 are not really advancing the program, if simultaneously you can have a pilot project on
10 something that is a real issue, if there's a rule making out there or if there's a topical
11 report that's under review or the MPC certification.

12 I think all of those are good candidates, but it won't be perfect
13 because the MPC isn't going to have, --nor a topical report if there isn't a candidate like
14 that out there. I myself could not support a mock trial because I think it would involve a
15 lot of resources. It would tie up a lot of people and while it would be fun to do, I think it
16 would be a diversion from where the program is going.

17 There is a risk, that if you do MPCs that, in December when I think
18 that if Congress is going to act on the last day of the session, is my prediction of when
19 it will act, we may find all that work is gone for naught, and as we've talked about
20 privately, I don't think that we can go down the road assuming that Congress is going
21 to do anything in particular, because there's no way to predict what the outcome is
22 going to be. We have to make our best choice of what an appropriate decision or
23 system or process is on which to test this. And if Congress changes the ground rules,
24 changes the ground rules but let's make our own decision from a technical and a
25 practical standpoint as to will it be something that we could test this on?

1 MPCs and TDOCS, particularly if it's a system that's going to be
2 ready in a month, and could be up and running in three months, it's hard to beat that.

3 MR. BECHTEL: I do have, I think also, you know, part of the idea of
4 testing a pilot system is just to test the system, you know, it's independent of issue, but
5 not entirely if you get something out of it that's good but, just to be able to work the
6 system and to see what bugs you have.

7 So, I have some concern about MPC also because it may go all the
8 way, but maybe that's not important. Maybe it's just important to, just to follow an
9 issue through using a system, find out where the problems are.

10 MR. ECHOLS: Are you testing this independently of this program,
11 for instance, if anyone's coming in to certify a storage or classification test, nothing to
12 do with this program but it's your TDOC, how are you prototyping and testing and
13 validating your own system if there was no pilot program and you still want TDOCS,
14 right?

15 MR. LEVIN: Well TDOCS was, as my understanding is, is an
16 internal reference data base, I mean, it isn't tied procedurally to any kind of activity, I
17 don't think. So, I mean, the only thing we look at TDOCS is, does it perform the way it
18 was supposed to perform. It wasn't designed as part of any given process.

19 MR. ECHOLS: So you don't anticipate using it for other
20 applications.

21 MR. LEVIN: Oh, we might, I don't know, that's --

22 MR. KALMAN: It could be, you know, again, our initial need for
23 TDOCS was for our technical staff to be able to have ready access to technical
24 documents. And the, you know, the works primarily -- area but from the very

1 beginning the idea was if the system could be used for other areas as well, but
2 although not always, was one that was identified at that time.

3 MR. ECHOLS: That's purely internally as a resource more than NRC
4 as a contractor.

5 MR. LEVIN: Right.

6 MR. VONTIESENHAUSEN: The thing about that, I guess one thing
7 that would be nice, and I don't know if it can be arranged, if the participants would also
8 have access to the system, so we could also kind of decide what our needs are and
9 maybe find out that there's issues within the LSS that we haven't thought about and
10 then I have to agree with Dennis, I mean, if we look at the MPC even it does away, it
11 really doesn't matter, because we have exercised the system and we have better to
12 find our needs.

13 MR. LEVIN: Like I say, when we scoped this out, those are the types
14 of things we find to put in there, those needs, because, why without the participants
15 having access, the potential participants having access to the system, we're going to
16 get very minimal returns from the pilot and that will have to be a part of our criteria
17 when we scope this out.

18 MR. CAMERON: One of the things that this brings out, if we use
19 MPC and in fact it could be ready, loaded with the MPC documents in October, the, it
20 seems like the critical path item is to make the thrust to propose some decisions on
21 who's going to have access and how that access is going to occur and what
22 documents besides NRCs, are going to be in the system. Developing all those
23 procedures takes time. I mean, to me that seems to be the, perhaps the most difficult
24 issue that we have to address and I wondered if we, do we have a plan or a schedule
25 for doing all this at this point, so that we can get feedback from the panel.

1 MR. LEVIN: No, no, we don't have a schedule at this part in the
2 scoping like I said, but we plan to have them for September. I'm going to proposed
3 this and see how the panel feels about this. If you could have any comments, any
4 comments on how we might use TDOCS with an MPC, if you have any proposals for
5 other pilots that we might use, other issues, if you could go back, think about it, put
6 that in a proposal, put down your comments and send it to John for consolidation.

7 Within the next month, within July, so we can use it and when we
8 scope out our plans, that would be very very helpful and that might be the best way to
9 do it.

10 What do you think?

11 MR. SWAINSTON: Well, as long as we leave open the choice of a
12 pilot project. I think, I think the major goal here is or the most important aspect of the
13 pilot is participation. If we select an issue that, when the State of Nevada doesn't have
14 anything on the MPC, we can't participate in that. But what we do have is abundant
15 documents in other areas that would be tickled pink to --

16 MR. LEVIN: If you could make a proposal, can you think about it,
17 that would be the best way to do it because we, we're looking for any kind of info we
18 can get on this and we're asking for two things. Proposals on other topics and also
19 functional requirements of the pilot, you know, like access, participants and just
20 anything you can think of that would make this successful. Now's a good time to do it
21 because like I said, we haven't even put the first thing down on papers, as far as our
22 plans yet. And that's what we're going to tackle right after this meeting between now
23 and the 1st of September.

1 MR. SILBERG: How close would the functional requirements of
2 TDOCS come to the functional requirements of the LSS? What are the major
3 differences or distinctions?

4 MR. LEVIN: I think we're going to have to go back and look at that.
5 Like you said, we're look at the Level II functional requirements for the LSS and match
6 them with the design specs for TDOCS and see.

7 MR. SILBERG: This has been on the pilot projects and the systems
8 are so totally different.

9 MR. LEVIN: No, I suspect from my understanding of looking at
10 TDOCS, I suspect that, this is just my gut feeling, 75 percent.

11 MR. GRASER: And Jay, perhaps I can contribute that. If you look at
12 TDOCS for example, if you wanted to search header fields at the same time you are
13 looking for the occurrence of a term within the text, in TDOCS those are two separate
14 searches. In the LSS functionality, one of our functional statements is to be able to
15 look for elements, document date filed such and such a date, with the occurrence of a
16 term in the text.

17 Now, we wouldn't be able to test that particular functionality, which is
18 an LSS functionality, but you would still be able to construct two separate queries and
19 get the same results, find the same document with this date. It's just, it wouldn't be
20 fully smooth and integrated. But the basic functionality that we would want to test
21 would be there.

22 MR. ECHOLS: If you keep it simple and inexpensive, not complex
23 and not a mock trial and all the rest of the, one advantage I can see is that when
24 you're ready for a prototype of the use of the LSS, because everyone will be ramped

1 up and have skills that they can now apply, even though it is not one on one, so that
2 the productivity in testing out the LSS would be much higher.

3 And you don't need to get bogged down on a whole block of
4 prototyping for this system, because everyone's skills will be shorter.

5 The concern about the MPC, just looking at this from an edge in the
6 issue, as I understand it, because if there's a big protest, or there's a desire to keep
7 some of this information proprietary on the part of the vendor and so on, you might get
8 bogged down on a whole lot of issues that you don't want to get involved with until
9 there's an actual application in a year from now. So it may not in fact be timely, for
10 October's time frame, if you're going to be faced with a lot of challenges on the use of
11 vicinity, that information outside within our city.

12 MR. CAMERON: That's a good point to take a look at because that.

13 MR. LEVIN: Well, one point to keep in mind is we say that they will
14 be available in October. We don't have our plans yet. That isn't to say that the pilot
15 will start in October, okay, and maybe when we scope this all out and look at the
16 concerns like you just raised, we couldn't start in October, maybe we'd have to start
17 later.

18 MR. CAMERON: Do we still have either a DOE or an NRC schedule
19 on the NPC certification about when that was supposed to happen? I remember we
20 were working with the schedule when we originally started considering this and I
21 thought it was going to be sometime next year that DOE wanted the certification.

22 MS. NEWBURY: Yes, but I really don't know where that schedule is
23 at this point.

24 MR. KALMAN: I think I've got one in my briefcase.

1 MR. BALCOM: Did I hear you say that this wasn't as much to test
2 hardware and software as it was procedures?

3 MR. LEVIN: Procedures and concepts.

4 MR. BALCOM: I was thinking about the concept of having access to
5 something like the sample management facility, for example, one of those concepts
6 that we think will be very important at some point and I would encourage and we can
7 put this in our comments, something that embodies conduct, materials as well, and
8 includes that as an important concept and test, it seems to me, and package
9 relationships, for example, which you said you don't conceive as being part of the
10 TDOCS at this point, but could be written in or coded or something like that.

11 MR. LEVIN: Yeah, exactly. Those kind of comments and
12 everything. Those boggle issues and that's the kind of input we need.

13 MR. BALCOM: And I understand that you will have hyper-text link
14 and I think that when people experience that they'll say that's great, and that is not, at
15 this point, part of the LSS design requirements.

16 MR. LEVIN: Are you talking about maybe
17 hyper-text link to put together a records package?

18 MR. LEVIN: Well, whatever.

19 MR. BALCOM: We don't have that design now.

20 MR. LEVIN: I think the users are going to say, well, that's terrific.
21 This is exactly what I wanted and we've specifically written that out in the level two
22 requirements because of the human cost of doing the coding. It's expensive to do
23 that.

24 MR. KALMAN: I'm sorry, I didn't bring the schedule with me.

25 MR. CAMERON: We don't have the schedule right now.

1 MR. KALMAN: It's probably upstairs.

2 MR. LEVIN: Any other comments?

3 MR. SILBERG: In terms of Stan's comment about having people up
4 and running and use LSS based on the experience with the pilot project, my
5 experience has been that if we want people to be capable to use the LSS system,
6 when it's up and running, we ought to limit its availability to people who are in the ages
7 of eight to 13.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MS. NEWBURY: They'll probably be the ones using it.

10 MR. HOYLE: All right. Moe has asked that you got your comments
11 to make by the end of the month and I'll disseminate those and working with Moe, get
12 something back out to you as quickly as I can.

13 MR. KALMAN: And obvious, we'll wait for a copy for the briefing.

14 MS. NEWBURY: I'd like a copy of that.

15 MR. HOYLE: Ken, you're also going to supply an imperative listing
16 of the functionality of LSS versus TDOCS?

17 MR. KALMAN: Am I on the record? We'll work on it.

18 MR. HOYLE: I heard that.

19 MR. SILBERG: I don't know if it has to be done to the third order of
20 magnitude but just conceptually what kind of things would be missing.

21 MR. FRANK: Hello, this is Jim Frank. One thing that the prototype
22 also shows is that the requirements that are already in the requirements documented
23 on this. So it's a two sided sword. You may find out that, for instance, the thing that
24 we were talking about is something that nobody cares about in the end, so it will work
25 both ways.

1 MR. CAMERON: Based on that comment, what sort of timing do we
2 need to have on this in order not to have a negative effect on the procurement, the
3 DOE procurement? Is that an issue?

4 MR. LEVIN: Well, we said this was, I don't know that we could get
5 anything definitive in time to affect procurement.

6 MR. CAMERON: But I mean, if we ended up saying we wanted to
7 take a functional requirement out, would that pose any problems for the? In other
8 words, is this pretty much independent of the procurement?

9 MS. NEWBURY: I would guess that if you're taking stuff out, no it's
10 no big deal because that saves you money, but if you're running a pilot program and
11 decide that you have additional requirements. Say you decide I really like hyper-text
12 and I want to put that cost in, that will cause significant twitterbations in the total cost of
13 the system and we'd come back and say, maybe this isn't such a great idea, even
14 though it's fun.

15 MR. LEVIN: But, Claudia, there still might also be the issue of when
16 you create a specification, you go out for bids, people are going to bid on the
17 specifications.

18 MS. NEWBURY: Right.

19 MR. LEVIN: And that's what they're going to bid and if we reduce the
20 specifications at a later date, that won't be reflected in their bids.

21 MS. NEWBURY: True.

22 MR. LEVIN: If the timing isn't right? What is the timing? I don't
23 remember.

24 MR. DICKERSON: You know, from the technical working group
25 perspective, we're trying to get the phase two requirements disclosed as quickly as we

1 can, you know, today, tomorrow or next week, and so if you're impacting the phase two
2 requirements of this process, you're derailing our next schedule in terms of the A, B,
3 C's.

4 MR. LEVIN: So that just kind of confirms what we had said earlier.
5 The way I had envision this, anyway, was two separate tracks that would not affect,
6 necessarily the procurement activities or the schedule, since we would just be focusing
7 on procedures and usability and if it was convenient, if we could work it in, if something
8 surfaces as a result of the pilot, that would make the procurement activities better, and
9 we could do it without adversely impacting things, we would try.

10 MS. NEWBURY: But we're looking at procurement early next year.

11 MR. LEVIN: The timing is just going to be too tight to build it in, to
12 plan to build it in as a result of the pilot.

13 MR. CAMERON: It seems like everyone is comfortable with that
14 assumption.

15 MR. LEVIN: Shall we go onto the next?

16 MR. HOYLE: Yes, let's go on. That's the draft of the initial.

17 MR. LEVIN: While you're starting to do that, I have a letter from
18 Mel Murphy, with comments on that. Here again, I think everybody got a copy of this
19 and hopefully you've had a chance to read the draft. I'm just going to go over very,
20 very briefly and then open it up for discussion because we do want your input on it. I
21 discussed this with Claudia and I guess I was voted or elected the spokesperson on
22 this.

23 This was a cooperative effort between my staff and Claudia and me
24 and I want to say that for the first MOU, this went very, very smoothly, we obviously
25 both committed to making this happen. There was some negotiation. There was

1 some give and take and I think we came out with a pretty good first cut and it was
2 really, really painless, at least, from my perspective and I asked, and it was actually
3 enjoyable, and I asked Claudia if at any point in time, if you have any comments, just
4 jump in.

5 MS. NEWBURY: I was surprised how smoothly it went and that we
6 got it done in the time we did.

7 MR. LEVIN: We met our schedule. I think we were done a week
8 ahead of schedule. Be aware that this is a first draft. It's at the staff level. When we
9 say we're amazed at how smoothly it came together, it still has to go up through our
10 respective organizations for concurrence and there will be a lot of comments and
11 there's always a chance that when you do these things, the document that comes at
12 the tail end of the process is not the process that was input at the beginning. It doesn't
13 look the same, but at least, we're going to start that next.

14 You remember our plan was to have four MOU's, which this is the
15 first one, which is the MOU defining our respective responsibilities during the design
16 and development phase of the LSS. Like I said, we had the first draft of that
17 completed and we're looking for comments and then we're going to start working
18 through our organizations for concurrence.

19 We've also set up a schedule for the other three MOU's. The second
20 MOU on transition and funding we have a tentative date of November '95, to have that
21 first draft of that one available. The third MOU which is covered is the responsibilities
22 of the operation of LSS during and until the end of the hearing, that we plan to have
23 the first draft of that by May of 1996. And the final one, which we may or may not do is
24 the post-hearing operation, the ongoing care and feeding and refinement aspects

1 beyond the hearing and we have tentatively scheduled to have a first draft of that by
2 October of 1996.

3 Now, the highlights, I've got some highlights here, at least from my
4 perspective of the first MOU and after I go through these highlights, I'll ask Claudia if
5 she has anything she wants to add or detract.

6 The highlights as I see them are that from LSSA's perspective we
7 have agreed that the functional, the LSS function requirements that the technical
8 working group has helped refine levels one and two, will be the LSA's acceptance
9 criteria for the LSS. In other words, when the LSS is delivered, I will look at the
10 technical, the level one and two functional requirements and look at the LSS and say,
11 do they match and if they match, from a functional level, I will accept the LSS.

12 Another highlight as I see it, in the MOU is that we have agreed to
13 develop major milestones and times and schedules for the LSS and we've committed
14 to, we're going to do that in a separate document and we've committed to having that
15 done 30 days after the signing of the MOU and this is a very, very important point
16 because these will be the dates that we'll track our progress against to see if things are
17 working or not working or if we're going to get in trouble and if there's any chance of
18 not making the LSS, the required LSS availability date.

19 Also, the MOU states that the provision for LSS care and feeding by
20 NRC will be funded through DOE appropriations. That's a very important issue as well.
21 Now, as far as the funding is concerned, from NRC's perspective, we're still waiting for
22 three things before NRC can basically say this is going to work. We have three things
23 from DOE and the three things we're waiting for is the concept is, for the funding, is
24 that it would be a direct pay and we need precise definition of what DOE means by
25 direct pay. We are budget people who would also like to see the specific appropriation

1 language that DOE will be using when they go forward for the funding and also we
2 need to know where the legal authority comes from, where DOE's legal authority to do
3 this kind of direct pay arrangement comes from.

4 Once we, and we're working, we're talking with DOE and once those
5 items are provided to us, I think we're pretty much satisfied that this will work, the
6 funding mechanism as proposed will work.

7 Those are the highlights of the MOU as I see it. Claudia, is there
8 anything that you wanted to add?

9 MS. NEWBURY: I wanted to point out that it does define that we will
10 have a series of technical interactions. Our monthly meetings and quarterly progress
11 reports that will kind of keep everything on track and make sure that we are
12 communicating as the IG asked, NRCIG asked and give a forum where we can
13 actually discuss all these things.

14 I notice we actually left the LSSARP here in one place and I was
15 looking at Moe's comments. We had the LSSARP in here, several places and decided
16 this was an MOU between NRC and DOE that bringing in the third body in discussions
17 of what our MOU was probably inappropriate. In other words, we can't tell the
18 LSSARP what to do or give them responsibilities in a memorandum between the two of
19 us.

20 I was really pleased because we were actually able to actually divide
21 up the responsibilities and make it pretty clear who has to do what and up until now, it's
22 been pretty loose. We talked about it a lot but by putting it down on paper, I think
23 we've accomplished quite a bit.

24 MR. LEVIN: Now, are there any comments on the MOU, any
25 suggestions, criticisms? I haven't had a chance to read this in finality.

1 MR. HOYLE: I didn't get it out and I apologize for that. I thought, if
2 we could, after we've gotten any other comments, maybe just read the question and
3 see if we can respond to it at this point. We're kind of all on an equal basis. I don't
4 think any of us have studied these questions.

5 MR. SWAINSTON: I just wanted to make a quick comment. We
6 went through a very extended negotiating rule making process with respect to how this
7 whole thing would be put together. You say now that the LSSARP doesn't have any
8 input into an MOU, which directly could impact the, the negotiated rule making
9 process. I think it doesn't really state the original intention of the whole process. I
10 think this committee should or this panel should continue to have some input even
11 though it is an MOU between NRC and DOE.

12 MS. NEWBURY: I think what I said was we can't write you into the
13 MOU. In other words, we can't give you responsibilities when it's an agreement
14 between two federal agencies.

15 MR. LEVIN: But we do plan to ask your input. That's why we're
16 presenting here and asking for comments. That wasn't meant that way. We want your
17 comments.

18 MR. BECHTEL: Does the MOU need a record someplace so the fact
19 of the rule making, I mean, that's kind of the basis for a lot of the things that come
20 after?

21 MR. LEVIN: Well, on Section 2.0, we have the regulatory basis. It
22 mentions that and originally this was much more wordy and everything but all we're
23 doing is basically copying words right out of the rules, so we just kind of referenced the
24 rule.

1 MR. BECHTEL: I have some concern, maybe unfounded, but on
2 3.1, the first sentence there, shall have all the responsibility for hardware, software
3 configuration used in the LSS and my concern is, you know, compatibility. I mean, you
4 know, we're kind of, not lesser players, but you know, if they decide something, we're
5 not able to participate with.

6 MR. LEVIN: That should be handled, I believe, through the technical
7 working group.

8 MS. NEWBURY: Yeah, we haven't tried to preclude anything that's
9 in sub-part J and in sub-part J it says that we will take the consensus and advice of the
10 LSSARP, but at some point, someone has to write their name at the bottom and the
11 person who writes their name at the bottom is the DOE.

12 MR. LEVIN: They have to have responsibility because they're
13 signing for it.

14 MR. CAMERON: You mean, they write their name at the bottom of
15 the?

16 MS. NEWBURY: The procurement.

17 MR. LEVIN: That's what we're talking about.

18 MR. CAMERON: I don't think, I think your concern was to not try to
19 speak for the ARP in this document, but going back to Dennis' point about referencing
20 the rule, I don't see why it would be inappropriate or stepping on the ARP's toes, in
21 anyway, to reference that section of the rule that provides for ARP comments. In other
22 words, you're not creating a new obligation for the ARP in this MOU by referencing that
23 part of the rule which requires ARP comment, if that's what the concern is, is creating
24 new obligations for the ARP.

1 MR. LEVIN: Well, one of the other concerns was and this is
2 something we want to discuss, it was a memorandum understanding between DOE
3 and NRC, not between DOE, NRC and the ARP. So we had a lot of discussion about
4 this and decided just looking at it logically that since it was between DOE and NRC, we
5 probably shouldn't even mention the ARP.

6 MR. CAMERON: DOE and NRC could agree upon between the two
7 of them that we're going to seek the advice of the ARP, right?

8 MR. LEVIN: We could.

9 MS. NEWBURY: Well, we have to. That's in the rules.

10 MR. LEVIN: That's in the rules. We had this discussion. We just
11 didn't know, originally, this was a much thicker document and the reason is because
12 we were copying. You know, we'd reference something like from the rule and then
13 quote it in the document. We thought for brevity and conciseness, we would just
14 reference the rules, say the rule is a regulatory basis and obviously we're bound by
15 anything that's in the rule, anything that we put an MOU cannot be counter or cannot
16 supercede anything in the rule. That was our logic.

17 MR. CAMERON: Your understanding is the ARP will be consulted
18 on it.

19 MS. NEWBURY: I don't think we have any choice in that. That's, if
20 we follow sub-part J, that's the way it is.

21 MR. HOYLE: I think this is a good. I think this is a good discussion
22 here. This is a document, a memo between the two agencies and as I read the first
23 paragraph number 3.1, is that the two of you, have agreed that between you, DOE has
24 responsibility ultimately and it has nothing to do with the role of this body here in
25 advising you on design.

1 Maybe the first sentence of 2.0 should be just expanded to say the
2 responsibilities of the LSSARP are also set forth in J and need to be taken into
3 account at the appropriate times and places. I don't want to change this document
4 particularly. You two have worked hard on it, but that would be my suggestion, as a
5 possible place for clarifying the point, saying it once and for all that there is an
6 LSSARP. These responsibilities are not changed by this document that are set forth in
7 the rule.

8 MR. LEVIN: Do the members feel strongly about that?

9 MR. SWAINSTON: I think we ought to have some statement to that
10 effect. Do you agree?

11 MR. HOYLE: Why don't the two of you see if you can write
12 something back in.

13 MS. NEWBURY: Put an order to that, yeah.

14 MR. METTAM: If we're going to change the document, I have a
15 comment.

16 MR. LEVIN: We asked for your comments, we didn't say we were
17 going to change the document.

18 MR. METTAM: I was a little concerned with section 6.0, that
19 perhaps, about pending congressional action, with this document, I can see people
20 perhaps, three, four, five years from now, wondering what in the world we're talking
21 about.

22 MR. SILBERG: And there may be many other reasons for wanting to
23 amend.

24 MR. METTAM: Certainly, the second sentence, I can understand
25 why that's in there, it's just the first, the preamble to that.

1 MR. SILBERG: I would agree with that. I don't know that that's
2 particularly useful in a document like this.

3 MS. NEWBURY: I'm sorry. Where were you?

4 MR. METTAM: 6.0, the first sentence, congressional action may
5 alter the nature and timing of licensing activities. It just seems like we all understand
6 what that means now. Two years from now, there will be other pending congressional
7 action and it won't make any sense.

8 MR. HOYLE: The suggestion is that first sentence be deleted, even
9 though it's a true statement.

10 MR. SILBERG: It's also not complete, because there are many other
11 reasons why you may want to change it.

12 MR. LEVIN: That's a good suggestion and we'll discuss it.

13 MS. NEWBURY: I will discuss it, but I've gotten some messages
14 from my upper management that maybe something like this needs to be in there.

15 MR. LEVIN: I got the same message in parallel from my
16 management that something like this should be in there.

17 MR. METTAM: What's the reason that they wanted the escape
18 clause or I mean, I can understand wanting the clause.

19 MR. LEVIN: Let me tell you, I think what the reason is. The reason
20 is that we're asking, both of us are asking our agencies to sign something that is, in an
21 environment that's very fluid and changing and we would like to get an understanding
22 down as quickly as possible so we can be clear that we all understand our
23 responsibilities and everything. We don't want the, what's happening in Congress or
24 anything else or the maybe's, to delay things. With this statement in here, it's stating

1 that we realize that whoever signs this document is signing it given the current
2 conditions and knowing that things are going on in Congress, it may change.

3 MS. NEWBURY: That's a fair summary of what's going on.

4 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: It's still basically a redundant
5 statement taking the second sentence into consideration.

6 MR. METTAM: It's really descriptive.

7 MR. LEVIN: It's a lot of times in documents like this, you put things
8 in for various audiences, various eyes, for various reasons and this is one of those
9 sentences that fall into that category.

10 MR. METTAM: Perhaps what might make it easier, once again, I'm
11 sort of picturing someone reading this document some years from now. Perhaps if you
12 put in such and so congressional session or you know, whatever we are in now.

13 MR. CAMERON: That might be too limiting, then because it's
14 something that could happen in the future. If you're worried about the decision makers
15 realizing what's going on. In the cover letter that you send to Dreyfuss and Taylor with
16 the document, you could say that it talks about the Congressional action, et cetera, et
17 cetera. That's why section six is included here that allows for the termination. That
18 may not solve your problem.

19 MR. SILBERG: You may want to, you may just want to delete the
20 word pending.

21 MR. LEVIN: That's a good, that would be acceptable.

22 MR. HOYLE: You need to change the grammar of that because
23 you're using pending this, the LSS.

24 MR. SILBERG: No, no.

25 MS. NEWBURY: Pending congressional action.

1 MR. SILBERG: It's a magic.

2 MR. LEVIN: All you have to do is say congressional action.

3 MR. METTAM: Their pull.

4 MR. LEVIN: Oh, I see, syntax.

5 MR. CAMERON: We put acts of God and other things in there. I
6 mean, let's be comprehensive.

7 MR. MITCHELL: So is the final suggestion then that we remove the
8 word pending.

9 MS. NEWBURY: Right.

10 MR. SILBERG: My preference would be to take the sentence out,
11 but I don't feel strongly about it. It just ties it too much.

12 MR. HOYLE: You may want to reverse the order of the sentences,
13 too. For example, congressional action made us do this.

14 MS. NEWBURY: We'll just take out the pending.

15 MR. SILBERG: When I looked at this and some of these questions
16 may get down to drafting nits and I apologize for that, and to go through them all, and
17 you guys select those that you want to deal with. When I looked at management
18 responsibilities, there were really three main areas of activity. One was design and
19 development. The second was acquisition. The third was implementation. Yet, when
20 I looked at other parts of the MOU, it left out the implementation phase, so I don't know
21 whether that was a deliberate choice or not. For instance, the title of the document, it
22 talks about design development and acquisition. The first section 1.0 only talks about
23 design development and acquisition and I wondered where implementation went in that
24 description. It may have been inadvertently left out of it.

1 In section 3.0, the description of the Yucca Mountain site yard office
2 responsibility and the LSSA responsibility is not quite consistent in that the Yucca
3 Mountain office talks about design development and implementation, while LSSA's
4 responsibilities talk about design development and procurement. Again, it's not clear.
5 The people looking back may see these distinctions and make more of them than
6 maybe there should be or maybe there's a reason that they're different, but it didn't
7 appear obvious to me on a quick reading.

8 Just editorially, in some places, you talk about system level
9 functional requirements. For instance, in Section 3.1.1, the first doc, and in other
10 places you just talk, you talk about level one and two functional requirements, it's not
11 clear whether those are meant to refer to the same things or not.

12 In section 3.1.2, the second bullet, an LSSA responsibility during
13 design and development process is provided in the Yucca Mountain office with criteria
14 for the certification process. I just was wondering, whether that was part of design and
15 development or belongs somewhere else and in the fourth bullet under section 3.1.2,
16 LSA responsibilities listed as review and comment on test plan, but you have to go to
17 the implementation phase for that to show up as the Yucca Mountain site office
18 responsibilities, so it's not clear whether these things are always matching and I don't
19 know whether that is important or not, but consistency being the hob gobbler of some
20 order, maybe it is.

21 Under section 3.2.1. in the first bullet, there's a reference to adhering
22 to all Federal regulations, I would like to see the word applicable there, although, I'm
23 sure it's understood that way, but I suspect there are a lot of federal regulations that
24 don't apply.

25 MR. LEVIN: This is good. We're getting all this free legal counsel.

1 MR. SILBERG: In section 3.2.2, in the first bullet on the top of the
2 third page, where it's a carry over, it talks about the LSA shall identify a representative
3 on the first evaluation board for the procurement of hardware and software for the
4 design and development of a computer system. I guess, I raise the question how do
5 you procure hardware and software for design.

6 In section 3.3.1, in the fifth bullet, the Yucca Mountain site office
7 responsibility including LSSA and DMV design review activities, I wondered why that
8 was part of implementation and not part of design.

9 In the first bullet under section 3.3.2, there's a reference, a phrase
10 that talks about strict quality control and that always raises a question in my mind
11 about what about quality control reviews that aren't strict. I would assume that all
12 quality control reviews will be equally strict, so I would suggest that that might want to
13 come out.

14 On the top of page five, first bullet, on LSS contingency planning,
15 that's supposed to be part of the compliance assessment program. It wasn't clear to
16 me, and I looked at this without benefit of the cap document, why contingency planning
17 was something that the compliance assessment program was looking at in the first
18 place. I didn't know that that was a requirement for the system to be certified or
19 remain in compliance.

20 In section 3.4, the first section, talks about a key to the success of
21 the LSS is the ability for LSSA to identify major milestones. I'm just wondering why
22 that's not also a responsibility of the Yucca Mountain on site characterization office,
23 why only the LSSA has to worry about milestones as a key to success.

1 And then in the next sentence where it talks about deviations from
2 milestones, it's not clear whose responsibility that is whether it's the LSSA's or the site
3 characterization office or both. I would think it would be both, but it's not clear.

4 And then the next to the last sentence in the paragraph, section
5 3.4.4, talks about the milestone document, it says the first revision of this document
6 will be created within 30 days, I assume that's the initial version.

7 And the general question I had based on your description of that was
8 why are we using a floating target for submitting the milestones. Why do you have to
9 wait for those milestones for this document to be signed? I would think we'd want the
10 milestones whether or not there's a MOU.

11 MR. LEVIN: Do you want me to answer that now?

12 MR. SILBERG: Yeah.

13 MR. LEVIN: We had a lot of discussion about this. Originally, the
14 dates were in the MOU. After discussion, we thought it would be, dates on a project
15 that is going to last this long are obviously, in milestones, are obviously going to have
16 to be adjusted as time goes on. We thought it would be easier to adjust them if they
17 were in a separate document that didn't have to go through the formality of the MOU
18 modifications. We'd be able to react quicker.

19 MR. SILBERG: I agree, my only question is why are you waiting for
20 the signing of the MOU which is a floating date.

21 MR. LEVIN: Oh, you mean, before we?

22 MR. SILBERG: Instead of just developing the milestones.

23 MR. LEVIN: 30 days, because we said we would develop them, they
24 would be locked in.

1 MR. SILBERG: I mean, if we're ready to develop them by
2 September 1st, why don't we say September 1st or August 1st or whatever the date is.

3 MR. LEVIN: That's a good point, I don't know.

4 MS. NEWBURY: We didn't want to the put the date in here, because
5 may have it done before. We may have it done later. We will be creating those
6 milestones, but in reference to this MOU we needed something, a document to tie it to.
7 In other words, those milestones will be there. it's not a question of we wouldn't do it, if
8 it weren't an MOU.

9 MR. SILBERG: It just didn't seem to be, the creation of the
10 milestones, didn't necessarily seem to be tied to the signing of the MOU.

11 MR. LEVIN: Let me tell you my thought on this and I didn't discuss
12 this with Claudia, but it's just something I kind of had in the back of my mind and I'm
13 not sure this is even valid. There maybe something that happens in the review
14 process of this MOU that would affect the milestones. It is conceivable. I wasn't sure
15 so I thought that was a good idea to leave in there. Once we have the MOU signed,
16 then we would know for sure, at least, for the first phase, what the plan was, what
17 everybody would agree to and I feel more comfortable about the dates of the
18 milestones.

19 Like I say, I'm not even sure that was valid, that was just my thinking.

20 MR. SILBERG: Okay. In section 4.0, the first paragraph, when you
21 talked about the anticipated, LSS funding requirements, I think what you mean to say
22 instead of tying it to the appropriate F190, is to say, to ensure that appropriate funding
23 for the subsequent fiscal year is included in the DOE budget, appropriate requested.
24 This is an ongoing proces and not just one.

1 In section 5.1, the last sentence in Section 5.1.3, on quarterly
2 management reports, deals with monthly meetings, decisions made at monthly
3 meetings, and I wondered why that isn't part of the technical interaction, since it
4 doesn't relate to the quarterly reports themselves. That sentence seems to be in the
5 wrong place.

6 I guess that's all I have.

7 MR. CAMERON: If I could make a comment that relates to some of
8 the Jay's earlier concerns. Note that the title of this document is design, development
9 and acquisition of licensing support system. Now, DOE has two major responsibilities
10 under the rule. One is as the designer and the developer of the system. The second
11 responsibility is the responsibility of DOE as a party for document compliance, which
12 every other party has the same responsibility.

13 Note that that document compliance responsibility is also folded into
14 this document and I think that that.

15 MR. SILBERG: This MOU?

16 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, isn't it, right, and I think that leads to some
17 of the confusion, some of the inconsistencies that you might have been noting and I
18 just wanted to emphasize that for the people on the panel.

19 MR. SILBERG: I didn't really see that in this MOU.

20 MR. CAMERON: That's what this compliance assessment program
21 is supposed to cover, isn't it, document compliance?

22 MR. SILBERG: But that's only an LSSA responsibility under this.

23 MR. CAMERON: I think Moe wanted to make sure that all of this
24 was folded in, but it may seem, it may be something that will allude panel members
25 and that they should focus on it.

1 MR. SILBERG: Because when you look at the Yucca Mountain on
2 site office responsibilities, the implementation phase, there's nothing in there about
3 actually out breaking the system, with documents, et cetera. It's just the system and
4 not the operation of the system. I always assume that those responsibilities would get
5 picked up in the later MOU's.

6 I see the compliance assessment program but that's only, that only
7 shows up here as an LSSA responsibility. There's no compliment to that on the DOE
8 side.

9 MR. CAMERON: Right, but just note though that if you think that this
10 only covers acquisition and development of the system, that it does cover more than
11 that, in the sense that it covers the document submission requirements of not only
12 DOE, but all the other parties as well.

13 MR. LEVIN: I want to thank you, Jay, for those comments. I think
14 those are excellent and we'll take those back and look at them and I for one, agree
15 that the document should be consistent in its wording, and I think you're comments will
16 make it a lot better. Thank you.

17 MR. HOYLE: How about looking at Mr. Murphy's comments, briefly
18 and see if we can deal with any of those. His first comment is why four, it seems to me
19 you should combine, could combine the first two, at least, into one.

20 Do you want to comment on that Moe?

21 MR. LEVIN: Looking at the phases that you go through, I think these
22 before phases that actually DOE proposed were logical phases. I mean they're
23 distinct, they're easily. You can draw bounds around them and it seemed to be a
24 logical thing to coordinate or design the MOU's in lock step with those activities since

1 they are sequential in time and the idea was to just get agreements between NRC and
2 DOE on the things that are facing us at the moment. It seemed to make sense.

3 MR. HOYLE: Bite off a piece.

4 MR. LEVIN: Bite off a piece, a logical, well defined piece and these
5 were very well logically defined pieces. The transition is definitely a different phase
6 than the implementation or the development and design. It's definitely different.

7 MS. NEWBURY: That's true. Especially, when you consider when
8 we go through an A, B, C if we have a contractor there's a lot of issues that are just not
9 defined yet for transition.

10 MR. HOYLE: The second point is the document should, it seems to
11 me, at least, mention the role of the LSSARP. I think we have discussed that and
12 taken care of that. The third is the monthly meetings called for in 5.1.2 should be
13 noticed to the LSSARP in potential for participants and open to them as observers.

14 We talked about maybe moving that sentence to somewhere else,
15 Jay said, but is there any problem with providing notice to the ARP?

16 MR. LEVIN: And inviting them?

17 MR. HOYLE: And inviting them as observers?

18 MR. SILBERG: Well, would these normally be public meetings?

19 MS. NEWBURY: No, they were intended simply as management
20 meetings and so I'd have to go back to my licensing people and say, what does this
21 imply in terms of federal register notices and formal meetings, et cetera. These were
22 meant to be extremely informal, manager to manager meetings.

23 MR. SWAINSTON: I don't see any need for notice, personally, on
24 behalf of the State, if these are meetings that are just.

25 MR. LEVIN: They're at the working level.

1 MR. SWAINSTON: Dealing with more or less informal matters, it's
2 not a cost benefit to our perspective, it's not worth it for us to get on a plane and fly to
3 Washington to sit there for an hour or so.

4 MR. LEVIN: The intent of these meetings was not to make any
5 decisions about the program or anything. It was just as two parties involved in the
6 same project, both with shared responsibilities. We all wanted to make sure that each
7 party is on track and if there were any operational issues, they can be smoothed out,
8 so it was not decision making type meetings.

9 MS. NEWBURY: In truth, half the time, they'll probably turn out to be
10 tele-cons, because I don't want to travel to D.C. once a month either.

11 MR. SILBERG: I was just going to ask that question whether you
12 read this language and talk about meetings as required face-to-face.

13 MS. NEWBURY: With modern telecommunications, technology, we
14 can video-con, we can voice con.

15 MR. SILBERG: No, I'm not concerned about that. I'm concerned
16 about the wording here, that meetings not be read down the road, to require face-to-
17 face.

18 Can you put in just informal interactions, something an obligation of
19 failure to meet federal register notice requirements or official meetings between DOE.
20 I take that back or just change meetings to informal interactions.

21 MR. LEVIN: Informal interactions monthly would be fine, I think,
22 because I could even envision us meeting by e-mail if nothing terribly exciting is
23 happening that month. E-mail would be fine by me. Okay. So informal interactions.

24 MR. SILBERG: Either that, or we'll move you and Bill out to Las
25 Vegas.

1 MS. NEWBURY: Great idea.

2 MR. LEVIN: It's a nice place to visit.

3 MS. NEWBURY: It's a great place to live.

4 MR. HOYLE: How about on your 5.1.1, technical directions. You
5 talk about monthly meetings there.

6 MR. SILBERG: That's where we talked about making this change.

7 MS. NEWBURY: Informal meetings or informal interactions.

8 MR. HOYLE: Okay. And the last sentence under 5.1.3, we'll also be
9 changing?

10 MR. LEVIN: Yes.

11 MR. HOYLE: This last point has to do with putting some flesh on the
12 dispute resolution and is suggesting use of the prelicense application presiding officer.
13 Did you all discuss how that might work out, just a higher level.

14 MS. NEWBURY: Yeah, we had a whole lot of words in there and
15 took them out. I'm trying to remember why we took them out.

16 MR. LEVIN: Just catching up on a side bar conversation here.

17 MS. NEWBURY: Do we have a prelicense application presiding
18 officer yet and I think the answer to that is no.

19 MR. LEVIN: No, we don't.

20 MS. NEWBURY: So it was difficult to write that person into the
21 MOU.

22 MR. SILBERG: You could put that in as a contingency to the extent
23 that the Commission appoints one that would become either the or a method for
24 resolving these disputes. I don't know whether that's good or bad.

1 MR. LEVIN: You mean in the time frame of this first MOU that it
2 covers if one should be appointed?

3 MR. SILBERG: Yes, maybe you guys will decide between the two of
4 you that having a mutual facilitator is worth having. Maybe there aren't going to be any
5 such disputes, then never mind. If there aren't any disputes than no one is going to
6 bother, but if you have a whole series of problems, you don't want to keep escalating
7 up to Chairman Jackson and Hazel O'Leary.

8 MR. SWAINSTON: I read this sentence to refer to disputes as to
9 this MOU. I think Mel's point is well taken. If it's a dispute resolution process that
10 would extend in time to cover all four of the MOU's, if it was that much. Just a phrase
11 if you added concerning policy matters as to this MOU will be referred to successively.
12 I think that would probably satisfy at least our concern.

13 MR. SILBERG: Would that include policy matters concerning the
14 design, development, acquisition and implementation of the LSS?

15 MR. SWAINSTON: No, just whatever this MOU, the scope of this
16 MOU, it would be limited to that. Because I think the point is very well taken that Mel
17 makes, that at some point in time the disputes may rise to the level where they actually
18 have to be addressed by some kind of
19 pre-licensing officer.

20 MR. LEVIN: We can work on that. I think that's a valid point. We
21 can work on the wording, to work that in, don't you think, Claudia?

22 MS. NEWBURY: I think we can. We went through a whole process
23 of we don't need somebody to resolve technical disputes because we already have all
24 that in the rule, but the policy issues are still important.

1 MR. LEVIN: Yeah, so we'll put some wording into reflect that. That's
2 a good point.

3 MS. NEWBURY: As I recall also the DOE has an, I can never say
4 that word, ombudsman, who is supposed to resolve these types of things.

5 MR. METTAM: Can I back up for just a moment to Mel's third point.
6 Am I clear that we resolved that point by changing the name of the interaction, from
7 meeting to informal interactions?

8 MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

9 MR. METTAM: I don't think that really answers the intent of his
10 question, which was can the LSSARP be told when those meetings are going on and
11 attend or participate as observers to those interactions. Whether you call them
12 meetings or interactions really doesn't resolve his question nor mine.

13 MR. LEVIN: I think what Claudia said was we have to look at the
14 ramifications of doing that. Does that make it a public meeting? Do we have to put it
15 in the federal register and, you know, those types of things because this is supposed
16 to be a working level meeting. It's something that's supposed to be easy to do and
17 informal.

18 MR. METTAM: Case in point, were notice or at least, these people
19 were active in the Yucca Mountain portion of the project, are notice on the directors
20 program review, which is not considered a public meeting, it doesn't go through federal
21 register posting, but we get courtesy notice that this is when we're going to do this, so
22 to speak. Is there some sort of an arrangement that could be made for these
23 interactions without getting you into the quagmire of a federal register.

24 MR. LEVIN: That's what we have to look at.

1 MS. NEWBURY: It would depend on how much of a meeting our
2 meeting was, if I'd have to ask you this, if we're meeting fact to face, should I put it on
3 the calendar of events, which is how you know about those things, like the directors
4 program.

5 MR. METTAM: Unless somebody calls me and let me know, I don't
6 know, I don't look at that.

7 MS. NEWBURY: But if we're just having a
8 tele-con, do we have to set it up with a dial in number? How much do you want to get
9 involved? Do I have to tell you every time we set up a meeting?

10 MR. SILBERG: I guess, if you're going to have these on a regular
11 basis, then somebody is interested in being on it, is it a big deal for you, in setting up
12 the call to have whoever was initiating it or scheduling it, just call those people who'd
13 like to know and say do you want to be on it this month.

14 MS. NEWBURY: That's what I'm asking. I need to know do you
15 want to be involved in something as simple as a tele-con or as an e-mail.

16 MR. SILBERG: I think Harry said, I'm sure we don't.

17 MS. NEWBURY: We'll call Brad.

18 MR. METTAM: What's the subject matter? Recently I saw and I
19 don't mean to pick on the NRC, but I saw an NRC meeting notice that said to discuss
20 items of mutual interest to DOE and NRC, which didn't tell me at all what that meeting
21 was about, but certainly if it's in our interest, we would like the courtesy of being able to
22 observe whether visually or audioly? That's not the correct word, to observe the
23 meeting.

24 MS. NEWBURY: Okay. We'll have to figure something out here.

1 MR. LEVIN: We'll have to talk about that because I think we had a
2 little different, like I say, picture of what these meetings were going to be and they
3 were monthly so that in case anything procedurally or operationally happened, you
4 know, almost a moment's notice type thing, just to keep things moving smoothly. A lot
5 of times we might not even have a lot of notice. Something may come up at the very
6 last minute that we want to talk about and it would be hard to inform people ahead of
7 time what the subject was. It's almost like a status or a staff meeting type
8 arrangement.

9 MS. NEWBURY: I appreciate that you want to get involved but I
10 cringe at the idea of the paperwork that I might get myself into if I just say yes.

11 MR. METTAM: However, it's not our intention to create some sort of
12 formal meeting that requires federal register notice.

13 MR. LEVIN: However, if you are the only one with this requirement
14 or Mel, or for a small number, it makes it easier to accommodate than if we open it up
15 for the general ARP.

16 MR. ECHOLS: If it's that informal in its structure, why would it even
17 be, periodic as opposed to, monthly sounds much more structured than, you seem to
18 be elevating it to a greater status than it may deserve by the fact that you're putting it
19 there and calling it a monthly meeting.

20 MR. LEVIN: The reason it's in there is to make sure that we have an
21 agreement that we're going to talk on a timely basis during the heat of battle to make
22 sure that things are going properly. It's just so we have it there, so we both committed
23 to it, so that both of our organizations can feel comfortable that we are talking in a
24 timely fashion.

25 MS. NEWBURY: It's better than writing, I will call Moe once a month.

1 MR. SWAINSTON: Would it work, if you just said the first Monday of
2 every month there would be an informal interaction.

3 MR. METTAM: No.

4 MS. NEWBURY: You can't do that, then the first Monday of the
5 month I was on vacation or somewhere else.

6 MR. LEVIN: It just says once a month. We could do it on the 30th of
7 one month and the 1st of the next.

8 MS. NEWBURY: We could do it a midnight and cover two months.

9 MR. HOYLE: All right. Any further discussion?

10 MR. MITCHELL: I just need to know a clarification about what Jay
11 had mentioned about major milestones on Section 3.4. Is it just the LSSA's
12 responsibility to identify the major milestones or what would be an appropriate intent of
13 that sentence?

14 MS. NEWBURY: I think the intent of that sentence was not that the
15 LSSA should identify in terms of defining milestones, but he should be able to identify,
16 see them within our documents. He should know what our milestones are. So it's not
17 an active verb, it's a passive verb. He's looking at the document.

18 MR. METTAM: Closer to recognize.

19 MS. NEWBURY: Yes, realize that there exists.

20 MR. MITCHELL: Can we change that to a reference major
21 milestones, is that the appropriate verb or recognize.

22 MR. LEVIN: Okay. We'll look at the word and see if there's a better
23 word than identify.

24 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Anything else?

1 MR. BECHTEL: Just a point of clarification. Also 3.4, in the second
2 sentence, deviation outside of the predefined variance for information of a procedure,
3 will be assessed, determination will be made of what action to be taken. What is
4 anticipated in that?

5 MR. LEVIN: As far as the?

6 MR. BECHTEL: Procedure and who makes the decision on, you
7 know, some deviation or something that you're.

8 MR. LEVIN: We haven't developed a procedure yet. We just know
9 this came about, this concept came about initially as a result of the NRC IG audit that
10 said that we have to develop contingency plans in case it looks like the LSS is not
11 going to be available as required and that was to satisfy that and this was a
12 mechanism that we decided on. We'll set dates and we'll give this a little push but if
13 the date isn't met, then we'll have to go into some kind of mode to assess is this really
14 going to impact the schedule and if so, if the LSS is in danger of not coming on line
15 when needed, we're going to have to take some action. We haven't developed a
16 procedure for that yet, we just wanted to account for it in here. Does that answer your
17 question?

18 MR. BECHTEL Yes, I guess, it did. I don't know whether I'm being
19 paranoid on this program or what.

20 MS. NEWBURY: The word procedure.

21 MR. BECHTEL: Or action. What sort of action was anticipated?

22 MR. LEVIN: Well, don't know. I think the most drastic action would
23 be if it's something so major that it looked like the LSS was not going to be available in
24 time. From NRC's perspective we'd have to consider going to Congress and saying
25 look, we're not going to have an LSS. That's one contingency.

1 Another contingency would be to invoke, what is it, sub-part G, the
2 old, the traditional form of licensing. I mean, there are pretty drastic but those are the
3 worse case but those are examples though of the type of contingencies that might be
4 invoked if it was serious enough.

5 MS. NEWBURY: When we first started on this, it was a much
6 shorter sentence that said something about a trigger point that will define
7 noncompliance or something like that but we needed it clearer. What is it we're really
8 looking at? When something happens and we miss a milestone, is it a big deal or not
9 so big a deal and something that could be recovered and so we need to go through
10 that assessment and make that determination, but we didn't want to put all that in an
11 MOU that said if this happens, this happens and if that happens then we do this,
12 because we can't define them at this point. Maybe procedure isn't a good thing to say,
13 just trigger an assessment of what the implications are.

14 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Any further comments on the MOU?

15 All right. It's now just about noon and on my schedule we appear to
16 be about an hour and a half behind. Do we want to try to bite off the participant
17 compliance guidance?

18 MR. LEVIN: I think it will take too long.

19 MR. HOYLE: All right.

20 MR. MITCHELL: We have to get back on track.

21 MR. LEVIN: We also have flexibility tomorrow morning to pick up
22 tomorrow morning.

23 MR. DICKERSON: We do have a personnel problem.

24 MR. HOYLE: Okay.

25 MR. DICKERSON: In order to get in the phase two requirements.

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

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:05 p.m.

MR. HOYLE: It's a little past 1:00. Why don't we get started with the report of the Technical Working Group on review of LSS Level II requirements. Fielden Dickerson, who has been the stand in Chairman of the group after Roger Hartwick left, will do it for us.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. Well, I'm pretty much simply speaking for the Technical Working Group. Moe, Engelbrecht, Jim, Tom, Preston, Dan, Kirk are all part of the Technical Working Group and so I would hope that you would direct your questions at them instead of at me.

This is, I'll tell you about what we've done and where we are and we want to respond to your questions and concerns about these Phase II LSS requirements. We'll tell you what our thinking is and what we think is going on but if you have other ideas of things that we've overlooked or stated incorrectly, we want very much to hear those.

Now, recalling the last ARP meeting, we were talking about the Phase I LSS requirements and they were part of the package that was sent out to you a little earlier. There were 29 identified requirements that were Level I and just to remind you, I just pulled up one here. This is LSS 1004. The LSS shall be capable of accepting electronically formatted documentary materials. Within the LSS there must be a concept of a records package and the records package grouping must be logically accessible. It's non-detailed, non-specific sort of requirements at the Level I, and those have been accepted and approved by the ARP and we're ready to move onto the Level II requirements.

1 Now, these Level II requirements are specific in terms of
2 functionality, performance, availability and security requirements and I point out to you
3 that these are the requirements for the LSS. If you don't see it here, we haven't
4 encompassed it as a requirement for the LSS. So the Phase II requirements stand
5 alone as a description of the LSS. And I'll bring that to your attention. I'll bring it to
6 your attention again, so that if there are elements that you feel that should be in the
7 LSS that are not identified in these Phase II requirements, now is the time to bring
8 them to our attention.

9 And we, the TWG, have been reviewing these draft Phase II
10 requirements at your behest since that last meeting. And the way, the process that
11 we've taken was that of creating a draft set of requirements and that draft set of
12 requirements became available to the TWG on June 1st. It was put out by DOE.
13 Preston Junkin was one of the principal authors associated with that and then we, the
14 TWG, received those draft set of requirements and started evaluating them, and we as
15 a group met on June 14th and 15th and we went through these requirements one by
16 one. And I can tell you, that to go through these one by one takes 14 hours and so
17 we're not going to do that today.

18 But the sorts of questions that we asked about each one of these
19 requirements as we looked at it was, can it be tested, is it appropriate? I'm going to
20 give you an example of something that we deemed to be inappropriate in a few
21 minutes, should it be a requirement, even though it's testable and appropriate, should
22 it be a requirement and are there other additional requirements that we somehow have
23 failed to identify and that's the process that we went through and we wound up
24 generating another iteration on these Phase II requirements and that's what you have
25 in your hands.

1 Now, there are a couple of errors in this. It's been a dynamic world
2 and a couple things haven't caught up. We'll try to bring those to your attention.

3 MR. HOYLE: Fielden?

4 MR. DICKERSON: Yes, sir.

5 MR. HOYLE: Excuse me, just a second. Let me also comment that
6 as LSSARP, we did not officially comment on Level I. I spoke to you on the phone
7 about it. I solicited comments from members. I got some comments from Brad and
8 from others. So as we go through the Level II, which are an expansion really of the
9 Level I, I would like to point out some areas, and maybe Brad and others, too, of
10 feedback perhaps into Level I, that if you haven't put that into final form yet or a final
11 document, perhaps we can make some changes.

12 MR. DICKERSON: Okay. Okay.

13 MR. HOYLE: I apologize to the panel for not having completed that
14 activity since the March, or I guess, the May meeting, but I haven't gotten to it.

15 MR. DICKERSON: Okay. And the final point, that I make up here, is
16 that in order to move on from a particular Phase II requirement, we, as the TWG,
17 either found one that we had unanimity regarding the requirement or if we couldn't
18 have unanimity, we'd simply move along, and say we'd have to put that to the side and
19 there are a couple of issues that I will be bringing to your attention today, where we
20 need some additional input from you, in terms of resolving those.

21 Now, I'm going to sort of lead you through this document that we
22 sent you. The primary LSS functional requirements is a major category. I think there
23 are six major categories that we have in this and then there are subcategories under
24 those, document captured, document storage, to put you in the right mood. Here's
25 some listing of those under document capture and all I've done is put in the short title

1 associated with that, scan paper image, for example. The long description is the LSS
2 shall override the capability to scan paper documents, to create an electronic bit map
3 image, including an eight and half by 11 inch single or double-sided pages and single-
4 sided pages up to E-size and E-sized is defined in the glossary. So we believe that
5 that's a complete stand alone requirement that we have defined up there under LSS 2-
6 001 and that's the way that the whole thing is put together.

7 Now, the next element, the second one, is that a systems
8 administration requirements and this is something that you may not be all that much
9 interested in, at least, in the first part of it, is really the system administration is a mode
10 problem but the end user system access is yours, as potential users, in that you're
11 going to be concerned with those requirements because they set the mechanism up as
12 to how you're going to be a user, the housekeeping details associated with that.

13 Security and data integrity requirements, again, are something, that
14 Moe is concerned with and the rest of us are only concerned with it in the sense that it
15 reflects what some details that are in the rule, that are carried through here, but he, as
16 administrator for the LSS, has to worry about all of those things. So we tried to be
17 responsive to those needs.

18 Now, data requirements. That's a major category again, and these,
19 these really are tied into the first three that's short. They're supporting the functions,
20 the requirements that are there in those first three categories and we start to see some
21 of the iteration that's going on. Down here there's header fields for documentary
22 material. Now, we had a TWG meeting June 14th and 15th and subsequently Kirk
23 convened the working group, I think, two days later or three days later and was, there
24 had been elements that we defined or recognized and we had the TWG working group
25 so the Header working group was responding to those and one of the elements that

1 we haven't caught up with yet, although the textual material has gotten into the draft I
2 sent you, there's also a modification to Table 7-2, is it, or 6-2.

3 MR. BALCOM: I don't know what the table number is.

4 MR. DICKERSON: It's the header table that's in there. We will be
5 modifying that.

6 MR. BALCOM: There have been some minor updates. Essentially
7 those were areas where it says TBD to be decided in the header table. Those have
8 been resolved by the header working group and are in the process of being typed,
9 probably as we speak, right. Is Marty in? So anyway, they're being handled. We may
10 be able to get those faxed out here by the end of the day.

11 MR. HOYLE: It's the technical working group, it's TWG.

12 MR. BALCOM: TWG, I guess, WHIGS, W-H-I-G-S, I don't know.

13 MR. HOYLE: Continue.

14 MR. DICKERSON: One of the reasons I mentioned that, is it gives
15 you a sense of the speed with which we're trying to bring these Phase II requirements
16 together and the draft was completed June 1st. We had a working group meeting
17 June 14th and 15th. The header working group was meeting a couple of days later.
18 We got this out to you very shortly thereafter, and we are interested in your feedback
19 today because we want to turn this around next week, so we can get them back out to
20 you and to ourselves for understanding of it and this is a lynch pin in terms of being
21 able to move forward with the other activities for the LSS.

22 Another major category and this is the one that Preston is going to
23 talk to you a little bit later about in terms of the performance of the LSS and the
24 response as you saw.

1 Now, this again, is a major category. I want to talk to you a little later
2 about availability, so we're going to come back to availability on that one.

3 And an issue, LSS sites. I've got a particular part of this presentation
4 that's going to address LSS sites and so let me just leave that for the moment.

5 Under communications, let me note to you, it's important in terms of
6 the definition of this, all, this is under 9.3, Section 9.3 under LSS facilities, equipment,
7 communications. The next to the last sentence says, "All communications equipment
8 and the lines necessary to meet the functional and performance requirements of this
9 specification are considered part of the LSS system. So we have a very broad based
10 definition of the system. I want to bring that to your attention, in particular, because if
11 we come back and say a few words about availability, that's going to be important.

12 Now, the final element of this major category is system architecture
13 and design. And these are a slightly different animal although we have them in here
14 as Phase II requirements, these are not Phase II requirements in the sense of testing.
15 Let me find one here. For example, LSS 2068, the LSS shall used established
16 government and/or industry hardware and software standards where practical. That is
17 hardly a testable sort of circumstance, but these were put in with a view that solutions
18 to implementing these requirements, that is the system design which used these
19 requirements, and had solutions that picked up on these items that we put in under
20 system architecture and design, would be considered technically superior to those that
21 did not respond to these particular elements. That's why they're there.

22 And finally, at the very end of this document, I brought, there's a
23 glossary and there are some definitions that we put in there. They're our definitions
24 from the TWG. We found it necessary to wind up with definitions of things. This is an
25 opportunity if you find problems with those definitions that we can rectify them, modify

1 them, elaborate upon them, whatever is appropriate. A duplicate document, for
2 example, it says, is a difficult one to deal with, in many ways, so we wound up with this
3 definition.

4 And I just, an additional page over there in terms of an official record
5 is something that we define the page and all that sort of thing.

6 Now, moving right along to some of the other things I wanted to bring
7 to your attention. I told you at the outset that one of the judgments that we put out was
8 whether a particular statement of what we called the requirement was appropriate or
9 not. This is an example of one which we deemed to be inappropriate through the
10 technical working group. I'll move that up so you can see it a little more clearly.

11 For example, at the outset, we had the LSS shall provide the
12 capability to export text selected from a displayed document as ASCII text. Now, what
13 that means is cut and paste and the view of the working group was that this was a
14 document discovery tool. It was not a word processing tool and cut and paste was not
15 necessary for it and so this requirement was deleted from the Phase II requirements.

16 There is no functionality of cut and paste currently in the
17 requirements for the LSS.

18 MR. BALCOM: Fielden?

19 MR. DICKERSON: Yes, sir.

20 MR. BALCOM: Can I comment, you can however down load a file to
21 your own machine and use your own word processor for that.

22 MR. DICKERSON: That's precisely right.

23 Now, here is, the next one is just an example of an evolution that we
24 went through as a technical working group. The original statement that we had in
25 there, this is the 12, Level II requirement and sub-element four. There are three other

1 sub elements and we start out with this statement, the LSS shall provide the capability
2 to locate terms in the document, which satisfy the text query and Kirk had raised the
3 point of saying well, gee, if you have a first hit on that and the next hit is 72 pages
4 away, does that mean that you have to reel through 72 pages of text? And so that got
5 modified and to move the term indicator from one term to the next or previous term,
6 without displaying the intermediate text. So one could make it more user friendly, if
7 you will, more convenient to use, in the sense of it being a tool.

8 Now, these are the issues that I wanted to bring up and one of them
9 was already raised earlier this morning in the TDOCS and the point was made that
10 TDOCS has color and the LSS does not have color. At the working group meeting, the
11 issue of color was something that was raised and we had to go away and do some
12 homework on it, number of remote locations. I'll tell you the details of that. Preston is
13 going to tell you about response times and then I want to say something finally about
14 availability. Those are really the issues that came out.

15 Now, should there be an LSS requirement for color?

16 MR. BALCOM: Are you going to talk about the difference between
17 scanning in color and continuously using Windows in color on your color monitor. You
18 wouldn't lose that.

19 MR. DICKERSON: Go ahead.

20 MR. BALCOM: In other words, your screen would display ordinarily
21 in color, if you have a color monitor. The issue is.

22 MR. DICKERSON: Is capturing.

23 MR. BALCOM: Capturing images like high level maps in color as
24 opposed to.

1 MR. DICKERSON: Precisely. That is, for a map, topological map
2 that has color coding on it, the issue was made, how much information content do you
3 lose by not having that color when you play back the map and we weren't able to make
4 any sort of closure on that as the technical working group. All we could do was come
5 up with anecdotal type information and we didn't know, one, how prevalent that
6 material was, nor what you might lose by going from color to simply a grey scale.

7 I had some estimates of those and I'll sort of come to those in a few
8 minutes. But the reasons against color, all came down, ultimately to cost, in the sense
9 that one is concerned in terms of putting color into the system of using more memory,
10 more space and again, you got caught up in anecdotal stories as to whether this was
11 two to the n or two to the twelfth or whatever, but ultimately, what we were talking
12 about is cost and the size of your memory costs money. You have a problem if you're
13 going to read in color, you have to have a color reader inner means of capturing a
14 station.

15 Now, what we did, is come back and do a little homework on that and
16 as you recall when we had done the original LSS options, we had used a cost model to
17 look at the six or seven options that we developed for that. So we took option six out
18 of that series and played this game and said, well, look, we know for no color that the
19 cost is, and this is cost per RMS, and for LSS over the time period, it's a total life cycle
20 cost, but it's both records management system and LSS, simply was a convenient
21 number to use, and the cost. You go to five percent color, the incremental cost is
22 about \$8 million according to our cost model.

23 Now, there are a number of issues that you could raise at that point.
24 You say, well, how good is that third significant figure and the answer is not very good.

1 In that, what we're seeing is that the jitter in terms of cost of color is down really in the
2 noise of the model. That third significant figure is not very good.

3 This is 150 and that's 160. That maybe a good way to look at it, so
4 the cost is \$10 million for five percent. Now, we're talking about 30 million pages,
5 though, five percent is one and a half million pages, and we've been asking what do
6 we anticipate for color material in that. You're going to have maps. You're going to
7 have some color photos. You're going to have some color keying graphs on occasion.

8 Predicting the future is always very difficult, but again, just going
9 around talking to people and saying what are you anticipating, the answer seems to be
10 we're not talking about millions of pages of color, we're talking about, at most,
11 hundreds of thousands of pages of color. 100,000, 200,000, 500,000 pages of color,
12 so that we're down well within this five percent and so we turn back to you, the ARP,
13 say, look, we have looked at this in the sense of what would it cost for putting color into
14 this. The cost, we believe, is not zero, it's going to be a few millions of dollars
15 associated with it, two or three or four or some such thing, and what return do you get
16 from that in terms of information content.

17 I don't know how to quantify that. Nor did the working group know
18 how to quantify that, although we could focus on something that we could quantify and
19 so we await your pleasure in terms of what we should be doing for requirements in the
20 LSS relative to color.

21 From our perspective, it's easy to write in the requirements for color
22 capability in it.

23 Yes, sir.

24 MR. KALMAN: I was just curious. How did you get going from 15
25 percent? Normally, you go from five to ten percent?

1 MR. DICKERSON: I don't know. I don't know.

2 MR. FRANK: If you purchase one piece of color, you purchase all
3 the equipment necessary for color. So there is a marginal return that you expand. All
4 you're talking about is storage capacity.

5 MR. KALMAN: But here it should be a scale, the more dollars.

6 MR. DICKERSON: I can't address that. I looked at it and I say, well,
7 gee, they're all, they're sort of roughly the same.

8 MR. KALMAN: But you're saying you would still be.

9 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, we're down in here somewhere. We also,
10 Ken, did the business of this particular model is a transmission for information to the
11 sites. This one uses CD's and we were just were looking at the sensitivity associated
12 with this and, you know, it's not different.

13 MR. KALMAN: The same thing.

14 MR. DICKERSON: I can't explain it. I only read the numbers. I don't
15 understand the models. Yes, sir.

16 MR. ECHOLS: I guess I'm looking at it from the perspective of
17 ultimately using it and if you have five percent, it might be of general interest, what is
18 really being used, what would be the difference in calling up and saying can I get a
19 copy tomorrow out of those ten out of 100,000 that you might want.

20 MR. DICKERSON: That's the other option, is that you can keep a
21 paper file of the maps for example.

22 MR. JUNKIN: That's the point I was, I had my hand raised. We're
23 not talking about whether or not it would be availability. Right now, the records
24 systems is in color and color is important. It's kept this one of a kind record and the
25 header simply points to its physical location.

1 MR. SILBERG: Is there any limit or guidance in the program as to
2 when to use color or restriction on using color?

3 MR. DICKERSON: You're thinking of the old joint committee?

4 MR. SILBERG: No, I'm just questioning. Are people encouraged not
5 to use color if it's not really necessary.

6 MR. DICKERSON: I don't know.

7 MR. SILBERG: Or encouraged to use color, because it's prettier.

8 MS. NEWBURY: Not that I know.

9 MR. FRANK: That's not quite true, because there is a color
10 accessory. One of the problems we all face, is you take a nice beautiful color
11 document, just like this and running it through that fancy thing we call a Xerox, you lost
12 all the color, unless you had a very expensive Xerox, although, it's not a prohibition,
13 but there is sort of leaning not to use color accessories.

14 MS. NEWBURY: There are a lot of, in geologic mapping, you have
15 to go to color because you can't tell things apart otherwise and so you have to keep
16 those as one of a kind as a record.

17 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: And most of the modeling runs that
18 are done.

19 MS. NEWBURY: Are color.

20 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: For thermal management are also in
21 color.

22 MS. NEWBURY: And again, so you can tell things apart.

23 MR. CUMMINGS: I believe that the only regulations you have with
24 regard to the use of color is for your normal daily word processing, graphics, kind of
25 presentation materials, not when you're talking about scientific data and mapping and

1 that sort of thing. If you want somebody to put color into a view graph, just for the
2 sake of having color.

3 MR. MITCHELL: Is there any anticipation of the cost of color
4 inclusion going down with the advent of higher degree of technology?

5 MR. JUNKIN: Storage certainly goes down continually, however the
6 model assumes reduction over time, so I would say these numbers anticipate that.
7 The answer is yes, but the numbers reflect that.

8 The other thing that is changing technology wise is the ease of
9 producing things in color is greater increasing. That's why it's hard to predict. It's very
10 hard to predict because color is becoming more now common.

11 MR. SILBERG: Is there an indication in the headers when you come
12 across a color document?

13 MR. BALCOM: There's probably, there's no field that says color, but
14 on the other hand, it certainly could be coded in a field that exists. I guess, there's a
15 field that exists for a document condition or something like that.

16 MR. JUNKIN: It's not in the header, but at the lower level of storing
17 the image, it's in, there's actually, get down into the weeds here, but there's actually a
18 header on the image of part of a format that specifies, that tells you what the renderer
19 needs to look at. They have scanners today that will recognize in the paper feeding
20 groove or this page or not.

21 MR. METTAM: But if you're saying all of your images are black and
22 white images, all your headers are in black and white.

23 MR. JUNKIN: Right.

24 MR. METTAM: Even if they started from a color source. Someone
25 better think about that.

1 MR. JUNKIN: The model assumes, this model assumes that you
2 can recognize color not color on a page basis, not the entire document.

3 MR. METTAM: I want to point out one thing. As an observer, more
4 and more materials that we get from the department are coming in color including view
5 graphs and copies of the view graphs. If that trend continues, we're going to see a
6 much more colorful Department of Energy, than we're seeing now.

7 That's one issue. The other issue, I think we need to address, if only
8 the header is stored in the LSS and we then have to document then we need to look at
9 response times for those requests as an issue.

10 MR. SWAINSTON: I just wanted to make the point that Nevada has
11 a major technical contractor that just uses an awful lot of color and I've seen some of
12 the graphs and pictures and samples of things that they've produced and they're just
13 basically meaningless in black and white, absolutely make no sense at all. I anticipate
14 that probably ten years from now, that will be the rule, rather than the exception, too.
15 Most people will be using color. I think we almost, as a given, have to include it at this
16 point, regardless what the cost is.

17 MR. DICKERSON: Our concerns is, it's not zero impact but it's not a
18 big impact in view of the total dollars that are being invested.

19 MR. MITCHELL: If we were to assume that, say 90 percent of the
20 documents in say ten years would be color, would there be a significant cost increase
21 that we're looking at compared to this model here?

22 MR. SILBERG: Well, 90 percent of the documents are word text.

23 MR. MITCHELL: 90 percent of the non-text documents.

24 MR. DICKERSON: I don't know. How many
25 non-text you have, I don't have a break down.

1 MR. JUNKIN: Probably around 15 percent.

2 MR. ECHOLS: That's total pages.

3 MR. DICKERSON: No, no, no. This is a page, when I do this sort of
4 thing.

5 MS. NEWBURY: Fielden, is page irrespective of size? I mean you
6 mentioned E-size drawings which are pretty big and most of the design drawings are
7 bigger sized.

8 MR. DICKERSON: This model assumes some number of E-sized
9 drawings and that sort of thing and that was in the model and what the fraction is I
10 can't tell you the
11 analysis here and that when we started playing with this, the technical working group, I
12 for one, I think the group as a whole didn't have any view as to whether, or what the
13 cost might go simply in an expedient fashion when we started talking about color.
14 And, and here you find out that it's just all necessity to color. Which is parting.

15 MR. BALCOM: Fielden, is it safe to say that if we were back
16 deliberating as the technical working group and had these numbers crowding us, which
17 we didn't have at that time. But, I think, I think I would've advocated to a conclusion of
18 color because of that. Because the figures aren't as high as we would've gone.

19 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, I think that that's probably a fair statement.
20 Yeah. And that's one issue where you could turn us back as a working group and ask
21 us to make the decision on the, on the thing, if you chose.

22 But as I indicated to you, at this point, we want to close on this and
23 so we're going to have to take some sort of a stance on it.

1 MR. SILBERG: What does it mean when you say to include color?
2 Does that mean the ability to look at it on a display screen, the ability to print it off in
3 ten seconds, you know, what does --

4 MR. JUNKIN: You would assume color scanners, color printers, and
5 color renphers for that format. Not every renpher would get color printers necessarily,
6 but I'd also say it was involved in the cost due to the result of increased storage
7 because color takes a lot more space. A lot more information in a color phase. So it
8 assumed all those things.

9 MR. ECHOLS: You assume the, I don't know, the differential of the,
10 the parties, since this is supposed to be a licensing support. The difference say, say to
11 the general public, because the general public has the remote sites, so they have to
12 have the color printer and all that, capability.

13 MR. JUNKIN: You would assume, I don't know what the differential
14 is, but the parties, if this is supposed to be a licensing support system -- will help the
15 general public at a remote site, do they have to have the color print and all that
16 capability, we would not assume that the color green -- would have the capability --
17 would have the document that says functional access is -- outcome.

18 MR. DICKERSON: And so they're just not making use of the
19 information content of what they're receiving.

20 MR. SILBERG: Does your cost include any difference in
21 transmission, do you have to have a more robust transmission system with color?

22 MR. JUNKIN: The model, that includes, I don't know how much that
23 includes this cost of model that, that's complicated by it's going over wires and what's
24 required is this little --

1 MR. CAMERON: Does that make any, in terms of what option you
2 chose to, if the costs of storage and transmission, can you treat the subset, the color
3 documents in a different way, rather than, you know, electronic image? I mean, can
4 you ship them overnight, I've heard that suggested by someone before.

5 MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

6 MR. CAMERON: I know, I don't, you know.

7 MR. BALCOM: Is it fair to say that another advantage would be that
8 when you have the color image on the screen, is that you have more control over
9 zooming in and out of the document, or you could only go up to a certain resolution
10 anyway. I mean, is there any advantage there?

11 MR. JUNKIN: I don't believe so. I believe it's only an issue of fidelity
12 of the, of the presented image to the original in terms of the colors and what they
13 represent. I don't believe there's any -- issues regarding that.

14 There may be, I know, I know what you're talking about, I don't think
15 so. Monitors have come so far in which resolution has come so far.

16 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: Just a comment, if they're not scanned
17 in color, all you'll see on the screen is black and white, so. You lose all that even just
18 looking at an image.

19 MR. DICKERSON: Do you have a question?

20 MR. MITCHELL: In line with Kirk's question, if we were to store
21 documents, for example, subsurface geology documents, et cetera, et cetera, and they
22 were in color, would we be able to, in the future, would new technology to printout say,
23 okay, we have a document on screen, can we highlight all the yellow portions,
24 everything else in black and white or can we have, highlight all the red, red, orange,
25 whatever color, portions so we can identify a specific water table or, or soil pipe and

1 have that stand out and then have that, everything in black and white for maybe a
2 color, highlighted up to a particular soil level, transmitted back to us, for example?

3 MR. JUNKIN: What you just described is the person I represented
4 as an LSS requirement, that it has something orange -- expensive ones that allow you
5 to do mark-ups on sticky pads and all kinds of things to a standard format.

6 That's not an LSS function as you just described it.

7 MR. METTAM: But if you captured that image as a black and white
8 image, I don't think you could, I can't think you're going --

9 MR. JUNKIN: No, no, no. I'm sorry, I misunderstood you, no, you
10 can't, no, you can't colorize a black and white image --

11 MS. NEWBURY: You can't assign a color to a bit map gray level,
12 you can? Yeah, you can.

13 MR. CAMERON: There is always a realization, I think, that you
14 could, there's all sorts of things that you can do to an image in terms of turning it
15 around, or highlighting certain parts, and the LSS was never intended to provide that
16 type of, of manipulation. Even though it might be something that a party is going to
17 want to use all the time.

18 MS. NEWBURY: But that would be, you would have the, the bit map
19 image, you could download it and then if you have the software, do anything --

20 MR. CAMERON: You could do anything you want, right.

21 MS. NEWBURY: You chose with it, once you've got it.

22 MR. CAMERON: If you get a color, if they, if we send a color image.

23 MS. NEWBURY: Well that's up to the --

24 MR. CAMERON: Right?

25 MS. NEWBURY: Whatever form it's stored in.

1 MR. CAMERON: I mean, if a party wants to do that type of stuff,
2 maybe it's on their own dime, rather than on the LSS.

3 MR. ECHOLS: This is licensing support, you're saying \$10 million for
4 color and there might be some very few key geologic map things that might be color.
5 Compare the price just when you prepare the documents, and you get a mailing list of
6 the parties and you sort of re-chart to do ten and everybody gets five copies, they
7 won't stand and play with them and do whatever they want to do, fine. But, if sounds
8 like it would cost thousands versus millions, not.

9 If the LSS gets hung on licensing support and therefore, this is
10 needed, to have a lawyer, and all of this, but this sounds more like technically driven
11 by people who are studying geology or whatever. Even though it's a very significant
12 figure.

13 MR. JUNKIN: I think it's a issue, if I could try and capture the flavor,
14 the discussion -- as you're coming along on time and when the LSS was first
15 conceived
16 -- a lot of people have it in their home, and so the question arose, you know, is this just
17 a, part of the fact that it's not in here, is there a driving reason to put it in here . I think
18 the gist of the discussion was, it's nice to have, but it's too expensive, you shouldn't do
19 it. And that's, that's the full -- of the idea. It's not really the way, it's a matter of
20 convenience versus cost. But it is becoming part of our --

21 MR. SWAINSTON: I'm going to make one more pitch for color. If
22 anybody is, has had an occasion to check some of these photographs of geologic
23 features and -- trench fork team. Unless you have a color system that has a certain
24 amount of fidelity, and I've seen a lot of Xerox, even though they were done on a color

1 Xerox machine, that just, I mean, you got stuff that's in white and it turns out blue and
2 it got purples and it's just not part of the picture.

3 And that's what, if we're going to get hard copies being sent around,
4 there's going to be a lot of criticism on the, the fidelity of the color.

5 Whereas if we can put a scanner, a very good picture into a system,
6 then we can all get the same thing and it all has the same fidelity.

7 And I just don't think the cost, ten years from now will be that
8 significant and people will wonder if we don't incorporate color, what were we thinking
9 about in 1995?

10 And I'm going to shut up about it.

11 MR. METTAM: You're saying then that you consider it's being
12 shortsighted not to include it now because the world is moving that way?

13 MR. SWAINSTON: That's right. I just don't think it's a close
14 question.

15 MR. HOYLE: Do you have another open item that has offsetting cost
16 to --

17 MR. DICKERSON: Nope. I have no savings plan. This is one of
18 those decisions we need to decide on how to, I mean, we need to move forward. And
19 all I'm hearing, I think, is preponderance for going to color.

20 MS. NEWBURY: I have a comment and question. A lot of the
21 photography that's going on now at the site is actually digital camera and so it's being
22 stored in the original format, not as a emulsion chemical film, but as a digital image.
23 So you've already got it, in essence, scanned in, and it's really a matter of storage and
24 it's already being stored in electronic media.

25 So really, is it a, is the cost that high?

1 MR. DICKERSON: Well, I don't know if we took advantage of that.

2 MR. CAMERON: So that's not, that is, that may not be reflected at
3 all.

4 MR. DICKERSON: We were, we were talking that, I'd have to check
5 with the model maker --

6 MS. NEWBURY: So you were looking at scanning a hard copy?

7 MR. DICKERSON: But you're not letting -- I mean, the point I want
8 to make to you, Chip, is, we look at these dollars, you don't get color for free, but it
9 doesn't break the bank.

10 And that's, it might cost you, you know, three, four, five million
11 dollars. That's over the, the time period, I mean we have associates for a lifetime that
12 we'll be associated with this.

13 MR. JUNKIN: That's what, that's what this model has written the
14 year 2004, this is a total life cycle cost.

15 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: Just a question, did you look at storing
16 any of this on tape? Or is it all hard disc capacity?

17 MR. JUNKIN: Well, let's see. The pricing that was used for
18 hardware in the model is -- storage, including optical fibers and optical tape, I believe.
19 Certainly optical fibers.

20 MR. LEVIN: Optical platters in a juke box?

21 MR. JUNKIN: Yes.

22 MR. SILBERG: Can you reuse current program for handling this
23 stuff? Well, is it several different technologies, one is handles storage, one is --

24 MS. NEWBURY: You have to remember you're dealing with
25 everything from a guy hand-coloring a map to a digital picture that's being taken by a

1 digital camera and fit on, into the system. So there's a whole range and, and the
2 hand-colored copy is a one-of-a-kind record and I'm not sure how you're storing the
3 optical --

4 MR. CUMMINGS: I think right now, I think you send down the --
5 hardware -- not into color right now.

6 MR. LEVIN: I'd like to reverse the question. Is there anybody that
7 thinks black and white is sufficient for everything? It sounds like we're coming to the
8 conclusion that we'd rather, we are all --

9 VOICE: Can I break that down?

10 MR. DICKERSON: All right. We will build that into our TWG. We
11 will build that into the requirements, the Phase 2 requirements.

12 Now, moving right along. A number of remote locations. Table 9.1
13 is a listing of access locations and it reflects the rule. And it does not include all of
14 what we believe to be the feathers in this game. In Inyo County, Clark County,
15 Esmeralda County, and so we as a working group, what we do not have the
16 wherewithal to go out and do other than what the rule tells us, in terms of scoping this
17 thing, what we're coming back to you is the, as a panel and say, this is what it's going
18 to cost to do the following and you add, I don't know, half a dozen other remote sites.

19 What we did again was play this game with both options. And option
20 8, you recall that option 6 is transmission, option 8 is CDs and a juke box. And the
21 incremental cost of adding the site, now this is for capital cost and maintenance cost
22 associated with it, and again, it's across the life cycle of the, of this system.

23 And for option 6, it was \$150,000 a site. And for option 8, it was
24 \$300,000 a site. And the reason it was so expensive for option 8 was because of the
25 necessity of buying the juke box, which is associated, and they are fairly expensive.

1 And this, this again came out of our model and the costing.

2 MR. CAMERON: A couple of things to check assumptions here,
3 Fielden, the locations that are listed in the rule. This is for the public access.

4 MR. DICKERSON: That would also list this the parties, potential
5 parties.

6 MR. CAMERON: I'm not sure about that, but I'll go back and check
7 on that, but it's, the second point is, is that it's not exclusive. In other words, they shall
8 include, okay? And I guess the question is, is the public private, the public participant
9 thing becomes important because we're providing a public access location. I wonder,
10 \$150,000 a site, okay? Why is that, why is it costing \$150,000 a site?

11 MR. DICKERSON: Well, this is for the participants.

12 MR. CAMERON: And that would be for like what type of work
13 station, I mean, what does that, what does that include?

14 MR. DICKERSON: Can you help me out, Preston?

15 MR. JUNKIN: Only a little. I don't have the model with me. We
16 made an assumption -- 9-3 there's a breakdown, parties versus reading round
17 equipment, back of the -- workstation -- for the option 8, this -- very large juke box.
18 And I believe there's a communications cost in option 6 there. In fact, I'm sure there
19 is. We assumed a fairly inexpensive communication, but we advised beyond
20 productivity, but there's a recommended leasing cost for communication lines, as well
21 as in fact, it does not include any on-site support. The, perhaps the conservative
22 assumption was that one or two workstations would not require somebody
23 permanently on site out there. So, it's hardware, software and the communications --

24 MR. CAMERON: And would, and would your answer, in other words,
25 like, A1 or 2000, 2.1007 talks about DOE, public document.

1 MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

2 MR. CAMERON: So okay?

3 MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

4 MR. CAMERON: And day two talks about access to full headers.

5 MR. DICKERSON: Um-hm.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Which is during the prelicense application,
7 which is all the public and that, okay? So that's why I read that as public --

8 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, well what --

9 MR. CAMERON: -- access.

10 MR. DICKERSON: Well, what we were doing, as you look at 9.1,
11 Chip, you'll see that we have the public document room users and we were actually
12 asking the question here in terms of whether the effective units of government were
13 comprehensive in this day and age in the listing that we have. The LSS participants.

14 MR. CAMERON: Sure. I guess that, that they, the point I'm trying to
15 make is, is there a difference in cost if you read the sites for the access terminals as
16 only being keyed to public access as opposed to participant access. In other words,
17 are we deciding now to give each participant basically their terminal for access, or are
18 we putting a terminal out there in these vicinities around the site so that the participant,
19 not for the participant themselves to use, only as participants, but for members of the
20 public to come in and get access to the headers of the documents, prelicense
21 application, and then to the full text of the documents after the license application.

22 In other words, do you need, do you need this image transmission
23 capability, et cetera? I mean, there's, there's differences in cost, depending on how
24 you, how you parcel it out.

1 MR. JUNKIN: Just to answer your question, the basic question of
2 whether or not the reading room is sufficient for both public and the participants driving
3 here, our concern was, everything up to know is assumed, in terms of Phase 1
4 requirements and Phase 2 has its -- timetable 1991 and 1993, they assume that
5 physical location, being one com line and one land, and one set of equipment, is going
6 to service both the public reading room and any participant involvement in a separate
7 workstation. But it's in one building. We realize that we are not up to assume that,
8 and if it's in a separate building, there's a different communication line, a different set
9 of hardware, and --

10 MR. CAMERON: But you're making a decision that we will, that the,
11 the participant is not going to have to assume the cost for their terminal to access the
12 LSS?

13 MR. DICKERSON: That's right. No, that's right.

14 MR. CAMERON: And that's included within the LSS cost.

15 MR. DICKERSON: That's precisely right.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

17 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah. And in particular, let me just back up just
18 a little bit, Chip.

19 This is what participated this discussion. This is, in the LSS 2-065,
20 the LSS function shall be available in multiple locations in accordance with Tables 9.1
21 and 2. And all that that requirement says and then we started looking at Tables 9.1
22 and 2, said, well, look, what we did was capture the rule here and what we believed
23 were the participants or the participants, and you know, they're issues such that
24 Preston brought up here in terms of joint usage, and so we wound up with this being
25 an open issue and coming back and saying, let us look at this table and you tell us

1 whether the table is appropriate or not. And, you know, we'll put in whatever table you,
2 as a panel, tell us to put in that's going to fix our costing.

3 MR. BALCOM: Part of the reason this is being raised, also, Chip, is
4 that these are the Level 2 requirements that will go into an RFP, so they need --

5 MR. CAMERON: They really need to know this, yeah.

6 MR. BALCOM: One way or the other, just to be able to issue an
7 RFP.

8 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: I got a question about your, about your
9 table, are, are you talking about physical locations here or?

10 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, um-hm.

11 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: About when, when you mentioned Las
12 Vegas, I mean, Las Vegas could mean Clark County or it could mean the City of Las
13 Vegas.

14 MR. DICKERSON: Well, that's part of our uncertainty.

15 MR. JUNKIN: Does not represent a, one physical location, that's one
16 building, one land.

17 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: Okay. Okay, but, but the way the law
18 is defined, we're a party in the Nuclear Risk Policy Act, as Clark County. So I don't
19 know whether we need to, I mean, it's fine to have assistance in Las Vegas, and that's
20 appropriate, but....

21 FRANK: What you show, if you'd have went on at that time with
22 something like, you would put terminals in the Clark County, the new Clark County
23 office building and people in Las Vegas or people in Clark County would use the same
24 set of facilities. We know it's a kind of discretion.

1 MR. SILBERG: Well, the Table 9 line 3 shows, I don't know what it's
2 called in numbers or anything, but it looks like seven and three-volt stations, LSS
3 parties in Las Vegas and three residual stations in the Las Vegas called the document
4 room.

5 So I assume that means at least two locations and maybe ten
6 locations, I don't know how to read this here.

7 MR. BECHTEL: Well, I get a little confused when Nigh county is
8 mentioned, Lincoln County, Nigh county could be torn apart, too, but...

9 MR. SILBERG: Well, this shows seven residual stations in Nigh
10 County also.

11 MR. DICKERSON: But that's because Nigh County is called out
12 specifically.

13 MR. BECHTEL: Well, yeah, but, well, Lincoln County, maybe that's -
14 -

15 MS. NEWBURY: But that's seven stations at one point.

16 MR. DICKERSON: That's right. That's right. That's just
17 workstations at one point.

18 MS. NEWBURY: How come you guys decided that you have to have
19 an optical juke box?

20 MR. JUNKIN: That's all for option 8.

21 MS. NEWBURY: I know, but why? The people are quite capable of
22 putting things in and out of the CD drive. Personally speaking, I change them all the
23 time. You know.

24 So I wondered why you assumed that --

25 MR. DICKERSON: You're asking the wrong person.

1 A juke box is something you put quarters in, as far as I'm concerned.

2 MR. JUNKIN: I think the assumption, we can go either way. We're
3 talking several hundred platters and the assumption is we're procuring and returning
4 and all that, but you could go either way.

5 MR. CUMMINGS: I, I think if I had to do with a volume of issues of
6 key word searching and so forth and then it going and getting different, you know,
7 different information being on different platters, instead of somebody sitting there and
8 putting them in and out. I think it was a volume issue.

9 MS. NEWBURY: Okay. I just, you don't locate them that often.

10 MR. METTAM: I'd like to say, it's not the public versus private, so to
11 speak, access. But the issue of what the locations are.

12 If you look at the rule where it calls out Lincoln and Nigh County, I
13 think we have to look at a little history and then if those were the effective units of older
14 government at the time the rule was written. I think the intent was to name the
15 effected units of government in my mind. Obviously, being one of those units not
16 named, I have a vested interest in that.

17 But I think that, just as, when, you know, when this panel was
18 formed, those units that were effective units of local government were formed on the
19 panel and obviously shaped an attitude, as other units have been added, I think that
20 the same thing has to be true of other parts of the rule.

21 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah. We're not arguing, we're, you know, all
22 we're saying is as a working group, we can't make that, that, we can't hold to that,
23 we're coming back to you and saying, hey, you know, give us the list that you want,
24 that's the one we will work toward.

1 MR. METTAM: I planned that. I did make that comment on the page
2 one. That, that I sent to John for comments.

3 MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

4 MR. BECHTEL: I guess that was kind of the basis of my question,
5 because Clark County was one of the three original effectives --

6 MR. METTAM: Right.

7 MR. BECHTEL: -- and I was confused when I saw Las Vegas and
8 then Nigh and Lincoln.

9 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, we, well, I, we know we're exhaustive in
10 terms of putting down things here, we were just trying to do examples of --

11 MS. NEWBURY: Fielden, at this point, are you just looking to say
12 how many remote locations?

13 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah.

14 MS. NEWBURY: Not where they are.

15 MR. DICKERSON: Not specifically.

16 MS. NEWBURY: Not specific locations, but one for each effected
17 unit of government?

18 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah. Tell us what the effective units of
19 government are.

20 MS. NEWBURY: I think those are defined.

21 MR. DICKERSON: I don't know where they are.

22 MR. METTAM: We almost have to say that we, currently there are --

23 MR. DICKERSON: Two.

24 MR. METTAM: Ten, and obviously the State.

25 MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

1 MR. METTAM: That may change in years to come. You know, I --

2 MR. DICKERSON: Well, we don't have any problem with that --

3 MR. METTAM: Okay.

4 MR. DICKERSON: But what we needed right now is scope
5 something so we put our, you know --

6 MR. GRASER: If I could characterize the nature of the problem, we
7 need to be able to put into a procurement specification and then we need to be able to
8 bid. If we don't put it in the spec, they don't deliver. If we put it in the spec, then they
9 deliver it. And that's the nature of the drill, we need to tell them, is it ten locations, but
10 two of the locations are co-located, what's the mix.

11 In order for them to be able to figure, you know, telecommunication
12 lines and, and, you know, buying the data flows, and so forth, so that, you know, the
13 underlying thing is to come down with a precise enough list that somebody can bid on
14 that list for the solicitation. And that's the nature of the --

15 MR. ECHOLS: Can we use just numbers and not names? In other
16 words, you said, 12, assume 12 locations --

17 MR. DICKERSON: Well, we needed to know a general location.

18 MR. METTAM: There's a significant difference between ten in Las
19 Vegas and ten scattered about.

20 MR. GRASER: Right. Now, and a T-3 line going to each of ten
21 different places within one city versus one T-3 line going in --

22 MR. ECHOLS: It's just a, potentially effective.

23 MR. GRASER: What you were mentioning, that number can go up
24 and down over time.

1 MR. METTAM: Potentially, yeah. It's not all that likely that it will
2 change significantly, but it could. I don't want to say no.

3 MR. SILBERG: I don't see any reason why we shouldn't take a head
4 count whenever this procurement spec goes out as to who --

5 MR. DICKERSON: Well, we need it now.

6 MR. SILBERG: Yeah. Well, then, the time is now. The local
7 governments now.

8 MR. CAMERON: Let's develop the list now.

9 MR. SILBERG: It's not very difficult.

10 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: We don't know whether this number,
11 gentlemen, I don't know if the number for tubal stations --

12 MR. MITCHELL: Are there any tribes that are listed as a remote
13 site?

14 MR. DICKERSON: No. That's another question that we have. Now,
15 I can here you, Ed.

16 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: Okay. My question was, we have a
17 certain number of the tubal stations listed for the various sites and ever though they're
18 not broken out yet, I assume that'll happen. But those numbers are not case in
19 concrete, either, are they?

20 MR. SILBERG: But I assume those numbers are also being used.

21 MR. DICKERSON: That's, that's why we're playing that game in
22 terms of, those are trade offs that we're making in there.

23 MR. BECHTEL: How did, how did you derive those numbers?

24 MR. DICKERSON: How did we derive those numbers? They're all
25 prime.

1 MR. JUNKIN: They are a strong and we're hoping for some
2 feedback, quite frankly, I mean, we don't know whether you, (a) whether you want a
3 separate station and knowing it already has a public reading room. And we don't know
4 how many you want.

5 Our concern was that you might say that I've got five law firms
6 working for me and that I want one at each of them. That's going to, we need to know
7 that.

8 And that reminds me to make some calls.

9 MR. MITCHELL: Is it my understanding at this point that we can
10 revise the list of remote sites in the future or do we need to define all those prior to a
11 certain date?

12 MR. DICKERSON: We would like to have you define those in the
13 next week or two.

14 MR. SILBERG: But it's only for the purpose of bidding.

15 MR. DICKERSON: That's right, that's right.

16 MR. BALCOM: Usually the way, I'm going to guess, procurement
17 folks out there that the way this will get set up is you would have a certain fixed figure
18 and, and that a facility in the procurement vehicle to add more --

19 MR. SILBERG: Right. Then it's just the changes.

20 MR. DICKERSON: Well, what we're trying to do is being as
21 complete as we can in terms of putting the package together.

22 MR. MITCHELL: Well, I guess at this time, on behalf of NCAI, what I
23 would like to suggest is that there be some, a remote site for cargo interests identified,
24 or at least maybe not identified, but at least put down a tribal site and then we can
25 identify the specific site at a future date and have that agreed in the bidding back-up.

1 MR. CAMERON: Because you're dealing with, you're dealing with a
2 number of different categories here, okay? If you're talking about public access,
3 terminals in the vicinity of the site, maybe you would have a public access terminal
4 somewhere near the western Shoshoni, okay? If that could if indeed be pinpointed
5 because people are all over the place.

6 You have the effected unit of local government, which is perhaps a
7 little easier to qualify for for local governments than the term in the NWPA, effected
8 tribal government. And we know that no tribe has been designated as effected tribal
9 government.

10 Then you have the whole issue of a potential party or party to the
11 proceedings, there's going to be much less trouble for a tribe in the vicinity of the site
12 or a national organization who has members in the vicinity of the site and become a
13 party to the proceeding, then it would be, I think, for them to become an effected tribe
14 under the NWPA.

15 So you sort of have to take all of that into the mix. I would take a
16 broad, I would take a, you know, a broad reading of that.

17 MR. DICKERSON: Well, one of the things that we as the technical
18 working group can do for the panel is, is, you know, having brought this to your
19 attention, we can go back and we can make a straw man for you in terms of, of what
20 this looks like. And what we need then is some sort of concurrence on, on that or
21 changes in it so that we can move forward.

22 We don't have to do this in real time today in terms of identifying all
23 of these, all of these places.

24 But this was a set of decisions that as a technical working group, we
25 did not want to make without bringing it to your attention.

1 FRANK: Now, the difficulty we were having, Chip, was the, you
2 know, where are these things going to be and how are they going to be related to each
3 other, because that's a big, big difficulty and expenses because of the loan. And that's
4 where the real issue is. And then of course, you have to tell that to some pencil
5 bender or benders so that they can --

6 MR. DICKERSON: I think somebody even mentioned, we have one
7 of these public reading rooms at, in a place that no longer exists.

8 MR. HOYLE: Can we, can you give the panel a recommendation?

9 MR. DICKERSON: Not today. And we could do it in within a couple
10 of weeks.

11 MR. HOYLE: Yeah. Okay. I think you should. I think currently
12 we're leaning toward putting in the largest -- that we can justify at the moment.

13 MR. SILBERG: One question I have on the numbers is whether
14 these number of stations make any sense.

15 MR. DICKERSON: The workstations?

16 MR. SILBERG: Yeah. On these ten that are on-site. Do you really
17 mean ten retrieval stations in Lincoln County? And that sounds like a large number to
18 me. But I don't know what a retrieval station is.

19 MR. DICKERSON: Preston, do you want to address that?

20 MR. JUNKIN: I, we appreciate any feedback on that but again, we
21 don't have what we're asking of size of your organization that would be specifically one
22 or two people at a site, that's important input. We, we assume three stations for a
23 public reading room and then for the other, we're probably a little high, is what I'm
24 hearing. We probably aren't the best people assessing that --

1 MR. SILBERG: Well, in some places there may well be, but I would
2 think in a lot of it, the counties, if you have one, that's probably enough.

3 MR. LEVIN: I think what we're going to have to do is develop the
4 straw man and have each party review it as far as the numbers of what they require
5 and get back to us and that way we'll, we'll refine these numbers.

6 MR. SILBERG: I also notice there's none listed here for the NRC
7 public reading room here in Washington. I don't know if that was intentional or not.

8 MR. CAMERON: That must be an oversight.

9 MR. SILBERG: Well, it says NRC headquarters --

10 MR. CAMERON: So this is a, you know, you're going to be providing
11 terminals for the, all the potential participants to use. Now, they're going to be
12 providing some terminals of their own, for their counsel who are probably not going to
13 be going out to sit in Lincoln County. You know.

14 MR. SILBERG: Well, if it's a, oh, if it's a dial, then you're not worried
15 about somebody.

16 MR. LEVIN: No. Anybody who dials in has to do it at their own
17 expense.

18 MR. DICKERSON: And that could be a party. I mean, what
19 happens is you may have one in your office, on a dial-in basis. And you're a party, you
20 know, you're working for a party.

21 Okay. Now that we've gotten that contentious issue behind us.

22 MS. NEWBURY: Can I ask one more question before we do? Just
23 one.

24 MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

1 MS. NEWBURY: What's the incremental cost of each, each
2 additional station at a single location? In other words, you've got a cost of, of I don't
3 know how much, that includes the line and putting it in. And if we put in one
4 workstation, is it a huge extra cost to tap off that and put in three?

5 MR. JUNKIN: The initial one would be the biggest cost because of
6 all the, I don't know the number that was used, but I'm guessing it was probably
7 somewhere of 5,000. Five to eight.

8 MS. NEWBURY: So conceivable, we could put one in a location,
9 each of several locations and if, if use warranted it, we could put another terminal in, or
10 workstation or whatever, at minimal cost.

11 MR. JUNKIN: We could start off with, you know, going low on the
12 numbers on the assumption that it's not a big deal to add another. That might be the
13 way to go.

14 MS. NEWBURY: Yeah. I'd go real low to start and then work my
15 way up as demand --

16 MR. JUNKIN: Yeah, the incremental workstations, that, oh, that's
17 very trivial cost compared to the --

18 MR. LEVIN: As long as we account for that in the original design so
19 that it's easy to add.

20 MR. SILBERG: How difficult is it to move sites around? I mean, if,
21 for instance, if you move your site in Las Vegas from building A to building B?

22 MR. JUNKIN: I'd have to make some assumption as to how the -- of
23 each -- but I know there's some leased lines at the DOE today that make a change in
24 50 days, minimum. I notice -- really depends on how the -- it's not something you just
25 pull the plug and -- .

1 MR. MITCHELL: One last question from, on behalf of NCAI. Is it
2 possible to designate a, or rewritten from NCAI, such as American Indian Science
3 Engineering Society or one or two tribes to be an LSS party via NCAI and have the
4 hardware at that location?

5 MR. HOYLE: I'm going to need a legal answer on that.

6 MR. CAMERON: I'm sure it isn't going to be a legal answer, but, it
7 gets, all of that can be sorted out, I think, but it gets difficult because NCAI is
8 representing tribal interests at the table here. Now when it gets down to providing
9 specific facilities to specific tribes, then of course, but first of all, that's an issue for
10 NCAI in terms of how they would want to, to do that. And maybe that's the most
11 important issue.

12 I know that sometimes there's been questions about, can NCAI really
13 speak for their tribes? And this may fall into a different category, but I, I think it's
14 worthwhile, it's worthwhile exploring. Because where would be the most useful
15 location for tribal interests during the prelicense application phase? Where would be
16 the most useful location for the tribes in terms of making use of the LSS.

17 So, maybe it comes down to, to your call at the first, the first
18 impression.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Probably to work out later, that your tribes are
20 represented in terms of all the getting access. Whether or not a tribe belongs to NCAI
21 or not, many tribes don't place boundaries along the different areas and all can come
22 together when it comes to a particular issue. So maybe it is something that we can
23 work out in the very near future and try and get an answer to the working group.

24 MR. SILBERG: If NCAI is an intentional participant or is representing
25 a potential participant, it seems to me that they can designate whoever they want as

1 their representative. Either counsel or technical or managerial or, however they want
2 to set it up.

3 MR. MITCHELL: Would you like to see a list of recommendations
4 within the next week or so from NCAI so we can --

5 MR. DICKERSON: Yes. If you could call me, Lloyd, that would be
6 just great. It might help if we're trying to put this package together.

7 MR. MITCHELL: All right. I'll do my best to get that information to
8 you.

9 MR. SILBERG: We'll do the same as to whether to see if she
10 wants a terminal or just we'll dial it or whatever.

11 MR. BALCOM: Do you mind if I ask for this, from everybody?

12 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah.

13 MR. BALCOM: So is that a requirement ARP at the table here with
14 whatever having respond with proposed numbers?

15 MR. DICKERSON: Well, I could check with the affected, the other
16 affected -- and come up with a number and get back to you on it.

17 MR. SILBERG: I would also put in as any strong assumptions that
18 you may have on other private groups, public or special interest groups. Any other
19 groups that may come in on a later stage of the proceeding, at the table and try to
20 qualify as potential participants. I would assume that you have one or two of those.

21 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah.

22 MR. SILBERG: Yeah.

23 MR. DICKERSON: Good idea.

24 Okay. Why don't we go on to the --

1 MR. JUNKIN: Let's see. We discussed each of the response
2 requirements that appear beginning with Requirement 060 is a table in your document
3 that lists a number of performance timing strains we call it.

4 Basically what we did was to identify key functions, including those a
5 primary user would use -- as well as system administration functions because we can't
6 administrate the system -- period is on the -- the next day and we defined conditions
7 under which the timing strength would be tested and then we determine our response
8 times for those.

9 Now, a couple changes have resulted for us since this there's been a
10 lot of considerations of this table. One comment from the tribe was they wanted to
11 raise the, the performance times according to the number of tribe users. We've shown
12 times for 18 users and 50 concurrent users.

13 And typically the way this is tested in our system development
14 environment is they would actually write scripts or scenarios that represent typical
15 usage of the system and you would literally have those number of people working
16 through the scripts and then you'd be measuring certain time strains under those
17 conditions.

18 One of the challenges of the LSS in terms of testing and acceptance
19 criteria is the large volume. The amount of labor involved in, in loading even five
20 million pages of data, for testing purposes, is significant. The assumption certainly
21 would be at this, at this point, that DOE would reuse important data from there.
22 Through the normal course of events, but nevertheless, it's difficult to conduct a test of
23 that magnitude. That first one there, there's significant effort just to do the testing.

24 One of the guidance points that came out of the TWG was that these
25 were private and should be established. I guess I phrased it as fairly conservatively, in

1 other words, make sure that these times are not so low that they're going to drive the
2 system -- the roof. If anybody raises their hand and says, could you do it in 300
3 milliseconds or whatever, the answer is always yes, given enough money. There is
4 certainly a relationship there.

5 We believe these to be very achievable using current commercial,
6 latest current commercial technologies. They're systems out there that achieve this
7 kind of response.

8 We also ran some of these numbers by and had some positive
9 feedback there in that regard as well, so, we feel that these are conservative numbers.
10 They do not, the first one may be the one of most interest. Another comment out of
11 the TWG, let me through this up here, so, -- specifics.

12 You'll see that this first one has changed since the document that
13 we, that you have before you. One of the TWG, originally this was specified as a
14 single word query across the system and one of the comments out of the TWG was
15 inducted and represented a very realistic scenario that's very complex. They provided
16 us with a couple of queries we believe to be more representative and let me just jump
17 ahead to a footnote that's referred to there so you can see what we're talking about.

18 Basically, a series of this and this, or this and this, or this and this,
19 that query. So it represents all our complexity and therefore more time. The time
20 restraint has gone up as a result of that and so for those two sample queries, which
21 are given their titles here that NLB uses, we're saying the conditions of this test will be
22 that the, that the -- has five million pages of documents in it. I'll explain why that
23 number was chosen in a moment. And then a total of ten documents were found
24 because of the response time is dependent on the number of documents you get in
25 some cases.

1 Why five million? It's not because we think that's the total sum of the
2 volume of documents in the data base. However, we believe it's unrealistic to think
3 that we're going to be able to conduct a test over some 30 million pages. And the
4 assumption is that if, once the system gets over five million pages, we'll probably do
5 some kind of partitioning in the design where we have designs that will partition at,
6 partitioned queries. In other words, I like to query across the documents from 1992 to
7 1994 as opposed to the entire set.

8 Not to say you wouldn't functionally be able to query across the
9 entire set, but typically the user for their own sake would want to limit their queries
10 more than that.

11 So the first one is for retrievable full text search in order to obtain a
12 list of documents. Again the slash, the 90/140 refers to number of concurrent users.
13 The second one, having retrieved a list of document hits, the second time the string is
14 to get a view of the header associated with a particular document.

15 The third timing string, refers to the display of the test under the
16 same conditions, five million pages. Having clipped on that, the next requirement,
17 yes?

18 MR. METTAM: Two quick questions.

19 MR. JUNKIN: Uh-huh.

20 MR. METTAM: The first one is, and I'll have to give you an example
21 to make it clear, at least to me.

22 In typical operations, everything works fine until everybody picks up
23 theirself and then the system crashes.

1 Is there a number, an outlying number that says, if we get 200,
2 2,000, whatever that number might be, x-number of users will lock this system up? I
3 mean, are you going to specify that for the vender?

4 MR. JUNKIN: That's a good comment, Brad, we have not done that.
5 We did not specify the maximum number of concurrent users that the system would
6 support. And that probably would be a good thing to do. I don't recall any discussion
7 coming up.

8 MR. ECHOLS: Preston, you're saying, these are document source
9 and I'm presuming this is during licensing, pre-licensing and both relicensing when the
10 public -- at this point presumption is --

11 MR. JUNKIN: That's when I would assume this function would be
12 used, but this is simply a system requirement. It doesn't care when, I mean, whoever
13 provides the system will have to prove that the system can handle this particular --

14 MR. ECHOLS: It goes to the crash requirement.

15 MR. JUNKIN: Right.

16 MR. ECHOLS: There was some discussion earlier that when you're
17 in licensing --

18 MR. JUNKIN: Um-hm.

19 MR. ECHOLS: The parties to the licensing proceedings should be
20 able to be identified somehow so that if there are others on that would potential crash
21 it, they get disconnected.

22 So if the public is running around doing this --

23 MR. JUNKIN: There is no functionality in the document right now
24 that has to do with, am I too close to the microphone? That has to do with, there's no
25 prioritization function in the document right now. That's an interesting concept, I'm not

1 sure, not that it couldn't be implemented, but it's a rather a user unfriendly. I'm sorry,
2 you've just been terminated. But, there is nothing in the --

3 MR. LEVIN: There is nothing in the, it would be user friendly to the
4 ones with priority, that is.

5 MR. JUNKIN: That's true. I'm not suggesting, I'm not arguing one
6 way or the other. I'm telling you it's not in the document to do that right now.

7 MR. METTAM: Well, I think it would be important when the
8 evaluating systems to know what that lock-up number is. What the maximum users on
9 channels, or however you want to classify it.

10 MR. JUNKIN: Is that how you feel then? That's a good comment,
11 we'll be happy to do that, that should be easy to --

12 MR. METTAM: The other question I had is something you said just a
13 moment ago which is that the UNLV test queries included billing searches. One of the
14 comments I had written down to write up, is that LSS21-3 basically specifies that all
15 you've got are single multi character wildcards. And some proximity searches. It
16 doesn't talk at all about bullion searches and the comment is only very fundamental
17 full-text options, which are available through a wide variety of products that have been
18 specified. And my note was, well, I think bullion is a fairly common --

19 MR. JUNKIN: I agree with you. I think that's an oversight and we
20 should probably add that specific requirement you just referenced and common --
21 expressions or simple -- expressions, something like that.

22 VOICE: Which, which

23 MR. METTAM: LSS211, batch 3, right?

24 MR. JUNKIN: Right. Because we certainly made the same
25 assumption, right, that there would be bullion queries. We simply didn't call that out.

1 MR. BALCOM: In the root search we talked about it, but the TWG
2 meeting, was that, was that question in?

3 MR. JUNKIN: I believe that is in the document. I don't have it with
4 me, but it must be.

5 MR. BALCOM: Go down the list --

6 MR. JUNKIN: I can look that up, right after, I believe we did retain
7 that.

8 MR. SILBERG: I raised the question yesterday about whether it
9 makes any sense to consider different response time requirements for different stages
10 of the process. For people that are concerned during the relicensing stage and
11 having, you know, virtually instantaneous turnarounds, it might be willing to take fairly
12 extended response times versus when a hearing is going on when you need current
13 tax forms.

14 Is there a way to, well, is it worth considering that as an option, is it
15 technically feasible to do that? Is there any savings to set the system up that way?

16 MR. JUNKIN: I'll give my answer and refer to the rest of the TWG. I
17 think operationally that represents reality; however, in terms of procurement, it's very
18 difficult to specify that the system will be this fast at this time and five years later it will
19 be that fast.

20 It's better to put the toughest requirements right up front because
21 vendors are not known for their honesty in some cases and they'll say, oh, yeah, five
22 years from now we'll have no problem. Rather they proved it before you accepted the
23 system, so.

24 Probably better to lay it all out at once and if you don't need that
25 capacity, with the exception of storage and you may want to buy storage incrementally,

1 but in terms of speed, you, you probably don't want to assume any increase later.
2 That would be naturally as hardware gets better anyway. I'd say it may be a vender's
3 highest form.

4 FRANK: Although administratively --

5 MR. JUNKIN: Absolutely, operationally.

6 FRANK: You could way that during that time you will, you will take all
7 other new men off the system and allow exclusively the function in that period. You
8 know, that will speed up the process tremendously.

9 MR. LEVIN: And we can do that just through procedures,
10 administrative procedures.

11 MS. NEWBURY: Do you want just a limited number of users anyway
12 because you only have those people that are at workstations, this isn't a Internet
13 worldwide web site, this is a limited access system in the first place.

14 MR. LEVIN: That's not totally true because of remote, because of
15 dialogue.

16 MR. CAMERON: If it was limited, you would be right, but you can
17 have, there's unlimited dial-in access.

18 MS. NEWBURY: No.

19 MR. LEVIN: Not totally. There's no such thing as unlimited, we
20 would have a limited number of ports, or a limited number of modems.

21 MR. JUNKIN: And accounts, I mean, nobody will access the system
22 that doesn't have an account. They won't be, like when you sit down anywhere and
23 automatically get on. I guess there'd be no security in that case.

24 MR. LEVIN: But it's not only the number of people, it's what they're
25 doing at any given time and that's what's unpredictable.

1 MR. JUNKIN: But we have taken action to prevent a requirement
2 based on Brad's comment that would specify a maximum number of concurrent users,
3 which really the system, but will not necessarily support higher than that. And I really -
4 -

5 MR. SILBERG: But the question --

6 MR. JUNKIN: I'm sorry? You might say prime blank. I hope I
7 answered Jay's question. Does that answer your question?

8 Let's see, and the next one, dash L4 has to do with the retrieval of
9 images. Yes, sir. There is a number of cases which specify a certain time for retrieval
10 of the first ten pages and then subsequent pages are, are faster because that
11 represents reality for a number of the systems that downloading first is, is the slowest
12 and some of them are sophisticated enough that they're actually downloading the next
13 one while you're looking at the first one.

14 The next has to do with the capture process. And it simply says that
15 we need to sustain a rate of 30 pages per minute, single-sided 15. Double sided,
16 that's very achievable. And we have single scanners that do that in the system and
17 this requirement doesn't even assume a single scanner can be met by multiple slower
18 scanners if they choose.

19 I'm almost done. The rest go quickly. There was a comment on this
20 one earlier and I'd like to hear your views on it. A document is being constructed
21 intentionally so as not to specify design as much as possible and in fact there's been a
22 temporary mandate that there be physical wires or fiber connecting the sites. I believe
23 it's safe to say that you can meet the requirements of this document with a CD based
24 library system, but because of that possibility, we wanted to put in dash 06, which says
25 if you're going to have the right size and all you've got is a CD that may not, you know,

1 you're going to have to have something to get latest documents available right away,
2 because monthly updates is not going to cut it.

3 So the comment we received earlier was, 24 hours isn't going to cut
4 it, let me make one distinction for it and I'd like to hear if you still think 24 hours is
5 inadequate.

6 In terms of transcripts and the messaging part of the system, the
7 files and motions part, those are available instantaneously essentially. They, they are,
8 we weigh the use of the word E-mail, but that's essentially what we're talking about, is
9 a large E-mail system for this stuff, transcripts would certainly be put in nightly.

10 This really was meant, maybe we need to clarify that this was
11 referred to documentary material in the database and so as the administrator puts a
12 new document into the database, then everybody in any of the remote sites is going to
13 be able to see that document within 24 hours.

14 That basically says there's some kind of a lack of, for at least the
15 latest documents. Now, you could have a book-of-the-month CD for that, for the
16 backlog or for the majority of the year, a collection, if you chose to do that.

17 Okay? Are you, are you comfortable with 24 now or is that still an
18 issue? because it's --

19 MR. SILBERG: Well, I just wonder again whether that may be longer
20 than you need early on and shorter, I mean, longer -- .

21 MR. JUNKIN: There is a, some recognition then during the hearing
22 and the world does change a lot. I understand these lawyers are going to want to be
23 in there every night looking at things.

24 MR. CAMERON: And that's when they really have fun.

1 MR. JUNKIN: Shall we leave that at 24 for now? Okay. That's part
2 of the operational course and we're just trying to recruit any design that would, could
3 even meet that. If it could meet that, then you're there and you're out of there.

4 Dash 07, again, we didn't want to specify design and not every full
5 text search utilizes an inverted index, but most of them do and for a document to be
6 searchable, it has to be quick indexed. And that takes time and there are several off
7 the wall systems out there in the commercial world where you actually have re-index
8 every document in the database to add one document and that certainly wouldn't work
9 for something of this magnitude.

10 So this, this requirement is to knock those guys out of the picture
11 and it simply says that it can't take more than 20 seconds to full text index, or whatever
12 is you do to make searchable, a document, 10 pages, you certainly won't be able to
13 get all the newly-scanned and OCR documents available for search, you know,
14 quickly, on a nightly basis at a minimum.

15 And then back-up and recovery are our last two and they simply are
16 done in terms of gigabytes per hour. I think this is just recognizing that this is a large
17 enough and significant enough system that you do need the, a serious backup and
18 restore capability you're not going to be happy hanging tapes to accommodate a
19 system of this magnitude.

20 MR. SILBERG: Let me go back to that 24 hours. We mentioned this
21 before, I can't remember whether it was on or off the record. But during the hearings,
22 during two depositions, you're going to need transcripts available much quicker than
23 24 hours. Now, since those would presumably be taken electronically, will those be
24 out of the system quicker?

1 MR. JUNKIN: We have an, we have a function in our data, it's not a
2 function, a requirement in our data section regarding the import of transcripts
3 specifically. I don't believe we specified a format yet, since those are done by
4 commercial companies. So, you know, you might specify numbers and common
5 formats.

6 But, you know, I guess I think we ought to an action to, to better
7 defining a modern requirement with a 24-hour availability so that we're clear that we're
8 not talking about transcripts and electronic message and all. Because you're
9 absolutely right. Transcripts need to go immediately, in fact, in the real world, I think
10 they're available a few hours later after the close of the day and lawyers are often
11 reviewing them at night, so. We should make that more clear. We were talking about
12 documentary material and we need to make that clear in the requirement.

13 Any other questions or comments?

14 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: I just have a question, getting back to
15 doing researchers, LS011-2. Would that not include doing researches?

16 MR. JUNKIN: 011-2.

17 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: No, it's 20-, 2-011-2.

18 MR. JUNKIN: The ability to clear the system by specifying one or
19 more character strings, with full text in the document, an internal list of what happened
20 to satisfy the query.

21 I guess we could be more explicit. They got other lists that was
22 referenced where we talked about specific.

23 MR. METTAM: Right.

24 MR. JUNKIN: You're right. Capabilities, but combination of the other
25 -- where's the thing that says proximity and all that?

1 MR. METTAM: 211-3. The one right below the one he was looking
2 at. Dash 2 is pre-text and the next one is --

3 MR. JUNKIN: Yeah. I guess the way I'm reading it, I think we still
4 ought to specifically say and combinations or something to that effect. Just so we're
5 not, you know, I don't mean to crash vendors, but it is a case where you need to worry
6 about whether they included an engine with that car, you know.

7 And I have to say there's, you know, there's a lot of conversations
8 about I saw this and I saw that at a trade show and I equate it to somebody walking in
9 a hardware store and saying, I need to dig up a square-foot shaft, you got something
10 to dig holes? And the guy says, yeah, I got this shovel. And he says, well, this thing's
11 not going to work and there's a lot of that going around. So. You need to say what it's
12 gotta do.

13 I want to reemphasize what Fielden said. You know, there's a long
14 history of discussions on the functions of a lot of notes and a lot of meetings and lot of
15 memories and none of which are entirely consistent in terms of the memories anyway,
16 and the purpose of this document is to narrow it down. So, if it's not here, don't
17 assume it's in the LSS. It's really important that we all appreciate that. Because you
18 don't close on your fire notes, you're never going to get a system.

19 MR. GRASER: Dan Graser, NRC. Regarding the placing a tap on
20 the advancement number of potential users for this system is part of our parameter
21 that you might give the bidders.

22 I'm just wondering if we wouldn't be better served, rather than trying
23 to exercise that particular crystal ball and not even knowing the final list of potentially
24 effective parties at this point, if we wouldn't in fact be better served to add something

1 into the section seven under performance of capacity requirements to give us the
2 capability to do dynamic performance monitoring as the system is growing.

3 I know we have a clause within the rule that allows us to identify
4 changes that need to be made to the LSS and gives us a mechanism, and go back
5 and ask the Department of Energy to go out and, you know, inquire or fix or do
6 whatever else is necessary. And it just seems to me that not knowing the number of
7 potential users or not knowing their real use patterns and how those use patterns may
8 change over time, we'd be better served by, by having a statement in here giving us a
9 better monitoring tool. So that we can monitor how the system is being used. Rather
10 than trying to nail down some number that may prove really inadequate five years from
11 now.

12 MR. JUNKIN: I remember during one of the discussions at the TWG
13 was that there probably are more specific system administration tools that we decided
14 in the end not to include here, but that at the time of an actual procurement, we might
15 want to include. And I think that's certainly one of them. In a distributed system,
16 you're going to need some way to assess the --

17 MR. GRASER: Well, the thing, the comment, as you said, it's not
18 here --

19 MR. JUNKIN: Right.

20 MR. GRASER: -- right now.

21 MR. JUNKIN: I understand. I think we still do need to specify
22 maximum users, at least to weed out the departmental size solutions, of which there
23 are many out there who would break, you know, around 80 or 90 users.

24 MR. METTAM: Rather than classifying it as a, a max number of
25 users, you know, look at the, it has to have at least a number of users.

1 MR. GRASER: You know, potentially in excess of.

2 MR. METTAM: Right. So that, what I'm really saying is, it's got to
3 have at least this capacity, you know, excess capacity would be a plus, obviously.

4 MR. JUNKIN: Right. So, you need to stay at a minimum, not in
5 excess of course, is not testable but if they, you could say at a minimum you need to
6 support up to, 200, and that expandable would be back in the chapter ten, if you don't
7 already have it, we could put something about scale or ability. Again, that's not
8 testable, but that's what chapter ten's all about, is untestable goals.

9 I'd say, with, with a number, I'm thinking back to the old SAIC
10 document, I'm thinking of a number around 200 as a maximum, as a max-out number.
11 I don't know if that's unrealistic high at this --

12 MR. LEVIN: That's what the issue is with all these numbers.

13 MR. JUNKIN: Well, -- for the day.

14 MR. LEVIN: How do we get a good feeling for the numbers, or
15 validate the numbers now. These are people's best guesses, but I'm not sure we're
16 making guesses with full information. So....

17 MR. JUNKIN: Well, people, aren't people are already on the hub to
18 provide sites, perhaps it should be on the hub to get us an estimated number of users.

19 MR. LEVIN: Concurrent users?

20 MR. JUNKIN: The best guess and currently is just a starting point.
21 Because we're shooting in the dark otherwise.

22 MR. SILBERG: Well, most of these, most of these users are think
23 are going to be within our NRC, DOE or its contractors. The bulk of the folks who are
24 using it day to day at the same time are going to be in, you know, Life Flint, and

1 Forrestal, and Vienna, and Las Vegas. And you, between the two of you, you can
2 probably come up with 80, 85% of what the total vote is like that.

3 MR. JUNKIN: All right. I have to hope or assume that most of the
4 users are represented in this room, at least as they're known today, even though it's
5 not a complete set, so any data we can get, then the real world will be better than
6 nothing. Even if it is your best guess. I mean, if seven is a ridiculous number for a
7 site, I need support information. We're going to try to make this as simple as possible.

8 Any other questions?

9 MR. SILBERG: Could I go back to the issue of color? There's a few
10 questions that I wanted to ask before.

11 MR. CAMERON: Was that yesterday?

12 MR. SILBERG: Seems like it, doesn't it. The current DOE and NRC
13 systems are T-dot systems, currently? What they do with respect to color?

14 MR. LEVIN: In what respect? I believe TDOCS handles color as
15 chemical. But I know that the other, other than TDOCS, the other text management
16 systems, or document management systems we have, do not handle color.

17 MR. SILBERG: Okay. What does DOE do? Electronically with
18 color, if anything.

19 MS. NEWBURY: Is that in terms of records, or electronically
20 everything? We have lots of pretty colored things. For our models and stuff, but in
21 records --

22 MR. SILBERG: I mean for the records and stuff.

23 MS. NEWBURY: Dave, you want to talk about that?

24 DAVE: What's that?

25 MS. NEWBURY: Coloring records.

1 DAVE: We don't, we haven't, we don't have a color --

2 MR. CUMMINGS: All of our colored maps up in --all of our colored
3 maps up till now are considered one of a kind.

4 DAVE: Right.

5 MR. CUMMINGS: Meaning, we don't, do our ball, they're treated as
6 one of a kind. There's not duplicates of every site like we have right now with our
7 microfilm. Right now, when we microfilm a document, it goes to, you know, like ten
8 different sites, everybody wants a copy of that microfilm.

9 Now, we've gone through the electronic imaging system, which
10 you're going to hear about later on, as of May 15th. But, but as far as color, we do
11 have they mentioned gray --

12 MR. JUNKIN: We have an addition of that is a gray scale printout of
13 a map. Which was originally a color map that's out of the system of DOE, you know,
14 but we're not storing and coloring. Storing is one time

15 MR. MITCHELL: The map that's, that came in our packet, for figure
16 9.1, -- locations. That, was that in color?

17 MR. DICKERSON: Okay. I wanted to bring another, just
18 development to your, to your attention. And that's a availability. So they're aren't
19 many hard decisions associated with that. That's the good news.

20 But, from the TWG's perspective, we were concerned about
21 availability because the rule specifically asked for availability in the sense that there
22 are certain exchanges of information that there are limited times available for it. It
23 points out that if the LSS is unavailable for a period greater than four hours, you lose
24 the day, you pay the penalty associated with it.

1 MR. METTAM: This is four access hours? Does that mean eight to
2 eight? Pacific to --

3 MR. DICKERSON: That's what's under available under rule, under
4 64.

5 MR. METTAM: But when you say four access hours, you're saying
6 some part back --

7 MR. DICKERSON: Some time greater than that.

8 MR. METTAM: Okay.

9 MR. DICKERSON: And, oh, thank you. And what we have
10 specifically addressed in that then is the --

11 MR. METTAM: I wanted to make sure that you weren't talking about
12 some 2 a.m. to 4 a.m. update or something?

13 MR. DICKERSON: No. Under, under this part 264, we have
14 addressed the hours of operation and so on.

15 But earlier on, I had drawn your attention to the system definition in
16 the sense of I told you, you know, look under part 9.3 and the system includes all the
17 communication links on initial. And so that becomes important and there is a typo here
18 and it's not the stability of hardware, it's the totality of hardware, software, et cetera,
19 that defines the system.

20 And so, in other part, in other 64, we have said, this is our definition,
21 availability to merge to availability of all sites listed in Table 9.1, you know, that was the
22 table when you were fussing about a bit ago when we were talking about remote sites.
23 And what we have done is we have not skimmed in any fashion here, we have really
24 stepped up to the bar and said, this is availability. The LSS will be up, including all of

1 those, those communication links and if we're down in one of those, or any one of
2 those for over four hours, we've lost a day.

3 MR. SILBERG: Does that make sense that you lose, that everyone
4 loses a day because one site is down?

5 MR. DICKERSON: It's not a matter of losing a day itself, it's that, it's
6 against the time, the clock is running that says you have five days to respond to a
7 filing. Now you have five days plus a day.

8 MR. SILBERG: All right. But does that extra day apply to everybody
9 or just someone on that site?

10 MR. DICKERSON: Nope. To everybody in the LSS.

11 MS. NEWBURY: So if we unplug Lincoln County, everybody gets an
12 extra day?

13 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, um-hm. That's the way I --

14 MR. JUNKIN: Yeah. But that's unrealistic. The rule says that
15 certain clocks that get set right from the time out, so it will say you have ten working
16 days to get this back. I mean, you're the one whose impacted if you're on a critical
17 path, it depends on the situation.

18 MR. SILBERG: Or it may or may not.

19 MR. JUNKIN: It may or may not. But, it could and our assumption is
20 you don't want that to happen. System-wise.

21 MR. METTAM: Can I, for clarification, what you're saying is there,
22 the entire system has to be intact?

23 MR. JUNKIN: Yes.

1 MR. METTAM: What if you get a voltage outage, say you have ten
2 T-3 lines coming in and for some reason you lose a car and now you only have nine
3 capable and so you roll, you know, you roll a few of the sites?

4 MR. DICKERSON: I suppose if you could do that, right?

5 MR. METTAM: But the systems not hold for the whole day.

6 MR. DICKERSON: right.

7 MR. METTAM: Does that mean that you lose a day?

8 MR. DICKERSON: No. I think you could beat it that way.

9 Now, you'll notice we've written this in, and you go back and look at
10 maintainability, for example, we've written in that parts and supplies have to be
11 available within four hours.

12 MR. LEVIN: But I think one of the things that's important that we
13 discussed with this technical working group was, if you're at a site and you've got
14 seven stations, seven terminals, if any one of those still have access to the LSS, you're
15 still okay. Because we don't want to go terminal by terminal, to the terminal level,
16 because any given time a PC may be broken or whatever. So we said, as long as the
17 site has access at least, that one --

18 MR. METTAM: That's why I was just stating the communication link
19 as the critical factor.

20 MR. LEVIN: It is.

21 MR. SILBERG: I'm just concerned though that one link down
22 somewhere automatically has the whole system being countless.

23 MR. JUNKIN: This is a system scrap, and it doesn't have anything to
24 do with what actually happens in the hearings in terms of decisions to delay scheduling
25 and all of that. All this says is that, there's going to be a test run on whoever delivers

1 this system to prove that what they've delivered is robust enough to stay up whatever
2 we said, five days a week, or seven days a week, 90% availability during four hours,
3 plus three hours on either side.

4 They need to run a test to prove this, that robust. It doesn't have
5 anything to do with, you know, I don't want to say the real world, but, you know,
6 whether or not a particular delay is caused by the LSS and we are not -- in the rule,
7 that's all operational procedure stuff. This has to do with, the system has to be
8 reasonably reliable. And this is not an extremely stringent reliability requirement.

9 MR. SILBERG: So just the way this -- tie that, that --

10 MR. JUNKIN: Yeah. You're right. For defining it this way, you
11 could've taken the type that said, that if any site is -- you know, for all but three hours
12 and doesn't have LSS, it's good enough. It has to be that most of the participants, that
13 didn't seem reasonable.

14 MR. DICKERSON: Okay. We're about to the end. Okay. Your turn.
15 Okay.

16 We'll develop a set of, of Phase 2 requirements, Phase 3, no, Phase
17 2 requirements today. We will be taking the issues the, the points you have here, we'll
18 reiterate on those and we will turn out the next version of the Phase 2 requirements.
19 We need info from you in several places to do that.

20 And then after the TWG has done that, we will be giving notes to
21 you, John, for transmittal to all the people, the panel, so we can come up with a
22 closure on those, those procedures.

23 MR. HOYLE: Okay.

1 MR. SILBERG: I have a really, I just read through this before this
2 meeting. Just a series of comments and questions. Do you want those now? Do you
3 want to do those outside the meeting?

4 MR. DICKERSON: I'd be, I'd happy to just have you mark them now.

5 MR. SILBERG: They may not be readable, but I'll sit down with you.

6 MR. BALCOM: Okay.

7 MR. HOYLE: Have others gone through line by line and have
8 comments as well?

9 MR. METTAM: I'd be happy to type them up and make them legible
10 in some, some manner. I think I have a quick question.

11 On Table 6.1, and it talks about document types and I understand
12 them all but I can't come up with a concrete answer for type B document. It's, it's
13 header only entry. But it's not because of graphics. Okay.

14 MR. DICKERSON: We've tried to include
15 non-documents in Table 6.1.

16 MR. METTAM: Very good. I couldn't, I just couldn't picture what we
17 were talking about.

18 MR. SILBERG: What is the cost of adding these E-size papers to
19 the system? Is that a big cost or a little cost? I'm now sure what a E-size piece of
20 paper is.

21 MR. JUNKIN: I know the percentage of the whole cost is, the
22 assumption is that -- using the whole system.

23 MR. SILBERG: But what is the cost of adding into the system the
24 inability to play around with those electronically? We're only talking about a very small
25 number of documents.

1 MR. JUNKIN: Basically, I think we're in storage, it's not similar
2 because it's a special capture, hardware. One thing about this particular size, it's not
3 very usable on screen. You can do it, but generally
4 they -- I don't have the numbers in front of me, I can find out what it is.

5 MR. SILBERG: But if we're talking, you know, those who order
6 magnitude it seems to me that having a system-wide electronic capabilities to those
7 documents is, I would think significantly less useful than color. And I wonder, and
8 that's going to be something that, I think, is more for the technical reviewers than the
9 hearing world and I just wondered why they --

10 DAVE: Both of this E-size things are your design.

11 VOICE: Design what?

12 DAVE: Those are going to be critical, so it's not just --

13 MR. SILBERG: Well, they're critical for the reviewers but do you
14 have instantaneous, electronic, ability for those documents or can you send those
15 around, treat them as one of a kind and --

16 MR. ECHOLS: If you can't read them, this is something we can
17 eliminate from --

18 MR. JUNKIN: In the pricing, we have included in our assumption, I
19 think in terms of how we got where we are, you know, it's not, -- technologies, I
20 guess. But it certainly is possible. I don't know. But I can find out what percentage it
21 is if you want to consider when.

22 MR. SILBERG: I would be interested in, I don't know if that's a
23 concern to anybody else, but....

24 MS. NEWBURY: Like I said, it all goes back to the question of what
25 is the LSS for, is it for the technical reviewers or strictly for the lawyers?

1 MR. SILBERG: Well, I think it's for both.

2 MS. NEWBURY: Then you need the use size if you're going to have
3 the technical reviewers using it.

4 But in truth, they will, the technical reviewers will have reviewed in
5 the design and review process.

6 MR. SILBERG: Right. But they just, they have to be in the electronic
7 system to do that. With all the bells and whistles that the other --

8 MS. NEWBURY: No, the, in the design process, the NRC comes
9 and participates in the actual design review.

10 MR. SILBERG: Right.

11 MS. NEWBURY: Now. As we speak.

12 MR. SILBERG: So we're doing that without --

13 MS. NEWBURY: Without an LSS.

14 MR. SILBERG: An LSS. Which reinforces my question as to do we
15 really need to have that in the system?

16 MR. VON TIESENHAUSEN: Well, there is another aspect to this
17 question of, a lot of the detail drawings that are used for the construction of the ESF et
18 cetera, are probably hard to come by at this point in time. And for review purposes, it
19 would definitely be an asset, speaking for myself and maybe other effected units of
20 local government to have the capability to call these up on a screen.

21 It's true, if you display the whole drawing, you can't see anything, but
22 you can zoom in on areas of the drawing and you can read it.

23 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Any other specific comments?

24 MR. CAMERON: When are we closing on the Level 2, Fielden?
25 When do you need input from, from us?

1 MR. DICKERSON: I would like to get your input today or the first
2 part of next week and mark the copy and what we'll do is turn out a new version of this
3 and we'll it run by the TWG and we'll close on that.

4 MS. NEWBURY: It does raise an interesting question, if we're not
5 going to have another ARP meeting for a while, when will the ARP close on the Level 1
6 and Level requirements?

7 MR. HOYLE: We should talk about that, about the future.

8 MS. NEWBURY: We do have to proceed with that.

9 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to get at is, you know,
10 what's our drop dead date, so to speak.

11 MS. NEWBURY: I wanted to, I wanted approval at this meeting. As
12 you recall.

13 MR. HOYLE: And that hasn't changed, rule hasn't changed.

14 MS. NEWBURY: So far, no.

15 MR. DICKERSON: Now, you said you had some Phase 1 changes,
16 John?

17 MR. HOYLE: Yes. I'll talk to you.

18 MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

19 MR. HOYLE: They relate, on the one instance to the notations.

20 MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

21 MR. HOYLE: That was one. Decision tracking. Brad had suggested
22 that we, that we someone or other address decision tracking. If DOE's decision
23 documents sufficiently reference documentation for the decision, that does the job. I
24 guess there was some hope that if, if their decision documents don't, that somehow
25 the LSS could be used to find those documents.

1 MR. METTAM: Or link them or something there.

2 MR. HOYLE: That was a kind that I was going to pass on.

3 Let's see. Those really, the word, the phrase dial up, I noticed earlier
4 in a discussion that the last meeting or prior meeting, we found the word dial up, I
5 think, in the LSS rule. And we decided it was outmoded and we should use remote
6 access. I just note we continue to use phrase dial on.

7 MR. SILBERG: I also thought we were not going to use things like
8 ask and text.

9 VOICE: Yeah, I thought so, too.

10 MR. SILBERG: And I see it all over here.

11 MR. JUNKIN: I can respond to both of those.

12 Both of them were on that subject. There's a list of things that we
13 thought were technology based and we'll be asked to be given some freedom on.
14 Having been given that freedom, there are a couple of incidents where we looked right
15 at it and decided that it made sense to, to be specific and in that case the dial-up
16 issue, I mentioned before, could you go to an all CD distribution approach? Well, the
17 answer is no and then you document availability within 24 hours because you're not
18 going to fill up the CD every 24 hours and have it shipped.

19 So, we think the fact that, we had discussed the fact, and the other
20 thing we haven't been on is, as we talked with Stan and others, about what's real
21 world, how's it going to be used, especially during hearings, it was clear that the
22 concept of there being a fixed office and you never go from there to do your work, just
23 isn't realistic. During the hearings, there's going to be people literally in hotel rooms
24 and all over the place that are going to need access and at a minimum to the, to the
25 motions and, you know, filings and all that stuff.

1 So, we put our -- through, you're absolutely right, John, we asked for
2 freedom and then we chose not to use the freedom that we were given. And that's
3 true with dial up and that's true with the other example that was given on ASCII. We
4 debated putting in STNL, for example, and GML is a mark-up language, it's, within
5 STML there is ASCII and in fact, STML is nothing but ASCII characters, using a certain
6 convention, faced bolds and underlines and we chose to keep it simple.

7 MR. LEVIN: I wonder, would the term dial up preclude Internet
8 access of Telenet access?

9 MR. JUNKIN: Would it preclude it as it's written? It wouldn't, no, it
10 wouldn't preclude that. Nobody should come, could, should infer from that that
11 Internet would work. But it doesn't preclude that.

12 MS. NEWBURY: You have to dial a number to get to Internet, too,
13 so I guess that's --

14 MR. METTAM: Talking about ASCII in that same section. There
15 were some very specific definitions of format, file format. All these version 6.0 TIP
16 files.

17 MR. JUNKIN: I'll tell you why.

18 MR. METTAM: Tell me why but also tell me whether or not there's
19 any provision, ten years from now, when everybody says, oh, that good old TIP stuff
20 we used to use. If there's any provision for subsequent update.

21 MR. JUNKIN: Well, let me answer the second, the question actually
22 asked first.

23 Certainly we can buy a system that handles a certain format. And
24 first of all, the chances of real good it's going to handle multiple formats anyway, so
25 this is really an, and at a minimum it shall. And the reason for that is, that's a formal

1 being used in the system and that's providing 80 percent of the data and, you know,
2 with one sentence, we've eliminated many millions of dollars of time in the schedule of
3 converting formats. So it makes a lot of sense to say that at a minimum, it's got to
4 handle that.

5 Could handle others, yeah, and it probably will in a commercial
6 package usually handles a variety of formats. What you don't want is some weird
7 proprietary format and say, trust me, I'll translate it.

8 MR. METTAM: I'm totally in agreement with that. My, my question
9 really is, should the government, in its infinite wisdom, five years from now, decide that
10 they're no longer going to use that format, they're going to use some other format. Is
11 that down necessarily by what you had to do to have done in the LSS?

12 Have you somewhere got predictions for keeping up with technology
13 in file format?

14 MR. JUNKIN: Not in those document. It would be difficult to do in
15 that this is a spec for a, you has to be a testable spec.

16 MR. METTAM: Section ten, maybe.

17 MR. JUNKIN: Well, is it?

18 FRANK: It is. It is in section ten.

19 MR. JUNKIN: Okay. I can double check, but that's a good point. It
20 would be a good one for section ten.

21 There, we had a lot of desire during the process to specify features,
22 you know, but we just, we just have to constrain ourselves there because if the
23 sponsor that or if they do, you wouldn't believe it anyway, so.

24 MR. METTAM: One of the, I'll try to make most of my comments
25 written so they're going to have to go through this. But I was looking at the turnover

1 schedule, I'm on page nine of the Concept of Operations. And it says that you will tell
2 the NRC when, and one of the bullets is, when a preliminary existing documentary
3 materials. And obviously with a change to a program approach, I mean, they may both
4 be a licensing and still be creating documents. I think to say that they are going to
5 have everything loaded before they give it to you is unrealistic.

6 MS. NEWBURY: I think that's why it says existing, Brad. That
7 doesn't preclude us from putting more in later.

8 MR. METTAM: So you're going to have to put the whole back-up in?
9 No, with that backlog.

10 MS. NEWBURY: Whatever exists in that format, we're going to get
11 in there.

12 MR. METTAM: In what format?

13 MS. NEWBURY: Whatever fits in the LSS. There may be backlog in
14 terms of stuff that hasn't been scanned, hasn't been converted to text format, older
15 stuff.

16 MR. METTAM: Okay. That clarifies it but what you're saying is that
17 those materials that have been either existing in digital form or processed into digital
18 form will be loaded before they're turned over.

19 MS. NEWBURY: Right.

20 MR. METTAM: But it doesn't necessarily require that you need to
21 clear the backlog, nor stop giving them material after you turn it over, so, okay, that's
22 fine.

23 MS. NEWBURY: No.

24 MR. METTAM: Thank you.

1 MR. HOYLE: Okay. I think we do need to discuss at the end of the
2 meeting, whenever that occurs, just how we're going to handle, getting back quickly.
3 Getting it to Fielden. Getting a good review back. So let's be thinking about that.

4 It's 3:10, folks. I'm not going to declare a break this afternoon. Let's
5 continue you on. Anyone who does need a break, take it individually.

6 Shall we go on now with the --

7 MR. LEVIN: I am going to introduce Tony Neville from LAI who is
8 going to make this presentation. Basically, we're coming very close to coming to
9 closure on the documents and the procedures for certifying participants in the LSS and
10 we want to present these to you and ask for your comments.

11 The one document that I think we have brought to closure is the
12 participant's commitment document. We first asked for comments for that, I think in
13 the December meeting, and then we followed-up in the, in the May meeting, and we've
14 received no comments since then, so we consider that document basically finalized.

15 And now there are a couple of other documents that Tony is going to
16 go through and we'd like your comments on. Tony?

17 MR. NEVILLE: Tony Neville for the record. You all at the break
18 should've received a complete copy of this briefing. If you haven't got it, yes, that's the
19 correct version. If you haven't got them, additional copies are here. They were left at
20 your desks, but I'm going to refer here, so, yes.

21 Well, as Moe has indicated, the purpose of the presentation is to
22 really give you a status report on where we are for all of the various elements of
23 guidance that he is, as the administrator, is really developing.

24 The list on the second page, really on the left, itemizes the major
25 parts of the documents that we're working on. As he's noted, you've already had a

1 chance to work on the participant commitments and give us comments and we've
2 turned those around and John Hoyle has issued them back to you back in May.

3 Then they're two new documents which we are giving out to you
4 today, looking for comments. They are the certification document of the, for participant
5 compliance program plan certification document, the guidance on the format and
6 content of the participant compliant program plans.

7 And really, what we're doing is, we want to initiate the same kind of
8 review that you gave the last time. In other words, going through the written document
9 in detail, giving us mark-up and comments, and then we will take that and integrate
10 those comments and issues into these documents and turn around the whole process
11 and give you the document back again. I think we found that that process worked
12 fairly efficiently the last time around.

13 So, let's for a moment, moving on to this next diagram, which talks
14 about the major relationship between these guidance documents. We really view the
15 commitments document as the substantive source document for all the remaining
16 documents. And that's the, in a sense, the dry run, the beginning point.

17 The certification document that I refer to simply summarizes the
18 element, all the details in those, that commitments document and includes a
19 certification form. And we take another look at that in greater detail later on in the
20 presentation.

21 The guidance on format and content describes an acceptable format
22 for the applicant's program compliance plan. And later on when we've got your
23 comments and come to agreement as to what should be in that format and content
24 document, we will supplement it with an example, a generic example, a filled-up
25 version of that plan.

1 So then, using these two documents, the applicant prepares a plan
2 and together with that completes the certification. And this sets the stage for
3 participation for access to the LSS.

4 So the next page here, in this itemizing, looking at the guidance and
5 format, on the content of the compliance program plans. Now, the purpose here is to
6 indicate to the applicant the proposed format and content for information an applicant
7 is expected to provide in this plan.

8 The goal is to promote compliance plan completeness and accuracy
9 the first time it's prepared. I guess this really two purposes then for this particular
10 document. The guidance will facilitate both the development of the plan on the part of
11 the participant and it will also assist in the administrator's effective review of those
12 plans.

13 So then looking at it on the next page, with respect to the
14 participants, it assists the participant, the applicant, in formulating their program plan,
15 informs them of the type and nature and format of reporting, and specifies data
16 needed by the LSSA for compliance evaluation, with respect to both the rule and the
17 program and is guidance itself.

18 Then on the other hand, looking more detailed at what it means to
19 the LSS administrator, he wants to assure certain outcomes from the review and use
20 of those plans.

21 Following the format will provide the administrator with a reasonable
22 level of assurance of the applicant's understanding and intense availability to comply.

23 Also, the administrator will use it to establish a base line for future all
24 on-site when measuring performance.

1 With respect to the administrator's program management, it will
2 provide planning data for projecting needed processing capacity at the QA, QC facility.
3 And then this information in turn becomes the basis for reporting to the Commission
4 and the LSSA certification of compliance to DOE.

5 A further point about these plans is as changes occur, participants
6 are to submit revisions to their compliance plans, only using the revised pages.

7 Also, as part of the compliance, participants are to respond to the
8 LSSA comments on their revised plans.

9 Moving on to the second guidance document, the certification
10 document. This is a particular straightforward document. It sets forth the applicant's
11 commitments in summary form, with rule citations where appropriate. It serves as an
12 applicant's official certification to the compliance with the rule and documents for the
13 administrator participant's continuing commitment.

14 From, so what must the applicant do with respect to certification?
15 Well, he must certify understanding and commitment to the LSS rule and
16 understanding in his responsibilities to the LSS program.

17 The applicants will submit executed, an executed certification
18 document in advance of petitioning to the pre-licensing application, or for access to the
19 LSS.

20 The final page of that document is a simple form and this really calls
21 for the designated LSS official to certify the participant's comp compliance. A simple
22 statement to that effect.

23 The next diagram address, well, how do all these LSSA guidance
24 documents supports the applicant's process for gaining access to the LSS? This is
25 what we call the road map and how we see this road map.

1 Right now, in these last months around these various meetings we've
2 had, you've been reviewing the guidance documents. That's the precursor to the first
3 step within this document, which of course is the participant's preparation of the
4 application to review the guidance itself. Then when he's used the guidance, the
5 participant develops and submits to the LSSA the compliance program plan and
6 completes the certification. Then the LSSA reviews this and either accepts or rejects
7 the plan and confers with the participant where rejection is involved.

8 Once it's accepted, it sets the stage for the participants prepare,
9 preparation of access petition, as per the rule.

10 Then once that's submitted, the Pre-Licensing Application Review
11 Board reviews the petition itself, confers with the administrator to see, has this
12 petitioner submitted an accepted plan and then makes the decision with respect to
13 acceptance and rejection.

14 That's really the complete use of the guidance as we see it, at this
15 stage.

16 MR. SILBERG: I've forgotten if the rule refers to it that there is no
17 more Appeal Board.

18 MR. CAMERON: It's a presiding office. That would, no appeal,
19 that's right, okay.

20 MR. SILBERG: I forget whether, I forget whether sub-part J refers to
21 the Appeal Board specifically, but --

22 MR. CAMERON: I think it does, actually.

23 MR. SILBERG: But the Appeal Board ceased to exist some time
24 ago.

1 MR. NEVILLE: I need to take note of that. Well, the punchline for
2 this whole presentation is to ask for your comments by August the 12th.

3 MR. MITCHELL: I just thought of one quick comment here. This is a
4 very well done document. It's easy to read through, a good job.

5 MR. SILBERG: Where are the documents of this conversion?

6 MR. NEVILLE: Well, that's what we have to hand out right now. We
7 wanted to get through this introduction first and get your mark-up and initiate that
8 process.

9 I mean we have in a sense got to make progress in consolidating this
10 whole process of developing documents and provide you more precise packages for
11 review and comment.

12 MR. METTAM: Just a quick question without having read through
13 any of this yet, but, is it likely that someone who's been close to the process of
14 developing a revised program can, when it's accepted, then not petition for access? It
15 seems like that's a step that, I mean, couldn't you combine those steps? Obviously if
16 they went through all that, they're going to petition for access, could the petition be part
17 of that immediate step?

18 MR. NEVILLE: Well, I think it's been seen as an incremental step.
19 Giving the administrator a chance to review the compliance plan and assessing the
20 ability and intent with respect to compliance. So that the administrator can confer with
21 the Board, once they receive the petition.

22 MR. SILBERG: Does the rule provide for process and review first?
23 Before it goes to the, nobody likes to --

1 MR. NEVILLE: I think the rule explicitly calls for that particular plan,
2 but it does allow the administrator to set certain requirements so that he can achieve
3 his goals under the rule.

4 MR. SILBERG: Because the way this is set up, it looks like the --
5 can prevent a petition from ever being filed. I suspect that's not the way the rule
6 reads, but, you know.

7 MR. NEVILLE: Well, we did want to suggest that. There's more
8 that, the petitioner can certainly submit the petition, but then if there's, you know, if
9 there is this consultation between the Board and the administrator.

10 MR. SILBERG: Yeah. The way you got the arrows going here, it's
11 rejection to go back around.

12 MR. NEVILLE: Um-hm. I see what you're saying.

13 MR. SILBERG: The participant. And there is no way to get to the
14 license, pre-licensing application presiding officer, unless you've got the -- and I
15 suspect that's not the way it's --

16 MR. LEVIN: No. That's not the way it should be.

17 MR. NEVILLE: In other words, this box to the left here can really be
18 a starting point and we should really characterize it then.

19 MR. METTAM: In which case, it makes sense to have it on there as
20 this sort of box, right?

21 MR. NEVILLE: Right. If that is viewed as a starting point.

22 MR. SWAINSTON: What is the time frame on some of these boxes?
23 If you don't have a system, or even designed or procured, I mean, what's the rush?

24 MR. LEVIN: Well, we want to have the procedures in place in
25 another --

1 MR. SWAINSTON: So this is just the procedures.

2 MR. LEVIN: This is jut to get the procedures in place. We're asking
3 for, we're going to have to structure there, so when we need it, it's available.

4 MR. SWAINSTON: But the need for it maybe, many years ago, is
5 that what they're saying?

6 MR. LEVIN: Right. Yes.

7 MR. NEVILLE: It's advance planning. Giving you a chance to --

8 MR. HOYLE: Tony, when did you want on comments, where?

9 MR. NEVILLE: August the 12th was our target date that we had
10 suggested. Is that agreeable with everybody, this date?

11 MR. SILBERG: It depends how long.

12 MR. NEVILLE: Oh, it's very concise, Jay, very concise, yes, indeed.
13 Well, they're all in a box here in the corner to be opened up and they're certainly safe.
14 Pass them out right now.

15 MR. METTAM: Does it create a serious timing to make it the end of
16 August?

17 MR. NEVILLE: I don't think so. I think we will try to be as flexible as
18 possible.

19 MR. METTAM: I only say, I'm back in my office for two days this
20 month and I would definitely require a little more time than that. I can give you airplane
21 comments, if you want, but that....

22 MR. LEVIN: Okay. End of August will be fine.

23 MR. METTAM: Thank you.

24 MR. LEVIN: Okay.

25 MR. NEVILLE: Any further comments, questions?

1 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Let's turn then to DOE's activity report. Do you
2 want to lead off?

3 MS. NEWBURY: No.

4 MR. HOYLE: What do you want to do?

5 MS. NEWBURY: Can we do the electronic capturing and scanning
6 now and save the rest for tomorrow morning, in the interest that we all have to be out
7 front at 4:00 o'clock?

8 MR. MITCHELL: Just as soon as possible, I, the van is, will be
9 available to leave any time after four.

10 MS. NEWBURY: That's a half hour.

11 MR. HOYLE: Yes. That's fine. I think one facility is closing at five
12 and we just want to be sure we're able to get to that one first.

13 All right. Well, it's your call. Let's, let's go to electronic capturing and
14 scanning.

15 MS. NEWBURY: Where'd Preston go? Because he thought we
16 weren't going to get to it until tomorrow. That's what he's doing.

17 MR. DICKERSON: I would like to comment and thank the technical
18 working group for its very hard work and its quick turnaround on item already and
19 we're going to be calling upon you to do the same when we figure out what the
20 schedule is going to be.

21 VOICE: We had a hard working group.

22 MR. DICKERSON: And you've done very, very well and I appreciate
23 your work and the work of all the members of the technical working group.

24 VOICE: Thank you.

25 MR. DICKERSON: You've done very well.

1 MS. NEWBURY: Okay. Okay. I can try this other part in half an
2 hour.

3 Brad's heard this twice, so he doesn't have to stay.

4 Okay. This is a section very similar to the presentation I gave to the
5 effected units of government last week. And similar to a presentation I gave to the HC
6 & W about a month and-a-half ago. So, you know, it'll be numerous audiences.

7 Five minutes or less on, no, you can't do it now because Brad's
8 gone. Okay.

9 In case you're not aware, there is a specific agreement between the
10 DOE and NRC, which details how we will interact with each other during the pre-
11 licensing phases of the program. And there are three things that I wanted to point out.
12 One is that we will have procedures for our consultation exchange of information. We
13 will make the, the data available to DOE on a permanent, no, DOE will make the data
14 available on a current, continuing basis. And will provide the NRC with samples.

15 And to do that, we have a lot of interaction schedules, and the newly
16 created daily management system that specific agreement says a lot of things. One
17 which it says there will be a catalog of all the data that was collected by the DOE and
18 there will be a data bank, when we make our own databases available to our
19 participants, we'll make it available to the NRC.

20 And it also says the NRC will make a catalog of its data available to
21 us and its databases there to us. We don't have that part yet.

22 In our program we do allow, that's the site characterization plan or
23 initially the SCA. The site characterization comments for the NRC were incorporated
24 into the plans and into the study plans. And the NRC has reviewed study plans, they

1 will not review them any more. But those comments are incorporated into how we do
2 all of those -- studies.

3 When we collect data, it's in the field, it's in the laboratory, it's in a lot
4 of places. And when the data is collected, or soon thereafter, you should write soon
5 thereafter, what we do is put data with it. It's the information associated with that data
6 that helps us find it. It's like a header. And in fact was created based on some of the
7 procuring requirements for header information in the LSS.

8 That data, the information about the data, I'm going to kill myself
9 here, goes into our data tracking system, the ATDT. On a phone call to TDIF. And
10 that goes into the scheduled records facility. When the record package goes into the
11 central records facility and the in session number that goes with the record package is
12 related back to the data backing system. And this all gets down to what I'm going to
13 give you as a prototype for the -- And then it goes to the users in the form of a catalog.
14 The data itself goes into the participant held records, it goes into the record system
15 and some of it goes into the technical data base, which will also be provided, And it
16 goes out to the users.

17 Your next item in the package is just a little more detailed version of
18 what I just said. GENESES is a technical data base. It's a sound, it's based on sun
19 and it's arc ingress. Arc info is a spatial database, ingress is a relational database.
20 And that information is reported in the GIS catalog, the spatial data and in the data
21 catalog for all the tabular relational data.

22 MR. SILBERG: What is parameter dictionary?

23 MS. NEWBURY: Oh, parameter dictionary. Parameter dictionary is
24 a handbook listing of key words in a sense. What we did was to, all the ways that

1 people can describe scientific data and tried to condense it down into something that
2 made sense. So they attached that key word when they were doing their work.

3 The ATDT is a system that stores the data that's centered on the
4 technical data information form. It provides a of technical data, acquisition, and
5 development. Where it was collected, who collected it, what procedures they used, the
6 time frame in which they collected it. If that data is developed data, because we have
7 two types of data required is, I got it from somewhere. I did an additional data
8 collection. Developed data is when I take that and I do some type of an algorithm and
9 I move it to a higher tier of extrapolation or developed-type data.

10 On the, on the dead information form, we provide the traceability
11 back. In other words, if I've taken three or four data sources and used them, I put a
12 new date on TDIF, technical data information form, and I relate back to all the earlier
13 ones that came with that. So it traces the development of the data for that process.

14 It, and then it applies data that's gone through the technical
15 database. And for us, I recognize what there is transferred to other people within the
16 program. And then it provides the catalog.

17 I'm telling you all this because it's on line in the, to the NRC. And will
18 be available to the effected units of government and whoever else wants to use it. And
19 this is what you'll find in the, when you use the system on line. The catalog itself is
20 very simple. It's the basic requirements of the site-specific agreement, which is
21 tracking number, a brief description of the data, where it was collected, and where you
22 can work at it.

23 The technical data information form in itself, the, on the tracking
24 system, has a lot more information. And all this information, which is what is in the
25 catalog plus additional descriptions and the preview, pre-curser data on the tracking

1 system. And that can be available, that is available on line and people can go and
2 search.

3 And when you search and you find a data tracking over something
4 you're interested in, that is linked to an succession number and we can then pull out
5 the records, but that's not on line. So this is basically just header information.

6 Anyway, this one tells you what I just told you, the direct data
7 tracking number is the identifier, designed by the participant, and some of our
8 participants are really smart, they use a smart number, and the number is, we made it
9 really 23 characters long, the first part is the participant number, and then the USGS
10 puts in the SCP activity number, which tells you what the data is about without even
11 looking at it and then it's sequential numbers having to do with the way it was
12 collected.

13 And again, that tracking number is in the ATDT data tracking system
14 and it's in the records system and it's in the database so that we have a, a single
15 number that identifies a piece of information.

16 This is not in your hand-out. The technical database was created for
17 our use and the question has been, how does this relate to the LSS and the answer is
18 basically, well, it doesn't. It does in that the excession number, the date of tracking
19 number there and they relate to the records package and if you pull out the records
20 package, the records package would be in the LSS.

21 But as scientists and engineers, we need information in a form we
22 can manipulate. And we can't manipulate data or pull out what you need if it's just an
23 ASCII text or image. You need a relational database and that's what we've created.

24 We use the relational database for tabular data and then we link to
25 the spatial data, that's in the arc/info GIS, and this is important for spatial data, you

1 ever do any -- then I guess it isn't important, but general geographic data committees,
2 more data standards, are part of an executive order from President Clinton that says
3 anytime you transfer spatial data between people you will comply with these standards.

4 So, that slows down some of our data transfer, but it does help us in
5 maintaining some kind of consistency.

6 The technical database is, well, it will be images in the database, let
7 me back up a little bit, this is spatial data, it's not just a picture. It's digitized lines
8 which have been given a tag of information about that line, where it is in space, how it
9 relates to other lines in space and if it's a polydom enclosed circle of something then
10 the inside of that is tagged with information as well.

11 The database that will be provided to people is going to be on CD
12 rom and you will get an image like this, of the spatial data, which then you can down
13 load and play with. And it will be in black and white, but you can color tag it any colors
14 you want to tag it with and play with it. That's the point of this type of a database is
15 you can do things with it.

16 The point of information, like a well, or a trench, or whatever, we can
17 click on the image at a point and it will tell you if there's something there, out of the
18 normal. And if the trouble were there, you'll find out what information there is about
19 that -- . And you'll also find out what data is associated with that building. So that now
20 you can find out at a location that this is USWH ecological, who collected those
21 samples at that point, what tests were run on those samples, what the minimal
22 composition of that was, and it's all in tables. Which you can now download and use
23 as information, do your own technical evaluations.

24 And this is where I get into a little bit about the technical review
25 versus regulatory reviews and who is using the LSS. This is available to the NRC, or

1 will be available soon to the NRC, so doing technical evaluations will have this
2 information long before analysis is on the line.

3 Daily right now reports data -- once its received its internal technical
4 review, that's a QHF we have to do. We provided anyone who asks for it, once it's in
5 our records management system. The interested parties can look at the data prior to
6 that, the NRC has asked for files of data, the states come and look at data. Once the
7 record package is figured into the records system, it's available for people to come to,
8 to ask for and we will provide it to them.

9 We have some other stuff on how to get the original SCIP. But this
10 isn't, I've got a reference, who's a technical data manager. So I would like a big
11 budget..

12 And we started producing large volumes of data and our scheduled
13 cost a lot of money, so I need to be able to charge for that somehow. I haven't figured
14 out how. But we won't lock the data in the format it exists in. I spent quite a bit of time
15 converting hard copy seismic information for the NRC. And we had to scan it as it was
16 only a paper copy available. The document itself was produced on a dot matrix printer
17 and it was pages and pages of numbers, zeros and eights look very similar when a dot
18 matrix printer prints them. We had to go through and do a line-by-line, human
19 corrected check on all that data and even then you could not guaranty it for use. So it
20 comes with all these caveats on it, it's, it's a different animal than -- because you have
21 a number wrong, your calculations are wrong.

22 What we're going to do is the ATDT is on line. We have a letter
23 going, is on line now with the NRC. We have a letter going out to all of you. They do
24 have a VT emulator, it's on a back system.

1 But our technical database is going to be on CD ROM. We chose
2 that because of the large volumes of information that are involved in the informational
3 data sets. And it takes a long time to dial up them on line so we thought CD ROM is
4 cheaper, we'll do it that way.

5 We'll be announcing availability, I think, by November or December
6 and the hardware and software requirements will be at the next meeting and if
7 anybody needs them, I've got them.

8 So again, it's on line and will be, it will be available on CD ROM. We
9 can do transfers by magnetic media and with a variety of formats and systems that
10 people use, this is a lot more difficult than it sounds. We do put out a quarterly data
11 catalog, we put out an annual list, that's one of those real pretty colored things that are
12 a capture of records. And we do have the reports on map products.

13 Okay. That took care of data, here's samples. We do have a
14 procedure for obtaining samples. And as I wrote up there originally, it's part of site
15 agreement, that we will provide them.

16 Now, to who the procedure applies to. Effected organizations and
17 outside interests, and who request geologic samples. And we've been processing
18 samples this way for quite some time. It was originally set up by -- and I'm not sure
19 who heads the sample oversight committee right now, but it's someone that would've
20 been the assistant manager for some of the programs and that's Sadia National
21 Laboratories.

22 To some of the members right now, but those are the main users of
23 the samples. The way the procedure works is first you ask for a sample. The sample
24 overview committee reviews that request and may or may not grant it, based on the
25 size of the request and where the request is from. Unfortunately, we have a lot of

1 samples and a lot of core, but usually everybody wants that one little piece right
2 around the fracture, or right around the fault. So you have to be judicious in who gets
3 that data, who gets the actual sample to do the data collection with, and who simply
4 gets the data after the work has been done.

5 If they disapprove it, it goes back to the requester and says, I'm
6 sorry, we can't give you that sample. If they approve it, they notify the requester,
7 sample management facility and the sample management facility bar codes that
8 sample and sends it out to the requester. The code associated with that sample is
9 maintained with the sample. So that anytime anyone wants to know what sample was
10 used in the evaluation, you can go back to that original one, you know where it came
11 from in the box of core, a box of core is about this big and represents about 30 feet
12 worth of, of rock, about this big around.

13 MR. SILBERG: What's the experience today in terms of how many
14 requests have come in, how many have been approved and disapproved?

15 MS. NEWBURY: I think that most have been approved. There, they
16 meet on a monthly basis and hand out samples and thousands of samples have gone
17 out. A request wouldn't be necessarily for one sample, it might be for a suite of
18 samples.

19 And then of course, getting back to the data tracking number, when
20 people are using a sample, that sample id is referenced in the data number so that we
21 can trace back through the data collection to the sample itself.

22 I wanted to, I promise less time to give you dates for the technical
23 basis reports. And I wanted to point this out: I asked Jane Summerson, who is in
24 charge of the technical basis reports, which are reports on a topic that don't make any
25 decision. What exactly goes into her record package when she puts this into the

1 record system, which would eventually go in the licensing support system. And this is
2 the list she gave me, the technical basis report itself, the report from the National
3 Academy of Sciences, the technical addendum that's required if we make changes
4 based on the National Academy's review, the draft done on compliance assessment,
5 public comments, our non-compliance assessment, which is part of 960 right now and
6 may go away. And the initial requirement information is required and our
7 recommendation for a higher level finding.

8 So that, I think that gets the flavor of what a records package, or
9 something that will be used as a decision tool, will look like. And you will find all that
10 information, either in the record package or reference.

11 And finally, I gave you, these are the technical basis reports. I
12 expect to start them and then we'll begin six months of that, the record packages will
13 be in the records soon and may be looking that in terms of loading the LSS.

14 Any questions?

15 MR. MITCHELL: How long is this peer review period, sorry, how
16 long again is the peer review period?

17 MS. NEWBURY: The NAS peer review?

18 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

19 MS. NEWBURY: We don't have any control over that as the peer
20 review there is supposed to take about six months.

21 MR. SWAINSTON: The DOE is going to formalize the relationship
22 with the NAS. Have they dropped that plan or forfeit it now?

23 MS. NEWBURY: There's a, for the review?

24 MR. SWAINSTON: Yeah.

1 MS. NEWBURY: There's a contract in place now with the NAS. And
2 they have started first, I think they started the first period here of the erosion.

3 MR. SWAINSTON: Yeah. But that's separate and apart from the
4 federal registry movement about these, the relationship that's going to be set up
5 formally, isn't it?

6 MS. NEWBURY: I can't tell you.

7 MR. SWAINSTON: Right.

8 MS. NEWBURY: I remember vaguely there's something about an
9 announcement that needs to go out. But the NAS, I believe the contract is in place to
10 have them do peer review.

11 MR. SWAINSTON: Well, you know, it was kind of a fuzzy gray area
12 because there was the federal register that would set up and formalize some kind of a
13 relationship. That was subject to comment and so forth and one of the major
14 comments was that there wasn't a truly open process. And then we got, here in the
15 fact that the DOE was going to enter into some kind of contractual relationship with the
16 NAS so they can keep their former way of doing things in tact and here in fact, do so
17 without the kind of openness that we would require or ask for.

18 Anyway, I thought that was just a question I thought you might have
19 an answer for.

20 MS. NEWBURY: I don't, unfortunately. I know that we did go with a
21 contract process and that they would not change their minds.

22 Any other questions? Great.

23 MR. HOYLE: Thank you. How about we order topics, can we do
24 either of those?

25 MS. NEWBURY: Preston's here, but Brad's not.

1 MR. HOYLE: All right. Brad's not here?

2 MS. NEWBURY: He's the one who asked the question.

3 VOICE: But Preston won't be here in the morning.

4 MS. NEWBURY: He can read his response into the record and Brad
5 can read it later. It's just a few minutes, that's all. That's what that technical basis
6 report stuff was.

7 MR. HOYLE: So really, the only thing we have left is the electronic
8 capturing and scanning. And to talk about what's next.

9 MS. NEWBURY: I showed you, I promised just give you the
10 technical basis report schedule, which I did. And we were talking about that as a
11 priority loading schedule.

12 MR. HOYLE: Okay. We're going to talk about electronic capturing v.
13 scan.

14 MR. JUNKIN: I believe the question, correct me if I'm wrong, Brad, I
15 believe it came from you, was whether or not the DOE is considering using electronic
16 file turnover in the record system to capture information.

17 MR. METTAM: It was me.

18 MR. JUNKIN: And let me see if I can give you a first answer here.

19 We are not currently doing that. We have investigated, done the
20 early stages of investigation as to the issues involved in doing that and are intending
21 over the course of the next several years, funding permitting, to migrating in that
22 direction. Probably never 100 percent, but to some degree.

23 Funding concerns being what they are, I can't tell you for sure and I
24 don't think you even want to commit that that's going to happen, but that certainly has
25 been our test plans and is in fact in our FY '96 test plans to make progress on that.

1 Preliminary investigations, however, have uncovered a number of
2 issues. We're basically talking about here, for everyone's clarification, is turning over
3 electronic files, such as native files, Word Perfect, 123, whatever your office
4 automation suite is, as a means of capturing information into the record system. And
5 the advantages being that you can convert native file formats to images without going
6 to paper. You can get very clean text. Why am I the only who -- request?

7 You can get very clean text from native files, of course, without
8 human intervention.

9 There are, however, some disadvantages. And these are
10 practicalities that have to be overcome. The first of which, the four that I want to
11 mention to you just so you understand the issues and why we're not doing this
12 tomorrow, they are not technological issues, we have, my own folks have converted
13 Word Perfect damage without going to paper. There's commercial packages that do
14 that.

15 Of course, you can always just save the word processing files on
16 ASCII. In most cases.

17 The first issue, though, is configuration management. That is
18 handing over electronic files, whether it's by floppy or transfer. There's an issue of, is
19 this an exact representation of the document that was initially approved? We have
20 had instances of turnovers where, you know, there was typo or something caught in
21 the last stages of sign off on page three that edited and wasn't saved in the final
22 electronic version, and you find the discrepancy between the electronic version and the
23 signed-off copy. That's a big issue.

24 The second issue is electronic authorization, the equivalent of a
25 signature. The electronic signature approaches that exist, including the, I guess the

1 defunk federal standard or soon to be defunk federal standard, as well as the ASCII
2 standard RSA, because I, certainly the federal standard under delete the industry
3 standard, both have to do with taking electronic snapshots of the file, hashing out that
4 kind of thing.

5 The problem is if anyone wrote the Word Perfect, or whatever, to
6 ASCII and image, that's lost. And you're not going to come up with the same answer if
7 you run the algorithm on it, the snapshot has to do with the bits and bytes of that
8 original file. So it doesn't translate and that means you have more complicated
9 records to process where you have somehow validate that this was at one time
10 electronically signed, but is no longer, you can no longer validate electronically.

11 Issue number three is the cost of reassembling the document
12 electronically. Documents today are updated using multiple packages, graphics have
13 been in Word Perfect for text and 123 for tables, for example. Those need to be
14 assembled into the proper order to represent the physical document.

15 We're not in an all electronic world right now is the bottom line and
16 as long as there's a single pile of paper that's correctly assembled to reassemble that
17 electronically may not be possible but it's often cheaper, it can be cheaper to through a
18 stack of paper on a scanner and scan it in.

19 Anyway, those are the issues we're looking at and of course, the
20 other issue, the packages themselves that do the conversions from native file formats
21 to images are dependent on the data file formats being constant and have to be
22 updated when they're not constant. Say you're into a scenario where you're constantly
23 hoping that the conversation software keeps up with the automation software.

24 So it sounds like a wonderful way to save money and efficiency. It
25 turns out to have some challenges with it. It still doesn't, that's not to say that it's not

1 worth doing, in some cases, the clean text is probably the biggest driver of the move in
2 that direction. As you know, there's a lot of costs associated with getting text cleaned
3 up. That's been OCR, and so that's probably what I've seen in that direction. But
4 we're not there yet.

5 MR. METTAM: A quick question, though.

6 MR. JUNKIN: Sure.

7 MR. METTAM: I understand, I can see what the complexities are.
8 Something to consider in this budgetary world. Those documents that are sent to the
9 governmental office, I believe that they use electronic file to print from, which, if I'm not
10 mistaken, I've heard that you can actually purchase their electronic file. Obviously
11 that's not the universal documents you're dealing with, by any stretch of the
12 imagination, but it is many of the big ones. Programmed-type documents, it's not the
13 technical reports, probably, because they're probably not being printed up. I don't
14 know, are they, they're probably not being printed by the GPO.

15 MS. NEWBURY: No, they're not.

16 MR. METTAM: Okay. But as a subset, or maybe a set a documents
17 that are handled that way that could be fairly easily, you know, that's a stop point.
18 Obviously if you gave it to the GPO, you didn't change it after that point because you
19 had to get it back to them.

20 MR. JUNKIN: Right. That would be a case where you had a
21 configuration, a management procedure that was viable. None of these are -- that will
22 keep you permanently from getting they just need to be overcome. And we've had
23 other priorities, quite frankly. Most important of which is the start enriching documents,
24 which is what we've done. Because we know we've got to do that.

25 MR. METTAM: Thank you.

1 MR. CUMMINGS: I just want to reiterate, the majority of the cost in
2 processing records is the indexing of the record and whether we, whether you get in a
3 native file or hard copy, you still have to index the record and that's where the majority
4 of your costs come from.

5 MR. SILBERG: I always thought that QA and the documents, once
6 they're scanned in, was the high cost of efficiency, if you're optically scanning in
7 documents, I thought there was an elaborate QA process that intends to matter or
8 intends --

9 MR. CUMMINGS: No. I mean there is QC that goes on and I'm sure
10 that you've got the right stuff in there, but it's not, you know, that labor intensive as
11 indexing it.

12 MR. JUNKIN: Right. The average document, as I recall, 7 to 13
13 pages, something like that, isn't is somewhere in that range? With a QC searches 13
14 pages in less than a minute, I think and --

15 MR. HOYLE: Okay. I'm just reminding myself that I bet we don't
16 have a sign-out sheet anywhere floating around, do we? Let's create one and -- a
17 release.

18 The only remaining item then is to talk about the future. Do we want
19 to reassemble in the morning and perhaps --

20 MR. DICKERSON: We still have presentations, John.

21 MR. HOYLE: I'm sorry? What do you got?

22 MS. NEWBURY: What we still, well, Jim Frank was going to do a
23 short one that that John Gandy had originally planned.

24 MR. HOYLE: Okay.

25 MS. NEWBURY: And that's, and Dave.

1 VOICE: And Dave's doing one on reprocessing.

2 MR. CAMERON: Reprocessing? That's looking to the future.

3 MR. METTAM: He said reprocessing documents.

4 MR. HOYLE: Right. About 30 minutes for Dave's and 45 for the
5 other one. All right? Approximately. All right? People are leaving, some before then
6 tomorrow. Okay. If we start at 8:30, we can, pardon me?

7 FRANK: 45 minute presentation gives me 45 minutes.

8 MR. HOYLE: Is now 45 minutes.

9 MR. SILBERG: If we start at 8:40, 8:42.

10 MR. HOYLE: Yes. Start at 8:30. We can go till, till about 10.

11 Okay? All right. Why don't we start then at 8:30 in the morning. With the two
12 remaining DOE presentations. And then let's talk about the future.

13 Okay. Those of you who, I guess, all of us who said we're going to
14 take the tour, we're --

15 MR. MITCHELL: If you're interested in going on the tour, the van will
16 be outside in approximately ten more minutes. We're going to assemble, if you want
17 to, either in the fireplace bar in the lobby or you may go directly to the van. We also
18 understand that there's going to be a travel car in case there's an overflow. I think the
19 van holds 20, so we do anticipate a van and another car to go with. Take your
20 cameras if you'd like to. And don't forget to sign in. There's a sign-in sheet going
21 around in the back.

22 (Meeting adjourned.)

1