

ML993370056.txt

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LSS ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL MEETING

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commis

sion

Two White Flint North  
3B45  
11545 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, Maryland

Friday, September 9, 1994

t to

The above-entitled meeting commenced, pursuan  
notice, at 2:00 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

[2:00 p

.m.]

sory

MR. HOYLE: This is a meeting of the LSS Advi

Review Panel. It's being held in accordance with the  
Federal Advisory Committee Act. It's an open meeting,  
members of the public are welcome. The meeting was  
announced in the Federal Register about 20 days ago.

ay is

aid

ll in

and

y a

The primary purpose of having the meeting tod  
actually twofold. At the end of our April meeting we s  
we would try to meet again in September, and you were a  
town for another purpose and so we decided to go ahead  
have it this afternoon, even though it will be primaril  
status report kind of meeting, as you will hear.

I have circulating, an attendance list, that

I  
e  
ke  
name  
ork  
Site  
Las  
rnia.  
ty,  
vada.  
ergy  
eral  
em  
p, if  
ng us

hope you could all sign, please, for the record. Before going any further, I'll introduce myself and I would like those at the table to introduce themselves, please. My name is John Hoyle, I'm the chairman of the panel, the NRC representative on the panel.

Claudia?  
MS. NEWBURY: My name is Claudia Newbury, I work for the U.S. Department of Energy at the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Office.

MR. CUMMINGS: Pete Cummings with the City of Las Vegas.

MR. POE: Vernon Poe, Mineral County, Nevada.  
MR. STAAT: Herman Staat, Mineral County.  
MR. METTAM: Brad Mettam, Inyo County, California.

MR. BECHTEL: Dennis Bechtel, Clark, Nevada.  
MS. HOFFMAN: Juanita Hoffman, Esmeralda County, Nevada.

MR. MURPHY: Mal Murphy with Nye County.  
MR. BRADSHAW: Les Bradshaw with Nye County.  
MR. BALCOM: Kirk Balcom with the State of Nevada.

MR. DAVENPORT: Jim Davenport, same.  
MR. SILBERG: Jay Silberg, law firm of Shaw, Pittman; representative for Nuclear Energy Institute.  
MR. HENKEL: Chris Henkel with the Nuclear Energy Institute.

MR. HOYLE: Joining me here at the table.  
MR. CAMERON: Chip Cameron, Office of the General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

MR. LEVIN: Moe Levin, Licensing Support System Administrator.

MR. HOYLE: Okay. I think at this point, Chip, if you're ready to give us a little bit of background, bring us up-to-date. We have some new faces which we greatly

nce appreciate seeing today, and perhaps those in the audie  
haven't quiet caught up with where we are in the proces  
s.

So Chip, I think, is prepared to tell us about that.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, John.

day Since there are so many new people with us to  
we thought we'd take just a few minutes to give a thumb  
nail sketch of what the licensing support system, the LSS, i  
s all about. And I'd just like to take a few minutes to do t  
hat.

o all Some of us around the table and in the room g  
the way back to when this idea of an electronic informa  
tion management system for use in the high-level waste licen  
sing proceeding began, and it began with a negotiated rule m  
aking that the Commission initiated to try to get a consensus  
among the affected interests; state, local, tribal  
ule government, industry, environmental groups, on what a r

would look like for using an electronic information  
management system in the high-level waste licensing  
proceeding. And we met over a period of nine months on  
the rule and we developed an agreement on a text of the rul  
e and the supplementary information. And for those of you wh  
o were there, you can remember that we parsed every word,  
every comma of that supplementary information and text.

And we did reach -- almost reach a consensus, in a sense a  
d the unanimous consensus, on the rule after we had negotiate  
nd we text and the supplementary information to it. At the e  
ded didn't have complete consensus, but the Commission deci  
as to adopt the proposed -- the draft proposed rule that w  
recommended by a majority of those on the negotiating  
committee. And this rule was issued as a proposed rule

'  
of  
em is  
o the  
l  
ste  
e  
the  
ion  
with  
of  
e  
n the  
ent  
al.  
ity  
ents  
nd  
se

there was public comment and the final LSS rule was promulgated in April of 1989, and it appears in part 2

the Commission's regulations -- subpart J of part 2.

Some basic elements of licensing support syst

-- are that it's an integral part of the Commission's repository licensing process. The LSS will contain the relevant documents of DOE, NRC, and the other parties t

high-level waste licensing proceeding. All parties wil

have full text access to the documents in the licensing support system. To become a party to the high-level wa

licensing proceeding, an organization or an individual, including the Department of Energy, must comply with th

document submission requirements in the LSS rule. And

Department of Energy cannot submit its license applicat

under subpart J, unless it's in substantial compliance

the document submission requirements in the LSS rule.

The broad objective of the licensing support system is to facilitate a thorough and efficient review

the DOE license application, including meeting the thre

year construction authorization review period set out i

Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

In order to do this the LSS has a number of features. One, the rule establishes a centralized curr

and comprehensive database of relevant licensing materi

Secondly, the LSS will provide full text search capabil

on this database to allow quick identification of docum

and relevant material within those documents.

The LSS will provide for the identification a

availability of discoverable documents before the licen

most application is submitted. And this will eliminate the  
burdensome and time consuming aspect of the traditional  
and system of document discovery in Commission proceedings,  
that's the physical production of documents that are  
e relevant to the decision which normally occurs after th  
license application is submitted.

The LSS will also provide for the electronic  
filing of orders and pleadings during the hearing, and  
cal therefore eliminate the associated delay with the physi  
cal delivery of these types of documents. And a lot of tim  
es we focus on the use of the LSS after the proceeding begins  
, but in the supplementary information to the rule there were  
some other objectives set forth. One was to allow use of th  
e LSS before the license application is submitted, to allow  
so to sufficient time for preparation for the hearing, and al  
allow the technical and legal and policy staffs of the  
stem potential parties and DOE, NRC, to use the full text sy  
before the license application comes in in the ordinary  
course of business.

One There are three major segments in the rule.  
t segment is the rule establishes a framework for documen  
t submission and access to those documents. The second m  
ajor aspects are nonsystem provisions. For example, specifi  
city on contentions, time schedules for various events durin  
g the licensing proceeding, and the third major aspect of the  
rule is the institutional framework for the management and  
tment development of the LSS, what are the rules of the Depar  
tion of Energy and the NRC in the development and implementa  
of the system.

At our last meeting we spent a lot of time on

this  
s NRC  
nt  
hear  
t the  
a  
he  
go  
d I'm  
e  
as  
s.  
g to  
like  
stay  
to  
g  
n  
ng,  
t  
about  
is

third aspect; who is going to develop the system, how i  
going to implement effective control over the developme  
nt  
and implementation of the system. And we are going to  
more about that today, but I just want to emphasize tha  
t the  
first aspect document identification and submission is  
a  
critical aspect of this rule. We've been focusing on t  
he  
system itself, the hardware and software, but we don't  
go  
anywhere if we don't have the documents identified. An  
d I'm  
reminding ourselves as much as anybody else, about the  
critical nature of doing this. And I believe that most  
people have some work ongoing that deals with complianc  
e  
evaluations of document submission requirements as well  
as  
what we need to do to capture those particular document  
s.

That's all I have to say.

MR. HOYLE: Okay, anybody want to add anythin

Chip's comments?

Looking at the agenda for today I don't feel  
we are going to need more than an hour, although we can  
stay  
as long as we need to to do our business. I would like  
to  
hear a status report from Mr. Levin next. And followin  
g  
that, a report by DOE, which will be in two parts. The  
n  
we'll talk a little bit about formation of a technical  
subgroup, which we first talked about at the last meeti  
ng,  
it was brought up there by Dennis, and we really haven'  
t  
gotten off the ground, so we need to talk a little bit  
about  
that; and get a topical guidelines update. I know Denn  
is

man  
ng of  
very interested in that, he mentioned that to the chair  
this morning. And talk about what's next for us, when  
should we get together again, when will we have somethi  
substance to talk about and listen to.

So, let's move on now to Moe Levin.

f to  
Moe,  
been  
ce  
he  
My  
alk  
MR. LEVIN: First I'd like to introduce myself  
those of you I haven't met yet. My name is -- I go by  
my real name is Arnold Levin, but the nickname Moe has  
with me for years. I've been the LSS administrator since  
October of 1993, and I'm also the deputy director for the  
Office of Decommissioned Resources Management at NRC.

professional background is in computer programming and  
systems development.

I'd just like to take a very few minutes to talk  
about my activity since the last ARP meeting. A little  
background. According to the LSS rule, the LSS  
administrator is responsible for the administration,  
management and operation of the LSS. Early in 1993, the  
Commission asked the staff of NRC to examine several  
alternatives for LSS program budget and funding  
responsibilities. This was done in order to ensure that

LSS was implemented and operated in the most efficient  
manner possible. As a result, the NRC staff recommended

those  
e  
somewhat different approach to LSS responsibilities in  
currently detailed in the rule. This approach, which we

have been calling alternative three, places the  
responsibility of the design, development, installation

operation and maintenance of the LSS within DOE, and makes

the LSS administrator responsible for overseeing the DO

operation of the LSS.

This oversight would be done through the

development and execution of an LSS audit and quality assurance program. Through discussions with the review panel at our last meeting in April of this year, a variation of alternative three was developed. This variation which we have been calling alternative acts, for lack of a better name, would make the LSS administrator directly responsible for the operation of the LSS by giving him direct control of the DOE contract that provides for that operation.

In procurement jargon, the LSSA would be the contracting officer's technical representative, COTR, over the DOE contract. And what this means is, a COTR is responsible for assigning tasks under contract, for making sure that the work was done properly, and for signing invoices. Or, in other words, seeing to it the contractor gets paid for work done.

As a result of that meeting, the LSSA and DOE agree to explore this alternative -- alternative acts and the issues related to it and report back to the panel on our findings at the next panel meeting. Well, due to organizational changes in DOE, which we are going to hear about later, I have had virtually no discussions with them regarding this issue since the April meeting.

I have, however, discussed this alternative with the internal NRC legal staff and procurement experts, and we have uncovered no reasons why the LSS administrator couldn't be in charge of a DOE contract for this purpose. However, it is conceivable that DOE may have some procedural, political or other reservations with this arrangement and I really look forward to starting our discussions in earnest on this issue when DOE is prepared to.

In the meantime we are proceeding with the development of the LSS audit plan and the LSS participation compliance program plans as far as we can, although some elements of these plans are tightly coupled with what alternative we finally settle on.

That is really all I have to report on in the activities since the last meeting. I'd like to ask the panel members if they have given any thought to this issue, the COTR idea or if they have any comments, I'd like to hear them. That's it.

MR. HOYLE: Thanks a lot, Moe.

MR. DAVENPORT: Can you professionally be satisfied that your control as a COTR would be equivalent to your control as the -- having the program managed as contemplated in the original.

MR. LEVIN: I think so, because as COTR I'm directly responsible for controlling the contractor that would be doing all the operations. So as part of my job I would be monitoring that on a day to day basis because I have to, because I have to sign off on invoices and make sure the work was done. If the work isn't done I don't sign off. That gives me a lot of leverage, a lot of control. So I think it would.

MR. DAVENPORT: Under the rule, wasn't the work have been done in-house, NRC, rather than by NRC contractor?

MR. CAMERON: No. If the rule was implemented the way it's written in terms of the LSS administrator being in charge of operation and maintenance, it was always conceived that the LSS administrator would contract those services out. In other words, a contractor would perform those services for the LSS administrator. So, essentially, M

oe's

role under either version would essentially be the same

.  
unds

MR. DAVENPORT: Just a question whether the f  
go directly from DOE's pocket to the contractor's pocke  
t or  
the DOE money goes to NRC and into the contractor's poc  
ket,  
and that's really the only distinction.

ney

MR. CAMERON: Probably.

MR. LEVIN: Yes, that's it.

MR. CAMERON: If you could assume that the mo  
ney  
would go from DOE to NRC. But, yes, right; exactly.

Y,

MR. DAVENPORT: I'm sorry, I meant Jay's mone

not DOE's money.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, that's what gave me pause.

MR. LEVIN: But I think in actuality, and I'm

not

sure on this, the money would be under DOE's budget and

it

would be DOE money. I would, in effect, be spending  
directly DOE's money. I don't think the money would co

me

from DOE to NRC.

MR. CAMERON: He meant if we would have gone  
through with the original memo.

MR. LEVIN: The original, sorry.

you

MR. SILBERG: Under the COTR proposal, would

have stop work authority as well as budget authority?

MR. LEVIN: COTR can, if things aren't going  
properly. If the contractor is not living up to the  
contract, I can order -- the COTR can order a stop work

,

that's part of the responsibility.

le

MR. DAVENPORT: Will the contract be reviewab

and commentable in advance of its execution?

MR. LEVIN: With the review panel -- advisory  
review panel? I don't know.

MR. HOYLE: We have to discuss that.

g

MS. NEWBURY: We'd have to ask the contractin

officer.

MR. CAMERON: I think that that's a possibili

ty.  
m not  
, but  
r and  
and  
the  
, as  
be  
I  
ract,  
ement  
rule.  
ess  
ding  
--  
. .  
be a  
t of

It's been done on other types of contracts, although I'm not an expert on procurement law.

MR. MURPHY: The master contract with Jay's clients -- I can't remember what the terminology is now the contract under which we track money and put in the nuclear waste fund was published in the Federal Register sent out nationally for comment before it was finalized signed by DOE and the utilities. There is no reason in the world why you couldn't put this contract in --

MR. CAMERON: The procurement document itself you remember in the LSS rule, there is a provision that statement of work for various contracts are supposed to be documents that are put in the LSS.

MR. MURPHY: I'm talking about the contract between DOE and their contractor to manage the LSS, the contract that will make Moe the COTR. I know I'm not a federal procurement expert so I could be corrected, but I know of no reason why that contract, that proposed contract, before it -- before it goes through the RFP process and before all of the provisions relating to federal procurement kick in, why a draft contract couldn't be published for comment in the federal register just like a draft note

MR. CAMERON: I think you're right now. I guess the thing that we need to think about is if we are building on the info-streams system for the LSS is what the additional procurement piece of that is going to be to provide the LSS functionality. But I think that that's -- you know, that's just a detail that could be worked out

MR. LEVIN: I think the point is there would be a lot of value in being able to do that and it makes a lot

sense. It would make everybody feel a lot better, have a chance to look at them and comment on whether they think it will do the job or not. The only question is I don't know now if we have any procurement experts in the room right now, so that's something we'll have to take under advisement and d look into and see if that can be done. I think it's an excellent idea.

king MR. SILBERG: I would strongly suggest not making it a rule, I think that would be an utter disaster. The e idea of circulating the provisions out for comment, that's fine; but let's not tuck this up in to a procedural plot.

hing MR. MURPHY: I don't mean that. Just, if not ently else, you could always, you know, leave a copy inadvertently on the couch in the public document room one day and we be could all go in there and look at it. There has got to have some way to give us notice of what the --

MS. NEWBURY: The request for proposal would have to be published anyway and there would be more interest in that than in the national contract. I'm not a procurement ent person either, I don't know.

If MR. METTAM: But by then it may be too late. we the proposal is on the street, it's not time to make t comments and changes. You're -- basically we're saying would like to see what the provisions are before it went out.

MS. NEWBURY: But that's before contract is ct. written. If you're talking about looking at the contract. I think you'd rather look at an RFP to make sure it has everything you need.

on  
MR. HOYLE: If there is no further discussion  
that point we'll move to the DOE presentation.  
Claudia?  
MS. NEWBURY: Does everyone have a copy of my  
handouts?  
and  
MR. MURPHY: Could I make a suggestion there,  
ust  
if I'm talking out of line, somebody jump on it. But j  
because John said he didn't think this thing shouldn't  
take  
longer than an hour, and I certainly agree with that; I  
don't see that it's necessary for you, Claudia, to go  
through for all of us, the proposed program approaches.  
MS. NEWBURY: That's fine with me.  
may  
MR. MURPHY: I'm sure it would have been. It  
n't  
be for other people in the room, I don't know, and I do  
want to cut that off, but I think all of us on the pane  
l,  
because we spent part of our morning criticizing the PP  
A to  
the Commission itself, I don't think it's necessary for  
you  
to go through the PPA for us.  
se I  
MS. NEWBURY: That's fine. I put it in becau  
e is  
was asked to address it very briefly, and probably ther  
one slide in there that you do need, which is the LSS  
relationship.  
y  
MR. MURPHY: Oh sure.  
e  
MS. NEWBURY: But I've heard it myself so man  
times I even hate to talk about it.  
re of  
My name is Claudia Newbury, I am right now th  
acting team lead for technical synthesis team, at DOE's  
Yucca Mountain office. For those of you who aren't awa  
nt.  
our organization, that's the group that deals with the  
performance assessment and technical database developme  
And I am the technical database manager in addition to  
everything else I do.

I'll briefly talk about the operation of the

LSS,  
alk a  
e  
one  
for  
e  
ative  
inal  
been  
en  
the  
ger  
is  
or  
here  
M  
on,

the issue of the COTR that's one slide; organizational changes; I can skip the proposed program approach and talk a little bit about -- Mike Cline will talk about the LSS working group that we have put together.

Operation of the LSS and COTR function for the NRC, we are still thinking about it. I have talked to one of our contracting officers and she is looking into it. Since the contracting officer is ultimately responsible for the contract not the COTR, I mean in the end they're the ones with the warrant from Congress, I think it's imperative that they're comfortable with this before we make any final decisions.

Organizational changes. Both at OCRWM, headquarters level and at the project office there have been several changes, one of them is, as it says here, the responsibility for records management in the LSS has been transferred from headquarters to Yucca Mountain. Also, the software development responsibility has been moved from headquarters to Yucca Mountain. And the assistant manager for suitability and licensing, Steve Brocoum, my boss, is now responsible for Licensing Support System.

I've given you a brief organizational chart for OCRWM, the director; and the deputy director is Dan Dreyfuss. And you'll see Yucca Mountain site characterization office off there to one side, that's where LSS has moved. And the next slide -- or picture is the Yucca Mountain organizational structure.

As I said, I worked for Steve Brocoum, the assistant manager for suitability in licensing. Our IR function is with the assistant manager for administration, it says Marshall Bishop here but Marshall has retired a

nd  
rom  
y  
of  
and  
e's  
a  
As  
for,  
lead  
s  
trol,  
'll  
ent  
ment,  
nts  
is a  
tedt  
y.

that position is currently being filled by Ken Powers f  
Nevada Operations Office. It will be filled permanentl  
from somewhere else, I assume.

Also, Bill Simecka retires effective the end  
this month, so he will not be in charge of engineering  
field operations and that was, I believe, one of someon  
concern this morning. It's our concern too, he's been  
great help.

The next slide is the AMSL, AMSL we call it.  
you see, there is a performance assessment, that's the  
technical synthesis team that I'm currently acting lead  
regulatory and licensing; April Gil is the lead, she's  
behind us in the blue shirt. Site suitability is being  
by Jane Summerson; systems and requirements, the system  
engineering part of the program, D. Royer. Project con  
Vince Iorii, and we are going add another team, what we  
do is take the technical database part out of this curr  
technical synthesis team leaving just performance asses  
and put technical data management and the LSS requireme  
development together as one team.

MR. MURPHY: What does home team mean?

MS. NEWBURY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: What does home team mean? There

little asterisk.

MS. NEWBURY: That's me. I work both for  
performance assessment, site suitability, and Tom Bjers  
works for both regulatory and licensing site suitabilit

We don't have enough people to cover all the teams.

MR. METTAM: So that that's your home team an

d

you're a visitor?

show

MS. NEWBURY: I appear on site suitability, I  
up at public meetings.

sing

The impact of our reorganization of the Licen  
Support System. Within DOE, the assistant manager for  
suitability and licensing has chartered a working group

,

us

it's a group of M&O contractors, to assess the LSS stat  
and direction. What we'd like to do -- what we are doi

ng is

looking at the requirements, the actual requirements in

the

regulations and trying to do an evaluation ourselves to  
bring to the LSSARP for your consideration on how to de

velop

the LSS, what actually needs to be in the system, and w

hat

we are considering in terms of size and cost, and Mike

will

talk about that.

ca

The LSS will be funded and managed by the Yuc

nd

Mountain Site Characterization Office at this point. A

t to

the DOE LSSARP representatives to this group will repor

e.

the AMSL. The next page, you get to find out who we ar

y and

Director, the assistant manager of suitability

asked

licensing is Steve Brocoum as I mentioned. And he has

ohn

that the LSSARP representatives for DOE be myself and J

Gandi. John is the one who didn't know what the LSSARP  
was. He's going to find out.

?

MR. HENKEL: Is this pittance for not knowing

e

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

my

We put in two names because I'm not a hardwar

person, I haven't the vaguest idea, well I can turn on

PC, but John is up on that part of the program and I am

I'm looking at more of the requirements, which is more what  
capable of handling. I'll skip the proposed program  
approach overview, except when it gets down to the prop  
osed program approach impact on LSS.

so We are looking at an accelerated schedule and  
the PPA is going to impact LSS implementation schedules  
. We'll have to have it operational probably at an earlie  
r time than we had planned, and that means we'll have to  
give a lot more emphasis to it and make sure it's available  
and on-line. We will be pursuing the design and implementa  
tion aggressively, with your blessings, and with a lot of  
interactions. And there is some back up material here  
that you may or may not want to look through. It's mostly P  
PA type stuff.

MR. METTAM: Is the LSS on here somewhere?

MS. NEWBURY: The LSS, actually as I recall,  
is not part of the PPA, these were put together prior to t  
he function of moving out to Yucca Mountain, so we didn't  
get them out.

th up MR. MURPHY: Have you had time yet to come wi  
with some sort of a reasonable approximation of what a  
schedule for developing and implementing might be?

here MS. NEWBURY: Guess what, I've got Mike Cline  
and he's going to talk.

MR. CLINE: Does everybody have a copy of the  
overview of the LSS? I have 25 of them, it should cove  
r everybody here.

he I'm Mike Cline, I'm with Woodward-Clyde and t  
and M&O. I'm the lead for the LSS working group activity,  
I'd like to point out three additional people from the

nd up  
rson,

working group that are here, Jim Boone, if he would sta  
or put your hand up; Camille Kerrigan and Fielden Dicke  
part of our working group.

has  
ca  
ation

First couple viewgraphs are really -- Claudia  
already covered them. I'll just indicate that as she  
indicated, the function of the LSS has moved to the Yuc  
Mountain project -- the Yucca Mountain Site Characteriz

ram  
to

Office, YMSCO. And with that, there was an election to  
re-evaluate the LSS concept, considering an improved  
understanding of the program and LSSARP needs, new  
milestones and constraints imposed by the proposed prog  
approach, PPA; and advancements in system components.  
YMSCO, as Claudia indicated, directs the M&O

nsing  
ves  
s it  
ategy  
PA

conduct this evaluation under the oversight of Steve  
Brocoum, the assistant manager for suitability and lice  
-- I'm sorry -- yes, assistant manager -- with his  
designees, Claudia Newbury and John Gandi. The objecti  
are to evaluate the key elements of the LSS, that is, a  
is currently conceived, and to modify and develop a str  
and/or develop a strategy that is consistent with the P  
that optimizes new technologies and minimizes cost, and  
provides recommendations for the DOE to consider for  
providing for moving forward with the LSS.

ned a  
s  
o

As I indicated -- I didn't indicate, I mentio  
couple people, but the working group is made up of an  
interdisciplinary team of scientists, engineers, system  
people, professional types, computer specialists and  
information management specialists. It's been tasked t  
conduct a comprehensive review of the LSS concept that  
addresses development of the lengthy history of the LSS  
statutory and derived requirements, identification  
evaluation of viable options that is consistent with su

bpart  
that  
stem  
  
under  
tion  
e  
ia  
rt.  
he  
I  
have  
a  
er to  
f  
r of  
ty,  
tinue  
ing  
and

J, analysis of capture and dissemination page volumes, is highly driven by relevancy -- document relevancy, system capabilities and options, and cost drivers development, implementation costs.

Products of the working group will be an evaluation of the requirements and understanding of the derived requirements with respect to the applicability of their applicability under the PPA. Development of a milestone schedule for the LSS; development, implementation and enhancement of the cost model and comparison to the previous cost analysis; development evaluation of viable options, and their evaluations, using evaluation criteria and the selection of a preferred option that would be presented to the DOE for consideration and a final report.

With respect to the working group schedule, the activities were initially initiated in May of '94, and I think the bottom two dates are important. We intend to have a draft report to DOE the 30th of September, and it is a hope that DOE can set up a meeting with LSSARP in October to find out the findings.

Working group status, we are in the process of preparing the final report. We are still doing a number of odds and ends but we have completed the requirements review. We developed detailed option descriptions. We developed a better understanding of the LSS functionality, considering statutory and derived requirements. We continue to find the cost model for an evaluation -- for evaluating the LSS through 2004, and we've established milestones, and we've developed some proposed recommendations for the D

OE to  
ms  
nt  
ty  
lume  
vings  
of  
and  
arios  
the  
- now  
ans,  
see  
And  
jor  
ion  
to  
what  
what  
the

present the LSSARP and to continue forward with the development of the LSS.

Some preliminary observations is that a system requirements document does exist but it is in significant need of revision, and that is one of our highest priority recommendations for the DOE to proceed with in '95. Volume estimates are less but reasonably consistent with the earlier studies. Cost savings -- we recognize cost savings can be achieved by improved technologies, desegregation of costs, we look very closely at those costs for the LSS to minimize over design of the system, all the while maintaining flexibility. We have identified seven scenarios driven by basically a text and image dissemination.

The working group and the DOE recognize that LSS is a critical element for meeting the license application milestone of 2001, and what we've done is -- this is not the comprehensive milestone chart by any means, but this is a summary of where we are. And as you can see that it is intended to have the LSS certified in '98. And above on that on the milestone chart you can see the major milestone -- program milestone, such as technical site suitability, the draft EIS, final EIS, site recommendation report and license application.

I'd like to talk a bit about the volume estimates. There has been a fair amount of time trying to project into the future and to come up with an idea of the volume estimates might be, and we want to estimate the total volume of data will be -- or pages will be in

LSS, assuming DOE receives a license to receive and process waste in 2010.

The assumptions are that the estimates include contributions from the DOE, NRC and stake holders, and the estimates are based on historical records from the existing historical records from the DOE data management system.

MR. MURPHY: Did you make any contact with the stake holders in coming up with those estimates? Because the DOE historical records system don't give you any idea how much data is sitting in the Carson City office or that the State of Nevada is going to input it into the system; or how much data Nye County is going to produce in it's independent scientific program.

MR. DAVENPORT: Or how much data Mal has in his office.

MR. MURPHY: Or how much data I have in my office.

MR. CLINE: We had some informal conversation with members of the NRC, and with the stake holders I'm not certain.

Fielden?

MR. DICKERSON: No.

MR. MURPHY: Comparative to DOE's data it's always going to be small, but.

MR. CLINE: That was our basic assumption.

MR. MURPHY: They were going to try to design the system dies I can business.

MR. CLINE: Exactly. We have a tremendous volume of material going into the system, and we felt that the principal contribution, overwhelming contribution would be from the DOE and its participants, and lesser amounts from

rom

NRC and the stake holders.

o in

MS. NEWBURY: It is important to look at, also terms of your formats for your contribution, if they're going to be submitted.

ion

MR. DAVENPORT: I want to differ with the notion that the contribution from the state or other parties is going to be small.

s

he

Indeed if Nye County gets the ability to do the research you guys are talking about this morning, you're

e

going to have a pile of data. Nevada's data is getting larger. There is a room this big with documents all ar

ound

round the walls in it; that's not small in my opinion. If yo

u

haven't calculated that and if you also haven't calcula

ted

ted the chairman's observation this morning that 2010 is on

ly an

assumption date, and it could well be later given the N

RC's

concerns, and now you're talking about a system where y

ou're

going to be monitoring for some 100 years and all that monitoring data has got to go in there ultimately so yo

u can

review determinations over time, you're talking about a

much

larger system.

s our

MR. CLINE: Agreed. We set -- for estimating purposes we set certain dates. We used the PPA dates a

in

milestones. But we recognize that it's going to go out

ntry

time beyond then; data collection will continue, data e

e

will continue beyond that time. It's important that th

ble

system be designed to be flexible -- sufficiently flexi

to hand increases.

hat

MR. CAMERON: Michael. On that point about w

ee  
ms of  
is  
able  
to time that so that the LSS is loaded before that.

bout  
And then a related question: When you talk a  
LSS certification in 1998, what do you mean by  
certification? Is that when the system will be loaded  
and  
ready for access?

point  
and  
it would be ready for -- to be used or transferred  
it would be put through a certification.

t in  
MR. MURPHY: The administrators, at some poin  
time, has to certify the system.

ether  
MR. CAMERON: No, I'm trying to figure out wh  
that's the meaning here. Because when you back up from  
that, that means that all of the parties are going to n  
eed  
to get their acts together in terms of submitting the  
documents. And so, you know, in that light if you go b  
ack  
and say well when do we need to start doing it, it's li  
ke  
yesterday.

MR. CLINE: Yes, we recognize that.

o all  
MR. CAMERON: I just want to emphasize that t  
the potential parties, including the NRC.

Jim  
MR. HENKEL: I would like to respond to what  
said. It's a very good point, but I think we need to  
remember that this is a computer system that would prob  
ably  
be obsolete within 10 years, and we are going to be upd  
ating  
it probably every 10 years for the next 100 years. So  
please don't design to accommodate it the next 100 year

s,

okay?

MR. METTAM: Just the next 10.

rs.

MR. CLINE: Our cost model is the next 10 yea

at

MR. MURPHY: Did you look at the documents th

e?

might be produced by the utilities in your cost estimat

of

Because remember, we are not going to let them be part

at.

the licensing process anyway, so we don't care about th

MS. NEWBURY: Aren't they intervenor?

d.

MR. CLINE: Let me jump two viewgraphs forwar

hey

MR. MURPHY: They didn't reach consensus so t

can't be arguing.

okay,

MR. CLINE: If we jump to this diagram here,

what we did is tried to get a handle on the volume. We pooled or canvassed a number of our experts, program experts, people who have been in the program for quite

some

time been through the SCP, at that and that sort of thi

ng,

and ask them to give us an idea of what -- where the in

puts

-- where the major inputs of data will come. And as yo

u

can see, all their evaluations were put together, and w

e

came up with a curve that looks like what you see in fr

ont

of you indicating that the greatest volume of material

will

come in in about 2000 to 2001.

MR. METTAM: This is the volume of documents submitted? Does it look at all of the backlog?

t

MR. CLINE: This is strictly looking at -- no

e

counting numbers of documents, just looking at where th

greatest input will come to --

at

MR. METTAM: But I would assume that those th

are already in existence that should be huge spikes

somewhere at '94?

MR. CLINE: They will be fed into the system, okay.

MR. MURPHY: When, that's Brad's question, when I mean I had the same question. I would have assumed that the huge spike would have come about 1996 or '97 when the LSS was available. You then start inputting all of, what we call during negotiations the back log documents, the documents that exist today that were created in 1983, and it seems to me there would be a huge spike when you put those documents in, rather than in 2001.

MR. CAMERON: That would -- I have that same concern. And I guess one of the things that -- I know at an early stage here, one of the things that we are going to have to talk about at some point is that we envision that there might be some sort of a scheme for loading the backlog and the current documents in order to try to put in comprehensive sets of information so that it might be useful earlier. That may not apply here or it may, but I think that's one thing that we need to think about in terms of loading. But I do share the concern about why the -- if the LSS certification date is 1998, why the bulk of the documents will come in right before the license application is to be filed.

MR. CLINE: Let me clarify. This is material generated.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. So this doesn't even relate to loading, this is material generated.

MR. CLINE: Material generated, yes, okay. Based on what DOE has now in the system we are looking at somewhere on the order of between 17 and 24

million pages of material in the 2001 time frame, okay? That's a lot of material.

But as I indicate in the next viewgraph, the last at bullet, there is considerable uncertainty exists and th will continue, because we are projecting well into the future.

The cost analysis -- this is page 13 -- cost analysis, as we've moved along and have become more and more sophisticated as our understanding of the LSS has increased, the cost elements of the LSS were desegregated and evaluated to better understand what they represent and what the actual costs of the LSS are. It is assumed also, in our cost analysis, that the DOE records management system will go to electronic imaging in the future, and that is a commitment.

The major cost drivers are data volume as we talked about both -- well, human verification versus mechanical input or LCR accuracy, and dissemination costs, how much material is going to go out of the system, okay? And that's very much dependent on the pages, pages disseminated.

Desegregating costs revealed that there are cost elements not attributable to the LSS, these are costs associated with the DOE records management system; I tried to separate those costs and look at only the LSS costs, the more sophisticated cost model that better addresses the sensitivity and the cost sensitivity and the cost profiles through 2004. And over a 10 year period right now we estimate that the cost for the LSS can be less than \$100 million.

MR. HENKEL: Mike, we are very glad to see that compared to the original cost estimates, but do you have any

indication as to why the original estimates were two to three times this level?

stem  
ost  
s an

MR. CLINE: Because the records management system was included, that's one of the largest aspects. The cost of the records -- daily records management system were included in those cost estimates.

MR. HENKEL: So you're segregating that out as an independent cost.

MR. CLINE: Which it should be.

I  
e

MR. MURPHY: There were some other things -- I think there was some Cadillac design provisions in there that were really not necessary.

line  
t we  
an

MR. CLINE: Right. And we looked at derived departments versus expectations, and we tried to streamline the system a bit. And we also -- our cost model is that developed -- I think a more sensitive model. And you can see where the real kickers are in kicking the cost up.

ny

MR. BALCOM: Do you know if there have been any design changes, search requirements types of things.

y has  
ct,  
ng  
- and  
And

MR. CLINE: Well, certainly the OCR capabilities have improved tremendously, and we have -- as a matter of fact, we have members of the UNLV's organization on our working group -- I didn't mention that earlier, I should have -- they have given us briefings on the OCR capabilities. And they're at a point now that they feel they can achieve pretty high levels of accuracy.

hat  
sign,

MR. BALCOM: They made a presentation about that at the last meeting. Well see, I was thinking about design, but --

the

MR. CLINE: If I may, it also depends on how the material comes into the system. If it comes in -- if it

t

comes in as hard copy or if it comes in as a balanced machinery or floppy -- electronic image.

MR. DICKERSON: Data file.

ns if

MR. BALCOM: Will we be able to see assumptio

they change and any back up data for the new cost model

.

ll be

MS. NEWBURY: At another meeting we could put together another one when they finish their report. I'

glad to show you what they have.

he

MR. SILBERG: What is the cost estimate for t

DOE records management, the LSS?

MR. CLINE: Camille?

n --

MS. KERRIGAN: I think it's somewhere betwee

, but

I was going to say it's going to sound like a big range

over

\$5 million to \$10 million a year. It was pretty steady

the years. There was some spikes based on doing the reprocessing, that kind of thing.

he

MR. SILBERG: The number I'm looking for is t

equivalent to this \$100 million number.

10

MS. KERRIGAN: But if you take 10 years at \$

ou

million a year you get \$100 million, because the cost y

see is over approximately a 10 year period of time.

he

MR. SILBERG: So you're saying the cost for t

DOE records management system is about the same for LSS

.

found

MS. KERRIGAN: That's right. That's what we

out.

MR. CLINE: Very close, very close.

e.

And currently the DOE is in our microfilm bas

ronic

But as I indicated earlier, they want to go to an elect

image, which should result in cost savings as well.

tion

MR. HENKEL: Can I just ask a clarifying ques

on that?

E  
e  
And I assume that that 100 million for the DO  
record system would be money spent regardless whether w  
have an LSS or not, right?

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

the  
ional  
fy  
ious  
e  
MR. CLINE: We identified seven options, and  
purpose of doing that was to differentiate among operat  
concepts, differentiate among attributes, and to identi  
operational cost drivers and to derive the DOE with var  
cost options for consideration and development. Now th  
scenarios --

MR. SILBERG: Do you really mean to say  
user-friendless?

MR. CLINE: Oh no. Oh dear.

sing.  
m.  
MR. LEVIN: That's kind of honesty in adverti  
MR. CAMERON: Wait until you get on the syste  
You know the seltzer bottles --

ould  
e  
.  
r  
e and  
in  
d  
, you  
ven  
MR. CLINE: The LSS is -- the scenarios, I sh  
say, are really driven by two considerations, one is th  
text dissemination and the other is image dissemination  
And this -- as we went along the scenarios became -- fo  
options became very complex, and so we tried to separat  
better understand, keep them separated. But the two ma  
drivers are text dissemination, image dissemination, an  
then under text dissemination, you have electronic copy  
have a network, and what we say in scenarios two and se  
are this format.

rd  
to a  
Image dissemination is both electronic and ha  
copy, as you can go on. Electronic copy you can go in

network system or CD Rom, and you can see which scenario address that. Under hard copy you have CD Roms, and th scenarios 2 and 4.

MR. MURPHY: There is no scenario one in here

What's scenario one?

MR. CLINE: Scenario 1 is our base case, and

IS the current system. And as I indicated earlier, the current system is a microfilm system. And we just use

-- we just carried that along, but it is in the intent DOE to go beyond that.

And as I say in the next viewgraph, the scenario is not compliant with subpart J, so it's -- for a number of reasons.

The common features to scenarios 2 through 7 that they are compliant with subpart J, compliant; use scanned images for records storage, and produce OCR full text documents, have on-lines searchable headers, also on-line searchable full text for retrieval, and provide transmittal of hard copy image, hard copy, okay, by mail or fax. The differences between the scenarios is that image availability only by mail or fax are scenarios 2, 3, 4 7; and on-line transmission of electronic images are scenarios 5 and 6.

The human corrected OCR full text scenarios are 3, and 5. And the machine corrected are 4, 6 and 7.

MR. MURPHY: Go over that image available only by mail or fax again.

MR. CLINE: In other words, there would not be -- if you were at a terminal you would not have access

ML993370056.txt

the image by electronic means.

ad  
ee  
the full text at your work station, you just couldn't see  
the actual image of the page, right?

MR. LEVIN: That's a band with consideration.

MR. CLINE: Yes.

maybe  
I don't -- maybe I'm just not understanding what you're  
saying. I'm sitting in front of my monitor and I want

to  
pull up something that has to do with --

xt on  
MR. CLINE: You would be able to read full text  
your monitor.

MR. MURPHY: On my monitor.

MR. CLINE: Right.

l  
see  
the  
MR. CAMERON: And you could download that full  
text to your printer right there. But if you wanted to  
the actual -- what you're seeing on your screen is not  
actual image of the page.

MR. CLINE: It's from an optical character  
reader.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, I see, okay. I got 'ya.

o the  
OCR.  
I'm not looking at a picture of what went into

MR. CLINE: If you want the image or picture

--  
guys  
MR. MURPHY: If I want to check to see if you  
screwed it up then I have to ask for it my mail.

a  
MR. SILBERG: Or if you want to see a map or  
photo or table.

What about tables and stuff, the same?

MR. CLINE: Yes, for the most part.

MR. METTAM: Yes it is available or?

MR. CLINE: Maps, figures, photos, designs,  
calculations.

this  
MR. BALCOM: One of the more costly parts of

is the development thesaurus, is that still part of the common features.

MR. CLINE: Development.

MR. BALCOM: Well the thesaurus, of all the materials related to the project and the tagging of each

document, to have all the items in a very elaborate thesaurus so you can search by subject terms, the words which may not be in the document, that's a major part of

current design.

MR. CLINE: You can do a word search.

MR. BALCOM: No, this is different. This is

labor intensive project that where a lot of people who are familiar with the subject matter look at a document and go into a 400 page thesaurus and they say it belongs to this category, this category and this category, and that makes searching easier on subject terms that may not have the word in the actual text of the document.

MR. CAMERON: It's also one of the big labor intensive cost drivers because these are.

MR. BALCOM: It's one of the more expensive parts of the whole project.

MR. CAMERON: Not that that has to be there, you have consider it.

MR. BALCOM: I think some people would suggest that it does have, it's been part of the design assumptions all the way along.

MR. CLINE: We did not consider it. We did not consider it, okay, but we'll take a look into it.

MR. DAVENPORT: Kirk, what is your estimate of the cost? Are we talking twice as much or what?

MR. BALCOM: I think it's significant because people. We are in the millions but I don't want to the

t  
to  
re is  
vious  
rsus

MR. CLINE: People are our biggest single cost driver. The system is most sensitive -- most sensitive that.

MR. CAMERON: Kirk, did you ever write -- the also the benefits -- increased benefits in terms of retrieval time, et cetera, et cetera, from using the thesaurus approach, I don't know if we ever, if the previous DOE estimates took a look at those types of benefits versus the cost thesaurus.

I'm  
n

MR. BALCOM: I think somewhere along the line we've done that. Back in the SAIC studies or somewhere pretty sure that there is some background information on that and probably some cost estimates as well.

we

MR. CLINE: From our review of the documents didn't find that, that's why we didn't consider it.

one

MR. BALCOM: You'll find it in there, it was of the major assumptions in the rule, actually.

it.

MR. CLINE: I'm sorry, we haven't come across

ions  
s to  
nd  
ith  
er

I'd like to move into the preliminary conclusions that we have. And these, again, are our recommendations to the DOE, the preliminary recommendations at this time and they are to the DOE, but -- that the DOE must proceed with development and implementation of the LSS without further delay.

it is  
ceed  
th  
up

In other words, it is critical, we recognize critical to the license application and that we must proceed with the development. The DOE must become proactive with the LSSARP, and the recommendations of this working group will assume the LSS is in compliance -- will assure I s

ould

say -- that the LSS is in compliance with all regulator requirements and that it is consistent with the philosophy of PPA, its cost and schedule.

That's all I have.

?

MR. HOYLE: Are there other questions of Mike

Brad.

or

MR. METTAM: Mike, I've got three questions f

you. On slide two it says you have an improved understanding of the LSSARP. Did you get that from the transcript or from.

the

MR. CLINE: Transcripts. We went through all

records, all the past transcripts.

ave

MR. METTAM: Page four, it took me awhile to translate this one, but under the list of bullets you h

d

analysis and capture of dissemination page volumes. An

y.

when you had that you said highly dependent on relevanc

And my question is who determines relevancy?

, you

MR. CLINE: Well that has to be evaluated and

know, I would hope the DOE would come up with recommendations for the LSSARP first.

aps

MR. MURPHY: Brad, that is one of the -- perh

is the most critical concern in our minds, when we are worried about whether or not DOE manages the system or

Moe

Levin manages the system; I want Moe Levin determining relevancy. I don't want DOE determining the relevancy

of

our documents for their own.

he

MR. CAMERON: Keep in mind, though, the distinction the COTR idea is on the development of the system itself. Moe -- there is never any doubt about t

the

fact that Moe is going to be looking to see if DOE and

other parties submit the relevant documents, that has nothing to do with the COTR --

MR. LEVIN: Absolutely.

ML993370056.txt

MR. CAMERON: -- business. And the relevance

MR. MURPHY: It has to do with how quickly you ensure compliance. And under the system he's proposing that we agreed to under the compromise, he's going to ensure if I say, hey, you didn't put these documents in because my documents in because -- or you didn't put some of your own documents in which I think are relevant, and DOE says oh, the heck with it. We are busy. We'll do that next year. It's going to be complied with by the end of the month if he's controlling the economic book.

MR. CAMERON: Right, in that sense; right.

MR. MURPHY: If they don't get paid until they put those documents in they're going to get in.

MR. CAMERON: Right. At that point, I understand.

MR. METTAM: The concern is they're designing the system based gauge volumes determined by some relevancy that they have to do before they design them. They have to make that judgment on how many pages do you think we are going to get before they finalize the system design. And if the office assumption is they're using are -- for example, inter-office correspondence is not going to be relevant, we are only going to do published public documents as a relevancy test, then we probably have got a problem in the way they designed the system.

MR. CAMERON: There is a relevancy test which is guided by the topical guidelines and then there is also the type of document that has to be included, but you're absolutely right. That has to be obviously considered.

MR. CLINE: Just for your information, in the October briefing -- I'm sure we'll get into this in gre

ater  
of  
nt

detail, but for our volume estimates we used 90 percent material that was coming in to the records and management system as relevant.

cords

MR. METTAM: I'm not sure I know what your records management system is capturing though.

MS. NEWBURY: Everything.

MR. CLINE: Everything.

and

MS. NEWBURY: And some of it is confidential some of it is not.

MR. CLINE: But the system is capturing everything.

MR. MURPHY: You're assuming 90 percent OF everything in DOE that's related to this --

r our

MR. CLINE: For our volume calculations -- for our volume calculations we assume 90 percent.

ure.

MR. MURPHY: That's a fairly conservative figure.

your

MR. METTAM: One last question. I'm back to bar chart. The page before it says the volume is estimated based on annual volume inputs and existing records data.

ated

.

ords

MR. CLINE: We have a track record -- the records management system has been operating for awhile and has know, has captured past material and is capturing new material as it comes in.

, you

our

MR. METTAM: But that's your annual volume, your past annual volume inputs and whatever estimated future ones, but it also talks about receiving records. You just

ust

use the volume of that --

ly

MR. CLINE: What we had originally was a fairly straight line projection, and there was a lot of discomfort with that. So that's when we went back and pooled the various experts to come up with the projections.

fort

MR. SILBERG: What is the projected volume as

ML993370056.txt

opposed to this relative factor analysis?

MR. CLINE: For what year, 2001?

MR. SILBERG: For 10 years or.

MR. CLINE: Jim, for 90 percent relevancy do

we

have.

MR. BOONE: I can look on the this, but I'm s

ure

it would be presented in the next meeting, but which ye

ar

would you like?

MR. METTAM: 2001.

MR. SILBERG: 2001, that's your maximum --

MR. BOONE: 2001, 90 percent relevancy is approximately 18 million pages. And for the year 2010

it's

approximately 32 million pages.

MR. SILBERG: Wait, wait.

MR. MURPHY: Jim, these are cumulative.

MR. CLINE: These are cumulative.

MR. METTAM: Just for that year, do you know

what

2001 totals would be for that year.

MR. BOONE: I don't have that information.

MR. METTAM: We can tape them all together.

MR. CLINE: What do we have in the records sy

stem

now, Camille? What do we have in the records system no

w.

MS. KERRIGAN: Today, the total number of rec

ords.

MR. DICKERSON: Today's?

MR. CLINE: Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: There are 8 million pages in

the

record system today at 2 o'clock.

MR. HENKEL: I guess it would be helpful if w

e can

find what the normalization of this number is here for

this

bar graph. You've got a relative factor.

MS. NEWBURY: We'll be discussing that in mor

e

detail later.

MR. CLINE: Our numbers are still bouncing ar

ound

a bit.

MR. HOYLE: I think this is very exciting, it

sort  
we  
with  
t  
is  
s,  
ey're  
w big  
what  
ns on  
tem.  
thing  
el as  
ago  
ow I  
you  
sions

of sounds like where we were in the December 1989 when had our first meeting. I think we are ready to get on it now, so I'm excited about what we are going hear next meeting.

MR. DAVENPORT: I have a question. I hope th isn't too naive, but how come you guys aren't doing thi how come my understanding was you guys were going to be doing this stuff?

MR. HOYLE: No.

MR. CAMERON: DOE was always the crew who was going to develop the system.

MR. DAVENPORT: The but the kind of things th talking about are already within the purview of the authority that you said you have. Why aren't you doing these things? These guys are making decisions about ho the system is going to be, what it's going to be like, relevance it is to put -- isn't that NRC's job?

MR. HOYLE: No, it's not.

MR. CAMERON: No. They're not making decisio what's relevant. I mean they're using the relevancy guidelines to try to estimate the page numbers.

MR. DAVENPORT: Right, they're sizing the sys

MR. CAMERON: And I also, I mean this is some that's going to be presented to the advisory review pan well as the NRC for comment, as I understand it.

MR. DAVENPORT: I know it's been a long time and I know my memory is not super great, but my understanding when we were sitting around the table negotiating is that this was going to be NRC system. N understand we are talking about transferring that with guys having a COTR designation, but these kinds of deci

are going to affect what the system is going to be like  
And you're not supervising it. I mean it's being done  
there. It's not being done in NRC, it's not being done  
your contract.

MR. CAMERON: They're not doing anything yet,  
Jim. Under the existing rule, DOE always had the  
responsibility to design and develop the system in  
consultation with the LSS administrator, and the type o  
stuff they're talking about is design and development o  
system. And Moe, do you want to --

MR. LEVIN: Well I was just going to say I be  
I was to certify that that met the needs of the LSS  
according to the rule, so I would certify that it was  
proper.

MR. CAMERON: They are supposed to take the l  
in doing that.

MR. LEVIN: Right.

MR. CAMERON: Which doesn't mean that the NRC  
doesn't have -- or the advisory review panel, for that  
matter doesn't have a say in what they actually impleme  
terms of design and development.

I don't want to say anything about the super  
memory and super things but -- no -- but I think that o  
the most important things that you're saying is that th  
isn't just a unilateral type of thing.

MR. DAVENPORT: These decisions affect what t  
system is going to be like, right?

MR. LEVIN: Correct.

MR. DAVENPORT: So these are activities that  
should be done under NRC supervision, control. Why is  
DOE's contractor -- NRC's contractor instead of DOE's  
sitting here?

MR. CAMERON: Not under the rule. This is pa  
design and development of the system.

MR. LEVIN: Not operation.

ars  
prior to '89.

e  
t me  
here  
ble  
are  
out the window that I thought we agreed on.

the  
nel  
are  
n and  
with  
the ways the rule is set up.

MR. LEVIN: This is just a study, it's not implementing anything.

MR. CLINE: Not at all.

their  
purview.

MR. CAMERON: So we get to have you come back  
,  
you're coming back.

of  
but  
o  
R,  
aying  
MS. NEWBURY: We'll give you hours and hours  
this, Jim, if you really want and you can critique it,  
the LSSARP group has to agree to whatever it is the  
requirements are that, as a group, we have to develop s  
that we can go out for a contract that Moe can be a COT  
maybe, for.

MR. DAVENPORT: I understand that. All I'm s  
is that my understanding was -- and perhaps it's just m

y  
hat  
you  
nd  
ere  
ike  
nt in  
e  
ct  
f  
sory  
they  
that  
size  
t  
share  
he  
ts of  
t was  
on.  
wave  
ause  
But

memory is lacking that the development of the system, w  
the system attributes were going to be were going to be  
guys design, these guys were going to pay for it.

MR. CAMERON: No, they were going to design a  
develop according to the functional requirements that w  
set forth in a rule in terms full text, image, things l  
that. But DOE was going to do the design and developme  
consultation with the LSS administrator. And I think w  
actually have made some progress on that because the fa  
of, it seems like the intent of DOE here to bring all o  
this not only to the LSS administrator, but to the advi  
review panel for review and comment and approval before  
march forward to implement it, to make sure that it is  
consistent with the functional requirements for the LSS  
are reflected in the rule.

MR. SILBERG: Certainly something such as the  
of the system, it was always my understanding, that tha  
would be determined by DOE. They are the relying on a  
of the records that design the system, that's part of t  
overall system design. It's got to meet the requiremen  
subpart J, but how big a system handling documents, tha  
never going to be something that would be an NRC decisi  
Certainly you would hope everyone would be on the same  
length and I would hope DOE would be talking to NRC bec  
NRC is going to be generating some documents as well.

those kind of questions are really design questions which are, I think, properly they're all DOE at that point.

MR. CLINE: The estimates of volume that we have now far and exceed anything -- any other program or project out there. There is a lot of material, that's a lot of material I should say.

MR. SILBERG: I think the 90 percent assumption is really quite conservative, assuming that you're counting drafts of documents and the records management system, because most drafts are not covered by the LSS rule, it's only that one category of drafts.

So, if your system is capturing -- easy for you to say -- iterative drafts, the overall number should be, I would think, significantly less than.

MR. HOYLE: Any further comments on the DOE presentation?

MR. MURPHY: Do you have any rough approximation of about how soon you're going to be able to get an answer on the COTR concept?

MS. NEWBURY: I would guess if we have another meeting in late October, early November I should have an answer.

MR. MURPHY: By then?

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

MR. HOYLE: I think we are all looking -- I heard certainly am looking forward to that next meeting. I heard more today than I expected to hear about some of the details of what you're studying. Obviously you've wetted a lot of appetites for more information. This panel does need to fully understand more about the scenario so we can help determine the direction that we would at least recommend.

r the  
e you  
ber  
ly

So, I do want to talk about setting a time for the next meeting. We can do that right now, I suppose. Are you fairly certain you'll be ready by the last week of October or should we really be looking --

ton?  
guess

MR. MURPHY: Last week of October is absolutely impossible, it's elk season.

MR. BECHTEL: Would the meeting be in Washington?

MR. HOYLE: No, either Las Vegas or Reno. I guess

we haven't been to Reno.

MR. HENKEL: Save the winter meeting for Reno,

okay?

MS. NEWBURY: We'd like to offer Las Vegas and

d  
allow time for a tour of UNLV and the facility there if anyone is interested in looking at OCR capability.

MR. HOYLE: I appreciate you mentioning that, Claudia, because Tom Nartker did call me and he invited

the  
s  
panel to make a tour, and obviously we need to be in Las Vegas to do that.

Is elk season one day or is it all week?

MR. MURPHY: It's a way of life.

MR. DAVENPORT: If he uses an assault weapon,

it's  
sting  
e  
r

quick.

MR. HOYLE: Chip is making a -- Chip is suggesting

we give DOE time to be sure that they're ready, maybe we should be looking at mid November. Did somebody earlier

tell me that mid November was not good?

MS. NEWBURY: I have a conflict with an NWTRB meeting here in Washington, 17th and 18th on performance

e  
assessment.

MR. HOYLE: When is that, 17th?

MS. NEWBURY: 17th and 18th.

MR. HENKEL: How about the week of the 7th of November.

tend MS. NEWBURY: Election day is that week, I in  
to for vote for my senator from Nevada.

MR. HOYLE: If a number of you are coming to  
Washington for that meeting do we want --

this MR. MURPHY: This is very, very tentative at  
point in time, but there is a technical exchange on TBM  
activity in Las Vegas on the 7th and 8th of November.

It wouldn't be a real, real big risk if you bet your home  
right now that the TBM will not be ready for a technical exch  
ange on its status by the 7th of November, it may not even b  
e started yet.

er, MR. HENKEL: At least until the 9th of Novemb  
right?

MR. MURPHY: That's not necessarily the same  
people involved in that, but, that might be, the 7th of  
November might be doable.

MR. HOYLE: How about the Tuesday the 8th?

1st, MR. MURPHY: What about the week of October 3  
what's the matter with that?

MR. CUMMINGS: 31st is a holiday.

not a MR. MURPHY: October 31st is Halloween, it's  
holiday.

MR. CAMERON: In Vegas it is.

MR. POE: In Nevada it is an official state  
holiday.

week. MR. MURPHY: What about some other day that w

7th. MR. POE: He was suggesting what, Tuesday the

MR. HOYLE: We're going off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. HOYLE: Let's set November the 8th in Las  
Vegas. I would ask DOE if we could use their facility  
again, I think that worked out all right last time. We  
used a training room.

a MS. NEWBURY: I'll see if I can get something  
little nicer if we have more advance notice.

do  
a lot  
of  
October for a full TRB board meeting.

I  
MS. NEWBURY: That's too early, I'm afraid.  
would some time to review that the M&Os come up with.

me in  
MR. MURPHY: You're going to get it by when?  
MS. NEWBURY: They're supposed to give it to  
October.

that  
MR. HENKEL: What about the other TRB meeting  
you said you had a conflict with?

one  
MS. NEWBURY: That's the 17th and 18th.  
MR. CAMERON: And that's in D.C.  
MS. NEWBURY: The October TRB meeting is only  
day you realize.

at,  
MR. MURPHY: The October TRB meeting is in wh  
Las Vegas?

2th.  
MS. NEWBURY: I have an agenda.  
MR. MURPHY: I haven't gotten one.  
MS. NEWBURY: I do. It's one day, it's the 1

13th  
MR. HOYLE: Off the record.  
[Discussion off the record.]  
MR. METTAM: So we've decided on the 12th and  
of December then in Las Vegas?

the  
MR. HOYLE: Las Vegas, 12th and 13th.  
MR. BRADSHAW: Will it be useful to schedule  
next meeting right now if you're going to have the same  
problem in December? You may not want to meet until Ap  
ril  
again.

e  
MR. HOYLE: The suggestion is that we make th  
date of the following meeting as well. Shall we go out  
four  
months?

e is  
MR. CAMERON: I guess it depends on what ther

to discuss at the next meeting.

ar

MR. MURPHY: If anybody has got a 1995 calend  
that goes out that far. Here I go, I do.

we

MR. SILBERG: Is this in place of the meeting  
once scheduled for November 8th is this in addition to?

MR. HOYLE: You better go off again.

[Discussion off the record.]

t

MR. HOYLE: I think we'll try to pick the nex

date in December when we are in Las Vegas.

ls

MR. DRAPKIN: Since DOE will have the materia

set

ready way ahead of our meeting is it possible to get a  
of the report distributed so that we are all prepared f  
or  
that meeting.

or

MR. HOYLE: I think that's a great idea.

Can DOE circulate material to us when it is  
available?

rials

MS. NEWBURY: I can provide you with the mate

e

before the meeting, yes. I'm not sure if it will be th

hat

full report or things pulled out of it. I'm not sure w

n

I'm getting yet, but I will provide you with informatio

before the meeting.

,

MR. DRAPKIN: That will come through you John

disseminate it out?

MR. HOYLE: That's fine with me.

Do you want to send it to me, Claudia?

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

tatus

MR. HOYLE: I think we'll spend a moment on s

of the topical guidelines, Chip?

ouple

MR. CAMERON: As you know, there has been a c

of rounds of comment on the topical guidelines, the  
regulatory guide on that. And the draft version that w

as

put out for comment was put out in July of last year, a

nd

we've received written comments from a lot of the panel

members, and also comments at the October meeting of the panel and subsequent written comments to that we folded into our comment analysis.

The schedule now is to have the final guide ready in April of next year, and I'm not prepared right now to go through a detailed comment analysis, but I would say that the Nye County comment and the Clark County comment, and I'm not sure if the state submitted the same comment -- but for environmental to include socioeconomic, that is our plan now, to define that to include socioeconomic.

MR. MURPHY: I notice that Dennis isn't here, you might want to let him know that or I can, or something. He was concerned about that this morning.

MR. CAMERON: I'll call him and tell him that. But I don't know if it would be if the October meeting, if you want to put anything on in terms of a detailed comment analysis, or whether that's something that would be best be saved for the meeting after that before the guide is issued final, maybe that makes more sense, but that's basically where we are on topical guidelines.

MR. HOYLE: I will talk to the NRC staff for audit and see if there would be something to be brought up at the December meeting or not.

I skipped over discussion of formation of the technical subgroup, Dennis Bechtel was also interested in that and suggested that at our last meeting. I think we

should pick up on that at the next meeting.

eet  
Future agenda discussion. We've decided to meet on December the 12th and 13th, and we have at least one topic, and that is DOE's report to us.

hat  
ines  
al  
Do we want anything else on the schedule at that time? I will be checking to see whether topical guidelines would be appropriate, and the discussion of the technical subgroup.

ion,  
ning  
MR. MURPHY: I'd like to continue the discussion, the issue that I raised in Las Vegas and again this morning with the Commission about the potential use of the NPC certification proceedings to debug the system.

the  
heir  
pe  
and  
t  
It seems to me if DOE is going to accelerate the development and implementation of the LSS system with the PPA, it may very well indeed be ready in pilot scale type form for us to screw around with this and play with it and tweak it during the not as an LSS, but a way to debug it during the MPC certification process.

Were you informed that have suggestion?

a  
MS. NEWBURY: I was, and I believe we put out a response that said we were not going to do that.

MR. MURPHY: I haven't seen such a response.

MR. LEVIN: He haven't seen it.

MS. NEWBURY: I think it went back up to our headquarters and I would check further that than that.

o  
MR. METTAM: Was there a rationale given as to why?

d be  
what  
ate  
dea  
MS. NEWBURY: We didn't think the system would be ready. I would have to find the letter and see exactly what it says. Also the process for the MPC is totally separate from the MGDS, the disposal system, so that I have no idea

what the records requirements are or what anything look  
s like for the MPC at this point.

MR. MURPHY: A big, big bell just went off in everybody's head here at this part of the table.

MS. NEWBURY: I'm sure it did.

MR. MURPHY: Are you suggesting that the MPC information is not going to be relevant to -- relevant

and

thus inputted into the LSS?

PC is

e on

ng to

MS. NEWBURY: It depends whether or not the MPC used in the repository. There has been no decision made whether the MPC will actually be made. It still is going to have to be discussed.

be

e to

SS

going

s of

over

h it

at

he

me

oid

ner

d and

MR. MURPHY: We went through these topical guidelines all over again. It's still going to have to be discussed in the EIS, and the NRC is still going to have to make a determination as to they can adopt DOE's as a practical matter, and if the information isn't in the LSS and thus isn't going to be available for our review and comment during the Yucca Mountain EIS process there is to be a big stink and undoubted litigation and all sort problems.

And we went through this over, and over, and again at several meetings of this body. We went through during the negotiations of the original LSS rule, we beat each other over the head and hammered on the table at the LSSARP meeting in Reno which prompted this topical guidelines process that Chip just went through, and let me just suggest in the strongest possible terms to DOE, avoid that problem. Don't force the stake holder into the corner of having to sue you over something as absolutely stupid

nto insignificant as not putting MPC data and information i  
r the LSS; that I cannot imagine you doing anything dumbe  
t than that.

t MS. NEWBURY: I hope I wasn't implying that i  
was wouldn't be in the LSS long-term, what I was suggesting  
at certification for the MPC is happening, I'm not sure th  
you the data is going to be put into the LSS system, and if  
'd be would like me to take an action to go back and develop  
something for you to respond to for the next meeting, I  
glad to do it.

a MR. MURPHY: Yes, please, do that. But I  
we understand that if the LSS wasn't developed, wasn't at  
down point that -- I'm not suggesting that you slow down and  
up never did, even back in October, suggest that you slow  
on an the MPC certification process to allow the LSS to catch  
r to with it. But, if you're going to push the LSS forward  
ch, accelerated basis as you just told us you will, in orde  
for keep it on a parallel track for proposed program approa  
mes, the 1998 date and you're going to be certifying an MPC  
under storage and transportation in about those same time fra  
the schedules that I've seen.

rong, And the MPC experts here, correct me if I'm w  
under but it seems to me that you're going to be pushing for  
certification by the NRC of storage and transportation  
part 71 and 72 of the MPC, pretty much at the same time  
you're bringing everything to a head, hopefully,  
optimistically to a head under the proposed program  
approach, and you've just told us that you're going to

may

accelerate the development of the LSS so that indeed it

s

be available in sufficient form to allow the parties to debug it during that process. It's just a suggestion I make. Otherwise we are going to -- you know, none of u

want to be in a position of having to debug the system during licensing.

MS. NEWBURY: We'll come back to you with --

MR. MURPHY: But you were suggesting that MPC information wasn't going back into the LSS.

MS. NEWBURY: No, I wasn't suggesting that.

m DOE

MR. HOYLE: Okay, so we will hear further fro

any

on that subject at the next meeting as well. Is there

hat

other business that anyone would like to discuss? In t

case, we stand adjourned until the next meeting in Las Vegas.

[Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

the

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: LSS ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

ML993370056.txt

nal  
clear  
d to

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original  
Transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission taken by me and thereafter reduced to  
typewriting by me or under the direction of the court  
reporting company, and that transcript is a true and  
accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

—  
td.

---

Official Reporter  
Ann Riley & Associates, L