

Distribution:

GREENES

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

Joan-Lick

Memorandum For Mr. Moeller
From St. Mary

Subject

NRC/DOE Meeting on DOE's Proposed Position on
Retrievability and Retrieval for a Geologic Repository

July 31, 1985

John:

Here's a copy of a proposed
memo transmitting your memo and the
minutes. Did appreciate and suggestions
of or comments. JackAttached is a memorandum from John Greaves commenting on my
memorandum to you on the above topic. John also provideda copy of the minutes of the meeting. I note that John
sent a copy of his memorandum to you and I am writing this
memorandum to inform you that John and I have talked at
some length about this matter.He quite correctly pointed out that he had made it
clear that the NRC staff made no commitments and reached
no agreements at that meeting. Further it was made clear
by the NRC staff that additional modifications or requirements could be imposed during
the licensing hearings. I agree with these points but pointed
out that it appeared that ~~with~~ ^{its contractors} the DOE and the States seemed
to feel, ^{it seemed to me,} that the proposed position was generally acceptable, subject
to modifications discussed during the meeting.John indicated that some of the items that I had
indicated stressed in my memorandum were implicit
in the NRC staff's position and comments. I noted thatI was ~~reporting~~ reporting on the presentations made at
meeting. I believe that this situation argues for aWM DOCKET CONTROL
CENTER

SEP 11 11:43:40 '85

8509300080 850911
PDR WASTE
WM-1

PDR

close cooperation and communication between the staff and the ACRS to avoid misinterpretation of each others intent.

With respect to the last paragraph in which I pointed out that the staff was proceeding ^{not to make agreements} without seeking advice or counsel from outside ^{peer} sources, the ACRS or the Commission John correctly noted that ~~this~~ ^{my} position was at variance with the ACRS letter to the Commission or the ACRS's future role in Waste Management. I concurred in that observation, but failed to point out to John that my memorandum preceded the ACRS's letter. He is now aware of that fact. The purpose of ~~the~~ ^{my August 8th memorandum} ~~discussion~~ was to bring the the Committee's attention that the staff was proceeding without independent consultation or review. I did not, nor do I now believe that the ACRS was aware of the staff's actions. I believe that the staff deserves the active support ^{and confirmation of their actions by} ~~and~~ ^{of} peers. Such support will only enhance their credibility during the licensing process, and minimize the possibility of trivial contentions being raised.

The staff's competence has ^{now is not being} ~~not~~ ^{been} questioned. The point I wished to make is that it appears that the

③
stuff is making long-range ^{quasi-} policy commitments that may not be supportable during ~~the~~ licensing actions, and that to avoid, or minimize, the possibility of being second guessed ~~other~~ independent review and confirmation of these decisions should be sought. That is still my position.

Attached

ACRS M, S, F
J. Greco, WMFG
C. Jupiter, OPR