

**CERTIFIED**  
MINUTES OF THE 87TH ACNW MEETING  
OCTOBER 22-23, 1996

ACNW-0108  
PDR 2/26/97

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

	Page
I. <u>Chairman's Report</u> (Open) .....	2
II. <u>Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Overview and Status Briefing</u> (Open) .....	2
III. <u>Branch Technical Position on Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land Burial Sites Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304, 20.302 and Current 20.2002</u> (Open) .....	8
IV. <u>Executive Session</u> (Open) .....	11
A. Report:	
"Comments on COUPLED Processes in the NRC High-Level Waste Prelicensing Program" .....	11
B. Future Meeting Agenda (Open) .....	11
C. Future Committee Activities (Open) .....	11

- APPENDICES -

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

280027

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By

*ENB*

*RSO291*  
*04M-7 ACNW*  
*x-04M-6 meeting*





# CERTIFIED

**CERTIFIED 12/10/96 BY  
PAUL W. POMEROY**

Issued: 12/3/96

**MINUTES OF THE 87TH MEETING OF THE  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE  
OCTOBER 22-23, 1996  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

The 87th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste was held at the two White Flint North Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, on October 22-23, 1996. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and take appropriate actions on the items listed in the attached agenda. The entire meeting was open to the public.

A transcript of selected portions of the meeting was kept and is available in the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. [Copies of the transcript are available for purchase from Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc., Court Reporters and Transcribers, 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Transcripts are also available on FedWorld from the "NRC MAIN MENU." The Direct Dial Access number for FedWorld is (800) 303-9672; the local Direct Dial Access number is (703) 321-3339.]

Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy, Committee Chairman, convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m. and briefly reviewed the schedule for the meeting. He stated that the meeting was being conducted in conformance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. He also stated that the Committee had not received any requests from persons or organizations desiring to make an oral statement during the meeting. However, he did invite members of the public who were present and had something to contribute to inform the ACNW staff so that time could be allocated for them to make oral statements.

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



I. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Open)

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

Dr. Pomeroy identified the following item that he believed to be of interest to the Committee:

The chance of a new volcanic center forming and disrupting a potential repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, over the next 10,000 years is about 1 in 70 million per year, according to DOE's Probabilistic Volcanic Hazard Analysis for Yucca Mountain. The report was compiled by a panel of 10 independent scientist with experience in studying volcanic systems. The panel evaluated the probability of a volcanic event disrupting the proposed repository and quantified the uncertainties associated with the assessment. Scientists from Los Alamos National Laboratory have been studying basaltic volcanoes west of Yucca Mountain and in the surrounding areas for 15 years. The volcanoes range in age from 20,000 to 3.5 million years. The panel's analysis indicates data and conclusions collected by DOE's Yucca Mountain project are appropriate for use in a performance assessment; the DOE expects to conclude volcanic studies at Yucca Mountain this year.

II. Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Overview and Status Briefing (Open)

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

Mr. James L. Milhoan, Deputy Executive Director for Operations, and other members of the rebaselining steering committee/task force briefed the Committee on the status of the rebaselining effort, and provided an overview of four Direction-Setting Issues (DSIs) of most interest to the Committee. The four DSIs include the following: DSI 5, Low-Level Waste (LLW) Options; DSI 6, High-Level Waste (HLW) and Spent Fuel; DSI 9, Decommissioning Non-Reactor Facilities; and DSI 12, Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Regulation. Other members of the steering committee present included Dr. Malcolm Knapp, who led the



discussion on the four DSIs, Mr. Jesse L. Funches, who discussed Phase 3, development of the strategic plan, and Ms. Clare DeFino, Special Assistant to Mr. Milhoan.

Rebaselining started in August of 1995 at the request of Chairman Jackson, because of changing internal and external environments. The steering committee was formed in response to this request. The committee is co-chaired by Mr. James L. Milhoan and Mr. James W. Johnson of the Chairman's staff, along with a support staff and contractor, Public Strategies Group.

Rebaselining is a 4-phased effort, consisting of Phase 1, strategic assessment; Phase 2, rebaselining and development of DSIs; Phase 3, development of strategic plan and stakeholder involvement; and Phase 4, implementation and budget. The Commission's preliminary decisions along with the DSIs will go out for public comment, and the strategic plan will be made available to the public once finalized.

Phase 1 was a bottoms up assessment of NRC's activities. Branches were asked what activities they are doing, what is the basis for doing them, and the internal and external factors that might influence their activities in the next five to ten years. About 4500 activities were captured, which were then grouped into three major categories: reactors, materials, and management and support. These categories were further subdivided into various lines of business within each major grouping and functions, including cross-cutting functions like training. A narrative was written for each function for the Phase 1 report. Then a top-down approach was used to identify 170 strategic issues, which were later grouped into 22 DSIs. The Commission requested the Committee to add two new DSIs, Reactor Decommissioning and Regulatory Excellence.

Phase 2 involved developing issue papers for each DSI, the framework document, and the process paper, all of which are available on the NRC home page. The Commission requested that the Committee not follow the SECY paper format, but rather, develop a rich



set of options for each issue, with no one preferred option or recommendation, and to use innovative thinking.

The Commission provided its preliminary views on the DSIs in August, 1996, including views on sixteen papers, which went out for public comment, as well as on eight other papers the Commission considered to be not part of strategic planning. The framework document describes how the Commission treated the 24 issue papers. The framework document also lays out the process for handling Commission decisions on the issue papers, and the production of the strategic plan.

NRC stakeholder meetings will start on October 23, 1996. The stakeholder meetings will consist of a plenary session to discuss the process, and a discussion of the issue papers. A facilitator will be used. NRC is most interested in getting comments on assumptions about internal and external factors, omissions, and the Commission's preliminary views. The comment period closes November 15, 1996.

The NRC will produce a stakeholder interaction report for the Commission due in early December, including a brief analysis of the comments for each paper. The stakeholder interaction report will be available to the public.

In response to a question from Dr. Pomeroy about whether they believe ACNW should have a special role in providing comments, the presenters responded that the ACNW/ACRS are stakeholders and can comment as stakeholders or in the Committee's usual fashion, i.e., a letter to the Commission. Dr. Knapp added that the ACNW should look at the Commission's preliminary decision on the LLW DSI to see if it is different from what ACNW recommended last year.

Phase 3 involves developing the strategic plan, to set a direction for the NRC for the next five or ten years, and to meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). The GPRA also requires agencies to develop an annual performance



plan that includes quantifiable goals and performance measures, and an annual performance report that reports on how the agency is meeting its goals. The strategic plan is due in early 1997. This plan provides a basis to prepare the FY 1999 budget and FY 1999 performance plan, which are due to the Office of Management and Budget in September, 1997. The first performance report is due in March 2000. The strategic plan is expected to be approximately 30 - 40 pages that will guide program decisions and resource decisions. The strategic plan will provide agency goals and objectives, strategies for achieving the goals and objectives, and will be updated at least every three years. It will contain a vision, mission, values and principles, goals, and strategies. The strategies consist of mission critical strategies, mission enabling strategies, and core resource strategies. For each area within these strategies, internal and external factors will be described, and the Commission's preliminary decisions will be heavily relied upon.

In response to a question from Dr. Hinze regarding where managing information fits into the DSIs, Mr. Funches responded that there is no single DSI on this topic, but the Commission has already factored in the Chief Information Officer Act into its preliminary decision. Mr. Milhoan noted that the strategic plan will capture the Commission's decisions about information management. Dr. Hinze reiterated that the Committee has a strong interest in information transfer.

Dr. Knapp described each DSI and briefly discussed the subsumed issues, related issues, key factors, and options. He also introduced the authors of each paper, Mr. James E. Kennedy for LLW, Mr. Timothy C. Johnson for Decommissioning, Dr. John H. Austin and Ms. Margaret E. Lusardi for HLW.

Dr. Knapp highlighted the subsumed issues for the LLW DSI, including whether to eliminate the LLW program, and the Commission's preliminary decision. He asked the Committee for their comment on the completeness of the key factors. The Commission's preliminary position is not in favor of reducing the program. The Commission endorsed the option to support a strong national program, and asked for public comment on whether the NRC



should encourage an integrated approach to minimize risk for the regulation of handling processing, recycle, and disposal.

In response to Dr. Hinze's question about the impact of decommissioning reactors on LLW disposal, Mr. Timothy Johnson indicated that many of the facilities can go into SAFSTOR (a safe storage of the plant prior to decontamination), so there shouldn't be a big problem as far as access to disposal sites. Mr. Kennedy added that states are closely tracking how industry deregulation may affect decommissioning, such as access to, and costs of, LLW disposal, and that there is much uncertainty now. Dr. Hinze suggested adding decommissioning to the list for key factors.

Dr. Hinze also asked where mixed waste fits in. Dr. Knapp noted that it is not really in any one place, but is touched upon in the materials DSI, and the risk-informed, risk-based DSI.

The HLW DSI includes the subsumed issues, how proactive should NRC be with EPA in addressing HLW standards and regulations, and should NRC take steps to encourage or assist DOE in dealing with Greater than Class C Wastes (GTCC). Related strategic issues include how the NRC can assure compatibility for spent fuel storage and transportation, and whether NRC should seek industry's experience. The Commission's preliminary view is Option 3, maintain NRC's existing HLW program, and explore taking a more active role in resolving issues in the national HLW program, consistent with NRC's mission. The Commission particularly seeks comment on what additional activities the NRC might reasonably undertake.

Dr. Pomeroy asked whether NRC was concerned that DOE may submit a license application before the EPA standard and NRC regulation are promulgated. Dr. Knapp suggested that he had not considered this. He added that his primary concern is new legislation that could change the whole program.



Dr. Garrick added that the NRC should take a more proactive role, in general, depending on the context, such as making strong recommendations to Congress on what should be done. Dr. Knapp again invited the Committee to comment on this to the Commission.

DSI 9 deals with how the NRC can take advantage of new and different approaches to optimize site remediation for the site decommissioning management plan. The Commission selected a combination of options that would place appropriate responsibility on licensees to remediate their sites while giving NRC appropriate tools to deal with problem sites and licensees. The combination includes change the decommissioning review process to take an aggressive position to develop regulatory frameworks for lower cost decommissioning waste disposal, focus on decommissioning cases in which progress can be made and transfer stalled sites to EPA, and develop a strong litigation strategy. Dr. Knapp noted that the combination of options gives them a lot to work with to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.

DSI 12 deals with what criteria NRC should use to expand the scope of a risk-informed, performance-based approach to rulemaking, licensing, inspection, and enforcement, specifically, in the materials and waste programs.

Dr. Knapp noted that performance assessment for HLW and LLW is very akin to probabilistic risk assessment (PRA), and the integrated safety assessments done at fuel cycle facilities are very much risk-informed, performance-based. He noted that some materials programs may not be well-suited for risk-informed regulation, i.e., regulation of radiography.

Dr. Knapp reviewed the Commission's preliminary options, which include focusing on higher risk activities, and to move more aggressively toward risk-informed, performance-based regulation. Dr. Knapp noted that the Commission is particularly interested in getting public comment on how the NRC should deal with dual regulation when applying a risk-informed, performance-based philosophy.



Dr. Garrick commented that NRC has a real opportunity now in the waste arena to move ahead with a risk-based approach, because the HLW standard is likely to be risk-based, and HLW performance assessment is moving from a deterministic to probabilistic approach. He also noted that a PRA format has yet to be adopted. Dr. Austin replied that he serves on the agency's PRA coordinating committee, which ensures that the agency is using PRA techniques where appropriate, and in a consistent manner.

III. Branch Technical Position on Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land Burial Sites Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304, 20.302, and Current 20.2002 (Open)

[Mr. Howard J. Larson was the Designated Federal Official for this part of the meeting.]

Dr. Pomeroy introduced Mr. Michael F. Weber and Ms. Heather M. Astwood, NMSS, who discussed the screening methodology that will be employed prior to decommissioning sites that previously had buried radwastes as authorized under former 10 CFR 20.304, and 20.302.

Mr. Weber discussed the background of shallow land burial sites, noting that while both sections of Part 20 previously authorized disposal of LLW onsite, 10 CFR 20.304 (which could be similar to a "general license") was rescinded on January 28, 1981, and 20.302 (which required the Commission to take action to permit onsite disposal) expired on January 1, 1994, having been superseded by 20.2002. In response to a question, Mr. Weber noted that, on the average, the agency receives perhaps a half-dozen requests a year for on-site burial in accordance with 20.2002 whereas perhaps there were several hundred prior burials that were not subjected to 20.2002 requirements (prior terminated licenses).

Mr. Weber noted that the Final Rule on Timeliness in Decommissioning Nuclear Facilities became effective on August 15, 1994, outlining a schedule for performing decommissioning activities (generally 2 years). That rule also contains a schedule for decommissioning



contaminated "outdoor areas," which included former 10 CFR 20.304 and 10 CFR 20.302 burials. According to the rule, licensees are required to notify the NRC about former burials by October 15, 1996, or request an alternate schedule by September 15, 1996. Information Notice 96-47, published on August 19, 1996, reminded licensees of their obligation to notify the NRC of "unused areas" and to commit to a schedule for decommissioning. The NRC staff anticipates that perhaps approximately 100 licensees will respond. These licensees cover the entire range from small to large, from those that buried onsite only once to those that buried onsite almost continuously.

Ms. Astwood then proceeded to discuss the need for a consistent and conservative screening methodology, stating that there were limited records for past burials and that a detailed characterization of all burials would be costly and unnecessary. The proposed method consists of the following three steps:

1. Review burial records.
2. Calculate the dose from ingestion of the total inventory in the groundwater; and, if necessary.
3. Calculate the dose to the resident farmer (slightly less conservative).

If the estimated dose from either step is less than 100 mrem/yr, the site will pass the screening. If the site passes, no additional site work is required and the site is considered acceptable for unrestricted use. If the site does not pass the screening, the site would then be required to undergo more detailed screening.

Ms. Astwood provided the assumptions that are to be used in these screening calculations. Among the assumptions are the following: the entire estimated total activity is assumed to leach into the groundwater in one year; the volume of groundwater is assumed to be 91 cubic meters; a well captures all of the contaminated water in 1 year; and an individual



drinks 2 liters/day of the contaminated water. The screening dose is then estimated using 10 CFR 20, Appendix B (calculations being performed for each isotope). She indicated that the resident farmer utilized in these calculations is assumed to obtain only 25% of his sustenance from the site (as opposed to 100% in a "subsistence farmer" model.)

Ms. Astwood next provided several sample calculations derived from the analysis of an actual site. In conclusion, Mr. Weber indicated that the NRC staff will publish the BTP for interim use and comment in the next several weeks, have the Agreement States review and comment in parallel, and collect and evaluate comments until the end of the calendar year. No decisions would be made until the finalization of the BTP.

Other questions asked by the Committee were whether the 100 mrem/yr calculated dose would meet the EPA- 4 mrem/yr drinking water standard. In response, Mr. Weber noted that while it would not, he would like to stress that EPA would have to apply their public endangerment criteria should it desire to undertake an enforcement action. He also said that it was not intended that the entire 100 mrem would be used by this single source and, furthermore, that the screening methodology was extremely conservative. Actual measurements compared to use of the proposed methodology revealed orders of magnitude conservatisms.

Questions were raised about the role of the NRC in reviewing the licensees' calculations; the impact of high atomic-numbered isotopes (>88) upon the calculations; the field monitoring capabilities of the NRC, and its intentions in that regard; the potential for major surprises to occur in the implementation of this methodology; and the applicability of the current interagency Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual (MARSSIM) project.

In response to the NRC staff's request, Dr. Pomeroy indicated that the Committee would consider submitting a comment letter on this topic. Such a letter report would be submitted



in time for the NRC staff to include with its evaluation of other comments received in response to the Federal Register Notice.

IV. Executive Session (Open)

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

A. Report:

Comments on Coupled Processes in the NRC High-Level Waste Prelicensing Program (Report to Chairman Shirley Ann Jackson, NRC, from Paul W. Pomeroy, ACNW Chairman, dated November 8, 1996)

B. Future Meeting Agenda

Appendix IV summarizes the proposed items endorsed by the Committee for the 88th ACNW Meeting, Rockville, Maryland, November 12-13, 1996, and future Working Group meetings.

C. Future Committee Activities (Open)

The Committee discussed anticipated and proposed Committee activities, future meeting dates, and agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m., Wednesday, October 23, 1996.



request for a hearing shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Chief, Docketing and Service Section, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies also shall be sent to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, to the Assistant General Counsel for Hearings and Enforcement at the same address, to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406, and to the Licensee. If such a person requests a hearing, that person shall set forth with particularity the manner in which his interest is adversely affected by this Order and shall address the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 2.714(d).

If a hearing is requested by a person whose interest is adversely affected, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of any hearing. If a hearing is held, the issue to be considered at such hearing shall be whether this Confirmatory Order should be sustained.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.202(c)(2)(i), any person other than the Licensee adversely affected by this Order may, in addition to demanding a hearing, at the time the answer is filed or sooner, move the presiding officer to set aside the immediate effectiveness of the Order on the ground that the Order, including the need for immediate effectiveness, is not based on adequate evidence but on mere suspicion, unfounded allegations, or error.

In the absence of any request for hearing, or written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing, the provisions specified in Section IV above shall be final 20 days from the date of this Order without further order or proceedings. If an extension of time for requesting a hearing has been approved, the provisions specified in Section IV shall be final when the extension expires if a hearing request has not been received. An answer or a request for hearing shall not stay the immediate effectiveness of this order.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of September 1996.

James Lieberman,

Director, Office of Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 96-25740 Filed 10-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7550-01-9

#### Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 87th meeting on October 22 and 23, 1996,

Room T-2B3, at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, December 6, 1995 (60 FR 62485).

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance. The agenda for this meeting shall be as follows: Tuesday, October 22, 1996—8:30 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. Wednesday, October 23, 1996—8:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. During this meeting, the Committee plans to consider the following:

**A. Decommissioning For Disposal of Radioactive Waste By Land Burial Authorized Under the Former 10 CFR 20.304, 10 CFR 20.302, and Current 10 CFR 20.2002**—The Committee will review a draft Branch Technical Position that will provide criteria for screening on-site burials disposed of in accordance with former 10 CFR 20.304 and 10 CFR 20.302 requirements to determine if further remediation is required.

**B. Direction Setting Issue Papers**—The Committee will be briefed by the NRC staff on the Direction Setting Issue papers (produced as part of the Agency's strategic assessment of regulatory activities) and will provide comments on issues where the ACNW believes their review will enhance the strategic assessment process.

**C. Ethics Training**—The Committee will receive its annual ethics training from a representative of the Agency's Office of the General Counsel.

**D. Preparation of ACNW Reports**—The Committee will discuss proposed reports, including: radionuclide transport at Yucca Mountain, specification of a critical group and reference biosphere to be used in the performance assessment for a nuclear waste disposal facility, consideration of coupled processes (thermal-mechanical-hydrological-chemical) in the design of a high-level waste repository, time of compliance in high- and low-level waste disposal, comments on selected Agency Decision Setting Issues papers, and shallow land burials licensed under the former 10 CFR 20.304 and 20.302 requirements.

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

**F. Miscellaneous**—The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed

during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the Federal Register on September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49924). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch, Mr. Richard K. Major, as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to schedule the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting will be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACNW meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should notify Mr. Major as to their particular needs.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting Mr. Richard K. Major, Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch (telephone 301/415-7366), between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EDT.

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

Dated: October 2, 1996.

John C. Hoyle,

Acting Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-25736 Filed 10-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7550-01-9

#### Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Procedures for Meetings

##### Background

This notice describes procedures to be followed with respect to meetings conducted pursuant to the Federal





APPENDIX II

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

October 7, 1996

SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION  
87TH ACNW MEETING  
OCTOBER 22-23, 1996

Tuesday, October 22, 1996, Two White Flint North, Room T-2B3 11545  
Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

- 40
- 1) ~~8:45~~ - 9:00 A.M. Opening Remarks by the ACNW Chairman  
(Open)  
1.1) Opening Statement (PWP/RKM)  
1.2) Items of Current Interest (PWP/RKM)
- 10:40
- 2) 9:00 - 10:30 A.M. Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining  
Overview and Status Briefing (Open)  
TAB 2 ----- (PWP/LGD)  
2.1) Overview and Status of Strategic  
Assessment and Rebaselining - James  
Milhoan, DEDO and John Craig, RES  
2.2) Question and Answer session on  
Specific Direction Setting Issues  
2.3) Future ACNW actions
- 10:40 11:10
- 10:30 - 10:45 A.M. \* \* \* BREAK \* \* \*
- 11:10 11:57
- 3) ~~10:45~~ - ~~12:15~~ P.M. Branch Technical Position on  
Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land  
Burial Sites Authorized Under Former  
10CFR 20.304, 20.302 and current 20.2002  
TAB 3 ----- (PWP/HJL)  
3.1) Discuss proposed BTP - Heather  
Astwood, NMSS  
3.2) Future ACNW actions
- 11:59 - 1:15
- 4) ~~12:15~~ - 1:15 P.M. LUNCH ON THE TABLE  
(During the Lunch Break, Members will  
receive their Annual Ethics Training  
from John Szabo, OGC, ~~12:30~~ - 1:00 P.M.)
- 6:05
- 4) 1:15 - ~~5:30~~ P.M. Preparation of ACNW Reports (Open)  
(Members/Staff)  
Discuss possible reports on the  
following topics:  
4.1) Time of Compliance in Low-level  
Waste Disposal (WJH/ACC)  
4.2) HLW Time of Compliance Road Map  
(WJH/ACC)  
4.3) TMHC Coupled Processes (WJH/LGD)

Break 3<sup>00</sup> - 3<sup>30</sup>



- 4.4) Critical Group and Reference Biosphere (PWP/HJL)
- 4.5) Radionuclide Transport (GMH/ACC)
- 4.6) ACNW Priority Issues (PWP/RKM)
- 4.7) Shallow Land Burial Sites (PWP/HJL)
- 4.8) Comments on NRC's Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Process and Direction Setting Issues Papers (PWP/LGD)

J. Greeves 6:05-6:10

6:15

~~5:50~~ P.M.

RECESS

Wednesday, October 23, 1996, Two White Flint North, Room T-2B3  
11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

- 5) ~~8:30 - 10:30~~ A.M. Continue Preparation of ACNW Reports  
 9:30 - 10:56 (Open)  
 Discussion of potential ACNW reports listed in item 4
- ~~10:30 - 10:45~~ A.M. \* \* \* BREAK \* \* \*
- 6) ~~10:45 - 11:45~~ A.M. Committee Activities/Future Agenda  
 10:50 12:1  
 TAB 6 ----- (Open) (PWP/RKM)
- 6.1) Set Agenda for 88th ACNW Meeting November 12-13, 1996
  - 6.2) Review Items for the Out Months
  - 6.3) Future Working Group Topics/Dates
  - 6.4) Reconcile EDO Responses to Committee Reports
  - 6.5) Other Topics
- 11:17 - 11:25 - Break + Lunch  
 11:45 - 12:45 P.M. \* \* \* LUNCH \* \* \* on Table
- 7) ~~12:45 - 1:00~~ P.M. Continue Preparation of ACNW Reports  
 12:1 2:55 (Open)  
 3:55 Discussion of potential ACNW reports listed in item 4
- ~~1:00~~ P.M. MAJORITY  
 3:55 ADJOURN

• Presentation time should not exceed 50 percent of the total time allocated for a specific item. The remaining 50 percent of the time is reserved for discussion.

- Number of copies of the presentation materials to be provided to the ACNW - 35



### APPENDIX III: MEETING ATTENDEES

87TH ACNW MEETING  
OCTOBER 22-23, 1996

#### ACNW MEMBERS

	<u>1st Day</u>	<u>2nd Day</u>
Dr. Paul W. Pomeroy	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. William J. Hinze	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. B. John Garrick	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. George M. Hornberger	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>

#### ACNW STAFF

	<u>1st Day</u>	<u>2nd Day</u>
Dr. Andrew Campbell	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Ms. Lynn Deering	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Mr. Howard J. Larson	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Mr. Richard K. Major	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. John T. Larkins	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Dr. Richard P. Savio	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Ms. Michele S. Kelton	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>



**ATTENDEES FROM THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**October 22, 1996**

J. Kennedy	NMSS
R. Cady	RES
C. DeFino	OEDO
M. Knapp	NMSS
C. Raddatz	OCM/Diaz
C. Abbott	OC
J. Funches	OC
J. Austin	NMSS
M. Lusardi	NMSS
T. Johnsa	NMSS
D. Mosen	NMSS
M. Weber	NMSS
H. Astwood	NMSS
R. Nelson	NMSS
J. Davis	NMSS

**ATTENDEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC**

**October 22, 1996**

R. Wallace	U.S. Geological Survey
R. Andersen	NEI
F. Rodgers	DOE
S. Crawford	SAIC/DOE
C. Jones	Sciencetech, Inc.
J. Weil	Exchange Monitor
J. Russell	CNWRA
C. Henkel	NEI



#### APPENDIX IV: FUTURE AGENDA

The Committee agreed to consider the following during the 88th ACNW Meeting, November 12-13, 1996:

- A. Planning Session - The ACNW will conduct a planning session during which the Committee will discuss the conduct of Committee activities, procedures and operations, and priorities for ACNW tasks. The Committee will not formulate advice for the Commission during this session.
- B. Preparation of ACNW Reports - The Committee will discuss proposed reports, including the following: (1) radionuclide transport at Yucca Mountain, (2) specification of a critical group and reference biosphere to be used in the performance assessment for a nuclear waste disposal facility, (3) consideration of COUPLED processes (thermal-hydrological-mechanical-chemical) in the design of a high-level waste repository, (4) time of compliance in high- and low-level waste disposal, (5) comments on selected NRC Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Decision-Setting Issue papers, (6) shallow land burials licensed under the former 10 CFR 20.304 and 20.302 requirements, and (7) ACNW Priority Issues.
- D. Committee Activities/Future Agenda - The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members.
- E. Miscellaneous - The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.



APPENDIX V  
LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

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

MEETING HANDOUTS

AGENDA  
ITEM NO.

DOCUMENTS

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 2   | <b><u>Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Overview and Status Briefing</u></b>  |
| 1.  | Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Initiative, Overview and Status Briefing, dated October 22, 1996 [Viewgraphs]   |
| 3   | <b><u>Branch Technical Position on Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land Burial Sites Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304, 20.302, and current 20.2002</u></b>  |
| 2.  | Branch Technical Position on Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land Burial Sites Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304 and 20.302, presented by Heather Astwood, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, NRC, dated October 22, 1996 [Viewgraphs]  |
| 4.1 | <b><u>Discussion of ACNW Report on Time of Compliance of Low-Level Waste Disposal</u></b>   |
| 3.  | Memorandum from Emile L. Julian, Acting Secretary, to James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, Subject: Staff Requirements - SECY-96-103, Regulatory Issues in Low-Level Radioactive Waste Performance Assessment, dated August 7, 1996 and Memorandum from James M. Taylor, Executive Director for Operations, for The Commissioners, Subject: Regulatory Issues in Low-Level Radioactive Waste Performance Assessment, SECY-96-103, dated May 17, 1996 [Agenda Item 4.1, Handout #1] |
| 4.5 | <b><u>Discussion of ACNW Report on Radionuclide Transport</u></b>   |
| 4.  | General Thoughts on the Meeting of the Working Group on Radionuclide Transport transmitting E-mail from George M. Hornberger, ACNW, to Andrew C. Campbell, ACNW, Subject: Working Group, dated October 20, 1996 [Agenda Item 4.5, Handout #1]   |



**MEETING NOTEBOOK CONTENTS**

**TAB  
NUMBER**

**DOCUMENTS**

**1     Opening Remarks by ACNW Chairman**

1.     Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman, undated
2.     Items of Current Interest, undated
3.     Introductory Statement by the ACNW Chairman - Second Day, undated

**2     Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Overview and Status Briefing**

4.     Table of Contents
5.     Status Report
6.     Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Overview and Status Briefing, October 10, 1996, John Craig, Strategic Assessment Coordination Task Group
7.     NRC Issues Long-Awaited 'Strategic Assessment' Mission, Activities, Inside NRC, September 30, 1996
8.     Memo from John Hoyle, SECY, to James Milhoan, James Johnson, James Taylor, and John Larkins, re SRM, COMSECY 96-028, "Strategic Assessment Issue Paper: Independent Oversight (DSI 19)"

**3     Branch Technical Position on Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land Burial Sites Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304, 20.302 and Current 20.2002**

9.     Table of Contents
10.    Status Report
11.    NRC Information Notice 96-47, "Recordkeeping, Decommissioning Notifications for Disposal of Radioactive Waste by Land Burial Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304, 20.302, and Current 20.2002," dated August 19, 1996
12.    ACNW Presentation on Burial Screening Methodology, October 1996
13.    "NRC Information Notice re On-Site Land Burials," p. 32, LLW Notes, August/September 1996



**3 (Cont'd) Branch Technical Position on Requirements for Radioactive Waste Land Burial Sites Authorized Under Former 10 CFR 20.304, 20.302 and Current 20.2002**

14. Draft Branch Technical Position on relevant screening methodology, unavailable at time of writing

**5 Preparation of ACNW Reports**

15. Facsimile from W. Hinze, ACNW, to A. Campbell, ACNW, Subject: "Revision of the TOC LLW Letter," dated September 9, 1996.
16. Facsimile from B. Hinze, ACNW to A. Campbell, ACNW, Subject: "High-Level Waste Time of Compliance Road Map," dated September 8, 1996.
17. Draft presentation overheads for ACNW Meeting on August 22, 1996, "Public Comments on the Branch Technical Position on the Use of Expert Elicitation in the High-Level Radioactive Waste Program"

**6 Committee Activities/Future Agenda**

18. Table of Contents
19. Set Agenda for 88th ACNW Meeting, November 12-13, 1996
20. Review Items for the Out Months
21. Future Working Group Topics/Dates
22. Future Outside Meetings for Members/Staff
23. Proposed Agenda Items for the ACRS and the ACNW, dated October 7, 1996
24. Maintenance & Operations List of Future Meetings
25. Reconcile EDO Response to Committee Reports
26. One Year Calendar of Events