

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

---

IN THE MATTER OF:

PUBLIC MEETING

BRIEFING ON FY 79 OPERATING PLANS

Place - Washington, D. C.

Date - Thursday, 14 December 1978

Pages 1-44

---

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
POOR QUALITY PAGES

Telephone:  
(202) 347-3700

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

*Official Reporters*

444 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D.C. 20001

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE - DAILY

7812280042

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on Thursday, 14 December 1978 in the Commission's offices at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determinations or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of or addressed to any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

CR1787  
HEER:mp  
mask

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING  
BRIEFING ON FY 79 OPERATING PLANS

Room 1130  
1717 H Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Thursday, 14 December 1978

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 11:10 a.m.

BEFORE:

DR. JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, Chairman  
VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner  
RICHARD T. KENNEDY, Commissioner  
PETER A. BRADFORD, Commissioner  
JOHN F. AHEARNE, Commissioner

PRESENT:

Messrs. Gossick, Haller, Barry, Pederson, Kelley and  
Cooper.



pv 1

## P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let's turn on to the  
3 budget-review matters. Okay, let us move on to the next  
4 subject this morning, which is titled "A Briefing on '79  
5 Operating Plans," and is intended to provide the Commission an  
6 opportunity to look at the situation with regard to the '79  
7 budget, where we're going, and also some questions about how  
8 we're going to look at these things, matter of fact, too.

9 Lee, why don't you go ahead?

10 MR. GOSSICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 As the chairman has indicated, this briefing is in  
12 response to the Commission's request for review, periodic  
13 review of our units and how best to track the expenditure of  
14 our resources against the agency's objectives.

15 As you know, we do have a pilot project under way  
16 to track selective units. However, it is not our intent to  
17 brief you on that pilot program this morning. You have been  
18 individually briefed by Norm Haller in the past two or three  
19 weeks with regard to what that program looks like.

20 What we would like to do this morning is to provide  
21 you with our suggestions on a way for you to exert your  
22 management control and oversight on our '79 program during the  
23 interim until we get this decision on a tracking system fully  
24 implemented with the fiscal year '80 budget.

25 The briefing is divided into two parts. Len Barry



pv 1 will first summarize how we finished up in '78 from the  
2 financial viewpoint, and our proposed application of the  
3 unobligated balance of '79 prior-year moneys. This was a  
4 subject of a paper that is before the Commission, and,  
5 depending upon your action on that, then, of course, we must  
6 go to Congress for appropriate reprogramming authority.

7 Mr. Barry will also discuss the impact of how our  
8 authorization for fiscal year '79 and the appropriation  
9 legislation will affect our '79 program.

10 After that, Mr. Haller will give a summary of our  
11 plans and the issues that are involved in the various programs  
12 for fiscal year '79. These issues are currently being  
13 addressed by the staff. And as Norm will indicate, we will be  
14 back to you in January with the details on that.

15 In his presentation, though, we do have something  
16 of a new approach that we would like to lay out. It is new in  
17 some ways or several ways. First, it updates the decision  
18 unit information to include events, guidance, legislative  
19 changes that have happened since the budget was submitted to  
20 OMB more than a year ago.

21 Previously, the Commissioners have not, for the  
22 most part, had a total update on program content and  
23 accomplishments until the next budget deliberation that occurs  
24 a year later. Because of this somewhat new approach, we do  
25 need feedback from the Commission, particularly to determine

pv 1      which areas, which decision units, all or selective ones that  
2      you want to cover in the reports that have been asked for, and  
3      some indication of the depth of coverage that you will want to  
4      go into.

5                      Now, I intend to modify our briefings which we  
6      carry on on a regularly scheduled basis with the staff to  
7      monitor the accomplishments in the pilot decision units. What  
8      we're talking about here is not an added decision but a  
9      modification and, hopefully, an improvement in our staff  
10     review of program activities and assessments of our  
11     performance.

12                     This is a rather ambitious undertaking and, really,  
13     the first time that we have tried to present all of the  
14     information sort of at one sitting in this fashion. I think,  
15     though, we can go through it quickly, or as quickly as  
16     possible. And we have asked the line office directors to be  
17     here to answer questions in their particular areas.

18                     Unless there are questions, I will ask Glen to  
19     start off with the '78-79 picture.

20                     MR. BARRY: Okay, I will take you in and out of '78  
21     pretty quick. You should have a chart in front of you that  
22     shows that we received an appropriation in 1978 of a little  
23     over \$281 million -- "budget authority" is what we call it now  
24     -- and, in addition, received a pay raise supplemental during  
25     the year. And if you will recall, we received an additional

pv 1 supplemental for the revised inspection program and the NMSS  
2 waste management.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: These are all '78 dollars?

4 MR. BARRY: All '78 dollars.

5 It gave us a total obligation, a new budget  
6 obligation authority, by the time the year was over, of \$290  
7 million. You can see by budget category about \$84' -- a  
8 little over \$84 million of that was for pay and benefits;  
9 \$181 million was for program support under contract to the  
10 labs and private contracts with universities and so on; and  
11 about \$24 million for administration, training, support, and  
12 travel.

13 The next chart shows you the program amounts, where  
14 that money was distributed, and the obligations that were  
15 incurred during the year. You will notice there at the bottom  
16 of the first column, in addition to the \$290 million, we had a  
17 \$2.5 million carryover from prior years.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is our money multi-year  
19 Until expended?

20 MR. BARRY: It is no-year money.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: All of our money?

22 MR. BARRY: All of our money.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Including personnel?

24 MR. BARRY: Yes. That was part of the great debate  
25 a couple of years ago. We convinced the Congress that it



pv 1 should be no-year money. It is just one appropriation. And  
2 we would be in trouble without it.

3 You notice we did obligate between the new budget  
4 authority of \$290 million plus the prior-year money, we did  
5 obligate \$278 million, and we had outlays of about \$282  
6 million.

7 One point I would make there: You have read quite  
8 a bit where the Administration has been happy with so many of  
9 the agencies on missing their outlay mark, under-outlaying.  
10 We have done pretty well. Our estimate was about \$275  
11 million, and we exceeded that by \$6 million. So, we did  
12 pretty well.

13 All right, if you want to turn to the next chart,  
14 we did have as a result of the obligations versus the  
15 availability a \$4.8 million unobligated balance. You can see  
16 in the columns where they were in terms of the organizations.  
17 We did have a little over \$800,000 in commitments. That was  
18 money we were really trying to get under contract, and we  
19 didn't make it. But those amounts are now under contract.  
20 In '79, the bottom line is it gave us an availability from '78  
21 in prior-year funds that we can use in FY '79, in addition to  
22 our new budget authority in '79, of approximately \$4 million.

23 You have a paper before the secretary now in which  
24 we proposed how we use \$3.1 million of that, and that is the  
25 first step in putting to use dollars in FY '79, and we did not

pv 1 have -- that we did not have in our original program.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That is \$1.3 million of the  
3 \$3.9 million available, and it falls into the "Proposed Uses"  
4 column.

5 MR. BARRY: Yes. Which means we still have a  
6 little over \$800,000 of prior-year money, prior to '79,  
7 available for further use, that we did not have earmarked in  
8 the program as yet.

9 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Where is the improved-safety  
10 research coming?

11 MR. BARRY: The improved-safety research is part of  
12 the \$3.1 million. Of the \$1.4 million you see there, \$400,000  
13 of that is to improve safety.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: A lot of this is a  
15 reallocation because your unobligated balance does not track  
16 very closely to your proposed usage.

17 Will much of that be treated as a preprogramming  
18 action?

19 MR. BARRY: It will be reprogrammed in the sense  
20 that we will have to go to the congressional committees  
21 because these funds for the uses intended were not previously  
22 identified, so we must go back now to the congressional  
23 committees and tell them how we propose to use these funds.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is it a combination of how  
25 you propose to use them and also that you do not propose to

pv 1 cover some items that previously we had indicated would be  
2 covered?

3 MR. BARRY: No, it is just money that was not  
4 necessary to finish out FY '78. You may recall that we  
5 received our supplemental on September 8, and that was pretty  
6 late in the year, so some of the things we were going to do  
7 earlier were not possible.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Of that \$4.8 million,  
9 approximately how much is potentially pay benefits?

10 MR. BARRY: None of it. Oh, do you mean how was it  
11 generated?

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

13 MR. BARRY: If you look down there on that last  
14 item, "Program direction and administration," I would suspect  
15 that probably about, I think --

16 Bruce, what, about \$400,000?

17 MR. COOPER: It is about \$400,000.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: In PDA?

19 MR. BARRY: Well, it is all lumped under there for  
20 the purpose of this exercise.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Your footnote says it's  
22 spread. Your footnote 1 says it is spread amongst the --

23 MR. COOPER: Under the PDA, it is about \$200,000.

24 MR. BARRY: I see what you mean. The total is  
25 \$400,000 of pay and benefits that we did not use.



pv 1           Okay, the next chart shows you of the \$3.1 million  
2       that we have that I mentioned before you what is proposed in  
3       that (INAUDIBLE). Two of -- well, in fact, most of the  
4       amounts here are in consonance with the authorization  
5       committee initiatives. In the language and the legislative  
6       history of their '79 authorization and the conference report,  
7       they encouraged us to use money to take care of the backlog of  
8       our amendments, our amended backlog. That is the \$900,000 you  
9       see under "Operating Reactors."

10           They also encouraged us to do more in waste  
11       management, and you see the \$650,000 there, which really is a  
12       part of the Livermore contract. And you see \$400,000 in  
13       improved reactor safety that will be blended with an  
14       additional \$400,000, reprogrammed from research, for a total  
15       of \$800,000. And that will start our improved safety research  
16       in fiscal year 1979.

17           And then, the million dollars you see at the bottom  
18       of that page, again, is in support of the initiatives in the  
19       authorization act for the alternate fuel cycle.

20           COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: May I point out, these  
21       amounts are very much in consonance with the authorizing  
22       committees. Are they in any way in dissonance with the  
23       appropriations committee?

24           MR. BARRY: No. There is nothing here that the  
25       appropriations committees put a restriction on.

pv 1 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: When does the NASAP program  
2 come to a conclusion?

3 MR. BARRY: At the end of fiscal year '79. There  
4 is no money in the '80 budget for NASAP support.

5 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Is that true of DOE?

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, DOE had tied NASAP to  
7 ENJ, and since that is supposed to end in '79 -- but that was  
8 the philosophy. Now, whether DOE continues on that, we don't  
9 know.

10 MR. BARRY: If you will turn to the next page, we  
11 will go through several of these charts quickly here. The  
12 format of these charts -- and I have one chart for each of the  
13 major program categories -- was applied to program offices and  
14 the program direction and administration and program support.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: By the way, when you say you  
16 have a paper before us on these proposed uses --

17 MR. BARRY: Yes, it came down last week. It was  
18 634. We would encourage pretty quick action on that, because  
19 we would like to put that money to work.

20 MR. GOSSICK: What is your estimate on the amount  
21 of time it's going to take to get approval?

22 MR. BARRY: Well, I can't be precise. I feel that  
23 both houses will be receptive to it because it falls right  
24 into particularly the authorization legislation.

25 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Does it require a positive

pv 1 action on the part of the congressional committees, or is it  
2 lying in wait?

3 MR. BARRY: As far as I am concerned, it requires a  
4 positive action.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: By the committees?

6 MR. BARRY: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: They will have to write us a  
8 letter. It will be the appropriations committee.

9 MR. BARRY: We are going to solicit all five  
10 committees.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: On reprogram actions, under  
12 our statutes, does that require the authorizing committees or  
13 the appropriating committees or both to take action?

14 MR. BARRY: Normally, in the past it has required  
15 the authorization committee action. But we have talked with  
16 the appropriation committees, and they also want to receive a  
17 letter from us and pass judgment. So, we are going to go to  
18 all five committees.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And in the event there is  
20 a difference, as there so often is?

21 MR. BARRY: We will have to work that out.

22 MR. GOSSICK: We have run into that before, if you  
23 will recall.

24

25

end#4



#5

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: My question, I think, was  
2 different. You asked: What was the right way of handling it?  
3 And I understand that.

4 I was asking, more: What is the legal requirement?

5 MR. BARRY: I would have to defer to Jim on that.

6 MR. KELLEY: I can look it up and tell you.

7 MR. BARRY: Commissioner, mostly we just normally  
8 just go to the authorization committees.

9 Okay, let me go to these charts. The purpose of  
10 these charts is just to show you what we requested in our  
11 President's budget for '79; what the authorization action was;  
12 what the appropriation action was; and we've got one of two  
13 types of line items.

14 One, where there is a different; and where there is  
15 no difference, we just simply say "the balance of the program."  
16 And what I mean by that is that the differences really manifest  
17 themselves in the individual items, such as on the first page.

18 We requested \$6.8 million for Standards. The  
19 Authorization Act came in and said we would like you to put  
20 \$500,000 of our amount into immunological work. And the  
21 appropriation action did not comment on it.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do I interpret, though, your  
23 line as being that we identified low-level radiation studies in  
24 our budget submission and asked for three people but no dollars?

25 MR. BARRY: Yes. That is correct.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And the authorizing then  
2 said: In addition, put \$500,000 in?

3 MR. BARRY: In effect, they said: You will use, of  
4 your total amount, you will use \$500,000 for that.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Except, according to this they  
6 also increased the total amount.

7 MR. BARRY: Yes; that is correct.

8 In other words, the authorization was increased, but  
9 the appropriation was not. So in fact, what we're doing is  
10 doing it within the appropriation amount.

11 On each of the following pages is the same type of  
12 situation. You will also see where the Appropriation Committees  
13 made a change.

14 As an example, on this page on I&E, you will note  
15 that in that case for the fuel facilities and materials, the  
16 authorization action was the same as our request, but the  
17 Appropriation Committees reduced our amount by a total of  
18 \$200,000 -- \$100,000 in fuel facilities, and \$100,000 in  
19 Safeguards. They simply gave us a general reduction of \$200,000  
20 from our budget request, and that is where we are.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm sorry? They gave us --

22 MR. BARRY: They reduced our budget by \$200,000.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Did they focus it specifically  
24 on those two areas?

25 MR. BARRY: Yes, sir.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: \$100,000 each?

2 MR. BARRY: Yes, sir.

3 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Now is it correct -- As I  
4 went through your charts, I can only find one case where there  
5 was any people difference in any of the columns. So on all  
6 of these, is it correct that, with the exception of that one  
7 situation, that neither committee addressed these people-  
8 strength allocated?

9 MR. BARRY: They did not, in the final report. In  
10 the Senate report before they went to conference, they did  
11 address the numbers of people associated with the increase in  
12 dollars for the various initiatives.

13 When they went to conference, they were silent on  
14 people. You could say: Well, legislative history would say  
15 they really meant for you to also put this number of people on  
16 those programs, but we kind of talked to the House side, saying  
17 it would be much more difficult for us to comply if you put the  
18 people on us in addition to the dollars.

19 And so the conference report, they took off the  
20 people. Would you like me to go through each one of these?  
21 Or are the charts self-explanatory enough to see what the problem  
22 is? Because the bottom line is --

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think, let's get to the bottom  
24 line.

25 MR. BARRY: The bottom line is that, in addition to



1 the paper we have before you now which we are requesting you to  
2 approve, the \$3.1 million in the use of unobligated balances,  
3 we also in the next 30 days are going to have to determine what  
4 our final financial plan is going to be in '79 to attempt to  
5 comply with both the Senate and House initiatives, and the  
6 reductions that the Appropriation Committees gave us as to what  
7 the best compromise is, and go up to the five committees with  
8 that proposal and see what happens.

9 And we hope to have that done within 30 days. And  
10 assuming, for just a moment, that they were to approve our  
11 recommendations, then our financial plan would be put to bed for  
12 the year.

13 So that is the second action that we will have down  
14 before you in terms of a proposal.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: And how soon will you have that  
16 proposition down?

17 MR. BARRY: I'm hoping, by mid-January or earlier.  
18 We have to sit down with each of the program directors that are  
19 affected -- particularly Research -- because we also have some  
20 additional requirements within some of these programs, particu-  
21 larly Research, that were not even addressed in Congressional  
22 initiatives that we might want to recommend to you.

23 So it is kind of a reprogramming exercise.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, the sooner, the better.  
25 The more straightened out we can get in that regard, the better

1 off we will be. And perhaps we can go forward with the budget  
2 testimony early in February.

3 MR. BARRY: I hope to have it all completed so we  
4 will have our baseline to talk from.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you have in here the total  
6 authorization and appropriation?

7 MR. BARRY: Not on this handout. I could certainly  
8 provide you with that.

9 The Authorization Committee, in effect, gave us  
10 \$3 million more than we requested in our budget. That is, we  
11 came out with about \$330 million, and they gave us \$333 million,  
12 and we actually came out with the Appropriation Committee at  
13 \$322 million.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So there is about an \$11 mil-  
15 lion difference between authorization and appropriation?

16 MR. BARRY: That's right.

17 And then we have a pay raise on top of that, and  
18 an unobligated balance on top of that.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Could you give me just one  
20 sheet which spreads this out?

21 MR. BARRY: Yes. We have that. I just do not have  
22 it with me.

23 MR. GOSSICK: Okay for Part II?

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes.

25 MR. HALLER: I believe you also have in front of you

1 the handout entitled "Initial '79 Operating Plan." Page 1 of  
2 that handout is the outline for my discussion this morning.

3 First, I will talk a little about the background.

4 Second, we will talk about the new-approach  
5 decision unit reviews. We will try to discuss both the pilot  
6 program, as well as operating plans. We will talk a little bit  
7 about the next steps, and then we'll go through a summary of  
8 the initial FY '79 operating plans, as well as issues that have  
9 been developed by the staff.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Excuse me. Just as a point  
11 of clarification, what is the reason we are hearing this at this  
12 moment?

13 And the related question is: If there is some time  
14 pressure, I understand it. If there is no time pressure, why  
15 didn't we get this so we could look through it before the  
16 hearing?

17 MR. GOSSICK: The request was for a briefing to see  
18 how the Commission could best track the decision units as they  
19 changed throughout the year, and to give you, as best we can  
20 this morning, where we are in that process.

21 It wasn't worked up as a paper, and perhaps we are  
22 tardy in getting the charts out.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I would appreciate it, just as  
24 Len gave us the charts yesterday. It just helps to be able to  
25 have gone through them and gotten some general sense and feel.



1 MR. GOSSICK: That is my fault. We made a lot of  
2 changes, and we just did not get them finished in time.

3 MR. HALLER: We got them reproduced last evening and  
4 brought them down this morning.

5 As part of the background, prior to FY '79 there were  
6 before the Commission periodic financial reviews in which  
7 spending was tracked over time versus the budget. Financial  
8 information was arrayed by Congressional Budget element by  
9 office.

10 Now "budget elements" are not the same as "decision  
11 units." At least they have not been in the past, although now  
12 we're working with the Comptroller's Office and the offices to  
13 have those aligned so that they are the same, or at least nearly  
14 the same.

15 There were also, for the Commissioners, occasional  
16 briefings on MBOs. There is, as you know, the Agency-wide  
17 measure for objective structure. Recently, the Commissioners  
18 have asked for a decision unit review to relate plans to  
19 accomplishments.

20 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: The MBOs are a stranger to  
21 me. That must have been pre-'78.

22 MR. HALLER: Yes, sir. As you recall, we talked a  
23 little bit about that when we briefed you before. The structure  
24 for MBOs was first put in place in the fall of 1976 when there  
25 were 12, or 11-or-so agency-wide objectives established at that

1 time, and I believe another one has been added subsequent to  
2 that.

3 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: But these occasional briefings  
4 in fact must have died off not later than --

5 MR. HALLER: I don't know when the last one was, but  
6 I have been told that there were briefings on such subjects as  
7 waste management, and this type of thing.

8 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Item-by-item, sure; but that  
9 wasn't a review of the MBOs.

10 MR. GOSSICK: What we did, Commissioner Bradford, was  
11 to send down periodically the MBO revisions and say, in our  
12 transmittal letter, what these were.

13 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What is the status of the  
14 MBO program?

15 MR. GOSSICK: This, in large measure, takes the  
16 place of the MBO.

17 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So we will be abandoning the  
18 MBO approach?

19 MR. GOSSICK: Unless the Commission feels there are  
20 still areas where it is useful to do that. We are sort of  
21 hoping to get a singular way of treating this, and I think we  
22 can do this, but that will depend upon your judgment after you  
23 see this this morning.

24 The waste management area, one thing this may not  
25 do is: It is something that cuts across all of the offices.

1 We either have to sit down and sort of review the entire pro-  
2 gram, or sift out the decision units that all relate to the  
3 degree that other offices are involved, and brief them on a  
4 comparable basis.

5 I think we can do that.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: In a sense, just as the classic  
7 problem of organization these days is to reorganize like  
8 disciplines or like projects, and in some places organize both  
9 ways and call it "matrix management," it is a question of how  
10 best to organize this.

11 And I wouldn't be surprised but what it is hard to  
12 do away with either system, but plunge ahead, rapidly.

13 MR. HALLER: On page 3, let me talk about the pilot  
14 program. In fiscal '79, which is the first part of our decision  
15 unit reviews in the new approach, there are in the pilot pro-  
16 gram 14 decision units from the line offices and ADM.

17 These decision units cover about 30 percent of NRC  
18 resources, both people and dollars. Information is arrayed by  
19 decision unit, both in terms of planned accomplishments as well  
20 as resources by office.

21 What we are working on is the capability -- trying to  
22 develop the capability to track planned versus actual performance  
23 in terms of dollars, people, and accomplishments themselves.

24 Now this pilot program is the skeleton for a more  
25 advanced system, a more comprehensive capability that we hope



1 to have in place in FY 1980, but we can't do it this year.

2 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Do you take these one at a  
3 time?

4 MR. HALLER: Yes. What we do is we have selected  
5 14 decision units from the offices. We are trying to break  
6 them apart, in terms of fine-grained detail, and relate both  
7 what it is that the offices say they are going to do, as well  
8 as the resources that they say they are going to use to do it.

9 And we establish that in the beginning as a baseline,  
10 and then during the year we would try to determine whether the  
11 accomplishment actually was obtained. And also, we would try  
12 to determine what amounts of resources were spent to obtain it.

13 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I'm just anticipating  
14 where you are going. And I may be wrong, but what you are doing  
15 is focusing on smaller pieces of the organization, and seeing  
16 whether they are functioning the way they ought to be.

17 Whereas, I think the problem should be more in the  
18 other direction: to see if the larger questions are handled  
19 the way they ought to be, where a number of offices are involved  
20 and the business is all coordinated and we are heading down the  
21 road dealing with the problems as we should be.

22 MR. GOSSICK: That goes back to kind of the MBO  
23 approach, where you take something that does cut across the  
24 board. And it may well be that the Commission, rather than  
25 going through office-by-office and tracking their decision unit

1 performance, will prefer to take topics like the overview  
2 briefings that we have had from time to time on waste, and  
3 export-import business --

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think you are confusing --  
5 I think there is a confusion between what you do with management  
6 tools. In that, it is not "either/or." As I understand it --  
7 if I understand this correctly, this is a technique to try and  
8 make sure that offices that have received budgets and have  
9 individual plans, that some mechanism for tracking them -- that  
10 is an important thing to make sure that it is being done, but  
11 it doesn't really address the more fundamental question of the  
12 overall Agency's mission and whether it's objections are (a)  
13 clear; (b) in a way that the individual programs that are here  
14 being tracked mesh into those objectives; and then (c) whether  
15 those objectives are being tracked.

16 And that is what I think Vic is talking about,  
17 which is, in a way, a broader and probably a more fundamentally  
18 important issue, but this is critical toward, once you have got  
19 \$300-and-some million, almost 3000 people doing things, to  
20 try to keep track of what you're doing.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, in particular it is impor-  
22 tant to give these, the units in which we carry out the annual  
23 budget review and preparation of the proposal for the next year,  
24 that is the current rule of the game.

25 Peter's suggestion some time ago was that, rather

1 than doing this once a year and then not see any of these deci-  
2 sion units until next July or August, was that about a couple of  
3 times a year, every four months or so, to have a summary of  
4 how these things are going along.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That is very valuable. That  
6 is keeping track of how you are spending your money, and how  
7 your resources -- your people and dollar resources are being  
8 used.

9 It is a budget control that is absolutely necessary,  
10 but it doesn't get to the more fundamental question of: Are  
11 the Agency's major mission accomplishments being addressed?  
12 Because the decision-unit structure and the budgeting structure  
13 really don't at the moment, seem appropriate to lending itself  
14 to that kind of approach.

15 You need some sort of track and crosswalk approach,  
16 and there does have to be that larger scale set of objectives,  
17 policy guidance, and tracking system. But that is different  
18 than this.

19 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: It is different, and it is  
20 clearly different as long as you're talking about a pilot pro-  
21 gram.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, it's even different if  
23 you have all of --

24 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: If you had them all, then I  
25 think the process of focusing on them all thoroughly, or whatever,



1 would be involved in the other, as well.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You would get involved,  
3 Peter, but I think you would need something else.

4 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: And in the process of being  
5 involved, I think it would inevitably set forth the other  
6 access.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But you can get there faster  
8 by doing it directly.

9 COMMISSIONER GOSSICK: But by having this as a tool,  
10 I think it enables us to take a topic like waste management and  
11 go into NMSS with those parts of the decision units that deal  
12 with waste, and the standards, and the parts of those decision  
13 units that deal with waste, and give you a cross-cut.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But I think the Commission  
15 needs what I would view as a policy and programming document  
16 that lays out fundamental policy which addresses these more  
17 major issues and provided fundamental programming guidance.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, that is the management-by-  
19 objective tack.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No, I don't think so. Manage-  
21 ment by objective is still a set of individual items. I am  
22 really speaking more of a document which addresses the overall  
23 policies of the Agency, and in some way addresses the Agency's  
24 goals in the framework of what everything is that is being done.

25 MR. GOSSICK: We have attempted that with the five-year

1 plan and finally found that it was of no earthly use to any-  
2 body.

3 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: One of the problems is, when  
4 you get an objective that everybody agrees on, then it becomes  
5 kind of vacuous.

6 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I would say that my policy  
7 guidance is that there are people that have to in some way  
8 agree that those are the objectives. Everyone doesn't have to.

9 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That's right. It tends to  
10 be harder here than in an Executive agency.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But I think we could get  
12 agreement among the five of us that that is what the objective  
13 should be: the policy guidance.

14 MR. HALLER: The Commission may wish to review the  
15 list of Agency-wide objectives that exist now.

16 MR. BARRY: This tracking is just what it says.  
17 This is what you said you were going to do during the year; and  
18 are you doing it?

19 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: But I think we have proven  
20 the point I tried to make. That is, that you can't get very  
21 far into that without starting to discuss the Agency's objec-  
22 tives.

23 MR. BARRY: Yes, that's right. But you can put it on  
24 a little higher level, and we can develop ways to do that. I  
25 know what you are getting at.

1 MR. PEDERSON: One of the problems with the MBO  
2 system is that it inherently tends to build from the bottom up,  
3 and even the Commission-level objectives really build from the  
4 bottom up, as opposed to the Commission laying out the policy.

5 COMMISSIONER GOSSICK: I don't know that I completely  
6 agree with that, Ken.

7 We got into the fact, a year or so ago, that decom-  
8 missioning was a topic that sort of left Len here, and that was  
9 from the top down. We got that thing together, and we've got  
10 the pieces -- wherever they are in the Commission -- pretty  
11 well saddled.

12 And it is tracking as an overall effort on a given  
13 objective. Sort of a major topic that was developed the other  
14 way.

15 MR. PEDERSON: But I would argue that that is almost  
16 the exception.

17 COMMISSIONER GOSSICK: It could be.

18 MR. PEDERSON: We created an objective to umbrella  
19 those.

20 MR. HALLER: On Chart IV, we discussed the second  
21 aspect of the new approach -- which is what we have termed  
22 "Initial FY '79 Operating Plans."

23 Now in contrast to the pilot program where we are  
24 working on 14 decision units and trying to get into those in  
25 detail, the operating plans really cover about 50 decision



1 units, which include those in the pilot program. And these  
2 50 decision units are from the line offices.

3 The coverage here is about 70 percent of NRC's  
4 people, and nearly all of the programs support dollars for the  
5 Agency.

6 Now when we are reviewing at this level, we are going  
7 to have coarser information than in the pilot program. For  
8 example, the resources. We can get at those by decision  
9 level right now.

10 And secondly, the planned accomplishments just aren't  
11 as detailed as what we are trying to work on in the pilot  
12 program.

13 MR. PEDERSON: Could I ask -- You get at this problem  
14 of cross-walking from office programs to broader issues. Do  
15 the operating plans, as you foresee them, will they include  
16 references to related programs ongoing in other offices? Will  
17 there be any -- will they be helpful in making these ties?

18 MR. HALLER: Probably not that helpful, Ken, because  
19 the operating plans are principally an array of the decision  
20 units in each of the offices.

21 What we have is cases where several of the offices  
22 may be working on an objective like waste management. We just  
23 don't have the structure, other than in some sort of a collec-  
24 tion of decision units in order to get at those bigger topics.

737.06.1

gsh 1 The operating plan would be the vehicle for providing the  
2 details of that, but then you would have to crosswalk against  
3 it or aggregate, say, the waste management work areas out  
4 of each of those plans in order to come up with the total  
5 picture of what is going on in the agency on waste management.

6 MR. GOSSICK: And norm, isn't it true that you can  
7 go within the decision units and pick up the things that  
8 relate to what is going on?

9 MR. HALLER: That's right. One of the capabilities  
10 we're trying to develop is this crosswalk, and I think what  
11 would be very useful to us is feedback from the commission  
12 in that regard. If the commission desires those kinds of  
13 things, we ought to be focusing more on them.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is that the normal way you  
15 develop the budget items, with what, four or five digits and  
16 then you can do that crosswalk?

17 MR. HALLER: That is what we're trying to do. That's  
18 right.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: So you ought to be able to  
20 automatically get those crosswalks --

21 MR. GOSSICK: Fully implemented. I would see no  
22 reason why we can't.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Why would you want to develop  
24 the system without having the ability to do the crosswalks?

25 MR. GOSSICK: Please understand. This thing that

787.06.2

gsh

1 Norm is discussing now is what can we do beyond the pilot  
2 program in '79 to try to get a leg up on full implementation,  
3 plus do as much as we can in keeping ourselves and the  
4 commission informed?

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: As I recall from other  
6 agencies, the difficulty usually comes about that some of  
7 the program people aren't particularly happy sometimes in  
8 having some of their moneys identified with some digits on  
9 it, and that can then be crosswalked.

10 MR. PEDERSON: But my understanding of the program,  
11 however, would be that when you get it all implemented, that  
12 the basic unit will be, the examination will be the decision  
13 Unit.

14 MR. GOSSICK: That's correct.

15 MR. PEDERSON: Now since the crosswalking is  
16 inevitably going to involve you in having to chop up --

17 MR. GOSSICK: That is done on the 14 pilot programs.

18 MR. PEDERSON: You will have the ability to cut  
19 those decision units.

20 MR. HALLER: That's what we're trying to develop.  
21 That is correct.

22 For example, if the commission wanted to know what all  
23 was going on in waste management, several of the offices have  
24 waste management related activities. What we would have to  
25 do is break into each of those offices into decision units



737.06.3

gsh

1 that involved waste management and pull out those areas.

2 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What you're doing is  
3 assigning a number of indices to your decision units and  
4 then combine them in various ways.

5 MR. HALLER: That's right.

6 MR. BARRY: We do that to some degree now with  
7 cross-cuts.

8 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We used to do it on  
9 selected issues. But where is the mechanism that's going to  
10 focus on the things we want to do and look back at these  
11 decision units?

12 MR. HALLER: I'm not sure quite I understand what  
13 you mean.

14 MR. BARRY: For each decision unit, of which we have  
15 about 50 some, right now we go forward in a budget time and  
16 we say, here is the reason we want this amount of dollars  
17 and people to do these things. And if you give it to them,  
18 they will do it. And it is our scheme that through the  
19 year, you can look at those objectives and look at what  
20 we're doing and measure what we're doing against those  
21 objectives, stated objectives.

22 MR. GOSSICK: But that decision unit would boil down  
23 to so many guides and so many standards on the following  
24 subjects. And that would be the detail within a decision  
25 unit with a schedule and the rate at which resources are

gsn 1 allocated.

2 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me ask you this. If  
3 we ask about something like, oh, I don't know, is the  
4 feedback system for operating reactors operating properly  
5 for getting information back into the licensing system and  
6 out to the licensees, would that involve discrete units or  
7 would you then have to break into some of the units, or what?

8 MR. HALLER: That is a pretty tough one right there.

9 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That would strike me as an  
10 important objective.

11 MR. GOSSICK: But it is not set up in that context.

12 MR. HALLER: Well, there are elements of it, of  
13 course, but first of all, I think we have to define what we  
14 mean by the feedback system and get some articulation of  
15 what we mean when we say, is it working properly? And then  
16 when we come up with some measurable quantities, then we  
17 can go into the various decision units that involve that  
18 activity and try to find out what is happening.

19 First, we have to define it, though.

20 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So it might actually  
21 involve pieces of decision units.

22 MR. HALLER: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: One of the critical things in  
24 developing this kind of system, since you are basically going  
25 to be limited to a certain number of digits that can allocate

787.06.5

gsh

1 to any one of these subelements, is to decide what types of  
2 cross-cuts that you will want to do.

3 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You mean labels of various  
4 kinds.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You might end up having an 8-digit  
7 number, or something like that, that identifies a decision  
unit and a particular element of the decision unit and  
9 certain characteristics.

10 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It is like the genetic  
11 code.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Once you have chosen that,  
13 you have really chosen what kinds of cross-cut information you  
14 can extract automatically. And you have also, in a way,  
15 chosen the way data is going to be kept.

16 It doesn't mean that you can't get other information, but  
17 it means that additional information is a manual search.

18 MR. GOSSICK: And you should be able to recognize  
19 why something didn't happen, where those resources went, and  
20 what else got accomplished.

21 MR. BARRY: Keep in mind this little program here is  
22 a resource tracking system and it has its limitations. It  
23 is a resource tracking system. It says what you're going to  
24 do and what it's going to cost you and what you did.

25 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: In other words, you are



787.06.6

gsh

1 providing some of the tools that can be used for looking  
2 at agency problems and objectives.

3 MR. HALLER: That's correct, performance against  
4 what was initially committed to be done and what actually  
5 got done.

6 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Of course you're going to  
7 do that, but I mean in terms of taking a larger view.

8 MR. HALLER: This would be the input into such a  
9 thing.

10 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: But we don't at this point  
11 have the mechanism for going beyond that.

12 MR. HALLER: No.

13 MR. GOSSICK: Only on an ad hoc kind of a basis.

14 MR. HALLER: With the operating plants in '79, of  
15 course, as we have discussed the capability to track,  
16 performance varies. We can track most of the spending at  
17 the decision unit level. We can probably track some of the  
18 people through existing manpower systems and the  
19 accomplishments.

20 Right now we are only set up to track those which are in  
21 the ; lot program.

22 I think it might be useful to say just a word at this  
23 point about what is an operating plan. I am going to use  
24 an I&E, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, paper as an  
25 example. Right here is the operating plan, or at least a

gsh 1 draft operating plan for the Office of Inspection and  
2 Enforcement.

3 Our Office, in connection with the comptroller, went in  
4 and took every decision unit, as well as the individual  
5 accomplishments, out of the budget document that was  
6 submitted to OMB about a year ago. We laid that out, and  
7 then for each decision unit, the comptroller put up there  
8 the dollars and manpower that we actually have available.

9 He also made whatever minor modifications he could to the  
10 accomplishments, but clearly, there is a lot of difference  
11 between what the offices originally planned to do a year ago  
12 and what they actually now can do, given the resources that  
13 are available.

14 So one of the jobs we are working on is to try and work  
15 with the offices, and the offices have been looking at this  
16 to try to align the present accomplishments with the  
17 resources that are now available within those constraints.

18 Now next steps. Mr. Gossick mentioned this and I also  
19 want to be sure that we talk about it here. We would like  
20 to obtain feedback from the commission on this in terms of  
21 are we giving you what you want? Is this the method of  
22 presentation that you desire, or what method of presentation  
23 do you desire? What level of detail do you want to get  
24 into this at, and so forth.

25 Right now, the way we are going is that the EDO staff and

gsh

1 the offices are going to firm up the plans and resolve  
2 whatever issues remain.

3 The intent is to provide written and updated plans like  
4 this to the commission in January. That will probably be  
5 late January.

6 As Mr. Gossick mentioned, the office performance appraisal  
7 reports would be modified to include in those reports that  
8 the office directors give their tracking of progress against  
9 at least the pilot decision units that we're talking about.

10 Now the next thirdly report will be to the commission in  
11 March or April, and at that time, we will talk about the  
12 things like combining the financial reviews and some of the  
13 pilot program reviews and this type of thing.

14 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are you talking about going  
15 through -- how many decision units do we have altogether?

16 MR. HALLER: It is on the next page, as a matter of  
17 fact, Commissioner Gilinsky. There are about 70 for the  
18 agency overall, but the 5 line offices, there is about 50  
19 in those line offices.

20 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So you are talking about  
21 running through all of those with the commission.

22 MR. HALLER: Well, this is the thing that we would  
23 like some feedback on.

24 My personal opinion is that's going to be very difficult  
25 to do.



787.06.9

gsh

1 MR. BARRY: It will only take about 9 hours of  
2 your time.

3 MR. HALLER: It depends upon what level of detail  
4 the commission wants to get into.

5 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I have my own view on  
6 that, but I think this is a terribly important activity, but  
7 one I would not expect the commission to get involved in  
8 too frequently.

9 On the other hand, I'm very much interested in looking at  
10 across the board at a whole series of issues, probably less  
11 than 70, but a fair number of them. And at least for myself,  
12 I would think that would be the more interesting approach  
13 for the commission.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: My reaction would be that,  
15 not at all dissimilar to Vic's, I believe this is a method  
16 that has to be put in place and I think that the tracking  
17 that is able to be done with this is something that EDO has  
18 to keep on top of and has to keep monitoring, and in  
19 particular, be aware when there seems to be a strong problem  
20 arising.

21 And at that time, if there is a very major problem, then  
22 obviously, we would want to know about it.

23 But I think the more important thing for us to focus on  
24 is the larger, and I don't in any way mean to denigrate this  
25 effort because I think it is an absolutely critical effort

gsh

1 that really is needed and certainly, would want to provide  
2 whatever encouragement I can give to getting on with it.

3 But as far as the time that I think is important for us  
4 to spend, it is on this broader, which are the sort of  
5 integration of a number of these now.

6 You can't really take the step of being detailed resource  
7 use analysis in the broader issue without having this kind  
8 of a system. It has to be a tool that goes into it.

9 But as far as our time, I think it would be better spent  
10 on the broader issue.

11 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I'm sure that is true as a  
12 general proposition. I think the first time I'm going to be  
13 interested in going through it in about as much detail as  
14 is possible. But that is something I could do apart from  
15 commission time as a whole.

16 MR. GOSSICK: What I might suggest, as we get the  
17 system in place, and even now we're doing it -- each Friday  
18 we have one or more PAR briefings at our staff meeting. And  
19 we would be happy to furnish you with a schedule of these  
20 things and let you know if there is one of high interest,  
21 or whatever. And you could sit in with us on these things.

22 But back to the other point, though. The commission sort  
23 of has to decide what are these cross-cuts or high interest  
24 topics that you would perceive as important for you to track  
25 in some orderly way. You can either do it by an exception

787.06.11

gsh 1 basis, which might not be all that helpful. But on the  
2 other hand, I guess that is the kind of feedback we're looking  
3 for.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, I would try to  
5 reiterate. And I'm sure -- I know Norm knows what I'm  
6 talking about, and I think Lee and Len also know -- we need  
7 a policy and planning guidance document that will end up  
8 identifying those high interest areas.

9 MR. HALLER: Let me say a few words about Chart 6,  
10 which is an attempt to give an overview of the agency, as  
11 well as show what parts of it are covered by the operating  
12 plans that we're talking about.

13 The operating plans that we have developed so far, of  
14 course, apply to the five offices which are above the  
15 subtotal line. I want to draw your attention particularly  
16 to the first column under "people," which is titled  
17 "Request to OMB."

18 This is the last time that the planned accomplishments  
19 were laid out in a form like this, and it was in the budget  
20 documents that went to OMB about a year ago.

21 Now these accomplishments were based on the resources that  
22 are shown in that column. Clearly, when we got the  
23 Congressional mark, we did not get the resources that we  
24 thought we were going to get before, and you can see that,  
25 both in terms of people, as well as dollars.



gsh

1       Therefore, what has to be done now is to revise the  
2       initial accomplishments to fit the resource constraints that  
3       actually are laid on the agency. And this is what the staff  
4       is attempting to do at this time.

5       There is a footnote there that I think brings up one  
6       general issue that we ought to talk about just briefly. You  
7       notice that as of about the end of October, we had on board  
8       in the NRC about 2656 people, and there were outstanding some  
9       80 commitments.

10       Now if we are going to do what we plan to do in Fiscal '79,  
11       we are going to try to hire up to about 2788 people. So we  
12       have to move from where we are now to the end of Fiscal '79  
13       strength that is shown on the chart.

14       However, on the first page, page 7, there are a couple of  
15       issues that I think it is important to bring to the attention  
16       of the commission. First, there is the Executive Branch  
17       freeze which is in effect, which involves a 142 hiring  
18       limitation, as well as, and that covers, I should say open  
19       vacancies, as well as attrition-type things, and we are  
20       looking now at attrition over the year.

21       This covers, as I understand, open vacancies, as well  
22       as vacancies created by attrition.

23               COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It doesn't cover the  
24       commitments, though, if you had already made a commitment.

25               MR. GOSSICK: That's right.

gsh

1

MR. HALLER: That is correct.

2

3

4

MR. GOSSICK: It is primarily attrition only. We can't take space for the spaces we haven't filled. You take your strength as of the date the freeze went on.

5

6

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right. So the fact that it shows 2788, the important number is 2750.

7

MR. GOSSICK: Right.

8

9

10

MR. HALLER: Another point to bring up to the commission is that there was a point in the Civil Service Reform Act which talks about employment limitations.

11

12

13

14

In other words, to paraphrase, it said that the total civilian employees in the Executive Branch at the end of '79, '80, and '81 must not be greater than those at the end of Fiscal '77.

15

16

17

18

19

20

I understand that Len Barry, and I believe his men are working on what the impacts of these things are. But if there is an impact on the agency that we can't hire the numbers of people that we had originally forecast, then that is going to be another impact on the accomplishments that are in these plans.

21

22

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are these for Executive Branch purposes?

23

24

25

MR. BARRY: We are not working on that impact because OMB has already told us we are not going to need them until '77. They are going to sustain the 2788.

gsh

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

MR. GOSSICK: We still don't have a signal to go ahead and hire, do we?

In answering the question, I guess it's just like we have to go to OMB with a budget. We are more or less bound by this.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think Vic's question was, as far as the law is concerned, are we bound by it?

MR. PEDERSON: With regard to hiring?

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: If the Civil Service Reform Act limits the Executive to this level, are we included for the purpose of that act?

MR. KELLEY: That is another one I will look up for you.

VOICE: Yes, we are.

MR. HALLER: What we thought we would do now is go into the first of the operating plans and a discussion of the Office of Inspection and Enforcement on pages 8, 9, and 10 of your handout, and then at that point, that discussion should be illustrative of the remaining items that are in the package. And we can go into the remaining items in whatever detail you would like.

First, on page 8, we have arrayed the key --

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let's see. Maybe people would prefer to stop at this point and scan the balance of the handout individually. What is your pleasure?



gsh

1 MR. GOSSICK: I would like to point out to you there  
2 are some issues that I think it might be helpful for you  
3 to look at the issues that we are in the process of resolving,  
4 and then we can come back and tell you how we have resolved  
5 them. Or if we run into a problem we can't resolve, we will  
6 come back to you for guidance.

7 But there are a number of rather sticky wickets here that  
8 we have got to shake out before we can put together this  
9 overall financial plan.

10 I'm just saying I think they are more or less  
11 self-explanatory. But I would suggest you might want to just  
12 glance at some of those.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you mean like Chart 10?

14 MR. HALLER: Right. That's an example that's  
15 correct.

16 MR. GOSSICK: And 13, NMSS. There's one for each of  
17 the major programs.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I would almost guess, I would  
19 like to have a discussion of each of those. But I don't  
20 think we have the time.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Not if anybody wants to prepare  
22 for this afternoon and have lunch.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Several of those do look  
24 very sticky. That almost looks worth a meeting.

25 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Why don't we break at this point,

787.06.16

gsh 1 and we can pick this up, in particular, focusing on the  
2 issues.

3 All right. Thank you very much.

4 (Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the hearing recessed for  
5 lunch.)

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

9.7

Enclosure

12-14-78

TRANS.

INITIAL FY 79 PROGRAM OFFICE OPERATING PLANS



OUTLINE

- . BACKGROUND
- . NEW APPROACH - DECISION UNIT REVIEWS
  - PILOT PROGRAM
  - OPERATING PLANS
- . NEXT STEPS
- . SUMMARY OF INITIAL FY 79 OPERATING PLANS AND ISSUES

BACKGROUND

- . PRIOR TO FY 79 - PERIODIC FINANCIAL REVIEWS  
TRACKED SPENDING OVER TIME VS BUDGET
- . FINANCIAL INFORMATION ARRAYED CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET  
ELEMENT BY OFFICE
- . OCCASIONAL BRIEFINGS ON MBOs
- . RECENTLY COMMISSIONERS HAVE ASKED FOR DECISION UNIT  
REVIEWS TO RELATE PLANS TO ACCOMPLISHMENTS

NEW APPROACH - DECISION UNIT REVIEWS  
(PILOT PROGRAM IN FY 79)

- . 14 DECISION UNITS FROM LINE OFFICES AND ADM
- . COVERS ~30% OF NRC RESOURCES (\$ AND PEOPLE)
- . INFORMATION ARRAYED BY DECISION UNIT, BOTH PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENTS  
AND RESOURCES, BY OFFICE
- . CAPABILITY TO TRACK PLANNED VS ACTUAL PERFORMANCE (\$, PEOPLE,  
ACCOMPLISHMENTS)
- . SKELETON FOR MORE COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM IN FY 1980



NEW APPROACH - DECISION UNIT REVIEWS  
(INITIAL FY 79 OPERATING PLANS)

- . 52 DECISION UNITS (INCLUDING THOSE IN PILOT) FROM LINE OFFICES
- . COVERS ~ 70% OF NRC PEOPLE AND 97% OF PROGRAM SUPPORT DOLLARS
- . COARSER INFORMATION THAN PILOT, (RESOURCES ONLY BY  
DECISION UNIT: PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENTS NOT AS DETAILED)
- . FY 79 CAPABILITY TO TRACK PERFORMANCE VARIES:
  - DOLLARS - CAN TRACK MOST SPENDING BY DECISION UNIT
  - PEOPLE - CAN TRACK SOME THROUGH MANPOWER SYSTEM
  - ACCOMPLISHMENTS - CAN TRACK ONLY THOSE FROM PILOT

NEXT STEPS

- . OBTAIN FEEDBACK FROM COMMISSION
- . EDO AND OFFICES FIRM UP PLANS AND RESOLVE ISSUES
- . WRITTEN PLANS TO COMMISSION IN JANUARY
- . MODIFY OFFICE PARS TO INCLUDE NEW APPROACH (USE PILOT DECISION UNITS)
- . NEXT "THIRDLY" REPORT TO COMMISSION IN MARCH-APRIL  
(INCLUDE PILOT UNITS, MID-YEAR FINANCIAL REVIEW)

FY 1979 OPERATING PLANS  
RESOURCE SUMMARY

<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF DECISION UNITS</u>	<u>PEOPLE a/</u>		<u>PROGRAM SUPPORT (\$ MILLIONS)</u>	
		<u>Request to OMB</u>	<u>Congressional Mark</u>	<u>Request to OMB</u>	<u>Congressional Mark</u>
IE	7	860	715	4.8	4.1
NMSS	15	302	293	13.0	12.8
SD	6	160	157	7.0	6.8
NRR	9	635	631	18.2	14.6
RES	15	170	162	162.0	142.6
SUBTOTAL	52	2,127	1,958	205.0	180.9
NRC TOTAL	72	2,999	2,788	209.8	186.2

a/ NRC strength as of 10-25-78: 2656 on board + 84 commitments



UNRESOLVED PERSONNEL ISSUES

EXECUTIVE BRANCH FREEZE

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT EMPLOYMENT LIMITATION

## KEY PLANS - INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

- OPERATING REACTORS 2000 INSPECTIONS AND 87,000 ONSITE HOURS
- REACTORS IN CONSTRUCTION 1550 INSPECTIONS AND 60,000 ONSITE HOURS
- LICENSEE CONTRACTORS AND VENDORS 215 INSPECTIONS AND 7,500 ONSITE HOURS
- FUEL FACILITIES 190 INSPECTIONS AND 14,000 ONSITE HOURS
- MATERIALS LICENSEES 2950 INSPECTIONS AND 16,500 ONSITE HOURS
- SAFEGUARDS 540 INSPECTIONS AND 30,000 ONSITE HOURS
  
- ESTABLISH AND ASSIGN RESIDENTS AT 49 SITES (45 REACTOR AND 4 FUEL FACILITY)

OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

(\$ Millions)

<u>Decision Unit</u>	<u>FY 1979 Request to OMB</u>		<u>FY 1979 Current Allotment</u>		<u>FY 1979 Operating Plan</u>	
	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>
Reactor Construction Inspection	262	.3				
Reactor Operations Inspection	348	1.5				
Vendor Inspection	35	.07				
Fuel Facility and Materials Inspection	98	.6				
Safeguards	99	1.5				
Management Direction and Support		N/A				
Inspector Training	18	.8				
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	860	4.8	715	4.1		



## ISSUES - INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

- RESIDENT PROGRAM SCHEDULE
  - ORIGINAL FY 1979 PROJECTION 49 SITES
  - CURRENTLY ON SITE 18 INSPECTORS
  - DESIGNATED, NOT YET ON SITE 4 INSPECTORS
  - ASSESSING CURRENT PROGRAM DIFFICULTIES
    - QUALIFICATIONS CRITERIA
    - PERSONAL IMPACTS
    - UPCOMING COMMISSION PAPER ON NEW PROGRAM SCHEDULE
  - CONTINUE TO PURSUE FULL IMPLEMENTATION

## KEY PLANS - NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFETY AND SAFEGUARDS

- . LICENSING CASEWORK
- . RULES ON URANIUM MILLING (PUBLISH FINAL GEIS AND INITIATE RULEMAKING)
- . FINAL GEIS ON HANDLING AND STORAGE OF SPENT LWR FUEL
- . HLW REGULATIONS: LLW REGULATION DEVELOPMENT ( $\sim$ 20% COMPLETE)
- . DECISION REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF PHYSICAL PROTECTION UPGRADE RULE
- . DRAFT UPGRADE RULES ON MATERIAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING
- . PARTIALLY IMPLEMENT RADIOISOTOPES LICENSING FLOW STUDY
- . SPECIAL STUDIES, e.g.
  - WASTE MANAGEMENT LICENSING AUTHORITY
  - INSIDER THREAT CHARACTERISTICS

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS SAFETY & SAFEGUARDS  
(\$ MILLIONS)

DECISION UNITS	FY 1979 REQUEST TO OMB		FY 1979 CURRENT ALLOTMENT		FY 1979 OPERATING PLAN	
	MY	\$PS	MY	\$PS	MY	\$PS
URANIUM FUEL CYCLE	27	1.7				
SPENT FUEL	16	1.0				
TRANSPORTATION	17	.8				
RADIOISOTOPES	47	.7				
OPERATIONS & TECH.	28	.7				
HIGH LEVEL WASTE MGMT. LOW LEVEL WASTE MGMT.	43	5.1				
CONTINGENCY PLANNING	21	.8				
INFO. ANALYSIS & EVAL.	23	1.0				
INTERN'L SAFEGUARDS	13	.9				
SAFEGUARDS LICENSING	30	.2				
SAFEGUARDS REG. IMP.	24	.7				
SAFEGUARDS TECHNOLOGY	13	.3				
TECH. PROG. ANALYSIS	-0-					
POLICY MANAGEMENT	-0-					
TOTAL	302	\$13.0	294*	\$12.3**		

\* INCLUDES 1 SPACE TRANSFERRED TO NMSS FROM EDO STAFF

\*\* DOES NOT INCLUDE \$.5 TRANSFERRED TO ADI:IN FOR ADP SUPPORT



## ISSUES - NUCLEAR MATERIALS SAFETY AND SAFEGUARDS

- . Program Support \$ for Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Divisions Combined Limited to \$9.7M with Mandated \$5.9M for Waste Management (Changes Requires Congressional Approval)
- . 10 Positions Specified in '79 Authorization Act to Speed up Waste Management Regulation Development (Not Clear Whether Added to Agency Total or Whether Must be Absorbed).
- . At Least \$1M Needed for Current HLW Program (Exact Requirements Not Yet Defined).

## KEY PLANS - STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

- ISSUANCE OF PROPOSED RULE FOR LICENSING HLW REPOSITORIES.
- COMPLETE PRIMARY REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING STUDIES.
- CONTRACT FOR FEASIBILITY/PLANNING STUDY FOR AN EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDY ON HEALTH EFFECTS OF LOW LEVEL IONIZING RADIATION.
- AMEND 10 CFR -21 REPORTING OF DEFECTS AND NONCOMPLIANCE TO REMEDY PROBLEMS WITH "SUBTIER SUPPLIERS."
- ISSUE 10 CFR -72 LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR SPENT FUEL STORAGE IN AN INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION
- REVISE 10 CFR 50.55a on ASME BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSEL CODES.
- PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR 1979 INCLUDE 36 REGULATIONS, 1 EIS, 71 GUIDES, 24 NUREG REPORTS, 10 PETITIONS FOR RULE MAKING AND 12 STANDARD REVIEW PLANS

## OFFICE OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

15

(\$ MILLIONS)

<u>DECISION UNIT</u>	<u>FY 1979 REQUEST TO OMB</u>		<u>FY 1979 CURRENT ALLOTMENT</u>		<u>FY 1979 OPERATING PLAN</u>	
	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>
Power Facility Standards	73	1.9				
Fuel Facility & Material Stds.	36	1.6				
Facility Operation and Material Utilization Standards	29	1.0				
Safeguards Standards	17	2.5				
International Standards	5	0				
Management Direction & Support						
TOTAL	160	7.0	157	6.8		



## ISSUES - STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

- ACUTE SHORTAGE OF TECHNICAL STAFF  
(PRIMARYLY IN REACTOR ENGINEERING) CAUSED BY:
  - ABNORMAL NUMBER OF TRANSFERS TO OTHER OFFICES
  - DEMANDS OF NRR ON DES STAFF
  - HIRING FREEZE
  - LIMITED AVAILABILITY OF TECHNICAL SPECIALISTS
- NEED POLICY GUIDANCE FROM EPA IN SPECIFIC AREAS

## KEY PLANS - NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

- . Decrease Backlog of Licensing Actions.
- . Resolve \_\_\_\_\_ Unresolved Safety Issues and Implement.
- . Complete Review of all Operating Power Reactors to Insure Compliance with 10 CFR 73.55.
- . Work Toward a 24 Month Safety and a 16 Month Environmental Review for 50 Per Cent of New CPs Tendered in FY 1979.
- . Issue SERs Six (6) Months After PSAR is Docketed for a Limited Number of Cases, i.e., Palo Verde 4 & 5 and American Electric Power (Western Virginia).
- . Process at Least 70 Topical Reports in FY 1979.

## OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

(\$ Millions)

<u>Decision Units</u>	<u>FY 1979 Request to OMB</u>		<u>FY 1979 Current Allotment</u>		<u>FY 1979 Operating Plan</u>	
	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>	<u>MY</u>	<u>\$PS</u>
Operating Reactors -						
Routine Effort	73	2.8				
Operating Reactors -						
Nonroutine	37	1.2				
SEP	32	.4				
Safeguards	16	.8				
Casework	213	4.9				
Technical Projects	210	7.1				
Advanced Reactors and Non-Power Reactors	10	.8				
Standards Assistance	22	0				
Training and Correspondence	22	.2				
Director's Office	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	635	18.2	631	14.6		



## ISSUES - NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

- . Operating Reactors Effort Increased to Reduce Backlog of Licensing Actions, Particularly License Amendments.
- . Casework Effort Increased Due to Large Increase in Labor Rates.
- . Generic Issue Effort Reduced to Support Higher Priority Tasks.
- . Standards Effort Reduced to Support Higher Priority Tasks.

## KEY PLANS - NUCLEAR REGULATORY RESEARCH

- . Complete UHI Testing in Semiscale
- . Complete Commission-Directed Electrical Connector Tests
- . Complete First Three Nuclear Tests in LOFT
- . Complete RELAP-4/MOD 7
- . Release TRAC-PIA to Public and Compare Predictions Against LOFT Data
- . Complete the Licensing Audit Code Package (WRAP)
- . Complete Vapor Explosion Experiments and Provide Information on Molten Core Interactions
- . Perform 3 LOCA and 2 RIA Tests in PBF
- . Complete In-Pile Creep Tests and Issue Report
- . Validate Warm Pre-Stressing to Preclude Vessel Fracture Under Thermal Shock
- . Recommend Design Guides for Crack Arrest in LWRS
- . A Best Estimate Tornado Model Will Be Developed for all Regions of the U.S.
- . A Complex Monte Carlo Seismic Hazard Code will be Developed
- . Issue Super System Code (SSC) for Fast Reactors
- . Perform Fast Reactor Fuel Aerosol Validation Tests

## KEY PLANS - NUCLEAR REGULATORY RESEARCH - CONTINUED

- . Continue to Provide a Verified Technical Basis for Predicting Operational Characteristics and Assessing the Environmental Impacts of Nuclear Power Plants
- . Identify Sources and Effects of Fuel Cycle Occupational Radiation Exposure
- . Initiate Assessment of Adequacy of Existing High Level Waste Predictive Models and Data
- . Determine Characteristics of Leachates in Shallow Burial Trenches
- . Provide Information for GEIS on Mill Tailings
- . Provide First-Generation Safeguards Effectiveness Evaluation Methods to User Offices
- . Provide a Generic Accounting Evaluation Method for the MCA Upgrade Rule
- . Provide Supporting Risk Analysis and Evaluation on Generic Issues
- . Issue Interim Report on Risk Assessment of High Level Waste Disposal
- . Train Various NRC, DOE and Contractor Employees in Reliability and Safety Analysis, Human Error Analysis and Quantitative Reliability Analysis
- . Specify Design Criteria for Improved Decay Heat Removal Systems
- . Improve Value/Impact Assessment Methods for Improved Reactor Safety Concepts



## OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REGULATORY RESEARCH

(\$ MILLIONS)

Decision Units	FY 1979 Request to OMB		FY 1979 Current Allotment		FY 1979 Operating Plan	
	MY	\$PS	MY	\$PS	MY	\$PS
Systems Engineering	23	45.9				
LOFT	16	28.0				
Code Development	11	9.9				
Fuel Behavior	15	24.1				
Primary System Integrity	11	6.8				
Site Technology	12	6.7				
Fast Breeder Reactor	15	15.0				
Advanced Converters	4	2.4				
Reactor Environmental Effects	9	4.5				
Fuel Cycle & Environmental Research	15	9.1				
Waste Management						
Safeguards	13	6.2				
Risk Assessment	26	3.4				
Improved Reactor Safety	-	-				
Management Direction and Support	-	-				
<hr/>						
Total	170	162.0	162	142.6		

## ISSUES - NUCLEAR REGULATORY RESEARCH

- . Resolution of FY 79 Proposed Reprogramming Actions by Commission and Congress
- . Scope of Gas-Cooled Reactor Research in Light of FY 80 Budget
- . Implementation of Improved Reactor Safety Research in Light of FY 80 Budget
- . Effort Related to Alternative Fuel Cycles (NASAP/INFCE)
- . Implementation of Lewis Committee Recommendations
- . Improve Effectiveness of User Requirement Procedure Through Clarifying Modification (SECY-77-130B, SECY-78-622)
- . High Level Waste Management Resources in FY 1979 and FY 1980

CHART 1

COMPOSITION OF FY 1978 BUDGET  
AS APPROVED BY CONGRESS  
(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROPRIATED FUNDS

	<u>DOLLARS</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
APPROPRIATION	\$281,423	
PAY RAISE SUPPLEMENTAL	5,000	
BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL	<u>3,600</u>	
	\$290,023	

BUDGET ALLOCATION

PAY AND BENEFITS	\$ 84,900	29
PROGRAM SUPPORT/EQUIPMENT	181,169	62
ADM/TRAINING/TRAVEL	<u>23,954</u>	<u>9</u>
	\$290,023	100

9.7  
ENCLOSURE TO  
12-14-78  
TRANS.



CHART 2

FY 1978 STATUS OF OBLIGATIONS & OUTLAYS  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY</u>	<u>OBLIGATIONS</u>	<u>OUTLAYS</u> <u>2/</u>
NRR	\$ 15,117	\$ 15,448	\$ 15,449
SD	5,982	5,597	5,217
IE	9,119	8,432	8,639
NMSS	13,331	12,714	11,944
RES	133,225	134,480	133,407
PTS	1,712	1,515	1,338
PDA <u>1/</u>	<u>111,537</u>	<u>109,513</u>	<u>105,968</u>
TOTAL	\$290,023 + \$2,465 Prior Year	\$287,699	\$281,962

1/ Includes Personnel Compensation and Benefits and Headquarters Administrative Support.

2/ Includes outlays incurred in 1978 for FY 1978 and prior year obligations.

## CHART 3

FY 1978 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Unobligated Balance</u> <u>1/</u>	<u>Commitments</u>	<u>Balance Available</u>	<u>Proposed Uses</u>
NRR	\$ 291	\$	\$ 291	\$ 1,060
SD	530		530	
IE	1,486	400	1,086	
NMSS	315		315	650
RES	73		73	1,400
PTS	321		321	
PDA	1,789	456	1,333	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$ 4,805	\$ 856	\$ 3,949	\$ 3,110 <u>2/</u>

1/ Unobligated balance of Personnel Compensation, Benefits and Administrative Support is spread based on year end strength (FTP).

2/ \$839 remains available for new unfunded requirements.

# CHART 4

## PROPOSED USE OF FY 1978 CARRYOVER FUNDS CONTAINED IN COMM ACTION PAPER (Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>UNFUNDED REQUIREMENT</u>
<u>NRR</u>	
OPERATING REACTORS.....	\$ 900
TRAVEL.....	160
TOTAL.....	<u>\$ 1,060</u>
 <u>NMSS</u>	
HIGH LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT.....	<u>\$ 650</u>
 <u>RES</u>	
IMPROVED REACTOR SAFETY.....	\$ 400
RESEARCH ON NASAP REACTOR CONCEPTS.....	1,000
TOTAL.....	<u>\$ 1,400</u>



FY 1979  
Comparison of NRC's Request to Congressional Action  
(Dollars in Thousands)  
(Program Support \$/People)

<u>Office of Standards Development</u>	<u>NRC Request (\$/People)</u>	<u>Authorization Action (\$/People)</u>	<u>Appropriation Action (\$/People)</u>
Low Level Radiation Studies .....	\$ 0/ 3	\$ 500/ 3	\$ 0/ 3
Balance of Program .....	<u>6,800/154</u>	<u>6,765/154</u>	<u>6,800/154</u>
Total .....	<u>\$ 6,800/157</u>	<u>\$ 7,265/157</u>	<u>\$ 6,800,157</u>

FY 1979  
Comparison of NRC's Request to Congressional Action  
(Dollars in Thousands)  
(Program Support \$/People)

<u>Office of Inspection and Enforcement</u>	<u>NRC Request (\$/People)</u>	<u>Authorization Action (\$/People)</u>	<u>Appropriation Action (\$/People)</u>
Fuel Facilities and Materials .....	\$ 565/ 98	\$ 565/ 98	\$ 465/ 98
Safeguards .....	1,520/ 99	1,520/ 99	1,420/ 99
Balance of Program .....	<u>2,225/518</u>	<u>2,225/518</u>	<u>2,225/518</u>
Total .....	<u>\$ 4,310/715</u>	<u>\$ 4,310/715</u>	<u>\$ 4,110/715</u>

FY 1979  
Comparison of NRC's Request to Congressional Action  
(Dollars in Thousands)  
(Program Support \$/People)

<u>Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation</u>	<u>NRC Request (\$/People)</u>	<u>Authorization Action (\$/People)</u>	<u>Appropriation Action (\$/People)</u>
Technical Projects .....	\$ 5,800/126	\$ 5,800/126	\$ 5,000/126
Advanced Reactors .....	850/ 10	1,200/ 18*	1,350/ 10
Balance of Program .....	<u>8,790/495</u>	<u>8,440/487</u>	<u>8,290/495</u>
Total <sup>1</sup> .....	<u>\$ 15,440/631</u>	<u>\$ 15,440/631</u>	<u>\$ 14,640/631</u>

\* Includes \$295K and 9 people for Alternate Fuel Cycle.



FY 1979  
Comparison of NRC's Request to Congressional Action  
(Dollars in Thousands)  
(Program Support \$/People)

<u>Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards</u>	<u>NRC Request (\$/People)</u>	<u>Authorization Action (\$/People)</u>	<u>Appropriation Action (\$/People)</u>
Transportation .....	\$ 750/ 15	\$ 750/ 15	\$ 450/ 15
Operations and Technology .....	735/ 27	735/ 27*	735/ 27
International Safeguards .....	90/ 11	165/ 15	165/ 11
Waste Management .....	5,125/ 37	5,965/ 47	5,125/ 37
Balance of Program .....	<u>6,320/203</u>	<u>6,045/189</u>	<u>6,320/203</u>
Total .....	<u>\$ 13,020/293</u>	<u>\$ 13,660/293</u>	<u>\$ 12,795/293</u>

\* Includes \$85K and 8 people for Alternate Fuel Cycle.

FY 1979  
Comparison of NRC's Request to Congressional Action  
(Dollars in Thousands)  
(Program Support \$/People)

<u>Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research</u>	<u>NRC Request (\$/People)</u>	<u>Authorization Action (\$/People)</u>	<u>Appropriation Action (\$/People)</u>
Systems Engineering .....	\$ 35,600/ 21	\$ 35,600/ 21	\$ 33,000/ 21
Code Development .....	9,900/ 8	9,900/ 8	9,330/ 8
Fuel Behavior .....	22,800/ 9	22,800/ 9	22,500/ 9
Primary Systems Integrity .....	8,400/ 8	8,400/ 8	7,600/ 8
Fast Breeder Reactors .....	12,600/ 12	12,600/ }	12,600/ 12
Advanced Converters .....	2,400/ 3	5,400/ } <sup>15*</sup> a/	2,900/ 3 <sup>d/</sup>
Safeguards .....	6,200/ 6	6,200/ 6	6,000/ 6
Waste Management .....	4,100/ 2	7,000/ 7 <sup>b/</sup>	4,100/ 7
Risk Assessment .....	3,400/ 20	3,400/ 20	3,400/ 20
Improved Reactor Safety .....	-/ -	1,500/ - <sup>c/</sup>	-/ -
Balance of Program .....	<u>41,700/ 73</u>	<u>34,300/ 68</u>	<u>41,200/ 68</u>
Total .....	<u>\$ 147,100/162</u>	<u>\$ 147,100/162</u>	<u>\$ 142,630/162</u>

\* Includes \$135K and 1 person for Alternate Fuel Cycle.

FY 1979  
Comparison of NRC's Request to Congressional Action  
(Dollars in Thousands)

(Program Support \$/People)

<u>Program Direction and Administration</u>	<u>NRC Request (\$/People)</u>	<u>Authorization Action (\$/People)</u>	<u>Appropriation Action (\$/People)</u>
Office of Equal Employment Opportunity.....	\$ 20/ 3	\$ 95/ 4	\$ 20/ 3
Other.....	<u>2,870/590</u>	<u>2,795/590</u>	<u>2,580/590</u>
Total PDA.....	<u>\$ 2,890/593</u>	<u>\$ 2,890/594</u>	<u>\$ 2,600/593</u>
 <u>Program Technical Support</u>			
Office of International Programs.....	\$ 80/ 28	\$ 80/ 28 *	\$ 40/ 28
Other.....	<u>1,570/211</u>	<u>1,570/211</u>	<u>1,310/211</u>
Total PTS.....	<u>\$ 1,650/239</u>	<u>\$ 1,730/239</u>	<u>\$ 1,350/239</u>

\* Include two people for Alternate Fuel Cycle.