

**ORIGINAL**  
**RETURN TO SECRETARIAT RECORDS**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

---

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**DOE-NRC MANAGEMENT MEETING**

**Place -** Washington, D. C.

**Date -** Friday, 24 February 1978

**Pages** 1-34

---

Telephone:  
(202) 347-3700

**ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.**

*Official Reporters*

444 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D.C. 20001

**NATIONWIDE COVERAGE - DAILY**

### DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on February 24, 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.

CR6490 1  
FRANK:mp  
NR 2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOE-NRC MANAGEMENT MEETING

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

Friday, 24 February 1978

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 2 p.m.

BEFORE:

DR. JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, Chairman

RICHARD T. KENNEDY, Commissioner

CR6490  
#1  
frnak  
cmwl

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We are meeting this afternoon on the happy occasion of the regular Department of Energy-Nuclear Regulatory Commission management meeting under our interagency policy agreement.

(Slide.)

And we intend, if we like what we hear, to sign a couple of things and put in place a modified agreement which we trust will allow us to continue to run smoothly together on the things we have to do.

I trust we won't have to sign one of these every time we meet.

MR. MYERS: Every time we change departments.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That seems fair.

MR. MYERS: I hope that's no longer a factor.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I hope so, too.

I don't know if you want to make any comments.

Then we will let the program proceed.

MR. MYERS: This is my meeting with the NRC.

I have met with our people and find that we have I think some very good working relationships going with the NRC people and I want to be sure from my standpoint and our DOE people that we are going to do everything we can to keep it going that way.

I think we ought to get on with the meeting and



cmw2

1 sign that historical document.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Good.

3 MR. GOSSICK: Mr. Chairman, I will just turn it  
4 over to Mr. Dircks, who has been really the day-to-day project  
5 officer in bringing this to the point where we are today,  
6 working with Mr. Barber and the other people on the DOE side  
7 of the house.

8 Bill?

9 MR. DIRCKS: I think I will start right in with  
10 the briefing.

11 I think Mr. Barber is the first one, from the  
12 Department of Energy.

13 He's going to give us somewhat of a historical  
14 background on this thing.

15 Bob.

16 MR. BARBER: Thank you.

17 (Slide.)

18 This gives you some brief background which most  
19 of you are probably aware of.

20 When AEC was split, the NRC became responsible for  
21 regulatory functions and also for research and technical  
22 assistance in support of those functions and ERDA promotional  
23 functions, but more importantly for this meeting to provide  
24 services and facilities to conduct NRC programs.

25 And in March 11th of '77 ERDA and NRC signed

cmw3

1 policy agreements which we are currently operating under.

2 The DOE Organization Act, put in place this last  
3 fall, brings us up to the DOE-NRC memo which we are going to  
4 sign today.

5 (Slide.)

6 This graphically shows the splitting of the atom  
7 and the formation of ERDA, NRC and then DOE.

8 (Slide.)

9 In implementing the ERDA-NRC policy agreement both  
10 agencies set up organizations, task forces were formed in  
11 both agencies and within the ERDA-DOE, the Office of Nuclear  
12 Safety Coordination was established.

13 The task groups implementing the requirements and  
14 conducting the major interagency actions and within DOE a  
15 focal point was established within the EV Office of Nuclear  
16 Safety Coordination.

17 The status of this activity which has been going  
18 on since last spring, summer, we had our first management  
19 meeting with ERDA last September and about four task group  
20 meetings have been held, and 20 actions are underway between  
21 the two agencies.

22 (Slide.)

23 The next viewgraph shows about six or eight  
24 of the major activities between the task groups.

25 We are going to hear about the status of these

cmw4

1 a little later from Mr. Beckwith on that, so I won't go over  
2 those in detail at this time.

3 (Slide.)

4 One of the key items is what we call signatory  
5 requirements which really is a documentary of how do you get  
6 to all the tiered documents and how do we do business at the  
7 lower level.

8 A key item here is the interagency or programmatic  
9 agreement which will define specific tasks to be accomplished,  
10 and then each agency within itself would have procedural  
11 agreements and instructions, to instruct the Staff and offices  
12 on the conduct of the work.

13 We have work going on in all these areas at the  
14 present time.

15 (Slide.)

16 That brings us up to the DOE-NRC memo.

17 What we did was take the March 11th ERDA policy  
18 agreement and convert it to DOE and provide for DOE access to  
19 the ACRS.

20 Those are the basic changes that have taken place.

21 There are many future actions here required.

22 We have agreements, procedure and instructions,  
23 as I mentioned earlier, which have to be prepared and we are  
24 working on them at the present time.

25 So that the next viewgraph gives you a brief outside

cmw5

1 of the 10 major items in the DOE-NRC MOU.

2 (Slide.)

3 I'm not going to read each one, but it provides  
4 for policy planning, how does the NRC request work and how  
5 does the DOE request the work from NRC and so on.

6 It's a comprehensive document but we have a rather  
7 sophisticated detailed interface.

8 So at this point, I think it would be appropriate  
9 if we were to proceed to signing the document before you  
10 proceed further into the agenda.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I was expecting to hear the  
12 whole presentation before we signed.

13 We seem to be rushing precipitously ahead, but  
14 on the assurance of Staff that it has been carefully researched  
15 -- okay. We are signed and sealed, so you can let us know  
16 the bad news.

17 MR. DIRCKS: We have Mr. Beckwith to take us  
18 through what we have been accomplishing over the past six  
19 months.

20 I think we might as well keep it moving.

21 MR. BECKWITH: Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman,  
22 coordination activities will cover those items which were  
23 brought up in the first semiannual meeting last September.

24 (Slide.)

25 The first of these is joint use facilities.



cmw6 1

As you see from the chart, this area has been resolved for '79, and agreements are being negotiated and written at the present time.

2

The questions really devolve down to two points on that.

3

First, who funds it.

4

As I say, this was resolved with DOE funding all of the joint use in '79 and NRC budgeted for all of our dedicated facilities.

5

The two controller organizations are examining this topic and a jointly acceptable agreement we believe will be forthcoming.

6

The second question is which facilities are we really talking about.

7

We have information and again coordination going on on that, in regards to those items which will come up in Fiscal Year '80.

8

The second point that was brought up before, there has been resolution of, at the point where we had a problem.

9

That was Sandia, and again a long-range agreement is being negotiated for foreign nationals, at various other DOE weapons facilities.

10

The third item is general purpose project funding. Again, it's been resolved.

11

cmw7 1

We had a list which was jointly reviewed by both agencies last September.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We found there were some items on there which were really project related rather than general purpose and those NRC in fact did fund.

The rest of the GPP is being funded by DOE presently.

Again, these will be covered in the controllers' agreement.

The final topic, which has been completely resolved, is with regards to printing and distribution, whether it's done by NRC here or done by the field laboratories themselves.

Suitable arrangements have been made on that, so that this matter is now completely closed.

(Slide.)

One of the big items as far as organization and our standardization of procedures was to come up with a new methodology of placing work with DOE from NRC.

Obviously, some 77 percent of our dollars flow through DOE laboratories.

I think the chart here is self-explanatory.

Mr. Gossick signed and published the 1102 document as of today jointly with the MOU.

It was one document which was fully coordinated

cmw8

1 in fact by both agencies.

2 It's a unilateral NRC document because it's one  
3 of our instructions.

4 However, I think some 350 copies go to DOE and  
5 we feel it will be very beneficial and useful to your people  
6 as well.

7 I might point out that almost all organizations  
8 internal to the DOE and NRC were involved in the writing of  
9 this and we tried to cover the whole waterfront as much as  
10 we could, in this area.

11 The next chart will give you an idea of those  
12 items which are covered in the 1102 bulletin.

13 (Slide.)

14 If there is no further questions on this, Mr.  
15 Yates will be your next presenter.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. YATES: If there are no questions, we will  
18 go ahead.

19 (Slide.)

20 As Chuck mentioned, the placement of work, on  
21 a day-to-day basis agreement has been signed.

22 Procedures are being developed for placement of  
23 work within DOE also, a similar kind of document.

24 Now, that's a day-to-day basis.

25 On a long-term basis, we need an institutional

1 planning process, and I want to give a little background on  
2 that.

3 To begin with, I want to mention how we have  
4 organized to develop policy in this area.

5 (Slide.)

6 We have established a field of laboratory  
7 coordination council headed by the Under Secretary.

8 Membership of the Assistant Secretaries and the  
9 Director of the Office of Energy Research and others,  
10 managers of field offices also attend the meetings.

11 The purpose as stated is to advise the Under  
12 Secretary in the established policy and coordination of  
13 activities with respect to R&D installations.

14 (Slide.)

15 There's examples of some of the functions  
16 performed by the ELCC.

17 The first one should read facility reporting  
18 relations to Assistant Secretaries.

19 The last item is the long-range facility  
20 utilization plans, and in that area a guidance memo has been  
21 issued on February 14th by the Under Secretary, addressing  
22 a number of items.

23 (Slide.)

24 But it does make a commitment to the institutional  
25 planning process, and this is based primarily on the results

cmw10, of the first cycle of institutional planning within ERDA.

2 (Slide.)

3 Basic objectives, supplement the existing  
4 laboratory headquarter contracts with an annual opportunity  
5 for exchange of views between the labs and headquarters  
6 people.

7 Annual review and basic means for multiyear  
8 guidance for the laboratories.

9 For those that are not familiar with the DOE  
10 laboratories, they number about 50 plants and laboratories,  
11 100,000 people, eight government-operated laboratories with  
12 about 1000 people, eight operations offices, two projects  
13 offices with about 5000 people, so we have in addition,  
14 there are power administration and other activities in the  
15 field, but it's a substantial field organization.

16 The institutional planning process, that I'm  
17 going to go on to discuss, address multiprogram facilities  
18 primarily.

19 Now, the institutional planning process overall  
20 will address plans for all facilities.

21 (Slide.)

22 The basic responsibility for institutional planning  
23 falls on the Assistant Secretary, to which the laboratory  
24 or plant or plan or facility is assigned.

25 All laboratories, multiprogram -- all facilities

cmwll

1 are assigned at this point except for several which are still  
2 reporting to the Under Secretary.

3 MR. MYERS: Four are still reporting to me.

4 MR. YATES: Four. The laboratory has the basic  
5 responsibility for the preparation of the institutional plan  
6 which is prepared on an annual basis.

7 Coordination is handled through the Assistant  
8 Secretary office.

9 Participating laboratories are the eight multi-  
10 program laboratories.

11 I think most of you are familiar with them.

12 I will read them off, Argonne, Brookhaven,  
13 Oak Ridge, Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Lawrence Livermore Lab,  
14 LASE, Sandia and Pacific Northwest Lab.

15 In addition, there are four others, HEDL,  
16 Engineering Development Lab, Savannah River Lab, Ames and  
17 Idaho National Engineering Lab, participating in this next  
18 cycle of institutional plans.

19 The content format is similar to last year's  
20 plans schedule.

21 I would like to go on to the next chart and then  
22 come back to this one.

23 (Slide.)

24 The schedule has been changed substantially since  
25 last year.



cmw12

1 Last year we had essentially two, three versions  
2 of the institutional plan, two drafts and one final this  
3 year, will be one draft and one final.

4 The cycle is shown there with draft plans in  
5 April and final plans in August.

6 (Slide.)

7 Uses. The plants have multiple uses.

8 Use by the laboratory in presenting his  
9 programs to the visitors, use by headquarters for program  
10 division for planning the programs of the labs.

11 These by DOE and NRC management, in terms of  
12 controlling and reviewing the placement of work.

13 Now, concerning procedures, the formal immediate  
14 interim management directive establishing the procedures for  
15 institutional planning will be issued shortly, or within  
16 the Department of Energy.

17 Field operations offices will have a major  
18 responsibility, as delegated by the Assistant Secretaries'  
19 implementation of the institutional plans, and to summarize  
20 briefly the status of last year's institutional planning  
21 process, the procedures worked very well.

22 Bob Barber's office worked to collate planning  
23 information from the various labs, to present it to NRC,  
24 and then have -- then feed back that kind of guidance to  
25 the lab, as well as NRC dealt directly with the labs.

cmw13

1 You may expect that to continue in the '78 plans.

2 In addition, we are asking for a little more  
3 planning information for each laboratory in the '78 plan.

4 Are there any questions?

5 MR. MYERS: Let me say a little about this.

6 Those laboratories are such a large part of our  
7 operation, we put a special amount of attention into the  
8 management aspects, and have decided to have the laboratories  
9 in general reporting to the Assistant Secretary who has the  
10 primary responsibility in the particular area.

11 As you know, we have had some of the laboratories  
12 whose prime mission is defense and they report to our defense  
13 programs.

14 We have others who have prime missions in other  
15 elements of energy and they report to a fair number -- a  
16 fair number report to Bob Thorne.

17 Four of them, as I said, report to me.

18 We in the Department are developing a long-range  
19 strategy of where we want to be many years from now, in the  
20 energy business, and then backing that up are what I call  
21 long-range plans, and what are here called institutional  
22 plans, which deal with about five years' projection forward.

23 That is the activity now being generated by the  
24 laboratories and gives us a base of the manpower and  
25 facilities that are required to carry out these kind of prog

cmw14

1 programs.

2 And then finally you break back down from that  
3 in the budget, which is a two-, three-year kind of budgeting  
4 we are getting into now, for administration.

5 So when we get our total strategy, long-range  
6 plan and budget elements put together, we have a flow of  
7 information that covers the whole thing.

8 As each of these specific tasks get developed  
9 by NRC and approved into the plan, that will become the  
10 baseline in the one or two years ahead, then we feed into  
11 that overall institutional planning, where do we think the  
12 whole structure of laboratories will go in that longer-  
13 range area, so I think we will have a plan where we can give you  
14 you a pretty good picture of the capabilities of the  
15 laboratories, their projections for the future, how tight  
16 they are going to be as far as their ability to carry out  
17 various tasks, and will give us probably also a much better  
18 picture of what kind of institutional planning in terms of  
19 upgrading of facilities, maintenance of facilities and  
20 things of that nature we need in a particular area.

21 So it's our objective to get into that mode by  
22 about the budget planning cycle of this summer, and I think  
23 everything is on track, to make that happen.

24 MR. THORNE: I might mention, until that's  
25 actually done, we have placed a ceiling on all the laboratories

cmw15

1 to kind of curtail their growth until we can go through the  
2 sorting out process to see where the strengths and capabilities  
3 are.

4 MR. BECKWITH: To fit into your institutional  
5 planning, Mr. Secretary, of course will require information  
6 from NRC.

7 (Slide.)

8 We have developed the information and we will  
9 start a very detailed level for our current fiscal year.

10 This chart shows our latest projections which  
11 will be placed at your labs.

12 This is known data.

13 Data at what we call the financial level or  
14 task level detail.

15 These have been provided to the operations  
16 planners and headquarters as well as data for '79.

17 Overall, about \$130 million is known funding,  
18 along with \$30 million more, of still undetermined funds,  
19 where they may go to a commercial firm or to DOE during  
20 the next seven months.

21 Of course, this is a wise thing, there have  
22 been several changes since the first of February.

23 For example, NMSS has raised that amount at  
24 Albuquerque and Oak Ridge, just since this chart was made,  
25 on 1 February.

cmw16

1 The bulk as you can see are four locations  
2 in Idaho, Albuquerque, Oak Ridge and Chicago.

3 Also note that our Office of Research has the  
4 largest amount of these.

5 Some 82 percent of the total or \$104 million in  
6 total.

7 Dr. Murley will provide greater detail on  
8 research's specific profile in just a few minutes, sir.

9 Now, changes in this profile for NRC are not  
10 expected to be radical in the next few years.

11 However, as advanced reactor or alternate fuel  
12 cycle work, waste management and other areas become more  
13 definitive, the change of course is possible.

14 It's still too early for us to tell now, but  
15 our work will go, of course, to the most appropriate location.

16 We do expect some overall growth, in our funding  
17 in the next few years.

18 (Slide.)

19 On the '79 chart, the picture is pretty much  
20 the same, except for a large increase by research at Idaho.

21 The work there is expected to climb by some  
22 43 percent to about \$39 million.

23 Mostly for LOFT operations, second core and so  
24 forth.

25 Again, I will defer to Dr. Murley on a later,

cmwl7 1 presentation.

2 This is pretty much the same as the total amount  
3 projected for each of the operations offices except for  
4 Idaho.

5 It's still too early to compare totals by year.

6 Such a large additional amount for '79 is still  
7 undetermined, much more so than in '78.

8 Also, like you, our budget is still to be  
9 approved by Congress.

10 NMSS as an example has projected \$3.5 million,  
11 not \$2.5 as shown on this chart, for their waste work at  
12 San Francisco.

13 They know again \$1.6 million is undetermined  
14 but they know it will go to an DOE location, in addition to  
15 the funds shown.

16 This data is being coordinated directly by our  
17 personnel, in our program offices, sir, with your field  
18 office managers on a day-to-day basis.

19 Of course, it should be reflected in their  
20 latest projections which will appear in your institutional  
21 plans and your budget processes for FY '80, as an example.

22 As I said before, overall some 77 percent of  
23 NRC's program support funds do go to DOE.

24 (Slide.)

25 I will now give you some projections, sir, by



cmw18 1 our five major offices, as the office directors have made  
2 them, out through the planning phase.

3 These will show the trends.

4 They are not scrubbed, I might note, and haven't  
5 been approved, of course, by the Commission as such by anyone  
6 else further up the line.

7 They represent the office directors' assessment  
8 of current needs.

9 For NRR, their technical assistance is to deal  
10 with the short-term inputs into the licensing process.

11 No experimental studies or facilities are  
12 involved.

13 About 50 percent of these funds shown on the  
14 bottom line that goes to DOE is for light water reactor  
15 safety work.

16 Some 25 percent is for siting and environmental  
17 matters, and the balance is for safety and advanced reactor  
18 work.

19 As you see, change is noted, the growth in the  
20 numbers of operating reactors and inflation account for the  
21 increase.

22 The percentage to DOE is again relatively  
23 constant, and spread basically to eight laboratories, as you  
24 saw in the earlier charts.

#2  
FP/fml  
CR6490

(Slide.)

For standards development, again the projections are quite stable. In fiscal '77 and '78, the substantial portion of their work had been performed at Oak Ridge and Pacific Northwest.

There is a growing portion now being done by Sandia as well, which picks up in '78. We expect these proportions to continue.

LASL, Mound, ANL and BNL are also tasks for some effort but, of course, at a lower level. The overall percentage, as you will note on the chart drops to about 60 percent in '79 and it will continue at that level out through '84.

I think the percentage for '78 was about 70 percent.

(Slide.)

For I&E, DOE work represents an analysis of samples and independent measurements. Some 90 percent of these funds are for those two categories. The workload again is primarily spread through 5 locations with some minor tasking to approximately 6 other laboratories, New Brunswick, Idaho, E&E, EGG, Argonne and Brookhaven.

The work is depending on the number of operating reactors or number of licensees. The figures allow for some inflation.

(Slide.)

For NMSS, this is a broken chart here. As you see. We show the total by the top line. It is very stable. And

fm2 1 four breakouts are shown. Of the two subjective breakouts  
2 on this chart, waste management shows a downward trend. Here  
3 we have a dramatic increase in our total funds in '77 and '78.  
4 About 70 percent of our funding is placed with your laboratories  
5 in this area.

6 However, as the criteria are settled, the percentage  
7 will drop to about 40 percent in 1984. In safeguards, about 15  
8 percent of our current dollars are placed with DOE at present,  
9 but this will climb to 40 percent by 1981, so DOE work will  
10 increase, even though the overall NRC program will decrease.

11 The two remaining areas are projected again to be  
12 fairly stable and predictable.

13 (Slide.)

14 Uranium fuel cycle program support, at all  
15 laboratories throughout the period. In the area of spent  
16 fuel storage, again almost all of our contract dollars are  
17 placed with DOE. We expect about 90 percent of these funds,  
18 although they are small in total, to continue to go to the labor-  
19 atory.

20 Overall I think 58 percent of our '78 funds went to  
21 DOE for our office, NMSS, Nuclear Material Safety and  
22 Safeguard, and it will continue at about this level according  
23 to our current projections.

24 (Slide.)

25 For research my last chart in this series, here are  
comparable projections for the Office of Research.

fm3

1 This represents, of course, the bulk of our funding,  
2 which is placed with the laboratories. That includes the major  
3 facilities funding, such as for LOFT.

4 Now, Dr. Murley will next speak to this area in  
5 detail, gentlemen.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. MYERS: You are carrying it about two years further  
8 than we are. That is great. That is a good help to us.

9 MR. THORNE: I am curious about very little growth  
10 beyond '80, probably not even a cost-of-living gross. Does  
11 that reflect anything in your program, no real new initia-  
12 tives?

13 MR. MYERS: You mean in research?

14 MR. THORNE: Really in the overall. They all kind  
15 of flatten out beyond '80.

16 MR. GOSSICK: I think that is probably true.  
17 We can't foresee what other kinds of problems might crop up.

18 MR. MYERS: They are projecting low inflation.

19 MR. THORNE: Very low.

20 MR. GOSSICK: Is inflation cranked into this?  
21 These are uninflated dollars?

22 MR. BECKWITH: These are uninflated dollars in  
23 most instances. A couple of offices such as I&E and SD did  
24 use some inflation in their figures, sir. It wasn't that con-  
25 sistent.

fm4

1 MR. MURLEY: Research dollars are in fiscal '80  
2 dollars.

3 Can I have the next slide?

4 (Slide.)

5 I would like to remind you that the research that we  
6 do is not developmental research. Rather it is to confirm  
7 the adequacy and the conservatisms in our regulatory decisions,  
8 so we are not really out to develop equipment or hardware  
9 processing.

10 This schematic figure shows the flow of how the  
11 research function works in NRC. Across the top line you see  
12 the scope of our responsibilities, ranges from nuclear power  
13 plants all the way to waste disposal licensing. Through the  
14 licensing process, then, there are technical questions that  
15 arise, and some of these need research information. The re-  
16 search needs are then communicated from the licensing staff  
17 to the research staff. We manage to contract for the research,  
18 and then feed back to the licensing groups data in the area of  
19 reactor safety, analysis, safeguards and environmental research.

20 (Slide.)

21 This represents a breakdown of where our research  
22 dollars go. As you can see, about 84 percent of our research  
23 dollars go to DOE laboratories.

24 I might add, that these numbers represent an update  
25 from Chuck's last chart because we have cranked into these

fm5 1 7.9 million of undesigned funds, that he did not have.  
2 Nearly all of which goes to DOE laboratories. We just haven't  
3 put that money out in the field yet, but we intend to. So  
4 about half of our projects, slightly over half of our projects,  
5 go to laboratories, but the bulk of those, because of large  
6 facilities like LOFT and the power burst facility in Idaho, 84  
7 percent of our money goes to that.

8 I might add that the other government agencies line  
9 item, like the Geological Survey, NOAA and Naval Research  
10 Laboratory.

11 (Slide.)

12 Except for Idaho, we are a small fraction of any  
13 one DOE laboratory. The Idaho -- at Idaho, we are about  
14 30 percent of EG&Gs responsibility.

15 Now, I hasten to add that the figures for Idaho  
16 do not include the Naval work or the Chem plant work  
17 but they do include all of EG&Gs responsibilities. We are  
18 30 percent and next year when NRC assumes operating responsi-  
19 bility for LOFT, we will jump close to \$60 million. It will  
20 be nearly half of the Idaho, EG&G Laboratory.

21 So there are some problems. Lest you think every-  
22 thing is sweetness and roses, there are some problems that creep  
23 up and I think I should talk about those just briefly.

24 Primarily at Idaho. They deal with adequate building space  
25 for our research programs, and general plant projects, namely,



fm6

1 adequate money to maintain PBF and LOFT and the roof and  
2 the building out there and so forth. I am satisfied the problem  
3 is being worked. I don't mean to indicate that this is a problem  
4 that is not being resolved, but it is there, and I think you  
5 ought to know about it.

6 (Slide.)

7 MR. THORNE: I think we did do a very good job of  
8 protecting their interest. When it came right down to the  
9 specific little bits and pieces, we didn't do bad.

10 MR. MYERS: Charlie talked to me about this. I  
11 call it spares, what do you call it, Charlie?

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Inventory.

13 MR. MYERS: Inventory.

14 We have a real job there of support parts and  
15 things to keep it going.

16 MR. THORNE: Charlie and I talked about that yester-  
17 day. We have to find a different way of managing that in-  
18 ternally than we have done before.

19 MR. LIVERMAN: That was a particularly tough year  
20 with the changing from ERDA to DOE, and so forth.

21 MR. MURLEY: We simply do not have the kind of  
22 budgetary flexibility to fix roofs and things like that.

23 MR. MYERS: That is another area we know we have  
24 not done well in in the last three years. That wasn't  
25 the transition to DOE that did it.

1           There has been a problem of what amounts to  
2 priorities, to basic plant maintenance activities. We have a  
3 major study under way to look at that whole picture.

4           MR. MURLEY: This chart shows the research trends  
5 through fiscal '84. There were two points I would like to  
6 make.

7           One is clear, with Idaho. We are jumping from about  
8 \$40 million this year to about 59 million next year and 62  
9 million, and then it levels off through '81, '82. and we  
10 show it tailing down. That is primarily because the heavy  
11 program in LOFT and PBF began to ~~tail down~~ somewhat.

12           I must admit we are trying to look through a cloudy  
13 crystal ball when we are looking that far, but we do, in  
14 fact, intend that they do trail down.

15           The other point I would like to make is with regard  
16 to Sandia. That increase, that is projected, is mainly as  
17 a result of our assumption of some growth in the advance  
18 reactor safety research programs, starting in '80. The advance  
19 reactor program is mainly our breeder and gas-cooled safety  
20 research program and they are now in a flat, kind of holding  
21 pattern, and for the last year and we projected for fiscal '79.  
22 This depends entirely on what DOE does, of course, and so if  
23 there are no increases in DOE's advanced reactor development,  
24 then our safety research will not grow accordingly, but  
25 as far as the assumed growth in Sandia, it is primarily the

fm8

1 result of the advanced program. That

2 That is all I have.

3 (Slide.)

4 MR. BARBER: We thought it would be important for  
5 DOE to present to NRC and give you some feel for our projections  
6 of NRC assistance to DOE in the next 3 or 4 years.

7 So this table summarizes the current situation  
8 and the projection. In '81, it is kind of vague, because  
9 they depend a great deal on the budget cycle in projects and  
10 facilities, but as you can see, there are a fair number of  
11 safety reviews, studies and transportation cask reviews that  
12 are coming down the road from which we will ask NRC for advice  
13 and assistance on.

14 The only one that I know of, where there is maybe  
15 some problem, is in the transportation cask reviews. We have  
16 some kind of a schedule problem. We will have to work that  
17 one out.

18 (Slide.)

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Before you go away from that one,  
20 what kind of things are on the facility safety review?  
21 Do you remember some of the items?

22 MR. BARBER: Yes. The next two viewgraphs will  
23 cover that. There is a list of facilities. You can see there  
24 is some weapons laboratories, fuel laboratories, the Navy  
25 facilities, SHE, A-1-W and so on.

fm9

1           Some are new, ~~some~~ are modifications. There is  
2 quite a variety.

3           MR. DIRCKS: Bob, the '79 facility requirements,  
4 is that tied in all with the NECE ~~work~~? The National  
5 Fuel Cycle Evaluation work? We keep hearing after October  
6 of '79 we will be faced with some more work coming over  
7 from DOE.

8           MR. BARBER: I have another viewgraph on studies,  
9 and I think that is related to the international fuel  
10 cycle work. It is related to the nonproliferation. A whole  
11 bunch of them.

12           (Slide.)

13           This is a continuation of the facilities safety  
14 review, which project out a little further, and again, some  
15 are licensed, the high level waste, most of them are unlicensed.  
16 The safety test facilities, fast reactor facilities and some more  
17 Navy cores coming down the road.

18           (Slide.)

19           I think this is what you were referring to, Bill.

20           These are what we call facility studies, wherein  
21 SRR, when you produce, there is no site per se for these things,  
22 but so-called preliminary information safety documents produced,  
23 and it asks for NRC advice in regard to the license problem  
24 in these facilities.

25           Again it covers the gamut. Heavy water reactors,

fm10

1 temperature gas cooled, liquid metal fast breeder, gas cooled.  
2 There is a wide variety.

3 MR. MYERS: Is this part of the UO-2 study?

4 MR. THORNE: Gas cooled and probably temperature  
5 gas cooled reactor.

6 MR. MYERS: This will be in support of that, to look  
7 at the safety issue, as we go down the pike on that?

8 MR. THORNE: My guess is it will be more than that.  
9 Probably another half-a-dozen more.

10 MR. BARBER: We checked with your staff for this list,  
11 primarily.

12 MR. DIRCKS: I think it is important. As we go into  
13 the '80 budget cycle, this stuff has to be found.

14 MR. BARBER: We have to do the best we can. Okay.  
15 We will do that.

16 (Slide.)

17 These are what we call information submittals,  
18 mainly they pertain to facilities that NRC or AEC Regulatory  
19 has reviewed in the past and there is some modification or  
20 change coming up. We thought it important to keep you apprised  
21 of the activity. Again there is a wide gamut in production  
22 reactor, Purex reprocessing plant at Richland, Brookhaven,  
23 research reactor and high level waste facility at Savannah  
24 River.

25 If there are no questions, that concludes this

fm11

1 part of this presentation actually.

2 MR. LIVERMAN: Our two agencies have an enormous  
3 amount of reaction commenting on EPA proposed regulations in  
4 the radiation area. In fact, I would guess, Bill, they are  
5 together almost every day in the week on those sorts of  
6 things. We are both deeply involved now in commenting on EPA's  
7 proposed plutonium regulations, so there is a lot of interaction  
8 going on on that basis all the time but never gets ground into  
9 this, but works most of the time I think very smoothly.

10 MR. DIRCKS: We have a 50-minute target and I think  
11 we just about made it.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think you did very well. Very  
13 well organized. I am surprised and delighted to see these  
14 things run on time.

15 Let me ask a question about the final -- just re-  
16 mind me again about the ACRS linkage now that we have agreed  
17 to. It is one in which you have access to the ACRS --

18 MR. DIRCKS: Generally through the staff, but with  
19 provision for direct access when required with information  
20 given to the staff, that the access is being made. I think  
21 we have all agreed on that.

22 MR. BARBER: Yes. That is in the MOU that you  
23 have before you.

24 Generally we expect to go to the staff, and then  
25 the staff would probably exercise the option, but there may be



fm1 some rare occasions where we need ACRS advice, so we have pro-  
12 vided, through the proper channels, for that.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Typically, the Committee will  
4 need staff support if it is going to do anything of any sub-  
5 stance, and that is provided for. Well, I think that the  
6 Committee has worked hard to produce an agreement that takes  
7 the recent document into account, it touches it up in a few  
8 places where it seemed to be needed.

9 My impression, I haven't been around for a couple  
10 of years. My impression is things are running a lot better now  
11 than they did in the beginning.

12 MR. GOSSICK: Indeed.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: So, I think we have got a good  
14 document as a basis, and the implementation documents that  
15 fall below that then are in the process of various stages, and  
16 seem to be doing well.

17 I think we just have to recognize, that in human af-  
18 fairs, things aren't always going to run smoothly and we are  
19 bound to come across glitches of various kinds and we just have  
20 to put our heads together and fix them.

21 I think in terms of the formal agreement between  
22 us, we are unlikely to do better than this in the near term.  
23 I am very pleased with it, as a matter of fact, with the inter-  
24 agency. The interagency group has done a fine job, in  
25 sorting out these things.

fm13

1 MR. LIVERMAN: I think both of the staffs need to be  
2 congratulated for the way in which the LOFT thing finally  
3 shook itself out. I hope the Commission is pleased. The last  
4 three years of progress has really been major strides forward,  
5 I think.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I had to assure Congressman Miller  
7 the other week that we were glad to have it.

8 So I am on record now.

9 You have taken over what, half of the construction  
10 sites, what would have been called construction sites in '79  
11 and I guess we will get the whole thing in '80. Along about the  
12 start of fiscal '80, we will hear the deep sigh of relief  
13 coming up from Germantown and other places and I will know  
14 what that is, but I think it is working pretty good. I am  
15 very pleased with it.

16 MR. LIVERMAN: Even the preliminary results confirm  
17 that.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: The experiments that have been run thus  
19 far have been enormously valuable and we are now getting on toward the  
20 nuclear runs which are going to be a little expensive.

21 MR. MYERS: I had a very good review, in-depth  
22 review of these things last week, and it is looking good.  
23 I sure saw the problems that were involved over the last  
24 few years, but it has really come on line beautifully.

25 Joe, I think just the one comment I would make as

fm14 1 a newcomer in this business, we have got certain things that  
2 are clear responsibilities of each of the agencies but we  
3 also have a clear responsibility to work very closely and I  
4 want to be sure if you see anything going off-line in that  
5 area, give me a call and I will do the same thing with you,  
6 and we want to be sure if there is any major issues that come up  
7 between now and the next formal scheduled meeting, get ahold of  
8 me and we will give whatever support we can.

9 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We won't hesitate to get together  
10 and get them straightened out before they become real annoy-  
11 ances and difficulties in getting out the program.

12 Do you have anything?

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. Just to say I was  
14 fascinated to think back over that historical summary, and  
15 note that the institutional framework that exists now for an  
16 effective interagency relationship reflects the very hard  
17 work that a lot of people have done over the past two or three  
18 years.

19 It seems to me right now it is just about as good  
20 as you are ever going to get, that kind of relationship.  
21 That is what really counts. An opportunity to talk to each  
22 other and make sure the problems get solved before they get  
23 unmanageable.

24 MR. THORNE: I think one of the real contributing  
25 factors in the good working relationship has been Charlie

15 fm Williams, shaping up the LOFT project and generally having a  
2 much better working relationship with NRC than existed be-  
3 fore.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I can attest to that.

5 MR. GOSSICK: I can attest to that as well.

6 MR. MYERS: Careful, he's sitting out there in  
7 the audience.

8 MR. GOSSICK: He gave us a tough time getting  
9 started but it's been useful.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think that is great. Okay.  
11 Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, at 2:59 p.m., the meeting was con-  
13 cluded.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

