

ML993370056.txt

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LSS ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL MEETING

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commis

sion

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

Friday, September 9, 1994

t to

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

[2:00 p

.m.]

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

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

ay is

aid

ll in

and

y a

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

I have circulating, an attendance list, that

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

Claudia?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, John.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some basic elements of licensing support system

-- are that it's an integral part of the Commission's repository licensing process. The LSS will contain the relevant documents of DOE, NRC, and the other parties to

high-level waste licensing proceeding. All parties will

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

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

document submission requirements in the LSS rule. And

Department of Energy cannot submit its license application

under subpart J, unless it's in substantial compliance

the document submission requirements in the LSS rule.

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

the DOE license application, including meeting the three

year construction authorization review period set out in

Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

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

and comprehensive database of relevant licensing material.

Secondly, the LSS will provide full text search capability

on this database to allow quick identification of documents

and relevant material within those documents.

The LSS will provide for the identification and

availability of discoverable documents before the license

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

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

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

At our last meeting we spent a lot of time on

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

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

That's all I have to say.

MR. HOYLE: Okay, anybody want to add anythin

Chip's comments?

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

very interested in that, he mentioned that to the chair

man

this morning. And talk about what's next for us, when should we get together again, when will we have something of

ng of

substance to talk about and listen to.

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

f to

MR. LEVIN: First I'd like to introduce myself

Moe,

those of you I haven't met yet. My name is -- I go by

been

my real name is Arnold Levin, but the nickname Moe has

ce

with me for years. I've been the LSS administrator since

he

October of 1993, and I'm also the deputy director for the

My

Office of Decommissioned Resources Management at NRC.

professional background is in computer programming and systems development.

alk

I'd just like to take a very few minutes to talk

about my activity since the last ARP meeting. A little background. According to the LSS rule, the LSS administrator is responsible for the administration, management and operation of the LSS. Early in 1993, the

e

Commission asked the staff of NRC to examine several alternatives for LSS program budget and funding responsibilities. This was done in order to ensure that the

t the

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

d a

somewhat different approach to LSS responsibilities in

those

currently detailed in the rule. This approach, which we

e

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

,

operation and maintenance of the LSS within DOE, and makes

kes

the LSS administrator responsible for overseeing the DOE's,

E's,

operation of the LSS.

This oversight would be done through the

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HOYLE: Thanks a lot, Moe.

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

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

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

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

oe's

role under either version would essentially be the same

.

unds

t or

ket,

MR. DAVENPORT: Just a question whether the f
go directly from DOE's pocket to the contractor's pocke
the DOE money goes to NRC and into the contractor's poc
and that's really the only distinction.

MR. CAMERON: Probably.

MR. LEVIN: Yes, that's it.

ney

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

Y,

MR. DAVENPORT: I'm sorry, I meant Jay's mone
not DOE's money.

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

not

it

me

MR. LEVIN: But I think in actuality, and I'm
sure on this, the money would be under DOE's budget and
would be DOE money. I would, in effect, be spending
directly DOE's money. I don't think the money would co
from DOE to NRC.

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

MR. LEVIN: The original, sorry.

you

MR. SILBERG: Under the COTR proposal, would
have stop work authority as well as budget authority?

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

,

that's part of the responsibility.

le

MR. DAVENPORT: Will the contract be reviewab
and commentable in advance of its execution?

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

MR. HOYLE: We have to discuss that.

g

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

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

ty.

m not

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

, but

MR. MURPHY: The master contract with Jay's clients -- I can't remember what the terminology is now the contract under which we track money and put in the nuclear waste fund was published in the Federal Register

r and

sent out nationally for comment before it was finalized and signed by DOE and the utilities. There is no reason in

the

world why you couldn't put this contract in --

, as

MR. CAMERON: The procurement document itself

you remember in the LSS rule, there is a provision that statement of work for various contracts are supposed to

be

documents that are put in the LSS.

MR. MURPHY: I'm talking about the contract between DOE and their contractor to manage the LSS, the contract that will make Moe the COTR. I know I'm not a federal procurement expert so I could be corrected, but

I

know of no reason why that contract, that proposed contract,

ract,

before it -- before it goes through the RFP process and before all of the provisions relating to federal procurement

ement

kick in, why a draft contract couldn't be published for comment in the federal register just like a draft note

rule.

MR. CAMERON: I think you're right now. I guess

ess

the thing that we need to think about is if we are building

ding

on the info-streams system for the LSS is what the additional procurement piece of that is going to be to provide the LSS functionality. But I think that that's

--

you know, that's just a detail that could be worked out

.

MR. LEVIN: I think the point is there would

be a

lot of value in being able to do that and it makes a lot

t of

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HOYLE: If there is no further discussion

on

that point we'll move to the DOE presentation.

Claudia?

MS. NEWBURY: Does everyone have a copy of my handouts?

MR. MURPHY: Could I make a suggestion there,

and

if I'm talking out of line, somebody jump on it. But j

ust

because John said he didn't think this thing shouldn't

take

longer than an hour, and I certainly agree with that; I don't see that it's necessary for you, Claudia, to go through for all of us, the proposed program approaches.

MS. NEWBURY: That's fine with me.

MR. MURPHY: I'm sure it would have been. It

may

be for other people in the room, I don't know, and I do

n't

want to cut that off, but I think all of us on the pane

l,

because we spent part of our morning criticizing the PP

A to

the Commission itself, I don't think it's necessary for

you

to go through the PPA for us.

MS. NEWBURY: That's fine. I put it in becau

se I

was asked to address it very briefly, and probably ther

e is

one slide in there that you do need, which is the LSS relationship.

MR. MURPHY: Oh sure.

MS. NEWBURY: But I've heard it myself so man

y

times I even hate to talk about it.

My name is Claudia Newbury, I am right now th

e

acting team lead for technical synthesis team, at DOE's Yucca Mountain office. For those of you who aren't awa

re of

our organization, that's the group that deals with the performance assessment and technical database developme

nt.

And I am the technical database manager in addition to everything else I do.

I'll briefly talk about the operation of the

LSS,

alk a

e

one

for

e

ative

inal

the issue of the COTR that's one slide; organizational changes; I can skip the proposed program approach and t

little bit about -- Mike Cline will talk about the LSS working group that we have put together.

Operation of the LSS and COTR function for th
NRC, we are still thinking about it. I have talked to

of our contracting officers and she is looking into it. Since the contracting officer is ultimately responsible

the contract not the COTR, I mean in the end they're th

ones with the warrant from Congress, I think it's imper

that they're comfortable with this before we make any f
decisions.

Organizational changes. Both at OCRWM, headquarters level and at the project office there have

been

several changes, one of them is, as it says here, the responsibility for records management in the LSS has be

en

transferred from headquarters to Yucca Mountain. Also,

the

software development responsibility has been moved from headquarters to Yucca Mountain. And the assistant mana

ger

for suitability and licensing, Steve Brocoum, my boss,

is

now responsible for Licensing Support System.

or

I've given you a brief organizational chart f

OCRWM, the director; and the deputy director is Dan

Dreyfuss. And you'll see Yucca Mountain site

characterization office off there to one side, that's w

here

LSS has moved. And the next slide -- or picture is the Yucca Mountain organizational structure.

As I said, I worked for Steve Brocoum, the assistant manager for suitability in licensing. Our IR

M

function is with the assistant manager for administrati

on,

it says Marshall Bishop here but Marshall has retired a

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

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

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

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

MR. MURPHY: What does home team mean?

MS. NEWBURY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: What does home team mean? There
little asterisk.

MS. NEWBURY: That's me. I work both for
performance assessment, site suitability, and Tom Bjers
works for both regulatory and licensing site suitabilit
We don't have enough people to cover all the teams.

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

d

you're a visitor?

show

MS. NEWBURY: I appear on site suitability, I

up at public meetings.

sing

The impact of our reorganization of the Licen

Support System. Within DOE, the assistant manager for suitability and licensing has chartered a working group

,

it's a group of M&O contractors, to assess the LSS stat

us

and direction. What we'd like to do -- what we are doi

ng is

looking at the requirements, the actual requirements in

the

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

velop

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

hat

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

will

talk about that.

ca

The LSS will be funded and managed by the Yuc

nd

Mountain Site Characterization Office at this point. A

t to

the DOE LSSARP representatives to this group will repor

e.

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

y and

Director, the assistant manager of suitability

asked

licensing is Steve Brocoum as I mentioned. And he has

ohn

that the LSSARP representatives for DOE be myself and J

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

?

MR. HENKEL: Is this pennance for not knowing

e

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

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

my

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

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

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

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

MR. METTAM: Is the LSS on here somewhere?

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

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

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

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

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

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

has
ca
ation
ram
First couple viewgraphs are really -- Claudia
already covered them. I'll just indicate that as she
indicated, the function of the LSS has moved to the Yuc
Mountain project -- the Yucca Mountain Site Characteriz
Office, YMSCO. And with that, there was an election to
re-evaluate the LSS concept, considering an improved
understanding of the program and LSSARP needs, new
milestones and constraints imposed by the proposed prog
approach, PPA; and advancements in system components.

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

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

bpart

that

stem

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

under

tion

e

ia

rt.

he

I

have

a

er to

f

r of

ty,

tinue

ing

and

Products of the working group will be an evaluation of the requirements and understanding of the derived requirements with respect to the applicability

their applicability under the PPA. Development of a milestone schedule for the LSS; development, implementa

and enhancement of the cost model and comparison to the previous cost analysis; development evaluation of viabl

options, and their evaluations, using evaluation criter

and the selection of a preferred option that would be presented to the DOE for consideration and a final repo

With respect to the working group schedule, t

activities were initially initiated in May of '94, and

think the bottom two dates are important. We intend to

a draft report to DOE the 30th of September, and it is

hope that DOE can set up a meeting with LSSARP in Octob

find out the findings.

Working group status, we are in the process o

preparing the final report. We are still doing a numbe

odds and ends but we have completed the requirements review. We developed detailed option descriptions. We developed a better understanding of the LSS functionali

considering statutory and derived requirements. We con

to find the cost model for an evaluation -- for evaluat

the LSS through 2004, and we've established milestones,

we've developed some proposed recommendations for the D

OE to

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

ms

nt

ty

lume

vings

of

and

arios

the

- now

ans,

see

And

jor

ion

to

what

what

the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fielden?

MR. DICKERSON: No.

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

MR. CLINE: That was our basic assumption.

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

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

rom

NRC and the stake holders.

o in

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

ion

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

he

Indeed if Nye County gets the ability to do the research you guys are talking about this morning, you're going to have a pile of data. Nevada's data is getting larger. There is a room this big with documents all around the walls in it; that's not small in my opinion. If you haven't calculated that and if you also haven't calculated the chairman's observation this morning that 2010 is on the assumption date, and it could well be later given the NRC's concerns, and now you're talking about a system where you're going to be monitoring for some 100 years and all that monitoring data has got to go in there ultimately so you can review determinations over time, you're talking about a much larger system.

much

s our

MR. CLINE: Agreed. We set -- for estimating purposes we set certain dates. We used the PPA dates as milestones. But we recognize that it's going to go out in time beyond then; data collection will continue, data entry will continue beyond that time. It's important that the system be designed to be flexible -- sufficiently flexible to handle increases.

in

ntry

e

ble

hat

MR. CAMERON: Michael. On that point about what

dates you used to estimate a mass of documents, I can see that by your last comment you're looking at 2010 in terms of sizing the system, but obviously a critical data point is how many documents -- how many pages have to be loaded before the license application comes in, in order to be able to time that so that the LSS is loaded before that.

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

MR. CLINE: System will be loaded up to that point and it would be ready for -- to be used or transferred and it would be put through a certification.

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

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

MR. CLINE: Yes, we recognize that.

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

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

s,

okay?

MR. METTAM: Just the next 10.

rs.

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

at

MR. MURPHY: Did you look at the documents th

e?

might be produced by the utilities in your cost estimat

of

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

at.

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

MS. NEWBURY: Aren't they intervenor?

d.

MR. CLINE: Let me jump two viewgraphs forwar

hey

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

can't be arguing.

okay,

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

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

some

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

ng,

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

puts

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

u

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

e

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

ont

of you indicating that the greatest volume of material

will

come in in about 2000 to 2001.

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

t

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

e

counting numbers of documents, just looking at where th

greatest input will come to --

at

MR. METTAM: But I would assume that those th

are already in existence that should be huge spikes

ML993370056.txt

somewhere at '94?

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

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

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

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

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

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

ML993370056.txt

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

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

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

The major cost drivers are data volume as we
talked about both -- well, human verification versus
mechanical input or LCR accuracy, and dissemination cos

how much material is going to go out of the system, oka

And that's very much dependent on the pages, pages
disseminated.

Desegregating costs revealed that there are c
elements not attributable to the LSS, these are costs
associated with the DOE records management system; I tr

to separate those costs and look at only the LSS costs,

more sophisticated cost model that better addresses the
sensitivity and the cost sensitivity and the cost profi

through 2004. And over a 10 year period right now we
estimate that the cost for the LSS can be less than \$10

million.

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

ML993370056.txt

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

stem
ost
s an
I
e
line
t we
an
ny
y has
ct,
ng
- and
And
hat
sign,
the

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

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

MR. CLINE: Which it should be.

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

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

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

MR. CLINE: Well, certainly the OCR capabilities have improved tremendously, and we have -- as a matter of fact, we have members of the UNLV's organization on our working group -- I didn't mention that earlier, I should have -- they have given us briefings on the OCR capabilities.

they're at a point now that they feel they can achieve pretty high levels of accuracy.

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

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

t comes in as hard copy or if it comes in as a balanced machinery or floppy -- electronic image.
MR. DICKERSON: Data file.
ns if MR. BALCOM: Will we be able to see assumption they change and any back up data for the new cost model .
MS. NEWBURY: At another meeting we could put together another one when they finish their report. I'll be glad to show you what they have.
he MR. SILBERG: What is the cost estimate for the DOE records management, the LSS?
MR. CLINE: Camille?
n -- MS. KERRIGAN: I think it's somewhere between I was going to say it's going to sound like a big range , but \$5 million to \$10 million a year. It was pretty steady over the years. There were some spikes based on doing the reprocessing, that kind of thing.
he MR. SILBERG: The number I'm looking for is the equivalent to this \$100 million number.
10 MS. KERRIGAN: But if you take 10 years at \$ million a year you get \$100 million, because the cost you see is over approximately a 10 year period of time.
he MR. SILBERG: So you're saying the cost for the DOE records management system is about the same for LSS .
found MS. KERRIGAN: That's right. That's what we found out.
e. MR. CLINE: Very close, very close.
And currently the DOE is in our microfilm base. But as I indicated earlier, they want to go to an electronic image, which should result in cost savings as well.
tion MR. HENKEL: Can I just ask a clarifying question on that?

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

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

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

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

MR. CLINE: Oh no. Oh dear.

sing. MR. LEVIN: That's kind of honesty in adverti

m. MR. CAMERON: Wait until you get on the syste
You know the seltzer bottles --

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

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

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

MR. MURPHY: There is no scenario one in here

What's scenario one?

MR. CLINE: Scenario 1 is our base case, and IS the current system. And as I indicated earlier, the current system is a microfilm system. And we just use -- we just carried that along, but it is in the intent DOE to go beyond that.

And as I say in the next viewgraph, the scenario 1 is not compliant with subpart J, so it's -- for a number of reasons.

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

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

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

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

ML993370056.txt

the image by electronic means.

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

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

MR. CLINE: Yes.

maybe
I don't -- maybe I'm just not understanding what you're
saying. I'm sitting in front of my monitor and I want
to
pull up something that has to do with --

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

MR. MURPHY: On my monitor.

MR. CLINE: Right.

l
see
the
actual image of the page.
text to your printer right there. But if you wanted to
the actual -- what you're seeing on your screen is not
actual image of the page.

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

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

MR. CLINE: If you want the image or picture

--
guys
screwed it up then I have to ask for it my mail.

a
photo or table.

What about tables and stuff, the same?

MR. CLINE: Yes, for the most part.

MR. METTAM: Yes it is available or?

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

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

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

MR. CLINE: Development.

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

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

current design.

MR. CLINE: You can do a word search.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

t
to
re is
vious
rsus

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

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

I'm
n

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

we

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

one

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

it.

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

ions
s to
nd
ith
er

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

it is
oceed
th
up

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

ould

y

phy

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

That's all I have.

?

MR. HOYLE: Are there other questions of Mike

Brad.

or

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

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

the

MR. CLINE: Transcripts. We went through all

records, all the past transcripts.

ave

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

d

analysis and capture of dissemination page volumes. An

y.

when you had that you said highly dependent on relevanc

And my question is who determines relevancy?

, you

MR. CLINE: Well that has to be evaluated and

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

aps

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

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

Moe

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

of

our documents for their own.

he

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

the

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

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

MR. LEVIN: Absolutely.

MR. CAMERON: -- business. And the relevance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ater

of

nt

cords

and

r our

ure.

your

ated

.

ords

, you

our

ust

ly

fort

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

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

MS. NEWBURY: Everything.

MR. CLINE: Everything.

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

MR. CLINE: But the system is capturing everything.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. SILBERG: What is the projected volume as

opposed to this relative factor analysis?

MR. CLINE: For what year, 2001?

MR. SILBERG: For 10 years or.

MR. CLINE: Jim, for 90 percent relevancy do

we

have.

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

ure

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

ar

would you like?

MR. METTAM: 2001.

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

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

it's

approximately 32 million pages.

MR. SILBERG: Wait, wait.

MR. MURPHY: Jim, these are cumulative.

MR. CLINE: These are cumulative.

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

what

2001 totals would be for that year.

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

MR. METTAM: We can tape them all together.

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

stem

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

w.

MS. KERRIGAN: Today, the total number of rec

ords.

MR. DICKERSON: Today's?

MR. CLINE: Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: There are 8 million pages in

the

record system today at 2 o'clock.

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

e can

find what the normalization of this number is here for

this

bar graph. You've got a relative factor.

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

e

detail later.

MR. CLINE: Our numbers are still bouncing ar

ound

a bit.

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

sort

we

with

t

is

s,

ey're

w big

what

ns on

tem.

thing

el as

ago

ow I

you

sions

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

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

MR. HOYLE: No.

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

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

MR. HOYLE: No, it's not.

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

MR. DAVENPORT: Right, they're sizing the system. MR. CAMERON: And I also, I mean this is something that's going to be presented to the advisory review panel as well as the NRC for comment, as I understand it.

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

are going to affect what the system is going to be like

.
over
by

And you're not supervising it. I mean it's being done there. It's not being done in NRC, it's not being done your contract.

f
f the

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

lieve

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

ead

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

MR. LEVIN: Right.

nt in

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

ne of
is

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

he

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

MR. LEVIN: Correct.

the

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

rt of

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

MR. LEVIN: Not operation.

ars
prior to '89.

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

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

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

MR. CLINE: Not at all.

their
purview.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MURPHY: By then?

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

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

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

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

ton?
MR. BECHTEL: Would the meeting be in Washing

guess
MR. HOYLE: No, either Las Vegas or Reno. I
we haven't been to Reno.

,
MR. HENKEL: Save the winter meeting for Reno
okay?

d
MS. NEWBURY: We'd like to offer Las Vegas an
allow time for a tour of UNLV and the facility there if
anyone is interested in looking at OCR capability.

the
s
MR. HOYLE: I appreciate you mentioning that,
Claudia, because Tom Nartker did call me and he invited
panel to make a tour, and obviously we need to be in La
Vegas to do that.

Is elk season one day or is it all week?

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

it's
MR. DAVENPORT: If he uses an assault weapon,
quick.

sting
e
r
MR. HOYLE: Chip is making a -- Chip is sugge
we give DOE time to be sure that they're ready, maybe w
should be looking at mid November. Did somebody earlie
tell me that mid November was not good?

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

MR. HOYLE: When is that, 17th?

MS. NEWBURY: 17th and 18th.

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

tend
MS. NEWBURY: Election day is that week, I in
to for vote for my senator from Nevada.
MR. HOYLE: If a number of you are coming to
Washington for that meeting do we want --
this
MR. MURPHY: This is very, very tentative at
point in time, but there is a technical exchange on TBM
activity in Las Vegas on the 7th and 8th of November.
It
wouldn't be a real, real big risk if you bet your home
right
now that the TBM will not be ready for a technical exch
ange
on its status by the 7th of November, it may not even b
e
started yet.
er,
MR. HENKEL: At least until the 9th of Novemb
right?
MR. MURPHY: That's not necessarily the same
people involved in that, but, that might be, the 7th of
November might be doable.
MR. HOYLE: How about the Tuesday the 8th?
1st,
MR. MURPHY: What about the week of October 3
what's the matter with that?
MR. CUMMINGS: 31st is a holiday.
not a
MR. MURPHY: October 31st is Halloween, it's
holiday.
MR. CAMERON: In Vegas it is.
MR. POE: In Nevada it is an official state
holiday.
MR. MURPHY: What about some other day that w
eek.
MR. POE: He was suggesting what, Tuesday the
7th.
MR. HOYLE: We're going off the record.
[Discussion off the record.]
MR. HOYLE: Let's set November the 8th in Las
Vegas. I would ask DOE if we could use their facility
used
again, I think that worked out all right last time. We
a training room.
a
MS. NEWBURY: I'll see if I can get something
little nicer if we have more advance notice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to discuss at the next meeting.

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

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

MR. HOYLE: You better go off again.

[Discussion off the record.]

t MR. HOYLE: I think we'll try to pick the nex
date in December when we are in Las Vegas.

ls MR. DRAPKIN: Since DOE will have the materia
ready way ahead of our meeting is it possible to get a
set of the report distributed so that we are all prepared f
or that meeting.

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

Can DOE circulate material to us when it is
available?

rials MS. NEWBURY: I can provide you with the mate
before the meeting, yes. I'm not sure if it will be th
e full report or things pulled out of it. I'm not sure w
hat I'm getting yet, but I will provide you with informatio
n before the meeting.

, MR. DRAPKIN: That will come through you John
disseminate it out?

MR. HOYLE: That's fine with me.

Do you want to send it to me, Claudia?

MS. NEWBURY: Yes.

tatus MR. HOYLE: I think we'll spend a moment on s
of the topical guidelines, Chip?

ouple MR. CAMERON: As you know, there has been a c
of rounds of comment on the topical guidelines, the
regulatory guide on that. And the draft version that w
as put out for comment was put out in July of last year, a
nd we've received written comments from a lot of the panel

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

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

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

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

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

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

should pick up on that at the next meeting.

Future agenda discussion. We've decided to meet

on December the 12th and 13th, and we have at least one topic, and that is DOE's report to us.

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

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

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

Were you informed that have suggestion?

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

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

MR. LEVIN: He haven't seen it.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. NEWBURY: I'm sure it did.

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

thus inputted into the LSS?

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

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

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

insignificant as not putting MPC data and information into the LSS; that I cannot imagine you doing anything dumber than that.

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

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

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

accelerate the development of the LSS so that indeed it

may

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

s

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

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

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

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

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

m DOE

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

any

other business that anyone would like to discuss? In t

hat

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

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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before

the

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: LSS ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

ML993370056.txt

nal
clear
d to

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

—
td.

Official Reporter
Ann Riley & Associates, L