

2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel

Report Run Date: 07/10/2025 03:01:46 AM

1. Department or Agency

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Fiscal Year

2025

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Licensing Support Network Advisory
Review Panel

3b. GSA

Committee No.

1104

4. Is this New Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

12/16/2024

6. Expected Renewal Date

12/16/2026

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

42 U.S.C. 2201

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 2201

13. Effective Date

01/19/1975

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Non Scientific Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for
this Fiscal Year

17a. Open

0

17b. Closed

0

17c. Partially Closed

0

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next
FY FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission relied on the Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel (LSNARP) for advice and recommendations on the design and operation of the searchable electronic database (Licensing Support Network (LSN)) for documents that were relevant to the licensing of a geologic repository for the storage of high-level nuclear waste as defined in 10 CFR 2.1003. The document collection contained

electronic copies of all of the material that was used by parties in the NRC's licensing proceeding for a high-level radioactive waste repository. The LSN was loaded with more than 3.7 million documents beginning in FY-2004 and continuing through FY-2011. Document addition continued during FY-2011, however, no committee meetings were held since December 2003. DOE had planned on submitting an application to build a high-level waste disposal facility at Yucca Mountain, Nevada in December 2004, however delays occurred, and, in the spring of 2006, DOE issued a revised schedule. DOE certified their LSN document collection in late 2007 and submitted a License application to the NRC in June 2008. The delay in DOE's program negated any need for LSN meetings during this period. During FY 2010 DOE asked to withdraw the Yucca Mountain License Application pending before the NRC. In FY-2011 through FY2018, Congress did not appropriate any funds for DOE or NRC for the Licensing of the Yucca Mountain Application. NRC shut down the licensing review in FY-2011 and preserved the record of the proceeding. The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that presided over the application hearing ordered the parties to submit their LSN document collections to the NRC Secretary for preservation. The LSN system was decommissioned at the close of FY-2011. Litigation continued before the DC Circuit Court in FY-2012 and in August 2013 the DC Circuit issued a Writ of Mandamus. During FY-2017 the NRC staff worked on documentation of their Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mtn repository using carryover funding. In FY 2017 the Commission authorized moving forward with information gathering activities to prepare for reestablishing a Document system should funding be appropriated

for resuming the Adjudicatory Proceeding. A virtual meeting was held in FY 2018.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The LSNARP is a Representational Committee and the membership was balanced by being drawn from among the full spectrum of parties to NRC's licensing proceeding for the burial of high level radioactive waste. Since the site under review is in Nevada, the membership includes the State of Nevada, local county governments of both Nevada and California, Indian tribes (represented by the National Congress of American Indians), and an environmental group (the Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force). It also included the nuclear industry, the potential licensee (DOE) and the licensing agency (NRC). Input by these representatives was essential to the success of the LSN project. In preparation for the FY2018 meeting, the members, as necessary, have designated new representatives.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

A meeting in was held in FY2018. No meetings have been held since that time.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The Committee was formed as part of a negotiated rulemaking to oversee the operation of the LSN. The advice provided by the state, county and tribal governmental units, together with other parties and potential users of the LSN and EHD, was unique to this particular computer application. It was not available from other existing committees or within the NRC itself. NRC considers it essential that advice on the design of the software

and hardware should come from representatives of the hands-on users of the LSN.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The LSNARP did not hold any closed meetings in FY 2024. If a meeting needed to be closed, it would be done in accordance with 5 U.S.C 552(b).

21. Remarks

In FY2024, Congress did not appropriate any funds for DOE or NRC for the Licensing of the Yucca Mountain Application. In August 2013 the DC Circuit Court issued a Writ of Mandamus ordering the NRC to "promptly continue with the legally mandated licensing process" for DOE's Yucca Mountain application using the carry over funds available. During FY2017 the Commission used available carryover funding to continue the documentation that supported the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued in 2016. Cleanup and documentation of the 2016 loading of 3.7 million documents from the LSN into a publicly accessible electronic library as part of the NRC's ADAMS document management system to fulfill the Courts mandate was completed. A Commission decision to gather the information necessary to move forward with the HLW Adjudication was made and a Letter was sent to all of the former Organizations and contacts seeking updated information in preparation for a virtual meeting of the Committee in FY 2018. In FY2018, a meeting of the LSNARP was held to provide information to, and gather input from, LSNARP members and the public regarding reconstitution or the Licensing Support Network (LSN) or a suitable replacement system. Future actions are dependent on Congressional appropriations.

Designated Federal Officer

Russell E Chazell DFO

Narrative Description

Under the Nuclear waste Policy Act the NRC is responsible for Licensing a High Level Radioactive Waste facility. The Committee supports the Commission in providing advice on making all of the relevant documents electronically available to the parties and/or potential parties to the licensing proceeding. The comprehensive document collection is intended to expedite the adjudicatory process by providing an easily searchable document collection.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if
Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>

\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

The Nuclear industry estimated in Congressional testimony in 1999 that the cost of adding waste storage at reactors was roughly \$537 million per year. The LSN was intended to enable an expedited discovery process. The exact time savings is unknown, but even several months saves a considerable amount in during the adjudicatory process.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

0

Number of Recommendations Comments

The meeting held in FY2018 was intended to provide information to, and gather input from, the LSNARP members and the public regarding reconstitution of the LSN or a suitable replacement system. No final recommendations were made.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

Data not available.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Data not available.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒

Agency Feedback Comments

Feedback has been provided through follow up meetings and/or written reports.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

Issuance of Guidelines, procedures, regulations for operation of the LSN and electronic submittal of documents to the NRC.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

All Committee documents are in the NRC Public Documents Collection at
<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>