U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE) TOPICAL REPORT ON DISPOSAL CRITICALITY ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Enclosed is DOE’s Disposal Criticality Analysis Methodology Topical Report (YMP/TR-004Q, Revision 0) for review by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). To facilitate your review, we are enclosing one copy of those references cited in the topical report that may not be readily available for your use. We have had many substantive interactions with your staff on our approach to disposal criticality analysis, and we look forward to the results of your acceptance and technical reviews of the topical report.

As we discussed with your staff in the most recent of these interactions (an Appendix 7 meeting on October 7, 1998), we are requesting NRC’s review and comments on DOE’s disposal criticality analysis methodology and the planned approach to validating the methodology. As you are aware, we will be requesting your review of the application of the methodology to specific waste forms and waste package designs at repository conditions when we have determined those specific conditions. We will continue to discuss these key areas with you and your staff to keep you informed as these issues are resolved.

Criticality analyses will use information on projected postclosure conditions when this information is available, based on design selection and design development sufficient to support detailed analyses of waste package and repository conditions for the chosen design. If our approach is acceptable, the license application and its supporting references would contain: 1) the demonstration that the methodology is valid for use under specific waste form, waste package, and repository conditions, and; 2) criticality analyses using the validated methodology.

The methodology presented in this topical report is risk-informed. It supports calculation of the probability and consequences of postclosure criticality, both of which will be inputs to the total system performance assessment that will support the license application. We believe the methodology presented in this topical report will support compliance with the risk-informed regulations currently under consideration by the NRC, as indicated in the draft 10 CFR Part 63. We agree with the NRC that risk-informed analysis is the best approach to providing reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be adversely affected by potential postclosure criticality.

In addition to this topical report, a submittal to the NRC on the subject of disposal criticality is planned. In September 1999, we plan to submit an addendum to this topical report that will describe the analysis methodology appropriate for naval spent fuel. The methodology described in this report, with minor exceptions, is planned for use for degraded naval fuel. However, a more deterministic methodology is
proposed for intact naval fuel as a result of its unique design. This methodology would employ different
codes, cross sections, and benchmarks to validate naval fuel calculational methods and results.

On a related subject, we discussed with your staff at the recent Appendix 7 meeting (referenced above)
disposition of NRC’s October 4, 1995 comments on the annotated outline for this topical report. As we
noted in the meeting, the three-year interval between development of the annotated outline and
completion of the topical report has resulted in a substantial maturation of our approach, as reflected in
differences between the annotated outline and the structure of the final topical report. We believe we
have addressed the staff’s comments on the annotated outline in the final topical report, where
appropriate. However, we look forward to your confirmation that your original comments on the
annotated outline have been adequately resolved.

Again, we look forward to your review of the topical report, as well as to future interactions with your
staff on the report and on the subject of postclosure criticality. If you have any questions, please call
Paige R.Z. Russell at (702) 794-1315, or April V. Gil at (702) 794-5578.

Stephan Brocoom
Acting Assistant Manager, Office of
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