

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**ORIGINAL**

Title: Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste  
130th Meeting  
Workshop on Research Needs

PROCESS USING ADAMS  
TEMPLATE: ACRS/ACNW-005

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, November 27, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-118

Pages 1-272

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 234-4433

TR08

**ACNW OFFICE COPY - RETAIN FOR  
THE LIFE OF THE COMMITTEE**

DISCLAIMER

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE

NOVEMBER 27, 2001

The contents of this transcript of the proceedings of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste, as reported herein, is a record of the discussions recorded at the meeting held on the above date.

This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, and edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

**NEAL R. GROSS**  
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW)

130TH MEETING

WORKSHOP ON RESEARCH NEEDS

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

NOVEMBER 27, 2001

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The workshop met at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, Room T2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, at 9:45 a.m., George M. Hornberger, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- |                      |                 |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| GEORGE M. HORNBERGER | Chairman        |
| RAYMOND G. WYMER     | Vice Chairman   |
| B. JOHN GARRICK      | Member          |
| MILTON N. LEVENSON   | Member          |
| WILLIAM J. HINZE     | ACNW Consultant |

1 ACNW STAFF PRESENT:

2 RICHARD P. SAVIO

3 SHER BAHADUR

4 JOHN T. LARKINS

5

6 NRC STAFF PRESENT:

7 ASHOK C. THADANI

8 MARTIN J. VIRGILIO

9 TIMOTHY J. McCARTIN

10 WILLIAM R. OTT

11

12 ACRS MEMBER PRESENT:

13 MARIO V. BONACA

14

15 ALSO PRESENT:

16 KENNETH ROGERS, Private Consultant

17 MALCOLM KNAPP, Private Consultant

18 MICHAEL T. RYAN, Charleston Southern

19 University

20 WESLEY C. PATRICK, Southwest Research

21 Institute

22 BUDHI SAGAR, Southwest Research Institute

23 JOHN H. KESSLER, Electric Power Research

24 Institute

25 ANDY CAMPBELL

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

ALSO PRESENT: (cont'd)

JANE LONG

JOHN WILSON

JEFFREY POHLE

BILL REAMER

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I N D E X

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

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introductory Remarks . . . . .	5
Technical Issues Associated with Regulatory Decisions	
Ashok Thadani . . . . .	9
Marty Virgilio . . . . .	20
Kenneth Rogers . . . . .	31
Malcolm Knapp . . . . .	43
John Kessler . . . . .	53
Question and Answer Period . . . . .	65
Knowledge and Technical Tools Needed for Future Decisions	
Budhi Sagar . . . . .	92
Malcolm Knapp . . . . .	115
John Kessler . . . . .	136
Michael Ryan . . . . .	162
Jane Long . . . . .	188
Panelist Comments	
William Hinze . . . . .	212
Tim McCartin . . . . .	221
William Ott . . . . .	227
Presentation by NRC Staff	
Jeff Pohle . . . . .	251

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

(9:48 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Good morning again,  
and welcome to the workshop portion of our 130th ACNW  
meeting.

Let's see. First, just an announcement to  
start off with. We had a written communication from  
Mel Silverburg related to the ACNW Research Needs  
Workshop. If anyone needs -- wants a copy of that,  
please see one of our staff members and we will make  
sure that they're available.

MR. LARKINS: That will be entered into  
the record also.

CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: And it will be  
entered into the record. It will be part of the  
record. Thanks, John.

So we have -- I'll thank at the outset all  
of the -- our distinguished guests who have agreed to  
come here. We really appreciate this. I think I'm  
looking forward to an interesting session.

Just a bit of background perhaps. The  
ACNW I think it was three years ago became responsible  
for providing review comments on research at the  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And the ACNW has lots  
of things that it does, and overview of research is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 only one of them.

2 We have -- the ACNW has heard from the  
3 Office of Research, which is the body within the NRC  
4 specifically charged with research. We have over this  
5 past year, in fact, heard presentations from several  
6 people on research being conducted under the auspices  
7 of the Office of Research -- leach -- for example,  
8 leaching of radionuclides from slag, aspects of  
9 radionuclide transport, and hydrology.

10 The ACNW, however, also is engaged pretty  
11 heavily in the NRC evaluation of the proposed Yucca  
12 Mountain repository, and that work is overseen by the  
13 Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards,  
14 NMSS, and a lot of that work is done by the Center for  
15 Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis.

16 That is officially called technical  
17 assistance. As an academic, I think of research as  
18 being, for example, something that is done that  
19 creates new knowledge and often leads to publications.  
20 Let's say in my field it might be in the Journal of  
21 Geophysical Research.

22 There's a fair bit of the technical  
23 assistance that goes on at the Center for Nuclear  
24 Waste Regulatory Analysis that results in such  
25 publications. And so the ACNW, thinking that it walks

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like a duck, and so forth and so forth, and quacks, we  
2 have incorporated that -- those aspects of the Center,  
3 the work done by the Center, and by the NMSS staff  
4 under our review of research as well.

5 So we don't make a distinction as to  
6 budgetary lines or anything else. What we're here to  
7 do is to consider what the NRC should be doing as a  
8 body and not just restricted to the budgetary  
9 constraints.

10 We've periodically grappled not so much  
11 with the specific review of individual research  
12 projects, but we've tried to take an overview on the  
13 scope of the work being done. Certainly, we look at  
14 the quality of the work, but we -- much more the scope  
15 of the work.

16 The other thing that we grapple with a lot  
17 is that the Office of Research has a very modest  
18 budget for research, and it's pretty clear that in  
19 trying to get the most for the least one has to face  
20 up to how one prioritizes. And so a lot of the  
21 comments that the ACNW has made back to the Commission  
22 has to do with making sure that appropriate  
23 prioritization schemes are in place.

24 All right. So with sort of that  
25 background as to what the ACNW has done in the past,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what we had envisioned coming out of this workshop,  
2 what we hope to get out of this workshop are -- is  
3 information that will help us advise the Commission.  
4 That's our job.

5 And in fact the objective, as stated in  
6 the paper in front of you, to develop insights as to  
7 the information and technical tools that will be  
8 needed for future NRC regulatory decisions --  
9 decisions related to the management, storage, and  
10 disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste, and how  
11 research can be used in making these decisions.

12 We've tried to organize the presentations  
13 to a certain extent. I also -- I know how these  
14 things go. I doubt that we'll be able to hold to the  
15 specifics of this structure. But, nevertheless, the  
16 overall structure is to look at the technical issues  
17 associated with regulatory decisions and then move on  
18 to the knowledge and technical tools that will be  
19 needed for those future decisions, and then to talk  
20 about what research is needed, and, finally, to  
21 consider how one might come up with prioritization, to  
22 make sure that the highest priorities really are being  
23 addressed.

24 That's our hope, and my fondest hope is,  
25 of course, that we will have some lively discussion

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 involving not just our panel members in the ACNW but  
2 other interested people whom we can engage in the  
3 audience.

4 With that, I think we'll move right into  
5 our presentations. And, let's see, who -- do we know  
6 -- is this schedule -- Dick, help me out. Is this  
7 going to go -- do you have the names in order?

8 MR. SAVIO: In the order.

9 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: In the order?

10 MR. SAVIO: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: So Ashok Thadani is  
12 going to lead off. Is that right? Yes?

13 MR. THADANI: Would you like for me to be  
14 in front, so you can actually look me straight in the  
15 eye?

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Yes, we want to look  
17 at you.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. THADANI: Well, first, let me thank  
20 you for inviting me to participate in this workshop.  
21 As you well know, obviously, it's of great interest to  
22 me and the Office of Research, the deliberations that  
23 are going to take place over the next two days.  
24 Clearly, it's -- the whole issue of management of  
25 disposal of radioactive waste is a very critical

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issue.

2 Over the last year or year and a half,  
3 certainly the climate has changed in this country, and  
4 I'll withhold what has happened since September 11th,  
5 addressing that issue. But, nevertheless, the climate  
6 has changed. There were those who were talking about  
7 renaissance of nuclear power, potentially significant  
8 number of nuclear powerplants being built.

9 But I think the public will demand and  
10 deserves clear resolution of the issue of waste. I  
11 think it will be an important issue in my view as to  
12 what happens and whether we do, in fact, end up with  
13 any new nuclear powerplants in this country.

14 Now, since I came to the Office of  
15 Research, it was fairly clear to me that the trend of  
16 declining -- continued declining resources had to be  
17 arrested, and the desire, of course, was that it could  
18 be reversed as a matter of fact. And this is  
19 important to be able to maintain a strong technical  
20 capability to support various regulatory decisions and  
21 the independence of those regulatory decisions.

22 And in that regard, of course, we have  
23 benefitted greatly from the advice and the reviews  
24 done by this committee, the ACRS, and, more recently,  
25 the expert panel that was headed by Dr. Rogers, who is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here, of course. Dr. Rogers noted in the report --  
2 the panel report -- that research must have efficient  
3 resources such that research is an unassailable source  
4 of technical information and support for regulatory  
5 decisions.

6 And in order to ensure that the role and  
7 responsibilities of the Office of Research are better  
8 recognized, we prepared a Commission paper -- it was  
9 SECY 99-281 in December of 1999, which articulated the  
10 vision of the Office of Research and the roles and  
11 responsibilities of the office.

12 Now, you will hear -- both Jack Rosenthal  
13 and Bill Ott are going to be participating in dialogue  
14 during these two days. They will talk about technical  
15 issues as well as the prioritization scheme that I  
16 know is of particular interest to you. I'll touch  
17 upon it, but there will be further discussion of that  
18 issue.

19 Now, this is the articulation of the  
20 vision as documented in the report I talked about, the  
21 SECY report. I just want to highlight some points  
22 here. We see our responsibility as not just  
23 developing technical basis for issues that we know  
24 about, but also responsibility to be probing/searching  
25 to see if, in fact, there are some issues that are not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 being addressed by the agency that deserve attention.

2 And yet another important element is to  
3 look to future, over the horizon as the Chairman says,  
4 to see what may be down the road and are we preparing  
5 ourselves for that future. It is important because as  
6 -- you know this as well or better than I do -- that  
7 a lot of the research that perhaps needs to be  
8 undertaken, it takes time.

9 And we certainly don't want to be what I  
10 would call a bump in the road, so to speak, come in at  
11 the last minute, identify issues that need to be  
12 addressed, and say it's going to take us five years of  
13 research to get some technical resolution. So it's  
14 really critical for us to be -- that our thinking be  
15 more forward-looking than perhaps we've been in the  
16 recent past.

17 And our focus, by and large, is to ensure  
18 that we generate sufficient information, data, and  
19 methods, to be able to make realistic decisions. And  
20 I'll come back to this issue of why is it important to  
21 try and make realistic decisions.

22 While the offices -- NMSS and NRR --  
23 certainly are mostly focused on what I would call  
24 short-term challenges, it is our responsibility to be  
25 looking ahead. As part of that, we certainly seek

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 views from various parties in terms of what the issues  
2 might be and what is it that we should focus our  
3 attention on. And certainly the distribution, the  
4 wide distribution given to the radionuclide transport  
5 research is an example of how we would like to conduct  
6 our business.

7 Next slide, please.

8 There are just a few points there.  
9 There's nothing new in this chart that I'm sure that  
10 you don't know, but I'd like to make a few points. In  
11 terms of the confirmatory research, by and large those  
12 are areas where it takes a few months to maybe two  
13 years kind of effort. And we're certainly focused, as  
14 you know, on things like parameter uncertainty,  
15 probabilistic considerations, and DND, and waste rad.  
16 And you mentioned slag degradation in your remarks,  
17 and areas such as that.

18 In terms of anticipatory research or the  
19 longer term -- let me put it that way -- we've had  
20 some interesting discussions about the choice of that  
21 word "anticipatory." But in any case, we're certainly  
22 looking at things like concrete durability, conceptual  
23 model uncertainties, and so on.

24 The important issue, in my view, is that  
25 we really need to be sensitive to protecting our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resources focused on anticipatory research. I could  
2 go into example after example of how issues come up  
3 and we're looking for resources, and we have a  
4 tendency to go, what are we doing in our anticipatory  
5 research? And let's see if we can't delay that  
6 program.

7 That tends to add a certain amount of  
8 inefficiency in the process, but that's the way much  
9 of our business goes on. We are sensitive. We try  
10 not to get there, but it's sometimes pretty difficult.

11 And as I said, our focus is on making sure  
12 we have tools and models for realistic analysis. In  
13 the end, when one has to make a decision, it's not to  
14 imply that one must not be looking for margin, but it  
15 is understandable margin that we're looking for in the  
16 decisions that we make. And that's critical.

17 I think, again, we could -- my background  
18 is, of course, in reactors, and I can tell you how at  
19 one point when I first joined the agency I think there  
20 were 24 branches reviewing applications. And each  
21 technical reviewer in each branch wanted to have  
22 certain margin that he or she thought was appropriate.

23 In the end, I'm not sure we know what we  
24 have, how much -- or what we call "conservatism."  
25 It's not clear to me that it's actual conservatism.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Sometimes, in fact, that may lead to unnecessary use  
2 of resources or perhaps misunderstanding of what the  
3 realistic expectation might be.

4 Next slide, please.

5 The radionuclide transport research  
6 program plan, you have seen that plan. Only point I  
7 want to make here is simply that this is sort of  
8 trying to make sure we have some sound planning basis.  
9 We have had input reviews, for example, from NMSS,  
10 from NRR state programs, certainly from the public  
11 through the website and the Federal Register notice.

12 Also, we have sought input from peers at  
13 scientific and technical meetings. We certainly  
14 expect this process to end sometime in January, and we  
15 should be finalizing this plan by the end of January.

16 Well, where are we focused today? Again,  
17 let me just briefly note that over the next few years  
18 our focus is going to be largely on the issues  
19 identified here. In terms of the source term,  
20 certainly the chemical and physical form of  
21 contaminants and their evolution over time, engineered  
22 barriers, their performance, trying to understand  
23 rates of releases from the isolation unit to the  
24 environment.

25 Certainly, monitoring is necessary to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provide assurance of long-term performance, and this  
2 is all because, again, we really do not have  
3 sufficient data. Parameter uncertainties and  
4 conceptual model uncertainties are, as I indicated  
5 earlier, going to get significant attention.

6 And there is also, certainly, the question  
7 that currently we don't really have a single tool for  
8 systematically assessing some complex sites. So those  
9 are areas that are getting our current attention.

10 What are some of the challenges? As I  
11 indicated, my own -- this is a personal view, that it  
12 is extremely important for us to resolve this issue of  
13 waste disposal. I think there will be significant  
14 public support if we were to resolve this issue for  
15 new designs and new plants to be built here.

16 Nevertheless, we see a number of things  
17 down the road, over the horizon in some cases,  
18 certainly in terms of the transmutation of waste. We  
19 would need to address this, as you know, considerable  
20 interest. DOE seems to be marching on. They have  
21 significant resources in their budget, and they are  
22 looking to a multi-year effort here.

23 Currently, all we're doing in these areas  
24 is just monitoring. We are not expending any  
25 significant resources. Monitoring is done through

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 management keeping sort of track of what's going on,  
2 perhaps attending a few meetings, and so on.

3 Certainly, there are going to be areas in  
4 terms of low-level waste. I talked about the issues  
5 of the need to monitor. Perhaps one can figure out  
6 ways to get away from that.

7 Clearly, the potential vulnerabilities in  
8 terms of security and safeguards, we'll need to  
9 consider lessons learned, it seems to me, from the  
10 September 11th event, just in terms of new  
11 technologies and new designs that might be developed.  
12 Early attention to such considerations I think would  
13 lead to more efficient end results rather than not  
14 considering such situations up front.

15 So if I had to summarize, what do I see as  
16 some -- some important issues in my mind, certainly  
17 long-term research resources I think need to be  
18 protected. We need to continually focus on  
19 distribution of our resources amongst the three arenas  
20 that we work in in Research -- that is, reactors,  
21 waste, and material arenas.

22 I admit that the prioritization scheme  
23 that we had developed initially was probably somewhat  
24 unreasonable in terms of how we should distribute our  
25 resources. This year we have made some improvements

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in that, and I think you'll hear about that some more.

2 I think it's -- I'm not convinced that we  
3 are there yet. We need to work on it some more, and  
4 we certainly seek your ideas/recommendations on how we  
5 can improve that process.

6 An important issue also to me is to get a  
7 sense from you to know whether you think we are  
8 properly focused on issues you believe are important  
9 today. I want to really acknowledge the thoughtful  
10 letter that you sent in February of this year. I  
11 think -- certainly, I thought it was a very good  
12 letter. In fact, it was discussed at the expert panel  
13 discussions, and there was a general view that that  
14 was the direction the office should be considering.

15 And we had some -- we've had, as you know,  
16 a very thorough evaluation of our programs in the  
17 reactor arena, and it was a very clear focus on, are  
18 we doing the right things in the office, given today's  
19 knowledge and understanding? And it was of great  
20 value to us in the office, but even equally important  
21 I'm sure it was very important to the Commission to  
22 get some independent views and thoughts in that area.

23 So I would seek your views in that  
24 appropriate time to see if you think we're focused on  
25 the right things.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           An area that is consistent in my view with  
2           the philosophy that was articulated in your letter,  
3           one that we believe in, we agree with, is where you  
4           need to be thinking about some alternatives, some  
5           other ways. Other things need to be considered, and  
6           this is the time to do it.

7           Now, the question is, obviously, of  
8           resources. And given the -- some boundaries there,  
9           what are the right things that the office should  
10          really be looking at? That's going to be a focus of  
11          our attention in the near term.

12          And, finally, it is critical for us as an  
13          office. And ever since I've come to Research we have  
14          increased our cooperative agreements with both  
15          domestic organizations, DOE, EPA, and others in this  
16          country, including EPRI, as well as the international  
17          community. I mean, these are common problems that we  
18          all face, so it is essential that we form some teams,  
19          leverage, or resources as we go forward.

20          So if I had to -- those are the key issues  
21          in my mind. And, again, I want to thank you for  
22          asking me to share some of my thoughts with you.

23                   CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thanks very much,  
24                   Ashok.

25                   What I'm going to do is, because I would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like to maintain some semblance of a schedule, is we  
2 are going to move on, and there will be some time for  
3 discussion I think at the end of presentations.

4 Before we go on to the next one, I  
5 neglected -- I had earlier introduced my colleagues  
6 Milton Ray. And I wanted to make sure that I did  
7 introduce John Garrick, whose plane did arrive from  
8 Nashville as we had hoped. And also to welcome a new  
9 member of the ACNW for today, Mario Bonaca, who is  
10 with the ACRS but he is an honorary member of ACNW  
11 today.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MEMBER GARRICK: So that means he really  
14 fits in with us here.

15 (Laughter.)

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Okay. And so next  
17 we're going to hear the -- an NMSS perspective. Marty  
18 Virgilio is going to have some comments.

19 MR. VIRGILIO: Good morning. It's a  
20 pleasure to be here with the committee again, and also  
21 with the invited guests, some of which I work with  
22 today and some of which I worked with and for in  
23 former years. So it's really a very good collection  
24 of experts that you've pulled together today. And I  
25 do want to give you a little perspective on NMSS

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 views.

2 My name is Marty Virgilio, for those of  
3 you who don't know me, and I am the Director of the  
4 Office of NMSS.

5 On the next slide, what I just wanted to  
6 do is just lay out a little bit of background in terms  
7 of where we are with regard to user needs and  
8 anticipatory research. I think NMSS and Research  
9 together have made significant progress over the past  
10 several years in developing confirmatory research  
11 programs for today's regulatory needs, since Ashok and  
12 his staff and our staff have worked very well  
13 together.

14 And I think when I look at the user need  
15 process that's in effect today for support of our  
16 today decisions, I see a very successful program where  
17 except where we're limited by resources we really are  
18 getting the support we need from Research to make the  
19 decisions that we make today.

20 We have synchronized our operating plans,  
21 and so we have deliverables. We know when they're  
22 due, and we know what's expected. So we've defined  
23 success, defined schedules, and I think that program  
24 is working very well today.

25 Anticipatory research is another matter.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It's not that it's not working well today, but I think  
2 it's an opportunity for us to make some significant  
3 improvements. I think about anticipatory research, as  
4 George spoke in his opening remarks, that goes beyond  
5 today's existing regulatory programs. It's  
6 anticipated what could be needed in the future and  
7 acting on that.

8 Anticipatory research I think needs to  
9 focus. It needs to be identified early on, and it  
10 needs to be prioritized. So we are working on the  
11 right things.

12 NMSS and Research and ACNW and other  
13 stakeholders I think need to work together in this  
14 process, and I look forward to the discussions today  
15 and future discussions around anticipatory research.  
16 In general, I'll go back and sort of underscore what  
17 I just said. I think that we all need to play a  
18 greater, more proactive role in anticipatory research  
19 than we've done in the past.

20 I think we need to be more proactive in  
21 providing input to Research on anticipatory projects  
22 and achieving I think in the front end of the project  
23 some notion of what we think success might be, and  
24 then actively engaging in monitoring the results that  
25 come out of the programs as they're being implemented,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the final results of the projects.

2 In my short discussion today, I'm going to  
3 give some broad views and some ideas where  
4 anticipatory research could probe in support of maybe  
5 some future needs. These are not I think well  
6 developed or mature in thought. They are more to put  
7 suggestions and ideas before you to stimulate your  
8 thinking and your input. And it follows along the  
9 lines of some of the areas where Ashok has suggested  
10 that we anticipate and explore. So I think they are  
11 very complementary presentations.

12 On the next slide, I just wanted to go  
13 into the area of low-level waste disposal and provide  
14 some thoughts there. The citing of low-level waste  
15 disposal facilities, as you well know, is at a  
16 standstill, primarily due to public opposition and not  
17 really the technical issues. Anticipatory research on  
18 environmental monitoring and economical waste packages  
19 I think might improve NRC's regulatory programs and,  
20 therefore, improve public confidence and reduce  
21 opposition to low-level waste disposal.

22 Improved techniques for monitoring and  
23 detecting radionuclides in the environment could be  
24 used to improve our understanding for estimating  
25 transport in the geosphere and provide assurances to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the public that releases are well understood and are  
2 well within safety limits.

3 Anticipatory research could be used to  
4 also support economical container designs that provide  
5 high confidence for containment of radionuclides, on  
6 the order of 300 years or more. This is not for us to  
7 design the container, but I think to scope and  
8 characterize what the needs might be.

9 I think we would also see some potential  
10 benefits from research that would support development  
11 of regulatory criteria for assured isolation, waste  
12 management facilities, and also for alternates, maybe  
13 shallow land disposal of greater than Class C waste.

14 On the next slide, I want to talk a little  
15 bit about decommissioning and materials regulation, so  
16 think about that broader title as I go through some of  
17 the talking points here.

18 Similar to low-level waste disposal I  
19 think license termination under restricted release  
20 could benefit from some improvements in our techniques  
21 and instrumentation for monitoring and detecting  
22 radionuclides in the geosphere. Additional  
23 anticipatory research could help us understand  
24 alternatives for institutional controls, which is a  
25 real stumbling block for us today.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We've been working trying to get  
2 cooperative arrangements, memorandum of understanding  
3 with DOE and for institutional controls, and that's --  
4 we're not making much progress in that area. So I do  
5 see that institutional controls are going to be a  
6 significant issue for us in decommissioning some of  
7 our sites in the future.

8                   What Research can do in this area is help  
9 us understand better what passive and active controls  
10 might be most effective for some of the conditions  
11 that we deal with, what active and passive controls  
12 might help us in understanding and controlling  
13 transport in various environmental settings and  
14 characterizing the source term.

15                   How can the human interfere, or how can  
16 the human activity change the transport or the source  
17 term? These are some issues that I think might help  
18 us in the area of institutional controls.

19                   Ashok mentioned entombment. I think  
20 that's another area where we could benefit from  
21 anticipatory research, understanding -- and I think  
22 Ashok mentioned concrete grouts, how they perform in  
23 the longer term. I think it's an area worth  
24 considering.

25                   Now draw the line on site decommissioning

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 -- and I just wanted to speak for a minute about  
2 materials regulation. We believe, to the extent  
3 permissible or supportable, by the information that we  
4 have available we ought to be using risk information  
5 in making our decisions. Both risk assessments and  
6 risk management techniques I think need to be part of  
7 anticipatory research.

8 We've done a lot of work in the reactor  
9 arena, and I think we're just starting to do some  
10 meaningful work today in the waste and materials  
11 arena. I think we've had Lawrence Kokiko on the staff  
12 come over and brief you on where we are with our case  
13 studies and some of the efforts that we've been doing  
14 around developing safety goals in the waste and  
15 materials arena.

16 I think this is pretty exciting work, and  
17 I really look forward to future interactions with you  
18 not only in developing these tools but also looking  
19 out into the future and seeing how we could apply  
20 them, how we could make a difference.

21 I think here anticipatory research could  
22 be used to help improve the methods that we're just  
23 now formulating about risk analysis in these areas.  
24 I think it's important to recognize the strengths and  
25 limitations of the approaches we have in health

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 physics today.

2                   Understanding the radiation effects on man  
3 continue to evolve. And I know Research has been  
4 engaged in anticipatory work in this area, and I think  
5 we need to continue these efforts to better understand  
6 how the program is evolving, how our knowledge is  
7 evolving, and how that evolving knowledge could change  
8 our regulatory programs.

9                   On high-level waste, our regulations  
10 require us to have a performance confirmation plan  
11 that means -- that would help us have increased  
12 confidence in the decisionmaking that we're going to  
13 be making about a repository.

14                   The performance confirmation program I  
15 think could involve anticipatory research, testing,  
16 and monitoring on extremely long time scales. We're  
17 talking about thinking on the order of hundreds of  
18 years down the road. That's truly anticipatory  
19 research.

20                   Accelerated tests could be evaluated over  
21 the extended performance confirmation period and could  
22 be used to help us provide more realistic  
23 extrapolations of test results and improved methods  
24 for estimating corrosion rates and other things about  
25 the waste packages.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We're dealing with slow processes in the  
2 geologic systems and releases of spent fuel and  
3 information along these lines. Anticipatory research  
4 in these areas I think would be very helpful. I think  
5 we also need to establish and continue to look forward  
6 to, how are we going to monitor performance? What  
7 kind of performance indicators might we have for this  
8 elongated period of performance confirmation? And I  
9 think that's an area where we could do some more  
10 anticipatory work.

11                   Looking down the road, I think there are  
12 other potential topics for high-level research. Ashok  
13 touched upon safeguards issues and security issues.  
14 I think about remote sensing techniques that would  
15 help us understand or provide information on the  
16 integrity of the physical protection systems is an  
17 area that might be worthy of exploration. So that's  
18 how you bring safeguards into this I think on an  
19 anticipatory, long-term scale.

20                   We've got -- we've had a number of delays  
21 in the high-level waste program for a variety of  
22 reasons. We may, in fact, be looking at having our  
23 casks -- storage casks stand for longer periods of  
24 time or have to stand for longer periods of time than  
25 we originally anticipated. So I think here might be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another opportunity for some anticipatory research,  
2 looking at and probing at what new materials might be  
3 best for long-term surface storage.

4           Recently, we've also had a number of  
5 discussions and a renewed interest about advanced  
6 reactors. One of the areas that I don't know that  
7 we've put enough emphasis on is the back end of the  
8 process about what are kind of -- what are the fuels  
9 that are going to be used associated with these  
10 advanced reactors, and how best to -- and safely store  
11 those fuels over the long term, both on the surface  
12 and in the repository. So these are yet other areas  
13 where I think we might be able to do some exploratory  
14 or some anticipatory research.

15           This is really the -- what I wanted to do  
16 is just put some ideas out on the table, just  
17 stimulate some thoughts for discussion. And these  
18 pretty much conclude the prepared remarks that I had.

19           Again, I think I want to stress where I  
20 started off, that I think there is a strong need for  
21 us to work in partnership -- both the line  
22 organization, ACNW, and Research -- around  
23 anticipatory research in a much stronger way than we  
24 have in the past, and to get to where I think we are  
25 today with regard to the user need process, where I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think that is working very well. And I think what  
2 we'll do through this process is maximize the benefits  
3 from anticipatory research.

4 Something that we've talked about between  
5 the staffs -- and I know we've had a lot of discussion  
6 about -- the end of the day, when it comes to  
7 anticipatory research, I think what we want to say is  
8 that was money well spent, whether we actually found  
9 something that we actually needed to change or really  
10 confirmed the path that we are on. Either way, I  
11 think that could be viewed as money well spent, and  
12 that's where I want to see our programs. And that's  
13 where I think we're headed today.

14 So I look forward to the conference. I  
15 look forward to the advice that comes from this group,  
16 and I wish you success. Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thanks very much,  
18 Marty.

19 I find myself delinquent again. I forgot  
20 to introduce Bill Hinze, a former ACNW member and a  
21 consultant with us today, also a participant on our  
22 group. So I think I've covered everyone now.

23 (Laughter.)

24 Okay. Next we're going to hear from  
25 former commissioner Ken Rogers. For those of you who

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't know, Ken chaired a group -- a committee about  
2 a year ago looking at NRC research. So Ken has lots  
3 and lots of insights into research at NRC.

4 MR. ROGERS: Thank you very much. You  
5 know, I have to remind you that I don't really have  
6 any detailed technical knowledge of the specialty  
7 areas that we're really focusing on in connection with  
8 radionuclide transport and such issues, although I  
9 certainly have been interested in them for many years.

10 So my remarks are going to be more of a  
11 general nature. I hope they have some value.

12 First, the draft report "Radionuclide  
13 Transport and the Environment" produced by the  
14 Radiation Protection, Environmental Risk, and Waste  
15 Management Branch of RES is a very comprehensive plan  
16 which appears to have touched on a great number of  
17 issues of generic as well as special interest in  
18 dealing with nuclear waste that calls for further  
19 study.

20 The plan reflects a great deal of careful  
21 thought and scholarship. I really was quite pleased  
22 with it. I hadn't seen anything like that before, in  
23 my view, in past years in -- with regard to research  
24 -- a research program in this area under RES.

25 If I had to choose a simple phrase to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 characterize the plan, it would be, "Requirements for  
2 establishing a realistic basis for the regulation of  
3 nuclear waste." It seems to me that that is the --  
4 that's the overarching view that just permeates that  
5 whole plan. Virtually every subject discussed in the  
6 plan is examined for its degree of realism. That is,  
7 the extent to which it is understood on the basis of  
8 established, quantitative, factual knowledge and  
9 experience rather than shaky facts conflated with an  
10 attempt at conservatism.

11 I was very interested in the discussions  
12 earlier this morning on how involved you are with  
13 defining conservatism. I think it's terribly  
14 important, and I was really pleased to hear that  
15 focus.

16 I found the approach in the report  
17 refreshing and stimulating. However, at the risk of  
18 appearing to quibble over language, I have to take  
19 issue with the wording in the appendix in the  
20 performance goal cited in A2.2 of the plan, which  
21 concludes with the statement -- I'm quoting now --  
22 "NRC will make its decisions more realistic by  
23 eliminating excessive conservatism."

24 Eliminating conservatism does not  
25 necessarily result in more realism. But insisting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that risk information, research results, and  
2 operational experience are the bases for regulation  
3 can result in the elimination of excessive  
4 conservativism. The distinction, while seemingly  
5 trivial, is, in fact, very important.

6 And what brings this to mind is the  
7 experience in the reactor area where we found, not  
8 surprisingly I suppose, the safest and best running  
9 nuclear powerplants, when we compare almost identical  
10 units with those which were the least expensive to  
11 run.

12 So if one draws the conclusion, then, that  
13 the way to get to a safe plant is to reduce costs,  
14 you're going to be in real trouble.

15 (Laughter.)

16 And I'd keep that in mind here with  
17 respect to this question of eliminating  
18 conservativism, that you don't eliminate  
19 conservativisms. What you do is become more realistic  
20 and they'll go away if they're not appropriate.

21 I certainly am mindful of the comments  
22 that Milt Levenson made this morning that, you know,  
23 we're not against conservative approaches. Of course  
24 not. It's just that when you don't know and you just  
25 inflate something that -- and then cobble it together

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with something else which has been done exactly the  
2 same way, that you get led into a never neverland that  
3 really leaves you on very unsure basis.

4 So I think that it's very important to get  
5 the cart -- get the horse before the cart and not the  
6 other way around. Realism, as it has been defined in  
7 -- by Ashok Thadani and in research, I think is -- is  
8 the proper meaning of realism at NRC.

9 I think that there has been a confusion  
10 sometimes that realistic meant less economically  
11 demanding. No, that might come about, but don't try  
12 to get that way, get there that way. Realism has to  
13 be most soundly based. That's, to me, what realism  
14 has to mean. You know, best data, best validation,  
15 best use of experience, rather than something else.

16 Given the draft plan as it is, the next  
17 step is to develop a basis for prioritizing all the  
18 possible studies and works described in that plan,  
19 because it's very apparent to me, and I'm sure to  
20 everyone, that it cannot be fully underwritten by NRC  
21 which this year is budgeting 11 FTEs and \$2.8 million  
22 in fiscal 2002 for this general -- in this general  
23 area. That's just simply, you know, nowhere near  
24 enough to do the job. On the other hand, it's a plan  
25 and a very important and interesting one.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I would suggest that high priority should  
2 be assigned to those projects that can be undertaken  
3 with a high degree of leverage of NRC funds. It's  
4 obvious, but I'll just remind you that there are  
5 really two reasons for this.

6 It seems to me that jointly supported  
7 projects are likely to have undergone a highly  
8 rigorous examination of their generic importance. And  
9 an NRC dollar, when contributed to a joint project,  
10 simply buys much more than a solely NRC supported  
11 project of the same dollar value. That's obvious, of  
12 course.

13 But I think the other point that is  
14 perhaps -- that they may get greater scrutiny and  
15 examination from the standpoint of their generic  
16 value. And I think that's very important,  
17 particularly in this area where we're doing a little  
18 ballet all the time to dance away from doing research  
19 in research that is applicable to Yucca Mountain  
20 versus doing research which is generally applicable  
21 that also might be of interest to Yucca Mountain.

22 And it seems to me that the -- combining  
23 resources and multiple support is a way to help to  
24 deal with that issue.

25 Also of high priority, it seems to me, are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 projects which stimulate other entities to continue  
2 and extend the work, maybe not through direct  
3 collaboration but to start something which then gets  
4 picked up by others and carries -- is carried forward.  
5 And this may be of particular importance in the low-  
6 level waste area, which some time ago NRC more or less  
7 handed over to the states, which by and large have had  
8 difficulty in funding relevant research into new  
9 issues.

10 With NRC leadership in low-level waste  
11 issues such as we heard about just a few moments ago  
12 from Marty, greater states involvement in low-level  
13 research might increase. It's not going to provide  
14 them with money, but maybe they will see the real  
15 value of carrying something a little bit further for  
16 their own purposes in low-level waste disposal.

17 The various research issues related to  
18 engineered barriers to radionuclide transport would  
19 fall into that category, it would seem to me,  
20 particularly the effective performance lifetimes of  
21 barriers -- very important -- noted in the research  
22 plan as a significant area for study that really needs  
23 attention.

24 I note that the prioritization rating  
25 factor scheme that RES does -- has proposed does, in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fact, take into account external  
2 participation/leverage. That's in there. It's  
3 mentioned in there. But I'm going to come back to the  
4 prioritization scheme a little bit later.

5 The research plan repeatedly stresses the  
6 need for improved conceptual bases for the models used  
7 in analysis. It seems to me that this is really very  
8 important. The particular -- it's particularly  
9 important in establishing the clarity of the basis for  
10 regulatory -- future regulatory decisions, when  
11 they're made that the public can understand the basis  
12 on which the decision was made, that this -- that the  
13 model is in some way -- at least can be understood,  
14 what its limitations and applicabilities are, clear  
15 statement of the underlying assumptions on which a  
16 model is constructed, what is included, and what is  
17 omitted in the model.

18 You know, very often you hear about what's  
19 in there, but not necessarily what was left out, which  
20 could ultimately be extremely important.

21 What the basis is for the numerical  
22 parameters that are built into these computer models  
23 and their quantitative uncertainties which  
24 characterize the model, what quantitative  
25 sensitivities are associated with those uncertainties,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what is the permissible range of input data for which  
2 the model is expected to yield valid results, and how  
3 well the model performs when compared to the results  
4 of actual measurements.

5 I'm not telling you anything new that all  
6 of us didn't learn as graduate students. And yet we  
7 tend to somehow rather forget some of these things in  
8 the great attention to detail that has to go into  
9 finally arriving at some kind of regulatory decision.

10 And it seems to me that -- that these  
11 considerations really take on great importance in  
12 performance assessments in which the uncertainties  
13 directly relate to certain margins. When you really  
14 come down to the performance assessments, you've got  
15 to know what those margins are and what they -- how  
16 they relate to safety.

17 And it would seem to me that a very useful  
18 activity -- I didn't put it in my little remarks here,  
19 but -- would be for somehow NRC Research, together  
20 with others, to develop some kind of a -- a method of  
21 forcing the display of these -- the applicability of  
22 all of the data, all of the parameters, all of the  
23 assumptions, that go into the use of any conceptual  
24 model, that it's all got to be there.

25 You don't have to go and chase it down and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pull it out. By the time it gets used, it should be  
2 very clear what those are. So that one can understand  
3 the limitations and -- and either derive confidence or  
4 a lack of confidence from them.

5 And that leads me to the very important  
6 observation that the ACNW made not so long ago, in  
7 already pointing out the importance of developing  
8 relatively simple risk models based on the dominant  
9 contributors to risk, the great value in the  
10 intellectual exercise of such an activity. Greater  
11 understanding of the results of more complex models is  
12 achieved, and ultimately higher confidence in those  
13 results.

14 We all know this, but, you know, somehow  
15 it gets forgotten. We get seduced by the beautiful  
16 complexity of a huge computer program that's got a  
17 million lines of code in it and has been worked on by  
18 hundreds of people over the years. But trying to come  
19 to grips in a simple way with what the really  
20 important features of that complex model are requires  
21 another approach.

22 You know, it's what we used to call the  
23 back of the envelope calculation that every  
24 experimental physicist had to do before they started  
25 taking data, or, you know, you wouldn't know where you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 were going.

2 What are the important things that govern  
3 this? What do you really think is going to come out  
4 of it? How do you develop a kind of common sense  
5 approach to looking at, you know, detailed numerical  
6 printouts of huge computer programs?

7 And so I don't see any explicit mention of  
8 this type of work in the RES plan, and it seems to me  
9 it would be very good to include it in some way. That  
10 somehow there's a complementarity here that really  
11 should be addressed.

12 RES has developed prioritization rating  
13 factors for work -- for the work carried out under  
14 this plan from their reactor safety-based  
15 prioritization scheme, with weighting factors and  
16 basic considerations largely carried over from  
17 reactors to waste. I know ACNW has commented about  
18 the need to prioritize, and I guess this was the first  
19 cut at trying to do that, take over what was done for  
20 reactor safety into the waste area.

21 It isn't clear to me that this is the best  
22 way to establish a prioritization system for waste  
23 safety research, although it might be a starting  
24 point. I'd prefer not to start that way and see  
25 whether you get there some other way.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   But it's been done, and I think it perhaps  
2 suggests that this needs another look, that the  
3 prioritization rating scheme for waste disposal is  
4 really, conceptually it seems to me, quite different  
5 from what you would -- how you would address reactor  
6 safety.

7                   The issues -- really, there are some that  
8 are very vital in reactor safety that really aren't  
9 all that important in waste. The thing that comes to  
10 mind to me is human -- some of the human factors  
11 considerations in running a safe nuclear powerplant  
12 probably are not easily translated over into how to  
13 deal with low-level waste, for instance. It's a  
14 different kind of animal.

15                   So it will be very important in reactor  
16 safety, probably not important very much at all in  
17 waste disposal.

18                   Not surprisingly, the plan doesn't put  
19 price tags in either FTEs or dollars on the various  
20 activities that are listed. So it's difficult to  
21 identify the low hanging fruit that easily and  
22 relatively inexpensively could be harvested. I think  
23 those things should be identified. These are things  
24 we might be able to get -- very useful -- out of this  
25 program right away with not an awful lot of additional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expenditure.

2 And also missing are easy ways to identify  
3 possible synergisms among the various studies. Where  
4 could you combine things? Where would a study here  
5 and a study there actually complement each other in an  
6 extent that leads to a sum that's greater than the --  
7 a whole that's greater than the sum of the parts.

8 And I think that one should very carefully  
9 try to go through that plan and try to identify  
10 possible synergistic activities. But these are all  
11 future steps that can be taken readily with the help  
12 of experts such as have been assembled in this  
13 workshop, omitting myself.

14 So that's what I -- the little bit I have  
15 to say to you right now.

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thanks very much,  
17 Ken. That's very useful.

18 Probably everybody is aware that the  
19 Office of Research has put out the draft plan for  
20 radionuclide transport, and Ken has obviously read  
21 that very carefully. It's out for public comment  
22 right now. So they are very useful comments, Ken.

23 Next we have Mal Knapp, consultant.  
24 That's a new -- new title.

25 (Laughter.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 At least since we've seen you last, Mal.

2 MR. KNAPP: Yes. Well, I was sort of  
3 under the impression that that's kind of the career  
4 path that you follow after you leave the NRC.

5 (Laughter.)

6 So I didn't want to deviate.

7 (Laughter.)

8 One thing that I think you'll find, partly  
9 in what I say now and partly in what I'll say later,  
10 that although I've come at it from a little bit  
11 different approach here and there, that many of the  
12 things that you just heard from Ken Rogers you're  
13 going to find that I tend to agree with.

14 The questions that I wrote down to address  
15 this morning were: what issues will be the subject of  
16 future decisions? Where is work needed to provide  
17 necessary information for decisions? And where will  
18 work provide a significantly improved and more  
19 realistic decision?

20 That first question, what issues will be  
21 the subject of future decisions, causes me to ask,  
22 well, what are the future decisions likely to be? And  
23 reminding you that this is my perspective on this, and  
24 that your mileage may differ, I have what I think will  
25 be three decisions that are pretty likely in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 future.

2 And the first is I'm talking about, say,  
3 the next five to 10 years, whether to license Yucca  
4 Mountain, whether to license private fuel storage, and  
5 -- and something that may be a little broader than  
6 what the ACNW has really worked with in the past, but  
7 nonetheless I think very much falls within the  
8 concerns associated with spent fuel and waste  
9 management as well as storage and disposal, what to do  
10 about spent fuel pools.

11 I think, in my mind, these are the three  
12 big areas where decisions will have to be made. Now,  
13 I don't want to take anything away from the things  
14 that you've heard Marty say, and I think he has  
15 provided a good perspective on such things as low-  
16 level waste and decommissioning. And there I think  
17 may well be issues yet associated with some of the  
18 uranium recovery work.

19 But from my perspective, these are areas  
20 where major decisions with major issues are not as  
21 likely to spring up, at least over the next five to 10  
22 years. Now, obviously, if there were a dramatic  
23 change, say, in what they're going to do at Barnwell,  
24 I might come in with an entirely different sheet.

25 But given that those are the future

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decisions that I'm anticipating, let me talk about  
2 some of the issues that I think might well come up.  
3 And I'm speaking broadly here.

4 One of the questions that I think we will  
5 need to address, and I'll talk more about it in a  
6 moment or two -- you'll also notice that I say "we" on  
7 occasion, so that although I am retired sometimes I'm  
8 not as retired as I'd like to think.

9 (Laughter.)

10 But I think something that the NRC will  
11 need to consider is the quality of the application  
12 that DOE will bring in on a high-level waste facility.  
13 I think another issue that will be important, but I  
14 think, frankly, maybe less than application quality,  
15 will be transportation associated with getting the  
16 waste facility, and, of course, as a result of  
17 September 11th terrorism.

18 And I have a few thoughts on terrorism and  
19 threat that I will share, but I've asked Marty to pay  
20 careful attention here. It's not my intent to stray  
21 into areas that we really shouldn't discuss publicly,  
22 but I may by accident.

23 The next question of whether to license  
24 private fuel storage -- again, in my view, the  
25 principal issues that will have to be dealt with will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be transportation and terrorism or threat. And with  
2 respect to the question of what to do about spent fuel  
3 pools, September 11th is what put that on my agenda.

4 If we can go on and talk a little more,  
5 where do I think work is necessary as opposed to where  
6 I think work will provide improvements? Again, with  
7 necessary work, I turn immediately to terrorism. Now,  
8 I don't know what's going on within the NRC at this  
9 point, and I don't really want to speculate too much.  
10 But I would suspect that work has been -- is going on  
11 and will go on to reevaluate the design basis threat  
12 as a result of what happened September 11th.

13 And once that threat has been evaluated,  
14 then I think that work will need to be done in a  
15 couple of ways. I think one needs to talk about the  
16 probability that that threat would, in fact, be  
17 successful from several viewpoints and how to alter  
18 that probability of success. And I think one should  
19 then look at the consequences of the threat being  
20 successful or partially successful and how those  
21 consequences can be mitigated.

22 And I'm talking, again, about all of the  
23 areas we've just discussed. We talked not only about  
24 the possibility of threat associated with  
25 transportation but threat against any of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facilities that I mentioned earlier. The threat may  
2 turn out to be the same or it may be different. And  
3 I don't know, but I think that it will be a basis for  
4 having to do additional work, as I said, on  
5 probability and consequences.

6 Having said that, let me turn to where  
7 perhaps the first of these areas might be examined and  
8 I talk about spent fuel pools. This is where I think  
9 with respect to improved and more realistic decisions  
10 -- with respect to spent fuel pools, I think that it  
11 would probably be a good idea to look for new  
12 paradigms.

13 Now, one, for example, that comes to mind  
14 -- certainly, in my experience, the way one ran a  
15 spent fuel pool, you wanted to safely get the spent  
16 fuel out of the reactor, into the pool. Once you had  
17 it into the pool, you obviously wanted to let it  
18 remain there to decay a good, long time, say five  
19 years, before you did anything with it. And with the  
20 exception of filling up the pool, you really had no  
21 rush. That paradigm may have to be changed.

22 I was at a meeting several weeks ago that  
23 really had very little to do with nuclear safety. But  
24 as soon as people found out what I did for a living,  
25 the question I was immediately asked is, what are we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to do about spent fuel pools? And I found it  
2 interesting that a number of people in the public  
3 simply brought that forward on their own.

4 That's not to say necessarily that there  
5 are great technical issues, but that there are going  
6 to be issues associated with pools and the NRC is  
7 going to have to make some decisions. When I talk  
8 about the new paradigms, I'm thinking about people who  
9 are concerned about how long the fuel should remain in  
10 the pool.

11 At one point, I would have said, well,  
12 there's no rush. Today, we may have to say this --  
13 that fuel should be removed from the pool promptly.  
14 That could suggest research. If you wanted to remove  
15 it in, say, less than five years, suppose you wanted  
16 to remove it in one-tenth of that time, say six  
17 months. Is that possible? How would you go about it?  
18 What are the hazards associated with, say, moving it  
19 into dry cask storage after six months? Just --  
20 that's just one possibility.

21 But I think there will have to be a  
22 reexamination of exactly what one has to do to store  
23 spent fuel, in a pool or to store it dry. There are  
24 additional considerations I just don't want to really  
25 bring forward in the meeting, but I think they can be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 examined, and I think research can definitely  
2 contribute to how some of those decisions might come  
3 out.

4 With respect to Yucca Mountain, I  
5 mentioned earlier the quality of the application.  
6 Now, questions have recently been raised about the  
7 quality of the technical work at Yucca Mountain. And  
8 DOE has met with the NRC, they have the message, and  
9 they are going to take the necessary steps to ensure  
10 quality.

11 Unfortunately, that happened when I was  
12 the Division Director in Waste Management in 1994. It  
13 happened again, I believe at least twice, before I  
14 retired. I have to say that I am somewhat skeptical  
15 as to whether DOE will succeed this time. I have no  
16 doubts that they will do the best they can, but their  
17 track record of being able to be responsive to this is  
18 something which may go beyond the capabilities of that  
19 program in some way we don't understand.

20 And that leads to the question: what  
21 would the NRC do with a high-level waste application  
22 where the quality was limited? Another reason to  
23 wonder about the quality, we have to recognize that  
24 they've been looking at that site now for about 14  
25 years.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Now, I'm not going to assert that there  
2                   won't be any breakthroughs over the next few years,  
3                   but the fact is much of the data has been taken.  
4                   Unless they extend the license application submittal  
5                   decades, most of what they have to base it on is  
6                   already there. That's a sweeping generalization, and  
7                   I'm sure that you can identify a number of areas where  
8                   that's not true.

9                   But I think we need to recognize that  
10                  there is a very real possibility that the quality of  
11                  that application is not going to be as sound as either  
12                  NRC or DOE would like. To my mind, that suggests  
13                  research perhaps on how to deal with that reduced  
14                  quality.

15                 Now, the easy answer, of course, for the  
16                 agency would be to simply have the application, under  
17                 those circumstances, fail the acceptance review. But  
18                 if you consider that one of the goals is to reduce the  
19                 regulatory burden, and I'm talking about the public as  
20                 well as the Department of Energy, is it worthwhile to  
21                 consider whether there are ways that less than high-  
22                 quality data and technical work could be examined and  
23                 could be treated so as to still be able to make  
24                 decisions, perhaps with greater uncertainty -- forgive  
25                 me, but perhaps with more conservatism.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But I just don't know. And it may be that  
2 there is no way that research can, in fact, improve  
3 this situation, and it may be that the problem that  
4 I'm describing is one for the attorneys, not for the  
5 scientists.

6           But I would be inclined to at least probe  
7 in that area a little bit and ask, is there something  
8 that could be done so that in the event that the  
9 application is of less than high quality that the  
10 agency could be more responsive to it?

11           The next item that I have, and you see I  
12 have a question mark after it, is transportation. I  
13 have it up there because I believe that transportation  
14 is going to be a major issue in at least two of the  
15 areas, the spent fuel storage and high-level waste  
16 storage disposal at Yucca. And I just ask myself, is  
17 there anything that can be done?

18           My sense has been that often we have --  
19 it's not fair to say that we've taken a brute force  
20 approach, but it has not been particularly high tech.  
21 Things are changing. If we consider the threat to  
22 transportation, obviously, the threat has changed.  
23 But also, the way that this country responds to threat  
24 and anticipates threat is going to change.

25           Further, I think there are a variety of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technical advances associated with information,  
2 information gathering, that I'm not certain have, in  
3 fact, been considered with respect to transportation.  
4 And so I think an area where technical work might be  
5 considered would be recognizing that it is a very  
6 different ballgame than it was five years ago, and  
7 will probably be very different five years from now.

8 And research into trying to forecast what  
9 that ballgame might be like, and ask how we could be  
10 more effective, ask how perhaps greater information  
11 could make things safer, is something worth  
12 considering.

13 At the same time, although probably at a  
14 lower priority, I would look with respect to  
15 transportation at incident response. Again, this is  
16 going to be a significant issue. Again, have we, in  
17 the last five years, looked at all of the changes that  
18 might be made, all of the opportunities associated  
19 with the incident response? Again, I think this is an  
20 area where information gathering, information sharing,  
21 could have -- result in improved response for  
22 transportation accidents.

23 Those are just a few thoughts. They are  
24 from my perspective. And that's really all I have at  
25 this point, although there are a couple of thoughts on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 prioritization and other things that I'll talk about  
2 a little later today.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thank you, Mal.  
5 Very good.

6 Finally, for this portion of the session  
7 we have John Kessler from Lawrence Livermore Lab --

8 (Laughter.)

9 -- or California anyway.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. KESSLER: All right. I did a bit of  
12 anticipatory research of my own, and recognizing that  
13 as I was the last speaker behind these particular  
14 speakers, I am going to try to keep this short.

15 Next slide, please.

16 I tried to follow the general questions  
17 here in terms of what I've put together. But in terms  
18 of spent fuel issues subject to regulatory decisions,  
19 I want to preface it by saying that what I look at as  
20 the spent fuel side is more -- probably more than low-  
21 level waste. So you'll have to bear with me there.  
22 But certainly, the industry recognizes that while we  
23 support Yucca Mountain, it's going to be a long time  
24 coming under the best of circumstances.

25 And the number one issue for us is going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to have to do with technical bases for storage of not  
2 only higher burnup fuel but also independent spent  
3 fuel, storage installation, license extensions, and  
4 license extension issues. Those things need to come  
5 first. No matter what happens with Yucca Mountain, we  
6 need to have good bases for storage of fuel,  
7 especially higher burnup fuel.

8 The current situation is that NRC has  
9 licenses for rather limited burnups now, limited in  
10 the sense of what's now coming out of the reactors,  
11 and there needs to be some work done. NRC is actively  
12 looking at that with industry, but I just want to  
13 highlight this as the -- as a number one issue in  
14 terms of spent fuel research that we would like to see  
15 progress on probably even more so than Yucca Mountain  
16 in terms of what needs to be done first.

17 So for the -- number one, it's the storage  
18 of high burnup fuel. That is, it must demonstrate  
19 that all fuel can be stored safely while final  
20 solutions are developed. Not only the lower level  
21 burnups for -- up to mid level, but the higher burnup  
22 stuff that's now coming out of the reactors.

23 In fact, the limits on burnup are such  
24 that I'd say the majority of the fuel now coming out  
25 of the reactors exceeds the burnup limits for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 current suite of storage systems out there. So this  
2 is a very pressing issue.

3 The majority -- I just said that here.  
4 The burnups now are higher than the ISFSI licenses or  
5 the Certificate of Compliance allow.

6 The next one is we've got a lot of stuff  
7 that's already in storage, and those storage license  
8 limits are 20 years, which back in the mid '80s seemed  
9 like plenty of time before something like Yucca  
10 Mountain would be on board. Well, we're reaching the  
11 end of some of those. In fact, the first one will  
12 come up in 2006, so we need to clearly distinguish  
13 issues associated with longer term ISFSI degradation  
14 from the original licensing bases.

15 That is, there were a lot of technical  
16 bases that were set down, established, agreed upon, to  
17 get those things in storage for the first 20 years.  
18 We need to distinguish just the research that's  
19 involved with, what are the long-term aging mechanisms  
20 that maybe weren't considered or part of the technical  
21 bases for the first 20-year application?

22 Things have been considered like cladding  
23 creep. It's not really a consideration now in terms  
24 of the original technical bases, probably not  
25 important beyond a few months to a few -- whoops --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years years -- in the sense that we feel that cladding  
2 creep is probably over, and that it's not going to  
3 contribute significantly and it probably isn't an  
4 issue for long-term storage.

5 And evaluating the integrity of the cask  
6 system components may be more important. I believe  
7 that was alluded to a little bit earlier.

8 Next viewgraph, please.

9 Okay. Now into general disposal issues.  
10 I echo earlier comments by quite a few of you that the  
11 appropriate use of total system performance  
12 assessments and other information in decisionmaking is  
13 something that can be the subject of research. While  
14 it may be mainly up to DOE, NRC should provide some  
15 guidance as to, you know, what is it that makes sense  
16 in terms of using that information in decisionmaking?

17 Well, the NRC guidance has got to be based  
18 on an adequate understanding of information  
19 limitations and where judgment becomes important.  
20 This is identifying how one uses judgment, how one  
21 uses data, to make decisions about very long-term  
22 performance.

23 The nature of reasonable expectation at  
24 each step of repository development really needs to be  
25 thought through. There is likely to be a research

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 component here. What added data needs and modeling  
2 are required to advance to the next stage? And along  
3 those lines, certainly we feel at EPRI that  
4 performance confirmation is a very important research  
5 topic that helps one establish maybe the data needs  
6 and can stage those data needs as we go through.

7 And EPRI hosted a workshop on the idea of  
8 performance confirmation. We talked a little bit  
9 about this issue then.

10 Next.

11 Getting down to the particular topic here,  
12 source term and radionuclide transport issues, I'm  
13 going to whiz through these right now and revisit them  
14 somewhat later on. Inventory issues, I would say that  
15 those are lower priority for spent fuel, if I think in  
16 terms of, you know, the uncertainties that are there  
17 and how much variability, although certainly there are  
18 some big question marks for inventory of defense fuel  
19 that might require some research there. But it's  
20 certainly higher for the other wastes, thinking of  
21 low-level waste, decommissioning waste, things like  
22 that.

23 Chemical conditions in the engineered  
24 barrier system, I think that's clearly understood to  
25 be something of importance that's fairly uncertain.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That certainly is something that can be amenable to  
2 research far and wide.

3           Role of diffusion and sorption in the  
4 engineered barrier system, I'll talk a little bit  
5 later about the idea that it seems like there's a lot  
6 of -- how would I say -- importance being placed on  
7 diffusion, and I would say that's only because we have  
8 a limited ability to model it realistically or  
9 understand that. And I'll talk a little bit more  
10 about that later.

11           And sorption within the engineered barrier  
12 system itself may actually be of importance if we can  
13 establish a decent technical basis to do that.

14           Fracture/matrix interaction, both use --  
15 especially in the unsaturated zone, but especially the  
16 saturated zone, could, if we had some more supporting  
17 research, dramatically change the case or the relative  
18 importance of those particular barriers, at least for  
19 the Yucca Mountain system.

20           Matrix sorption also, which these two are  
21 really linked, are again areas of -- amenable to  
22 research that could make a significant difference to  
23 our understanding of the relative importance of the  
24 system. And that would really be almost -- many  
25 systems, not just Yucca Mountain. So it's sort of up

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to NRC to decide whether this is an NRC Research or an  
2 NMSS activity.

3 Now, here is a pretty Yucca Mountain  
4 specific one for the Tephra part. But Tephra and  
5 common dust resuspension and radionuclide distribution  
6 is something that is certainly making the top of the  
7 list right now for the volcanism consequences, the  
8 Tephra part. But, in addition, our revised model for  
9 our biosphere for the normal release, just due to  
10 irrigation of crops, is that dust resuspension or dust  
11 inhalation is our dominant pathway for most of the  
12 actinides, even for not the volcanism scenario.

13 Lower priority might be neptunium and  
14 uranium solubility. When we did our sensitivities, we  
15 just didn't see that those were big hitters, even  
16 though there's been a lot of press attached to them.  
17 And I'll talk about that a little bit in one of the  
18 later talks.

19 Colloid-aided transport, I think that  
20 we're -- we could nail that lid on that coffin a  
21 little bit tighter, certainly with some more R&D. But  
22 even with the analysis that's done that I would argue  
23 sort of maximizes the potential for colloid-aided  
24 transport, we are not showing it up in terms of risk  
25 space as being hugely important.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Sorption in the alluvium -- again, I'll  
2 get back to why I feel that's of secondary importance,  
3 and there are certainly lots more.

4 And in terms of additional work needed to  
5 provide regulatory decision bases, evaluate NRC spent  
6 fuel storage guidance from a more risk-informed  
7 perspective. This was developed, I would say, mostly  
8 in the era before NRC started talking and trying to  
9 internalize risk-informed thinking.

10 And some of the guidance -- I'm thinking  
11 in particular some of the interim staff guidance for  
12 spent fuel storage -- may be aimed at lower risk  
13 aspects. I would encourage NRC to look at that, think  
14 about whether there is an opportunity for some  
15 research in some of those areas to identify what level  
16 of risk those -- that guidance is for.

17 And some of the guides seem rather  
18 conservative based on available information. I'm  
19 thinking particularly of the source term ISG-5 that's  
20 -- talks about what an applicant needs to assume in  
21 terms of things coming out of a package for normal  
22 release in accident conditions.

23 Continue forming the bases to support  
24 storage and disposal of higher burnup fuel.  
25 Additional research may allow for future flexibility

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and approaches. What do I mean there? There are  
2 approaches that are available for high burnup. They  
3 are not very pleasant from an economic standpoint,  
4 causes additional transportation requirements because  
5 we may have to derate packages and the like.

6 And some additional research -- and here's  
7 an opportunity where EPRI and others are already  
8 working with NRC Research in this area -- is something  
9 that could be of high benefit.

10 Advanced capabilities to conduct more  
11 realistic performance assessments -- yes, I'll jump on  
12 that wagon, too. It's really impossible to properly  
13 prioritize. Certainly, we can prioritize, but we  
14 can't properly prioritize research needs without a  
15 more realistic performance assessment. It's got to be  
16 based on currently-available information.

17 But we've got questions about if not  
18 conservative or what we generally understand to be  
19 conservative -- and I'm sorry, I missed the discussion  
20 about that this morning -- then how to get a best  
21 estimate. It's not easy, and it's going to cost a lot  
22 of money sometimes to get to a best estimate. And  
23 that needs to be thought through in terms of what  
24 might be done for research.

25 It may also require a greater flexibility

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the use of expert judgment. There may be cases  
2 where it's just going to be really hard to get to  
3 these best estimate cases. How might one use best --  
4 the proper mix of data that you can collect with  
5 expert judgment to get at something you may feel is a  
6 more realistic performance assessment in the end.

7 And from the recent expert panel report  
8 that Ken Rogers chaired, certainly we like the idea  
9 where they say research should be doing more work on  
10 the utilization of PRA results and in developing  
11 improved PRA methods.

12 For additional work to facilitate improved  
13 regulatory decisions, continue supporting joint  
14 research on higher burnup fuel, improve understanding  
15 of material degradation trends with burnup is  
16 certainly a key to that aspect.

17 There's a good example of cooperation  
18 between reactor and storage needs with NRC. We've got  
19 NRR, NMSS, and Research all involved with that. I  
20 think it's a shining example of how cooperation, both  
21 within NRC and between NRC, DOE, and industry, in  
22 terms of actually co-funding particular projects, is  
23 going rather well.

24 And the technical bases for decisions are  
25 still different between NRR and NMSS -- for example,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the allowable oxide thickness on cladding. Well, they  
2 came from two different approaches. They came up with  
3 two different answers, and yet it's an example of  
4 where NRC needs to think through the entire fuel cycle  
5 there to come up with a common approach that would  
6 help.

7 Next.

8 Developing approaches to get -- to get to  
9 a realistic TSPA is the additional work that needs to  
10 be done. Developing an understandable TSPA -- I think  
11 that I'm echoing what I believe Ken Rogers just talked  
12 about. The current attempts aren't playing very well.  
13 Come up with some sort of simplified performance  
14 assessment.

15 We need to decide on the stories to tell  
16 with performance assessment. There's a billion things  
17 we could be doing with those PA codes. What is it  
18 that you want to show, and does the code show it? Can  
19 you get it to show it? Is there something else you  
20 need to be doing, either within the code or outside of  
21 the code, to tell the stories that need to be told?

22 Clearly identify data used and assumptions  
23 made. We all tend to get rather parochial when we  
24 develop these models and forget to do this quite  
25 often. In fact, in one of my later talks I'm going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 compliment the Center's research proposal where they  
2 actually do try to do this before they identify what  
3 research needs to be done in a particular area.

4 Continue exploring the role of natural  
5 analogs. What we're concerned about is that not all  
6 of the important FEPs -- highly uncertain ones, highly  
7 sensitive in terms of the results -- features, events,  
8 and processes here will be amenable to performance  
9 confirmation. You may not be able to get the data.  
10 You may not be able to measure it.

11 What is it you're going to use? Perhaps  
12 natural analogs is one of those techniques, and more  
13 could be thought about in terms of how one uses  
14 natural analog information.

15 That ends that section. Thanks.

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thanks very much,  
17 John.

18 Because we're on the record, of course, I  
19 should point out that everybody knows that John  
20 Kessler is with EPRI. I'm from the University of  
21 Virginia, and at the high-level waste conference John  
22 made the mistake of introducing me as from Virginia  
23 Tech.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. KESSLER: Some year I'll live it down.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: So I was just trying  
2 to get back at John a little bit.

3                   (Laughter.)

4                   What I think I'd like to do now is take  
5 some time to basically have some -- we have some time  
6 to offer questions to some of our presenters from this  
7 session. We didn't schedule a lot of time for this,  
8 but I think that it's worthwhile for us to take some  
9 time to do that.

10                  I don't know if Ashok and Marty want to  
11 join us at the table for this discussion.

12                  Does anybody have any questions? John, do  
13 you have anything that you want to pose to any of our  
14 presenters, or comments you want to make?

15                  MEMBER GARRICK: Well, perhaps.

16                  (Laughter.)

17                  One of the things that came to my mind as  
18 I was hearing from Ashok and the NRC people was a  
19 couple of -- a couple of thoughts here as to how to  
20 maybe enhance the public confidence in what we're all  
21 doing. And one of the things that comes to my mind at  
22 least is something that Ken Rogers touched on, and I  
23 would put it in the context of greater exposure of the  
24 NRC decisionmaking process.

25                  This committee has long advocated that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what really should be the basis for our decisionmaking  
2 is the evidence that can be presented for the  
3 different alternatives that are under consideration.  
4 And I think sometimes there is the thought on the  
5 outside that the decisions are made in the absence of  
6 the consideration of alternatives, and sometimes even  
7 in the absence of the consideration of real evidence.

8 So one of the things that may be important  
9 here and may even be a research topic is, how can we  
10 better display not only the evidence that is behind  
11 the decision, but also the alternatives that were  
12 considered in the process. And I was anxious to see  
13 if anybody from the NRC wanted to comment on that.

14 MR. THADANI: I believe Marty had to  
15 leave, so I will at least give you my views on this  
16 subject. I'm in total agreement with some of the  
17 comments that were made in the last hour about what is  
18 behind the so-called conservative decisions.

19 I was at a workshop last June with the  
20 role of research in the regulatory context, and it was  
21 sponsored by Nuclear Energy Agency in Paris and  
22 included top decisionmakers, researchers, and other  
23 interested organizations. From NRC, Chairman Meserve  
24 participated, and I did from Research perspective, and  
25 so on.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And there was interesting discussion of  
2 this issue of conservative, and the comment was made  
3 -- and I think -- I don't mean to imply this is done  
4 all the time, but sometimes we hide ignorance behind  
5 the statements of, "I will make a conservative  
6 decision." Obviously, that's not done regularly. But  
7 it has happened, and I think it is essential, it seems  
8 to me, to do exactly what John is saying; that is, to  
9 lay out the bases.

10           And the Advisory Committee on Reactor  
11 Safeguards -- Safety sent a letter to the Chairman not  
12 too long ago recommending that the NRC Research  
13 develop some thoughts, principles, for formal  
14 decisionmaking. And I hate to admit this, but it --  
15 when we used our prioritization scheme, it came out  
16 somewhat lower than the way we drew the line as to  
17 areas we should be pursuing.

18           We'll consider it again this year. It's  
19 clearly an area where I do think it will improve  
20 public confidence if we do a better job really laying  
21 out how we make some decisions. Having said that, as  
22 you know, the agency is doing a number of things to  
23 make sure its decisionmaking process is better  
24 understood.

25           And, in particular, we have more meetings

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with various stakeholders, public meetings, where  
2 alternatives are, in fact, discussed. There's a great  
3 deal of give and take, and I would say better  
4 understanding of the decisions that are being made  
5 today as compared to perhaps some time ago.

6 But, again, like you, John, I also believe  
7 that we should be disciplined, and for all significant  
8 decisions at least we ought to have a clear  
9 articulation of what went into that decisionmaking.  
10 And we in the Office of Research will look at it again  
11 to see how we can help in that process.

12 MEMBER GARRICK: Yes. I only want to make  
13 one other comment. As George Hornberger pointed out,  
14 that my absence this morning allowed the meeting to go  
15 very quickly --

16 (Laughter.)

17 -- on the subject of conservatism. So I  
18 didn't mean to have that kind of reputation. But what  
19 this committee has strongly -- long advocated is not  
20 that we are against conservatism. We, in fact, think  
21 that the regulatory process should be conservative.  
22 What we are very much in favor of, though, is knowing  
23 what that level of -- what the level of conservatism  
24 is.

25 And in order for us to do that, we need to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 calibrate from some sort of reference or baseline that  
2 is developed by the experts as constituting what they  
3 think will really happen. Then, the regulators have  
4 a basis for deciding how -- what the margins ought to  
5 be. And in that context, we're very supportive of a  
6 certain amount of conservatism.

7 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Bill, got anything?

8 MEMBER HINZE: Well, one thing that I  
9 would like to ask about is going back to Commissioner  
10 Rogers' comments about leverage. I think that's very  
11 important because it sets the right tone in these days  
12 of modest resources. And I sense that in the nuclear  
13 reactor field that this has been a tradition, that  
14 there is a lot of evidence, a lot of examples of this  
15 kind of thing.

16 And I wonder if that -- if that -- if  
17 we've seen much of that in the waste area. John has  
18 talked about some of that. But, for example, when we  
19 talk about radionuclide transport in the environment  
20 we think about ground water and we -- that comes to  
21 mind immediately. And the -- I think the acknowledged  
22 groundwater -- largest reservoir of groundwater  
23 expertise in the country is in the U.S. Geological  
24 Survey and -- outside of academia, George, of course.

25 (Laughter.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Well, and I just wonder if -- how one --  
2 if Commissioner Rogers or anyone else has given any  
3 ideas on how this synergism between agencies and  
4 groups can really be affected in the waste area. I  
5 think EPRI is a good example, but I think if we're  
6 going to get the leewards that we're talking about,  
7 especially in the radionuclide transport and the  
8 environment, that we have to go beyond that. And we  
9 have to get some better ideas. We have to get some  
10 new ideas, and that, of course, brings to mind  
11 competitive research, proposals, the use of academia.

12 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Any responses?

13 MR. THADANI: Let me at least --

14 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: It's a tough  
15 question.

16 MR. THADANI: I can only address part of  
17 your comment, and I'm hoping that Bill Ott later on  
18 will share with you some details.

19 As John noted, we have some cooperative  
20 efforts with EPRI plus other organizations in the area  
21 of high burnup fuel, in the area of cladding behavior  
22 if you go beyond 20 years of license period, perhaps  
23 as long as a hundred years. We are looking at  
24 structural issues on cask.

25 And we're working with both domestic

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 organizations -- and that includes EPRI as well as the  
2 international community -- it's the so-called package  
3 performance effort -- to leverage our resources.

4 In terms of trying to get to the point of  
5 developing analytical tools to deal with some complex  
6 issues, we have an agreement -- and I think -- I'm  
7 trying to remember what it's called. It's a  
8 multimedia -- Bill, if you can address that. And  
9 participants in that program are many of the U.S.  
10 agencies.

11 The idea was exactly that that Dr. Rogers  
12 pointed -- there was a synergism issue. When you're  
13 developing these models, there can be various  
14 applications. There may be different interests. And  
15 if we can identify those up front and integrate our  
16 thinking, we will end up with a better tool and a more  
17 effective tool. And I don't remember the number of  
18 organizations involved, but there are several  
19 organizations. The concept is that.

20 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: We had a  
21 presentation on the MOU, and so I don't want to invite  
22 Bill to give us a long --

23 MR. THADANI: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: -- exposition of it.  
25 But there is a memorandum of understanding with --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 including the USGS and USTA on multimedia. But I  
2 think Bill was asking a broader question rather than  
3 a -- to get a list of the things that are currently  
4 underway.

5 MEMBER HINZE: I guess what I'm really  
6 getting at is that one would have to take a very  
7 proactive stance to get something like this going.  
8 It's not going to happen without some real effort.  
9 And if the NRC wishes to save money and have a broader  
10 base of people to be active in a research area, it  
11 seems to me that you really have to go out and search  
12 these opportunities and develop them. It's not going  
13 to happen without some serious effort.

14 MR. ROGERS: Can I just say something  
15 about it?

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Ken?

17 MR. ROGERS: I think that this is the time  
18 to start doing that sort of thing. I think that the  
19 climate for cooperative efforts in the past was really  
20 quite different from what it is today.

21 There was this total, I thought,  
22 preoccupation with the possibility that a decision  
23 would be contaminated if it involved in some way some  
24 other organization that had some possible connection  
25 with what the decision was, and that to avoid that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just cut them off, do everything yourself.

2 And that just isn't possible today. It  
3 just simply is not possible. The resources are not  
4 there.

5 So the thinking, I think, is very  
6 different. I think one of the reasons why that hasn't  
7 happened in the past as much was because of this kind  
8 of legal worry about a decision being upset in some --  
9 in a court or someplace because somehow it was  
10 contaminated by a self-interest -- the self-interest  
11 of a party that was somehow rather involved.

12 My feeling is that that's -- that that's  
13 not as serious a concern today as it was. It's always  
14 a concern. It'll never go away. But it used to be  
15 absolute showstopper on almost everything. And, of  
16 course, this reinforces the insularity of the  
17 organization, which is what you want to break down.  
18 So I think that this is the time to do that.

19 My other guess is that -- that in the  
20 reactor area everything was better organized in the --  
21 within the licensees. And there was just a lot more  
22 money, more power, more sophistication in many ways.  
23 When you start dealing with some of these issues, say  
24 in low-level waste, I don't know about high-level  
25 waste, but in low-level waste you're talking with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 totally different kinds of organizations that don't  
2 have the kinds of history or resources to offer.

3 And some really new, creative thinking has  
4 to go into how to -- how to bring those things  
5 together in a way that produces some new results. It  
6 is a real challenge, I think.

7 MEMBER HINZE: I think, too, that it has  
8 to be emphasized that this is not only a resource  
9 leverage, but it is an expertise leverage, which may  
10 in the long run be the more important aspect of it.

11 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Yes. Absolutely.  
12 Let's go to the other end and start back. Mario?

13 MR. BONACA: Well, just -- I just was  
14 reflecting on, first of all, I mean, I am here to  
15 learn more than anything else, because I don't have  
16 much expertise in nuclear waste.

17 But one thing that struck me was somewhat  
18 of a different focus between the presentation of Mr.  
19 Knapp, which really was -- I believe is on target, it  
20 seems to me, and speaks about certain issues that are  
21 somewhat different from the ones that are being  
22 presented by EPRI, which may be an obstacle to the  
23 level of cooperation we would like to have or  
24 collaboration among the organizations.

25 Clearly, it seems to me that the EPRI

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 activities presented focus on immediate needs of  
2 licensees in discharging the fuel and looking at  
3 higher burnup fuel and issues of that nature. And the  
4 one presented in the previous presentation had to do  
5 with not only quality of application but  
6 transportation issues to -- to a repository, terrorism  
7 -- which is really beyond what the industry may be  
8 focusing on.

9 I'm just -- I was just reflecting. I  
10 don't know if there is any point there, but that some  
11 collaboration may be somewhat difficult at this stage  
12 because the RES is looking at the -- at a longer focus  
13 I think, and maybe these issues that -- that Mr. Knapp  
14 presented, and they may be somewhat different from  
15 what the industry is focusing on right now. That may  
16 be -- that was an observation.

17 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Mal, did you have  
18 something you wanted to say?

19 MR. KNAPP: I think I might agree in part  
20 and perhaps disagree in part. Again, while I don't  
21 claim at this moment to know immediately what's going  
22 on, I think that probably the transportation and the  
23 spent fuel issues are going to be of immediate and  
24 pressing need in industry.

25 Again, I don't want to speak for them, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that would be my guess. And so I would say of the  
2 things that I've brought up, there will probably be  
3 some areas or parts of areas where there could  
4 certainly be leverage and extensive cooperation and  
5 others, exactly as you have said, where there would  
6 probably be limited interest in industry, very much  
7 because of the short term here.

8 MEMBER HINZE: I wouldn't want to give the  
9 impression that we're not interested in  
10 transportation.

11 (Laughter.)

12 But certainly we're involved in  
13 participating, mostly from the outside, but also on  
14 some panels -- on, say, NRC's modal study for  
15 transportation risks, things like that -- we do  
16 participate in that area.

17 Right now, we are taking a look at the  
18 work that has already been done in terms of  
19 transportation and storage hazards, as they relate to  
20 terrorism, to see -- we feel that a lot of the  
21 regulations that NRC has already imposed probably  
22 bounds many of the terrorism scenarios that could be  
23 considered.

24 We're looking to see whether that's really  
25 true by seeing what's -- what do we know, what's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 already been known, and then try to define from there  
2 what we think will be the research needs that may  
3 result from maybe other terrorism scenarios that  
4 haven't been currently thought of.

5 The little that I know on the reactor side  
6 of the house, they are doing much the same, looking to  
7 see what has already been done, applying it to perhaps  
8 some scenarios that hadn't been thought of before, to  
9 see whether -- that that work does or doesn't bound  
10 it, and what does need to be done. I'm sure that NRC  
11 is doing that as well.

12 MR. BONACA: I was more reflecting on that  
13 particular line you have on new paradigms, and that  
14 really struck me as something that would be, you know,  
15 a possibility in today's environment. And you have to  
16 look for something --

17 MR. THADANI: If I may comment --

18 MR. BONACA: -- reflected on before.

19 MR. THADANI: I think Mal has identified  
20 some issues that need to be thought through, some  
21 interesting points that I think you have brought out.  
22 But I do want to make sure that we are giving you  
23 enough information and background in terms of, what is  
24 the Office of Research doing in terms of collaborating  
25 with others to take advantage of the infrastructure

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issues, the expertise facilities, and certainly  
2 includes training considerations.

3 But let me make sure that you don't -- I'm  
4 not misinforming you. First of all, there is no  
5 alternative. I agree with issue resources going down.  
6 We've got to become more creative on how can you get  
7 what you want. And, clearly, making sure we're  
8 focused on the right things, risk-informing what we  
9 do, and paying attention to what is really more  
10 important from the point of view of safety. And the  
11 issue of public confidence I think is critical.

12 Secondly, then looking to areas which are  
13 appropriate for research, then making sure we get out,  
14 we try and understand what's going on. We have -- to  
15 that extent, we have a significant number of  
16 agreements. I think we have 84 bilateral or  
17 multilateral agreements, and we have on the order of  
18 in the twenties domestic agreements.

19 Dr. Rogers is exactly correct.  
20 Environment has changed. We have -- I have signed an  
21 agreement with EPRI, and that agreement has fairly  
22 broad scope, and that includes the following  
23 consideration. That Electric Power Research Institute  
24 and Nuclear Regulatory Commission research  
25 organization may well collaborate in doing joint

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 experimental work.

2 The independence of decision would come  
3 once we take the data, EPRI will take the data, and we  
4 will do with it what we believe is appropriate with  
5 our analytical tools, and so on.

6 So I want to be sure that if -- if you  
7 would like, we can come back and we can brief you on  
8 where we are in terms of collaboration with other  
9 organizations, where we think there may be mutual  
10 interest. And if there are any hard spots, we will  
11 certainly share those as well with you.

12 Just wanted to make that comment. In case  
13 you are planning to address it in your letter, I just  
14 want to be sure that we've given you enough  
15 information.

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Fine. Thank you.

17 I also -- just a point of clarification,  
18 I should point out that in our instructions for this  
19 meeting we recognize that we can talk about a wide  
20 range of potential research topics. We know this, and  
21 I certainly don't want to overly constrain people, but  
22 to try to focus, at least a little bit because in  
23 these workshops what we like to do is get into  
24 technical nitty-gritty to as great an extent as  
25 possible, we gave directions to try to focus, to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 extent reasonable, on radionuclide transport and  
2 source term.

3 And so some people have taken that to  
4 heart, and I wouldn't, Mario, read too much into  
5 disparities you may hear in what people have said.

6 Milt?

7 MEMBER LEVENSON: Well, let me ask you a  
8 question, first. Does it -- as a disciple of John's,  
9 I have a long list of questions. How much time should  
10 I take?

11 (Laughter.)

12 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: You have five  
13 minutes.

14 MEMBER LEVENSON: I'll talk fast.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MEMBER GARRICK: For the purpose of the  
17 recorder, we probably need to distinguish the Johns  
18 here. I think the Johns that were referred to by Bill  
19 and by somebody over here was John Kessler.

20 MEMBER LEVENSON: My comment was to John  
21 Garrick.

22 MEMBER GARRICK: Yes. Protect the  
23 innocent.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MEMBER LEVENSON: Well, none of the other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Johns are old enough to possibly be --

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Okay. You've used  
4 two of your minutes.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MEMBER LEVENSON: I really have several  
7 comments. One was the discussion about future  
8 reactors I think has a potential impact on our  
9 priority for research, because for all of the reactors  
10 that have been licensed and approved to date, ultimate  
11 waste disposal wasn't at issue.

12 For a new reactor design coming up, it's  
13 going to be a major issue, and I think we need to  
14 reassign the priorities and recognize that waste  
15 disposal is now critical to reactor licensing, which  
16 has never been the case in the past.

17 Secondly, I think that there was a comment  
18 made about greater than Class C waste. In an era  
19 where we want to move into risk-informed performance-  
20 based, I think the old categories of Class A, B, C,  
21 and greater than C have really no significance because  
22 concentration of a material is irrelevant. And I can  
23 have one-tenth of a curie of something that's greater  
24 than Class C and a million curies of something that's  
25 Class B, and, obviously, the greater than Class C is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not the bigger risk.

2 So we have to recognize, if we want to  
3 move into a risk-informed future, that the old  
4 classifications just don't fit.

5 The third one is in the ratio -- in the  
6 subject of fission product transport. Historically,  
7 that has been primarily water-related colloid  
8 solubilities, etcetera.

9 I think we need to reassess transport for  
10 two reasons. One, the question of things like  
11 volcanism for Yucca Mountain. But perhaps more  
12 importantly is the whole issue of terrorist attacks.  
13 If there are terrorist attacks, what will be most  
14 important is airborne transport, and I think that's an  
15 area that's been sadly neglected. It wasn't ever all  
16 that important, so we could make a conservative guess  
17 and let it go at that. I think we need to be able to  
18 understand for real what are the potential risks of  
19 transport by air.

20 Since I've got a half a minute left, I'm  
21 going to make one comment on conservatism. In another  
22 incarnation, I've recently participated in source  
23 reconstruction operation using the NCRP screening  
24 criteria, which are very elaborate and very reviewed.  
25 It turned out to be probably close to meaningless.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   There were 50 or 60 isotopes involved.  
2                   Because different degrees of conservatism had been  
3                   used on the different isotopes, the screening criteria  
4                   picked out the half a dozen that are most important  
5                   and what ought to be focused on, and they were the  
6                   wrong ones. Some of the really most serious ones were  
7                   screened out as something you shouldn't consider, and  
8                   that's really a major risk that arises from  
9                   inconsistent conservatisms.

10                   It isn't that the conservatism per se is  
11                   bad. It's that it can lead you to ignoring things  
12                   that are more important.

13                   CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Milt, I really  
14                   didn't want to constrain you too much. Do you have  
15                   other things that you need to address now?

16                   MEMBER LEVENSON: No.

17                   CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: You just talked  
18                   quickly? Okay.

19                   Ray?

20                   VICE CHAIRMAN WYMER: As usual, he who  
21                   talks last has nothing to say.

22                   (Laughter.)

23                   But I have one comment. As Milt said, in  
24                   another incarnation I was involved pretty deeply in  
25                   institutional management, institutional controls. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think that's an 800-pound gorilla that's lying  
2 waiting to spring on us as soon as we get around to  
3 it. And we're getting around to it pretty rapidly.

4 And I was interested to hear Marty  
5 Virgilio bring that up. And since he's not here, I've  
6 got to ask for a little bit more clarification on --  
7 and I have some ideas, too -- but on what the research  
8 needs might be related to institutional controls. I'd  
9 just to hear what the current thinking is of the  
10 research people.

11 MR. THADANI: Well, I'm going to ask for  
12 help on that one. We have -- if you are interested,  
13 I would certainly want to ask Bill to address that.  
14 But this is an issue that clearly deserves some  
15 attention from Research. It was an issue that was  
16 discussed at some length, not exhaustively certainly,  
17 at the last nuclear safety research conference that  
18 the Office of Research sponsors. It was last month.

19 And there were different -- radically  
20 different views expressed by the participants; on one  
21 hand, the strong need for institutional controls, on  
22 the other hand a view or other strongly-held view that  
23 institutional controls don't work. You've got to look  
24 for something else.

25 So it seems to me that, given that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 background, it's clear to me that Research needs to  
2 start thinking about this issue and develop some  
3 plans. And we've sort of briefly touched upon it in  
4 the plan that you've seen, but it's an area that we  
5 need to do some more thinking about. But Bill Ott may  
6 want to add to what I'm saying.

7 MR. OTT: I think Tim will try and give  
8 you some perspectives from Marty. We have not focused  
9 on this a lot yet. We are keeping track of what the  
10 Department of Energy is doing. They went -- the  
11 National Academy had a fairly major study done on  
12 institutional controls. That study came out saying  
13 they had a major problem, and I think we're trying to  
14 follow what they're doing.

15 I think we did touch on it in the plan,  
16 but not to an extensive degree. I think right now  
17 what we're trying to do is follow what DOE is doing.

18 MR. McCARTIN: Yes. Just briefly, in  
19 terms of -- the institutional controls we put forward  
20 for primarily decommissioning, and we have restricted  
21 release, and certainly the question of the durability  
22 of the controls.

23 But also, one of the things that -- part  
24 of the thinking for research would be that for  
25 decommissioning you have a lot of very different types

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of settings, both source term and geological. And the  
2 question would be, it may not be a situation where one  
3 size fits all, here are my suite of institutional  
4 controls. But, rather, depending on the  
5 radionuclides, the nature of the source term, the  
6 geologic setting, there may be certain things that  
7 human activities could effect release of the  
8 radionuclides more so than other areas.

9 And are there things that you could do,  
10 from an institutional control standpoint, that would  
11 make more sense at site A for radionuclides X and Y  
12 versus other ones. And the concept was forward-  
13 thinking, gee, are there things we need to be more  
14 worried about and where controls would be more  
15 appropriate.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WYMER: Now, considering the  
17 rate at which this problem is rising to the surface,  
18 it seems to me that it would be a very good idea to  
19 get your thinking long about now.

20 MR. KESSLER: It leads me to ask, is NRC  
21 -- NRC is certainly not alone in having to worry about  
22 institutional controls. I think EPA's got that issue  
23 in spades for cleanup there. And certainly there are  
24 other institutions worldwide that may be actually  
25 having a few research dollars to do something.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I would encourage NRC to consider talking  
2 to their sister agencies in broader perspective to see  
3 if there are some opportunities to get a joint program  
4 going.

5 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Okay. So let's see,  
6 I'm really last, so --

7 (Laughter.)

8 One of the things that I noted in -- on  
9 several of Marty's slides was that he had listed  
10 instrumentation and monitoring, instrumentation  
11 development and monitoring. And we're talking about,  
12 of course, the NRC primarily and issues that will be  
13 important for regulatory decisions.

14 And I just wanted to toss it out to the  
15 rest of the speakers this morning, do you also see  
16 instrumentation development and monitoring as  
17 important for regulatory decisions? And should NRC be  
18 doing more of that kind of work? John?

19 MR. KESSLER: One of the things that came  
20 up in EPRI's performance confirmation workshop a  
21 couple weeks ago was the idea that if you're going to  
22 put forth a candidate activity for performance  
23 confirmation, you have to be able to know that you can  
24 define what it is you want to measure and that you can  
25 actually measure it, and you can measure it in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 amount of time that is the right amount of time,  
2 whatever time that is that's available.

3 And part of that is certainly the idea of  
4 developing techniques by which you can measure what  
5 you want to measure after you've defined that. So  
6 that it's -- I would agree that it's an important  
7 component of our research.

8 MEMBER LEVENSON: But it's not so clear  
9 that it's the NRC component. I mean, if we look at  
10 the reactor field, it's very clear that you need all  
11 kinds of instrumentation to monitor everything that's  
12 going on. But it's not NRC's role to develop that  
13 instrumentation. Since NRC doesn't own or operate,  
14 say, a repository, is it their responsibility?

15 MR. KESSLER: Well, I see the Center doing  
16 what EPRI does all the time. It was -- I think it  
17 goes back to one of Ken Rogers -- says that projects  
18 that stimulate others to pick up the work, EPRI does  
19 that all the time. I see the Center doing that from  
20 time to time. And this is one where the Center is  
21 doing that.

22 They are looking at one particular  
23 technique of looking at ways you can measure corrosion  
24 of alloy 22 in situ, where they're not going to get  
25 all the way down the road. DOE will need to pick that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 up and go with it, but they've got a good start.  
2 That's the kind of thing that I think that NRC could  
3 also contribute to.

4 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Yes. I think that's  
5 probably a point worth our keeping in front of us, the  
6 point that John just made, and that is this whole idea  
7 of stimulating work that needs to be done. And I  
8 think that probably falls into this -- what has been  
9 called by NRC anticipatory research. There's a bit of  
10 creativity involved when you do these kind of things.

11 Bill, did you have something?

12 MEMBER HINZE: Yes, I'd like to come off  
13 the wall and --

14 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Why?

15 (Laughter.)

16 MEMBER HINZE: Well, as we've heard this  
17 morning, it's important to be consistent.

18 (Laughter.)

19 As I think about this word "future  
20 regulatory" or these words "future regulatory  
21 decisions," I wonder if we shouldn't be concerned  
22 about CFR 60, CFR 63, going into the future. This  
23 country is going to have to face the problem, either  
24 on a technical basis or on a political basis, that  
25 we're going to need another repository at some time.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   And that repository likely will be in an  
2 environment quite different than the current candidate  
3 site. In other words, it may be east of the  
4 Mississippi where the hydrologic and meteorological  
5 and climatic conditions -- as well as many other  
6 conditions will be somewhat different.

7                   If I recall Mel's discussion with this  
8 committee several years ago about how 60 was put  
9 together, it was put together certainly with a -- and  
10 I'm not putting words in his mouth, he can speak for  
11 himself, but was on an ad hoc basis because there was  
12 a lack of information in many areas. And it was also  
13 designed more or less for comparison of the three  
14 sites that were then candidates. That approximates  
15 the truth.

16                   63 is a different matter. That's aimed at  
17 Yucca Mountain. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission I  
18 think really has to look forward to the possibility of  
19 another repository and what that will mean in terms of  
20 a new CFR on the topic and what information is going  
21 to be needed.

22                   If you're going to really look into the  
23 future, and if you want to come off the wall with me,  
24 I think you're going to have to do this.

25                   CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: That's off the wall.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

(Laughter.)

I think what I would like to do, seeing what the hour is, I would like to take now a one-hour break for lunch. And I would like to reconvene at five minutes to 1:00, and we will then start the second part of our session where we'll talk about the knowledge and technical tools needed to address some of these issues.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., the proceedings in the foregoing matter went off the record for a lunch break.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

2 (12:59 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Okay, we are going  
4 to continue on with our workshop topic and the topic  
5 for this afternoon, "Knowledge and Technical Tools  
6 Needed for Future Decisions" and we have several  
7 presenters and then we have some panelists who are  
8 going to comment somewhat, I think, on the  
9 presentations, but knowing the panelists, it will also  
10 be somewhat free form. They will not feel constrained  
11 to offer comments only on what they've heard.

12 So it looks like we're scheduled to have  
13 a tag team here. First, Wes Patrick and Budhi Sagar  
14 from the Center are up. And I don't know how you want  
15 to do it?

16 Budhi's going to do it.

17 MR. SAGAR: Well, obviously Wes didn't  
18 want any blame for this.

19 (Laughter.)

20 I'm by myself and after lunch too. I'd  
21 like to make a couple of introductory remarks before  
22 I begin my presentation. First of all, I did take the  
23 instructions you gave us in the agenda very seriously,  
24 so still just focused on the radionuclide transport  
25 and source term topic, not that the other topics

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 discussed this morning are not important. We think  
2 they are important.

3 And secondly, I did consult with the staff  
4 at the Center in preparing these vu-graphs, so it's  
5 just not my views. There are other people who have  
6 had experience that have input to these topics that I  
7 would bring to you. But I would like to say that we  
8 have not gone through any scientific or systematic  
9 study of prioritizing these topics. These are more ad  
10 hoc topics I asked the staff to tell me what, based on  
11 their experience, what the topics that were most  
12 important for research. And when I say research, we  
13 mean some long-term.

14 I have personal difficulty in classifying  
15 research just anticipatory and confirmatory. To me,  
16 it's very difficult to put them in one box or another.  
17 But my point of view is that if something takes 3, 5,  
18 7, 10 years that's research, which ever form you want  
19 to put it in.

20 (Slide change.)

21 MR. SAGAR: To define research all I mean  
22 or we mean is that it's some combination of laboratory  
23 experiments, field investigations and computational  
24 analyses together to solve some problems. I will not  
25 go into whether this is generic research applicable to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all sites or facilities or not. It's scientific work,  
2 that's what all this amounts to. It would apply to  
3 multiple science, even though some of the examples I  
4 would present at Yucca Mountain, about 80 percent of  
5 the work we do at the Center is related to Yucca  
6 Mountain, so obviously that is the background we come  
7 from, at least in the examples that would be  
8 reflected.

9 We are also not making any distinction  
10 between who sponsors it. I know it's an issue at the  
11 NRC whether it is RES, Office of Research that  
12 sponsors it and assets the work. To us, it doesn't  
13 matter who pays the bills so long as work gets done.  
14 So we're not getting into that organizational issue  
15 here.

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thanks for doing  
17 that Budhi, and I surely hope you don't get into  
18 trouble for being honest with us.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. SAGAR: I hope, and also who conducts  
21 it. I heard this morning and I think we supported  
22 that, the regulator, even NRC, from my international  
23 experience as a lot more associates than the other  
24 regulators in other countries, Europe, for example,  
25 it's still very limited resources. And if you can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 leverage it, as someone said this morning, it's great.  
2 If you can do that, it's great.

3 Of course, there are legal issues some  
4 times. If the Applicant joins into the research, your  
5 research could be questioned on the legal ground,  
6 whether there's a conflict of interest or not. So of  
7 course, the lawyers, would have to get involved at  
8 some point to say whether something can be done or  
9 not. But again, we don't make any distinction on who  
10 sponsors or conducts the research.

11 Well, what are the objections of research?  
12 Of course, risk significant is the most important  
13 foundation on which you're going to choose what topics  
14 to research, so identification of risk significant  
15 features, even some processes. That covers a  
16 multitude of sins here.

17 Any process, any event, any feature of the  
18 geologic setting that might impact the bottom line  
19 risk assessment is a topic, appropriate topic for  
20 research; any structure system and components I'm  
21 bringing into the design issues which may also have  
22 long-term research associated with them; the interface  
23 between natural and engineered systems, there will be  
24 some topics of research in this area.

25 Even though Dr. Rogers this morning said

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 he didn't think human factors were important in  
2 repository, having started some work in the last year  
3 or two which may be naivety on our part because we  
4 started it very late, but we found that for the  
5 preclosure safety, the human factors and the  
6 reliability of software would be extremely important,  
7 that any catastrophe that might happen would probably  
8 have an underlying reason related to human factors and  
9 that the repository ought to be looked at from that  
10 point of view which hasn't been done much. So maybe  
11 at the end of two or three years, we would say gee,  
12 not much needs to be done and if it exists, we do some  
13 review from which the opinion we found was this was  
14 important.

15 To obtain conceptual understanding, again  
16 this has been said this morning. Of course,  
17 conceptual means any foundation of your models has to  
18 be correctly understood. The more realistic you can  
19 make it, the better you understand it, the more  
20 confidence you will have in your bottom line results.

21 More realistic, I say more rather than  
22 simply realistic because I personally believe that  
23 it's impossible to tell when a model is realistic.  
24 You can, as you keep working on it, as you understand  
25 more and more the realism improves, but there's always

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something that you don't understand either because you  
2 simplified something or because the scales are  
3 different between your measurement and what you put in  
4 the models. So there's always approximations  
5 involved.

6 And simplified models, as we heard, and we  
7 agree with it, they are important to understand and to  
8 even do some analysis that you cannot always go to the  
9 detailed level physically realistic, physics  
10 demonstrated as realistic models but that you must  
11 understand what those simplifications do to your  
12 results.

13 So the simplified model, they're the  
14 support for those models and then the main purpose of  
15 research, of course, is at any point when we make a  
16 decision, we think we know what we are doing. Even  
17 the uncertainty bounds are assumed to be known or  
18 estimated, but there are always anomalous phenomena  
19 which this is the unknown kind of things where in  
20 research you try to design experiments, try to design  
21 studies which would detect those, if there are any.

22 And of course, in addition to the  
23 conceptual understanding, the better definition of  
24 model parameters is important because most of our  
25 estimates for long term performance are based on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 models and most of the models are parametric. And how  
2 those parameters are defined, how well we know those  
3 parameters is important. Reduce the number of  
4 assumptions which is my way of saying make them less  
5 conservative by using actual data, if you have them.

6 And I again believe that the conservative  
7 assumptions cannot be completely removed from the  
8 analysis and then again as was discussed this morning,  
9 understand what that does to your analysis, what  
10 safety margin it builds up. I completely agree that  
11 if you do not -- if you're not consistent or if you do  
12 not understand the conservative assumptions that you  
13 make, that some of the important effects would be  
14 masked, that your sensitivity analysis would be  
15 faulty, that any importance you determine may not be  
16 correct, so you have to keep open mind. You have to  
17 figure out what assumptions you made.

18 And then in simplified models, I basically  
19 think of them as lumping various parameters and you  
20 have to understand what that does to your results.

21 The one topic in terms of radionuclide  
22 transport and I'm merely thinking of in geologic  
23 media, not in the atmosphere in terms of the, for  
24 example, the volcanism scenario where it is  
25 transported through atmosphere is -- that comes for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 most as I talk to people is how do we characterize  
2 heterogeneity in the field if you have is you have a  
3 hundred square kilometers in area and maybe 500 meters  
4 in depth, that kind of real estate. How do you  
5 characterize field heterogeneity. And there are two  
6 aspects to it, how do you measure things.

7 We all talk about fractures and faults and  
8 those discrete geologic features, but while physically  
9 one can locate them, even the three dimension geometry  
10 of these features is almost difficult or very  
11 difficult to determine and to measure their, for  
12 example, hydrologic properties or transport  
13 properties, there are no good methods. This might  
14 take five years. This might take 10 years to do, but  
15 that is something one needs to look at.

16 And then most of the data bases that I  
17 have looked at would tell you the hydraulic  
18 conductivity is X or 5. But they will not tell you  
19 well what volume of rock does that apply? The  
20 associated scale summation are rarely mentioned in  
21 data bases. In fact, sometimes they are difficult to  
22 figure out from the test where that scale is. But  
23 that's an important area of research and once you have  
24 figured out that scale, how this is input into a  
25 model, whether you need upscaling or downscaling based

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on your measurements is another theoretical study that  
2 I think needs to get done.

3 The preferential transport paths, we all  
4 know those are important for transport and safety  
5 issues and uncertainties, of course, the stochastic  
6 description of these properties. I must say that some  
7 of the research that has been sponsored by NRC in the  
8 past including a dissenter and elsewhere including in  
9 Arizona and Tucson, in Las Crusas many years ago for  
10 unsaturated flow, in my opinion, is an outstanding  
11 example of trying to do research on this topic. And  
12 I think that's probably one topic that will may take  
13 50 years to figure out reasonably well, but that ought  
14 to be continued.

15 (Slide change.)

16 MR. SAGAR: This is a simple example, let  
17 me do some simulations on Yucca Mountain where the  
18 middle layer that you see, the paintbrush stuff which  
19 is supposed to be not as fractured as the other, the  
20 layers at the top, the Topapah Springs and the Diablo  
21 Canyon, but yet because of the heterogeneity, you see  
22 discrete -- these are particle tracks that are shown  
23 here in white. You see they're discrete paths of  
24 higher flow rates. So the heterogeneity definition  
25 becomes important, even if you are looking at average

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fluxes. You still have to bring in some amounts, some  
2 description of heterogeneity.

3 The other process that plays a major role  
4 in transport are the retention processes and this  
5 includes, of course, the absorption, the ion exchange,  
6 etcetera and that as most hydrologists know, we  
7 started out with assuming simple equilibrium models  
8 with  $K_p$ s as coefficients in the flow and transport  
9 equation. The field, I think, has progressed quite a  
10 bit.

11 Again, NRC two researchers participating  
12 in an international project sponsored by the Nuclear  
13 Agency in Paris which is looking at mechanistic  
14 modeling and comparing the results of the mechanistic  
15 modeling, different types of mechanistic modeling with  
16 actual field data, I think it's an excellent way of  
17 trying to learn what more can be done in this  
18 particular area.

19 But nonreversible line exchange need to be  
20 studied. I'm not again -- let me emphasize, I'm not  
21 saying these things need to be necessarily resolved  
22 before we make a decision, these are long-term  
23 research topics to improve the knowledge base that we  
24 have today. They are not totally unknowns at this  
25 point.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Thermodynamic data, the last bullet on  
2 this slide is another one I want to emphasize because  
3 most of the mechanistic modeling, whatever we end up  
4 using, and these are process level models I'm talking  
5 about, then we will, of course, have the task of  
6 simplifying these mechanistic models to input into the  
7 performance assessment. The thermodynamic data which  
8 are nuclide-specific would need to be collected.

9           Again, NEA is a good example where they  
10 are at least looking at all the literature that exists  
11 anywhere to try to summarize what we know about  
12 thermodynamic data. That is the first step, I think,  
13 after which you can decide what other experiments we  
14 need to do.

15           Another example, again, this is not site  
16 specific, but essentially showing how the  $K_D$  even if  
17 we used the  $K_D$  approach could be related to the  
18 geochemical conditions at a site, for example, for  
19 neptunium, plutonium plotted here as function of pH  
20 and inorganic carbon. True mechanistic modeling. The  
21 idea here was we did detailed level of modeling, the  
22 best we know to date, not that this is the ultimate in  
23 mechanistic modeling, but then simplify it through  
24 these curves to input to the performance assessment  
25 models. That's one way of trying to go from very

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 detailed models to simplified models.

2 John Kessler said this morning he didn't  
3 think colloid was important. That's probably true  
4 with the existing knowledge with the sensitivity  
5 analysis we have done so far, but that doesn't mean --  
6 I still believe it's a less understood topic even --  
7 that was your Ph.D. wasn't it, John?

8 MR. KESSLER: Yes.

9 MR. SAGAR: He probably has more authority  
10 than I have. But to most people I have spoken to tell  
11 me that this is still a very poorly understood topic  
12 and there is a potential for it affecting the risk  
13 that we estimate that that detail of research at the  
14 longer time frame research needs to get done,  
15 including how the colloids are generated, whether  
16 they're stable or not, whether they will be filtered  
17 through the porous media as they move and retardation  
18 of these colloids.

19 I'm trying to finish this in 15 minutes.  
20 Those are the instructions.

21 (Laughter.)

22 (Slide change.)

23 MR. SAGAR: And again, my example shows  
24 you the effect of colloids on transport where the  
25 vertical axis shows you the retardation factor and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 horizontal axis shows the  $K_p$  value and as you include  
2 the colloids which are the flatter curves, what is  
3 showing is that the retardation factor can decrease  
4 quite a bit which means the delay that we expect  
5 normally in the radionuclide transport would be less,  
6 if they were transported by colloids in the field.

7 (Slide change.)

8 MR. SAGAR: Among the source term, the  
9 most important topic that the staff at the Center  
10 thinks is the study of evolution of in-package  
11 environment. This may not apply so much to low level  
12 waste or to apply so much to decommissioning, but  
13 certainly to high level waste where the dissolution  
14 rates of spent fuel and even gas that is formed  
15 depends a lot on what the chemistry is as a function  
16 of time within the waste package, depending upon the  
17 flow rate of water into the waste package, the  
18 corrosion products and how that changes the chemistry  
19 and the rates of corrosion. So those are again things  
20 that need to be studied, we believe, experimentally to  
21 come to some conclusion as to how, at least, bound  
22 them if we don't know realistically what might happen  
23 at this point.

24 And then the waste dissolution rate,  
25 again, mechanistically with different pH values and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 redox conditions. The secondary mineral phases that  
2 affect the dissolutions, especially with the high  
3 burn-up fuel. I think you brought up that topic this  
4 morning in another context.

5 Another example I'm showing here is the  
6 evolution of in-package chemistry where the different  
7 curves here show how the pH varies for different type  
8 of spent fuels as a function of time. This is of  
9 course, model generated, assuming certain flux rates,  
10 assuming certain other conditions, based on a lot of  
11 assumptions. So I wouldn't call it a realistic  
12 simulation at all, but this is trying to get some  
13 sense of how the pH might evolve as time goes on and  
14 as the pH evolves, so does the source stream that  
15 needs to be factored in.

16 (Slide change.)

17 MR. SAGAR: The fuel cladding which is  
18 again an issue and again that might bring you up to  
19 whether you should be conservative or not because, for  
20 example, in the NRC models for Yucca Mountain, we  
21 don't give any credit to cladding. We view cladding  
22 as if it doesn't exist. The DOE, on the other side,  
23 does take quite a bit of credit for cladding and if  
24 that's the case, then of course, as a regulator you  
25 have to have such knowledge to check whether that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cladding does exist and that DOE is assuming is  
2 appropriate or not. And stress corrosion cracking  
3 study again is needed for this, if that credit is to  
4 be allowed, but that is again a research topic.  
5 Unzipping of cladding, under wet and dry conditions is  
6 another topic that we believe has not been studied and  
7 needs to be looked at.

8 My example again shows you that the  
9 fracture, stress corrosion cracking, the stress, the  
10 crack propagation rate could be much higher than we  
11 would normally see under passive conditions.

12 (Slide change.)

13 MR. SAGAR: My last topic is the one  
14 related to performance confirmation and other safety  
15 questions. I think John Kessler answered this  
16 morning, his answer was perfect, I think, from my  
17 point of view, which is that as a regulator, you do  
18 have to worry about whether are indeed reliable  
19 instruments to do the monitoring or not, even though  
20 it is DOE's job, of course, to figure that out, but as  
21 a regulator, the data that comes out of it is supposed  
22 to tell you something and those instrumentations,  
23 those instruments have lost for 20 years, for 30  
24 years, 40 years, whatever number of years, because I  
25 don't know if you can go into that high radiation

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environment and change those things once they fail,  
2 first, and secondly, whether the instruments will  
3 survive that kind of severe environment or not. Now  
4 when we were discussing this topic I was told that  
5 some of this work could be borrowed from space  
6 research. While that may be true, but again, we need  
7 to take a look. I don't think we have really paid  
8 attention.

9 At the Center we did a small project to  
10 see how one might monitor the corrosion rates which  
11 means the corrosion potential, actually, is what we  
12 were trying to measure as a function of time. And  
13 that's again to start some ideas flowing and then  
14 perhaps the DOE will pick it up and run with those  
15 ideas.

16 Long-term monitoring of flow and water  
17 chemistry is important and the instrumentation is not  
18 totally clear how or what the instruments tell you,  
19 how do you analyze those data? How do you draw any  
20 conclusions out of those? That's not a given. We  
21 think it's a simple topic, but when we started  
22 thinking about it, we found it not so easy to figure  
23 it out.

24 And in the context of performance  
25 confirmation and this was discussed at the workshop

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 two weeks ago at EPRI, what are the performance  
2 indicators that you would use and if those performance  
3 indicators exceed certain value or below certain  
4 value, what actions would they call for?

5 The performance indicator definition could  
6 be a research topic because it's not quite clear what  
7 you would measure and how do you correlate those  
8 measurements to how the safety of the system is  
9 judged.

10 Then there are other questions like for  
11 the long term, what the percolation rates are. We  
12 have -- even paleohydrology study may be of interest  
13 here, but certainly actual measurements at site would  
14 be much better for providing some confidence.

15 Do or do not preferential flow paths exist  
16 in the chlorine-36 issue and why does that happen?  
17 What's the explanation? Can you predict it for the  
18 future, therefore, estimate it for the future? The  
19 stability of the drifts is another issue which  
20 supposedly should be simple from rock mechanics point  
21 of view, but my boss tells me it's not so simple.

22 (Laughter.)

23 NRC assumes these -- or DOE assumes these  
24 drifts will be stable for 10,000 years. Well, there's  
25 no historical evidence of that. How do you convince

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people the drifts will be stable, if they will be.

2 Monitoring of trace elements, because  
3 those issues recently have come up that might affect  
4 the life of C-22 containers and coupling of processes  
5 is another big issue. In the simplified models you  
6 obviously cannot have fully coupled processes playing  
7 a role, therefore, there is some research which tells  
8 you how the various coupler processes might be  
9 simplified so that the factors aren't lost when you do  
10 the performance assessment.

11 That's about my last line. So in summary,  
12 these topics, as I said, are ad hoc in the sense I  
13 have no systematic basis of saying well, these are the  
14 only topics. There definitely could be others, I  
15 believe, but these are based primarily on the  
16 experience we have had in the past. I have been in  
17 this program for too long, actually.

18 (Laughter.)

19 I stopped counting after 15 years, but the  
20 rest of the staff at the Center for the last 10 years,  
21 so thank you for giving me the opportunity.

22 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thank you, Budhi.  
23 What we're going to do is take a half hour and I'll  
24 get to you in just a minute. So what I was going to  
25 suggest is we'll take questions up until a half hour

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and rather than me doing it formally and going around  
2 asking, I'll try to just be traffic director and if  
3 Members and guests could just indicate to me with a  
4 wave of the hand and all, I'll try to direct traffic.

5 Milt, you're first.

6 MEMBER LEVENSON: One for clarification.  
7 The figure you have on colloids, is that based on data  
8 or is that a parametric analysis?

9 MR. SAGAR: That's the parametric  
10 analysis. We would like to get some data though.  
11 That's the point of the research issue.

12 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Other questions?

13 MEMBER GARRICK: The things you talked  
14 about are well within the bounds of your guidelines of  
15 talking about the transport and what have you, but you  
16 didn't say anything hardly about the issue of the  
17 chemical and physical properties of the waste itself.  
18 Does that mean that there are no issues there?

19 MR. SAGAR: I wouldn't say that. I would  
20 say that we at the Center have had very little  
21 experience in actually doing experiments on waste  
22 form, simply because they are very expensive, but I'm  
23 sure the high burn-up fuel has issues on what nuclides  
24 and inventory of nuclides in the spent fuel. There  
25 are issues we know about in the glass waste form. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wouldn't go that far to say there are not issues. I  
2 just haven't identified them.

3 MEMBER GARRICK: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Others? Budhi, how  
5 would you characterize the list of ideas that you gave  
6 us? How much of the work that is currently going on  
7 at the Center covers some of these topics?

8 MR. SAGAR: Most of the topics we are  
9 working on one aspect or another, but are not  
10 necessarily in a quote unquote research mode. We do  
11 have the mission at the Center which is to assist in  
12 the licensing actions. Longer term research is  
13 therefore harder to justify in that framework. I was  
14 merely bringing this up, for example, the  
15 heterogeneity issue where you might have a fuel site  
16 where you collect data under controlled conditions for  
17 whatever number of years, do the analysis, change the  
18 experiment according, try to understand the basic  
19 phenomena.

20 We are not doing that. We are doing some  
21 small scale lab experiments on certain things. I have  
22 pleaded with NRC to have a niche at the site for us to  
23 go there and actually do some Institute experiments,  
24 but there is some programmatic problems with doing  
25 that, so we are doing some work, but not to the extent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that could solve the problems.

2 MR. PATRICK: If I could just add a couple  
3 of things to that, I'd also say that I believe without  
4 exception there are one or more agreements in the  
5 issue resolution process with DOE, so DOE is also  
6 pursuing those topics and with the -- and I'd be hard  
7 pressed to find -- colloids may be one or two others -  
8 - these also reflect our experience so far in through  
9 performance assessment, examining how these contribute  
10 to risk.

11 Most of these, because they are in the  
12 research realm, and I guess that's the third point I'd  
13 make. We're talking about areas where we see  
14 opportunities to reduce uncertainties or to increase  
15 the understanding upon which some of those risk  
16 judgments are made and the calculations are founded.

17 MEMBER HINZE: Budhi, I'd like to ask a  
18 question about coupled processes. This was a very  
19 significant item of discussion several years ago. The  
20 low thermal loading has not in any way decreased my  
21 concern about the coupled processes. Coupled  
22 processes are inherent certainly to the high level  
23 waste problem, but to all of the other waste problems  
24 that we have.

25 I have the sense though that these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nonlinear processes that we end up with as a result of  
2 coupled processes have not advanced very far and we --  
3 there seems to be a limited amount that's being done.

4 Is that true and if so, why isn't more  
5 work being done and if more work could be done, what  
6 kind of work do you think should be done?

7 MR. SAGAR: Well, I can express my  
8 personal opinion. It's obviously a very broad topic.  
9 I personally think that not a whole lot of work is  
10 being done or can be done is because they are  
11 difficult to study any time you couple let's say the  
12 thermal, the hydrologic and chemical processes  
13 experimentally or even in the field sites, the  
14 instrumentation itself, it's not known. Any scale of  
15 experimentation it's a very difficult -- we have seen  
16 this, the bulkhead is moved, it starts leaking from  
17 somewhere, the heterogeneities are not known. What do  
18 you do with such a test. You can't interpret it.

19 So I think that's the main reason is the  
20 difficulty and interpretation. I think it surely has  
21 progressed quite a bit. I think the data, the actual  
22 experimental and field data is what is lacking to  
23 check those theories or hypotheses plus I do believe  
24 that in the end as engineers, we do have to figure out  
25 how to linearize the nonlinear processes best, how to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decouple the coupled processes, to simplify the model  
2 and to be able to really do this sensitivity analysis.  
3 To me that's the important step that needs to be done.

4 MEMBER HINZE: Natural analogs would also  
5 seem to be a way that one could, if one could  
6 deconvolve the results that one ends up with in  
7 natural analogs and geoscientists do this all the  
8 time. It would seem that this would be a fertile  
9 area.

10 Perhaps this is an area in which some  
11 competitive research, RFPs, might draw some things out  
12 of the woodwork that would start to give us a little  
13 more confidence that we have a handle on these coupled  
14 processes.

15 I still think that this is a weak point  
16 and it's something that we shouldn't be just  
17 relegating to longer term research. These problems  
18 are important in some of the decommissioning of the  
19 tailing sites and so forth.

20 MR. SAGAR: I agree with you, but partly.  
21 I have spent quite a bit of time looking at natural  
22 analogs and I think they have to be by their very  
23 nature longer term projects because to be deconvolved,  
24 you have to first characterize those natural analog  
25 sites reasonably well and that requires resources.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That requires time and if you do half job which is not  
2 just going and do bullet holes and say well I can  
3 deconvolve, I don't think you can.

4 MEMBER HINZE: I agree with you. I failed  
5 to express myself well. It's a long-term problem in  
6 terms of getting at it, but the problems are right  
7 with us today. That's what I wanted to -- that's what  
8 I mean.

9 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Okay, thank you very  
10 much, Budhi.

11 MR. SAGAR: Thank you, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Mal, you're going to  
13 put on a different hat.

14 MR. KNAPP: In some ways, this is in part  
15 a continuation of some of the things that I said this  
16 morning and I'd like to make a couple of caveats with  
17 respect to radionuclide transport and source term  
18 work, I have to defer to what I think is some  
19 outstanding work that's been done by the Center and by  
20 the staff.

21 I think it's well documented in the  
22 technical portions of the IRSRs. I do have a few  
23 views on that that I will share, but I'm going to ask  
24 your indulgence while I speak about one or two other  
25 things that I think might be worth considering as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 research is pursued and one that will come up  
2 tomorrow.

3 The first thought that I wanted to talk  
4 about briefly was the topic of the pursuit of flaws  
5 and I'll explain a little more what I mean about that  
6 in a minute and a little bit about prioritization and  
7 then I will talk about some views on radionuclide  
8 transport and source term.

9 When I talk about the pursuit of flaws,  
10 it's something that crossed my mind more than once at  
11 the NRC and one that may very well apply to research.  
12 In my years at the Agency, I was never particularly  
13 interested in developing a system that got an A. But  
14 I was keenly interested in a system which never got an  
15 F and so I was less interested in achieving  
16 outstanding performance than I was in a system which  
17 was robust against virtually anything that uncertainty  
18 or unknowns could throw at it.

19 With that in mind, I wonder if research  
20 done by the NRC might not on occasion take what I  
21 might call a contrarian approach. Somebody once said  
22 when everything appears to be going in one direction  
23 that's a signal it's time to take a good hard look in  
24 the other direction.

25 For example, when I did my graduate work

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I suspect that's probably true of a number of  
2 people around the table, I started with something very  
3 simplistic. I was intending to model the blast  
4 furnace, but I did stuff in a small lab on very simple  
5 well understood materials and I developed some  
6 understanding of that, but the ability to translate  
7 that into the blast furnace was obviously work that  
8 was going to take another decade or two or three.

9 I sometimes wonder if we would be looking  
10 for flaws and looking for the potential for Fs if  
11 maybe it wouldn't be worthwhile to start with some  
12 systems that are very complex, watch how they behave  
13 and if you've seen this behavior then try to simplify  
14 them using something like say a dichotomous search, to  
15 ask what aspects of this complex system were, in fact,  
16 contributors to the misbehavior.

17 I would assert and this is literally an  
18 unsorted assertion, that maybe an avenue for research  
19 again, perhaps anticipatory research might be less to  
20 understand what was going on and more to simply try to  
21 observe failures and then once a failure is observed  
22 then try to bear in and become more simple to pursue  
23 the understanding. It's just a thought for  
24 discussion.

25 I'd like to talk a little bit about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 prioritization processes because that was a feature of  
2 the radionuclide transport program plan. And I just  
3 had a couple of thoughts. As I read it, the current  
4 system that's used in research is shown on the slide  
5 with a number of contributors to prioritization,  
6 credibility and agency support, safety significance,  
7 so forth, down to unnecessary burden reduction or  
8 reduction of unnecessary burden and what the  
9 contributors might be.

10 If one presumes that research and the  
11 Agency will continue with this sort of a  
12 prioritization scheme, I did have one or two questions  
13 that came to mind. With respect to whether or not a  
14 project was credible or had Agency support or what its  
15 safety significance was, while I don't want to take  
16 anything away from safety significance, I remember  
17 Edison's statement "what use is a newborn baby?"

18 One of the problems that I had in NMSS  
19 years ago, was that I was very uncomfortable with  
20 attempting to support anticipatory research because I  
21 was looking at a very small window, one or two years  
22 out into the future and so I might question whether  
23 seeking what was obviously a safety significant  
24 problem or seeking agency support might not move the  
25 research into topics that are a little more short term

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a little more essential to confirmatory research and  
2 so I might ask whether those are really things that  
3 should be used.

4 I also asked the question in  
5 prioritization about what I'll call rewards. If we  
6 can talk about risk, I'm just talking about the  
7 inverse. What I see in the prioritization system is  
8 something that leads to identification of an area as  
9 an area worth doing work in, but I didn't really  
10 necessarily see an effort to say take a particular  
11 research project and ask if this project is  
12 successful, what would be the impact of that success  
13 on this significant area and while we're at it, what's  
14 the probability of success of that particular avenue  
15 of research? Now that may be implicit in some of the  
16 things under the prioritization process, but they  
17 didn't jump out at me.

18 And if I'm going to be contrary, I'll also  
19 go against a number of things that Bruce said earlier  
20 today in terms of leverage. While I think leverage is  
21 certainly important and I particularly agree with Ken  
22 Rogers' view that a program which is supported by  
23 everybody will probably be subject to more scrutiny  
24 which I think is a good idea, I also worry  
25 fundamentally about the cost. We should be asking at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 least in part of the questions what's the cost to the  
2 NRC? If it's leveraged, that's good. But if the  
3 basic cost to the NRC is high, that's still something  
4 to think about.

5 So I guess what I'm headed toward is if  
6 research continues with this system that they're using  
7 now, it would seem to me that it could profitably be  
8 considered whether there might be some modifications.  
9 Perhaps one of the two of the factors could receive a  
10 lower weighting than a couple of other factors. The  
11 ones I've mentioned or others perhaps might get  
12 greater consideration than I think they're getting  
13 now.

14 As an alternative, of course, we have  
15 performance assessment and I mean performance  
16 assessment with respect to waste matters, not just to  
17 include the TSPA or the TPA and the high level waste  
18 program, but performance assessment which has been  
19 done on low level waste and I know that in the not too  
20 distance past there's a pretty significant program.  
21 Perhaps the results of that program or reapplication  
22 of it could be considered as a basis for deciding what  
23 are some areas for research might be fruitful.

24 But if you want to talk about the high  
25 level waste program, the TPA was just finished. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think you've heard at least a bit about it in August,  
2 published in August and of course, that's identified  
3 a number of areas such as the ones that I have behind  
4 me where at least research or significant influential  
5 parameters have been identified and those are  
6 certainly some areas that I would probably look at in  
7 looking at what on the list of the current research  
8 program plan could be attacked.

9 And of course, I'd be very interested in  
10 how that performance assessment or any might be  
11 flawed. I think that was discussed a bit. While, of  
12 course, I'd be interested in whether or not the code  
13 would work and whether or not the abstractions were  
14 right, I'm also interested in whether the fundamental  
15 models underlying the entire concept is, in fact, well  
16 understood and I'll get to that in a minute because  
17 that's something I worry about in transport and in  
18 source term.

19 Another thing that is just a side bar on  
20 this that troubles me a little bit is that I seem to  
21 be seeing more and more comments that read something  
22 like the performance assessment tells us this or the  
23 TSP tells us that and I sometimes wonder if we haven't  
24 created a complex code in our own image which we are  
25 now -- we don't really understand what's going on in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the code, but it tells this, so it must be right. I  
2 think there was discussion this morning about well,  
3 shouldn't we have some simpler models which  
4 essentially do about the same thing which we can  
5 understand. I think that's a very good idea. I am  
6 concerned about the possibility that some of these  
7 codes may have flaws in them which are too  
8 sophisticated for any of us to see, but nonetheless,  
9 point us in the wrong direction. I worry about that.

10 But if you're going to use performance  
11 assessment to figure out where research might be done,  
12 again, I return to some of the questions I asked a  
13 moment or two ago about the current research process.  
14 Performance assessment has identified a number of  
15 influential parameters and I'd consider them, but then  
16 I'd go back and ask some more questions. How  
17 influential is that parameter? What kind of research  
18 might the NRC do on it? If that particular project is  
19 successful, what would its impact on that parameter  
20 be? What's the probability that it will succeed? And  
21 again, how much will it cost?

22 Anyway, I appreciate your indulging me for  
23 a couple of thoughts on prioritization and what I'd  
24 like to do now is to say a few words about  
25 radionuclide transport.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think that the program plan, I saw it,  
2 I believe it's very comprehensive. While I certainly  
3 wouldn't call myself an expert in the area, I can say  
4 that nothing came to my mind that I thought should be  
5 considered which was not reflected somewhere in the  
6 plans, so I think it does deal with again, as far as  
7 I can tell, just about everything one might want to  
8 consider.

9 On the other hand, I think as Ken Rogers  
10 said this morning, it's now time to cull out something  
11 that can be done with the resources available, using  
12 some of the prioritization schemes that I mentioned or  
13 what you will be discussing tomorrow in terms of  
14 prioritization.

15 And I also heard Budhi say some thoughts  
16 about mechanistic modeling and that sort of leads me  
17 to the first bullet that I have here. One of the  
18 things that I'm troubled about is whether we, in fact,  
19 have a fundamental understanding of retardation. And  
20 I don't know.

21 I can tell you that we understand it one  
22 heck of a lot better than we did 20 years ago when I  
23 got into the business, but do we really understand it  
24 well enough, recognizing that we are extrapolating the  
25 results for 300, 3000 times the intervals that we're

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actually look at them, maybe 10,000 in some cases.  
2 And when I talk about the fundamental understanding,  
3 what I worry about is in a number of these areas and  
4 I noticed it in looking at the surface complexation  
5 models recently. They're good models. They make good  
6 intuitive sense. They fit the data, but I wonder if  
7 we can say more about them than that. Is the only  
8 thing that we can say is that they are intuitively  
9 sound and that we can select parameters within them to  
10 fit the data? What independent lines of study have we  
11 to confirm that those are, in fact, the applicable  
12 mechanisms? Or are there other models out there which  
13 also make good intuitive sense, but where parameters  
14 may be selected that fit the data, and yet the two  
15 models perhaps a 1,000 or 10,000 years from now might  
16 lead to different results. And I'm not sure. I don't  
17 mean to particularly pick on that particular set of  
18 models, but I just ask myself how well do we really  
19 understand these things and to what extent are they  
20 simply things which are intellectually satisfying, but  
21 may yet not be fully descriptive. So Budhi's comment  
22 earlier on mechanistic modeling was one that I  
23 heartily endorse.

24 Another area that is of interest to me, I  
25 guess what I'll call predecessor and companion

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 effects. What I mean is that once radionuclides are  
2 released, say from any facility, high level waste  
3 facility, they are going to have been preceded  
4 probably by heaven knows what and you folks can write  
5 it up better than I can, very possibly changes in  
6 oxygen as a result of having created the repository,  
7 leftovers from corrosion of titanium drip shield,  
8 leftovers from alloy 22, leftovers from the stainless.

9 I see these things as a bow wave as one  
10 does chromatography through the entire system and to  
11 what extent will these predecessors or could the  
12 predecessors affect radionuclide transport to the  
13 point that some of the tests that are done to date, in  
14 fact, really don't bear on what they will see. They  
15 may bear on what's there now, but do they bear on what  
16 will be there?

17 And likewise, I wonder about companions.  
18 And I'm just talking about other species which one  
19 might not look at. Are there other say decay products  
20 from radionuclides which could alter the way that  
21 chemical processes work, but which we've ignored  
22 because after all, they're benign. Or are there other  
23 things that will travel along with them and obviously,  
24 this is not a discontinuous set. There will be a  
25 continuum of a variety of materials and species that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can travel. That's not to say that work is not being  
2 done in the area. I just haven't seen it and that's  
3 something that I would ask whether or not that kind of  
4 work might be done.

5 If you want to get a little bit more  
6 specific, one of the things that I noted from Ken  
7 Rogers' panel is that Jan Long mentioned that -- to  
8 her understanding we did not yet have a conceptual  
9 model that explained chlorine 36 at depth. If that  
10 continues to be the case that's certainly something  
11 I'm curious about and I'd like to know if there is a  
12 model.

13 Likewise, there are specifics on  
14 radionuclide transport that again come from the TPA  
15 that Tim McCartin and the Center folks and others ably  
16 did. They identified key radionuclides. They  
17 identified absorption in the alluvium. I know the  
18 question was raised as to whether that was necessarily  
19 a high priority, but these are just some of the things  
20 that jumped out at me in terms of transport from my  
21 perspective.

22 Let me move on and talk a little bit about  
23 the source term. And I return to the same concerns  
24 about fundamental understanding, from the same  
25 perspective about extrapolation of results far into

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the future.

2 I worry about accelerated testing and I  
3 think the Center has worried about that. Perhaps  
4 there's some accelerated testing that has not been  
5 done because we don't really understand it. I know  
6 that when I did accelerate testing in industry, we did  
7 it for shorter terms. We developed models where in  
8 the case of the work that I did, we actually, if we  
9 waited around long enough could validate the things.  
10 But for that reason we did it empirically and a lot of  
11 the accelerated testing really had an empirical basis,  
12 was not well understood.

13 I asked myself are some of the accelerated  
14 tests that are done here equally based on picking up  
15 from these empirical tests that have been done in the  
16 past and how well do we really understand the  
17 fundamental differences in what we are accelerating  
18 the tests for. And of course, there are things that  
19 you ask about what, in fact, if you test spent fuel or  
20 waste form today, what are you doing to give you  
21 confidence that it's like the spent fuel or waste form  
22 that you might have 1,000 years from now after it's  
23 been subjected to the passage of time, radiation and  
24 all the other things that occur.

25 I'm also worried about scaling effects.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And when I talk about scaling effects what I'm asking  
2 is are the samples which are being tested today, in  
3 fact, equivalent to what one will see in the  
4 repository when this is a working industrial sized  
5 process. I think about particularly the container and  
6 I think about the differences and again, you folks  
7 know the materials I'm sure better than I, but you  
8 know what's important: composition, processing and  
9 you get the properties. I worry about the processing  
10 of one of these containers and I ask myself will there  
11 -- is there a possibility things will be introduced in  
12 the processing of a large-scale container we might not  
13 see in the test today?

14 Some of the times I have found processing  
15 of lots of material introduces perhaps small amounts  
16 of impurities, but these small amounts of impurities  
17 can have a very large impact on the properties and on  
18 the material that's being worked. And so perhaps I'd  
19 ask if you were to process alloy 22, what does our  
20 experience show in how it -- what are the things that  
21 might happen to it? I know some work has been done  
22 and been considered. Has it been fully considered?  
23 I'm just not real sure.

24 So I'd be interested in whether or not  
25 moving up to that scale or perhaps having something

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tested constructed at that scale would give us some  
2 information that would be useful. And again, it's  
3 just a fundamental understanding of these things. Do  
4 we have enough to extrapolate into the future?

5 If you want to get a little more specific,  
6 I'm worried about alloy 22. And I'm not really sure  
7 I can tell you why. It's almost intuitive. Maybe  
8 it's that I've known 316 for a lot longer and maybe  
9 it's because spent fuel has been around longer and  
10 because I've got more experience with Borosilicate  
11 glass and that may just be it. It may just be that I  
12 don't know that much about it and that I'm uncertain,  
13 but I still worry about it a little bit and I wish I  
14 knew more.

15 I know the Center has identified stress  
16 corrosion cracking in alkaline environments. That's  
17 something I'd like to know a little more about. Other  
18 things have popped up that just -- I'm curious about.  
19 You folks had a presentation, I think, the 28th of  
20 August when Ray Wymer noted that one of the processes  
21 on corrosion looked as a result of the temperature  
22 dependence, I think is what might be diffusion  
23 controlled. Well, Lord, if it's diffusion controlled,  
24 what will be done other than maybe measure diffusion  
25 coefficients? That's where I get back to my concern

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the fundamental understanding of how these  
2 things go on.

3 I'm just -- I wish I was more comfortable  
4 with alloy 22 and I guess what I would do of the  
5 various things that are out there, that's something  
6 I'd mess around with a little bit simply because I'm  
7 just not that comfortable with it. Now Wes and Budhi  
8 and others may very well tell you that it's a very  
9 well understood material and that if I were more into  
10 it I wouldn't have these worries and if they were, I'd  
11 certainly defer to them, but that's something that  
12 does have me a bit bothered.

13 So those are a few of the thoughts that I  
14 have. I was a little general, but hopefully I've  
15 gotten down to at least a few specifics that might  
16 merit further discussion.

17 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Thank you. John?

18 MEMBER GARRICK: Yes. Malcolm, you have  
19 articulated some very interesting and thought-  
20 provoking ideas and we appreciate them a great deal.  
21 There is one theme to what you're saying that I just  
22 want to comment on and get your reaction to and that  
23 theme is basically that there's a lot of things here  
24 that we don't understand to the level of satisfaction  
25 that would bring one great comfort. And so the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question is how well do we understand things like  
2 retardation?

3           Isn't the real question though not so much  
4 how well do we understand it, but how well do we need  
5 to understand it if we take into account what we don't  
6 understand? That's kind of the foundation of risk  
7 assessment. And I worry about getting on to a line of  
8 thinking that we've got this long list of things and  
9 we are uncomfortable about our level of understanding  
10 of them and really, the best way to deal with it is to  
11 go down the list one by one and gain that level of  
12 understanding to where you have arrived at the comfort  
13 zone.

14           One of the things that we've discovered by  
15 the use of the risk assessment thought process is that  
16 in the end, we have found out that many things we  
17 don't need to understand very well, as long as we have  
18 some real sense of the bounds that are involved. We  
19 can have seven orders of magnitude of uncertainty in  
20 the frequency of occurrence of an earthquake of a  
21 certain magnitude, as long as it doesn't contribute  
22 much to the core melt frequency, for example.

23           So that's the one thing I'd like to get  
24 your reaction to.

25           MR. KNAPP: And I would agree with you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 completely. I think the question that I would ask and  
2 you've just given a good example, I could care whether  
3 there are seven orders of magnitude uncertainty in the  
4 prediction of an earthquake if we have confidence that  
5 the number is small enough that that seven orders of  
6 magnitude does not hurt us.

7 MEMBER GARRICK: Yes.

8 MR. KNAPP: Have we enough understanding,  
9 enough - -and perhaps we don't need understanding.  
10 Have we confidence in that number? That's where I  
11 would say if we're comfortable that -- if we are  
12 comfortable that seven orders of magnitude is not  
13 going to have an impact on the repository, then I'd  
14 say fine.

15 I certainly did not mean to suggest that  
16 yes, if we had the world's budget and two or three  
17 lifetimes, it would be nice to know all of this in  
18 detail, but absolutely. The place where I'm looking  
19 for understanding would be in those areas which we  
20 already believe to have a significant influence on the  
21 repository and any time we can throw out some of that  
22 as a result of other -- something that gives us  
23 confidence that we don't need to look at this  
24 particular piece or that piece, I agree  
25 wholeheartedly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARRICK: See, this touches on the  
2 whole issue of good science versus adequate science.

3 MR. KNAPP: Right.

4 MEMBER GARRICK: Yeah.

5 MR. KNAPP: My real question is more if --  
6 one of the reasons I was interested in waste packages  
7 is obviously DOE places a great deal of reliance on it  
8 and so the question I would ask is well do we  
9 understand those tests well enough that we believe  
10 that reliance -- are we comfortable extrapolating. If  
11 we are comfortable extrapolating without understanding  
12 particular areas, I certainly wouldn't push it just  
13 for the sake of understanding.

14 MEMBER GARRICK: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Ray?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN WYMER: For the benefit of  
17 those who weren't exposed to my wisdom at that August  
18 meeting, I'd like to point out that I wasn't speaking  
19 for many deep understanding of the corrosion of alloy  
20 22, but only from the point of view that the  
21 activation energy for the corrosion is based on the  
22 temperature dependence was right in the ballpark of  
23 what is normally considered to be diffusion-controlled  
24 reactions whereas a chemical reactions generally are  
25 a factor of 5 higher, 3 to 5 higher.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KNAPP: And I would agree entirely.  
2 It's simply that when you see that, to me, certain  
3 alarm bells go off and you ask, well, does this tell  
4 us it's diffusion-controlled or does it tell us  
5 perhaps it's chemistry-controlled, but perhaps they're  
6 competing chemistry processes, one of which goes up  
7 and one of which goes down. It just causes me to sort  
8 of ask myself, do we really understand what's going  
9 on, given that step.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN WYMER: Well, it does me  
11 too, Mal.

12 MR. KNAPP: That was basically my concern,  
13 do we really know why this is the case.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN WYMER: Same way if affected  
15 me.

16 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Michael, did you  
17 have a -- okay. Other questions?

18 MEMBER LEVENSON: Clarification. You  
19 referred to it would be nice to have a model or  
20 concept to explain the chlorine 36 at depth. Has it  
21 been established for sure that there is chlorine 36 at  
22 depth? I thought that was still a very much open  
23 question.

24 MR. KNAPP: That's a good question and I'm  
25 going to have to admit my ignorance. My only thought

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is given that it's there, I'd feel a lot more  
2 comfortable if there was a satisfying model that  
3 explained it. If it is not there or if it had already  
4 been explained, then I wouldn't ask that it be  
5 pursued.

6 MEMBER LEVENSON: As far as I know, it's  
7 not been confirmed that it's there. That was the  
8 context of my question.

9 MEMBER GARRICK: One lab thinks it is and  
10 another lab thinks it isn't.

11 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Andy?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: The chlorine 36 is there.  
13 The real issue is the ratio of the chlorine 36 to the  
14 stable --

15 (Laughter.)

16 Both labs are coming up with similar  
17 numbers for chlorine 36, but different numbers for the  
18 much larger amount of the stable isotope of chloride  
19 and that's where those chlorine 36 ratios differ  
20 between those two labs. In fact, it's a similar  
21 amount of chlorine 36 in both sets of analyses.

22 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Other questions or  
23 comments? Thank you, Mal.

24 John, John Kessler is going to be our next  
25 presenter.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER LEVENSON: Still with EPRI?

2 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: Still with EPRI. As  
3 far as I know.

4 MR. KESSLER: I also attempted to follow  
5 the general theme here and focus a bit more this time  
6 on source term and radionuclide transport, but my  
7 comments will go everywhere and I have the same caveat  
8 as Budhi. I don't care whether it's NMSS or research,  
9 it's all research that might be something that NRC  
10 would wish to consider, so you'll have to bear that in  
11 mind as we go through.

12 CHAIRMAN HORNBERGER: And you certainly  
13 won't get into any trouble for saying that.

14 MR. KESSLER: Yes, exactly. Okay, so what  
15 did I look at to make the comments here? Basically,  
16 all the stuff that Dick so nicely sent to us, the ACNW  
17 letters, the expert panel report on the role and  
18 direction of NRC research, the NRC research draft plan  
19 for radionuclide transport, the Center's May 2001  
20 research plan report and then some work that we've  
21 done on top of it.

22 Okay, so I'm going to start with the  
23 advice from the panel of experts. I think their  
24 advice was fundamentally sound, sounded like good  
25 stuff to me: analytical hierarchy program by research

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 needs to better account for waste research,  
2 absolutely. The high level waste program needs to  
3 have a long term anticipatory research program.

4 Sounds good to me, but let's figure out  
5 what that means. I'm still having my trouble wrapping  
6 my arms around what this anticipatory research thing.  
7 Can we distinguish it from the others? I think that  
8 was something that Budhi expressed concern about as  
9 well. I think we can. I really think that there's  
10 some aspects to anticipatory research that can be  
11 distinguished, but let's do that.

12 Research should be doing more work on the  
13 utilization of PRA results and developing improved PRA  
14 methods. Again, I would agree.

15 NRC needs to be doing work on secondary  
16 phases. Yes. It may be falling in the cracks between  
17 NMSS and research responsibilities. I leave that to  
18 NRC to figure it out. But it does seem to be that  
19 sort of in between kind of subject where secondary  
20 phases could conceivably be quite important.

21 And the draft NRC research plan for  
22 radionuclide and transport and the Center both include  
23 it and I only note that to make sure, to ask the  
24 question are they fully coordinated with each other on  
25 what aspects of that problem they're working on.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Certainly, we encourage expanded use of  
2 collaborative R & D. Sorry, I'm going to be a broken  
3 record on this, but it's certainly our bread and  
4 butter. We do a lot of it. It works well for our  
5 extremely limited budget. I'm probably one of the  
6 less collaborative guys at EPRI in terms of the amount  
7 of collaborative R & D that's done. I'm going to  
8 point to one success story here that I alluded to this  
9 morning.

10           Sorry, Ashok isn't here, but this is the  
11 dry cask storage characterization project where I'm  
12 the EPRI project manager, Roger Kenneally is the NRC  
13 research project manager and we've got DOE-EM and DOE-  
14 RW that all kicked in some money. What did we do? We  
15 reopened the cask that was in storage for 14 years to  
16 look for some signs of aging. It was one of the sort  
17 of lead casks out there. This took a lot of money.

18           None of us had it by ourselves, so we  
19 jointly funded work that was limited to data  
20 collection here. And this was discussed earlier.  
21 They did an interpretation. We all go off and do our  
22 own interpretation. But we're all very careful and I  
23 really think that in practice we are careful about  
24 making sure that when we work these things through,  
25 we're trying to define what data we're looking at and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interpretations will be left for another day.

2 I would just say that having suffered  
3 through the process of getting this thing, this  
4 agreement set, that a cooperative agreement with a  
5 nonfederal organization should be made easier, please.

6 (Laughter.)

7 It just -- I think that we've made some  
8 progress by going through these, but it is tough to  
9 establish the ground rules by which one co-funds work.

10 Let's see, the NRC research, draft  
11 research program plan -- I'm going to skip to  
12 radionuclide transport and the environment. I think  
13 the overall philosophy that they use is sound for the  
14 plan. For example, they say conduct research that  
15 will support credible, realistic and defensible  
16 estimates of risk to the public. Sure sounds like  
17 music to me. It's a tall order, but I think that they  
18 can do a lot to do that.

19 Incorporate the best scientific  
20 information on uncertainties and risks. Again, sounds  
21 like the right words. They also say  
22 oversimplification of models lead to underestimates  
23 and overestimates of risk. And both are deemed  
24 unacceptable. That also sounds good.

25 And maintaining an awareness of the latest

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 scientific and technological developments. This is  
2 sort of the, the exploratory research for the future  
3 technologies. And that also sounds like it's an  
4 important component to what they do. Teasing this out  
5 of what they do is perhaps something that could be  
6 done better.

7 Okay, I'm going to start to be  
8 controversial here just to prove a point or just to --  
9 not to prove a point because God knows, we can't prove  
10 anything, but to elucidate a point, let's put it that  
11 way.

12 This is some recent work of EPRI here with  
13 our performance assessment of dose rate which looks  
14 like it got cut off there, versus time, where again,  
15 this is for one particular branch, where we looked at  
16 let's move -- this is the maximum likelihood Wet  
17 Branch, just one where we actually get some invection  
18 through our part of the repository. It says  
19 accessible environment out in front of the alluvium  
20 and we had two kilometers of alluvium out at the back  
21 end. What we see is that if we move it out two  
22 kilometers ahead and lose all that sorption and all  
23 that delay, well, at least on a log scale here, we  
24 just don't see much. And why don't we see much when  
25 others see more? And I would argue it's because we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take a lot more credit for fracture matrix interaction  
2 and other processes in the saturated zone that the  
3 others don't.

4 Now maybe we've taken too much credit.  
5 Fine. All I'm saying is is that your research  
6 priority here is an example of where it might be  
7 affected by your understanding of another system, in  
8 this case fracture matrix interaction in the saturated  
9 zone which I would argue is a much more important  
10 thing to get right.

11 So if we can -- if I can say that we've  
12 done a more realistic job, one would say that you need  
13 to be more realistic as possible and if not, it  
14 affects the relative features of processes  
15 performance. That's the point I want to make here in  
16 terms of trying to decide what you want to go after  
17 here.

18 But this is what leads me to not be so  
19 excited about studying sorption in the alluvium. It's  
20 because I'm more excited about taking proper credit  
21 for fracture matrix interaction in the saturation  
22 zone.

23 Okay, while we certainly all advocate the  
24 idea of trying to make our PRAs more realistic, that's  
25 just not enough. First of all, as I alluded to this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 morning, they're very difficult to put together, a  
2 realistic PRA in some areas and one that Budhi talked  
3 about and I think that they're making strides at  
4 trying to get some way down that road is in-package  
5 chemistry. It governs corrosion and waste form  
6 degradation and solubility limits, in-package  
7 sorption, all that stuff. Well, I don't know if that  
8 falls within the NMSS or the research program, but I  
9 imagine it's one of these overlap issues that could be  
10 defined.

11 Our favorite one, whipping boy, these days  
12 is diffusion from the waste forms surfaced through the  
13 container internals through the container wall, down  
14 the pedestal, through the invert to the nearest  
15 flowing fracture. That is a complicated system and  
16 what DOE has been doing is modeling it in my mind on  
17 the whole seems very conservative.

18 You could probably come up with some  
19 nonconservative scenarios in there, but I would argue  
20 on the whole it's extraordinarily conservative, how  
21 they models this, almost to the point where they've  
22 got diffusion as a dominant release mechanism from the  
23 EBS. Well, if I had diffusion as a dominant release  
24 mechanism from the EBS I might care a whole lot about  
25 the solubility limits of certain things because that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sort or my driver to force my diffusion out of the  
2 EBS.

3 If it's not, well, maybe I don't care any  
4 more or don't care that much about solubility limits.  
5 I care more about the actual infection through than I  
6 care about maybe the degradation rate of the fuel and  
7 even then I wouldn't argue. But I'm just saying  
8 getting this model right may affect what you say is  
9 important and is a really tough problem to be  
10 realistic.

11 Transverse dispersion in a fractured media  
12 across many kilometers, gee, I'm glad Jane is here, is  
13 something that I don't know if there's much field data  
14 out there for a fractured porous media system. I mean  
15 they've done a lot like Bordon and nice porous media  
16 and found not much going on, but I think that the  
17 situation is probably different and especially over  
18 the time scales of importance.

19 Whether you care about transverse  
20 dispersion or not when we are forced to think about  
21 3,000 acre feet per year is another issue from a  
22 regulatory standpoint, but if not, it could be  
23 important.

24 So all of this is going to require  
25 multiple approaches. Again, I argue for the use of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expert judgment in elicitation. I don't want to say  
2 that we want to replace collecting data with expert  
3 judgment, but let's be realistic here. We are not  
4 going to be able to collect all the data we'd like to  
5 collect when it's time to make decisions. And  
6 somehow, we need to think through and have a better  
7 process for using expert judgment in such situations  
8 for maybe where we have limited data. How are we  
9 going to do that?

10 Long term R & D and performance  
11 confirmation. Again, that's out there. It's  
12 something where we should have reasonably high  
13 confidence as we proceed to the next stage of  
14 repository development, but long term R & D in a  
15 performance confirmation program should help us manage  
16 the data uncertainties that may be out there as we  
17 proceed into the next stage.

18 And certainly, we talked a lot about how  
19 that falls into the whole program of how you proceed  
20 in our performance confirmation workshop. A summary  
21 report from the panel, I think, is out on the back  
22 table, if you haven't got one where we talked about  
23 that.

24 And then natural analogs is again another  
25 one where if you can look at what's out there, it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 might help you provide even a better PRA or some sort  
2 of independent understanding as to what's going on.

3 Okay, on to -- these are some random  
4 comments on the proposed NRC research R & D plan.  
5 I'll get back to this point again. There's no clear  
6 distinction between regulatory needs and exploratory  
7 research in the proposal. Can the exploratory  
8 elements be identified? And are they inextricably --  
9 or are they inextricably linked to the regulatory  
10 needs. I think we heard the argument earlier today  
11 that they probably are somewhat mixed up. Well, fine.  
12 But I really do feel that the exploratory component  
13 could be highlighted and that should help in decision  
14 making as to whether it gets funded or whether it  
15 doesn't get funded.

16 I'm picking on Biosphere merely as an  
17 example of the kind of detail that one would go into,  
18 not that biosphere is more important than any other  
19 aspect of what's in the plan.

20 There was some discussion about working  
21 toward benchmarking RESRAD when they said well,  
22 there's lots of extent biosphere model codes out  
23 there. I know we're funding our own, that would do  
24 just as well and I'm wondering why RESRAD -- my guess  
25 is that there's regulatory reasons, but again, it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be nice if there was some discussion as to why  
2 that's there.

3 Work on radionuclide distribution and  
4 resuspension factors for tephra and dust is now  
5 critical. I talked about that again this morning.  
6 It's the predominant importance for extrusive igneous  
7 activity. Certainly, that's within NMSS. In our  
8 biosphere model, the dominant pathway for normal  
9 release is dust inhalation for most of the actinides,  
10 and again, now for that, where it's more generic, I  
11 don't know whether that's a research, NRC research or  
12 an NMSS sort of activity.

13 Switching now to the Center's R & D plan,  
14 May of 2001, I just want to say I'm really impressed  
15 with the Center staff capabilities. They're quite  
16 good. Their work is very often innovative and I would  
17 argue ahead of DOE and that is especially in the use  
18 of natural analog information. They're out there  
19 looking at sites in innovative ways to evaluate or  
20 test the assumptions that DOE is making on processes  
21 that are really hard to get at necessarily in the lab  
22 and I think that's very creative.

23 Many of the KTI, key technical issue  
24 sections begin with assumptions about sensitivities  
25 that they use to prioritize their work. That's great.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701