Rec'd with letter 9/5

9707110018 970702

MINUTES
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION/U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
QUARTERLY MANAGEMENT MEETING
APRIL 30, 1997

On April 30, 1997, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Division of Waste Management met with representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) for a quarterly management meeting. The meeting was held at NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland and the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office in Las Vegas, Nevada with a video conference connection to DOE Headquarters in Washington, DC and the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis (CNWRA), in San Antonio, Texas. Other attendees at these locations represented the State of Nevada; Nye County and Clark County, Nevada; the CNWRA, Nevada Indian Environmental Coalition (NIEC), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and the U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NTRW). This periodic meeting provides a forum for management level discussions of issues and concerns associated with the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization project and other aspects of the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management System program. Attachment 1 provides the meeting agenda and Attachment 2 lists the attendees.

OPENING REMARKS: The meeting was opened with comments by John Greeves, Director, Division of Waste Management, NRC emphasizing the importance of the management meeting and in keeping the lines of communication open and information flowing directly between the two agencies. In addition, Margaret Federline provided brief comments on Chairman Jackson's April 29, 1997, testimony on Capital Hill. No other opening remarks were presented.

MANAGEMENT ISSUES RAISED BY THE STATE: John Greeves raised this issue at the management meeting to discuss NRC's response to the State of Nevada letters dated January 24 and 27, 1997. The January 24, 1997 letter which addressed State concerns regarding the adequacy of NRC Quality Assurance (QA) program and their January 27, 1997 letter on the State's concerns regarding Issue Resolution (Attachment 3). With regard to the State's concerns on QA, the NRC staff reiterated the points made in its response dated March 6, 1997 (see Attachment 3) and specifically indicated that, although impacted by the recent budget and re-assignments, NRC's QA oversight has not been eliminated. Specifically, the NRC's Senior On-site Representative is carrying out the QA responsibilities and NRC is currently hiring for another QA position. NRC reminded DOE that they have responsibility for QA and need to be vigilant in this activity considering the problems in the past. In response to the State's concern on issue resolution, the NRC staff restated its March 12, 1997 response (see Attachment 3) which emphasized that issue resolution refers to having "no more questions at the staff level"; the NRC cannot close issues until the licensing procedings.

UPDATE ON DOE/NRC BRIEFING TO COMMISSION: NRC and DOE will be addressing the Commisson regarding their respective High-level Waste Programs on May 14 and 15, 1997. In addition the State of Nevada, Nevada counties, and Tribes have also been invited to make presentations on May 15, 1997. The content of these presentations were briefly described by the attendees. The NRC indicated that its presentation would describe the external factors impacting the program, provide an overview of the refocussed program and present NRC's perspective on DOE's program, as well as, discussing the progress achieved in this fiscal year. DOE indicated that it would provide update and status of the program, in doing so, most likely discuss the Viability Assessment; support for 10 CFR 960 revisions; and status of the EPA standard. The State of Nevada representative indicated that the topics to be highlighted by the state were the differentiation of the Commission's role vs the staff's role in the Viability Assessment; and the Commission concurrence on 10 CFR 960. The topics to be highlighted by Nye County were an update on Nye County's HLW program and to discuss repository design and performance issues. Clark County stated that it had no information to provide on the topics at this time.

102

9707110021 970702
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

Rec'd w/LTR DTD 9707110018 970702

Legislative/FY98 Budget Update: Neither NRC or DOE had new information to discuss regarding this topic.

Status of Licensing Strategy: DOE provided an status of their Repository Licensing Strategy document (see attachment 4) which focuses activities on the "safety case", instills a licensing focus in all Project participants and identifies roles and responsibilities, and identifies DOE and NRC actions needed at every stage and establishes a focus for interaction with NRC. NRC indicated that it would be interested in an opportunity to comment on the document since NRC activities are specified. Specifically, NRC needs to know what NRC milestones are critical to those in DOE's program, for example by what date DOE would need to see the NRC final rule before it impacts their program. DOE also provided a discussion of the level of detail for information in the Initial License Application (LA) and expert elicitation in this presentation. With regard to level of detail, DOE expressed the need for a common understanding with NRC regarding what is needed for the initial LA. NRC agreed that it needed to focus on the level of detail, but with specific information and not on a generic basis. For example, the NRC will be in a better position to provide input or level of detail questions upon completion of the on-going sensitivity analyses. DOE expressed specific concern that NRC did not give sufficient weight to the results of the PVHA expert elicitation in the Igneous Activity Technical Exchange. In response, the NRC stated that the licensing board will ultimately make the final decision on the use of expert elicitation. The staff will complete an independent evaluation of the LA and will consider the results of expert elicitations in their analysis. As in reactors, the weight given to any expert elicitations will vary. It is DOE's responsibility to decide which expert elicitations will be used to support Licensing.. With regard to the PVHA Technical exchange, NRC management stated that NRC and CNWRA staff presented the NRC's position with regard to the probability of igneous activity and consider the issue resolved as a result of the agreements reached at that technical exchange. The basis for the NRC staff independent analysis of the PVHA expert elicitation was provided at the Technical Exchange and the ACNW meeting. The NRC indicated that it would be glad to arrange additional interactions to clarify any DOE question or concern.

Early Feedback to DOE Prior to VA: NRC plans to provide early feedback to DOE on potentially significant site, design, or assessment vulnerabilities for DOE's consideration in preparing its 1998 viability assessment. The NRC's goal is to have no surprises as a result of the staff's review of the viability assessment unless significant new data or analyses are revealed as part of the viability assessment. In other words, no significant comments should be made at the time the NRC staff reviews the viability assessment that have not already been identified in writing to DOE for their consideration as they prepare the viability assessment unless these comments result from new significant data, information or analyses which staff has not had access to before. The specific means of feedback to DOE is discussed in Attachment 5

Yucca Mountain Project Mid-Year Course Correction: DOE provided information on the additional work planned as a result of an additional $14.6 M funding in FY97 and 98. The details of the additional work activities is provided in Attachment 6.

Discussion of the Annual Report: DOE provided its assessment of the NRC annual report as described in Attachment 7. Although DOE did not provide detailed comments at this time, NRC and DOE agreed to continue separate discussions to determine the most useful mechanism for receipt and discussion of DOE's comments.

Status of DOE's Waste Containment and Isolation Strategy: DOE indicated that the draft WCIS highlights issued July, 1997 is being updated and is expected to be issued in late summer. The Technical Basis Document which will provide the technical basis for the highlights document is now scheduled to be issued in fall or winter of 1997. These changes have resulted from the new flux data and its impact on the uncertainties associated with the engineered barrier system and its enhancements.

Status of the Project Integrated Safety Assessment: DOE provided a general introduction to the Project Integrated Safety Assessment (PISA) document. Specific information is provided in Attachment 8.

Interim Storage Topical Report: DOE provided an update on the the status of the Topical Report being submitted to NRC on May 1, 1997 (see Attachment 9). Representatives from NRC's Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO) were present for this update. In addition, the State of Nevada had requested information on the status of a Review Guide for review of this document. SFPO indicated that it will use existing Regulatory Guides, where applicable, to review this document, but would not be developing a Regulatory Guide for this specific action.

Tribal Pre-notification of Shipment: Currently the regulations require the shipper to only notify the State Governor or their designee of a shipment. The shipper may, but is not required, notify the Tribes. DOE is currently evaluating the best mechanisms, including petitioning a rule change, handling on a case-by case basis, to make notification of the tribes a requirement.

Additional Items: As a test case for hypertext format of the LA, DOE notified NRC that it has put Seismic Topical Report #2 in hypertext format on their intranet with all links working (see Attachment 10). Due to certain technical limitations, DOE will not be able to put the document with its hypertext links on the internet at this time. DOE encourage NRC staff to visit their Las Vegas offices and try out the document. NRC indicated that it would be very difficult to give any feedback on this document. In addition, DOE notified NRC of their plans to no longer update the study plans or issue new study plans, but to keep them as historical record. DOE feels the annual plans, long-range plans have matured to the point that they are keeping the program focused and documented and study plans are no longer needed. NRC expressed a concern about commitments made to close out SCA open items in the study plans. As long as these commitments are continue and are traceable in the new system, the NRC has no specific objections the the DOE plans concerning study plans. DOE agreed this traceablity to commitments would be maintained in the records systems and regulatory databases.

Closing Remarks: NRC indicated that the meeting provided a good exchange of information, but highlighted the need to keep the management meetings to a quarterly basis, otherwise agendas become too long. DOE agreed that the meeting allowed a frank exchange of information and was one of the more productive. The State of Nevada, Ney County and Clark County had no comments. Alan Mendal with the NIEC noted that Anita Collins had become the new director of this organization.

Sandra L. Wastler
High-Level Waste and Uranium
Recovery Projects Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material
Safety and Safeguards
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Nancy Slater
Regulatory Coordination
Division
Office of Civilian
Radioactive Waste Management
U.S. Department of Energy

ATTACHMENT 1

FINAL AGENDA
NRC/DOE MANAGEMENT MEETING
April 30, 1997
Video conference, Hillshire Blue Room; NRC Headquarters, T2B5; DOEHeadquarters, GF-277

10:00 AM PST (1:00 EST)

- **OPENING REMARKS**
  ALL

- **PROGRAM STATUS**

- Update on DOE/NRC briefing to Commission	ALL
- Legislative/FY-98 budget update	DOE/NRC
- Status of Licensing Strategy	DOE
- Early Feedback to DOE Prior to VA	NRC
- Additional Work for VA Risk Mid-year Course Correction	DOE
- Discussion of NRC's Annual Report	DOE/NRC
- Status of DOE's Waste Containment and Isolation Strategy	DOE
- Status of Project Integrated Safety Assessment (PISA)	DOE
- Management Issues Raised by State	NRC
- Interim Storage Topical Report	DOE/NRC
- Tribal Pre-notification of Shipment	DOE

- **CLOSING REMARKS** ALL

- **ADJOURN**

2:00 PM PST (5:00 PM EST)

ATTACHMENT 2

NRC-DOE MANAGEMENT MEETING ATTENDANCE LIST
April 30, 1997
Video conference between
DOE DC/Forestal - Las Vegas/YMSCO
NRC/Rockville - CNWRA/San Antonio

PRINTED NAME	ORGANIZATION/COMPANY	PHONE
Nancy Slater	DOE	202-586-9322
Alan Brownstein	DOE	202-586-4973
John Greeves	NRC/NMSS	301-415-7358
Steve Frishman	NV/NWPO	702-687-3744
Judy Treichel	NV/NW Task Force	702-248-1127
John O. Thoma	NRC	301-415-7293
Michael Bell	NRC/NMSS/DWM	301-415-7286
Margaret Federline	NRC/NMSS/DWM	301-415-6708
John Rosenthal	YMP/MTS	702-794-1393
Nick Stallavato	Nye County	702-295-6142
Mike Lugo	M&O/TRW	702-795-4761
Steve Fogdall	M & O	702-295-5562
Aaron Engel	M & O	702-295-5490
Tom Bierstedt	DOE/YMSCO/AMVA	702-794-1362
Mal Murphy	Nye County	360-943-5610
E. von Tiesenhausen	Clark Count	702-455-5184
Ken Ashe	M&O	702-295-5563
Robert Barton	DOE/YMP/AML	702-794-1455
Debra Bryan	DOE/YMP/AML	702-794-1419
Stan Echols	Winston & Strawn	202-371-5777
Paul Harrington	DOE/YMP	702-794-5415
Stephen Brocoum	DOE/YMP	702-794-1359
Donald Horton	DOE/OQA	702-794-5568
Margaret Federline	NRC/DWM	301-415-6708
Colin Heath	M&O	702-488-6740
Ray Wallace	USGS	202-589-1244
Elison Turner	DOE/RW-44	202-586-4251
Carol Hanlon	DOE/YMP	702-794-1324
Keith Lobo	Booz-Allen & Hamilton	702-794-5424

NRC-DOE MANAGEMENT MEETING ATTENDANCE LIST
April 30, 1997
Video conference between
DOE DC/Forestal - Las Vegas/YMSCO
NRC/Rockville - CNWRA/San Antonio

PRINTED NAME	ORGANIZATION/COMPANY	PHONE
Susan Rives	DOE	702-794-7905
April Gil	DOE/YMPO/AMSL	702-794-5578
M. Cline	BAH	702-794-5481
Jean Yonkers	M & O/ TRW	702-295-5647
Wes Patrick	CNWRA	210-522-5158
Ali Hagi	M&O	702-794-4873
Richard Guffi	Weston	202-646-6743
Jack Bailey	M & O	702-794-4251
Dennis R. Williams	DOE/AML	702-794-1417
Terry Grant	M & O/SPO	702-295-5628
Alan Mendal	NIEC	702-323-6432(telecon)
Sandra Wastler	NRC/DWM	301-415-6724
Bob Gamble	CRWMS M7O/WOFS	202-488-6730
Paul M. Krishna	M & O	202-488-2303
Dan Fehringer	NWTRB	703-235-4473
Robert Johnson	NRC/DWM	301-415-7282
Charles Haughney	NRC/SFPO	301-415-8360
Nancy Hardwick	Booz, Allen & Hamilton	202-484-8338
Phyllis Sobel	NRC/DWM	301-415-6714
Mike Lee	NRC/DWM	301-415-6677
Bill Kane	NRC/SFPO	301-415-8360
Chris Kouts	DOE	202-586-5722
Bill Reamer	NRC/OGC	301-415-1640
John Bartlett	EPA	703-893-6600
Ronald Milner	DOE	202-586-6850
Buhdi Sagar	CNWRA	210-522-5252

ATTACHMENT 3

BOB MILLER
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT R. LOUX
Executive Director

AGENCY FOR NUCLEAR PROJECTS
NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT OFFICE
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710
Telephone: (702) 687-3744
Fax: (702) 687-5277

January 24, 1997

Mr. John Greeves, Director
Division of Waste Management
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555

Dear Mr. Greeves:

At the December 5, 1996 NRC/DOE QA videoconference, the NRC stated that there would no longer be a full-time NRC person devoted to oversight of quality assurance matters for the high-level waste program. Recent budget cuts were cited as the reason for this action. Mr. John Thoma of your office stated that he could possibly call on other staff in the NRC to work in this area as necessary.

The State of Nevada is extremely concerned by this action. The DOE high-level waste program is currently at a stage where the data collected by the project over the last 17 years is beginning to be compiled in order to make some type of determination regarding the regulatory issues for the Yucca Mountain site. The DOE QA program will play an important role in determining the QA pedigree of this data, the final quality of this data, and if it can be used in licensing. The NRC should be actively involved in oversight of this determination, not reducing its oversight. The public perception given by this move is that the NRC believes that quality is no longer important in the high-level waste program.

Mr. Thoma's plan to call on other NRC staff is not a viable solution given that the majority of the staff he indicated he would use either has been out of the high-level waste program for years or has no background in this program at all. The DOE QA program has had such a convoluted history that to bring in someone with outdated or no background would be of no benefit.

The State of Nevada urges the NRC to reevaluate this action to eliminate the NRC QA oversight of the high-level waste program. As has become obvious from recent observations of

9702050149 970124
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

2 pp.

1/0

NH03

WM-11
102.7

ATTACHMENT 5

DOE QA audits, QA still has a major role to play in the high-level waste program. For the NRC to fulfill its responsibilities, it should maintain its oversight on a full-time basis, not do a piecemeal job with inappropriate staff.

As you are aware, the Commission has a statutory duty at the time the Secretary of Energy recommends a site to the President for development of a repository to provide "preliminary comments...concerning the extent to which the at-depth site characterization analysis and the waste form proposal for such a site seem sufficient for inclusion in any application to be submitted by the Secretary for licensing such site as a repository" (NWPA, Sec. 114(a)(1)(E)). The demonstrated quality of the data to be incorporated in a license application is critical to any determination of its sufficiency.

The Commission has spoken repeatedly of the need for a high quality license application to be submitted by DOE, and the NRC staff has, at times, gone even beyond what the State considers to be appropriate pre-licensing bounds in its attempt to assure that, as you put it in a recent NRC/DOE Management meeting, " there will be no surprises from the Staff" associated with its review of the substance of DOE's Viability Assessment and license application. Yet, in this most fundamental area of DOE's Quality Assurance program, you have elected to essentially eliminate any effective form of oversight, virtually assuring that there will be "surprises", if the NRC staff intends to meet the public's expectation of the NRC as a responsible regulator and advocate of the health and safety of the public.

I or my staff would be glad to discuss this issue with you further. If you have any questions, please contact me or my QA manager, Susan Zimmerman, at (702) 687-3744.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Loux
Executive Director

cc: Susan Zimmerman, NWPO
Nevada Congressional Delegation
Don Horton, DOE OQA
Dwayne Weigel, GAO
Bill Barnard, NWTRB

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 6, 1997

Mr. Robert R. Loux
Executive Director
Agency for Nuclear Projects
Nuclear Waste Project Office
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Dear Mr. Loux:

I am writing in response to your letter of January 24, 1997, expressing concern about the recent transfer of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff qualified in quality assurance (QA) from the high-level waste (HLW) program. In your letter, you interpret this transfer as an elimination of the NRC QA oversight of the high-level waste program. You urge the NRC to reevaluate the assignment of QA personnel to the HLW program because, in your view, the NRC has eliminated any effective form of oversight in an important area.

First, I disagree with your statement that NRC has elected to essentially eliminate oversight of the DOE QA program. The NRC has provided, currently does provide, and will continue to provide oversight of QA in all radiological programs because, as your letter indicates, QA oversight is a fundamental component of protecting the public health and safety. The NRC did experience a budget reduction in the HLW area, which required a restructuring and a focusing of staff efforts in all areas, including QA. Our dedicated QA staff in HLW was reduced to one person who also had some collateral duties; but he could call for assistance as required in specific circumstances. However, it did not result in eliminating our QA efforts.

In a parallel action not related to the HLW budget reduction, the Agency experienced an immediate need to transfer qualified QA staff with a material background to a project involving an existing facility actually handling radioactive waste. The person assigned to the HLW QA effort met the requirements necessary for this immediate Agency concern and was transferred. I knew at that time that I would need to fill that important vacancy and have initiated efforts to achieve that objective, but it may still take several additional months to find the right staff, appropriately qualified in QA.

In the meantime, this action does not mean that the NRC has abandoned or eliminated its focus on QA. As your letter indicates, John Thoma is the first line supervisor responsible for HLW QA issues. Working for John is Bill Belke, one of the two senior NRC On-Site Representatives assigned to the Yucca Mountain site. Bill is qualified in QA and has been assigned a collateral duty of monitoring HLW QA efforts at Yucca Mountain and advising management on QA matters in general. If John or Bill requires additional assistance, on a case-specific basis, the need will be justified through management and additional Agency resources will be assigned as necessary and appropriate. In addition, the technical leads for the NRC Key Technical Issues will monitor QA trends in their area of technical expertise and will report quarterly through their management to the NRC HLW

9703110235 2 pp.

Management Board. NRC management will continue, as they have done in the past, to bring appropriate concerns to DOE management for action.

Additionally, DOE is responsible for demonstrating, in any license application for a HLW repository, that it will adequately protect the public health and safety. As part of this demonstration, DOE must have an effective QA program, which includes an appropriate QA organization and an effective program implementation by the line management. NRC oversight will be an audit function. Where the NRC audit indicates a problem exists, the responsibility is on DOE to review their entire program for similar concerns. I personally have emphasized the importance of a strong and viable QA program in both management meetings with DOE and direct individual communications with DOE management.

In conclusion, I understand your concern about recent NRC personnel decisions in the HLW area. I am taking actions to obtain at least one additional staff qualified in QA for the HLW area, but this action may take months to complete. I appreciate your concerns, however NRC will not eliminate oversight responsibilities in the HLW program in the important area of QA.

Sincerely,

John T. Greeves

John T. Greeves, Director
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

cc: R. Milner, OCRWM
C. Johnson, State of Nevada
B. Price, Nevada Legislative Committee
J. Meder, Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau
M. Baughman, Lincoln County, NV
P. Niedzielski-Eichner, Nye County, NV
V. Poe, Mineral County, NV
R. Williams, Lander County, NV
J. Hoffman, Esmeralda County, NV
L. Bradshaw, Nye County, NV
R. Holden, NCAI
S. Brocoum, YMPO
N. Stellavato, Nye County, NV
R. Milner, YMPO
A. Gil, YMPO
W. Barns, YMPO
D. Weigel, GAO
M. Murphy, Nye County, NV
C. Einberg, DOE/Wash, DC
D. Bechtel, Clark County, NV
B. Mettam, Inyo County, CA
W. Cameron, White Pine County, NV
L. Fiorenzi, Eureka County, NV
J. Regan, Churchhill County, NV
W. Barnard, NWTRB
T. Burton, NIEC
R. Arnold, Pahrump, NV
J. Lyznicky, AMA
B. Russo, EPA
R. Anderson, NEI

BOB MILLER
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT R. LOUX
Executive Director

AGENCY FOR NUCLEAR PROJECTS
NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT OFFICE
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710
Telephone: (702) 687-3744
Fax: (702) 687-5277

January 27, 1997

Mr. John Greeves, Director
Division of Waste Management
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Greeves:

It has been nearly five years since we and the NRC staff exchanged views and expectations regarding "issue resolution" in the context of the Department of Energy's high-level nuclear waste program. Since that time, the NRC staff has placed increasing emphasis on issue resolution, and in fact, it is now the stated goal of prelicensing technical interactions between the NRC staff and DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management personnel regarding the repository program.

In his August 11, 1992 letter to me, B.J. Youngblood, then Director of the NRC's Division of High-Level Waste Management, stated our common understanding that "issue resolution at the [NRC] staff level only means that there are no more questions and no more disagreements, at a particular point in time." He also noted that "the staff has both the right and responsibility to reopen any issue, or to request further information on any issue, at any time during the prelicensing period when warranted by new information or analysis." Our mutual understanding of the non-binding nature of prelicensing "informal conference" as described in 10 CFR Part 60.18(l) also was reiterated.

9702050168 4pp.

Since that time, circumstances of the repository program have changed. OCRWM is in an accelerating mode of ending site characterization work on topics relevant to licensing. The NRC staff, because of funding limitations, is reducing its independent research and review of OCRWM technical plans and reports. The State, due to lack of appropriated funds, has terminated the technical and scientific oversight work of most of its contractors.

Of current concern is that the NRC staff, through both the increased emphasis on issue resolution and the changing circumstances of the overall waste program, appears to be attaching new implications to prelicensing issue resolution. For some issues, resolution now appears to essentially imply "closure", i.e., no further inquiry will be needed in a DOE repository license application review. And for other issues, any continued inquiry will be reserved for the time when the staff is actually reviewing the submitted application. Notwithstanding the language of 10 CFR Part 60.18(l), we find this trend to be an unacceptable and dangerous one.

This trend among the NRC staff is of particular concern for at least three reasons. First, the staff members who, through technical review, recommend to management that an issue is "resolved" are most likely not the same people, sharing the same views and experience, who later will be reviewing a license application and who, in practice, will be bound by the earlier finding unless they take extraordinary measures to reopen the issue. Second, with OCRWM considering some issues to be "closed" from their point of view, there will be little, if any, chance that new information or analysis would be discovered that would trigger the NRC staff to reopen an issue previously determined to be "resolved". And third, with OCRWM's and the NRC staff's greatly increased reliance on total system performance assessment(TSPA) and sensitivity analysis, resolution of any of the NRC staff's Key Technical Issues is premature, pending review of OCRWM's license application Total System Performance Assessment and the role that each Key Technical Issue plays in that TSPA.

An example of this trend in NRC staff thinking regarding issue resolution is found in the staff's draft statement of the objective of an upcoming, February 25-26, 1997, Technical

Exchange on Igneous Activity. The Statement of Objective is as follows:

> "To achieve issue resolution on the approach to considering igneous activity in TSPA-VA [Viability Assessment] and identify areas of agreement and disagreement on the relevant geologic date, the probability of volcanism, models for calculating consequences, and performance assessment models of igneous activity."

It is legitimate under 10 CFR Part 60 for the NRC staff to comment on DOE's site characterization work, and even identify areas of current agreement and disagreement, but to seek resolution, i.e., closure, on the OCRWM's approach to this issue in a TSPA that even OCRWM admits cannot be considered the license application TSPA puts an improper burden on the NRC license application review staff to justify the allocation of resources to reopen the issue when it should never have been considered resolved.

The NRC staff draft agenda also assumes that scientists who have carried out independent investigations on this topic will make presentations in the meeting and assist in achieving the objective of issue resolution on this topic. Nevada has agreed that its scientific and technical information will be made available for all parties in a manner that will assist in expediting the licensing proceedings, and by definition, Nevada will be a party to that proceeding. Nevada has not agreed, and will not agree to participate in an NRC issue resolution process that is premature and construed by NRC staff and management to be binding on NRC staff license application reviewers, unless that staff can persuade management that the issue should be reopened.

This is especially important since the TSPA-VA is intended by DOE to contribute heavily to the basis of a prelicense application decision by Congress and the President regarding whether to continue pursuit of repository development at Yucca Mountain. Once an issue that contributes to this "viability" decision is said to be "resolved" by NRC staff and management, there clearly will be strong reluctance to reverse this position and reopen the issue in a license application review without overwhelming safety justification.

Nevada will continue to be represented and participate in NRC/DOE repository program interactions as part of our oversight duties, to the extent we can justify the expense. But Nevada will not support technical participation in a prelicensing issue resolution process that, under current circumstances, appears to be increasingly binding on any future NRC staff review of a DOE repository license application.

If you have questions about our views on this matter and the position stated in this letter, please contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Loux
Executive Director

RRL:cs

cc: Paul Pomeroy, ACNW

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 12, 1997

Mr. Robert R. Loux, Executive Director
State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects
Nuclear Waste Project Office
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Dear Mr. Loux:

I am writing in response to your January 27, 1997, letter in which you express the State of Nevada's concerns about the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)/U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff attempts to address issues with respect to the ongoing high-level radioactive waste (HLW) program at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. Your letter suggests that the NRC staff is placing increased emphasis on issue resolution and you express concern about the willingness of both DOE and NRC to re-visit, in the future, any issues (including so-called "open items") closed at the staff level prior to the submittal of a potential license application. Moreover, you also suggest that there are disincentives to re-visit such issues owing to the resource constraints now imposed on the HLW program. Finally, your letter indicates that you believe it is premature to seek resolution of the igneous activity issue through consideration of DOE's total-system performance assessment (TSPA) viability assessment.

The staff does not share your view that there has been a change in the implementation of the issue resolution process by the two agencies. As you know, the staff's position on issue resolution was first expressed at a February 6, 1992, DOE/NRC management meeting on pre-licensing consultation which was attended by representatives of the State of Nevada. This position was subsequently clarified in letters to you dated May 6, 1992, and August 11, 1992. Simply stated, this position consistently has been (and is) that issue resolution, at the staff level, means that there are no more questions and no more disagreements, at a particular point in time. Moreover, the staff has both the right and the responsibility to reopen any issue, or to request further information on an issue, at any point in the pre-licensing consultation period, or later, during the review of a license application.

As regards your view that the staff is placing increased emphasis on issue resolution and attaching new implications to it — i.e., for some issues, resolution now appears to essentially imply "closure" with no further inquiry by the staff — again, the staff does not share your view. What your letter does not acknowledge is that there has always been an attempt by the two staffs to focus on those issues and concerns that are most important. This approach was envisioned by the Commission in its final rule for 10 CFR Part 60, in which the Commission noted that it contemplated an ongoing review of information on site investigation and site characterization, such as those with long lead-time procurement actions, so as to allow for the early identification and resolution of potential licensing issues. The Commission felt that this approach would help to reduce the number of, and to better define, issues that will be litigated during a potential licensing hearing, by obtaining input and striving for consensus from the technical community.

9703170120

2 pp.

In closing, NRC staff will continue to implement its aforementioned policies in order to prepare for the potential licensing of a geologic repository with the goal of focusing on those issues most important to public health and safety.

Sincerely,

[Original signed by:]

John T. Greeves, Director
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

cc: R. Milner, OCRWM
C. Johnson, State of Nevada
B. Price, Nevada Legislative Committee
J. Meder, Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau
W. Barnes, YMPO
C. Einberg, DOE/Wash, DC
M. Murphy, Nye County, NV
M. Baughman, Lincoln County, NV
D. Bechtel, Clark County, NV
D. Weigel, GAO
P. Niedzielski-Eichner, Nye County, NV
B. Mettam, Inyo County, CA
V. Poe, Mineral County, NV
W. Cameron, White Pine County, NV
R. Williams, Lander County, NV
L. Fiorenzi, Eureka County, NV
J. Hoffman, Esmeralda County, NV
J. Regan, Churchhill County, NV
L. Bradshaw, Nye County, NV
W. Barnard, NWTRB
R. Holden, NCAI
T. Burton, NIEC
S. Brocoum, YMPO
R. Arnold, Pahrump, NV
N. Stellavato, Nye County, NV
J. Lyznicky, AMA
R. Milner, YMPO
B. Russo, EPA
A. Gil, YMPO
R. Anderson, NEI

ATTACHMENT 4

Repository Licensing Strategy and Related Topics

Presented by

Stephan J. Brocoum

Assistant Manager for Licensing

Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office

DOE-NRC Management Meeting

April 30, 1997

Outline

- Repository Licensing Strategy
  - Purpose
  - Summary
  - Status and Next Steps
- Level of Detail for Information in the Initial LA
- Use of Expert Elicitation

Repository Licensing Strategy

Purpose of the Strategy

- Provides a framework for focusing future work on licensing needs and issue resolution
- Presents an overall philosophy on how DOE plans to engage the NRC in future interactions
- Documents the key activities DOE will be concentrating on over the next several years
- Identifies what DOE expects from the NRC
- Establishes internal roles and responsibilities on licensing matters

Documents Related to Licensing Strategy

- Other more detailed Project documents pertaining to the LA are being developed that flow down from the Strategy
  - The LA Plan describes the work to be done between VA and LA, including associated cost and schedule
  - The LA Management Plan describes how the LA will be prepared
  - The Technical Guidance Document describes the detailed format and content of the LA, including acceptance criteria and level of detail guidance
  - The Project Integrated Safety Assessment (PISA) Management Plan describes how the PISA will be prepared, including a detailed content guide

Summary of the Strategy

- Technical Component focuses activities on the "safety case", both preclosure and postclosure
- Management Component instills a licensing focus in all Project participants and identifies roles and responsibilities
- Procedural Component identifies DOE and NRC actions needed at every stage and establishes a focus for interactions with NRC and other parties

Technical Component

- For the preclosure safety case, DOE will make use of standard practices of the nuclear industry
  - Compliance will be demonstrated primarily through use of deterministic analyses
- For the postclosure safety case, reliance will be placed on both engineered and natural barriers
  - Compliance will be demonstrated primarily through probabilistic analyses, supplemented by expert judgment
  - The Waste Containment and Isolation Strategy will help focus the Project on the more important issues
- The preliminary safety case will be presented in the Project Integrated Safety Assessment (PISA)
  - NRC'S Key Technical Issues (KTIs) will also be addressed

Management Component

- DOE Secretary is the applicant and licensee
  - The Office of the Director carries out the responsibilities of the Secretary
- YMSCO has been delegated authority for repository licensing matters
  - The Office of Program Management and Administration assists YMSCO in executing its licensing authority
- Contractor responsibilities
  - The M&O contractor provides the primary support to OCRWM regarding licensing strategies and documentation
  - The Management and Technical Support Services contractor primarily provides project management support to OCRWM

Procedural Component

<u>Focus of Interactions with NRC</u>

- Lines of communication will be opened and maintained at all levels
- A main goal is to ensure that DOE-NRC interactions are constructive
  - Primary focus will be placed on reaching agreement on analysis methodologies and on the level of detail needed for the LA
  - DOE will focus on the intent of the NWPA and on what is reasonable to ask science and engineering to provide
  - DOE will identify issues requiring resolution and propose resolution plans

Procedural Component

(continued)

Licensing Stages and Milestones

- The Strategy identifies DOE and NRC actions during each of four licensing stages
  - Stage I - Viability Assessment Stage
  - Stage II - Site Recommendation Stage
  - Stage III - Initial LA Stage (construction)
  - Stage IV - Updated LA Stage (operation)
- Those NRC actions required by legislation or regulation are identified

Status and Next Steps

- The Strategy is undergoing internal DOE review
- The Strategy will be sent to NRC after DOE concurrence
- The Strategy will be reviewed periodically and updated, as needed
- Elements of the Strategy will be contained in the License Application Plan, to be submitted to Congress by September 1998 as part of the VA

Level of Detail for Information in the Initial LA

Overview

- DOE will submit a complete, docketable LA by 2002
  - This LA will allow NRC to make its reasonable assurance determination for the Construction Authorization
- It is important for DOE and NRC to have a common understanding of what is needed for the initial LA
  - How much is enough?

How Much is Enough?

- Enough = When uncertainties have been sufficiently understood and bounded
  - Further testing and analysis will not add significantly to this understanding
- Sufficiency depends on what the information will be used for
- Three levels of sufficiency
  - Initial LA (for Construction Authorization)
  - Updated LA (for License to Receive and Possess)
  - Updated LA (for Closure)
- This step-wise process was contemplated by both the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and 10 CFR 60

Sufficiency for Initial LA

<u>Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA)</u>

- The NWPA restricts site characterization to what the Secretary decides is necessary for the initial LA and for compliance with NEPA (§ 113(c))
- House Report 97-491 (accompanying H.R. 3809, ultimately enacted as the NWPA):

  "Site characterization activities are intended to be kept to the reasonable minimum expense and impact and are intended not to be so extensive as to result, through physical impact or through economic commitment, in the prejudicing of decisions regarding further development of the site."

Sufficiency for Initial LA

(continued)

NWPA (cont'd)

- The Site Recommendation is to be based, among other things, on limited site characterization information and preliminary engineering specifications (§ 114)
- The NWPA requires DOE to submit the LA shortly after the Site Recommendation becomes effective
  - As a practical matter, there would be little new information between the Site Recommendation and LA
- Therefore, the initial LA would also be based on limited site characterization information and a preliminary design

Sufficiency for Initial LA

(continued)

<u>10 CFR 60</u>

- Part 60 requires the initial LA to be as complete as possible in light of information available at the time of docketing (§ 60.24(a))
- The Commission contemplates that there will be "uncertainties and gaps in knowledge" (§ 60.101)

Sufficiency for Initial LA

(continued)

<u>10 CFR 60</u> (cont'd)

- The Commission recognized that it would be unable to make definitive findings on some issues at the early stages of repository licensing
- Consequently, Part 60 requires DOE to identify issues requiring further study, including a schedule for their resolution (§ 60.21(c)(14))

Sufficiency for Initial LA

(continued)

- In summary, DOE will provide in the initial LA the information sufficient for the decision being made
  - To authorize construction of the repository
- Consistent with the NWPA and Part 60, additional information will be provided in subsequent LA updates to support future decisions
  - To grant a license to receive and possess
  - To amend the license to close the repository
- This is also consistent with the step-wise information provided to support reactor licensing

Use of
Expert Elicitations

Purpose for Expert Elicitations

- Expert elicitations are particularly useful when there is significant uncertainties or limited information
  - Can be used to bound uncertainties, especially with the unprecedented time frames being evaluated
- DOE plans to use expert elicitations to strengthen licensing arguments
- DOE expects that these elicitations will be given the proper weight during the licensing review

DOE Plans for Expert Elicitations

- DOE recently completed an expert elicitation on probabilistic volcanic hazards analysis
- DOE plans to conduct the following elicitations in the near future
  - Unsaturated Zone Flow (almost complete)
  - Waste Package Degradation (ongoing)
  - Saturated Zone Flow and Transport (FY97 start)
  - Thermohydrology (FY98 start)
  - Waste Form Dissolution (FY98 start)

DOE Concern

- At the 2/25/97 meeting on volcanism, NRC staff did not give sufficient weight to the results of the PVHA expert elicitation
  - The opinion of one NRC staff expert seemed to be weighed the same as our ten experts
- DOE does not believe this is appropriate
  - It puts the licensing value of expert elicitations in question
- The value of such elicitations needs to be agreed to with NRC management
  - These elicitations are quite resource intensive

Summary

- DOE will provide the Licensing Strategy to NRC after DOE concurrence
- DOE and NRC need to focus upcoming interactions on understanding the level of detail required for the initial LA
  - This is important input for the LA Plan required by Congress as part of the Viability Assessment
- DOE and NRC need to agree on the usefulness of expert elicitations before DOE expends additional resources

ATTACHMENT 5

ISSUE RESOLUTION STATUS REPORTS BY KTI
(Identified in NRC and CNWRA Operating Plans)

Title	Planned Completion Date CNWRA	NRC
IGNEOUS ACTIVITY		
1. Probability of future igneous activity	08/30/97	11/30/97
2. Consequences of igneous activity	07/31/98	09/30/98
STRUCTURAL DEFORMATION AND SEISMICITY		
* 1. Tectonic models	07/31/97	09/30/97
2. Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis	12/01/97	01/30/98
3. Fracture Models	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
4. Fault Control of Magma	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
5. Fault Disruption of Waste Packages	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
* 6. Type I faults	05/27/97	07/28/97
EVOLUTION OF THE NEAR FIELD ENVIRONMENT		
* 1. Effects of near field chemistry resulting from coupled processes on containment, release, and radionuclide transport	06/28/97	08/01/97
* 2. Mineralogy, petrology, and rock chemistry and their control on the near-field environment	06/28/97	08/01/97
3. Man-made materials and water interactions	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
4. Microbial effects on groundwater chemistry and near-field environment	06/06/98	07/09/98
RADIONUCLIDE TRANSPORT		
No IRSRs planned		
CONTAINER LIFE AND SOURCE TERM		
* 1. Significance of dry oxidation of container materials	---------	07/31/97

* IRSR's most likely to be available to DOE by end of FY97

Title	Planned Completion Date CNWRA	NRC
THERMAL EFFECTS ON FLOW		
* 1. Effect of gravity driven refluxing on parameters important to waste package integrity and resulting effects on repository performance	08/29/97	09/26/97
2. Effect of thermally induced perturbations in water flux through the repository on repository performance	04/30/98	05/31/98
REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL EFFECTS		
* 1. Seismic design	--------	09/30/97
2. Design control processes	--------	TBD FY98
TOTAL SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND INTEGRATION		
* 1. Model abstraction in TSPA (will include joint development of sensitivity study plan)	06/30/97	08/30/97
* 2. Relative importance of issues to performance	07/30/97	09/30/97
3. Presentation/documentation of TSPA inputs-outputs	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
ACTIVITIES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY YUCCA MOUNTAIN STANDARD AND NRC RULE		
No IRSRs planned.		
UNSATURATED AND SATURATED FLOW UNDER ISOTHERMAL CONDITIONS		
* 1. Future climate, precipitation, and water table rise	Complete	05/15/97
* 2. Present-day shallow infiltration	05/12/97	07/18/97
3. Present-day deep percolation	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
4. Deep percolation through the performance period	TBD FY98	TBD FY98
5. Dilution in the saturated zone	01/31/98	05/31/98

* IRSR's most likely to be available to DOE by end of FY97

ATTACHMENT 7

YUCCA
MOUNTAIN
PROJECT

Studies

DOE Comments on NRC's High-Level Radioactive Waste Program FY 96 Annual Progress Report

Presented to:
DOE/NRC Management Meeting

Presented by:
Dr. Stephan J. Brocoum
Assistant Manager, Licensing
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office

April 30, 1997

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

DOE's Reaction to the NRC's Annual Progress Report

- The NRC's Annual Report is well-written and effectively communicates the NRC staff's current thinking on key technical issues
  - It enables the DOE to better understand the NRC staff's technical concerns
  - It also documents those issues that the staff is not concerned about
- The Report provides insight to DOE in its preparation of reports for the NRC

Conclusion

- The Report can be an important factor in the issue resolution process if it clearly reflects acceptance criteria and articulates remaining unresolved sub-issues.

ATTACHMENT 8

YUCCA
MOUNTAIN
PROJECT

Studies

Introduction to Project Integrated Safety Assessment

Presented to:
DOE/NRC Management Meeting

Presented by:
Carol L. Hanlon
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office

April 30, 1997

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

Purpose of PISA

- Internal vehicle for presenting integrated information on scientific programs, design, and performance assessment
- NOT part of the Viability Assessment process
- Sections of the PISA may be available in the same time frame as the Viability Assessment
- PISA will support site suitability determination, Environmental Impact Statement, and Site Recommendation
- PISA may be used to initiate preliminary sufficiency comments

Purpose of the PISA*

The PISA is an internal vehicle for presenting integrated information from the three technical areas of the Project (Scientific Programs, Design, and PA) in an appropriate format to be updated and used in the Safety Analysis Report. Although the PISA is not a part of the Viability Assessment process, sections of the PISA may be available to present information that would result in added confidence for the Viability Assessment. The PISA will also support the site suitability determination, the Environmental Impact Statement, and the site recommendation. The PISA may be used to initiate the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's preliminary sufficiency comments as required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as Amended. This will be supplemented by various information exchanges with the Commission staff.

*Statement from Management Plan for the Development of a Project Integrated Safety Assessment

Eleven Chapter Outline

- Presents integrated coherent safety case
- Based on industry safety assessment examples
- Resulted from intense replanning effort involved in preparing Draft Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program Plan
- Assumptions were built into multi-year planning base

Outline for Project Integrated Safety Assessment

Chapter 1	Introduction and General Description of Repository
Chapter 2	Site Characteristics
Chapter 3	Design of Structures, Components, Equipment and Systems
Chapter 4	Repository Design
Chapter 5	Waste Package Design
Chapter 6	Engineered Barrier System Design
Chapter 7	Radiological Safety Assessment of the Repository Through Permanent Closure
Chapter 8	Performance of the Repository After Permanent Closure
Chapter 9	Radioactive Waste Management
Chapter 10	Radiation Protection
Chapter 11	Conduct of Operation

Correlation of PISA

- Waste Containment and Isolation Strategy Hypotheses
- NRC Key Technical Issues
  - Consideration of KTIs Being Built into PISA Framework
  - Consideration of KTIs will evolve with the Issue Resolution Status Reports
- LARP and 10CFR60 Content Requirements for License Application

Relation of PISA to License Application

- PISA provides basis for Safety Analysis Report of License Application
  - Detail and substantiation to be expanded in the License Application
  - License Application will include additional chapters, including Overall Introduction; Quality Assurance; Performance Confirmation; Land Ownership and Control; Organizational Structure; and Assessment of Compliance with 10CFR60

ATTACHMENT 9

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY
TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

PRESENTED TO

DOE/NRC Management Meeting

PRESENTED BY

Christopher A. Kouts, Director
Storage and Technology Division
Office of Waste Acceptance,
Storage and Transportation

April 30, 1997

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- Facilitate timely design and licensing of CISF following site designation
  - Move interim storage facility design efforts off the critical path of license application development
    - Identify and resolve major design and regulatory issues prior to license application
    - Develop facility design and operating plans that can be referenced in a license application
  - Provide cask vendors with facility design and operating description

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- Utilizes non-site specific design
  - Design employs conservative environmental design parameters, e.g.
    - Design Basis Tornado - 360 mph
    - Seismic (0.75g loading)
    - Snow/ice loading 50 psf
  - Facility can be sited virtually anywhere in the Continental U.S.

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- CISF Capabilities
  - Handles only canistered spent fuel in NRC - approved systems/casks
  - Receives fuel at an initial rate of 1200 MTU/yr (maximum receipt rate of 3000 MTU/yr)
  - Provides temporary facilities for administrative and logistical functions
  - Capacity limited to 40,000 MTU

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- DOE SUBMITTED LETTER OF INTENT TO SUBMIT TSAR TO THE SPENT FUEL PROJECT OFFICE ON JUNE 4, 1996
- FOUR PRE-SUBMITTAL CONSULTATIONS HELD WITH NRC STAFF
  - AUGUST 20, 1996 - NON-SITE-SPECIFIC APPROACH, SCOPE OF TSAR, GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETERS
  - NOVEMBER 20, 1996 - DESIGN APPROACH, CRITERIA, DESIGN BASIS EVENTS, NUCLEAR ANALYSES
  - FEBRUARY 19, 1997 - RECOVERY FROM DESIGN BASIS EVENTS, OCCUPATIONAL RADIATION EXPOSURES, CONDUCT OF OPERATIONS
  - APRIL 29, 1997 - REVIEWED CONTENT OF TSAR/SUGGESTED NRC STAFF EVALUATION FINDINGS

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- ISSUES RAISED BY NRC STAFF AND DISPOSITION
  - VALUE FOR DESIGN BASIS TORNADO - DESIGN MODIFIED TO INCLUDE CATEGORY I, 360 MPH TORNADO
  - INCLUSION OF HEPA FILTER - DESIGN OF HVAC SYSTEM MODIFIED TO INCLUDE IN-LINE HEPA FILTER WITH DISCHARGE VENT MONITORING
  - ADDITION OF INDIVIDUAL ASSEMBLY TRANSFER CAPABILITY - DESIGN MODIFIED TO ADD DTS FACILITY TO CISF TO ENHANCE CONFIDENCE IN RECOVERY CAPABILITY

CENTRALIZED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- CISF TSAR WILL BE SUBMITTED ON MAY 1, 1997
  - TRANSMITTAL LETTER REQUESTS SER BY END OF FY 1998

DRY TRANSFER SYSTEM
TOPICAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

- DOE SUBMITTED LETTER OF INTENT TO SUBMIT TSAR TO SPENT FUEL PROJECT OFFICE ON MAY 24, 1996
- DOE SUBMITTED TSAR TO NRC STAFF SEPTEMBER 30,1996
  - REQUESTED SER BY APRIL 1998 (18 MONTH REVIEW)
- DOE RECEIVED NRC STAFF ACCEPTANCE LETTER DATED OCTOBER 28, 1996
- STAFF NOTED IT WOULD ENDEAVOR TO MEET THE REQUESTED APRIL 1998 DATE
- DOE AWAITING FURTHER INFORMATION FROM NRC STAFF ON HOW IT INTENDS TO PROCEED

ATTACHMENT 10

YUCCA
MOUNTAIN
PROJECT

Studies

Web Based Information System (WBIS)

Presented to:
DOE/NRC Management Meeting

Presented by:
Claudia M. Newbury
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office

April 30, 1997

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

WBIS

- In the LSS Forum, DOE suggested that it might be possible to submit a License Application in a hypertext format with links to supporting information
- As a test case, Seismic Topical Report #2 has been placed in a Web environment with hyperlinks to supporting documentation, data and requirements

WBIS

- The hypertext version is not available on the Internet, but can be viewed at the Yucca Mt Project Office in Las Vegas
- DOE would like to invite NRC and the LSSARP members to review the hypertext document
- Comments are invited on the format, not the content, of the document