

23



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

WM Record File
101

WM Project 10

Docket No. _____

PDR July 9, 1984

LPDR ✓

Distribution:

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert E. Browning, Director
(Return to WM 622 SS) Division of Waste Management

FROM: F. Robert Cook, Senior On-Site Licensing Representative, Basalt Waste Isolation Project, BWIP

SUBJECT: BWIP SITE REPORT FOR WEEKS OF JUNE 10, 17, AND 24, 1984

1. Based on discussions during the hydrology workshop, I consider the following issues, identified in these discussions of greatest importance to potential future licensing:

a. The omission of a pumping well and related monitoring wells to the north of the RRL. This well, DC23, was originally included in the conceptual testing plan agreed to by the staff approximately a year ago, however, it was eliminated from the plan because of budgetary constraints, according to RHO statements. I consider DC23 would be useful in determining the nature of the hydrologic barrier to the north of the RRL. Future BWIP scheduling presented at the workshop includes the installation of DC23 in FY86.

b. The workshop participants briefly discussed the question of accuracy and precision of instrumentation being used in the hydrologic studies, including the piezometers. It was considered that detailed discussion of this question was a QA issue and outside the scope of the workshop activities, and hence, it was agreed that it would be taken up as part of the still unscheduled QA workshop at BWIP. The RHO representatives indicated that instrumentation evaluations were on-going and outlined various technical issues they were considering. The RHO presentation indicated that "up-front" instrumentation design assessments were not performed prior to the installation of instrumentation. RHO indicated, however, they were beginning to assess the instrumentation.

2. The matrix management session provided a useful introduction for the staff into the characteristics of a well functioning matrix organization. The identification of the respective roles of project and functional personnel in the organization was of most interest to me. The observation by the lecturer that matrix organizations do not work well if project personnel assume functional personnel roles is a ground rule which we should keep in the forefront of management cognizance. If not already planned in connection with the consultants review of the organization, I would recommend that you consider requesting that

8508140096 840709
PDR WASTE
WM-10 PDR

1499

the consultant review branch functional descriptions and responsibilities and propose changes which better and in more detail delineate these responsibilities consistent with matrix organization principles.

3. I sat in on the meetings of Verma and Prestholt with their respective staff project teams. The three of us site representatives primarily related problems associated with establishment and implementation of QA requirements, particularly in the geotechnical areas of our respective projects.

4. BWIP SITE OBSERVATIONS (WEEK of JUNE 24, 1984)

a. The BWIP project is focusing on revision of their Environmental Assessment and budgetary presentations for DOE headquarters. RHO and DOE reviewed the assessment portion of the (EA's) being written by DOE headquarters. A problem BWIP is trying to address is how the large differential in the amounts of site specific data from site-to-site would be considered in selecting sites. Both RHO and DOE personnel have voiced their concern in this regard over the current draft of the common part of the EA's.

b. Various laboratory functions within the BWIP project, which were shut down in February by RHO because of QA non-compliance, (primarily inadequate procedural control of testing), are starting up again. I am told that appropriate procedures are now in place.

c. I reviewed a report of a DOE QA audit of geotechnical investigations. There were no major problems found. The audit did not review QA on the planning/design of testing nor on the qualifications of personnel doing design work or any other technical functions.

d. RHO was preparing a recommendation for DOE relative to potential future use of WPPSS-4 fuel handling facilities at the WPPSS site. RHO considers the site which is being "scrapped" by WPPSS has a 1000 ton fuel handling facility which has been stopped in its construction at after about \$98 million was expended. I have been told the design is 99% complete. RHO considers the use of the facility in connection with a potential repository at the RRL could improve the schedule considerably for accepting spent fuel. They are considering the potential of adding a packaging facility at the WPPSS site. This site is about 15-20 miles from the RRL and near a rail spur which serves the rest of the Hanford Site.

RHO has asked me what would be necessary in way of NRC licensing involvement with the WPPSS facility. I have indicated I do not know.



F. R. Cook
Senior On-Site Licensing
Representative