

MAY 12 1989

Mr. Ralph Stein, Associate Director
Office of Systems Integration and Regulations
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
U. S. Department of Energy RW-2
Washington, D.C. 20545

Dear Mr. Stein:

SUBJECT: MINUTES FROM APRIL 20, 1989 MEETING ON THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE) INTEGRATED SCHEDULE

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes from the April 20, 1989 meeting between the staff of the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and representatives from DOE and the State of Nevada (via telephone). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the integrated schedule provided by DOE in its letter dated April 3, 1989. A detailed summary of the meeting is enclosed. As a result of the meeting, it was agreed that there is a need for the program participants to meet in early June 1989, after the NRC staff has identified its preliminary concerns on the SCP to agree on the type, number, and schedule of interactions. In addition, the NRC staff has a number of technical interactions it believes are necessary that should be included on the DOE schedule. These are an attachment to the minutes.

Besides the interactions discussed in this meeting, the participants also discussed the need for technical exchanges at the April 25, 1989 meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada (see my letter dated May 12, 1989). The types of exchanges discussed at that meeting dealt with interactions similar to those discussed in the enclosed minutes, interactions among researchers, and NRC staff access to DOE's data bases. It was agreed at the April 25, 1989 meeting that the interactions discussed then would also be ocered in the early June meeting.

If you need any additional information, please feel free to contact Mr. Joe Holonich of my staff at (301) 492-3403 or FTS 492-3403.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

John J. Linehan, Director
Repository Licensing and Quality
Assurance Project Directorate
Division of High-Level Waste Management

Enclosure: As stated

cc: C. Gertz, DOE/NV
R. Loux, State of Nevada
M. Baughman, Lincoln County
D. Bechtel, Clark County
S. Bradhurst, Nye County
K. Turner, GAO DISTRIBUTION AND CONCURRENCE: SEE NEXT PAGE

8905150138 890512
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDC

102.2
WM-11
NH16 1/1

DISTRIBUTION

Central File
LSS
CNWRA
LPDR

B.J. Youngblood
J. Linehan
NMSS R/F
ACNW

R.E. Browning
R. Ballard
HLPD R/F
PDR

J. Bunting
On-Site Reps
J. Holonich
B. Bordenick / J. Moore OGC

OFC	:HLPD	:HLPD	:HLPD	:	:	:	:
NAME:	J.Holonich	:J.Linehan	:	:	:	:	:
DATE:	05/17/89	:05/17/89	:05/17/89	:	:	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ENCLOSURE

Minutes of April 20, 1989 Meeting

On April 20, 1989, staff from the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) met with representatives from the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the State of Nevada (via telephone). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the DOE proposed integrated schedule provided to the NRC staff by letter dated April 3, 1989. Attendees at the meeting were:

- (1) J. Linehan, NRC;
- (2) J. Holonich, NRC;
- (3) G. Appel, DOE;
- (4) C. Johnson, State of Nevada; and
- (5) M. Lugo, Weston/DOE.

Attachment 1 is a revised integrated schedule that was provided by DOE at the meeting and reflects the status as of the date of the meeting. Based on its review of the proposed integrated schedule provided in the April 3, 1989 letter, the NRC staff had several points it believed needed to be considered. These points and the DOE responses are contained in Attachment 2. In general, the State of Nevada had concerns that were similar to those of the staff. Besides discussing the proposed interactions identified on the integrated schedule, the staff also told DOE that it had a number of interactions that were not on the schedule but needed to be held. A copy of the additional interactions is contained in Attachment 3.

As a result of the discussions, it was agreed by the parties that a meeting in late May or early June would be held to explore the type, number, and schedule of interactions in more detail.

Joseph J. Holonich May 10, 1989
Joseph J. Holonich, Section Leader
Systems Engineering and Special
Analysis Section
Repository Licensing and Quality
Assurance Project Directorate
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Gordon Appel 5/10/89
Gordon Appel, Chief
Licensing Branch
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management
U. S. Department of Energy

Attachment 2

Points of Discussion April 20, 1989 Meeting

Schedule Topic 1: Reference Schedule

- What effect has the delay in the start of new design work for the exploratory shaft facility (ESF) had?
- Is the start of work for the multi-purpose borehole (MPBH) and ESF construction on schedule?
- What effect does not looking at the implementation of the quality assurance (QA) program have on the schedule of activities? For example, the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS) is involved in the MPBH but implementation of the USGS's QA program will not be verified during the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) audits.

DOE Response to All Questions

The need for changes to this schedule is being evaluated.

Schedule Topic 2: Site Characterization Plan (SCP) Schedule

- DOE needs to add the May 9, and 10, 1989 meetings on the SCP and the Design Acceptability Analysis.
- DOE needs to move the milestone for the Site Characterization Analysis to more accurately reflect its July 28, 1989 issuance date.

DOE Response:

DOE agreed with both comments.

Schedule Topic 3: Study Plan Schedules

- The first 90-day meeting will not occur until after the staff receives the requested quality evaluation of the study plans.

DOE Response: Agreed

Question

- Will DOE meet the schedule for the next four study plans?

DOE Response: DOE will probably need to update this schedule based on the lesson learned from the results of the study plan analysis.

Schedule Topic 4: Quality Assurance

- DOE agreed that it needs to revise the schedule to show that the staff received the USGS and Sandia National Laboratory QA plans.

Question

- Is the submittal of the Yucca Mountain Project (YMP) Office QA plan on schedule?

DOE Response: It is likely that DOE will not provide the YMP QA plan on the schedule shown.

Question

- Where is the need for additional audits to cover the implementation of the QA programs identified?

DOE Response: DOE responded that the need for a second qualification audit at some of the program participants will be discussed as a topic at the bi-monthly QA meetings.

Schedule Topic 5: Design Process

Question

- What is the purpose of the NUREG-1318, "Technical Position on Items and Activities in the High-Level Waste Geologic Repository Program Subject to Quality Assurance Requirements," meeting identified on the schedule?

DOE Response: DOE wanted to discuss with the staff the method it used to identify the elements important to safety and important to waste isolation. DOE believed that it would be better for this meeting to be held after the May 9, and 10, 1989 SCP meeting.

Question/Concern

- There is a need for a design control process meeting in early May to cover:

- (1) missing design requirements documents;
- (2) the YMP's response to the DOE/Headquarters surveillance; and
- (3) site preparation work.

DOE Response: DOE agrees that the meeting is needed; however, it believes that the meeting should be held in late May.

Schedule Topic 6: Technical and Regulatory Positions

- DOE agreed to change the schedule to show that the greater-than-class-C waste meeting was complete.
- DOE agreed that there was not any need for the meeting on the safety analysis report outline and waste confidence, and it will remove these from the schedule.

Schedule Topic 7: Waste Acceptance Process (WAP)

- The staff wanted to inform DOE that it had not identified any resources in Fiscal Year 1990 and beyond to review any of the WAP documents, except in the area of quality assurance.
- The staff and DOE agreed to confirm that the Defense Waste Production Facility (DWPF) Waste Acceptance Preliminary Specifications (WAPS) and Waste Compliance Plan (WCP) had been provided to the staff on the date shown on the schedule.
- The staff identified the need for DOE to include QA interactions for the glass producers. The staff anticipates these QA interactions will be needed to support its above position on the reviews.

Question

- The West Valley Demonstration Project (WVDP) has slipped its schedule four years. What effect will this have on the submittal schedule for the WAPS and WCP for WVDP?

DOE Response: DOE needs to reevaluate its WVDP schedule.

Question

- What is the purpose of the WAP performance assessment meeting?

DOE Response: This would be a meeting where DOE provided information on how the DWPF and WVDP waste would be tied into the performance of the repository. All parties involved agreed this was an important meeting.

Question

- What are the other documents shown for submittal in December 1989?

DOE Response: The Process Control Report would describe the waste producers control process for manufacturing glass. The Waste Qualification Report would describe the quality of the glass.

Schedule Topic 8: Other

- DOE agreed to add the geology field trip on volcanism.
- All participants agreed that the technical interactions identified in this area were needed; however, the time frames for these would need to be discussed.

Attachment 3

Preliminary NRC-DOE Technical Interactions

HYDROLOGY

Approaches to Groundwater Travel Time

On-Site Visit and Review of Hydrologic Monitoring Activities

GEOLOGY (First four are the highest priority)

Anticipated and Unanticipated Processes and Events

Concerns Involving the Technical Content of the Five Exploratory Shaft

Facility (ESF) - Related Study Plans

Concerns Involving Ongoing Geoscience Activities

Problems of Volcanism (including a field visit)

10,000 year Cumulative-Slip Earthquake

Neotectonics/Faults (including a field visit)

Core and Drillhole Logging and Quality Assurance (QA): Underground Mapping
Methods (field visit)

Tectonic Models/Alternative Conceptual Models

Human Intrusion/Natural Resources (including a field visit)

MATERIAL SCIENCE

Substantially Complete Containment

Waste Acceptance Process

Modeling Behavior of Materials Over Long Times

ROCK MECHANICS/DESIGN

Interactions on ESF Title II Design Early Feedback on ESF Concerns
Definition of Engineered Barrier System and Implementation of
Provisions in 10 CFR Part 60.113 Assessments of Alternative
Design Features in the License Application

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Compliance with the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency's Standard
(40 CFR 191.13) Use of Performance Assessment as a Program Guide During
Site Characterization Linkage of Issues Hierarchy With Investigations
Validation of Computer Codes

QUALITY ASSURANCE

QA has bi-monthly meetings with DOE as well as a schedule of
two audits per month.

OTHER

Management Meetings with the Project Office and DOE-HQ (The first
meeting is scheduled for August.)
Review of DOE Comments on State of Nevada Study Plans.