

WM Record File 102 WM Project 11
 Docket No. _____
 PDR
 LPDR
 Distribution: REB HM NN
MJB LEB Caplan
JOB JG KStabala
 (Return to WM, 623-SS) MK C2

9
 May 25, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert E. Browning, Director
 Division of Waste Management

FROM: Paul T. Prestholt, Sr. OLR - NNWSI

Subject: NNWSI Site Report for Weeks of May 14, and 21, 1984

WM DOCKET CONTROL
 CENTER
 84 MAY 29 PM 2:19

1. On May 15, I met with Bill Dudley, Bill Wilson, and Craig Bentley of the USGS in Denver, Colorado. Jerry Szymanski, DOE-WMFO, was also present. Four major subjects were discussed:
 - a. The content of the Surveys NNWSI program;
 - b. Groundrules for NRC-USGS interactions;
 - c. Availability of data;
 - d. The detailed format and an agenda for the upcoming Geophysical NRC/DOE workshop.

2. The USGS takes its portion of the NNWSI program very seriously. In general the areas of investigation they are fully or partially responsible for include geology, hydrology, seismic (earthquake) studies and exploration geophysics. They also participate in tectonic and hydrochemistry investigations. There are three problem areas:
 - a. There are no clear lines of authority in the USGS project management. Bill Dudley calls it "management on bended knee."
 - b. Data and document review. The USGS data and document review procedures result in considerable time between data collection and data release. The NRC's insistence that "raw" data be put in the PDR reinforces the USGS insistence that ALL data go through the review process.
 - c. Quality Assurance. At the present time the Los Alamos QA organization is handling formal QA matters for the USGS. This does not seem to be a happy marriage. I understand that there are changes in the works and I'll keep an eye on this.

B406120215 B40525
 PDR WASTE
 WM-11 PDR

NV840969

263

3. I invited the USGS investigators to use the OLR office as an easy avenue for help on regulatory matters, within the protocol established by DOE-WMPO of course. Bill Dudley seemed to like the idea of being able to speak with the NRC directly, either to this office or to the appropriate person in Silver Spring.
4. Bill Dudley was adamant that all data developed by the USGS must go through the review process as long as the NRC requires that all data that comes into its possession be put in the PDR. He sees no possibility that the USGS will relax this requirement. If the NRC will relax its position and hold "raw" data out of the PDR, then the USGS will reconsider its position on this matter.
5. In discussing the format and agenda for the upcoming Geohydrology workshop; I stated that the NRC would prefer to have the meeting formatted so that there is a maximum of interaction between the NRC and the USGS investigators and a minimum of formal presentation. There was a certain coolness on the part of Bill Dudley and Bill Wilson but no formal objection. The agenda the USGS prepared has been forwarded to King Stablein for comment.
6. On May 24, I had a meeting with Dr. Vieth to discuss my impression of the work being accomplished by Sandia, Los Alamos and the USGS for the NNWSI to the extent that I could considering my very brief introduction to these programs. We discussed the topics I have reported above and in the Site Reports for the weeks of April 30, and May 7.

The only other topic of substance that was discussed was the statement by Los Alamos QA personnel that there didn't seem to be a tie between all QA elements in the NNWSI to form a consistent whole. This tie must come from the DOE-WMPO QA organization. Dr. Vieth took great interest in this observation and will look into it. If a problem exists, it will be addressed.

7. I am to be a regular participant in the NNWSI TPD - Project Manager meetings. The next meeting will be held on May 30 - 31, an agenda is enclosed.
8. Enclosed is a copy of the NNWSI monthly report for the month of March, and a copy of the latest NNWSI weekly report.



Paul T. Prestholt
Sr. OLR - NNWSI