

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555 AUB 0 8 1828

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Ronald Ballard, Chief

Technical Review Branch

Division of High-Level Waste Management

FROM:

John J. Linehan, Acting Chief

Operations Branch

Division of High-Level Waste Management

SUBJECT:

REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL REVIEW BRANCH ASSISTANCE ON

SCHEDULES FOR TECHNICAL POSITIONS

Enclosure 1 is a list of technical positions (TPs) that was developed by the Operations Branch (HLOB) and the Technical Review Branch (HLTR) as background to support the Division budget. Since the list was developed with the HLTR Section Leaders, it represents those TPs that are presently being developed or are planned by HLTR.

Recently, HLOB has been tasked with the assignment of preparing a Commission paper that discusses the Division's efforts on regulatory guidance. In this paper, HLOB has been requested to address rulemakings, regulatory guides, and TPs. Therefore, the purpose of this memorandum is to request assistance from HLTR in the areas of TPs. Basically, the information that is needed on the individual TPs identified in Enclosure 1 is (1) background information on the applicable parts of the regulations, (2) a short summary of what the TP will address, and (3) a revised schedule for completion of the TPs.

In order to assist HLTR in providing the necessary information, Enclosure 2 contains an annotated outline of the type of information desired. For each TP identified in Enclosure 1 that is the responsibility of HLTR, please provide the information identified in Enclosure 2. In addition, HLTR should prepare a revised schedule using the generic schedule given in Enclosure 3 and the original found in Enclosure 1. In preparing the schedule, HLTR should use the generic durations given in Enclosure 3 as a guide. Where possible, HLTR should adhere to the generic schedules; however, deviations are acceptable if justified. No revisions to the FTE and dollar amount budgeted for the TPs in Enclosure 1 should be made.

As I am sure you realize, there are several TPs that also are the subject of rulemakings. Examples include Anticipated and Unanticipated Events and Groundwater Travel Time. Because of this, HLTR should either identify if the TP in Enclosure 1 will be eliminated or if the TP will still be issued to address an acceptable methodology once a final rule on the subject has been issued. If a TP falls into the latter category, its schedule should be consistent with the projected schedule for completion of the rulemaking.

8808090330 880808 PDR WASTE PDC

1-mm

Ronald Ballard

- 2 -

In order to support the schedule for the Commission paper, it is requested that HLTR provide the needed information by Thursday, August 11, 1988. The HLTR response should be coordinated at the branch level and transmitted as a single document. If you require any additional assistance, please contact the responsible project managers, Robert Johnson for the Commission paper itself at x20409 or Joe Holonich for specific TP questions at x23403.

15/

John J. Linehan, Acting Chief Operations Branch Division of High-Level Waste Management

Enclosures: As stated

cc: D. Chery, HLTR

D. Brooks, HLTR

P. Justus, HLTR

R. Weller, HLTR

R. Nataraja, HLTR

DISTRIBUTION:

Central File	B. J. Youngblood	R. E. Browning
CNWRA	R. Ballard	J. Bunting
LSS	J. Linehan	P. Prestholt
J. Gilray	J. Holonich	J. Gilray
HLOB R/F	NMSS R/F	R. Johnson

OFC :HLOB		:HLOB RU	:HLOB		:	:	:
NAME:JHoJe	N _{Ch}	:RJohnson	:JLi m ehan :		:	:	:
DATE: 08/5	/88	:08/8/88			:	:	:
		•	OPFICIAL	RECORD	COPY		

ENCLOSURE 1 LIST OF TECHNICAL POSITIONS

SECTION:

Tas	k Title	Priority	Task Leader	Devel	op Scope e SW	FTE \$	Develo Compl. Dat	op Internal Di te SW F	raft TE \$	Develop Ex Compl. Dat	ternal Draft e SW FI	E \$	RES\$
DES	IGN												
· 1.	Borehole and Shaft Sealing in the Unsaturated Zone	1	Gupta	7/1/88	6	0	10/1/88	14	145	6/1/89	14	85	
2.	Extrapolation of Short- term Data to Long-term Results	1											
	Geomechanical Mechanical Geochemistry	1 1 1	Gupta Peterson Bradbury	7/1/88 7/1/88 7/1/88	2 2 8	0 0 20	11/1/91 11/1/91 01/1/91	5 7 36	30 10 100	7/1/91 7/1/91 7/1/91	5 12 16	0 0 50	50
3.	Design, Construction ar Monitoring of ESF	nd 1	Peshel	8/1/88	3	0	12/1/88	15	90	4/1/89	15	75	
4.	Waste Retrievability	1	Tanious	12/1/88	15	15	6/1/90	15	145	1/1/91	10	40	
5.	Level of Retrieval Demonstration Needed During Site Characterization	1	Tanious	7/1/88	4	20	12/1/89	4	15	6/1/90	4	10	
6.	Repository Design	2	Tanious	6/1/89	15	15	1/1/91	50	360	9/1/91	50	100	
MAT	TERIALS												
7.	Boundary Conditions for EBS Analysis	r 1	Chang	12/1/88	3		1/1/91	5		7/1/91	8		
8.	Substantially Complete Containment	1	Peterson	6/1/88	2		9/1/88	7		6/1/89	12		(

- (

SECTION:

Tas	k Title P	riority	Task Leader	Develop Compl. Date	Scope SW	FTE	\$	Develop I Compl. Date	nternal Draft SW FTE	\$	Develop Exter Compl. Date	nal Draft SW FTE	\$	RES\$
9.	Acceptable Scope for Waste/Package EBS Testin Program	g 1	Peterson	7/1/88	2			10/1/88	7	10	7/1/89	12		
10.	Waste Package Reliabilit (Revision)	y 2	Chang	1/1/89	3			8/1/89	6		2/1/90	10		
HYD	HYDROLOGY													
⁄11.	Pre-emplacement GWTT	1	Ross	-				-			11/1/88	20	30	100
<i>√</i> 12.	Adequate Hydrology and Climate Site Characteri- zation	1	Pohle	6/1/88	4		10	1/1/89	30	200	5/1/89	20	50	120
GEO	CHEMISTRY													
13.	Environment of EBS Package	1	Bradbury	11/1/88	8		10	1/1/91	16	200	9/1/91	12	50	100
14.	Radionuclide Transport	1	Bradbury	12/1/88	10		20	1/1/91	52	200	9/1/91	16	50	100
15.	Rock/Water Chemical Interactions	1	Bradbury	9/1/88	8 -		10	5/1/90	26	250	9/1/90	12	50	100
GEOLOGY														
16.	Anticipated Processes and Events Unanticipated Processes and Events	1	Trapp	Complete	0		0	Complete	0	0	9/30/88	0		

SECTION:

				Develop Scope Develop Internal Draft						Draft	Develop External Draft			
Tas	k Title	<u>Priority</u>	Task Leader	Compl. Date	SW	FTE	\$	Compl. Date	SW	FTE \$	Compl. Date	SW FTE	\$	
<i>¥</i> 7.	Pre-closure Earthquake Hazard Evaluation Metho	1 ods	Blackford	6/24/88	2		5	6/1/89	11	8	9/1/89	4	4	
18.	Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis	1	Ibrahim	6/1/88	2		0	11/1/90	15	20	6/1/90	12	15	
19.	Probabilistic Volcanic Hazard Analysis	1	Abrams	8/1/88	3		4	11/1/90	15	20	9/1/89	12	15	
20.	Tectonic Models Evaluation	1	McConnel1	7/1/88	2		4	1/1/91	15	20	9/1/91	12	15	
£1.	Natural Resources Assessment Methods	1	Lefevre	6/1/88	3		8	9/1/88	16	20	9/1/89	12	15	
½ 2.	Geologic Mapping of Shafts/Drifts	1	Cardone	11/1/88	3		12	3/1/89	11	8	7/1/89	5	4	
23.	Geomorphic Hazards Analysis	1	Lefevre	4/1/89	3		4	1/1/91	15	8	6/1/91	5	4	
COM	PLIANCE DEMONSTRATION													
24.	Implementation of EPA Containment Requirement	1 t	Fehringer	11/1/88	3			3/1/89	7	10	11/1/89	14	10	
25.	Scenario Identification and Screening	n 1	Fehringer	9/1/88	3			1/1/89	7	10	6/1/89	14	10	

SECTION:

Task Title	Priority	Task Leader	Develop Compl. Date	Scope SW_	FTE_	\$ Develop Compl. Date	Internal Draft SW FTE	\$	Develop Exte Compl. Date	rnal Draft SW FTE	\$	RES\$
26. Model V and V	1	Codell Mo Hydro Material Geotech Geology	2/1/89	4		1/1/91	7 2 2 2 2 2	10	9/1/91	14	10	50
27. Data and Parameter Uncertainty	1	Codell Geochem Hydro Material Geotech Geology	10/1/88	3		1/1/91	7 2 2 2 2 2 2	10	9/1/91	14	10	50
28. Formal Use of Expert Judgement	1	Brooks	7/1/88	3		12/1/89	7	10	7/1/90	14	10	
29. Pre-closure Performand Assessment	ce 1	Neel Hydro Geology Geotech Materials Geochem	6/1/88	3		10/1/88	9 2 2 2 2 2	10	6/1/89	10	10	

SECTION:

<u>Ta:</u>	sk Title	Priority	Task Leader	Develop Compl. Date	TE \$	Develop 1. Date	Interna SW	Draft FTE	\$	Develop External Compl. Date SW	Draft FTE	\$ RES\$
1.	Pre-closure Radiation Safety Analysis	3							•			
2.	Identification of Performance Confirmati Testing	3 on										
3.	Criteria for Alternati EBS Release Rates	ve										
4.	Criteria for Alternati Waste Package Contain- ment											
5.	Waste Package ASME/ANS Code Requirements	3										
6.	Hydrologic Siting Criteria	3										
7.	Hydrologic Monitoring and Surveillance after Permanent Closure	. 3										
8.	Post-Closure Dose Factors/Radiation Protection	3										
9.	QA/QC of Drill and Core Logs	3										

Enclosure 2

Annotated Outline

TP Title: Lead Technical Contact: Additional Technical Contacts:

1.0 Regulatory Evaluation

In preparing this section, provide information on what specific part of 10 CFR 60 the TP is addressing or if appropriate, other parts of the Regulations. For example, the TP on Seismotectonics deals with 10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A. Likewise, the TP on Site Sealing deals with, in part, 10 CFR Part 60.34(a) and 10 CFR Part 60.34(b). Not only should the TP identify the specific section of CFR that is being addressed, but it should also be associated with a performance objective. Therefore, the related performance objective should be included.

2.0 Summary of Guidance

In this section, a summary should be prepared that discusses the guidance the TP will contain. Generally, it should discuss what guidance will be given and, if possible, provide supporting details. At a minimum, it should identify what new information besides that contained in the Regulations will be given in the TP.

3.0 Justification for Staff Effort

Finally, describe why a TP is needed. What is required here is the rationale for deciding to develop a TP. The type of information that is needed here is justification as to why the staff is undertaking this effort and not DOE. Several examples may include the fact that DOE has requested staff guidance in this area; it is apparent to the staff that DOE does not view the regulations in the same way as the staff; or previous staff experience indicates guidance is needed.

Enclosure 3

Generic

TP Schedule

Milestone	Elapsed Time(wk)	Accumulated Time(wk)	Date
Initiate need for TP	0	0	(1)
Obtain PPSAS Number	1	1	
Preliminary Outline Complete	2	3	
Internal Draft	16	19	
Internal NRC Comments	4	23	
Public-Comment Draft	8	31	
Federal Register Notice/ Transmittal to ACNW	3	34	
Public Comment Period Closed	8	42	
Public Meeting on disposition of comments	8	50	
ACNW Meeting	2	52	
Final TP	8	60	

⁽¹⁾ To be completed by individual author for each TP. This should be the date that work on the TP will actually begin.