

sc

JUL 31 1986

426-1(D1021)JP/86/07/30

~~WM s/f(426.1)~~

WMGT r/f
NMSS r/f
RBrowning
MBell
JBunting
PJustus
JPohle & r/f
MFIiegel
PDR
LPDR (B,N,S)
EDavis, PPAS

WM-RES1 -
WM Record File
D1021
NWCI

WM Project 10, 11, 16
Docket No. _____
PDR ✓
LPDR B,N,S

Mr. Mark J. Logsdon, Project Manager
Nuclear Waste Consultants, Inc.
8341 South Sangre de Cristo Road
Suite 6
Littleton, Colorado 80127

(Return to WM, G23-SS)

Dear Mr. Logsdon:

I have reviewed your Monthly Progress Report for June dated July 14, 1986. This report describes the status of Nuclear Waste Consultants' technical assistance under under Contract No. NRC-02-85-009. Progress made to date under this contract is satisfactory.

Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum from Mr. Coleman concerning the training seminar on the theory and use of the SWIFT II code. Please make arrangements for appropriate personnel to attend.

I am trying to arrange a series of working sessions between NRC staff and contractors for the first quarter of next fiscal year. Hopefully, each site lead can spend a week with each major contractor (or in your case, the appropriate sub-contractor) and, working together, develop a detailed scope and outline of a Topical Report on Objectives of Site Characterization. Each contractor will be tasked with completing the Topical Report which will provide the "what is important and why" summary. These reports will provide site specific technical guidance for evaluating each SCP. I am expecting that the series of "mini-reports" will provide the bulk of the technical input to the topical reports. The topical reports will be oriented toward the performance objectives of 10 CFR 60. This may well require consideration of favorable and potentially adverse conditions. For example, in reviewing a license application I can envision the staff being tasked with reviewing the adequacy of investigations relevant to DOE's conclusions on the presence or absence of the siting criteria and the impact of such conclusions on providing "reasonable assurance" that particular performance objectives are met (i.e., enhance or detract from the case made). Therefore, you should consider the need for "mini-reports" dealing with any such siting criteria relevant to providing reasonable assurance that performance objective(s) will be met. Also keep in mind we haven't "identified" the criteria in these terms as yet which is evident from the draft work plan for GWTT.

I have no further comments.

DFC :WMGT	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME :JPohle	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE :86/07/	:	:	:	:	:	:

B610030179 B60731
PDR WMRES EECNWCI
D-1021 PDR

2738

The action taken by this letter is considered to be within the scope of the current contract NRC-02-85-009. No changes to cost or delivery of contracted services and products are authorized. Please notify me immediately if you believe that this letter would result in changes to cost or delivery of contracted products.

Sincerely,

ISI

Jeffrey A. Pohle, Project Officer
Geotechnical Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc:
Mary Little, ACB
Neil Coleman, WMG
Fred Ross, WMG
Michael Weber, WMG

OFF :	WMGT	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME :	JPohle	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE :	86/07/30	:	:	:	:	:	: