



98 East Naperville Road
Westmont, IL 60559-1595

ENGINEERS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Telephone: 312/963-3460
Facsimile: 312/968-6884
Telex: 280102 ICO OAKR
Cable: ENGINT

WM-RES

WM Record File

D1004
EI

WM Project 10, 11, 16

Docket No. _____

PDR ✓

LPDR B, N, S

02 May 1985

Ref. No. 1148-007-065

Distribution:

BUCKLEY

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

13

Waste Management Engineering Branch
Division of Waste Management
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Attention: Mr. John Buckley, Project Officer
Mail Stop 623-SS

Subject: Report for the meetings held on April 17 and 18, 1985, in
Silver Spring, Maryland

Dear Mr. Buckley:

I am enclosing the report for the above-mentioned meetings. Please
call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

ENGINEERS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Rajaram

V. Rajaram
Assistant Project Manager

V. Rajaram/ja

Enclosure

cc: B. Bromberg, NRC Contracts
M. M. Singh, EI

8505170063 850502
PDR WMRES EECENG
D-1004 PDR

MR/L
1148A

WM DOCKET CONTROL
CENTER

85 MAY -6 AMO:48

2047

Meeting Report

Location: Willste Building
Silver Spring, MD
Date: April 17 and 18, 1985
Purpose: To discuss performance allocation and conceptual design aspects of DOE's Site Characterization Plan (SCP).
Attendees: Representatives from the DOE, NRC, and Yakima Indian Nation
V. Rajaram, Engineers International, Inc. (EI)
K. Wahi, Sandia National Laboratory/SAI
J. Daemen, Sandia National Laboratory/University of Arizona

Summary:

1. The agenda for the April 17 and 18 meetings is attached. EI participation in the performance allocation meeting was to determine the impact of DOE's performance allocation methodology on the conceptual design and testing requirements to be provided in the SCP.
2. The objective of the Conceptual design meeting was to determine the extent of coverage that DOE is planning in the conceptual Design Report (CDR). The CDR will form the basis of the Design Chapter in the SCP report.
3. DOE stated that the conceptual design described in the SCP report is a reference concept; however, this concept is not finalized until the Advanced Conceptual Design (ACD) phase which is expected to be initiated during late 1985.

NRC stated that the SCP report should contain design details and their relationship to site characterization activities. The CDR should contain a description of alternative concepts that were considered, and describe the reference concept and an alternative that is being seriously considered in sufficient detail so that the site characterization plan to support the design can be properly evaluated.

4. The NRC's Draft Technical Position on Design Information Needs was presented by Mr. David Tiktinsky of NRC.
5. Selected Comments on the scope of the CDR were made by Dr. Dinesh Gupta of NRC. The importance of identifying design components that require site characterization, and the information needs to resolve design issues was stressed by Dr. Gupta.

6. Review by NRC of DOE's method of classifying repository systems, structures, components, and excavations according to importance to safety and waste isolation will be done before the SCP submittal.
7. DOE agreed that the potential adverse impacts of site characterization activities on repository performance will be discussed in chapter 7 of the CDR.
8. Other topics that were discussed included retrieval, borehole and shaft seals, thermal loads, flexibility of design to accommodate geologic anomalies, and site characterization activities for surface facilities.

Cost Breakout

A cost breakout for this trip is attached.

AGENDA

April 17, 1985

NRC/DOE MEETING ON SCP PERFORMANCE ALLOCATION

Silver Spring, MD
Room 106, Willste Building

- o Introduction - *Don Alexander, DOE Issue Paper* DOE/NRC 9:00 A.M.
- o Approach for Assigning Performance Goals *Seth Caplan, NRC Position.* DOE/NRC
 - Discussion
- o Should Performance Goals be Set for Preclosure? DOE/NRC
 - Discussion
- o At What Level Can Performance Goals be Meaningfully Allocated to the Repository/Waste Package Design? DOE/NRC
 - Discussion
- o Is it Appropriate or Meaningful to Allocate Performance to Site Characteristics? If so, How? DOE/NRC
 - Discussion
- o At What Stage(s) in the SCP Process will Performance Goals be Assigned or Revised? Can Tentative Goals be Assigned at an Early Stage? DOE/NRC
 - Discussion
- o LUNCH 12 NOON
- o Should Reliability Values be Attached to Performance Goals? If so, Can They be Technically Defended? If so, Would They be Useful in Determining the Number and Kinds of Tests? DOE/NRC
 - Discussion
- o Agreements DOE/NRC 3:00 P.M.

