

WM 085
WM Record
DIOTG
ITASCA

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

Distribution:
* Tiktinsky
(Return to WM, 623-SS)
st



4 September 1986

David Tiktinsky - SS623
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Waste Management
Washington, D.C. 20555

"NRC Technical Assistance
for Design Reviews"
Contract No. NRC-02-85-002
FIN D1016

Dear David:

Enclosed is Itasca's trip report for the presentation of the draft in-situ testing paper for the BWIP site attended by Mark Board, Roger Hart, and Adrian Brown, 14 August 1986. Please call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Roger D. Hart
Roger D. Hart
Project Manager

cc: J. Greeves, Engineering Branch
Office of the Director, NMSS
E. Wiggins, Division of Contracts
DWM Document Control Room

Encl.
rdh/ks

85 SEP -8 P2:49
WM DOCKET CONTROL CENTER

8611200118 860904
PDR WMRES EECITAS
D-1016 PDR

3464

ITASCA TRIP REPORT

DATES: 14 August 1986

LOCATION: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Silver Spring, Maryland

PURPOSE: Presentation of Draft In-Situ Testing Paper for the
BWIP Site

ATTENDEES: M. Board and R. Hart (Itasca), Adrian Brown (Nuclear
Waste Consultants), and J. Buckley, D. Gupta,
M. Nataraja, J. Pearring, J. Peschal, N. Tanious, and
D. Tiktinsky (NRC)

PREPARED BY: Mark Board

SUMMARY

The purpose of this meeting was to present the NRC review of the draft in-situ testing point paper for the BWIP site and to discuss the outlines for in-situ point papers for the salt and tuff sites.

Mark Board gave a discussion of the ideas behind the suggested basalt testing approach as well as the methodology for testing. John Buckley then reviewed the major NRC comments on the plan. A good deal of discussion then followed on the rationale for in-situ testing. It was determined that what was missing from this plan was a series of analyses which support the suggested program. It was also determined that, for basalt, the outline should be revised as follows.

1. Overview — The overview from the present plan should be condensed as much as possible and placed in an appendix.
2. Rationale — Parameter sensitivity studies which lead to the testing information needs should be performed and included in the plan.

3. Test Plan — The integrated testing approach and example testing program should be included more-or-less as it now stands.

Essentially, the decision was made not to make the basalt plan conform to Section 8.3 of the SCP but to follow the outline given above. An estimate for the work effort required to perform the parameter analyses and to revise the present plan is to be submitted to the NRC prior to completing this task.

N. Tanious and J. Pearring requested a similar effort for salt but with a review plan for the ONWI-Golder SCP Chapter 8.3 as well. The review plan will supply a checklist against which the SCP can be examined to judge the appropriateness and completeness of testing. D. Gupta and J. Peschal felt that the tuff program was more "cut-and-dry" and felt that only an SCP review plan for Chapter 8.3 was necessary. It was agreed that L. Lorig and J. Daemen of Itasca will call them the week of 18 August to define the document outline and to arrange for due dates for a detailed outline and plan.

Respectfully, submitted,

Mark Board

MB

COST BREAK-OUT

Labor

Mark Board	16 hrs @ \$48.99/hr*	\$ 783.84
Roger Hart	8 hrs @ \$49.21/hr*	393.68

TOTAL LABOR \$ 1,177.52

Actual Expenses

Travel

Airfare (to WDC) \$ 288.00

Miscellaneous Travel Expenses \$ 137.75
(car rental, mileage)

Motel

(2 nights @ \$71.50/night) \$ 143.00

Meals

\$ 83.20

Miscellaneous Expenses
(telephone)

\$ 18.65

TOTAL EXPENSES: \$ 670.60

*includes overhead and fee

NOTE: Cost break-out for Adrian Brown is not yet available. It will be forwarded as soon as it is received. No travel expenses will be billed for R. Hart.