

JUN 28 1988

- 1 -

Dr. Roy E. Williams
Williams and Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 48
Viola, Idaho 83872

Dear Mr. Williams:

I have received your monthly progress report for April dated May 5, 1988. This report describes the status of Williams and Associates technical assistance under Contract No. NRC-02-85-008. Overall, progress made to date is satisfactory.

Task 1- NNWSI

I have received your letter of May 6 (Communication No. 182) containing suggestions on scenarios which could be investigated using UNSAT2 in order to evaluate some basic questions associated with the consideration of flux at Yucca Mountain. I appreciate your suggestions but at this time I am not prepared to issue any specific tasks with regard to modeling of the Yucca Mountain site. At the moment the Division is reevaluating our modeling strategy position (essentially the policy for independent staff assessments). In addition, the Hydrology Section is in the process of developing its hardware/software needs in order to perform independent analyses as well as participate in specific research programs such as INTRAVAL. This is a busy agenda and our focus at this time is not in developing specific Yucca Mountain modeling objectives and scenarios. However, your suggestions will be retained until such time as we are prepared to develop and implement specific modeling tasks.

I have received your Communications Nos. 181 and 184 (note this #184 should be #185, see comment below) discussing your ongoing evaluation of the basic assumptions inherent in the description of the groundwater flow system provided by DOE in the CDSCP. Because I provided detailed guidance on this task in my letter of May 6, I do not need to reiterate it here. I do note the agreement between your thoughts and Tom Sniff's (WW&L) in that there are many assumptions in the DOE description of the groundwater flow system that are not expressed explicitly. I need to remind you of the importance of incorporating specific references to the CDSCP in the update report. I recognize that this is not necessarily a simple task (referencing an implicit assumption) but there should be some referable discussion or text which leads one to conclude a certain assumption is necessary although not stated explicitly.

I have received your letter of May 31 submitting three document reviews. I believe this should be Communication No. 184 rather than 183 as shown on the letter. Your letter to Mr. Ross with comments on the draft GTP on GWTT (May 12) is shown as Communication No. 183.

As a final note, please cancel the remaining reviews requested in my 9/25/88 letter. We will reevaluate and reassign reviews in the future with more specific objectives and schedules.

Tasks 2 and 3

No comments

Task 5

Your comments on the draft GTP on GWTT were received by Mr. Ross and will be given consideration.

I have no further comments.

The action taken by this letter is considered to be within the scope of the current contract NRC-02-85-008. No changes to costs or delivery of contracted products are authorized. Please notify me immediately if you believe that this letter would result in a change to costs or delivery of contacted products.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Pohle, Project Officer
Hydrology Section
Technical Review Branch
Division of High-Level Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

DISTRIBUTION

Central File
PDR
LPDR
CNWRA
LSS
R. Browning
EDavis, PMDA
WFord, HLTR

R. Ballard
NMSS R/F
HLTR R/F
D Chery
J Pohle R/F
EKnox, ACB
FRoss, HLTR

NColeman, HLTR
TVerma, HLTR

Wm-11
NH18
D1020
0044

OFC	: HLTR	: HLTR	:	:	:	:
NAME	: JPohle/cj	: DChery	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 6/3/88	: 6/27/88	:	:	:	: