

DISTRIBUTION:
 WMHT r/f
 NMSS r/f
 CF
 JBMartin
 REBrowning
 MJBell
 PAItomare
 HJMiller
 RWright & r/f
 PDR-

NOV 5 1982

HJM/82/10/15/0

1 -
WM- 10
PDR
 (Return to WM, 623-SS)

WMHT: 3104 101,2

Mr. John H. Anttonen, Assistant Manager
 Office of Assistant Manager for Project
 & Facility Management
 825 Jadwin Avenue
 P.O. Box 550,
 Federal Building, Room 663
 Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Anttonen:

This is in response to O. L. Olson's letter of September 23, 1982 regarding "BWIP DOE/NRC WORKSHOPS."

Since our receipt of Mr. Olson's letter there have been several opportunities, both in Richland and in Washington, to discuss the matter of future information exchanges. During our most recent conversation, in Germantown on November 1, we agreed that information needs of NRC, during the next few months, will probably center on clarifications of the Hanford Site Characterization Report, under review during that period. For this purpose, a question-and-answer mode seems appropriate along the following lines:

1. NRC's questions to be placed by telephone, with confirmation in written form-perhaps hand written to save time.
2. DOE's answers to be handled in similar fashion.
3. Rapid turn-around desired - i.e. 1 or 2 working days.
4. Initial contacts to be Wright for NRC and a to-be-named person for DOE. If the work volume proves too large, additional contact persons may be needed-each dealing with a particular subject.
5. Aim for a regularly scheduled; daily telephone contact time.

We agreed that the matter of establishing specific guidelines for future technical meetings or workshops should be postponed until we are well

OFC :	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME :	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE :82/10/15 :	:	:	:	:	:	00188

into our site characterization report reviews. It is not until then that the appropriate scope and nature of such technical meetings can be reasonably determined.

The remainder of this letter is related to other topics raised in the September 23 letter where we perceive that differences in viewpoint may exist. In particular, a question was raised about the purpose of reviewing design aspects of the repository and site characterization activities and facilities at the present time.

As noted in 10 CFR 60.11(a)(6)ii and the Standard Format and Content Guide(RG 4.17), a conceptual design should be included in the SCR in sufficient detail to allow assessment of the site characterization program. This is intended to make sure that the important information needs and unresolved issues related to repository design requirements, and overall performance objectives of 10CFR 60, have been identified and addressed in planned site characterization programs. The related but separate concern for reviewing information about designs of the exploratory shaft and site characterization activities (mentioned in the letter from R. Wright to D. Squires dated August 6, 1982) is explicitly identified in 10 CFR 60.11 (a)(6) iii: viz. the SCR shall include "provisions to control any adverse, safety-related effects from site characterization including appropriate quality assurance programs." [See also, general concern expressed by Commission in FR Notice promulgating procedural final rule (46 FR 37, 13975 "Site Characterization Report") that there be no safety impacts from site characterization]. We feel it is important for us to inquire about the construction specifications and quality assurance procedures associated with site characterization activities, including the exploratory shaft and development activities, as they may impact on long-term repository sealing capabilities.

I should point out that the third paragraph of the September 23 letter contains a number of apparent misunderstandings, according to our records and recollections. We feel it incorrectly stated that NRC has pressed for three additional workshops beyond those agreed upon in June. The workshop on tectonics and site stability was agreed upon in our telephone conversations of June 22 and 24 firming up the specific slate of workshops prior to SCR submittal. A quality assurance workshop has not been proposed by NRC; see attached Wright to Goranson Letter of July 7, 1982. A performance assessment workshop was proposed by Rockwell, not NRC, at the management wrapup on August 12, upon conclusion of the waste package/geochemistry workshop.

OFC :	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:
NAME :	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:	-----:
DATE :82/10/15	:	:	:	:	:	:

HJM/82/10/15/0

NOV 5 1982

- 3 -

Finally, I wish to express our appreciation to DOE and Rockwell for the cooperation shown and the attention given to NRC's information needs during the series of recently completed workshops. These have been invaluable in preparation for our review and analysis of the Hanford Site Characterization Report.

Sincerely,

Hubert J. Miller, Chief
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

Enclosure:

- 1. Richard Goranson Letter - 7/7/82

cc: O. L. Olson
R. Stein

OFC	: WMHT:isk	: WMHT	:	:	:	:	:
NAME	: R. Stein	: H. Miller	:	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 82/11/15	: 11/4/82	:	:	:	:	:



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

ATTACHMENT

JUL 07 1982

WMHT: 3104

Richard Goranson, Project Manager
BWI Project Office
Richland Operations Office
U. S. Department of Energy
P. O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Goranson:

An important subject which is to be covered in the Site Characterization Report, and which is not included within the presently scheduled technical workshops at Richland, is Quality Assurance.

On July 2, I discussed this matter with David Squires, by telephone. I proposed that in order to fill the information gap, which otherwise might be satisfied by a quality assurance workshop, the existing BWIP quality assurance documents might be provided to NRC. These would include manuals, guides, and other documents of DOE and Rockwell that are relevant to site characterization activities. No new efforts would be needed. The idea would be to provide documents already in the hands of DOE and its contractors.

The purpose of this letter is to advance this proposal to you. May I have your response in the near future, so we can plan accordingly. If there are any questions please contact me (FTS 427-4674) or Dr. M. Nataraja (FTS 427-4678).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert J. Wright".

Robert J. Wright
Senior Technical Advisor
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

cc: Ralph Stein, DOE-HQ