MAY 20 1983

WM Record File 106

WM Project 16
Docket No.
PDR ✓
LPDR ✓

Distribution:

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Regis R. Boyle
High-Level Waste Licensing
Management Branch
Division of Waste Management

FROM: Edward P. Regnier
High-Level Waste Licensing
Management Branch
Division of Waste Management

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT - NRC/DOE/ONWI INFORMATION MEETING ON SALT REPOSITORIES, APRIL 19-20, 1983, COLUMBUS, OHIO

I attended the subject meeting. A copy of the agenda and meeting minutes is attached. A binder containing the viewgraphs from all of the presentations was distributed to, and can be obtained from, myself and all other meeting participants.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
Edward P. Regnier
High-Level Waste Licensing
Management Branch
Division of Waste Management

Enclosures:
As stated

Distribution:
WM file: ~~3103~~ 106
WMHL r/f
NMSS r/f
REBrowning
MJBell
EPRegnier & r/f
HJMiller
JOBunting
PDR

8401300071 830520
PDR WASTE
WM-16 PDR

OFFICE	WMHL							
SURNAME	EPRegnier :lm							
DATE	5/20/83							00095

FINAL MEETING AGENDA

(First Day - April 19)

8:30 a.m.	Welcome and Introduction	J. Neff/S. Goldsmith
8:45 a.m.	NRC Introduction and Comments	H. Miller/L. Chase
9:00 a.m.	NPO/DOE Organization and Responsibility	L. Casey
9:25 a.m.	ONWI Organization and Responsibility	M. Glora
9:50 a.m.	Break	
10:00 a.m.	NRC Organization, Responsibility and Regulatory Review	H. Miller
	• 10 CFR 60 Changes and Schedules • Legislation Impacts • SCR Review Process and Schedules	
11:00 a.m.	NPO/ONWI Information System	
	• Document Review and Clearance Process	L. Anderson
	• Document Distribution Process	L. Anderson
	• SCR Reference Library and Data Base	
	• Discussion	
12:00 noon	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Engineering } Function Overview Including Available Documents	S. Matthews
2:00 p.m.	Geology }	G. Heim
3:00 p.m.	Systems }	M. Glora J. Kircher
4:00 p.m.	Discussion	
5:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

(Second Day - April 20)

8:30 a.m.	NPO/ONWI SCR Program	
	• Waste Legislation	R. Wunderlich
	• Schedules	
	• Siting Guidelines	
	• Regulatory Guide 4.17	M. Glora
10:30 a.m.	Break	
10:40 a.m.	NRC/DOE Interaction Procedures	NPO/NRC/ONWI
	• Implementation of Agreement • Meeting Arrangements • Proposed Topics for Future Meetings	
12:00 noon	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Meeting Minutes Preparation and Finalization	NPO/NRC/ONWI
4:00 p.m.	Closeout	

Distribution (with minutes)

Jeff Neff, NPO
Max Blanchard, NPO
Bob Wunderlich, NPO
Leslie Casey, NPO
Roger Wu, NPO

Virgil Lowery, DOE-NE-22
Larry White, Weston

Hubert Miller, NRC
Lawrence Chase, NRC
Robert Johnson, NRC
Julia Corrado, NRC
~~Ed Regnier, NRC~~
Mike Weber, NRC
Ludwig Hartung, NRC
Donna Mattson, NRC
Frank Kendorski, Eng. International (Consultant)

Mike Glora, ONWI
John Kircher, ONWI
Sam Matthews, ONWI
George Heim, ONWI
Ping Chen, ONWI
Larry Anderson, ONWI
Stan Goldsmith, ONWI
R. W. Klingensmith, ONWI
Dill Shipler, ONWI
Jack McDowell, ONWI

Steve Frishman, TENRAC
Hall Bolinger, LA - with viewgraphs
Gary Tomsic, UT - with viewgraphs
Ron Forsythe, MS - with viewgraphs

Don Vieth, DOE-NV
John Anttonen, DOE-RL

Department of Energy
National Waste Terminal
Storage Program Office
505 King Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

MAY 6 1983

Distribution

MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19-20, 1983 MEETING OF NRC AND DOE/NPO PREPARATORY TO SUBMITTAL OF SALT SITE SCP

Enclosed are the meeting minutes of the subject meeting. Any questions can be addressed to L. Casey (FTS 976-5918) of my staff.

R W Underlich
for J. O. Neff
Program Manager
NWTS Program Office

NPO:LAC:dsl

Enclosure: Subject meeting minutes

ST# 284-83

MINUTES OF APRIL 19-20, 1983 MEETING IN COLUMBUS
FIRST MEETING OF NRC AND DOE/NPO PREPARATORY
TO SUBMITTAL OF SALT SITE SCP

Background and Facts

NRC, DOE/NPO and contractor representatives met at the Battelle facilities in Columbus, Ohio on April 19-20, 1983 to discuss the ONWI program including legislation impacts and available documentation. The agenda, attached, was followed and completed. A list of attendees is also attached.

The copies of the viewgraphs serve as a partial record of the meeting and were provided to all attendees and will be transmitted to the invited state contacts in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Utah. Texas was in attendance.

NRC was provided with a copy of a letter from R. L. Morgan to J. Gervers, dated March 14, 1983 (attached) as an expression of DOE's commitment to developing procedures for supplying primary data to states and NRC on a timely basis.

The meeting minutes which consist primarily of lists of observations and open items by NRC and DOE were drafted before the close of the meeting, read, and signed by H. Miller of the NRC and J. Neff of DOE. The original of this rough version was provided to the NRC for their files. What follows here is the typed and edited version of the signed rough record. No consolidation of NRC and DOE observations and open items was attempted other than through cross referencing.

DOE Observations

1. The DOE recognizes that the level of detail of information appropriate to SCP is a major area of interest to both the NRC and the DOE. DOE will read the BWIP SCA and develop questions relative to NRC's level of detail positions.

2. NRC reiterated that they have no approval authority on start of shaft construction. DOE may proceed at their own risk. Prudence dictates timely consultation with NRC on issues of potential licensing significance.

3. DOE stated that NRC's role in site screening is defined by legislation as being limited to concurrence on guidelines. Therefore, pre-site selection interactions with NRC will be of a general informational nature only. See NRC observation on this matter.

4. NRC does not have current plans to modify RG-4.17 beyond what is indicated by legislation, and expressed a willingness to discuss possible DOE modifications - specifically deletion of Chapter 2 as being redundant to legislative EA's.

5. NRC clarified that the mechanics of SCP updates is DOE's option (e.g. - replacement pages or other mechanisms). See also NRC comment.

6. NRC stated that they are not predisposed against licensing salt domes.

7. DOE recognizes that NRC needs sufficient data to make independent evaluations at the time of SCA preparation.

8. NRC expressed concern about effects DOE schedule slips may have on NRC SCP review. Such slips will be considered on an ongoing basis in shaping the pre-SCP consultation.

NRC Observations

1. NRC position on expected level of detail and currency information in the SCP, SCP appendices, and SCP references delivered with the SCP. Level of detail applies to: 1) plans for data collection, analysis, and performance assessment; 2) existing data and associated data collection and analysis methods used; and 3) conceptual designs. The NRC's general position at this time is presented in Chapter 10 of the BWIP SCA. Specific emphasis should be placed on Figures 10.1 an 10.2. Further definition of level of detail will be developed in each technical area during technical workshops. A critical question in workshops will be the level of detail to be provided in the SCP on plans and test procedures of site characterization. In each technical area the level of detail to be provided in the SCP, SCP appendices, and SCP references provided at the time of submittal will be discussed. Emphasis will be placed on areas where less specific information may be presented than is generally called for by RG-4.17, (e.g. in Sections 10.3, 10.4, 10.5 and 10.6).

2. The NRC position on timely release of data and data analysis and information, including newly developed plans, procedures or changes in existing plans will be discussed with DOE on an ongoing basis. Currently DOE is working on a procedure for data release; DOE estimates that they can develop these procedures within the next 60 days. In order to assure that DOE will be able to provide the procedures by the date of completion, DOE will take the lead in scheduling a meeting with NRC to resolve concerns if any and develop a specific plan to develop the procedures by May 16, 1983.

3. Follow up is needed on defining the character and content of the DOE data base beyond current published reports. This follow up will consist of a conference call to NRC initiated by DOE before May 16, 1983.

4. The mechanics of updating semi-annual reports (particularly updates to the SCP), other reports and documents, will be the responsibility of DOE. NRC has no requirement for "page change updates". NRC requires current perspective on the following in such updates:

   a. licensing issues
   b. current knowledge (uncertainties)
   c. plans

5. DOE is currently evaluating comments received in the draft guidelines. Depending on the scope of revisions and a potential determination that EA's and SCP's cannot be issued until guidelines are finalized and hearings held there is a potential for significant delay in the SCP submittal - possibly up to one year.

6. Exploratory Shaft Letter

NRC will transmit to DOE within a few weeks questions related to shaft construction. Both the mode of construction and the details of design and testing will be questioned in terms of two concerns: 1) ultimate shaft sealing. 2) information gathering.

7. Agenda of Future Workshops

In general priority will be given to workshops on relatively generic subjects before the nomination of one salt site. A productive first workshop could focus on guidance on the salt SCP preparation based on the BWIP SCA. This workshop should be held very early (possibly May).

Tentative generic workshop topics include:

1. Performance assessment (late July suggested by DOE after transmittal of DOE performance assessment plan)

2. Waste Package (late June suggested by DOE after transmittal of DOE report)

3. Design

4. Quality Assurance

Meetings also should be held on:

a. Hydrogeology
b. Geology/Geologic Stability
c. Geochemistry

Specific topics, dates, and places for workshops will be finalized within about 3 to 4 weeks (at same time as the first workshop on the BWIP SCA). (See also DOE open item #3)

8. NRC Involvement with Site Screening

There is not yet a legal determination by NRC on what NRC's involvement in the site screening stage should be given passage of NWPA. The practical affect of this is ambiguity about how much NRC can or should be kept abreast of data and information collected and analyzed at current, multiple salt sites being considered.

9. Public Comment on the SCA

It is presently unresolved how the NWPA has affected the public comment process on the NRC SCA.

10. Changes in 4.17

No significant changes in 4.17 have resulted from the NWPA beyond what is clearly stated.

11. There may be impacts of DOE schedule slips on NRC SCP review preparation

Open Item's Identified by DOE

1. It is not resolved how agreement is to be reached on convention for certain test procedures (e.g. in situ test plans) and also convention on use of certain terms such as "conceptual design", "disturbed zone", and "accessible environment".

2. Development of procedures for providing NRC and state access to primary data within 30-60 days of data generation.

3. Development of future meeting timing and topics subject to the following constraints:

   - Signing of agreement with NRC
   - Results of conference call by May 16, 1983 concerning definition of data base beyond current documentation

   - DOE/NPO review of BWIP SCA for generic issues and intent applicable to salt

   A tentative list of meeting topics include:

   - Generic meeting to discuss SCA
   - Waste Package Conceptaul Design
   - Performance Assessment

   See NRC observation #7

4. NRC will provide a list of considerations appropriate to exploratory shaft construction.

5. DOE to provide NRC with list of key salt state contacts for document distribution.

6. Concerning timing of future meetings, DOE requests finalization of agenda at least two weeks prior to meeting date to allow sufficient time for state notification.

7. Consideration will be given to the development of procedures to enable DOE to receive NRC documents, copies, at time reports to go to printers (and vice versa).

Open Items's Identified by NRC

1. letter stating considerations about exploratory shaft in salt to be provided by NRC to DOE

2. NRC distribution list to be provided to DOE for distribution of ONWI reports to NRC

3. Numerous questions remain, such as:

   a. What is proper trade-off between borehole drilling and protecting the integrity of the sites?

   b. Which agency will send the SCA's to the States and Indian Tribes.

   c. Guidance is needed for hydrologic monitoring.

   d. Mechanics for notifying the States and Indian Tribes should be finalized.

4. States should be participants in meetings rather than observers.

5. An undecided item remains as to which agency shall notify the States and Indian Tribes of meetings.

6. Procedure for the release of NRC reports will be furnished to DOE.

7. Plans for the preparation of NRC Technical Positions will be furnished to DOE.

8. NRC will document its needs concerning samples for confirmatory measurements.