Distribution
WMHT r/f
NMSS r/f
WM r/f
DBrooks & r/f
PSJustus
HJMiller
MBell
PAltomare
REBrowning
CF
JCORRADO & r/f

001.6/DJB/82/03/24/0

MAR 26 1982

WMHT: 001.6
(109)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Memo to the File

FROM: David Brooks
Julia Corrado
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

THROUGH: Philip S. Justus, Section Leader
Siting Section
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

SUBJECT: NRC/DOE DISCUSSION OF 1981 GEOCHEMISTRY TRIP REPORT

Attached are meeting minutes of our meeting with DOE on February 25, 1982 to discuss our 1981 geochemistry trip report.

David Brooks
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

Julia Corrado
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

cc: TLongo-DOE
CNewton-DOE

DIST:

TICKET NO:

OFC	WMHT	WMHT	WMHT	WMHT			
NAME	DBrooks:bd	JCorrado	PSJustus	HJMiller			
DATE	:82/03/24	3/25/82	3/24/82	3/26/82			

MEETING REPORT

Date of Meeting: February 25, 1982

Place: DOE, Germantown, 4th Floor Conference Room

Purpose: To discuss the Draft 1981 Geochemistry Trip Report with respect to NRC Prelicensing Needs and the DOE Research Program in Geochemistry.

Meeting Attendees:

NRC	DOE
H. Miller	C. Cooley (HQ)
P. Justus	H. Smedes (HQ)
D. Brooks	T. Longo (HQ)
G. Birchard	J. Moody (ONWI)
J. Corrado	J. Burnett (BES)
	P. Stevens (USGS)
	E. Schreiber (BES)
	M. E. Langston (NE-510)
	C. Klingsberg (NE-330)
	J. Duguid (ONI)

Background

NRC staff D. Alexander, G. Birchard, and D. Brooks visited nine national laboratories taking part in the DOE's geochemistry research program in high-level radioactive waste disposal in a series of one-day trips during August and September 1981. The NRC issued a first draft of the resulting trip report to DOE staff in February 1982. The February 25 meeting was intended to provide an opportunity for DOE staff to discuss observations made in the 1981 Trip Report with the authors of the report and other NRC staff.

Summary of Meeting:

The following reflects points of discussion and agreement reached, many of which require further action on the part of both NRC and DOE:

The NRC stressed the need for documentation of a DOE program plan which establishes and prioritizes the issues, the nature and level of information needed, and methods of data acquisition to assure the development of data that are complete and of adequate quality. DOE stated that there exists several documents which, in part, address these questions. DOE referred to two ONWI (J. Moody) documents but did not specify when they would be available. NRC (H. Miller) requested to see them as soon as possible and indicated that these appeared to be vehicles for establishing agreement on what constitutes an adequate data acquisition program and assurance that adequate information will be available for licensing.

2. NRC reiterated the main observations concerning the DOE's research program in geochemistry that were expressed in the Trip Report. NRC stated that although there is agreement with DOE on the need to address issues such as radionuclide species solubility, a comprehensive, accurate solubility data base does not exist. Such a data base is essential for performance assessment modelling.

3. DOE (T. Longo) produced a cross-check of issues brought forth in a draft NWTS position paper in geochemistry, a draft NRC contractor report, and the NRC trip report. There was general agreement on the issues. The question of what kinds of programs and what resources should be devoted to resolution of these issues was discussed to the extent possible in this general meeting. In absence of a program plan, it is not possible to comment definitively on the adequacy of the level of effort and timetables planned for addressing the issues and information needs. The NRC made the point that these are important matters to take up as soon as the DOE formulates its plans for its data acquisition program to assure that research efforts are well-targeted and will result in an adequate and timely data base upon which issues may be resolved.

4. NRC asked to what degree will DOE cover these matters in the SCR's (Ostensibly, the SCR's should lay out the details in describing the issues and information needs and the methods and approaches for their resolution). DOE (Cooley) indicated that, at this time, field program managers have full responsibility for guiding the program at the sites. The specific contents of the SCR's, therefore, are not yet known. NRC indicated its willingness to be flexible with respect to the level of detail contained in the SCR, with the provision that the plans in the SCR satisfy site characterization needs and that

timely discussion of the details are provided in other documents and resolved before programs proceed very far.

5. DOE mentioned that they are generating a request of ANS to establish a reference of standard or conventional tests and methods that address geotechnical issues, including geochemistry. NRC stated that it was pleased to see that some steps were being taken in this area, but expressed these concerns about DOE's plans as they were discussed by DOE:

   a. The topics to be covered by the proposed ANS standards appear too broad to be useful for obtaining the level of detail that is needed.

   b. The timing of the promulgation of ANS standards does not appear to be geared to site characterization work.

   c. NRC questioned whether there would be adequate lead time for carrying through the design, implementation, data gathering and cross-checks that should determine the suitability of a lab or field test for standardization.

   To resolve these concerns, NRC stated that DOE and NRC should work together to scope out this consensus standard effort. This is the kind of interaction that has been urged by numerous NRC letters over the past year.

cc: TLongo
CNewton

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

MAR 26 1982

WMHT: 001.6

MEMORANDUM FOR: Memo to the File

FROM: David Brooks
Julia Corrado
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

THROUGH: Philip S. Justus, Section Leader
Siting Section
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

SUBJECT: NRC/DOE DISCUSSION OF 1981 GEOCHEMISTRY TRIP REPORT

Attached are meeting minutes of our meeting with DOE on February 25, 1982 to discuss our 1981 geochemistry trip report.

David Brooks
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

Julia Corrado
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

cc: TLongo-DOE
CNewton-DOE

MEETING REPORT

Date of Meeting: February 25, 1982

Place: DOE, Germantown, 4th Floor Conference Room

Purpose: To discuss the Draft 1981 Geochemistry Trip Report with respect to NRC Prelicensing Needs and the DOE Research Program in Geochemistry.

Meeting Attendees:

NRC	DOE
H. Miller	C. Cooley (HQ)
P. Justus	H. Smedes (HQ)
D. Brooks	T. Longo (HQ)
G. Birchard	J. Moody (ONWI)
J. Corrado	J. Burnett (BES)
	P. Stevens (USGS)
	E. Schreiber (BES)
	M. E. Langston (NE-510)
	C. Klingsberg (NE-330)
	J. Duguid (ONI)

Background

NRC staff D. Alexander, G. Birchard, and D. Brooks visited nine national laboratories taking part in the DOE's geochemistry research program in high-level radioactive waste disposal in a series of one-day trips during August and September 1981. The NRC issued a first draft of the resulting trip report to DOE staff in February 1982. The February 25 meeting was intended to provide an opportunity for DOE staff to discuss observations made in the 1981 Trip Report with the authors of the report and other NRC staff.

Summary of Meeting:

The following reflects points of discussion and agreement reached, many of which require further action on the part of both NRC and DOE:

1. The NRC stressed the need for documentation of a DOE program plan which establishes and prioritizes the issues, the nature and level of information needed, and methods of data acquisition to assure the development of data that are complete and of adequate quality. DOE stated that there exists several documents which, in part, address these questions. DOE referred to two ONWI (J. Moody) documents but did not specify when they would be available. NRC (H. Miller) requested to see them as soon as possible and indicated that these appeared to be vehicles for establishing agreement on what constitutes an adequate data acquisition program and assurance that adequate information will be available for licensing.

2. NRC reiterated the main observations concerning the DOE's research program in geochemistry that were expressed in the Trip Report. NRC stated that although there is agreement with DOE on the need to address issues such as radionuclide species solubility, a comprehensive, accurate solubility data base does not exist. Such a data base is essential for performance assessment modelling.

3. DOE (T. Longo) produced a cross-check of issues brought forth in a draft NWTS position paper in geochemistry, a draft NRC contractor report, and the NRC trip report. There was general agreement on the issues. The question of what kinds of programs and what resources should be devoted to resolution of these issues was discussed to the extent possible in this general meeting. In absence of a program plan, it is not possible to comment definitively on the adequacy of the level of effort and timetables planned for addressing the issues and information needs. The NRC made the point that these are important matters to take up as soon as the DOE formulates its plans for its data acquisition program to assure that research efforts are well-targeted and will result in an adequate and timely data base upon which issues may be resolved.

4. NRC asked to what degree will DOE cover these matters in the SCR's (Ostensibly, the SCR's should lay out the details in describing the issues and information needs and the methods and approaches for their resolution). DOE (Cooley) indicated that, at this time, field program managers have full responsibility for guiding the program at the sites. The specific contents of the SCR's, therefore, are not yet known. NRC indicated its willingness to be flexible with respect to the level of detail contained in the SCR, with the provision that the plans in the SCR satisfy site characterization needs and that

timely discussion of the details are provided in other documents and resolved before programs proceed very far.

5. DOE mentioned that they are generating a request of ANS to establish a reference of standard or conventional tests and methods that address geotechnical issues, including geochemistry. NRC stated that it was pleased to see that some steps were being taken in this area, but expressed these concerns about DOE's plans as they were discussed by DOE:

   a. The topics to be covered by the proposed ANS standards appear too broad to be useful for obtaining the level of detail that is needed.

   b. The timing of the promulgation of ANS standards does not appear to be geared to site characterization work.

   c. NRC questioned whether there would be adequate lead time for carrying through the design, implementation, data gathering and cross-checks that should determine the suitability of a lab or field test for standardization.

   To resolve these concerns, NRC stated that DOE and NRC should work together to scope out this consensus standard effort. This is the kind of interaction that has been urged by numerous NRC letters over the past year.

cc: TLongo
CNewton