

WM Record File

115

WM Project \_\_\_\_\_

Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

PDR \_\_\_\_\_

LPDR \_\_\_\_\_

Distribution:

BIARRANTA

DUNKLEMAN

(Return to WM. 623-SS)

WM DOCKET CONTROL  
CENTER

NRC-NMS/DOE

'84 APR 23 A11:47

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

DISCUSSION OF THE OCRWM MISSION PLAN

April 11, 1984

Forrestal Building  
1000 Independence Avenue SW.  
Room 1E 245  
Washington, D.C.

Sowers Reporting Company

ORIGINAL

Transcript of Proceedings

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION

HEARING

REVISION OF THE 1968 MISTON PLAN

Washington, D.C.

February 27, 1968

FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Special Reporters

44 North Capitol Street

Washington, D.C. 20001

NATIONAL COVERAGE DAILY

GREENWOOD

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. BROWNING: For the benefit of the people who don't know all the NRC representatives who are here, I would like to just walk through who is here.

On my right is Jim Wolf from our Executive Legal Director staff. To my left is Hud Miller who is the head of the Repository Licensing Branch under me; John Greeves who is the Branch Chief in the Engineering Branch and Chip Cameron from the Executive Legal Director staff.

The main purpose from our standpoint of this meeting is to make sure that if there are any questions related to the comments that we gave you on the mission plan that we discuss those enough so that there is no misunderstanding as to what those comments were about. My understanding is that based on the comments that you received from us and other interested parties during the process of revising the mission plan and in the latter part of the meeting, if it is appropriate, we would like to understand from you where you think you are headed based on the comments that you have received so far even though it may still be preliminary thinking, and to the extent we can we would be willing to give you observations or to take back any questions you have so that we could give you some insight into what our approach might be for those particular aspects that you plan to include in the Mission Plan.

Bowers Reporting Company

1           The scope of this session will be limited to the  
 2 repository part of the mission plan. Of course, the intent is  
 3 consistent with the Commission policy as we have incorporated  
 4 in our procedural roles to make ourselves available to you  
 5 as necessary to make sure that any issues are raised early  
 6 in the process, and hopefully, come forward with a mission  
 7 plan that is understood by everybody on both of our staffs  
 8 and is mutually agreeable.

9           On late Monday we received from you a list of  
 10 questions that you specifically would like to pursue in this  
 11 meeting; for the benefit of the people in the room who have not  
 12 seen those questions, as we get into the discussion of those,  
 13 we will indicate what the question was and what our response  
 14 to the question is where we can actually give you a response  
 15 today.

16           In some cases the questions that you raised are  
 17 apparently related to what you are thinking about putting into  
 18 the revised mission plan, and in that case we probably would  
 19 like to hear from you as to what your thought process is or  
 20 what the specific plan element would be in order that we can  
 21 either respond to it in this meeting or be able to quickly  
 22 respond to it once you issue the draft mission plan for  
 23 comment.

24           In a manner similar to the practice that has been  
 25 evolving as a result of our mutual dialogue on the site selection

Source Reporting Company

1 guidelines we are going to, I guess DOE has made arrangements  
2 to have a transcript made of this, so that the public could  
3 see after the fact what it was that was discussed during this  
4 session. Also, in common with the practice there, I would  
5 propose that we open up the meeting to the observers in the  
6 audience to make any comments or observations they care to  
7 make upon completion of whatever it is we wanted to discuss,  
8 if that is acceptable to you.

9 I guess I would like to turn it over at this point  
10 to Hub Miller.

11 MR. BENETT: Could I make a couple of opening  
12 remarks first, and introduce the people here?

13 MR. BROWNING: Sure.

14 MR. BENETT: Let me first say that it is excellent  
15 timing for the meeting because we are in what we hope are the  
16 final stages of revising the Mission Plan to be in a position  
17 to put out a draft Mission Plan for public comment late this  
18 month or early in May, and the last i's are being dotted and  
19 t's are being crossed, and schedules are being drawn to put  
20 into that plan, that final review of that within the  
21 Department, and that is why some of the people you might have  
22 expected might have been here aren't here at the meeting  
23 because they are busy doing that, and I apologize for them  
24 not being here.

25 Let me take a second and introduce the people who

1 are here. Some of you may not know the people. I assume you  
2 do, but for the benefit of the observers, on my right, first,  
3 I am Bill Benett. I am the Associate Director for Geologic  
4 Repository Deployment in the Civilian Radioactive Waste  
5 Management Office. I am one of the people who have been  
6 acting for a while, and the Department has been criticized for  
7 struggling along with such poor leadership. Soon we will be  
8 in a position to rectify all that.

9 On my right is Mark Frei. Mark is the Acting  
10 Director of the Engineering and Licensing Division in my office  
11 and is another one of the acting people. On my left is Jay  
12 Rhoderick. Jay Rhoderick recent joined the Department from  
13 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and works in Mark's  
14 Engineering and Licensing Division and on his left is Hank  
15 Bermanis who is the Licensing Manager for our technical  
16 support contractor, Weston. It is the technical support  
17 contractor to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.  
18 I understand that what we are going to do is focus first on the  
19 questions that are directly in response to the comments you  
20 provided us on the previous draft and then get into the approaches  
21 we may be considering in the revised draft and that is fine.

22 As far as comments are concerned at the end,  
23 the only thing I would like to try to do is finish by two,  
24 and therefore make sure we finish in time to allow comments  
25 by two because I have to go to another engagement by two.

1 All right, so, I will turn it back to Hub.

2 MR. MILLER: We should, hopefully, be able to finish  
3 by then. We should try to finish before lunch, if we can do  
4 that.

5 Your list of questions included nine questions.  
6 The one that I think first goes to comments that we made in the  
7 letter to Lawrence on the Mission Plan was what time periods  
8 for in situ testing does NRC recommend for the various  
9 candidate sites, and I believe it might be useful to review  
10 again what was our comment.

11 Our comment was that we felt that while the draft  
12 Mission Plan did convey some uncertainty concerning the amount  
13 of time it would take to complete site characterization and  
14 more specifically to complete that phase of site characteriza-  
15 tion which is likely going to be on critical path, namely the  
16 in situ testing, we felt that it did not adequately reflect  
17 the uncertainties about technically what would be required as  
18 a part of in situ testing. We pointed out that in particular  
19 there was uncertainty with respect to what was going to be  
20 needed to deal with the thermal effects that will be a result  
21 of the emplaced waste and the bottom line really of this  
22 comment was that the resolution of this uncertainty depends  
23 upon the department laying out and making their case with  
24 respect to how important the near field, the host rock is to  
25 the performance of the repository, what portion of the load or

1 the performance of the site will be taken up by this near  
2 field, because it is the near field that in great measure is  
3 being examined through testing in this underground facility.  
4 So, your question here is at what time periods for in situ  
5 testing does NRC recommend? We have no specific number of  
6 years that we can recommend. We have over the past several  
7 years done a number of systematic studies which have been  
8 published in documents, such as the ones I am holding up here  
9 where we asked the question of what technical issues must be  
10 resolved during site characterization and specifically by  
11 testing in the underground facilities, and what we come away  
12 with is that not knowing how important that near field  
13 component is to performance one cannot be prescriptive at the  
14 beginning in terms of saying how long it is going to take.

15 I think that with that as a kind of a general  
16 response which you might want to react to, it might be good  
17 to have John Greeves walk through a few vugraphs or a few  
18 points that need to be understood about what in general is  
19 going to be needed for the licensing reviews, again, focusing  
20 on in situ testing because I think the reason why you have  
21 written the question this way is because in situ testing is  
22 on critical path for being able to submit a license application,  
23 but if we can beg your indulgence for a few minutes I think  
24 that --

25 MR. BENETT: Excuse me, what I have heard you say,

1 Hub is how much in situ testing is required is a function of  
2 the extent to which near field component is going to be relied  
3 on in the overall repository performance. Can you bracket that  
4 then? What if I tell you not at all on one extreme and a whole  
5 lot on the other?

6 MR. MILLER: I think we attempted to do that in our  
7 letter, and what we said was that we thought the estimates that  
8 you have in your Mission Plan were reasonable, that is the  
9 8 to 27 months, I think is what you had. I am not sure if the  
10 8 months necessarily is something that we feel comfortable  
11 with, but on the order of one year or two years if you are not  
12 going to take any credit at all for it, and I think that what  
13 John will get to is explain a bit more about what our basis  
14 for that is.

15 At the other end of the extreme, we, I would point  
16 out again that the letter that the USGS sent to you on the  
17 Hanford site where they alluded to testing that might take as  
18 long as 10 years, we have had contractors look at this question,  
19 and this is a report prepared for us by the Lawrence Burkey  
20 Laboratory where they talk about large-scale thermal tests that  
21 can take that long, but these are tests which are mainly aimed  
22 at understanding precisely what is happening in the near field.

23 If you determine that you don't need that level of  
24 precision because you can take up the load at other parts of  
25 the system, you can perhaps bound that. So, my answer is a

1 couple of years seems reasonable at one end, many, many years  
2 if it is highly critical to your case to know about in your  
3 field.

4 MR. BENETT: That was helpful.

5 MR. MILLER: I think it would be helpful to have  
6 John walk through these. What we are going to walk through,  
7 Bill, I should warn you is going to go to this question here,  
8 but it, also, goes to other questions that you have raised,  
9 and maybe I could read those off.

10 The fifth question was what level of repository  
11 design detail does NRC believe is required prior to the first  
12 SCP, prior to the exploratory shaft sinking, prior to the  
13 submission of the construction authorization application, and  
14 the sixth question you asked was to what level in the  
15 repository system does NRC believe that site specific system  
16 component performance requirements are needed, and when relative  
17 to the site characterization and design process, and I think  
18 these points here are points that are very important to the  
19 bottom line as we discuss any of these questions.

20 MR. GREEVES: Okay, what I would like to do is  
21 quickly go through a series of slides in these handouts and  
22 give you the background on where our comment was coming from  
23 in the mission plan and further explanation on that.

24 Fundamentally this question of what is enough in  
25 site characterization must be approached from a general point

1 of view with at least these two points, that is we have got  
2 to get out and test a volume of rock and groundwater systems  
3 to make representative statements about the performance of  
4 that entire volume. The testing associated with that needs  
5 to be sufficient to get to the point where we can determine  
6 with reasonable assurance that the repository will meet  
7 performance objectives, and what this involves is conducting  
8 the site characterization program and getting out to a point  
9 where marginal additional effort would result in important  
10 information to apply to meeting those performance objectives.

11 Now, these two general points beg a number of  
12 questions.

13 MR. BENETT: Excuse me. This is probably going to  
14 show my ignorance, but I hear the concept of reasonable  
15 assurance said a number of times. What does that mean?

16 MR. GREEVES: Reasonable assurance is embedded  
17 in the regulation and it is the burden that is on the hearing  
18 board to come to the findings that are provided in Part 60,  
19 and Part 60 includes a number of subelements that will require  
20 findings as indicated in Part 31 and add all those up together  
21 and that is the point where one gets to reasonable assurance.  
22 I think that it would be illustrative for me to get to the  
23 next slide.

24 MR. MILLER: Also, Bill, before you get to that,  
25 the \$64 question is always what is reasonable assurance, and

1 the Commission in the way it constructed the rule broke that  
2 down into quite a few specific findings that have to be made.  
3 You don't go into the hearing room and just flat assert there  
4 is reasonable assurance that public health and safety is  
5 protected. You don't make just that statement. You have got  
6 to face off against the EPA standard, against the requirements  
7 of the NRC with respect to components of the system and all  
8 the other siting criteria and design criteria in the rule, and  
9 so it isn't quite an all or nothing binary type of thing as  
10 one might get the impression if you just look at that phrase  
11 by itself.

12 So, reasonable assurance is what the DOE staff  
13 or the DOE will have to prove to the Board and the NRC staff  
14 as well, as we are finding on the same side as the DOE, but  
15 it won't be a simple binary thing. There are lots of elements  
16 that when taken together will have to be considered to make  
17 that kind of finding.

18 One other point here, the second point in that  
19 second bullet, and I am not sure if it is coming out here,  
20 what we are saying is you have got to get during site  
21 characterization to the point where additional investigation  
22 is only going to give you marginal returns in terms of reduction  
23 of uncertainty.

24 MR. FREI: Let me ask one other point to clarify  
25 what you had on that first slide? You say that it must be

1 completed prior to license application. Is that the application  
2 of the license to receive it in place or application for  
3 construction authorization?

4 MR. MILLER: Construction authorization.

5 MR. GREEVES: To further expand on those first two  
6 points and illustrate a concept, what we are trying to show  
7 here is generally the reduction of uncertainties as one  
8 proceeds through the process with time. Fundamentally we are  
9 out here in the beginning during siting studies, and at the  
10 appropriate point in time a site characterization plan, a  
11 series of site characterization plans would be submitted. At  
12 that point we would be going into an exploratory shaft and  
13 in situ testing mode, while we gain information on reducing  
14 these uncertainties during this time frame, and the point is  
15 as Hub mentioned earlier, in situ testing is fundamentally  
16 on critical path, and it is the type of activity that is  
17 required to get us this increasing knowledge and reducing  
18 uncertainties and getting us to the point where any additional  
19 effort would be a marginal increase in that level of knowledge  
20 and reduction in those uncertainties, and it is that point  
21 that the license application would be brought in.

22 MR. MILLER: I think the other points that are  
23 important to bring out on this slide are that this slide  
24 recognizes that even after the construction authorization is  
25 granted or after the license is submitted you are continuing

1 to do things and the words used in our rule would refer to  
2 these activities as performance confirmation, but the point is  
3 that during that period of time you are going to continue to  
4 reduce uncertainties. You are going to continue to learn.  
5 It is just that after the time when you submit an application  
6 it has got to be of the sort where you at least, knowingly  
7 you are not on the steep portion of this curve.

8 MR. GREEVES: Okay, let us move on to the next  
9 slide. Okay, all I want to do --

10 MR. BENETT: Were you going to comment at all on  
11 this map?

12 MR. GREEVES: Yes, the map will be --

13 MR. BENETT: You chose that just as a hypothetical  
14 example?

15 MR. GREEVES: Yes.

16 MR. BENETT: That is not some --

17 MR. GREEVES: No.

18 MR. BENETT: We didn't do it.

19 MR. MILLER: You are jumping ahead, Bill.

20 MR. GREEVES: That particular slide is out of  
21 order. We are going to get to that. Okay, all I really want  
22 to point to on this slide, as we started out, we want to  
23 focus on underground testing and why it is on critical path.  
24 Really in characterization there are two key parts, and that  
25 is understanding what is going on in the far field and then

1 determining what the performance needs in the near field are,  
2 and these first series of bullets here, the other parts of  
3 site characterization, including far field investigations, and  
4 the one we want to be focusing on in this particular discussion  
5 is the underground testing and what the relationship of the  
6 near field performance needs have to how extensive that is.

7 Each of these investigation approaches has innate  
8 capabilities and limitations, but they are all necessary, but  
9 none of them is sufficient by itself.

10 MR. MILLER: Again, if I could make a couple of  
11 comments on this, I think the point of this slide is really  
12 this. How much in situ testing, using rate measures dependent  
13 upon how much other kind of testing we are doing, if you do,  
14 if you characterize the far field rule through the surface  
15 investigations that were going on through the surface bore  
16 hole investigations that are going on, it reduces the amount  
17 of testing that one might require for the in situ underground  
18 testing. It is, also, again dependent, as I mentioned before  
19 upon how critical that host rock is. So, what we are trying  
20 to convey here is that NRC cannot be in a position of telling  
21 DOE, "You know you ought to put it into your mission plan.  
22 It ought to be two years or it ought to be three years or  
23 four years." You have to, knowing the answer to how much  
24 you intend to do in the far field and knowing how much credit  
25 you are going to take for the near field host rock decide and

1 propose and defend the answer to that question.

2 MR. FREI: Hub, when you say, "Repository  
3 performance," you mean the system performance objective that  
4 EPA is setting in terms of releases to the environment?

5 MR. MILLER: We are referring to that and the  
6 other performance objectives that we have to make findings on  
7 the rule making which would include performance of the engineer  
8 barriers.

9 MR. FREI: And the lifetime of the waste package.

10 MR. MILLER: Lifetime of the waste package and  
11 releases from the engineered system.

12 MR. GREEVES: This next slide conveys those  
13 components. There are multiple categories of barriers that you  
14 can rely on in the far field system, and more explicitly there  
15 are a number of them located within the near field, and some  
16 folks don't seem to understand that there are a number of these  
17 individual barriers that can be called upon and the rule is  
18 embedded in the multiple barrier concept. So, I just wanted  
19 to show this slide to identify what some of those components  
20 are.

21 What I would like to do next is quickly just run  
22 through some figures showing the scale, the relationship of  
23 some of the far field and into the near field and what we have  
24 here is just a regional scale layout that you can see right  
25 here in the center a repository of about 3 square miles, and

1 remember that in situ testing is just a dot in the center of  
2 that area of the facility and then the area or the accessible  
3 environment can go out to up to 10 kilometers in velocity up  
4 to 125 square miles of real estate. One would expect to be  
5 putting down investigations in terms of bore holes of inside  
6 and outside of the zone of the accessible environment and  
7 doing geologic mapping around the region to bring that information  
8 to bear on what kind of barriers, what kind of constraints do  
9 we have from the geology and how does that relate to the  
10 in situ testing.

11 MR. MILLER: Before you leave that, I think it is  
12 important to point out that we note here at the bottom this  
13 is for illustrative purposes only. People who are familiar  
14 with the current version of the EPA rule understand that the  
15 accessible environment is defined to encompass that amount of  
16 geology up to 10 kilometers. There is language in there  
17 concerning consideration of aquifers and in some cases on a  
18 site-specific basis it may be appropriate following again the  
19 EPA standard to have accessible environment much closer to the  
20 repository than 10 kilometers. We just threw this on here  
21 just for illustrative purposes. Some might argue that the  
22 Columbia River is something that is an important body of water  
23 and other aquifers and based upon a site-specific determination  
24 DOE might prove that it is 2 kilometers instead of 10, but the  
25 point is that this gives you a sense of the scale, the

1 relationship between the repository and the overall volume  
2 of rock that one has to characterize.

3 MR. GREEVES: Just trying to take a look at this  
4 in a section and just to indicate the relationship of what  
5 is going on in exploratory test program which would be at the  
6 bottom of an exploratory shaft and just the scale of that with  
7 the rest of the accessible environment that is going towards  
8 helping meet those performance objectives. Just taking a  
9 look at the scale of openings that we have down in exploratory  
10 test facility, you can characterize rock very well up to  
11 several diameters of that particular opening. This is where you  
12 can get into very precisely trying to understand what is going  
13 on in the near field, depending on what performance one is  
14 looking for out of the near field rock to meet those performance  
15 objectives.

16 I just wanted to put this up to show how those  
17 investigation techniques can be integrated. Remember in situ  
18 testing is right here at the bottom, an exploratory shaft,  
19 and there are a number of far-field techniques that would be  
20 utilized to define what performance one can expect from the  
21 far field as related to what you can do in the near field.

22 Fundamentally the bottom line really goes to you  
23 question of what is the duration. It is characterized on this  
24 slide. The first two types of observations really are  
25 conventional and don't take that much time. It is the third

1 bullet that has the greatest impact on cost and schedule, and  
2 that is state-of-the-art type testing similar to the types of  
3 things folks have done at the Colorado School of Mines tests,  
4 testing in blocks.

5 This is the area that causes the greatest uncertainty  
6 in terms of how long it is going to take, and this is the  
7 area that is dependent on DOE defining what is needed to, in  
8 terms of taking credit for the near field and, again, the  
9 bottom line is that this has the greatest impact on cost and  
10 schedule and what role do these long-term tests that folks  
11 have identified taking up to 10 years even, what role does  
12 that have to play in the test program?

13 MR. MILLER: Back to numbers again, though, the  
14 number of years, we get a lot of feedback from folks who  
15 either have read our comments or have heard about our comments  
16 that goes along the following lines. NRC is, are you guys  
17 saying that 10 years worth of testing is required? Of course,  
18 that is not what we are saying. Also, when people hear us  
19 press so hard on the need for DOE to evaluate explicitly these  
20 thermal effects and to address how they are going to deal  
21 with that technically and when we press hard on the need for  
22 DOE to establish component performance requirements, at least  
23 on a tentative basis starting at the beginning of this  
24 whole process, I think the impression gets formed that we are  
25 saying that long time and testing is needed.

1           Back to what I said earlier, Bill, the first two  
2 bullets, as John said are what basically I think you had in  
3 mind and was the assumption upon which your estimates of 8 to  
4 27 months were based in your draft mission plan, and those  
5 don't look totally unreasonable to us, but if you get into this  
6 third category of things, large-scale thermal tests you are  
7 talking about perhaps much longer periods of time. So, I  
8 think that hopefully that has answered Question No. 4. It is  
9 a little longwinded, but there are a lot of precise points  
10 that I think are important to understand.

11           MR. GREEVES: The other slides are there in case  
12 we need to get into that particular area.

13           MR. MILLER: Does that help?

14           MR. FREI: Not having read your comments on the  
15 BWIP draft exploratory shaft test plan, would you say that the  
16 scope of the tests that are in that plan currently only cover  
17 the first two bullets on that last slide or do you see some  
18 of the state-of-the-art testing you are referring to?

19           MR. MILLER: Let us go to another vugraph here.  
20 This is a segment from a letter that we sent to DOE, Richland  
21 commenting upon the plan that they had laid out for exploratory  
22 testing at that site, and basically what we commented on was  
23 that we did not see that the plan addressed this question of  
24 how much testing is needed in the way of this third category,  
25 this state-of-the-art type of testing, coupled thermal tests, and

1 we commented that, you know, we have pressed on this for  
2 several years now. We went on to say under what conditions  
3 would we find it acceptable to restrict yourself just to the  
4 first two types of testing, in other words, the conventional  
5 type of tests. The direct answer to your question is we  
6 thought it was treating only the first two types of testing,  
7 conventional type of tests. It was not addressing this  
8 third category one way or the other.

9 We laid this out to say, "All right, we would find  
10 that acceptable, provided you do the kinds of things that are  
11 talked about here, that you are not taking any credit for that  
12 near field in terms of performance, that you have characterized  
13 well the portions of the natural system that you are going  
14 to take credit for," and it appears that it is important to  
15 digress here for a moment. Frequently when I say or we say,  
16 "Don't take credit for the near-field host rock," people think  
17 we are saying, "Put the burden on engineer barriers," and of  
18 course, you get into the trap of making it sound like you  
19 are going to engineer around deficiencies in a site, and that  
20 is you are going to get into the thing that people have been  
21 suspicious about in the siting guidelines, that is that DOE  
22 would put all the burden on engineered barriers instead of the  
23 natural system, and that is not what we are saying at all.  
24 We are saying that you still have to characterize the far field  
25 of the rest of the natural system beyond that near-field

1 component, and then you have to worry about engineered system  
2 performance. Your question a moment ago, Mark, was are we  
3 concerned only about the overall system performance objectives,  
4 and you worry about that, but you, also, have to make a  
5 finding on releases from the engineered system and performance  
6 of the cannister, and you have got to be able to demonstrate  
7 that the tests of your cannister materials, of the waste  
8 package are conservative with respect to the kinds of  
9 hydrothermal conditions that you can expect with the emplaced  
10 wastes.

11 In other words, you are not going to be able to  
12 ignore the thermal effects question entirely. You still have  
13 to deal with it, but you have to -- again, is that helpful?

14 MR. BENETT: Yes, very helpful, to me.

15 MR. MILLER: Maybe we can go to the fifth question  
16 which is what level of repository design detail does NRC  
17 believe is required prior to the first SCP, prior to exploratory  
18 shaft sinking and prior to the submission of the construction  
19 authorization application?

20 Again, I will beg your indulgence for using a  
21 slide, but I think it is helpful to have the words on the  
22 screen. There is a longwinded answer, and there is a short  
23 answer. The short answer is shown on the slide, and I know  
24 it might be frustrating to some to get the short answer, but  
25 I think that is where we have got to start. We need enough

1 detail on the SCP in order to be able to determine whether  
2 the plan that you are laying out for site characterization is  
3 sufficient. You cannot identify how many tests and what  
4 sort of tests you need unless you know what you are trying to  
5 prove with respect to the design, and a second element of  
6 concern here is we need to have enough detail on your design  
7 and particularly those that are associated with your exploratory  
8 shafts to determine that the things that you are going to do  
9 are not going to compromise the site. A question of how you  
10 construct the shaft, the mode of shaft construction, whether  
11 you blind bore a shaft or construct it with a drill and blast  
12 technique can have a significant impact on the ability to  
13 seal that shaft when you are done.

14 With respect to the construction authorization  
15 stage the short answer is we need enough detail to be able  
16 to make the kinds of findings that are required by our rule  
17 and to go through the adjudicatory, the rigors of the  
18 adjudicatory process.

19 Now, again, people don't tend to find those  
20 definitions very satisfactory, but they are the ones that you  
21 have to return to. We have no fixed notion that it is Title 1  
22 or Title 2 or any other type of definition that I think may  
23 have some currency within the DOE program. It may or may not  
24 be that some of those kinds of concepts can align themselves  
25 very neatly with these two general definitions, but what we

1 have found over the past several years is we have had to  
2 answer this question in our interactions with the various  
3 sites and that you have got to get down to specifics. With  
4 these two points in mind in order to answer the question, we  
5 have got some examples of the kinds of information that we  
6 could see falling under these, and if you would like we could  
7 walk through those.

8 MR. FREI: Yes, please, that would be helpful.

9 MR. MILLER: Just illustrative, and again, this is  
10 not all encompassing, but obviously enough detail to know how  
11 many shafts you are talking about and what are the sizes of  
12 those shafts? What is the mode of shaft construction, the  
13 planned sealing materials. I should point out here that over  
14 the past year we have sent letters to each of the projects  
15 identifying a list of specific questions which we feel need  
16 to be addressed, if I could just expand on that first bullet  
17 where we have identified specific things that we think need  
18 to be addressed by DOE in their site characterization plans  
19 or in fact, beforehand, if you find yourself in a situation  
20 where the long lead times for planning of exploratory shafts  
21 has you making decisions well before well before the SCP's  
22 are submitted. We want to take up with you what are your --

23 MR. BENETT: Excuse me, I looked away for a  
24 second, and that list of examples went away. Can you put that  
25 back up?

1 MR. MILLER: Yes, I am taking this first item here,  
2 Bill.

3 MR. BENETT: Oh, you are going to come back to it?

4 MR. MILLER: I am going to come back to it.

5 MR. BENETT: Okay, good.

6 MR. MILLER: I think this is one that is very  
7 timely now, particularly going to your first three questions  
8 which gets into several shafts for site characterization and  
9 so on. Regardless of how many shafts you have, this list  
10 conveys the technical questions that we think must be addressed,  
11 and I won't go through all of these, but what we are concerned  
12 about is that many times the argument is made that the  
13 exploratory shaft may not be a part of the repository, and  
14 that is true, but it is probably more likely that it will be  
15 a part of the repository than not, and so what one has to  
16 deal with is assuming that the exploratory shaft would be a  
17 part of the repository, one has to worry about the ability to  
18 seal it and so it gets us into addressing these questions  
19 right from the very beginning.

20 We, also, in addition to the question of sealing  
21 and compromising the site, we are, also, concerned about  
22 weighing the alternatives as they may impact your ability to  
23 characterize the site. If you go one mode of shaft construction  
24 you may limit your ability to gather information about the  
25 rock layers that overlie the host rock, and you just have to

1 consider and weigh and balance and make trade-offs, of course  
2 in deciding on a shaft construction mode. These are the  
3 concerns that we are raising, the kind of details that we are  
4 looking for.

5 Back to this one, we need to have a sense of the  
6 general layout. What do these rooms look like that you are  
7 proposing for emplacement of waste, and if you are talking  
8 about, for example, placing waste in horizontal bore holes  
9 drilled between drifts that are hundreds of feet apart you  
10 have got a different kind of test program than you might have  
11 if you were talking about bore holes for waste emplacement  
12 that are drilled into the floor. The second and third bullets  
13 are kind of related.

14 The fourth point really is the point that we made,  
15 that we felt important enough to make as a separate point in  
16 our letter to you on the Mission Plan, and it is the thing  
17 we keep talking about, and it is that we are looking for you  
18 at this stage to identify how are you breaking the system down  
19 in terms of components both with respect to the natural system  
20 and engineered barriers and for each of those components what  
21 credit are you planning to take.

22 The geochemists and the hydrologists are always  
23 stumped when you ask them what kinds of these are enough. They  
24 always throw back at you, how important is this to overall  
25 performance, and you simply have to define that. Waste package

1 you have got to come forward with some knowledge of what the  
2 materials are. Obviously you don't know what kind of tests,  
3 what failure mechanisms to worry about in identifying information  
4 needs if you don't have some concept of that.

5 Construction authorization and here we just -- I am  
6 not sure how much help this slide is going to really be. WE  
7 have the word "detail" there and of course, the question is  
8 how much detail is enough, and here I think you just have to  
9 go back to consideration of that general point which is the  
10 bottom line here.

11 I have found, Bill, that when the project people  
12 are meeting with the technical staff it is fairly easy once  
13 the staffs get together and sit down and look at specifics,  
14 applying those general rules to come up with some pretty good  
15 agreement on it. That is way too much detail. That is a net  
16 compared to the kind of site suitability and findings that  
17 you have got to make at the time of construction authorization.  
18 That can be put off.

19 So, I think while I am not giving you an answer  
20 here in terms of specifics, the ability to do that with those  
21 general ground rules I think is there. So, that goes to  
22 Question No. 5, and here I just ask you, has that been helpful?

23 MR. BENETT: Not as helpful as the first, the  
24 answer to the first question.

25 MR. FREI: It appears that in terms of alignment

1 of our design phase buzz words to what we saw in your vugraphs  
2 the conceptual design we plan to do pretty well meshes with  
3 what you are looking for at the SCP stage. I guess it is  
4 rather fuzzy what detailed means. We envision doing a Title 1,  
5 followed by a Title 2 design, and the Title 2 design comes  
6 up with your construction drawings and specs that you can give  
7 to the construction manager and he goes and builds your  
8 facility. Is that what you mean by detailed? Can you give us  
9 a feel? Is it a construction level detail or not quite that?

10 MR. GREEVES: The level of detail, and we don't  
11 want to get trapped into using the terminology that you use  
12 for budget constraints and all these ad nauseum graphs and  
13 charts that you can put together in a five-volume Title 1,  
14 Title 2 design. The level of detail that we are looking for  
15 would be within Title 1, Title 2, but not necessarily all of  
16 it. I would, also, point you to, Mark --

17 MR. BENETT: Somewhere between the two, is that  
18 what you just said?

19 MR. GREEVES: You have got Title 1, Title 2 design  
20 document for lots of other reasons, isn't that correct?

21 MR. BENETT: Not at the same time.

22 MR. GREEVES: No, consecutively. There is a little  
23 bit of overlap towards the end of Title 1 and Title 2, and the  
24 charts that I have seen show you having a Title 1 type of  
25 series of documents available prior to construction authorization

1 application. The types of details that were met in that drawing  
2 are buried in that document.

3 MR. MILLER: I think the reason why we are  
4 reluctant to give you a quick answer, yes, Title 1 is it is  
5 because there are a lot of things that are in Title 1, but  
6 for your other purposes you have in there that we may not  
7 require it. As well, there may be some things in Title 1 by  
8 the definitions that you have come up with after many, many  
9 years of building facilities and for other purposes, and they  
10 may not contain all of the things we are looking for. I would  
11 point you to the portion of the rule which goes into some  
12 detail on this question of design information needs, and I  
13 wouldn't propose here to read sections, but it is the section  
14 that talks about safety analysis report. It is 60.21c, and in  
15 that section there is a fairly extensive discussion of  
16 functionally what we are looking for and what we think is  
17 needed to make those findings.

18 MR. GREEVES: It includes the relationship to the  
19 performance objectives of that design.

20 MR. MILLER: For example, let me just read a few  
21 excerpts from it. It talks about the need for the principal  
22 design criteria and the relationship to the performance  
23 objectives, the design basis and the relationship of the  
24 design basis for the principal design criteria and on and on.  
25 It has got some things which I think you should be considering

1 carefully.

2 MR. BENETT: Clearly you are not making a final  
3 decision, but what I am hearing you say is at the construction  
4 authorization time it is more or less Title 1. There might be  
5 some items that are required to meet the 10 CFR 60 findings  
6 that would not be in our typical Title 1, but it is more or  
7 less Title 1.

8 MR. BROWNING: Where in the process do you envision  
9 we can be more specific on that?

10 MR. MILLER: As I said, I think, in the way it has  
11 worked the past several years is that in the consultations  
12 that we have been having with the projects on site-specific  
13 issues this question comes up. There is probably not a workshop  
14 that it doesn't come up, and I think that where in the process  
15 this gets ironed out is through these sessions. To get more  
16 specific you have to get down in terms of looking at specific  
17 types of design detail, take a look at a design package or a  
18 waste package design for example or a description of room  
19 configuration and the technical people who are going to be  
20 reviewing the application have to, I think convey those kinds  
21 of specifics. We have tried several times, for example, in  
22 the standard format content guide for site characterization  
23 plans. There have been a number of meetings over the past  
24 several years, and they always get hung up on this point, and  
25 each time we go through those meetings we come out and both

1 sides conclude that you have got to get down to exchanging  
2 examples, and we have always taken the position of availing  
3 ourselves to the DOE to, in fact, consider examples and to  
4 where they have got question, rapid turnaround give you specific  
5 responses.

6 MR. BROWNING: Let me just say something and see if  
7 it fits the concept. Somewhere between the time of the site  
8 characterization plan that you submit with the conceptual  
9 design and the time you come in for a license application  
10 somewhere in between that time we ought to mutually be able  
11 to identify what aspects of the design we need more detail  
12 than Title 1. The question is where in that time frame does  
13 that get pinned down so that it won't be a situation where  
14 you come in with the license application, and we say, "Now,  
15 we want to see all these additional items"? We want to try  
16 to avoid getting into the get me another rock syndrome here.

17 MR. MILLER: Here is where we are counting on DOE  
18 to tell us when it becomes critical path for them. DOE knows  
19 better when these decisions have to be made one way or the  
20 other, and the only position I think we can take, Bill, and  
21 let me have you react to this, is that as you are going about  
22 your business of preparing the designs, as you see that you  
23 start to cross a bridge you bring it to us, and we, I don't  
24 think there is a case where if there has been a question that  
25 we have not been able to quickly -- now, I think what Bob, also,

1 is asking is how can we generalize on some of this, and I  
2 think we ought to be alert to perhaps through technical position,  
3 perhaps even through rule making, if that is appropriate,  
4 to establish this more specifically, and we are, also, willing  
5 to do that, so, we are not ad hocing the thing so much that  
6 you don't get the benefit of what is happening at one site  
7 at the other sites.

8 MR. FREI: Let me raise one additional point on  
9 your comments and your detailed comments. You indicated that  
10 we should acknowledge that a conceptual design is necessary  
11 at the time of the SCP and that is required by the Nuclear  
12 Waste Policy Act. Our reading of the Act is that a completed  
13 conceptual design for a given candidate site is required prior  
14 to shaft sinking, exploratory shaft sinking and that necessarily  
15 does not have to coincide with a first site characterization  
16 plan. Is your reading different?

17 MR. MILLER: Yes, I have to defer to the lawyers  
18 here, I guess for a precise answer to that question. But our  
19 rule in the contents of the SCR or the SCP we took the  
20 position that we needed a conceptual design. Again, here I  
21 have experienced a lot of confusion over what does conceptual  
22 design mean in the sense that we had it in our regulation  
23 and this very fixed term that you folks in DOE, in the whole  
24 DOE program have of what a conceptual design is; it is very  
25 possible that the conceptual design as you have defined it

1 goes beyond what is required in order to address the basic  
2 question. These are the criteria we will always come back to.

3 In face, I think the experience has been, hasn't  
4 it, John, that what you folks have in the way of conceptual  
5 design does contain perhaps more information.

6 MR. GREEVES: It goes beyond what is needed to make  
7 assessments of what tests are needed to bring to bear on the  
8 performance objectives. It goes into things like facilities  
9 for the handicapped, budgets, things like that that aren't  
10 required to help us understand what kind of tests are needed,  
11 what parameters need to be measured. So, it does go beyond  
12 our needs in terms of your standard canned definition of what  
13 a conceptual design is.

14 MR. BENETT: So, what I am hearing is what we call  
15 a conceptual design may be more than what you need at the SCP,  
16 initial SCP state. What we call a Title 1 may not be enough  
17 at the construction authorization stage.

18 MR. GREEVES: To the extent that it doesn't go  
19 after these main points here, yes. We have gone into a draft  
20 of the conceptual design information needs. As Hub said, this  
21 has been a confusion factor in the past, and have put out  
22 copies of that for comment, and we are revising that. It should  
23 be out shortly.

24 MR. MILLER: As I said, most of the confusion  
25 arises from the fact that DOE has these very well-defined

1 concepts of conceptual design, Title 1, Title 2 and so on,  
2 has built drawings and when people start trying to match those  
3 up literally with our requirements, it causes a lot of  
4 confusion. We always return to these two points.

5 MR. FREI: Could we get a copy of these slides?

6 MR. MILLER: Sure. One other point we need to  
7 make about our comment on your Mission Plan. We did not say  
8 that we thought what was in the mission plan was wrong. There  
9 were several places where it was not possible to -- it wasn't  
10 real clear what you were intending, particularly at the later  
11 stage. So, don't get us wrong. We did not say, and we tried  
12 to make this clear in the letter that what you have got is all  
13 wrong. It is just the point that we think we have had  
14 experience, for example, in our workshops of situations where  
15 program people have thought that information on the waste  
16 package, for example, was not needed at the SCP stage or in  
17 fact, even in cases where individuals have thought that the  
18 determinations of performance of the waste package was not a  
19 finding that you have made a construction authorization, and  
20 it was kind of with that background we felt it important  
21 enough to make that kind of comment, just to make sure there  
22 weren't wrong assumptions on those points.

23 MR. FREI: All right.

24 MR. MILLER: We can go on to the next point. To  
25 what level in your repository system does NRC believe that

1 site-specific component performance requirements are needed  
2 and when relative to site characterization and design process,  
3 and just as a talking point, again, I will go back to the  
4 one slide where we broke this think down into components.

5 The short answer is that you folks determine how  
6 you are going to design the repository, and you folks determined  
7 how you break everything down in terms of components. Obviously  
8 you have to at least deal with the natural system at the level  
9 of near field and far field because that is going to be the  
10 key to answering your Question No. 4 on what is needed for  
11 in situ testing.

12 Beyond that in direct answer to your question, what  
13 level do you break it down, that is up to you. Now, I think it  
14 is safe to say that consistent with where the Commission is  
15 coming out, and where I believe DOE is coming out on the  
16 siting guidelines, at least initially at this early stage you  
17 have got to plan on redundancy between natural system and  
18 engineer barriers. In other words, it would be inappropriate  
19 to plan on 50 percent of the load being put on natural barriers  
20 and 50 percent on waste package at this time, and we have  
21 tried to emphasize the word "tentative" when we talk about  
22 the need to prescribe performance requirements because obviously  
23 as you go along you may be able to sharpen your pencil. As  
24 you get more confidence in the site you may be able to cut  
25 back on the degree to which you are providing engineered

1 barriers, but the answer to the second part of your question,  
2 when do you have to do this, we say as early as possible.  
3 We think it is needed for us to be in a position to give you  
4 guidance at this SCP stage, emphasizing the word "tentative."

5 MR. BENETT: I think you are saying more than that  
6 though. You are saying that you think that is something that  
7 is crucial for us to determine early to get on with the program  
8 and make decisions in the direction we are going to go, and  
9 the whole program is siting investigations, the approach to  
10 waste package development and testing, besides what you require  
11 to be able to react back.

12 Finally, I am starting to understand the message  
13 you have been saying at different times and to appreciate it  
14 more.

15 MR. MILLER: Your fate is in your own hands on  
16 Question 4, and I think it is dependent upon your answering  
17 Question 6, which is really the bottom line.

18 MR. BENETT: Yes, okay, I won't summarize, but it  
19 sounds like what you said is if we want to take any significant  
20 credit for the near field, then we are going to have to do a  
21 long program, testing program at depth to prove that we can  
22 take that credit, and that length of time isn't consistent  
23 with the length of times we put in that mission plan.

24 Therefore, if we want to have any way of making  
25 that schedule in the Mission Plan, we cannot take credit for

1 the near field.

2 MR. MILLER: I think that is about right. If you  
3 want we can move on to 7 and 8 which are pretty narrow legal  
4 questions which --

5 MR. BENETT: Can we pursue that, so we can walk  
6 out of here and write a letter out to our projects and say  
7 that you cannot take credit for the near field? What happens  
8 for concerns about the waste package where we have to consider  
9 the interaction between the waste package and the near field?  
10 I can kind of conceptualize saying that as far as eventual  
11 release to the accessible environment we will take a position  
12 that says that we won't take any credit, and it goes instan-  
13 taneously to the far field and we start from there. How do we  
14 deal with the waste package to show the release rate and the  
15 lifetime criteria are met? We cannot ignore the near field.

16 MR. MILLER: I did not want to muddy your waters  
17 a whole lot by putting a lot of caveats on my response to  
18 your restatement of our point. Obviously what we said earlier  
19 is true. What you are saying is it is a little bit of an  
20 oversimplification to say that you just don't take credit for  
21 the near field, and you cannot make the next statement that  
22 you can ignore the external effects. You somehow have to  
23 still deal with them, and you have to do some testing and  
24 pull together a technical story that will support a case that  
25 you have adequately bounded those effects on the waste package,

1 even if you don't take credit for the near field, because you  
2 are right, the heat and the reactions between the rock and the  
3 water and the waste package are going to be important when  
4 you are trying to make your case on the lifetime of the  
5 cannister and releases from the system.

6 MR. GREEVES: The question comes down to the  
7 precision with which you need to know what is going on in the  
8 near field, how precisely you need to know it. If you need to  
9 know it extremely precisely, you are looking at these long-term  
10 types of testing, and it is --

11 MR. MILLER: I think the point we are trying to  
12 get at here is that do you or don't you do this large-scale  
13 long-term type of test. That is the real question we are  
14 focusing on here because that is the thing that determines how  
15 long in situ testing lasts, and you have got a binary type  
16 of decision there. Do you do them or don't you do them. It  
17 is not yes or no, do you look at the thermal effects in a waste  
18 package. I think that the elaboration of what we are saying  
19 here is in the minutes of the meetings that we have had over  
20 the past year or so. I think the things we are talking  
21 through here are not new points. They are the points that  
22 show up in the record of the past year. So, I would refer you  
23 to those. We can give you a bibliography, and we have pulled  
24 the other bibliography.

25 In fact, I understand that you did not get a copy

1 of the letter that we sent about one week ago. We tried  
2 several times to send it over by telecopy and so on. The  
3 letter was sent to the Richland folks, and in that letter  
4 which I forwarded.--

5 MR. FREI: We do have it, by the way.

6 MR. MILLER: Okay, you will see a list of documents  
7 that convey in more detail what we are saying here, and you  
8 will see in there the list referencing the meetings that we  
9 have had going through these points, and so that should be  
10 helpful to you if you have got more questions on it.

11 MR. BENETT: We have the facts. So, does the letter,  
12 but the attachment, of course, has more facts.

13 MR. MILLER: Okay, but I would just point you to  
14 that. Your Question No. 7, let me read it. Does NRC believe  
15 the Act and specifically Section 114A1D requires them to  
16 comment on DOE's final EIS or the draft EIS as a part of the  
17 Secretary's recommendation to the President? Does the Act  
18 require us to comment on the draft EIS and --

19 MR. FREI: The real question was your comments  
20 seemed to be implying that you felt the Act required you to  
21 comment on the final EIS. We, of course, plan on you commenting  
22 on the draft. The question was were you commenting on the  
23 final as part of our scretarial package to the President.

24 MR. WOLF: Your interpretation or what you propose  
25 to include in the plan would be a procedure in which NRC had

1 an opportunity to comment on the draft and DOE would be  
2 responsive to whatever our comments were and would include  
3 our comments and the response of DOE in the document that  
4 went forward.

5 MR. FREI: Yes, that is correct.

6 MR. WOLF: In the absence of any tremendous  
7 mismatch between, in our judgment between what was finally  
8 said and the final, and our comments, it seems that would be  
9 a reasonable way to read it although I would not want to say  
10 that if the Commission were very unhappy with the contents of  
11 the final EIS that it wouldn't wish to make some additional  
12 comments which we would anticipate would be included.

13 MR. BENETT: Couldn't that be covered under,  
14 I cannot find it quickly in here, but the other requirement  
15 accompanying the Secretary's recommendations and evaluation  
16 by the Commission of the ability to --

17 MR. WOLF: No, because there are other aspects of  
18 the EIS that would only appear in the EIS. It would not relate  
19 to the extent to which that site characterization analysis  
20 and the waste form proposal were appropriate for inclusion.

21 MR. BENETT: That wasn't what I was referring to.  
22 Isn't there something in here that says that --

23 MR. WOLF: One of the many things, the suitability  
24 for license applications.

25 MR. BENETT: Yes.

1 MR. WOLF: Even so, I don't think necessarily  
2 that is of as broad a scope as what our comments might be  
3 conceptually with respect to the environmental impact statement.

4 MR. BENETT: I just assumed you could use the  
5 same extension there that you used in the guidelines for the  
6 argument.

7 MR. WOLF: That would even be an easier extension  
8 to make. I am not sure that I accept the premise of your  
9 argument, but nevertheless. No, I think the way you expected  
10 it to operate is you would give us a chance to comment on the  
11 draft, and you would incorporate our comments. That seems like  
12 the simple way to read this. All I am saying is if we were  
13 really unhappy, I am sure the Commission would find some way  
14 to make its concerns noted.

15 MR. MILLER: I think the thing that may be made as  
16 a background statement here is that the Act while it does  
17 provide for the NRC to adopt the DOE EIS to the extent  
18 practicable, it does not remove from NRC an independent NEPA  
19 responsibility. Isn't that part of what is behind having to  
20 hedge a bit and saying we would never comment on the final.  
21 I think that is --

22 MR. WOLF: I think that is a fair statement.

23 MR. MILLER: The next question was should the  
24 construction authorization application, let me see if W have  
25 got this right here, be called the license application.

1 MR. FREI: What we are trying to do is make sure  
2 that we understand the terminology. We are not using incorrect  
3 terminology.

4 We refer to the, once we have completed site  
5 characterization and site designation as effective, submitting  
6 an application to you which will result in construction  
7 authorization, and we in the mission plan refer to that as  
8 the application for construction authorization. Your comments  
9 seem to be saying that we should be calling that the license  
10 application. Is that correct?

11 MR. WOLF: Yes.

12 MR. FREI: In effect so what do we call the thing  
13 we submit later to get the license to receive it in place?

14 MR. WOLF: The scheme provided for by Part 60  
15 before the Waste Policy Act was enacted called for our DOE  
16 to submit the license application before commencing construction,  
17 and it was the license application that was to be as complete  
18 as possible at the time with some caveats. So, it was a license  
19 application, and that is the point technically we are making.

20 Now, we recognize that for ease of discussion and  
21 presentation in the plan, there may be some merit in having  
22 a term such as construction authorization application,  
23 particularly since that does appear in parts of the Waste  
24 Policy Act, provided that the relationship or whatever terminology  
25 you use to the Part 60 terminology is made clear somehow.

1 It can be in footnotes and so forth. You may choose to say  
2 you are talking about a construction authorization application.  
3 What is intended here is the document referred to in Part 60  
4 as a license application. So, we encourage you to be clear  
5 in making your document a readable and understandable thing  
6 but nevertheless I think it is important that it be precisely  
7 tied in in some manner with the regulatory requirements to make  
8 sure that the two fit.

9 MR. BENETT: Could we call it something else in  
10 the Mission Plan to make it clear and understandable? We  
11 ought to have a footnote or some kind of asterisk that explains  
12 when we say this, we mean that thing in 10 CFR 60.

13 MR. WOLF: Right, okay, just a bit of housekeeping  
14 detail.

15 MR. FREI: Let me ask a related question on the  
16 license application or as we call it the construction  
17 authorization application? Does NRC intend to put out a  
18 standard format and content guide on that in the near future  
19 or is that something that is way downstream?

20 MR. MILLER: The answer is it is downstream a bit,  
21 but the real format and content guide, the content guide for  
22 the license application is the SCP SCA process. If you look  
23 at what is the SCP, it is, in fact, a scoping document for  
24 what ought to go in the license application. Now, this is  
25 being a first of a kind type of thing and having not licensed

1 a bunch of repositories already, we are just not in a position  
2 like, I guess, the reactor people are after licensing 60 or  
3 so plants to know exactly what to put into them and to tell  
4 the next guy coming down the line. This free licensing  
5 consultation process which features this SCP as the key  
6 document is, in fact, the scoping of the license application.

7 Now, what we would expect is if not planning on  
8 a permit and content guide early on, it is because we think  
9 that after -- we don't want to write that until after we have  
10 gone through a few of these and then perhaps after walking  
11 through some site-specific cases we can generalize on some  
12 of these points. I think you understand what I am saying.

13 MR. WOLF: There is another point, also, and that  
14 is that the rule we have in place in Part 60 insofar as it is  
15 relevant at this point was done in two parts. It was done  
16 in the procedural rule and then a technical rule. As a result  
17 the procedures, the content of application part of the  
18 procedures and the requirements, the technical criteria in the  
19 back half of the rule may not fit as precisely and neatly  
20 as is desirable, and there has been some thought given to  
21 perhaps reviewing the content of application section to see  
22 whether or not the final technical criteria suggests any  
23 change in the content, and so if something is seen to be  
24 desirable in that area it, in turn would provide a means for  
25 communicating more clearly just what needs to be in the

1 application.

2 MR. MILLER: I think at this point we begin to get  
3 into questions which perhaps you ought to be restating because  
4 they get into the things that you --

5 MR. BROWNING: Maybe before we get into that, there  
6 was a lot of attention placed on our comment in the mission  
7 plan regarding the limited work authorization, and one of the  
8 things that got generated within the staff as a result of that  
9 was a paper prepared by the ELD people laying out what the  
10 rationale constraints are with regard to limit of work  
11 authorization. We are going to provide you copies of that  
12 so that you can understand if, in fact, that concept is  
13 continued to be pursued in some vein, you can understand better  
14 what the NRC thoughts were with regard to that concept.

15 MR. FREI: Good, that will be helpful.

16 MR. BENETT: Can I suggest we take a five-minute  
17 break?

18 MR. MILLER: Sure.

19 MR. BENETT: We will reconvene in about five minutes  
20 and then we will get into the fun stuff.

21 (Brief recess.)

22 MR. BENETT: We are ready.

23 MR. BROWNING: The first three questions that  
24 were included on your list of nine questions appear to relate  
25 to what we are thinking about in your revision to the

1 Mission Plan. So, I guess the first thing that would be  
2 helpful to us if you could sort of describe what it is.  
3 I gather since there weren't any questions on the limited  
4 work authorization, is that concept being pursued or --

5 MR. BENETT: Let me say a few things first. The  
6 approach we took in the preliminary draft was to lay out a  
7 scenario that would get us to an operational repository in  
8 1998. We have gotten a number of comments on that approach  
9 and have raised concerns to us and not least of those comments  
10 was yours, saying that if you are going to count on an LWA  
11 like you are talking about, we have concerns. In retrospect  
12 we are not surprised that that was the case. Since then we  
13 have been actively exploring other ways, options for having  
14 an operational repository in 1998, and we are now incorporating  
15 these other ways as options into the Mission Plan that we are  
16 preparing now. So, it is not cast in concrete yet. It is  
17 getting cast that way as far as the draft that will come out  
18 in a few weeks is concerned, and what we would like to do is  
19 run through for you the approaches that we are considering  
20 for the mission plan that would get us to a 1998 repository  
21 and get your reaction to them, to the extent you can do it  
22 now, because if we are really off base on one of these  
23 approaches, we would like to know it now and consider that  
24 before we put another draft out.

Bowers Reporting Company

25 So, Mark Frei will walk through the concepts we

1 have in mind.

2 MR. FREI: What I will say encompasses the three  
3 questions that we have on this. One of the approaches we are  
4 looking at in order to look at meeting 1998 is to shorten the  
5 construction time of the repository facility or to accelerate  
6 certain portions of it so, in fact, we can have a complete  
7 facility by 1998, so we can begin to receive and accept wastes,  
8 and when we analyze the construction schedule there are two  
9 key items on that schedule. One is the surface facilities  
10 and in particular the waste handling building where we will  
11 receive, inspect, cannister the waste and get it ready to send  
12 down the waste handling shaft, and the other item is the  
13 shaft's construction and the subsurface development of the  
14 underground.

15 The two approaches we are considering, one is the  
16 two-step licensing approach, and the second is a staged  
17 repository construction, two stages. Both are ways to take  
18 one or both of these items on critical path. Both approaches,  
19 the two-step and the two-stage construction approach use or  
20 include development or construction of a second exploratory  
21 shaft at our candidate sites and the shafts would be needed  
22 not only to maintain a prudent level of safety with the mining  
23 regulations and so forth, but we would size the shafts so that  
24 we can get some benefits so that those shafts can be used  
25 during repository construction. So, that is a key element of

1 both of these approaches, both the two-step licensing approach  
2 and the two-stage repository construction approach.

3 On the two-step licensing approach, what our game  
4 plan, if you will, for that is is as follows: Prior to the  
5 repository site designation becoming effective, according to  
6 the Act, we would apply to NRC for construction authorization  
7 for the waste handling building and any associated surface  
8 facilities we need to construct that building, and because  
9 we have not yet received designation of the selected site,  
10 we would be in essence applying an application that would  
11 encompass the three sites that are still in the running.

12 Now, this application would come in after the  
13 draft environmental impact statement for site selection, and  
14 we would have already completed the Title 1 design for that  
15 portion of the repository, the surface facilities. Once the  
16 site designation is effective, the application would be  
17 winnowed down to just the one site that has been selected  
18 so that the NRC review could focus on that one, rather than  
19 trying to review three different sites.

20 Then the balance of the construction authorization  
21 application would come in after site designation immediately  
22 afterwards, and that would cover the balance of the surface  
23 facilities, the shafts, including the exploratory shafts we  
24 have already sunk if they are to be used in construction and  
25 the underground facility and again that would be based on a

1 completed Title 1 design, and so following that sequence, we  
2 would expect basically two construction authorizations from  
3 NRC, one covering the first application of the waste handling  
4 building and then the second authorization covering the  
5 balance of the repository, and in that way we can finish the  
6 surface facilities by 1998, as well as the underground area.

7 Now, let me cover the second approach that --

8 MR. BENETT: Wait a minute. You have covered an  
9 awful lot so far.

10 MR. MILLER: I have a question about the time  
11 of those two submittals.

12 MR. FREI: Okay, the first submittal would come in  
13 after the draft EIS would be issues for public comment, agency  
14 comment. I believe the date is sometime in 1989, like  
15 September 1989. And then about one year later we would be in  
16 a position where it had gone through review of the draft EIS.  
17 We would issue the final EIS. We would make the recommendation  
18 package to the President, and the President would recommend  
19 to Congress, and then we would have site designation becoming  
20 effective. That period is about one year after that first  
21 application comes in.

22 MR. BENETT: Sometime early in 1991?

23 MR. FREI: It is late 1990, like August.

24 MR. MILLER: There is about a one year's difference  
25 between the first submittal and the second.

1 MR. FREI: That is right.

2 MR. MILLER: You would still be assuming three  
3 years for our action.

4 MR. FREI: That is correct.

5 MR. BROWNING: So, the idea is to get us something  
6 early in the process. We would be reviewed in parallel with  
7 other things that are going on rather than in series, is that?

8 MR. BENETT: Right. It would allow us three years  
9 after the submission of the first license application if  
10 construction authorization is granted then to be able to  
11 begin constructing the surface facilities and then three years  
12 after the submission of the second license application to be  
13 able to begin the shafts and the --

14 MR. BROWNING: We would look at three in parallel  
15 and then eventually would narrow it down to one.

16 MR. FREI: Approximately one year into the review  
17 it would be down to one.

18 MR. MILLER: I think the next question is what are  
19 you assuming in terms of our action on that first request,  
20 in other words you submit the full license application to us  
21 in let us say, 1990, and you have three years for us to act  
22 on that and get construction authorization. I presume that  
23 you are submitting the other one earlier in hopes that we would  
24 give you a partial instruction authorization before the full  
25 one or am I wrong on that?

1 MR. FREI: No, that is correct. We would like  
2 to get a construction authorization back on the first piece  
3 we submitted to you early.

4 MR. MILLER: This is important. How long are you  
5 assuming for that kind of review to be complete?

6 MR. FREI: Three years.

7 MR. BENETT: Basically getting about one year,  
8 if you back off from 1998, when do you have to start constructing  
9 the surface facilities?

10 MR. MILLER: Can we make some observations on  
11 this?

12 MR. BENETT: Please?

13 MR. BROWNING: Let me ask a question first. Is  
14 it your concept that the surface facilities would be fairly  
15 generic for each of the sites or would it be radically --

16 MR. BENETT: Fairly generic, that is correct.

17 MR. MILLER: The findings that the Commission  
18 has to make before giving any construction authorization are  
19 the findings that are described in detail in the rule, and  
20 you have got a system that is coupled, engineered and natural  
21 system type of -- it is a coupling of natural systems and  
22 engineered systems, and the basic kind of determination that  
23 has to be made is in site suitability, and the concern that  
24 you have to have as you pursue this option is can you decouple  
25 the issues? I think even in the first case to give authoriza-

1 tion to construct even the surface facilities we are still  
2 squaring off against the same kinds of -- we are squaring  
3 off against the performance objectives that go to the releases  
4 to the accessible environment performance of the system and  
5 so you have to ask yourself, and we would have to ask ourselves  
6 could we, either on technical grounds or as now written in  
7 our regulations parse the licensing in the manner that you  
8 would have to do in order to do what you would be wanting  
9 through this option, you know that the rule does provide for  
10 flexibility for trade-off insurance systems against natural  
11 systems and so in order to make that site suitability finding  
12 that has to be essentially made before a commitment to  
13 construction is made, you pretty much have to go through and  
14 square off against all of these criteria, and it is not clear  
15 that when you submitted an application in 1989, that you would  
16 have all the kinds of information that would be required of the  
17 sort that John kind of walked through this morning, and you  
18 see what we are saying. It is not clear that there is any  
19 advantage in terms of how long it will take us to complete our  
20 licensing review by submitting the surface facility part to  
21 us early.

22 MR. BENETT: What you are saying is if we have to  
23 have all the answers in to make the final kind of determination  
24 that you envisioned and you reflected 10 CFR 60, if that is  
25 the case, then we are not buying anything. I think what we

1 are getting at is we would want if this approach were  
2 adopted, we think that there would need to be a change in  
3 10 CFR 60 and some lesser finding of determination would have  
4 to be made as a basis to start the construction of the surface  
5 facilities.

6 MR. MILLER: I think the easy thing to say here  
7 is that would require a change of part --

8 MR. BENETT: Yes, I think we recognize that.

9 MR. MILLER: But then you have to ask yourself the  
10 next question. It is one thing to change Part 60. It is  
11 another question to deal with the technical questions that  
12 have to be answered, and what you are really saying is that  
13 you would like to be permitted to start the surface construction  
14 and encumber those costs and make commitments prior to the  
15 Board finding, making it final.

16 MR. BENETT: Correct, in that case.

17 MR. MILLER: This is obviously again a policy  
18 matter that of course, would have to go to the Commission  
19 itself in order to get some sort of reaction.

20 MR. BROWNING: Let me just discuss that for a  
21 minute. There is a concept in some of the Commission actions  
22 of a so-called "topical report review," where you review  
23 something in a generic sense and then when it comes to site  
24 specific application you have to reassess does it still fit  
25 for that particular site. I gather that is the concept you

1 are talking about. Is that right? You are going to have a  
2 generic surface facility which you think you could decouple  
3 from a site-specific case, at least at one level, and you could  
4 allow to get review of that in parallel with other things and  
5 then separately address the site-specific aspects?

6 MR. FREI: Yes, in a sense. There may be some --

7 MR. BROWNING: The kinds of things you are talking  
8 about are the subsurface.

9 MR. MILLER: It is not quite -- they are questioning  
10 it a little bit differently. There is a concept of topical  
11 report and a lot of the pre-licensing consultations in fact,  
12 are, you know, very much like that. What they are saying though  
13 is they want to change the timing of NRC's authorization, that  
14 is to advance the point at which NRC would say that it is okay  
15 to go construct and to do that prior to making the finding  
16 of site suitability.

17 MR. BROWNING: Okay, you would actually be  
18 constructing something.

19 MR. MILLER: While the hearing process is going  
20 on.

21 MR. BENETT: On this schedule you would start  
22 construction of the surface facilities one year before you  
23 made the final finding on suitability of the site to allow us  
24 to proceed to construct the underground facilities and the  
25 shafts.

1 MR. MILLER: Jim has a comment.

2 MR. WOLF: Yes, first of all, I agree with your  
3 recognition that the proposal that you have tabled just doesn't  
4 fit with Part 60 as it is presently written. In addition, I  
5 would call to your attention, if you wish to pursue this the  
6 discussion in the state of the considerations on the proposed  
7 procedural rule that was the December 6, 1979, Federal Register,  
8 in which the Commission dealt with a concern about expenditures  
9 of funds before you knew everything you needed to know about  
10 the site and had an opportunity to go through the hearing  
11 process. I think you ought to address that policy concern  
12 in your own thinking, also, but as Hub says it is --

13 MR. BENETT: What was the site?

14 MR. WOLF: I think the most relevant section is  
15 Pages 70,410 and 44 Federal Register. I think that is probably  
16 where it comes out most clearly. It comes through the rest  
17 of it, but I think that is the --

18 MR. CAMERON: I think it, also, might be useful to  
19 point out that this is analogous to the LWA scheme.

20 MR. WOLF: The same kinds of policy concerns.

21 MR. CAMERON: Part 50 and you will see some of the  
22 policy concerns that the Commission has had over LWA procedures  
23 and what types of activities might be permitted before our  
24 initial licensing decision in the memo that we handed out,  
25 and I think it would be good to apply those types of considerations

1 also, to this the way you have it presented here.

2 MR. BENETT: Okay, clearly this is a unique  
3 situation. We will by that time, as far as investing in the  
4 sites concerned, we will by that time have invested over  
5 one-half billion dollars into the site that we would be  
6 proposing, independently, and so there will have been a big  
7 investment at that time at each site.

8 MR. MILLER: I think those are the kind of facts  
9 that I think you need to present, and what the Commission  
10 had considered at the time that it rather explicitly looked  
11 at this idea of what construction can occur when, that it  
12 perhaps did not have that kind of facts or figures before it  
13 and it certainly is not unreasonable to have the DOE at least  
14 propose it and to lay out facts that go to the kinds of  
15 considerations that are written down in that statement of  
16 considerations that Jim is referring to.

17 MR. CAMERON: I, also, think be aware of the fact  
18 that the expenditure of money for gathering information about  
19 the site may be okay in terms of your getting a benefit from  
20 that expenditure of money, whereas you may not be getting the  
21 same type of benefit in expending money to construct surface  
22 facilities, and I think that is another thing that comes out  
23 in some of the policy statements that were made in the  
24 statement of consideration, Part 60.

25 MR. BENETT: All right.

1 MR. FREI: Should we move on to the second  
2 approach which we call the two-stage repository construction?

3 MR. BENETT: Do you want to bring it up in this  
4 one, just bring up the second rule and say that it, also, was  
5 needed?

6 MR. FREI: Yes. As in the two-step licensing  
7 approach we would, again, be using or developing two exploratory  
8 shafts at our candidate sites as part of site characterization,  
9 the second one being size so that it could be beneficial in use  
10 in repository construction. Basically it can be used for  
11 subsurface development once we get the construction authorization  
12 from NRC. That, in essence, removes subsurface development  
13 off the critical path, and what is different about this  
14 approach then is what we do to get the waste handling building  
15 time, construction time shortened, and in the two-stage  
16 approach what we would do is following site designation we  
17 would apply for the construction authorization application,  
18 the full authorization for both surface and subsurface, and  
19 once we have that authorization, we would basically proceed  
20 in parallel on two construction efforts, at least for the  
21 surface facilities. One, the first stage would be a limited  
22 waste handling building which would be limited in receipt  
23 rates, for example on the order of 200 to 400 metric tons  
24 per year. and it would be limited to one waste form, namely,  
25 spent fuel. We would receive it bare in the shipping casks

1 and so forth and put the site-specific cannister around it,  
2 and again that would only be limited to spent fuel. We can  
3 build that facility fast enough so once we have the authoriza-  
4 tion, that facility would be operational, and we would be  
5 finished with pre-operational checkout and testing and so  
6 forth by the January 1998 date and at the same time the  
7 subsurface development and the shafts would be complete so  
8 we could not only receive the waste, we can then begin to  
9 emplace it at that time.

10 In parallel with that building, we would have  
11 Stage 2 underway which would be a full-scale waste handling  
12 building which would accommodate up to the 3000 metric tons  
13 waste acceptance we have been talking about in the Mission  
14 Plan, and that would provide the capability for disassembling  
15 and consolidating the spent fuel which is what our plans are  
16 for the waste packages and then putting the waste cannister  
17 around that. So, that is basically the two-stage approach.  
18 We build two facilities in parallel on the surface.

19 MR. MILLER: What you are really saying is that  
20 in this approach you are not trying to get to construction  
21 authorization faster, you are trying to minimize the time  
22 after construction authorization of getting the repository  
23 ready for receipt.

24 MR. FREI: That is correct.

25 MR. MILLER: I think that going back to conversations

1 that we have had over the past several years on reacting to  
2 various things, I think we have always said that this tends  
3 from our point of view, at least to make the most sense as  
4 to not take and try to parse the front end before licensing,  
5 get that decision out of the way but to look to --

6 MR.FREI: The application for construction  
7 authorization would include, if you will, both stages, and  
8 what we would need then is the license to receive it in place  
9 for the first stage of 1998, followed by the license for the  
10 second stage, the larger facility which would come on line  
11 perhaps three years later.

12 MR. MILLER: There are a number of relevant sections  
13 in the rule that we might point out to you to keep in mind as  
14 you raise this kind of option. The first section that I would  
15 like to point to, we talked about two shafts as far as site  
16 characterization. In the Subpart B under 6010 on site  
17 characterization there are words that go along the lines that  
18 first of all the rule and even the statement of considerations  
19 that surrounded the promulgation of the procedural rule  
20 recognize that site characterization would likely or very  
21 possibly include more than one shaft.

22 In fact, I think the kind of scope that was  
23 referred to in our statement of consideration was we expected  
24 that there would be several shafts with drifts in between.  
25 There is admonition in the rule, however, 6010D2 which talks

1 about limiting the number of bore holes and shafts to the  
2 extent consistent or practical consistent with what you need  
3 to obtain information for licensing. So, you have got to do  
4 a balancing, but in reaction to your concept of two shafts  
5 it certainly isn't inconsistent with what the rule is talking  
6 about.

7 Also, use of shafts, exploratory shafts and  
8 incorporation of those into the ultimate repository, again,  
9 it is a concept that is recognized and pretty explicitly in  
10 that section of our rule.

11 With respect to -- yes, there is another part of the  
12 rule which could be -- I don't think that we would say that  
13 this would prohibit what you are talking about in the way of  
14 beginning the operation of one piece of the repository before  
15 the full repository is operating, but I should call out 60.41  
16 and Subsection A of that Section talks about getting into the  
17 phase of acting on requests for operations occurring after  
18 construction is substantially complete and it goes on to talk  
19 about surface and interconnecting structure systems and  
20 components and any underground storage space required for  
21 initial operation are substantially complete, and that is  
22 something that we need to look at. We would have to look at  
23 it in response to that. There is another point, also, yes,  
24 that is right, in connection with what the Commission requires  
25 the DOE to submit in their license application there are

1 words to the effect that the license application must evaluate  
2 the maximum capacity of the repository, and here I am pointing  
3 to 60.21(c). Again, I just point that out. It clearly argues  
4 against what you are doing, but you need to be sensitive to  
5 those kinds of, those points in the rule.

6 MR. BENETT: Maybe you have to change the rule for  
7 this one, too.

8 MR. MILLER: I point those out just to -- Jim,  
9 or Chip, are there any other points that we should observe?

10 MR. WOLF: I am a little bit surprised, but this is  
11 more a technical question. I am not sure I understand how this  
12 gets on the critical path that the surface facilities tend to  
13 be on the critical path that would provide a basic premise  
14 and need for the kinds of changes you are talking about, but  
15 presumably that would be spelled out and explained as to why  
16 that would be --

17 MR. FREI: The construction schedules that our  
18 various architect-engineers have developed for the projects  
19 through the conceptual design stages show in some cases very  
20 long construction times for a waste handling building that  
21 will have the capability to handle multiwaste forms and do  
22 disassembly and consolidation operations.

23 MR. BENETT: And in this approach you would build  
24 a little simple one in a shorter time while building the bigger  
25 complicated one to come on line three to four years later.

1 MR. CAMERON: And this would give you the capability  
2 to do what specifically?

3 MR. FREI: Begin to accept spent fuel from the  
4 utilities.

5 MR. WOLF: One problem you have to be aware of  
6 is the sensitivity about possibility that you would end up  
7 with just a fuel storage facility, and if there is one thing  
8 that is clear in the Act it is that repository location must  
9 not be an interim storage location or an MRS location, and  
10 while I am not suggesting necessarily that that is in any  
11 way implicated here, you need to, I think, be concerned about  
12 it and address it.

13 MR. BENETT: The intent would be to emplace the  
14 waste underground.

15 MR. WOLF: Sure, not receive it and keep it on the  
16 surface, but is the intent sufficient? You see, if you have  
17 an authorization actually to emplace the waste at the same  
18 time, then this issue doesn't arise, but unless you have made  
19 the findings necessary with respect to emplacement, then you  
20 have a concern about isn't this a storage facility.

21 MR. BENETT: I am sorry, we would want authorization  
22 to emplace.

23 MR. WOLF: Okay, all as part of the same --

24 MR. BENETT: Yes. We don't just want to receive  
25 it and keep it there. We want to receive and emplace it.

1 MR. MILLER: I think you may be getting into the  
2 last question, but one other point we should make in response  
3 to your question on the second shaft and this concept of it  
4 being a large diameter shaft, it appears that our technical  
5 people, at least in a preliminary look at it feel that you  
6 know, you have got to address those questions which I put on  
7 the screen before, but when you address those, it appears as  
8 if the diameter of the shaft has less impact on those questions  
9 than whether it is this mode of construction or that mode  
10 of construction. What I am saying is that their initial  
11 reaction is that with respect to how many shafts, I have already  
12 talked about that, but with respect to large diameter --

13 MR. FREI: For example, in salt we did a large  
14 diameter second shaft. We may, in fact, use conventional  
15 sinking techniques, rather than blind hole boring.

16 MR. BROWNING: All other factors aside, I don't  
17 know how many people would volunteer to go down a shaft to  
18 do work down in a facility like this without having some other  
19 means of getting the hell out of there.

20 MR. BENETT: That is the mine safety rules we are  
21 talking about.

22 MR. BROWNING: Yes. I think we have had discussions  
23 with the, was it Bureau of Mines that had that shaft? They  
24 sank just one shaft and did work down there. My understanding  
25 is that they said that they would never do that again.

1 MR. FREI: We are looking at the extent of under-  
2 ground development we are going to do in order to do our  
3 site characterization tests and couple that with the number  
4 of people we need under there to run and monitor those tests,  
5 and the length of time those tests will run. It just seems  
6 prudent from safety that we have a second means of escape in  
7 accordance with the MSHA regs.

8 MR. BENETT: But that doesn't in and of itself  
9 lead us to a big second shaft.

10 MR. MILLER: It looks like we have covered the  
11 first three points.

12 Any questions about No. 9?

13 MR. BENETT: What is the answer?

14 MR. MILLER: Why don't you tell us what you have  
15 in mind there?

16 MR. BENETT: One of the things we considered in  
17 the preliminary draft emission plan, I think we had it in  
18 there, and maybe it was just in our minds then was a several-  
19 year lag storage facility on the surface to have a number of  
20 functions, but principally to be sort of a buffer between  
21 being able to on one end continue emplacing waste at the  
22 operational rate while still having enough waste there on the  
23 surface to do it in the event some delays happened in bringing  
24 waste to the repository and then second to be able to continue  
25 receiving waste in the event something happened in the repository

1 that would have prevented us from emplacing waste, and we have  
2 not come up with -- you see, our concept up until we started  
3 thinking about that was size it so that if you have a problem  
4 shipping waste you have enough room to take whatever was in  
5 transit, and that is not very big, and we are looking at a  
6 bigger concept then which would have enough there to be able  
7 to continue receiving it at the guaranteed acceptance rates  
8 and still be able if you have a month's, approaching year's  
9 delay or problem in the repository to be able to emplace it  
10 and what we thought, bracketed that without having the studies  
11 was a couple of years worth of storage on the surface, and  
12 that was the concept we had in mind.

13 MR. FREI: That was the one that Bob Morgan had  
14 discussed at the information meeting.

15 MR. BENETT: Yes, and we are interested in reaction  
16 to that.

17 MR. MILLER: The concept here is given that the  
18 facilities whether underground or the other surface facilities,  
19 the more complex ones that you talked about may not permit you  
20 from the time of construction authorization to 1998 to get all  
21 that done. It would be to have at least the part that would  
22 allow you to bring waste on site to be able to receive waste  
23 if you did not get those other facilities done? Is that what  
24 you are saying?

25 MR. BENETT: That would be another way to look at

1 that it would be a way to receive waste ahead of the facilities  
2 being available, and that was what I think you were getting  
3 at, but I think the approach we are coming to now, we ought  
4 to have a bigger facility there to be that buffer for the two  
5 kinds of problems, problems in shipping so that we have enough  
6 there on the surface to continue operations and problems in  
7 emplacing waste so we don't have to stop taking the waste.

8 MR. GREEVES: It is the continuity question.

9 MR. BENETT: Yes, it is operational continuity.

10 MR. MILLER: I think there is nothing in the rule  
11 that puts limits on your ability to do this kind of thing.  
12 We recognized all along in all of the designs you have ever  
13 come up with there has been some provision for lag storage,  
14 and the need for it is obvious.

15 The real limitations that you face are the ones  
16 that are posed by the law that Jim referred to, and I guess  
17 what you are facing off against is concerns that if you did  
18 that this is an MRS or it is an interim storage facility, and  
19 there I guess you have to consider such things as if you are  
20 doing this after construction authorization, and you are  
21 actively building the repository I suppose you might argue that  
22 that is evidence that it is not an MRS or an interim storage  
23 facility, but that is the kind of thing you have to answer  
24 not to NRC but to your --

25 MR. BENETT: We understand that one. We are

1 concerned more about the NRC position.

2 MR. MILLER: Unless you have a different answer,  
3 there is nothing in our regulations that restrict the size of  
4 lag storage.

5 MR. CAMERON: No, I don't think there is. Of  
6 course, you would have to meet all the interim requirements  
7 that you ordinarily would have to meet.

8 MR. FREI: I am certain it would be part of our  
9 license application.

10 MR. WOLF: I think the bigger problem is primarily  
11 yours. I would not want to say that we would not have to face  
12 it at one time or another, but I think the concern is primarily  
13 yours.

14 MR. MILLER: Is there anything else?

15 MR. BENETT: I think we have finished the questions,  
16 the things we wanted to cover. Did you have anything else  
17 you wanted to point out?

18 All right, how do we want to handle the -- do we  
19 want to do the comments now or break for lunch and come back?

20 MR. BROWNING: I think we would just as soon do it  
21 now.

22 MR. BENETT: Does anybody have any comments or  
23 points they want to make?

24 MR. MILLER: Hopefully, Bill, this has been useful.

25 MR. BENETT: It has for me, yes.

1           You know that we appreciate you coming over and  
2 taking the time to do this, and we are going to reflect on  
3 what we have heard today in making the final changes to the  
4 draft that we will be putting out soon, and I am sure we will  
5 have more of these interactions.

6           I have been comfortable with the way the guidelines  
7 interaction has gone and this has gone, and maybe we have  
8 stumbled on a format that we can work to and involve the public  
9 and other people who want to listen. This seems to be fine  
10 to me.

11           MR. BROWNING: I guess we would appreciate getting  
12 some feel for whether what you have heard here is going to set  
13 you back in terms of your schedule on the Mission Plan. We  
14 would hope it would not.

15           MR. BENETT: I think the answer is no, for  
16 substantively. I don't think anything you said in the way  
17 we are presenting some of these things would cause us to make  
18 drastic changes in the way we are doing it.

19           MR. BROWNING: Okay, thank you very much.

20           MR. BENETT: Thank you. By the way, if anybody  
21 needs copies of anything we alluded to, let us know.

22           (Thereupon, at 12:24 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)  
23  
24  
25