

## HLWYM HEmails

---

**From:** Randall Fedors  
**Sent:** Friday, January 11, 2008 10:55 AM  
**To:** Jack Parrott; Jack Davis  
**Cc:** Frank Jacobs; Jack Guttmann  
**Subject:** Re: RESPONSE - a quick question

Jack D.,

In the re-prioritization caused by recent events, I been working under the presumption that this tunnel visit probably should not be high priority.

As for impacting our review ....

In the most recently available DOE documents, they do not "use" the field tests for model inputs. Some portions of some field tests, including the Drift-Scale Heater Test, are used to some extent in model validation. The potential NRC observations in the DST were related to DOE's abstraction that no liquid water drips from the drift ceiling (thus none contacts the engineered barrier) when the drift wall temperature is above 100 C (boiling temperature is closer to 97 C at YM for pure water). Thus, NRC's objective falls in the category of evaluating the consistency of observations with DOE model results. If the consistency is not apparent, then we should understand why certain observations are not consistent with the DOE model results. There are several types of reasons why observations need not be precisely consistent with model results.

The importance attached to this site visit also considered that this information (observations of features) likely will dissipate in quality by the time the RAI process comes up.

I will be happy to talk with you (<15 minutes needed) more on Monday when I'm back in the office. Note that I pared down the cc list, since I classify this as a preliminary discussion/input from the UZ2 group.

--Randy

>>> Jack Davis 01/10/08 5:52 PM >>>  
Jack/Dave,

The real significance of this work for our review depends in part on how much the DOE uses any heater test results to support their case. If it turns out that the heater test is used in a significant way, it certainly could have an impact on our review and definitely would have been more efficient for us to have completed our observations and sampling now, rather than gaining information through the RAI process.

Jack

>>> Jack Parrott 01/10/2008 4:49 PM >>>  
Dave,

The sampling work was requested by NRC in a letter and attachment dated September 5, 2007 (attached). Jack Davis and his folks would be better able to assess the significance of the delay. We were participating in DOE's quarterly underground entries but otherwise currently don't do regular visits to the site, only on an as needed basis to do tours for NRC personnel or sometimes to do above ground sampling or observations (which won't be affected). As far as I know, there won't be any licensing impact from not being able to do those other NRC site visits.

Jack

>>> David McIntyre 1/10/2008 12:00:54 PM >>>

Jack -

I have a press query regarding your sampling work that has been postponed. Can you assess how significant this delay would be to your work? And are there regular site visits that maybe hadn't been definitively scheduled that will now be put off - ie., once a month or so, but now indefinitely postponed?

Thanks,  
Dave Mc, OPA

>>> Jack Parrott 01/09/2008 5:18 PM >>>

That is correct, the site closure has not affected the work of the NRC OSRs. However, it will affect our (NRC and the Center's) requested access for observation and sampling in Alcove 5 which was to occur next week. It is now postponed indefinitely.

>>> Michael Weber 1/9/2008 2:11:49 PM >>>

No, we will not issue RAIs during the acceptance review. The acceptance review is intended to determine whether we received a complete application, and if so, whether the application should be docketed for review. We plan to issue RAIs, as necessary, if we docket the application and commence the technical review.

The partial closure of the site/layoffs is not affecting our OSRs, at least no yet [Jack/Len - can confirm].

Thanks for getting the word out on the cancellation of the public meeting on the GROA rule.

>>> David McIntyre 01/09/2008 2:53:19 PM >>>

Lawrence -

Elaine Hiruo of Platts is asking if the staff could/would issue RAIs to DOE during the acceptance review, or if that would necessarily wait until the post-docketing technical review?

She's also wondering if DOE's partial closure of the site and layoffs due to the budget cut is affecting our OSRs in any way.

BTW, FSME informed me of the cancellation of the Jan 23 GROA public meeting in LV. I informed Elaine and the LVR-J about that in order to get the word out since the meeting had been publicly noticed.

**Hearing Identifier:** HLW\_YuccaMountain\_Hold\_EX  
**Email Number:** 179

**Mail Envelope Properties** (Randall.Fedors@nrc.gov20080111105512)

**Subject:** Re: RESPONSE - a quick question  
**Sent Date:** 1/11/2008 10:55:12 AM  
**Received Date:** 1/11/2008 10:55:12 AM  
**From:** Randall Fedors

**Created By:** Randall.Fedors@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Frank Jacobs" <Frank.Jacobs@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Jack Guttman" <Jack.Guttman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Jack Parrott" <Jack.Parrott@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Jack Davis" <Jack.Davis@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:**

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	4399	1/11/2008 10:55:12 AM

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**