

HLWYM HEmails

From: Oleg Povetko
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2004 4:59 PM
To: Roberto Pabalan
Cc: Osvaldo Pensado
Subject: FW: criticality agreements

FYI

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Dennis Galvin [mailto:DJG3@nrc.gov]
>Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2004 2:45 PM
>To: vjain@cnwra.swri.edu
>Cc: OPOVETKO@cnwra.swri.edu; Tae Ahn
>Subject: Re: criticality agreements

>

>

>Vijay,

>

>We need to respond to all agreements, including the >criticality agreements, by the end of the year. I have the >responsibility to prepare the response for all the >criticality related agreements. Marissa would like to close >the agreements. I still have questions/concerns about how >DOE is handling criticality. My understanding is that DOE >will use burnup credit, neutron poison plates (alloy 22 with >gadolinium), loading curves, and moderator exclusion to >essentially exclude criticality by design. Criticality will >become a design review as compared to a scenario analysis >review. I believe arguments exist for keeping agreements >open or for closing them. Except for CLST 5.03, the >agreements were written in a very general manner that may >give us the option of closing them with limited additional >work. We may not see reports associated with CLST 5.03 until >November. My main limitation is making time to review the >submitted materials.

>

>Assuming DOE is able to design the waste packages to be >subcritical by design, DOE's criticality and isotopic model

>reports are most useful to review. A useful exercise would

>be to compare the approaches used in these reports against >approaches approved by SFPO. This may also require reviewing >the applicable portion of the Topical report. This would >also increase familiarity with approaches used by SFPO.

>

>I am currently doing a criticality evaluation for SFPO. I >will learn SFPO methods by doing which will help me in doing >the above reviews. It would be helpful to have someone >(possibly Oleg) do a review of the documents as I have >described as a backup/peer review. This review would >initially look for major differences in approach similar to >what we did for the CLST agreements (summarize what DOE does >in the model reports and identify major differences with >current practice). The purpose would be to identify >potential licensing issues like was done for preclosure, not >necessarily do detailed reviews. The review could also >identify potential references to review should a detailed >review be performed.

>

>In any event, I will prepare a response letter. When >prepared, I will share it with you and other CNWRA and NRC >for comment. If you would like to suggest input to the >response letter as I have described above, that would be >helpful. As you plan work in this area, we should set up a >call between you, me, Tae and the CNWRA staff involved.

>

>Thanks,

>

>Dennis

>

>>>> Vijay Jain <vjain@cnwra.swri.edu> 10/06/04 03:02PM >>> >Dennis, > >Are you handling Criticality agreements received from DOE? Or >what's plan. I want to make sure staff is available to >complete response to all CLST agreements by December end.

>

>How is your SFPO work going on?

>

>Vijay

>

>

>

>

>

>Vijay Jain

>

>Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses > >Southwest Research Institute > >6220 Culebra Road >

>San Antonio, TX 78228 >

>V: (210) 522 5439

>

>F: (210) 522 6081

>

>

>

>

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 1512

Mail Envelope Properties (000901c4ce82\$e89adcb0\$7bc8a281)

Subject: FW: criticality agreements
Sent Date: 11/19/2004 4:58:31 PM
Received Date: 11/19/2004 4:58:29 PM
From: Oleg Povetko

Created By: opovetko@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"Osvaldo Pensado" <opensado@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Roberto Pabalan" <rpabalan@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: cnwra.swri.edu

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3352	11/19/2004 4:58:29 PM

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