

HLWYM HEmails

From: Biswajit Dasgupta
Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2007 9:32 AM
To: Wesley Patrick
Cc: Asadul Chowdhury; Sitakanta Mohanty; Simon Hsiung; Amitava Ghosh
Subject: RE: Preclosure Design Information

Wes,

During conversation with Asad yesterday late in the day, he indicated that he will sought through the material placed in the g: drive and forward them to NRC. He is traveling today and will be in office some time around 2:00 PM.

It appears NRC will talk to DOE today to push for early preclosure interaction (Nov, 07) than desired by DOE (Jan – March, 08). Yesterday Robert called a brief meeting with the preclosure counterpart leads (Simon, Amit, Bis, Yong and Albert) to come up with suggestions on the areas for interaction. The meeting was also attended by Sheena Whaley and Eugene Peters. The recommendation was to engage DOE in Appendix 7 meeting to show a vertical slice of PCSA – starting from hazards to identification of SSCs ITS including design information. This will help us understand level of design information DOE plan to provide to demonstrate preclosure compliance. It was felt proposing Appendix 7 meeting in near term will be valuable to the team; however, NRC management may want a tech exchange.

The point was made during the meeting that DOE is required identify all potential SSCs ITS through PCSA, however level of design information may vary for CA. For example, significant information on design process (loading, material, analysis, and design) on some SSCs like Waste package, surface facility structures will be needed than for mechanical systems say cranes, trolleys etc where design bases and criteria, and reliability information will be sufficient to assess compliance with preclosure safety. For some mechanical systems, however, such as TEV (Transporter Emplacement Vehicle), if considered as unique system, more information will be required that may include detailed description of systems and structural, thermal, and reliability analysis depending on the functions credited. From previous interactions it appears DOE understands this. However, vertical slice proposed should provide us understanding if DOE changed their approach when they indicated that design level of SSCs will be at 30-40% during LA submittal.

Simon, Amit please weigh in if you see things differently.

Bis

From: Wesley Patrick [mailto:wpatrick@cnwra.swri.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2007 6:05 AM
To: 'Bis Dasgupta'
Cc: Asadul Chowdhury; Sitakanta Mohanty
Subject: RE: Preclosure Design Information

Bis,

Did this information ever make it to Asad and, from him, to Whaley, Davis, and others? That is the approach I was pushing, but I have not heard back from any of you whether the information went anywhere other than to our own management staff.

Please advise.

Wes.

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 1547

Mail Envelope Properties (003801c8068a\$efe2c990\$26c8a281)

Subject: RE: Preclosure Design Information
Sent Date: 10/4/2007 9:31:57 AM
Received Date: 10/4/2007 9:31:58 AM
From: Biswajit Dasgupta

Created By: bdasgupta@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:

"Asadul Chowdhury" <achowdhury@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Sitakanta Mohanty" <smohanty@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Simon Hsiung" <shsiung@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Amitava Ghosh" <aghosh@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Wesley Patrick" <wpatrick@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: cnwra.swri.edu

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2691	10/4/2007 9:31:58 AM

Options

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