

February 28, 2001

Stephan Brocoun, Assistant Manager
Office of Licensing and Regulatory Compliance
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office
P.O. Box 30307
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

SUBJECT: U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION/U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY TECHNICAL EXCHANGE AND MANAGEMENT MEETING ON
REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL -MECHANICAL EFFECTS
(FEBRUARY 6 THROUGH 8, 2001)

Dear Mr. Brocoun:

Enclosed are the meeting summary highlights agreed upon during the February 6 through 8, 2001, Technical Exchange and Management meeting between the staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the U.S. Department of Energy. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss one of the Key Technical Issues, Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects (RDTME). The meeting was held in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Please note that the NRC staff has identified two errors in the agreement matrix. First, under RDTME Subissue 3, Agreement 15 should reference Agreement 19 vice 22. Second, there is a typographical error in the title for Subissue 2, it should read "Design of the geologic repository operations area for the effects of seismic events and direct fault disruption." We regret any inconvenience this may have incurred. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact the technical lead for RDTME, Mr. Mysore (Raj) Nataraja or the Senior Project Manager for issue closure, Mr. James Andersen. Mr. Nataraja can be reached at (301) 415-6695 and Mr. Andersen at (301) 415-5717.

Sincerely,

/RA/
C. William Reamer, Chief
High-Level Waste Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosure: Summary Highlights of NRC/DOE Technical
Exchange and Management Meeting on RDTME

cc: See attached distribution list

DISTRIBUTION:

File Center	NMSS r/f	DWM r/f	HLWB r/f	EPAB r/f	DBrooks
CWReamer	NStablein	MComar	LCampbell	TAhn	JBradbury
NColeman	PJustus	Bleslie	TMcCartin	MNataraja	JPohle
JTrapp	SWastler	JFirth	OSR	DHiggs	

ACCESSION #:

DOCUMENT NAME: S:\DWM\HLWB\JWA\MEETING SUMMARY 02-06-01.WPD

OFC	HLWB	HLWB	HLWB
NAME	JAndersen	KStablein	CWReamer
DATE	02/27/01	02/28/01	02/28/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ACNW: YES ☒ NO ☐ Delete file after distribution: Yes ☐ No ☐

- 1) This document should be made available to the PUBLIC: JWA 02/23/01
- 2) This document is related to the HLW program. It should be placed in the LSS: JWA 02/23/01



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

February 28, 2001

Stephan Brocoum, Assistant Manager
Office of Licensing and Regulatory Compliance
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office
P.O. Box 30307
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

SUBJECT: U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION/U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY TECHNICAL EXCHANGE AND MANAGEMENT MEETING ON
REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL -MECHANICAL EFFECTS
(FEBRUARY 6 THROUGH 8, 2001)

Dear Mr. Brocoum:

Enclosed are the meeting summary highlights agreed upon during the February 6 through 8, 2001, Technical Exchange and Management meeting between the staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the U.S. Department of Energy. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss one of the Key Technical Issues, Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects (RDTME). The meeting was held in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Please note that the NRC staff has identified two errors in the agreement matrix. First, under RDTME Subissue 3, Agreement 15 should reference Agreement 19 vice 22. Second, there is a typographical error in the title for Subissue 2, it should read "Design of the geologic repository operations area for the effects of seismic events and direct fault disruption." We regret any inconvenience this may have incurred. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact the technical lead for RDTME, Mr. Mysore (Raj) Nataraja or the Senior Project Manager for issue closure, Mr. James Andersen. Mr. Nataraja can be reached at (301) 415-6695 and Mr. Andersen at (301) 415-5717.

Sincerely,

C. William Reamer, Chief
High-Level Waste Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosure: Summary Highlights of NRC/DOE Technical
Exchange and Management Meeting on RDTME

cc: See attached distribution list

Letter to from dated: February 28, 2001

cc:

R. Loux, State of Nevada

S. Frishman, State of Nevada

L. Barrett, DOE/Washington, DC

A. Brownstein, DOE/Washington, DC

S. Hanauer, DOE/Washington, DC

C. Einberg, DOE/Washington, DC

J. Carlson, DOE/Washington, DC

N. Slater, DOE/Washington, DC

A. Gil, YMPO

R. Dyer, YMPO

S. Brocoum, YMPO

R. Clark, YMPO

S. Mellington, YMPO

C. Hanlon, YMPO

T. Gunter, YMPO

K. Hess, BSC

D. Krisha, BSC

S. Cereghino, BSC

M. Voegelé, BSC/SAIC

S. Echols, Winston & Strawn

B. Price, Nevada Legislative Committee

J. Meder, Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau

D. Bechtel, Clark County, NV

E. von Tiesenhausen, Clark County, NV

A. Kalt, Churchill County, NV

G. McCorkell, Esmeralda County, NV

L. Fiorenzi, Eureka County, NV

A. Johnson, Eureka County, NV

A. Remus, Inyo County, CA

M. Yarbro, Lander County, NV

R. Massey, Lander County, NV

J. Pitts, Lincoln County, NV

M. Baughman, Lincoln County, NV

A. Funk, Mineral County, NV

J. Shankle, Mineral County, NV

L. Bradshaw, Nye County, NV

M. Murphy, Nye County, NV

J. McKnight, Nye County, NV

D. Weigel, GAO

W. Barnard, NWTRB

R. Holden, NCAI

A. Collins, NIEC

R. Arnold, Pahrump County, NV

J. Larson, White Pine County

R. Clark, EPA

F. Marcinowski, EPA

R. Anderson, NEI

R. McCullum, NEI

S. Kraft, NEI

J. Kessler, EPRI

D. Duncan, USGS

R. Craig, USGS

W. Booth, Engineering Svcs, LTD

J. Curtiss, Winston & Strawn

N. Rice, NV Congressional Delegation

T. Story, NV Congressional Delegation

J. Reynoldson, NV Congressional Delegation

S. Joya, NV Congressional Delegation

J. Pegues, City of Las Vegas, NV

L. Lehman, T-Reg, Inc.

2001-02-12

Please Note: The enclosed letter to DOE documents a Technical Exchange and Management Meeting on the Key Technical Issue, "Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects," conducted on February 6-8, 2001. The meeting summary is included as an enclosure to the letter. Attachment 1 to the meeting summary lists the agreements made by the NRC/DOE at the meeting, Attachment 2 provides some additional detail on one of the agreements, Attachment 3 is the agenda, and Attachment 4 is the attendance list. Due to the size of Attachment 5 (presenter's slides), they are not included in this mailing. If you are interested in viewing or printing this attachment, it can be obtained from the NRC website (www.nrc.gov) under the ADAMS icon (or you can go directly to the ADAMS homepage at www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS). If you do not have access to the website and/or are interested in getting a hard copy of Attachment 4, please contact Ms. Darlene Higgs at 301-415-6711 or e-mail at gdh1@nrc.gov.

Summary Highlights of NRC/DOE Technical Exchange and Management Meeting on Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects

February 6-8, 2001
Las Vegas, Nevada

Introduction and Objectives

This Technical Exchange and Management Meeting on Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects (RDTME) is one in a series of meetings related to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) key technical issue (KTI) and sufficiency review and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) site recommendation decision. Consistent with NRC regulations on preclicensing consultations and a 1992 agreement with the DOE, staff-level resolution can be achieved during preclicensing consultation. The purpose of issue resolution is to assure that sufficient information is available on an issue to enable the NRC to docket a proposed license application. Resolution at the staff level does not preclude an issue being raised and considered during the licensing proceedings, nor does it prejudice what the NRC staff evaluation of that issue will be after its licensing review. Issue resolution at the staff level, during preclicensing, is achieved when the staff has no further questions or comments at a point in time regarding how the DOE is addressing an issue. The discussions recorded here reflect NRC's current understanding of aspects of repository design and thermal-mechanical effects most important to repository performance. This understanding is based on all information available to date which includes limited, focused, risk-informed reviews of selected portions of recently provided DOE documents (e.g., Analysis and Model Reports (AMRs) and Process Model Reports (PMRs)). Pertinent additional information (e.g., changes in design parameters) could raise new questions or comments regarding a previously resolved issue.

Issues are "closed" if the DOE approach and available information acceptably address staff questions such that no information beyond what is currently available will likely be required for regulatory decision making at the time of any initial license application. Issues are "closed-pending" if the NRC staff has confidence that the DOE proposed approach, together with the DOE agreement to provide the NRC with additional information (through specified testing, analysis, etc.) acceptably addresses the NRC's questions such that no information beyond that provided, or agreed to, will likely be required at time of initial license application. Issues are "open" if the NRC has identified questions regarding the DOE approach or information, and the DOE has not yet acceptably addressed the questions or agreed to provide the necessary additional information in a potential license application.

The objective of this meeting was to discuss and review the progress on resolving the RDTME KTI (see Attachment 1 for the description of the subissues). The quality assurance (QA) aspect of this KTI was determined to be outside the scope of the meeting and is being tracked in NRC's ongoing review of the DOE's QA program.

Summary of Meeting

At the close of the Technical Exchange and Management Meeting, the NRC staff stated that Subissues 1 and 4 are "closed," and Subissue 2 and 3 are "closed-pending." Specific NRC/DOE agreements made at the meeting are provided as Attachment 1. Information

pertaining to Subissue #3, Agreement 4 is provided as Attachment 2. The agenda and the attendance list are provided as Attachments 3 and 4, respectively. Copies of the presenters slides are provided as Attachment 5. Highlights from the Technical Exchange and Management Meeting are listed below.

Highlights

1) Opening Comments

In its opening comments, the NRC stated that it had received valid comments about the terms used to document the status of technical issues during the precicensing stage, specifically about the use of the term "closed-pending." The NRC stated that it is possible to infer from the use of "closed-pending" that more progress has been made in closing an open issue than is actually the case. In a letter dated January 22, 2001, the Chairman of the NRC addressed this issue and copies of the letter were made available at the meeting. In his letter, the Chairman discussed the terms used and indicated that to mark the status of a technical issue during the precicensing stage, the NRC used "closed," "closed-pending," and "open" as "bookkeeping terms." The NRC then discussed the terms and the goal of issue resolution (this discussion is similar to what is discussed in the Introduction and Objectives section above and is not repeated here).

The DOE stated that the intent of the meeting was to reach agreement on the current status and path forward for each of the RDTME subissues (see "Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects" presentation given by Kirk Lachman). In the RDTME Issue Resolution Status Report (IRSR), Revision 3, the NRC stated that RDTME Subissues #1 and 4 are "closed," Subissue #2 is "closed-pending," and Subissue #3 is "open." During this meeting, the DOE stated that its presentation would focus on the open items identified by the NRC in the IRSR and subsequent discussions. The DOE stated that it felt that the details provided during the current meeting would be the basis for NRC to continue to list Subissues #1 and 4 as "closed," and Subissues #2 and 3 as "closed-pending."

2) Technical Discussions - Subissue 1: Design Control Processes; Subissue 2: Seismic Design Methodology; Subissue 4: Repository Seals

A summary of the current status of resolution was presented (see "Subissue 1: Design Control Processes; Subissue 2: Seismic Design Methodology; Subissue 4: Repository Seals" presentation given by Dan McKenzie and Richard Quittmeyer).

Subissue 1: Design Control Processes

The DOE stated that it has developed a technical work control process consistent with the quality assurance program. The DOE stated that the NRC has identified this subissue as "closed" in the RDTME IRSR, Rev. 3 and considers that this subissue remains "closed." The NRC noted that most of its review to date in this area was in response to design control concerns related to the Exploratory Studies Facility. The NRC further stated that, although the design control process was acceptable, it would continue to monitor implementation of the design control process, especially in the pre-closure area, and would bring relevant issues to the DOE's attention as they arise. The DOE also clarified that the same requirements are

applicable for design and performance assessment. As a result of additional discussions, the NRC stated that Subissue #1 could continue to be listed as "closed."

Subissue 2: Seismic Design Methodology

The DOE discussed the seismic design methodology which is the subject of the second in a series of three topical reports. The DOE noted that the first two topical reports had been completed and that the NRC had no further questions related to them. The NRC stated that after receiving Topical Report 3, it would review all three topical reports in an integrated manner and may have questions related to the first two topical reports at that time. The NRC also asked whether the substantive technical content of Topical Report 3 could be provided prior to publication of the formal report which is currently scheduled for completion in 2002. The DOE stated that it would provide the preliminary seismic design input data sets used in site recommendation design analyses to the NRC by April 2001.

As a result of additional discussions, the NRC and DOE reached two agreements for Subissue #2 (see Attachment 1). With these two agreements, the NRC stated that Subissue #2 could be listed as "closed-pending."

Subissue 4: Repository Seals

The DOE stated that it does not take credit for the use of repository seals in the performance assessment. Based on this fact and that the NRC listed this subissue as "closed" in the RDTME IRSR, Rev. 3, the DOE stated that it considers this subissue "closed." The NRC noted that information pertaining to seal design, construction, and material selection was still required even though seals are not relied upon in meeting the performance objectives and proposed 10 CFR Part 63 does not include requirements specific to seals. The NRC also stated that any potential negative impacts of seal construction and seal materials must be evaluated by the DOE. The DOE stated that such an evaluation is part of its overall evaluation of repository performance.

Mr. Steve Frishman (State of Nevada) stated that this would be the first time the NRC would be basing its decision to list a subissue as "closed" based on proposed 10 CFR Part 63. He stated that either this issue should remain open with respect to 10 CFR Part 60, or if listed as "closed," it should be linked to proposed 10 CFR Part 63. The NRC stated that in its discussion of Subissue #4, closure is linked to proposed 10 CFR Part 63.

As a result of additional discussions, the NRC stated that Subissue #4, with respect to proposed 10 CFR Part 63, could continue to be listed as "closed."

3) Features, Events, and Processes Relevant to RDTME

The DOE summarized the total system performance assessment process, including the identification and screening of features, events, and processes (FEPs). The NRC questioned what was meant by the phrase "effect partially included" in the FEPs table. The DOE stated, that it took no credit for ground control systems in postclosure, and, even if a primary FEP were excluded, the associated secondary FEPs could still be included in the total system

performance assessment. The backup material on this presentation includes examples of included, excluded, and partially included FEPs.

The NRC questioned the DOE about screening out rockfall. The DOE stated that rockfall was screened out because the design of the waste package and the drip shield would take into account the design basis rock size. The NRC stated that it would address this issue again in the subsequent presentations, specifically in Subissue 3, Component 3, Acceptance Criterion 5.

4) Technical Discussions - Subissue #3, Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Underground Facility Design and Performance

Component 1, Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Design of Underground Facility

A summary of the current status of resolution was presented (see "Subissue 3, Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Underground Facility Design and Performance – Component 1, Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Design of Underground Facility" presentation given by Dan McKenzie, Barry Thom, Richard Quittmeyer, and Fei Duan). The DOE identified the NRC information needs from Revision 3 of the RDTME IRSR and subsequent discussions. The DOE stated that the presentation would provide the basis for going to "closed-pending." The DOE then presented the information related to the various acceptance criteria (AC).

Acceptance Criterion 1 addresses the design assumptions, codes, and standards used for the design of subsurface facility structures, systems, and components important to safety. The DOE stated that design control is described in Procedure AP-3.13Q, which requires the design to be developed in accordance with system description documents. The NRC questioned whether the DOE would update the requirements to correspond to the most current version of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code. The DOE stated that, for now, the design will be based on the 1995 ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code. Furthermore, the DOE stated that they would generally "freeze" the selected codes and standards and not continuously revise the design to keep up with evolving version of codes and standards, consistent with industry and NRC practice for reactors, and spent nuclear fuel dry cask storage licenses.

The NRC asked how the applicability/appropriateness of various design codes and standards are determined, particularly for situations for which standards do not exist. The DOE stated that they use engineering judgement, industry and NRC practices and precedents to choose the appropriate design code and standard and document the basis for the decision in Appendix A of the appropriate system description document.

Acceptance Criterion 3 addresses the materials and material properties used for the subsurface facility design. The DOE stated that material standards are specified in the system description documents. The ultimate selection of committed materials is an iterative process involving the subsurface designers and performance assessment team. The NRC questioned the technical basis of precluding corrosion of rock bolts and maintaining relative humidity less than 40%. The DOE stated that their position regarding corrosion is based on previous waste package overpack studies and their position regarding relative humidity is based on Yucca Mountain meteorology data and ventilation calculations.

The NRC questioned why temperature dependent effects on engineered barrier system materials were not discussed. The DOE stated that this issue would be discussed in more detail in later presentations, specifically Subissue 3, Component 2, Acceptance Criterion 2.

Acceptance Criterion 4 addresses whether design analyses use appropriate load combinations for normal and Category 1 and 2 event sequence conditions. In its presentation, the DOE addressed three specific NRC concerns: (1) appropriateness of in-situ stress ratio, (2) incorporation of thermal load in ground support design, and (3) appropriateness of seismic design inputs for design analysis.

In its discussion of in-situ stress ratio (K_0), the DOE stated that both hydraulic fracturing data and Goodman Jack measurements indicate that K_0 values of 0.3 and 1.0 are lower and upper bounds for the horizontal to vertical stress ratio, respectively, at the proposed repository host horizon.

In its discussion of thermal load in ground support design, the DOE stated that thermal loads for thermal-mechanical models are based on the heat output and ventilation rate from thermal management analyses and use them as input for the ground control analyses. The DOE further stated that the thermal load used is the upper bound. The NRC questioned how the upper bound was determined and how the DOE plans to maintain the temperature below the upper bound. The DOE stated that the project design goal for preclosure emplacement drift wall temperature is 96°C (below boiling point) and that modeling was performed using peak preclosure drift wall temperatures of approximately 125°C. The DOE indicated that it would use the design to control peak temperature (e.g., adjust the spacing of waste packages, change ventilation rate, etc.).

In its discussion of seismic design inputs, the DOE stated that the Seismic Design Inputs AMR will contain the inputs to be used for design. The NRC requested that the critical combinations of in-situ, thermal, and seismic stresses for the period of interest, together with their technical bases, and their impact on ground support system be provided.

Acceptance Criterion 5 addresses whether the design analyses use appropriate models and site-specific properties of the host rock, and consider spatial and temporal variation and uncertainties in such properties. In its presentation, the DOE addressed four specific NRC issues: (1) justify mechanical properties for continuum rock mass modeling, (2) justify mechanical properties for discontinuum rock mass modeling, (3) provide basis for mechanical degradation of rock support materials, and (4) justify thermal-mechanical modeling.

In its discussion of mechanical properties for continuum rock mass modeling, the DOE stated that the models are appropriate and adequately justified, and that NRC concerns on mechanical properties will be examined through sensitivity studies. The NRC asked why the 1997 Yucca Mountain Geotechnical Characterization Report concluded that additional information was required, but that the DOE now considers the information to be acceptable. The NRC asked for details regarding any additional work that was conducted since March 1997 and where the results were documented. The DOE stated that the information was available in various sources in the Technical Document Management System and it will provide the additional information in a future document.

The DOE discussed two reports expected to be completed in fiscal year 2002, Design Parameter Analysis and Rock Mass Classification Analysis. The NRC indicated that additional information was needed in these two documents, as well as a third report documenting sensitivity analyses in fiscal year 2003. The DOE stated it would provide these three reports.

In its discussion of mechanical properties for discontinuum rock mass modeling, the DOE stated that its discontinuum rock mass models are appropriate and adequately justified, and that NRC concerns on mechanical properties for blocks between fractures, fracture patterns, and fracture friction angle will be examined through sensitivity studies.

In its discussion, the DOE indicated that both continuum and discontinuum modeling were used to conduct ground control analysis for emplacement drifts for site recommendation. The NRC noted that performance of ground support systems were not modeled using discontinuum modeling and the results from discontinuum modeling may drive the support design.

The DOE discussed the seismic analysis conducted in its ground control for emplacement drifts for site recommendation. The NRC questioned the use of sinusoidal time history with single frequency and short duration because a sinusoidal signal may not be able to bound the site-specific ground motion time history. The DOE responded that its study indicated that effects of frequency and time history on rock bolts were analyzed and no effects were found; however, no documentation is available for review. The DOE stated their position that the ground control design was sufficiently robust, but would agree to additional discontinuum analysis to further enhance the understanding of ground support performance.

In its discussion of mechanical degradation of rock support materials, the DOE stated that it has adequately documented the basis for mechanical degradation of rock support materials.

Acceptance Criterion 6 addresses whether the design of ground support systems is based on appropriate design methodologies and interpretations of modeling results. The DOE stated that numerical approaches are the primary means of analyzing ground support design. The selection of ground support systems is compared against the empirical approach. The NRC asked what empirical data is being used for comparison with the numerical ground support calculations. The DOE responded that they used the empirical design methodology for conventional underground excavation to check the numerical results.

Acceptance Criterion 7 addresses whether subsurface ventilation systems are adequately analyzed. The DOE stated that it has extensively evaluated and checked the ventilation model since its development in 1995. To enhance confidence that the model is adequate, the DOE stated that model results are compared with results from another model that performs similar calculations. In addition, an ongoing 1/4-scale test at the Atlas Facility will provide data that can be used to gauge the accuracy of the model. The NRC raised questions regarding the discretization employed in the ANSYS ventilation model. The DOE responded that based on their study of using more discretized segments, their discretization is adequate.

The NRC questioned whether radial heat flow is adequately represented in the Atlas ventilation testing. The DOE responded that they are continuing to evaluate this issue. The DOE also emphasized that the primary objective of the ventilation test is presently limited to verifying the ANSYS ventilation model.

The NRC pointed out that the line load assumption used in the ANSYS ventilation model may not be applicable if the waste package spacing within the drift is significantly increased. The DOE responded that there would be some additional effects if the spacing were increased significantly. The spacings currently being considered do not appear to cause large temperature disparities, and that they may have to address this concern if, at a future time, it is determined that waste package spacing will in fact be increased. The DOE stated that one report would synthesize all the ventilation test results and would include comparison with numerical models.

Component 2 – Effects of Seismically Induced Rockfall in Engineered Barrier Performance

A summary of the current status of resolution was presented (see “Subissue 3, Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Underground Facility Design and Performance – Component 2, Effects of Seismically Induced Rockfall in Engineered Barrier Performance” presentation given by Dwayne Kicker and Scott Bennett). The DOE identified the NRC information needs from Revision 3 of the RDTME IRSR and subsequent discussions. The DOE stated that the presentation would provide the basis for going to “closed-pending.” The DOE then presented the information in the appropriate acceptance criteria.

Acceptance Criterion 1 addresses the evaluation and abstraction of design features and processes. In its presentation, the DOE addressed nine specific NRC issues: (1) basis of assumption regarding modeling of joint plane radius, (2) representativeness of joint mapping data, (3) basis for exclusion of small joint trace lengths, (4) treatment of thermal and long-term degradation of joint strength, (5) joint sampling bias, (6) temperature dependency of titanium material properties, (7) design basis rock size, (8) use of 10^{-4} ground motion values for postclosure seismic ground motion analysis, and (9) verification of key block analysis approach.

The NRC raised questions regarding the location of the model boundaries being located too close to the drift. The DOE responded that they will reconsider the location of the model boundaries. The DOE stated that it used subcritical crack propagation theory to simulate thermally-induced degradation of joint cohesion. The basis of this methodology is the assumption that joints are either not persistent (joint bridge) or with filling material. The NRC expressed concerns about the approach and a lack of field data to justify the simulation. Furthermore, the DRKBA program does not simulate joint bridges. Consequently, assuming that joint cohesion is a result of joint bridge is not a reasonable assumption. The DOE said it plans to perform additional analysis to verify the approach.

The NRC asked if observations in the field justify the joint filling assumed in the key block analyses. The DOE responded that such joint filling (“locked patches”) is common in Yucca Mountain.

The DOE briefly discussed its positions on the status of fracture data adequacy for input to rockfall analysis. The DOE believes that sufficient fracture mapping data have been obtained and are representative of the potential repository area. The DOE further believes that it has resolved the NRC’s concern about fracture sampling-bias errors (in the Fracture Geometry Analysis AMR). The NRC stated that these issues will be addressed in future interactions with the Structural Deformation and Seismicity KTI staff who are reviewing the DOE’s technical bases.

The NRC questioned the exclusion of small trace length joints as being conservative in terms of block size. The DOE responded that not including small trace length will result in relatively larger size rock blocks and, therefore, it is conservative. The NRC pointed out that while it may be the case for Topopah Spring crystal-poor middle non-lithophysal unit, it may not be the case for Topopah Spring crystal-poor lower lithophysal unit. The DOE indicated that field observations in the lower lithophysal do not suggest the occurrence of large blocks. The DOE indicated that it will examine the effect of small trace length joints on block number and size.

The NRC commented that the DOE determination of shape and size of rockfall blocks using UNWEDGE program did not include the effect of variation of joint dip angle. The DOE stated that the approach used was based on field observations in which strike variation was more prominent than dip variation. The DOE stated that dip variation will be evaluated. The NRC questioned the representativeness of fracture data used to obtain potential rock block size. The DOE responded that the fracture data set for the site was one of the most extensive in the world. Specifically, the fracture data set for the lower lithophysal unit in the Repository Host Horizon was derived from approximately 1000 meters of continuous exposure in the enhanced characterization of the repository block and that it is considered sufficiently representative for the same lower lithophysal located in the emplacement drift area.

The NRC pointed out that the technical bases for the result that the drip shield can withstand a 10MT rock has yet to be provided. Various agreements were made at the CLST Technical Exchange to address this issue however.

The NRC questioned how seismic effects can be accounted for by friction angle. The DOE responded that the technical basis for the approach is documented in the Drift Degradation AMR. The NRC raised concerns regarding validity of the verification analyses presented by the DOE. The DOE stated that the seismic effects approach is adequate, based on the consistent prediction of blocks compared to an alternate numerical solution, and based on the comparison to natural analogues of seismic motion. The DOE stated further that it plans to perform more analyses to verify the approach.

The NRC questioned the frequency and duration of sinusoidal loading used in the verification analysis and the technical basis for the response measure used to compare the analysis cases. The DOE responded that the objective of the verification analyses to confirm the adequacy of the quasi-static approach was fulfilled by the approach used.

Acceptance Criterion 2 addresses the sufficiency of data. In its presentation, the DOE addressed three specific NRC issues: (1) temperature dependency of titanium material properties, (2) adequacy of drip shield stress analysis, and (3) adequacy of stress corrosion cracking analysis. The DOE concluded that the data collected to date, analysis performed, and planned work captured in existing Container Life and Source Term (CLST) agreements with the NRC support closure of this criterion. The NRC asked several clarifying questions regarding the boundary conditions for the finite element models used to assess the consequences of rockfall on the drip shield and waste package. The DOE indicated that they are modeling the drip shield as a free standing structure and include the potential interaction with the gantry rail in the analyses. The DOE also pointed out that they are accounting for the ground motion by including the effects of the invert floor moving vertically upward in their drip shield and waste package models.

Acceptance Criterion 3 addresses the data uncertainty. The DOE concluded that data collected to date, analyses performed, and planned work captured in existing CLST agreements with the NRC support “closed-pending” of this criterion as it pertains to the presently proposed engineered barrier materials.

Acceptance Criterion 4 addresses alternative conceptual models. The DOE stated that it considers this criterion to be “closed-pending” completion of additional rockfall verification and completion of additional waste package and drip shield analyses as agreed to during the CLST meeting. The NRC raised concerns on the applicability of the DRKBA code to determine rock block size and distribution under seismic and thermal conditions. The DOE stated that it believes DRKBA code gave reasonable results based on the verification activities described under Acceptance Criterion 1 and will conduct further verification studies to confirm the DRKBA results.

The NRC questioned how the DOE accounted for the multiple rock block scenario. The DOE responded that it may account for the multiple rock block scenario by using maximum available block size. The NRC stated that it will review the analysis when it becomes available. The DOE also stated that it will assess the effect of fall height associated with subsequent rock fall at the same location on waste package and drip shield performance.

Acceptance Criterion 5 addresses model abstraction. The DOE stated that because rockfall has been excluded from TSPA based on low consequence, this criterion is not applicable. However, the DOE stated that based on the information presented under AC #1, additional rockfall verification analyses are being considered.

Component 3 – Thermal Effects on Flow into Emplacement Drifts

A summary of the current status of resolution was presented (see “Subissue 3, Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Underground Facility Design and Performance – Component 3, Thermal Effects on Flow into Emplacement Drifts” presentation given by Bo Bodvarsson, Robert MacKinnon, Ernest Hardin, and Stephen Blair). The DOE identified the NRC information needs from Revision 3 of the RDTME IRSR and subsequent discussions. The DOE stated that the presentation would provide the basis for going to “closed-pending.” The DOE then presented the information in various acceptance criteria (AC).

The DOE divided the Component 3 presentation into three parts with their associated AC: (1) Degradation of Engineered Barriers, (2) Quantity and Chemistry of Water Contacting Waste Packages and Waste Forms, and (3) Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Flow.

In the discussion of the degradation of engineered barriers, the DOE addressed two issues: (1) the adequacy of treatment of seismic and thermal loading in drift degradation analysis, and (2) assumption of thermal load initial conditions for thermal-hydrological effects on the engineered barrier environment.

The DOE stated that the effect of floor heave on engineered barrier system performance has been screened out because the predicted displacement is only about 10 millimeters. The NRC asked whether the DOE was counting on the drifts remaining stable for the entire 10,000 year

period. The DOE stated that its analysis results showed that there will be only 40 cubic meters of fallen rock in one kilometer length of the drift. The NRC asked what the effects of natural backfill on engineered barrier system component temperatures would be. The DOE stated that the thermal effects results would be similar to and generally bounded by the analysis which was done for the design option that included backfill.

The DOE stated that as a basis for closure of the fracture permeability issue, it was considering additional modeling to evaluate spatial heterogeneity effects, which would include major faults and other permeable features. The DOE has identified spatial heterogeneity of fracture characteristics as a potentially important factor for seepage during the thermal period, as well as for post-thermal (ambient) seepage. The DOE has a three-dimensional study underway which incorporates fracture sets used in the Drift Degradation Analysis. This study will provide a basis for resolution by estimating the fracture permeability over time resulting from thermal-mechanical effects. Results will be documented in the Coupled Thermal-Hydrologic-Mechanical Effects on Permeability AMR.

In the discussion of the quantity and chemistry of water contacting waste packages and waste forms, the DOE addressed six NRC issues: (1) evaluation of changes in drift geometry on water chemistry and quantity, (2) technical basis for parameters used to assess thermal-mechanical effects on hydrological properties, (3) technical basis for temperature distributions used in ventilation design, (4) alternative conceptual models to assess effects of changes in drift geometry, (5) alternative conceptual models to assess effects of changes in rock mass hydrological properties, and (6) alternative conceptual models to assess effects of changes in ventilation on water chemistry and quantity.

The DOE stated that thermal-hydrologic-mechanical effects on fracture permeabilities will vary for horizontal and vertical fractures that are in close proximity to drift openings. The NRC asked if water from the pillar will be diverted to the drifts. The DOE responded that its evaluation indicates that water diversion from pillar to drift is unlikely.

The NRC commented that the drift scale models are not adequate to capture thermal-mechanical effects on flow (a repository scale is required). The DOE described current models for evaluating the effects of changes in fracture properties, on flow fields in the host rock, and the potential for drift seepage. These models indicated that changes in fracture permeability of up to two orders of magnitude (comparable to existing variability) would not significantly change the flow fields or the potential for lateral diversion. Also, the vertical permeability in the pillars will likely remain more than sufficient for vertical drainage, given the magnitude of permeability changes which are expected to occur.

The NRC questioned whether drift collapse has been considered in drift seepage and accounted for in the TSPA code. The DOE stated that based on results from the Drift Degradation Analysis, the volume of rock expected to fall into a drift is small and has no significant impact on the seepage into the drift.

The DOE presented a basis for resolution of fracture permeability that includes a Distinct Element Analysis which: incorporates discrete fractures, provides stress redistribution due to local shearing along fractures, includes shear effects on permeability, and uses the cubic law to relate fracture deformation to permeability change.

The NRC asked why the model was set up to examine changes around the drift but not in the pillar. The DOE stated that the model will be modified in the future to include regions of the pillar that may affect seepage into the drift. The NRC asked for more information pertaining to the choice of fracture pattern. The DOE stated that the fracture pattern was selected to be consistent with hydrologic flow models.

The NRC questioned the primary sources of fracture data used in the three-dimensional discontinuum model. The DOE responded that the orientation data were taken from the Fracture Geometry Analysis AMR and the spacing data were taken from the Calibrated Rock Properties AMR. The NRC asked if the sensitivity analysis will include permeability changes in the pillar. The DOE stated it would.

The NRC asked how flux would be affected by changes in fracture aperture in the pillar. The DOE stated that experimental data does not indicate that changes in permeability in the pillars could lead to lateral diversion. The NRC noted that thermal loads are not accounted for in the pillars. The DOE acknowledged that repository thermal loading is not accounted for in the data. The NRC asked how major faults are being considered. The DOE stated that sensitivity analyses addressing this issue are planned and will consist of thermal hydrology modeling with spatially heterogeneous fractured properties. The NRC questioned how the DOE could consider its drift seepage analysis to be conservative though complete collapse of drifts was not accounted for in the analysis. The DOE stated that complete collapse is highly unlikely.

RDTME Subissue 3, Overall Status

As a result of additional discussions, the NRC and DOE reached 21 agreements for Subissue #3 (see Attachment 1). With these 21 agreements, the NRC stated that Subissue #3 could be listed as "closed-pending."

5) Public Comments

Ms. Judy Treichel (Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force) commented that (1) proposed 10 CFR Part 63 should not be used at this point since it is not final and that, 10 CFR Part 60 would be more appropriate, (2) the NRC should understand in more detail the DOE reliance on ventilation and ground support for the first 300 years, and (3) the NRC should not list subissues as "closed-pending" if the DOE states that it is still considering what course of action to take. Regarding the first issue, the NRC stated that the Commission directed that staff use a risk-informed, performance-based approach for Yucca Mountain. Proposed 10 CFR Part 63 was developed with this in mind and, for this reason, the NRC uses it as a reference in meetings with the DOE. When the final rule is published, the NRC will revisit each of the key technical issues to determine if additional information is needed from the DOE and whether the current status of the issue is appropriate. The NRC acknowledged the validity of Ms. Treichel's second comment. Regarding her third comment, the NRC stated that it had reviewed past agreements

and believed it was using the word "consider" appropriately in its agreements with the DOE. The NRC requested that Ms. Treichel identify specific agreements with which she takes issue and the NRC would discuss them with her.

King Stablein 2/9/01

C. William Reamer
Chief, High Level Waste Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dennis R. Williams 2/9/2001

Dennis R. Williams
Deputy Assistant Manager
Office of Licensing & Regulatory Compliance
Department of Energy

Summary of the Resolution of the Key Technical Issue on Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects

<u>Subissue #</u>	<u>Subissue Title</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>NRC/DOE Agreements</u>
1	Implementation of an effective design control process within the overall quality assurance program	Closed	N/A
2	Design of the geologic repository operations area for the effects of seismic vents and direct fault disruption	Closed-Pending	<p>1) Provide Topical Report 3, Preclosure Seismic Design Inputs for a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain. Consistent with SDS Subissue 2, Agreement 2, the DOE will provide Seismic Topical Report 3, <i>Preclosure Seismic Design Inputs for a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain</i>, expected to be available to the NRC in January 2002.</p> <p>2) Provide the substantive technical content of Topical Report 3. The DOE will provide the preliminary seismic design input data sets used in Site Recommendation design analyses to the NRC by April 2001. The DOE will provide the draft final seismic design inputs for license application via an Appendix 7 meeting after calculations are complete prior to delivery of Seismic Topical Report 3.</p>

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance	Closed-Pending	<p>1) Provide the technical basis for the range of relative humidities, as well as the potential occurrence of localized liquid phase water, and resulting affects on ground support systems. The DOE will provide the technical basis for the range of relative humidity and temperature, and the potential effects of localized liquid phase water on ground support systems, during the forced ventilation preclosure period, in the <i>Longevity of Emplacement Drift Ground Support Materials</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000003 Rev 01, and revision 1 of the <i>Ventilation Model</i>, ANL-EBS-MD-000030, analysis and model reports. These are expected to be available to NRC in September and March 2001, respectively.</p> <p>2) Provide the critical combinations of in-situ, thermal, and seismic stresses, together with their technical bases, and their impacts on ground support performance. The DOE will examine the critical combinations of in-situ, thermal, and seismic stresses, together with their technical bases and their impacts on preclosure ground support performance. These results will be documented in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>3) Provide the Seismic Design Inputs AMR and the Preclosure Seismic Design Inputs for a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Seismic Topical Report 3. Consistent with SDS Subissue 2, Agreement 2, the DOE will provide the <i>Seismic Design Inputs</i> analysis and model report and <i>Preclosure Seismic Design Inputs for a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain</i>, Seismic Topical Report 3. These documents are expected to be available to NRC in January 2002.</p>
---	---	----------------	--

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.	<p>4) Provide in the Design Parameter Analysis Report (or some other document) site-specific properties of the host rock, as a minimum those included in the NRC handout, together with the spatial and temporal variations and uncertainties in such properties, as an update to the information contained in the March 1997 Yucca Mountain Site Geotechnical Report. The DOE will: (1) evaluate the adequacy of the currently available measured and derived data to support the potential repository licensing case and identify areas where available data may warrant additional field measurements or testing to reduce uncertainty. DOE will provide a design parameters analysis report (or other document) that will include the results of these evaluations, expected to be available to NRC in FY 2002; and (2) acquire data and/or perform additional analyses as necessary to respond to the needs identified in 1 above. The DOE will provide these results prior to any potential license application.</p> <p>5) Provide the Rock Mass Classification Analysis (or some other document) including the technical basis for accounting for the effects of lithophysae. The DOE will provide a rock mass classification analysis (or other document), including the technical basis for accounting for the effects of lithophysae, expected to be available to NRC in FY 2002.</p> <p>6) Provide the design sensitivity and uncertainty analyses of the rock support system. The DOE will prepare a scoping analysis to determine the significance of the input parameters for review by NRC staff by August 2002. Once an agreed set of significant parameters has been determined by the DOE and the NRC staff, the DOE will prepare an analysis of the sensitivity and uncertainty of the preclosure rock support system to design parameters in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p>
---	---	---

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.	<p>7) The DOE should account for the effect of sustained loading on intact rock strength or provide justification for not accounting for it. The DOE will assess the effects of sustained loading on intact rock strength. The DOE will provide the results of this assessment in a design parameters analysis report (or other document), expected to be available to NRC in FY 2002.</p> <p>8) Provide the design sensitivity and uncertainty analyses of the fracture pattern (with respect to Subissue 3, Component 1). The DOE will provide sensitivity and uncertainty analysis of fracture patterns (based on observed orientation, spacing, trace length, etc) on the preclosure ground control system design in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>9) Provide appropriate analysis that shows that rock movements in the invert are either controlled or otherwise remain within the range acceptable to provide for retrieval and other necessary operations within the deposal drifts. DOE will provide appropriate analysis that shows rock movements in the floor of the emplacement drift are within the range acceptable for preclosure operations. The analysis results will be provided in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>10) Provide technical basis for the assessment that two-dimensional modeling for emplacement drifts is considered to be adequate, considering the fact that neither the in-situ stress field nor the principle fracture orientation are parallel or perpendicular to emplacement drift orientation. The DOE will provide the technical bases for the modeling methods used in ground control analysis in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p>
---	---	--

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.		<p>11) Provide continuum and discontinuum analyses of ground support system performance that take into account long-term degradation of rockmass and joint strength properties. The DOE will justify the preclosure ground support system design (including the effects of long term degradation of rock mass and joint strength properties) in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>12) Provide dynamic analyses (discontinuum approach) of ground support system performance using site specific ground motion time history as input. The DOE will provide appropriate analyses to include dynamic analyses (discontinuum approach) of preclosure ground support systems, using site specific ground motion time histories as input, in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>13) Provide technical justification for boundary conditions used for continuum and discontinuum modeling used for underground facility design. The DOE will provide the technical justification for boundary conditions used in modeling for preclosure ground control analyses in a revision to the <i>Ground Control for Emplacement Drifts for SR</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000002 (or other document) supporting any potential license application. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p>
---	---	--	--

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.		<p>14) Provide the results of the ventilation modeling being conducted at the University of Nevada-Reno (Multi-Flux code) and validation testing at the Atlas Facility (validation of the ventilation model based on the ANSYS code), including: 1) the technical bases for the adequacy of discretization used in these models and 2) the technical bases for the applicability of the modeling results to prediction of heat removal from the repository. The DOE will provide the results of the ventilation tests in a update to the <i>Ventilation Model</i>, ANL-EBS-MD-000030, analysis and model report including: 1) the technical bases for the adequacy of discretization used in these models and 2) the technical bases for the applicability of the modeling results to prediction of heat removal from the repository. This is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2002.</p> <p>15) Provide field data and analysis of rock bridges between rock joints that are treated as cohesion in DRKBA modeling together with a technical basis for how a reduction in cohesion adequately accounts for thermal effects. The DOE will provide clarification of the approach and technical basis for how reduction in cohesion adequately accounts for thermal effects, including any additional applicable supporting data and analyses. Additionally, the adequacy of the cohesion reduction approach will be verified according to the approach described in Subissue 3, Agreement 22, of the Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects Technical Exchange. This will be documented in a revision to the <i>Drift Degradation Analysis</i>, ANL-EBS-MD-000027, expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>16) Provide a technical basis for the DOE position that the method used to model joint planes as circular discs does not under-represent the smaller trace-length fractures. The DOE will analyze the available small trace-length fracture data from the Exploratory Studies Facility and Enhanced Characterization of the Repository Block, including their effect on block development. This will be documented in a revision to the <i>Drift Degradation Analysis</i>, ANL-EBS-MD-000027, expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p>
---	---	--	--

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.		<p>17) Provide the technical basis for effective maximum rock size including consideration of the effect of variation of the joint dip angle. The DOE will provide the technical basis for effective maximum rock size including consideration of the effect of variation of the joint dip angle. This will be documented in revisions to the <i>Drift Degradation Analysis</i>, ANL-EBS-MD-000027, and the <i>Rockfall on Drip Shield</i>, CAL-EBS-ME-000001, expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>18) Provide a technical basis for a stress measure that can be used as the equivalent uniaxial stress for assessing the susceptibility of the various engineered barrier system materials to stress corrosion cracking (SCC). The proposed stress measure must be consistent and compatible with the methods proposed by the DOE to assess SCC of the containers in WAPDEG and in accordance with the agreements reached at the CLST Technical Exchange. The DOE will include a detailed discussion of the stress measure used to determine nucleation of stress corrosion cracks in the calculations performed to evaluate waste package barriers and the drip shield against stress corrosion cracking criterion. DOE will include these descriptions in future revisions of the following: <i>Design Analysis for UCF Waste Packages</i>, ANL-UDC-MD-000001, <i>Design Analysis for the Defense High-Level Waste Disposal Container</i>, ANL-DDC-ME-000001, <i>Design Analysis for the Naval SNF Waste Package</i>, ANL-UDC-ME-000001, and <i>Design Analysis for the Ex-Container Components</i>, ANL-XCS-ME-000001. The stresses reported in these documents will be used in WAPDEG and will be consistent with the agreements and associated schedule made at the Container Life and Source Term Technical Exchange (Subissue 1, Agreement 14, Subissue 6, Agreement 1).</p>
3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.		<p>19) The acceptability of the process models that determine whether rockfall can be screened out from performance assessment abstractions needs to be substantiated by the DOE by doing the following: (1) provide revised DRKBA analyses using appropriate range of strength properties for rock joints from the Design Analysis Parameters Report, accounting for their long-term degradation; (2) provide an analysis of block sizes based on the full distribution of joint trace length data from the Fracture Geometry Analysis Report for the Stratigraphic Units of the Repository Host Horizon, including</p>

			<p>small joints trace lengths; (3) verify the results of the revised DRKBA analyses using: (a) appropriate boundary conditions for thermal and seismic loading; (b) critical fracture patterns from the DRKBA Monte Carlo simulations (at least two patterns for each rock unit); (c) thermal and mechanical properties for rock blocks and joints from the Design Analysis Parameters Report; (d) long-term degradation of rock block and joint strength parameters; and (e) site-specific groundmotion time histories appropriate for post-closure period; provide a detailed documentation of the analyses results; and (4) in view of the uncertainties related to the rockfall analyses and the importance of the outcome of the analyses to the performance of the repository, evaluate the impacts of rockfall in performance assessment calculations. DOE believes that the <i>Drift Degradation Analysis</i> is consistent with current understanding of the Yucca Mountain site and the level of detail of the design to date. As understanding of the site and the design evolve, DOE will: (1) provide revised DRKBA analyses using appropriate range of strength properties for rock joints from a design parameters analysis report (or other document), accounting for their long-term degradation; (2) provide an analysis of block sizes based on the full distribution of joint trace length data from the <i>Fracture Geometry Analysis for the Stratigraphic Units of the Repository Host Horizon</i>, ANL-EBS-GE-000006, supplemented by available small joint trace length data; (3) verify the results of the revised DRKBA analyses using: (a) appropriate boundary conditions for thermal and seismic loading; (b) critical fracture patterns from the DRKBA Monte Carlo simulations (at least two patterns for each rock unit); (c) thermal and mechanical properties for rock blocks and joints from a design parameters analysis report (or other document); (d) long-term degradation of joint strength parameters; and (e) site-specific ground motion time histories appropriate for post-closure period. This will be documented in a revision to the <i>Drift Degradation Analysis</i>, ANL-EBS-MD-000027, expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003. Based on the results of the analyses above and subsequent drip shield calculation revisions, DOE will reconsider the screening decision for inclusion or exclusion of rockfall in performance assessment analysis. Any changes to screening decisions will be documented in analyses prior to any potential license application.</p>
--	--	--	--

3	Thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance - cont.		<p>20) Provide the sensitivity analyses including the effects of boundary conditions, coefficient of thermal expansion, fracture distributions, rock mass and fracture properties, and drift degradation (from Subissue 3, Component 3, Slide 39). The DOE will provide sensitivity analyses of thermal-mechanical effects on fracture permeability, including the effects of boundary conditions, coefficient of thermal expansion, fracture distributions, rock mass and fracture properties, and drift degradation. This will be provided consistent with site data and integrated with appropriate models in a future revision to the <i>Coupled Thermal Hydrologic Mechanical Effects on Permeability</i>, ANL-NBS-HS-000037, and is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p> <p>21) Provide the results of additional validation analysis of field tests (from Subissue 3, Component 3, Slide 39). The DOE will provide the results of additional validation analysis of field tests related to the thermal-mechanical effects on fracture permeability in a future revision to the <i>Coupled Thermal Hydrologic Mechanical Effects on Permeability</i>, ANL-NBS-HS-000037, and is expected to be available to NRC in FY 2003.</p>
4	Design and long-term contribution of repository seals in meeting post-closure performance objectives	Closed	N/A

Technical Exchange with DOE, Las Vegas

1. Design Parameter Analysis Report (Page 11, Delta Analysis)

(i) Laboratory Measurement

1. For each type of test (e.g., uniaxial compression, triaxial compression, etc.)

Intact Rock Properties:

- ▶ Number of tests
- ▶ Procedures used
- ▶ Measured results
- ▶ Interpretation of results (e.g., m_i , σ_c , etc.) including intermediate parameters

Joint Properties

- ▶ Number of tests
- ▶ Procedures used
- ▶ Measured results
- ▶ Interpretation of results (e.g., normal and shear stiffnesses, friction angle etc.) including intermediate parameters

Thermal Properties

- ▶ Number of tests
- ▶ Procedures used
- ▶ Measured results
- ▶ Interpretation of results (e.g., thermal expansion coefficient, etc.) including intermediate parameters

(ii) Rock Mass Properties Determination

Rock Mass Quality Data (Q, RMR)

- ▶ Actual measurements used in estimation of the rock mass quality data
- ▶ Incorporation of laboratory and mapped information
- ▶ Fracture data
- ▶ Process of data reduction

(iii) Estimation of Rock Mass Mechanical Properties (e.g., Young's modulus, thermal expansion coefficient, etc.) from Q and RMR

- ▶ Procedure or methodology used for data reduction
- ▶ Interpretation of data
- ▶ Verification of data reduction procedures
- Plate Loading Tests

- ▶ Procedure or methodology used
- ▶ Interpretation of results

☐ Thermal Expansion Coefficient

- ▶ Test procedure
- ▶ Procedure or methodology used for data reduction
- ▶ Interpretation of results
- ▶ Comparison of test results with rock mass properties

(iv) Estimation of Rock Mass Strength Properties from Q and RMR

- ▶ Procedure or methodology used for data reduction
- ▶ Interpretation of data

(v) Field Measurement

(vi) Data Collection and Interpretation of Thermal Test Results

- ▶ Verification of empirical relationships by correlating with heater test results

DOE-NRC Technical Exchange Agenda
**KEY TECHNICAL ISSUES ON REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-
MECHANICAL EFFECTS**
Regent Hotel
Las Vegas, Nevada
February 6 through 8, 2001

Objective: Provide the basis to resolve open issues related to the Key Technical Issue (KTIs) on Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects.

Times are approximate because the agenda items are expected to provide a framework for wider ranging discussions. Time allotted for each presentation includes time for the DOE presentation and time for accompanying discussion.

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 8:00-8:20 AM | Introduction/Objectives/Logistics – Opening Remarks (DOE/NRC)
Purpose of the Interaction |
| 8:20-8:40 AM | Key Technical Issue on Repository Design and Thermal-Mechanical Effects
– Summary of Status from DOE Perspective (DOE-Lachman) |
| 8:40-9:40 AM | Subissue 1- Status of implementation of an effective design control process within the overall quality assurance program (DOE/McKenzie)
Subissue 2- Status of design of the geologic repository operations area for the effects of seismic events and direct fault disruption (DOE/Quittmeyer)
Subissue 4- Design and Long-Term Contribution of Seals to Performance (DOE/McKenzie) |
| 9:40-10:45 AM | Caucus on RDTME Subissues 1, 2 & 4 |
| 10:45-11:00 AM | BREAK |
| 11:00-11:30 PM | DOE/NRC Discussion of Resolution Status of RDTME Subissues 1, 2 & 4 |
| 11:30-12:30 PM | LUNCH |
| 12:30-1:00 PM | RDTME FEPS Overview (Peter Swift) |
| 1:00-2:15 PM | Subissue 3- Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 1- Thermal-mechanical effects on design and performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acceptance Criterion 1 – Design assumptions, codes, and standards used for the design of subsurface facility SSCs important to safety are acceptable(DOE/Thom)• Acceptance Criterion 3 - Materials and material properties used for the subsurface facility design are appropriate (DOE/McKenzie) |

DOE-NRC Technical Exchange Agenda
KEY TECHNICAL ISSUES ON REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-MECHANICAL
EFFECTS
Regent Hotel
Las Vegas, Nevada
February 6 through 8, 2001

- Acceptance Criterion 4 – Design analyses use appropriate load combinations for normal and Category 1 and 2 event sequence conditions (DOE/Duan)

2:15-2:30 PM Break

2:30-3:30 PM **Subissue 3- Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 1- Thermal-mechanical effects on design and performance (continued)**

- Acceptance Criterion 5 – Design Analyses use appropriate models and site-specific properties of the host rock and consider spatial and temporal variation and uncertainties in such properties (DOE/Duan)

3:30-4:30 PM Caucus on RDTME Subissue 3, Component 1 - Acceptance Criteria 1 through 5

4:30-5:30 PM DOE/NRC Discussion of Resolution Status of RDTME Subissue 3-Component 1, Acceptance Criteria 1 through 5

5:30-6:00 PM Closing Comments

6:00 PM Adjourn first day

Wednesday, February 7, 2001

Subissue 3- Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 1- Thermal-mechanical effects on design and performance (continued)

8:00-9:00 AM Acceptance Criterion 6 – The design of ground support systems is based on appropriate design methodologies and interpretations of modeling results (DOE/Duan)

9:00-10:00 AM Acceptance Criterion 7 – The subsurface ventilation systems are adequately designed (DOE/McKenzie)

10:00-10:15 AM Break

10:15-11:45 AM Caucus on RDTME Subissue 3, Component 1 – Acceptance Criteria 6 and 7

11:45-1:00 PM LUNCH

DOE-NRC Technical Exchange Agenda
KEY TECHNICAL ISSUES ON REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-MECHANICAL
EFFECTS
Regent Hotel
Las Vegas, Nevada
February 6 through 8, 2001

- 1:00-1:30 PM DOE-NRC discussion of resolution status of Subissue 3, Component 1, Acceptance Criteria 6 and 7
- 1:30-4:30 PM **Subissue 3: Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 2-Effects of seismically induced rockfall on the engineered barrier system performance**
- Acceptance Criterion 1 – Important design features, physical phenomena and couplings, and consistent and appropriate assumptions have been identified and described sufficiently for incorporation into abstraction of mechanical disruption of EB components. (DOE/Kicker)
 - Acceptance Criterion 2 – Sufficient data pertaining to the EB materials mechanical failure processes, and the characterization of potential disruptive events are available to adequately define relevant parameters and conceptual models. (DOE/Bennett)
 - Acceptance Criterion 3 – Parameter values, assumed ranges, probability distributions, and bounding assumptions used in the MDEB abstraction are consistent, technically defensible, and account for uncertainties and variables. (DOE/Bennett)
- 4:30-5:00PM Closing Comments
- 5:00 PM Adjourn Second Day

Thursday, February 8, 2001

- 8:00-9:00 AM **Subissue 3: Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 2-Effects of Seismically induced rockfall on the engineered barrier system performance-(continued)**
- Acceptance Criterion 4 –Alternative modeling approaches are investigated and results and limitations are appropriately factored into the MDEB abstraction (DOE/Kicker)
- 9:00-10:00 AM Caucus on RDTME Subissue 3, Component 2, Acceptance Criteria 1 through 4
- 10:00-10:15 AM BREAK
- 10:15-11:15 PM DOE-NRC discussion on RDTME Subissue 3, Component 2, Acceptance Criteria 1 through 4

DOE-NRC Technical Exchange Agenda
KEY TECHNICAL ISSUES ON REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-MECHANICAL
EFFECTS
Regent Hotel
Las Vegas, Nevada
February 6 through 8, 2001

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 11:15-12:15 PM | Subissue 3: Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 3 – Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Flow into Emplacement Drifts <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Degradation of Engineered Barriers.(DOE/MacKinnon) |
| 12:15-1:15 PM | LUNCH |
| 1:15-2:15 PM | Subissue 3: Status of thermal-mechanical effects on underground facility design and performance. Component 3 – Thermal-Mechanical Effects on Flow into Emplacement Drifts (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Quantity and Chemistry of Water Contacting Waste Packages and Waste Forms (DOE/MacKinnon, Bodvarsson, Hardin, Blair)• Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Flow (DOE/MacKinnon) |
| 2:15-2:30 PM | BREAK |
| 2:30-3:30 PM | Caucus on RDTME Subissue 3, Component 3 |
| 3:30-4:30 PM | DOE-NRC Discussion on RDTME Subissue 3, Component 3 |
| 4:30-5:30 PM | DOE caucus to discuss proposed agreements |
| 5:30-6:00 PM | Closing Comments |
| 6:00 PM | Adjourn Technical Exchange |

REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-MECHANICAL EFFECTS
TECHNICAL EXCHANGE AND MANAGEMENT MEETING
FEBRUARY 6-8, 2001
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NUMBER
Jim Andersen	NRC/NMSS/DWM	301-415-5717
King Stabilein	NRC/NMSS/DWM/HLWB	301-415-7445
RAVAB JAGANNATH	NRC/NMSS/DWM/HLWB	301-415-6653
MYSOORE(Raj) Nataraja	NRC/DWM	301-415-6695
Asadul H. Chowdhury	CNWRA	210-522-5151
Simon Hsiung	CNWRA	210-522-5209
Goodhue Ofoegbu	CNWRA	210-522-6641
Antonio Gudi	CNWRA	210-522-5814
BISWAJIT DASGUPTA	CNWRA	210-522-6815
Doug Gute	CNWRA	210.522.2307
DAN MCGREGOR	CRWMS M&O/PA	572-425-2076
April Gil	DOE/YMP/OLRC	702-794-5578
Fri DUAN	CRWMS M&O	702-295-4491
DAN MCKENZIE	M&O	702-295-4393
DWAYNE KICKER	M&O	702 295 0251
RICHARD QUITMEYER	M&O/AR&T/SI	702-295-3551
DAVID LANIER	M&O/LICENSING	702-295-5331
Tom Beckman	M&O/LICENSING	702-295-4392
TIM GUNTER	DOE/YMSCO	702-794-1343
Carl Hauln	DOE/YMSCO	702-794-1324
DAVID R WILLIAMS	DOE/YMSCO	702-794-5526
Kirk Lachman	DOE/YMSCO	702-794-5096
Harris Greenberg	MTS/BAH	702-794-1385
George Hellstrom	DOE/YMSCO	702-794-5519
Patricia Campbell	Winston & Strawn	202-371-5828
DAVID SASSANI	MTS/G&E	702-794-5501
Isa Rodriguez	M&O/CBWL	570-486-4789
Martin Haas	DOE/YMSCO	702 295 4899

**REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-MECHANICAL EFFECTS
TECHNICAL EXCHANGE AND MANAGEMENT MEETING
FEBRUARY 6-8, 2001
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA**

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NUMBER
Nick DiNunzio	DOE OGC	202-586-8953
Kal Bhattacharyya	M&E	702-295-4414
ROBERT HOWARD	M&O PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	702 295-3097
Jim Linhart	USNFA-LV	(702) 295-0366
Jim Snyder	NR	702-295-2465
CHARLES FAIRHURST	Itasca Consulting Inc Group	612-371-4711
TERJE BRANDSHAUG	Itasca Consulting Gp. Inc	612-371-4711
Stephen Blair	LLNL - M&O	925-422-6467
Steve Sobkowinski	MTS	702-794-1364
JAMIE GONZALEZ	DOE SUBSURFACE DESIGN	702-794-5454
Darrell Gardner	M&O Licensing	702-295-5337
Michael Scott	M&O / Duke ETS	702-295-3016
Richard Slayden	M&O	702-295-5465
Ardyth Simmons	M&O / LBNL	56-486-7106
EVON TIESSENHAUSEN	CLARK COUNTY	702 455-5184
BOB BOUTIN	BSC	(702) 304-5869
JEFF STEINHOFF	M&O - SSD	702-295-4832
JOHN H. PYE	USNWTRB	702-656-0868
ROBERT SANDERS	M&O SSD	702 295 4380
ROGER KELLER	M&O SSD	702-295-4503
Reina Downing	Nye County	775-727-7727
George Penneil	M&O LICENSING	702-295-5324
Hang Yang	M&O SSD ✓	702-295-7860
Bruce Stanley	M&O SSD	702-295-1758
Ming Lin	M&O SSD	702-295-0327
Michael Itamura	M&O / SNL	505-284-4815
Jinghua Leem	M&O / Duke	702-295-6779

**REPOSITORY DESIGN AND THERMAL-MECHANICAL EFFECTS
TECHNICAL EXCHANGE AND MANAGEMENT MEETING
FEBRUARY 6-8, 2001
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA**

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NUMBER
C. Barry Titem	M&O	295-3952
Ernest Hardin	M&O	702/295 3897
Kathy Gaither	SNL/M&O	505-844-5019
CARL STEPP	URS/M&O	830-833-5446
Steve Freshman	NV NRC	775-687-3744
Judy Treichel	NV NRC	702-248-1127
LINDA LEHMANN	STATE OF NEVADA	(952) 496-0594
WESLEY C. PATRICK	CNWR	210-522-5158
Sitakanta Mohanty	CNWR	210-522-5155
ROBERT K. JOHNSON	US NRC	301-415-6900
BOB BRADBURY	MTS	(702) 794-5424
WILLIAM HINZE	PURDUE (ACNU)	765-583-2530
YIMING SUN	M&O	702-295-4537
ALF WIKJORD	AECL / DOE	702-794-5067
Diego Suarez	M&O / subsurface Design	702/295-7847
S.T. CEREGHINO	BSC	702-243-3943
Lorraine DeGarmo	M&O	702-295-5488
David Haught	DOE	702-794-5474
Ernest Lindner	M&O	702-295-4060
Clinton Lum	M&O	702/295-5745
Ken Gilkerson	STATSS - GA	702/295-2950
Guy Ragan	M&O	702-295-7588
Zekai Ceylan	M&O	702-295-4744
Scott M. Bennett	M&O	702-295-4663
PHILIP JUSTUS	U.S. NRC	301 415 6745

JOHN STAMATAKOS	CNWR	210 522 8247
-----------------	------	--------------

Jim Nowak	M&O SNL	505 284 4810
Robert MacKinnon	M&O SNL	505-844-1069