

(NOTE: This review plan is being revised to reflect input from RES, ELD, OSP and DOE).

REVIEW PLAN  
FOR  
SITE CHARACTERIZATION REPORTS

DIVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT  
U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Revision 1 - May 1982

8303300122 820930  
PDR WASTE  
WM-10

PDR

REC'D W/DOC 8303300120 820930

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

GENERAL APPROACH TO REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

SITE SELECTION

SITE CHARACTERIZATION PROGRAM

REVIEW PROCEDURE

INTRODUCTION

STEPS IN SCR REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

1.0 ORGANIZATION OF REVIEW

2.0 DEVELOPMENT OF PREPARATORY SCA

3.0 PREPARATION OF DRAFT SCA

4.0 PREPARATION OF FINAL SCA

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

APPENDIX A - SITE ISSUE ANALYSIS FORM

APPENDIX B - TOPICAL OUTLINE OF SCA

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PURPOSE OF SCR REVIEW PLAN:

To indicate how NRC will review each Site Characterization Report (SCR) submitted by DOE and publish a final Site Characterization Analysis (SCA) within 8 to 10 months after SCR receipt.

### GENERAL APPROACH OF SCR REVIEW PLAN:

To work with DOE before SCR receipt, in order to resolve questions on SCR scope and content; review results of investigations conducted to date; identify potential licensing issues; and confer on SC methods, tests and procedures, so the SCA can be completed in a sound and timely fashion.

### SUMMARY OF SCR REVIEW PLAN:

#### ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN ADVANCE OF SCR RECEIPT

- Establish SCR Review Team
- Become Fully Familiar with Site Screening Data and Project Area Investigations
- Systematically Identify, Prioritize and Track Issues
- Participate in Workshops, Meetings and Site Visits with DOE Field Personnel
- Develop Preparatory SCA

### PREPARATION OF SITE CHARACTERIZATION ANALYSIS

- Focus on Major Technical Issues
- Avoid Extensive Treatment of Policy Issues
- Reference Previously Prepared NRC Contractor Reports and Staff Analyses
- Incorporate Public Comments into SCA
- Write SCA in Brief 40 Page Format

## INTRODUCTION

This review plan is developed for use by NRC staff and NRC contractors and consultants who will be involved in the SCR review. The plan provides a set of procedures to prepare for SCR receipt and review, which includes working with DOE to assure that the SCR is of adequate scope and quality and to identify and resolve questions of site characterization plans and approaches. It will be applied to each site for which DOE intends to submit an SCR. The plan is not intended to be a rigid set of procedures; it will be altered as necessary to reflect unique project-specific conditions and the overall evolution of the repository program.

The effective implementation of this review plan depends heavily on obtaining up-to-date, site specific information prior to receipt of the SCR. This will derive from a variety of activities that both precede and are concurrent with each SCR review. These include, to the extent practicable, continuing interactions between NRC and DOE - site visits, topical and programmatic discussions, and other technical interchanges. Interactions will also be needed with other involved parties, such as State agencies, the U.S. Geological Survey, etc.

## BACKGROUND

### Site Characterization (SC)

"Site characterization," as defined in 10 CFR 60, at 46 FR 13980, means the program of exploration and research, both in the laboratory and in the field, undertaken to establish the geologic conditions and the ranges of those parameters of a particular site relevant to the procedures under 10CFR60. Site characterization includes borings, lateral excavations and borings, and in situ testing at depth needed to determine the suitability of the site for a geologic repository and the adequacy of proposed design, but does not include preliminary borings and geophysical testing needed to decide whether site characterization should be undertaken.

The objectives of site characterization (SC) are:

1. To collect pertinent geological and other site characteristic information so that the construction authorization application will be complete enough to enable NRC to do the evaluation required by 10 CFR 60: namely, a meaningful analysis of (a) the suitability of the site to isolate radionuclides and (b) the adequacy of the repository design to site conditions.
2. To collect necessary data from alternative sites and media to permit the NRC to make a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) finding on the site proposed in DOE's license application for construction authorization.

### Site Characterization Report (SCR)

On February 25, 1981, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) promulgated the licensing procedures for the disposal of high-level waste in 10 CFR 60 -- "Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Waste in Geologic Repositories" (46 FR 13971). As part of the pre-licensing procedures set forth in the final rule, the Department of Energy (DOE) is required to submit a Site Characterization Report (SCR) to the NRC as early as possible after commencement of planning for a particular geologic repository operations area and prior to starting site characterization.

The basic purpose of the SCR is clear: to provide a mechanism for identifying problems at a proposed repository site and the plans for resolving them at an early time in order to avoid delays in the licensing process.

It is anticipated that each SCR will be an extensive document covering the many technical and institutional aspects of characterizing a high-level waste repository. Types of information to be provided in the SCR and a uniform format for presenting the information are detailed in the NRC "Standard Format and Content of Site Characterization Reports for High-Level Waste Geologic Repositories" (April 1981 draft, currently being finalized).

The SCR, in accordance with the Standard Format and Content, should accomplish the following:

1. Establish what is known about a site from site screening, selection and exploration activities completed to date,
2. Describe the issues that DOE has identified at a site in light of the results of investigations to date, and
3. Describe the detailed plans of work to provide information so that the NRC can make licensing findings on the issue identified.

#### Site Characterization Analysis (SCA)

##### General Nature of the SCA

The Director of NMSS will prepare a draft SCA after receipt of the SCR and, after a public comment period on the draft SCA, the Director will prepare a final SCA which takes into account comments received and any additional information acquired during the comment period. Included in the final SCA will be either an opinion by the Director that he has no objection to DOE's SC program, if such an opinion is appropriate, or specific objections of the Director to DOE's proceeding with SC at the proposed site.

The SCA is intended to be a concise analysis, approximately 40 to 50 pages in length, which will not provide coverage of all items presented in the SCR. Technical positions, preliminary and supporting analyses, NRC contractor reports and related materials may be provided as appendices to the SCA. For complete understanding of the SCR, readers will need to refer to the SCR and supporting materials submitted by DOE.

#### General Approach to SCA Development

This review plan indicates how NRC will review each SCR and develop a Site Characterization Analysis (SCA) from the Office of the Director of NMSS.

Because of the short turnaround time from receipt of the SCR to issuance of the draft SCA, the draft SCA will be issued approximately 3 months after SCR receipt and prior to public comments on the SCR or the SCA. Elapsed time between receipt of the SCR and publication of the final SCA is expected to be 8 to 10 months, depending in part on the extent of the public comments and the availability of information and data prior to SCR receipt, NRC emphasis will be placed on "advance work" prior to receipt of the SCR. This advance work will consist of activities such as: developing technical background material; reviewing available site data; and establishing and maintaining contact with all necessary DOE staff, DOE contractors, State agencies, and other individuals and organizations who are likely to be involved in the preparation/review of the SCA. Continuing interaction with DOE and other interested parties is essential to NRC's development of a sound and effective SCA in the short time that will be available.

Upon receipt, the SCR will be given a brief acceptance review by the NRC staff to determine whether it contains the information identified in the Standard Format and Content of Site Characterization Reports for High-Level-Waste Geologic Repositories. Once the SCR is accepted, the NRC shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that the SCR has been received and shall make the SCR available at the Public Document Room (PDR). NRC will also transmit copies of the Federal Register notice to the Governor and the legislature of the State and to the chief executive of the municipality (or county or Tribal organization as appropriate) in which a site to be characterized is located and the Governors of any contiguous States.

The NRC staff will critically review the SCR and then prepare a draft SCA. The draft SCA will include consideration of all pre-SCR consultations with DOE, States, the USGS and other organizations. The draft SCA will be published for public comment (the comment period shall not be less than 90 days; all public comments will be available at the

PDR) and transmitted to Governors and chief executives as noted above. The NRC will prepare written responses to State, Indian tribal and local government comments, and shall make these responses available at the PDR. The final SCA will incorporate public comments received by the NRC.

The NRC analysis of the SCR has two main objectives:

1. To review DOE's identification of issues and site characterization program. Specifically, does the SCR adequately:
  - a. establish what is known about a site from site screening, selection and exploration activities completed to date,
  - b. describe the issues that DOE has identified at a site in light of the results of investigations to date, and
  - c. describe the detailed plans for work to provide information so that the NRC can make licensing findings on the issue identified.
2. To examine information on the process by which the site was selected for detailed site characterization. This is to ensure that the DOE will be able to develop a slate of candidate sites that are among the best that can reasonably be found and from which DOE will select its preferred site for construction authorization. As indicated in the supplementary information to the final rule, (10CFR60) (46 FR 13973 February 25, 1981).

Since the DOE program of site characterization will need to be a phased process, NRC expects that the SC plan may be better defined and more detailed for early phases of site characterization (e.g., testing in the exploratory shaft) and less detailed for later phases (e.g., testing in an underground facility with two shafts). As DOE finalizes the plan for later phases of site characterization, additional details can be submitted to NRC in periodic updates to the SCR, as provided for in 10 CFR 60.

The NRC review must encompass the plan for all site characterization activities for gathering information needed (1) to conduct the full 10 CFR Part 60 evaluation of site suitability and acceptability of design and (2) to make required NEPA findings. Although the levels of detail in the SC plan may vary among issues, the NRC review team must ensure that DOE has a plan to adequately address all issues.



## GENERAL APPROACH TO REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

This section of the review plan describes the conditions and procedures which will govern the review of each SCR.

### Site Selection

#### Type of Material for Review

Descriptive material, largely taken from earlier site selection documents. Many documents may be referenced in the SCR; some may be submitted as attachments to the SCR, others may be on file at DOE field offices. As specified in 10 CFR 60, the information will deal with (a) criteria used in selection, (b) method of selection, (c) identification and location of alternative sites in the same and other media, and (d) the decision process by which the site was chosen for characterization.

#### Nature of Analysis

Generally, the purpose of this review is to ensure that DOE has a workable mechanism for ensuring that the screening process will ultimately result in a slate of candidate sites that are among the best that can reasonably be found, as indicated in the supplementary information to the final rule in 46 FR 13973. As indicated in the supplementary information, the object of this screening effort is not to find the "best" site but to assure there is a slate of sites that are among the best. The gauge for evaluating a site will be the prescribed in the criteria of regulations.

- a) Determine reasonableness of site selection method and decision process focusing primarily on the site-specific factors considered in selecting a specific site within a candidate area.
- b) Examine selection criteria for validity and completeness.
- c) Examine descriptions of other sites and media for validity as alternatives.

### Site Characterization Program

#### Type of Material for Review

- (a) Site conditions: (1) reports which describe existing properties of the site, (2) reports on the interpretation of the geologic history of the site, (3) data summaries such as core logs and borehole test

results, and (4) scientific literature relevant to understanding properties or processes which may impact the site. Other data will be available in advance from DOE at the specific site.

- (b) Conceptual repository design: design criteria, functional description, conceptual drawings.
- (c) Waste form and package: design concepts, alternatives.
- (d) Identification and discussion of plans for resolution of issues in siting, design, waste form and performance assessment.
- (e) Site characterization program. Description of tests to be conducted underground, at surface and in laboratory: objective, selected method and technique, application, alternative methods/techniques. Final design of underground test facility: design criteria, drawings, specification. Schedule of activities with milestones, decision points, outputs (reports).
- (f) Description of the quality assurance (QA) program for SC at the selected site, supported (perhaps) by QA reports and documents from other sites. Description should include QA procedures of DOE's principal contractors at the selected site.

#### Nature of Analysis

- (a) Review data and information from investigations to date and evaluate the interpretations by DOE. How was it collected and what is its quality and its relevance to site issues? How are data to be interpreted?
- (b) Evaluate each issue: (i) identification; (ii) importance to site, (iii) degree of resolution; (iv) information specific needs for resolution; and (v) SC investigations needed to develop information for resolution. Analyze data in SCR and at site to determine whether all relevant issues are recognized and developed.
- (c) Determine whether proposed investigations to address outstanding issues are properly conceived. Determine whether appropriate tests, test methods and investigative strategies are proposed. Evaluate appropriateness and reasonableness of program schedule, mileposts and plans. Judge applicability and suitability of QA program,

determine acceptability of activities to be covered under QA;  
determine suitability of QA procedures.

- (d) Examine validity of design criteria and functional description, and adequacy of design. Analyze integration and compatibility of exploratory shaft and underground test facility with repository.
- (e) Check DOE's modeling (if available) of groundwater flow/radionuclide migration. Establish the importance of site-specific variables through sensitivity studies and preliminary modeling based on existing, limited data.

#### Comments

Through site visits and meetings with DOE, to review site data and informally consult on plans, NRC and its contractors should be reasonably familiar with much of this material. The review and analysis will require assistance from outside contractors and consultants with guidance provided by NRC on (1) method and completeness of review, (2) form of output, and (3) timing of review activities.

All personnel involved in SCR review should note that there may be several site reviews and other staff activities going on in parallel (see the WMHT HLW plan). Since there will likely be constraints on time available for SCR reviews, care must be given to determining priorities of issues, levels of detail of analyses, schedules for issue resolution, and other aspects of each SCR review.

## REVIEW PROCEDURE

### Introduction

In preparation for the SCR review, the review team is named and a project manager (PM) is selected. Most of these individuals are members of the NRC's High-Level Waste Technical Development Branch and the High-Level Waste Licensing Management Branch.

For review purposes, the content of the SCR is considered to be embraced within five review topics. Each member of the review team is assigned to one or more review groups. These are:

1. Radionuclide transport - geochemistry, hydrogeology, performance assessment, structural geology.
2. Stability - geochemistry, geomorphology, geophysics, hydrogeology, site exploration, structural geology, tectonics.
3. Repository design - engineering geology, repository design, thermomechanical considerations.
4. Engineered barriers - geochemistry, borehole and shaft seals, underground facility backfill, waste form and package.
5. Institutional concerns - NEPA, environmental site selection, socio-economic and demographic concerns; and state participation under subpart C of 10CFR60.

In a further breakdown of SCR content, each review topic is divided into a group of site issues, which are the basic units for the SCR review and analysis. A site issue is a question about a site that is critical to determination of site suitability and adequacy of repository design at the construction authorization stage. There may be about 25 site issues. All site issues will be linked to performance objectives and requirements of 10 CFR 60.

Among all the site issues at a particular location, the more important ones (identified during the SCR review process), will be thoroughly discussed in the SCA. Such an issue is referred to herein as a prime issue: an important site issue that is of high priority during SC and is discussed in the SCA. There may be about 10 prime issues at a site.

The responsibility of directing and executing the review and analysis of site issues rests with group coordinators, i.e., a designated senior member of a topic review group or section leaders. Because of the extensive interrelationship among issues -- the fact that the data required to

resolve many of them are exactly the same -- there will be a need for operating as teams according to the topics described above. Group coordinators will be appointed with the responsibility of assisting the project manager in: (a) assuring rapid dissemination of relevant information to all group members and assuring that all members are current on each others activities; (b) assuring coordination among specific activities of group members through frequent meetings, phone conferences, etc.; and (c) assuring coordination of reports (e.g. Site Issue Analyses) from group members.

The review and analysis of specific site issues will be carried out by designated issue reviewers, i.e., a review group member who is an NRC staff member, an NRC contractor or an NRC consultant - as determined by the group coordinator and PM. For uniformity of presentation and efficiency of SCA preparation, the analysis of a site issue will be presented on a two-page Site Issue Analysis form (see Appendix A of this review plan). The completed form may be accompanied by one or more pages of supporting material prepared by issue reviewers.

As part of the advance work before receipt of the SCR, a preparatory SCA will be developed utilizing information already in hand. The development will parallel the process indicated for preparation of the draft SCA.

## Steps in SCR Review and Analysis

The SCR analysis involves four main activities:

- 1.0 Organization of Review
- 2.0 Development of Preparatory SCA
- 3.0 Preparation of Draft SCA
- 4.0 Preparation of Final SCA

On the following pages, each of the four main activities is divided into a sequence of numbered steps.

The activities described herein are mainly those to be undertaken by the NRC, its contractors and consultants. These activities depend heavily on an active exchange of information between DOE, NRC and various contractors. The interactions with DOE include site visits, topical discussions and programmatic discussions, all representing a thorough technical interchange to facilitate the review process. In addition, discussions on matters related to the site investigations are expected to be held with a wide range of non-DOE groups, such as the U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Bureau of Mines, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, state groups, and the National Academy of Sciences. These activities are essential parts of this review plan, even though they are, of necessity, somewhat ad hoc in nature and cannot be specifically defined or enumerated. In fact, it is only because of these activities that it will be possible to complete a review of the SCR and prepare an SCA in the limited time that will be available.

### 1.0 Organization of Review

- 1.1 Topic review group convenes with project manager to (a) systematically prepare a comprehensive list of site issues to be handled by the group, (b) assign each site issue to issue reviewers and (c) establish priority among the issues. Site issues will be identified mainly from trip reports, project reviews performed by staff and others and other documents already in hand. At an early time a systematic and comprehensive review of site issues will be tabulated and categorized for tracking purposes.

- 1.2 For each site issue, the responsible issue reviewer prepares a one-page development with (a) statement of the issue, (b) importance of the issue to repository performance, (c) applicable sections of the draft 10 CFR Part 60 and (d) references and sources used in the development.
- 1.3 An inventory of documents and other data that pertain to each site issue is prepared by group members designated by the group coordinator or P.M.
- 1.4 Group coordinator or P.M. (a) sets priorities among assigned site issues, (b) designates responsibilities for review, and (c) establishes priorities and schedules.
- 1.5 PM, in consultation with all involved section leaders, integrates all site issue review schedules from 1.4(c) into an overall project review schedule that (a) sets priorities among all site issues, (b) determines level of effort for SCR review of each site issue, and (c) identifies issue reviewers.

## 2.0 Development of Preparatory SCA

- 2.1 SCR workshop is held to (a) inform all issue reviewers of review plans, procedures and policies, (b) identify information needs of issue reviewers, and (c) plan development of preparatory SCA. (This workshop will provide initial overall coordination of reviews, but frequent meetings will be required by the groups to assure continuing close coordination of group members). The specific products of issue review will be identified and scoped.

[Note: the following is developed assuming that separate reports on each issue will be prepared -- Site Issue Analyses -- and then final reports prepared by P.M. Other options, such as coordinated issue reviews which can be incorporated directly into final reports, will be considered in connection with workshop.]

- 2.2 Each designated issue reviewer prepares a Site Issue Analysis and delivers same to the group coordinator. These analyses will likely be coordinated and combined together where plans for data gathering are virtually the same.

- 2.3 The group coordinator, with assistance from designated issue reviewers (a) edits Site Issue Analyses for clarity, consistency and relevance to review topic and (b) transmits these to PM.
- 2.4 With input from 2.3 above, PM develops a preparatory SCA.

### 3.0 Preparation of Draft SCA

- 3.1 Upon receipt of the SCR, each group coordinator (a) provides each site issue reviewer with relevant portions of the SCR and (b) identifies portions of the SCR review for which each reviewer is responsible.
- 3.2 For each site issue, the issue reviewer prepares a Site Issue Analysis, based on available information, and delivers same to the group coordinator.
- 3.3 Each group coordinator with assistance from selected group members (a) edits the Site Issue Analysis for clarity, consistency and relevance to review topic, (b) combines, in collaboration with other topic reviewers, appropriate Site Issue Analyses into analyses of prime issues and (c) delivers all analyses to PM.
- 3.4 PM (a) prepares draft SCA and (b) combines all Site Issue Analyses into a document for filing in the NRC Public Document Room.

[Note: based on early experience in review, steps 3.1 through 3.4 above may be combined or coordinated to make it a single step process where issue reviewers prepare designated sections of SCA, instead of having PM do this.]

- 3.5 Draft SCA is reviewed (revised) by WMHT and WMHL.
- 3.6 Draft SCA is reviewed (revised) by WM.
- 3.7 Draft SCA is reviewed (revised) by NMSS.
- 3.8 Simultaneously with 3.7, draft SCA is discussed with the Commission and Site Issue Analyses (from 3.4) are docketed.
- 3.9 Draft SCA is published and all Site Issue Analyses are provided for public review in Public Document Room.



4.0 Preparation of Final SCA

- 4.1 During 90 days public comment period, each comment, as received, is assigned by PM to a topic reviewer.
- 4.2 Designated issue reviewers, (a) prepares a draft response to the comment, (b) prepares any needed change in draft SCA and (c) delivers both to the PM.
- 4.3 PM develops final SCA.
- 4.4 After all comments have been evaluated, NRC consults with DOE about proposed changes in the draft SCA.
- 4.5 Designated review team members prepares document covering the response to public comments.
- 4.6 Document in 4.5 is presented to Commission.
- 4.7 Final SCA is reviewed (revised) by WMHT and WMHL.
- 4.8 Final SCA is reviewed (revised) by WM.
- 4.9 Final SCA is reviewed (revised) by WMSS.
- 4.10 Simultaneously with 4.9, SCA is discussed with the Commission.
- 4.11 Final SCA is published.

### SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

In this section, the review schedule of the SCR for BWIP is used as an example to illustrate (1) the interactions between DOE and NRC as an integral part of the review process and (2) the approximate timing of the steps described in the previous section.

Successful completion of the SCA within the time frame provided will depend heavily on a great deal of advance preparation, which will involve an ongoing interchange with DOE on major issues to be investigated during SC. Only the more significant interactions are indicated in the schedule below. Other interactions are expected to include discussions of preliminary draft SCR materials, technical meetings on selected topics, and contacts between the NRC review members and technical personnel of RHO and DOE.

The schedule reflects the expected sequence of activities in reviewing the SCR for any site. However, certain activities run concurrently, and the order of some may be changed to fit the circumstances of a particular SCR submittal. The schedule is based on the premise that the SCR for BWIP will be delivered in September 1982 and the draft SCA will be due four months later.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>
<u>1981</u>	
December	Project manager and review team are nominated
<u>1982</u>	
April - June	SCR review is organized (steps 1.1-1.5).  At the conclusion of step 1.5, the site issues and their priority are discussed with DOE.
July - September	<u>July</u> - SCR workshop is held (step 2.1)

Date (cont'd)

Activity

July - Issue reviewers prepare Site Issue Analyses (step 2.2).

August - Group coordinator, with assistance from designated issue reviewers, prepare Site Issue Analyses in final form (step 2.3)

August - PM prepares preparatory SCA which is distributed to all issue reviews (step 2.4)

May - September - Issue reviewers visit site to collect data, as needed.

Weeks After SCR Receipt

Activity

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 1   | Group coordinator, with assistance from designated issue reviewers screen SCR for materials relative to site issue reviews.  |
| 2   | Relevant material is distributed to issue reviewers by group coordinator (steps 3.1)   |
| 3-4 | Issue reviewers develop Site Issue Analyses for assigned issues (step 3.2)   |
| 5   | Issue reviewers deliver completed Site Issue Analyses and supporting documentation to responsible topic reviewers.   |
| 6   | Project Manager, in consultation with group coordinator, develops priorities for, and analyses of, prime issues.   |
| 7-8 | Project Manager prepares draft SCA; group coordinator, with assistance from designated issue reviewers, finalize Site Issue Analyses, with supporting documentation (step 3.4) |
| 7-8 | Project Manager prepares draft SCA; review group members finalize Site Issue Analyses, with supporting documentation (step 3.4)  |
| 9   | Draft SCA is reviewed at branch level and revised as necessary; draft SCA is submitted, for review., to the Office of Executive Legal Director (step 3.5)                      |
| 10  | Draft SCA is reviewed at division level and revised as necessary (step 3.6)  |

Weeks After SCR Receipt (cont'd)

Activity

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 11 | Draft SCA is reviewed at NMSS office level and revised as necessary (step 3.7)  |
| 12 | Draft SCA is published for public comment; Site Issue Analyses, with supporting documentation, are delivered to Public Document Room for docketing (step 3.9) |

It is expected that the draft SCA will be issued three months after receipt of the SCR. Thereafter, with the beginning of the 90 day public comment period, NRC attention will shift to the processing of public comments and preparation of the final SCA.

The final SCA is expected to be published two months after the close of the public comment period, following the sequence of activities described in 4.0 (previous section). The general schedule is as follows:

Weeks After Close  
of Public Comment Period

Activity

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 1-2 | Group coordinator, with assistance from designated issue reviewers complete processing of public comments. |
| 3-4 | PM prepares final SCA (step 4.3)   |
| 4   | Proposed changes in SCA are discussed with DOE (step 4.4)  |
| 5-8 | Final SCA goes through NRC review chain (steps 4.7-4.9)  |
| 8   | Final SCA is published (step 4.11)   |

APPENDIX A  
SITE ISSUE ANALYSIS

- (1) Name of the site:
- (2) Statement of the issue (in form of a question):
- (3) Importance of the issue to repository performance:
- (4) Portions of 10 CFR 60 that are directly connected to the issue:
- (5) Summary of the present state of knowledge, with analysis of uncertainties:
- (6) Summary of the information needed to close out the issue by the time of construction authorization application:
- (7) Summary of the planned approaches to testing, tests, test methods and investigations to provide the information needs of (6):
- (8) Analysis of (7) as to completeness, practicality and likelihood of success:

APPENDIX B  
TOPICAL OUTLINE OF SCA

Executive Summary

Director's Opinion

Chapter

1. Introduction

Purpose of SC and SCR  
Overview of Licensing Process  
Description of Material Submitted in DOE's SCR  
Description of NRC's SCR Review Process  
Attention to Prime Issues

2. Site Selection Process

Technical Basis  
State Interactions  
Other Sites in Same Medium

3. Radionuclide Transport

Issues  
Plans for Resolution

4. Stability

Issues  
Plans for Resolution

5. Repository Design

Issues  
Plans for Resolution

6. Engineered Barriers, Waste Form and Package

Issues  
Plans for Resolution

7. Summation of Site Issue Analyses

8. Discussion of Prime Issues

9. Analysis of Planned Site Characterization Program

Appendices - Technical position papers and other supporting documents, some of which are prepared in advance of SCR receipt.

References - Documents and other information sources used in preparation of the SCA.



Document Name:  
3104.1/PTP/82/06/01/0

Requestor's ID:  
BEVELYNB

Author's Name:  
Prestholt

Document Comments:  
Review Plan for Site Characterization Report