

AUG 26 1981

Dr. Colin Heath, Director
Division of Waste Isolation
Office of Nuclear Waste Management
U. S. Department of Energy
Mail Stop B-107
Washington, DC 20545

Dear Dr. Heath:

We have reviewed your letter of August 12, 1981 regarding Licensing Topical Reports (LTR) that you are considering submitting to NRC. In addition to the items listed in your letter, we have developed additional items which should be discussed during the September 1 meeting.

We expect that this meeting will be an initial step in satisfying the need to mutually explore methods for developing consensus on resolution of specific licensing issues. We feel the meeting should center on developing approaches to address the requirements of 10 CFR 60 that will achieve broad acceptance. We should discuss ways to involve the public, other government agencies, and the technical community in this process. We view the goal of this process to be to identify and resolve as early as possible potentially significant licensing issues so that the overall licensing process is completed efficiently, thoroughly and without avoidable delays.

Attached is a list of items and questions, including issues identified in your letter of August 12, that we propose be discussed in the September 1 meeting. We suggest that based on these discussions the group should:

- (1) identify and prioritize important licensing issues which need consensus development;
- (2) estimate schedule requirements to resolve these issues;
- (3) determine to what extent the licensing topical report concept meets these needs; and
- (4) to explore and identify other means (e.g., NRC Technical Position Development) for developing consensus on important issues.

We are looking forward to this opportunity to meet with the DOE staff and discuss development of consensus on the resolution of licensing issues.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
Hubert J. Miller
Hubert J. Miller, Chief
High-Level Waste Technical
Development Branch
Division of Waste Management

Distribution:

WMHT file: 3109

WMHT r/f

CF

NMSS r/f

WM r/f

JB Martin

RE Browning

HJ Miller

JT Greeves

CL Pittiglio & rf/

MJ Bell

OFFICE	Enclosure: As stated	WMHT	WMHT	WMHT		
SURNAME		CL Pittiglio:lmc	JT Greeves	HJ Miller		
DATE		8/25/81	8/25/81	8/26/81		

Topics for Discussion
During 9/1/81 Meeting
Between NRC and DOE

Introduction

In general, the NRC staff considers those issues which are most subjective and which potentially involve the most technical uncertainty (i.e., those issues which will involve the most technical judgement to resolve) should be identified for early discussion and consensus building efforts. In attempting to resolve each issue we believe that efforts should focus on what it takes to demonstrate compliance with the applicable 10 CFR 60 requirements.

A. Issues the NRC staff anticipates developing Technical Positions on.

1. Quality Assurance
2. Retrieval
3. Borehole and Shaft Sealing
4. Geochemical Issues
5. Monitoring Response
6. In-Situ Testing

B. Additional items considered important by the NRC staff

1. Human Intrusion
2. Resource Assessment
3. Test Shaft Excavation Methods
4. Thermomechanical Methods
5. Performance Assessment Methods

6. Radionuclide Release Scenarios
7. Treatment of Uncertainty
8. Long-Term Climatic Analysis
9. Waste Package Containment
10. Ventilation
11. Emergency Response

C. DOE Licensing Topical Reports

1. Performance Modeling
2. Brine Migration
3. Volcanism
4. Pre Application QA
5. Seismicity
6. Human Interference

D. Questions for Discussion

1. What are the appropriate methods for achieving consensus and resolution of issues? This would include methods of documenting such resolutions, so there is little chance for later, unnecessary reopening of issues at a critical time in licensing.
2. What mechanisms are available for involving all interested parties? (NRC, DOE, other government agencies, technical community, industry, etc.)
3. What issues require early consensus development? Issues which require conformance with 10 CFR 60 and may impact early steps in the licensing process should be given priority. For example, what issues are important to resolve prior to the beginning of full site characterization?

4. What are the schedule requirements for review of LTR's by NRC?
5. What is an appropriate mechanism for DOE and NRC to update status of these issues?