

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300 Arlington, VA 22201

Winter Board Meeting Agenda

Environmental Issues
Socioeconomic Impacts
Exploratory Studies Facility Update
DOE Waste Isolation Strategy and Program Priorities

Beatty Community Center Beatty, Nevada 89003 Tel: (702) 553-2050

January 10-11, 1995

Tuesday, January 10, 1995

8:30 A.M. Welcome and opening remarks

John Cantlon, Chair

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB)

8:35 A.M. OCRWM program outlook

Lake Barrett

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM)

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

9:05 A.M. Session introduction

Garry Brewer, NWTRB

9:15 A.M. Update on Yucca Mountain environmental monitoring studies

Wendy Dixon

Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Office (YMSCO)

• 10-minute overview of environmental activities at Yucca

Mountain

• Significant results of fiscal year 1994 activities

• Planned changes, including reduction of monitoring from 48

study plots to 15-18 plots

9:25 A.M. Site-characteration effects monitoring and thermal-loading

ecosystem studies

Ronald Green — EG&G Systems, Inc.

Management and Operating Contractor (M&O)

• Plans for thermal-loading ecosystem study

Tuesday, January 10 — continued

10:00 A.M. BREAK (15 minutes)

10:15 A.M. OCRWM strategy for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Chris Kouts, OCRWM

- Plans and schedules for developing multiple environmental impact statements (EIS)
- Estimated costs of NEPA compliance for each EIS and for the OCRWM program overall
- Rationale for the DOE decision on a programmatic EIS
- Coordination of various EISs, especially to maintain consistency of assumptions and analyses
- OCRWM coordination with external EISs, including the sitewide EIS for Nevada Test Site and the DOE spent fuel programmatic EIS
- Actions OCRWM will take to ensure there are no unpleasant surprises when other parties (e.g., EPA) review and comment on the EISs

10:35 A.M. EIS preparation for procurement of multipurpose canisters (MPC)

Gerald Parker, OCRWM

- Overview of plans for EIS development
- Summary of results of scoping meetings: will the EIS evaluate alternate disposal locations or indefinite storage options (at reactor or off-site)? What alternate MPC designs will be considered?
- How will the EIS evaluate the influence of MPC materials and design decisions on disposal?
- MPC decisions: impact on later transportation decisions, e.g., possible requirement for rail transport
- Development of technical information to support the MPC EIS

10:55 A.M. EIS preparation for a Yucca Mountain repository Wendy Dixon, YMSCO

- Overview of plans for EIS development
- Possible alternatives to be considered
- OCRWM coordination of EIS preparation with development of a license application: what steps will the OCRWM take to ensure that the EIS can be adopted by the NRC during licensing?
- Technical information needed to support the EIS

Tuesday, January 10 — continued

11:15 A.M.

Integrating Yucca Mountain site-characterization studies with EIS preparation

Wendy Dixon, YMSCO

- Technical areas (e.g., performance assessment) that support both the site-suitability determination and EIS preparation
- OCRWM determination of EIS needs while planning sitecharacterization studies
- Incorporation of on-going site characterization and performance confirmation information into supplemental EISs

11:30 A.M.

Public questions and comments

12:00 P.M.

LUNCH (1 hour)

SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

1:00 P.M.

Overview of OCRWM socioeconomic impact analyses

Wendy Dixon, YMSCO

1:10 P.M.

Update of OCRWM socioeconomic program

John Carlson — SAIC (M&O)

- Descriptions of current and planned research efforts on "standard" effects
- Methodological approaches
- Findings to date

2:30 P.M.

BREAK (15 minutes)

2:45 P.M.

Panel discussion: state, local & tribal government views of "standard" socioeconomic impact analyses

Les Bradshaw and George Blankenship, Nye County; Dennis Bechtel, Clark County; Robert Loux and Joe Strolin, state of Nevada; Michael Baughman, Intertech Consultants; and Ian Zabarte, Western Shoshone National Council

- What issues should the DOE address in its socioeconomic impact analyses?
- What methods and approaches are most suitable for addressing those issues?
- What findings should the Board be aware of?

4:30 P.M.

Public questions and comments

5:30 P.M.

Recess until 7:00 P.M.

Tuesday, January 10 — continued

7:00 P.M. Reconvene for additional public questions and comments

8:00 P.M. Recess until 8:30 A.M., Wednesday, January 11

NOTE: Recess time may be later, depending on the number of questions/comments.

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

8:30 A.M. Welcome and opening remarks

John Cantlon, NWTRB Chair

8:35 A.M. Session introduction

Edward Cording, NWTRB

DOE WASTE ISOLATION STRATEGY AND PROGRAM

PRIORITIES

8:45 A.M. ESF construction sequence to waste isolation strategy and the

site-suitability determination

Russell Dyer, YMSCO

9:30 A.M. Panel on DOE waste isolatin and containment strategy

Stephan Brocoum, YMSCO; Jean Younker, TRW Environmental Safety Systems, Inc. (M&O); Susan Jones, YMSCO; and Dennis Williams, YMSCO.

The Board would like to continue the dialogue on the DOE's waste isolation strategy and resultant priorities that began at the October Board meeting in Las Vegas, and allow additional time for questions.

- Evolution of the DOE's waste isolation strategy since the Board's October meeting
- Relative importance of the barriers included in the waste isolation strategy
- Features, events, and processes (aka disqualifiers) that could pose a serious challenge to the site's viability
- Correlation between the waste isolation strategy (including possible disqualifiers) and the DOE's testing and exploration

priorities

Wednesday, January 11 — continued

10:15 A.M. Break (15 minutes)

10:30 A.M. Reconvene panel

12:00 P.M. LUNCH (1 hour)

1:00 P.M. ESF testing update

Dennis Williams, YMSCO

- Test alcoves are planned at the upper and lower contacts of the Paint Brush vitric nonwelded tuff unit (PTn), in which geomechanical, hydrogeologic and geochemical tests are to be performed
 - Specific data to be collected in these test alcoves and how will these data support the site-suitability determination
 - Rationale that led to the decision to make this testing of higher priority than all other exploration and testing activities linkage of this high priority to the waste isolation strategy
- A thermal test alcove is to be located in the high lythophysae welded devitrified tuff (TSw1)
 - Data to be obtained: whether it will support the sitesuitability determination, licensing, or both
 - Nonrepresentative (i.e., to repository construction) drill and blast excavation and the introduction of water into the host rock: effects on thermal-testing data
 - Linkage between testing and the reference repository thermal management strategy and the waste isolation strategy

1:20 P.M. Surface-based testing update

Susan Jones, YMSCO

- Until the advent of the program approach, approximately 40 deep dry-drilled boreholes were required for site suitability. This number now appears to be something between 4 and 10.
 - Rationale used to severely reduce the number of deep drillholes

Wednesday, January 11 — continued

1:40 P.M. Update

Update on ESF construction activities Richard Craun, YMSCO

- Current ESF configuration and construction schedule for site suitability and licensing
- Detailed (6th level) fiscal year 1995 ESF budget (WBS 1.2.6).
- Planned production profile (i.e. usage) for the tunnel boring machine (TBM) and the rationale for limiting fiscal year 1995 production to only 1,280 meters (4,200 ft)
- Disposition and daily stand-by costs of TBM crews (3 shifts/day) during TBM shutdown for alcove construction (4 weeks for each alcove)
- Assuming that all alcove construction and exploratory drifting (other than that done by the large TBM) is to be by drill and blast, how is the introduction of water into the geology to be rationalized given the "to be minimized" mandate of 10 CFR 60? Will 10,000 gallons/ft of excavation be used as in the starter tunnel?

2:15 P.M. Public questions and comments

3:15 P.M. Adjournment (Note: May be later, depending on questions/comments.) John Cantlon, NWTRB Chair