

Continued

— How will Nevada and other stakeholders be involved in these various phases?

- What is the relationship between the environmental impact statement (EIS) and site-suitability determination?
- What is the difference in the level of performance assessment needed to support site suitability and that needed to support the EIS?
- How will Nevada and other stakeholders be involved in site-suitability assessment?
- How could deliberations of the NAS committee on standards affect site suitability?
- Expert judgment and peer review in site-suitability determination
 - When and how will the different forms of expert judgment (such as formally elicited judgments, informal advice from individual experts, and peer review teams) be used?
 - The use of outside (of the DOE and its contractors) expert judgment
 - Status of DOE follow-up on recommendations from 1992 Expert Judgment Workshop

10:05 A.M.

BREAK (15 minutes)

10:20 A.M.

The NRC view of and its role in the DOE's site-suitability assessment

[Malcolm Knapp](#), NRC

- The NRC's role in site-suitability assessments made in compliance to 10 CFR 960
- The relationship between 10 CFR 960 assessments and assessments for licensing under 10 CFR 60
- Do 10 CFR 960 and 10 CFR 60 require different levels of data collection?

10:50 A.M.

Comments by the state of Nevada on the process of determining site suitability

Steve Frishman

Nuclear Waste Projects Office

Continued

11:45 A.M.

LUNCH (1 hour and 15 minutes)

1:10 P.M.

Comments by the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) on the process of determining site suitability
[Steven Kraft](#), NEI

12:45 P.M.

Exploration, testing, and data collection priorities for technical site-suitability determination and licensing, and their rationale

[Jean Younker](#)

Management and Operating Contractor (M&O) — TRW Environmental Safety Systems, Inc. (TRW)

- The DOE's waste isolation strategy for Yucca Mountain
 - Conceptual model of how radionuclides will be prevented from harming the public and the environment
 - What are the roles of the different barriers and sub-barriers in this strategy?
 - What is the relative importance of these different barriers?
 - How much does this strategy depend upon regulations? For example, what would be the effect of a dose standard or a period of performance longer than 10,000 years?
 - How has the strategy evolved since the SCP?
- Features, events, or processes (potential disqualifiers) that could seriously challenge the viability of the Yucca Mountain site
 - What are they?
 - How easily can they be identified?
- Existing priorities for FY 95 and beyond and their rationale
 - What are they?
 - What was the process used in determining them?
 - What are the underlying technical bases for these priorities?
 - How will they be implemented?

Continued

- Is thermal loading (e.g. site thermal-hydrologic properties) a DOE technical site-suitability issue? Will it be for the construction authorization application?
- What information and analyses, in addition to those used in determining technical site suitability, will be needed to support an application for construction authorization and a license to receive and possess nuclear materials in the repository?
- Future plans for setting priorities

1:45 P.M.

The Belgian repository concept and the role of engineered and natural barriers

[J. Van Miegroet](#)

The National Agency for Radioactive Waste and Enriched Fissile Materials (ONDRAF/NIRAS)

2:45 P.M.

Crystalline rock repository concepts and the role of engineered and natural barriers

[Edward Patera](#)

Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)

3:20 P.M.

BREAK (15 minutes)

3:40 P.M.

Round-table discussion on natural and engineered barriers and site suitability

Moderator: Garry Brewer, NWTRB

Participants: Stephan Brocoum (DOE), Malcolm Knapp (NRC), Steve Frishman (state of Nevada), Martin Steindler (Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste-NRC), Chris Whipple (Board on Radioactive Waste Management-NAS), William Magavern (Public Citizen), James Curtiss (Winston and Strawn), Thomas Cotton (TRW), Willis Clarke (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), Julie Canepa (LANL), Felton Bingham (Sandia National Laboratories), Gene Roseboom (USGS), and J. Van Miegroet (ONDRAF/NIRAS), Edward Patera (LANL) Jean Younker (TRW)

- Opening presentations by selected participants (five minutes each)

Continued

- Sample discussion topics:
 - What are the regulations and guidelines with respect to limitations on the use of engineered barriers?
 - To what extent can engineered barriers be used to mitigate adverse site conditions?
 - To what extent can engineered barriers be used to reduce uncertainty in the performance of the natural barriers?
 - How do the uncertainties in the performance of engineered and natural barriers compare over different periods of time?
 - What are the advantages of redundancy or diversity among barriers?
 - What are the limitations of analysis in defining optimal configurations of natural and engineered barriers?
 - What types of events should be considered in defining the role of natural and engineered barriers?

5:20 P.M.

Comments from the audience

5:25 P.M.

Summary remarks

Clarence Allen, NWTRB

5:30 P.M.

Closing remarks and adjournment

John Cantlon, Chairman, NWTRB