

## UNITED STATES NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300 Arlington, VA 22201

December 16, 2003

Dr. Margaret S. Y. Chu Director Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management U.S. Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20585

Dear Dr. Chu:

The Board thanks you and the rest of the Yucca Mountain Project team for participating in our September meeting in Amargosa Valley. Your program overview and the presentations by your staff and contractors were very clear and helpful to the Board.

We were pleased to hear that you have completed your selections for key management positions within the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. It appears that you have assembled a highly qualified and competent management team.

Our observations and recommendations from this meeting are presented below.

## **Issues Relating to Natural Characteristics of Yucca Mountain**

*Igneous scenarios.* According to the DOE's estimates, igneous scenarios may dominate the risk to humans from a Yucca Mountain repository. To date, it appears that the DOE intends to pursue only one of the three recommendations made by the Board in its June 30, 2003, letter—study of aeromagnetic anomalies near the Yucca Mountain site. The Board repeats its recommendation that the DOE also conduct modeling studies of compressible fluids and studies of waste package-magma interaction and waste entrainment.

*Enhanced borehole studies.* As plans are developed for drilling aeromagnetic anomalies near Yucca Mountain, the Board encourages the DOE to consider additional development of those boreholes as monitoring wells to obtain hydraulic head, water chemistry, and related hydrogeologic data at relatively small additional cost. Additional hydrogeologic data from these areas may resolve differing hypotheses regarding the direction of water flow in the saturated zone and may provide additional information about the ability of the saturated zone to function as a barrier to migration of radioactive materials.

*Chlorine-36.* The Board encourages the DOE to resolve discrepancies in chlorine-36 studies and agrees with the decision to commission a third-party review that includes integrated chlorine-36 and other bomb-pulse data to help address inconsistencies. Such an integrated

methodology should include the measurement of tritium. If an accepted integrated methodology could be developed, it could enhance understanding of hydrogeologic controls on fast-path flows into the repository and yield a conceptual model consistent with both chlorine-36 and other bomb-pulse data. The Board believes that resolving chlorine-36 discrepancies will require a "root cause" analysis that lays out each step in the procedure, how the discrepancies were addressed by each of the two analytical groups, and what each set of measurements has in common as well as what differences exist and the potential reasons for these differences and actions for resolving them.

## **Issues Relating to Potential Waste Package Corrosion**

*Microbial activity.* Decreasing nitrate concentrations with depth, as shown in one of Bo Bodvarsson's slides, suggest microbial activity. A waste package design that relies on nitrate to reduce the likelihood of localized corrosion must take into account the effects of microbial activity on nitrate concentrations both before and during the thermal pulse.

*Gas pressure.* The maximum temperature at which brines can exist on waste package surfaces is a strong function of gas pressure. Elevated pressures allow brines to exist at higher temperatures, increasing the likelihood that corrosion will be initiated. Even transient elevated pressures could be important. The DOE should provide a careful and complete explanation of gas pressures during the thermal pulse within the drift environment.

## **Issues Relating to Management and Communication**

*Quality/schedule tradeoffs*. The Board appreciates John Arthur's assurance that the license application schedule is not constraining the quality of work within the Yucca Mountain project. The Board strongly agrees with the DOE that a license application should be filed only when appropriate quality standards have been met. A schedule-driven approach to quality management can potentially compromise the safety culture surrounding the preparation of the license application, thereby making the project vulnerable to poor decision-making. The Board emphasizes the importance and inherent long-term efficiency in "taking the time to do it right."

*Repository performance confirmation.* With an operational period that may extend beyond repository closure, it appears that performance confirmation may be a component of the DOE's proposed radioactive waste disposal system that will span licensing, construction, and possibly operation. Thus, performance confirmation holds the possibility of enhancing confidence in repository prediction not only by "confirming" DOE models but also by testing the underlying conceptual, physical, and mathematical bases of those models. The Board encourages the DOE to have a clear understanding of what it means by performance confirmation and integrate it thoroughly with performance assessment and repository design. This includes the need to establish formal management practices that ensure that appropriate interactions occur between these system components. Moreover, the Board believes that the performance confirmation program can benefit significantly from the input of the interested public and affected parties.

*Program integration and communication.* The Board believes that the technical basis documents being developed for the Yucca Mountain Project have significant potential for improving program integration and enhancing program communication with the wider technical community as well as the general public. For gaining the maximum benefit from these documents, integrating their most important conclusions into a concise description of the safety case for a Yucca Mountain repository will be important. However, if the documents are not well integrated or if they contain technical errors, then communication of the safety case to the broad scientific and public audiences will be weakened. Where appropriate, the discussion of relevant analogs can be used as a line of evidence and enhance the DOE's communication.

The Board reiterates the need for early and continuous involvement of interested members of the public and affected parties in transportation planning. This involvement is critical to develop a safe and secure transportation system and to engender public confidence in system performance.

Once again, the Board thanks you and the rest of the Yucca Mountain Project team for participating in the Board's September meeting. We look forward to continuing the Board's ongoing technical and scientific review and to commenting on Project activities in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Corradini Chairman