

MEMO

TO: Barbara Hoditschek
FROM: Connie Walker
RE: Weekly Report, November 6 - November 10, 1995
DATE: November 16, 1995

cc: B.Garcia
S.Zappe

Attached please find the weekly report outlining activities performed during the week of November 6 - November 10, 1995, for the NMED. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.



**NMED SUPPORT
WEEKLY STATUS REPORT
for the period:
November 6 - November 10, 1995**

Status of Work and Progress to Date

A.T.Kearney is currently conducting technical review of the WIPP Part B Permit application, Revision 5, for the Disposal Phase. Detailed review/comment integration for Chapters D, E, and I has been completed, with the final deliverable sent to the NMED on November 6, 1995. The detailed review of Chapters A, B, and C has been completed, with QC comments integrated and the deliverable provided to NMED. On November 8, 1995, A.T.Kearney and NMED met to discuss comments pertaining to Chapters D, E, and I. A meeting was also held on November 9 with DOE to discuss issues pertinent to these Chapters. Review of all remaining Chapters is being finalized.

Percentage of Work Completed and Status of the Schedule:

Total approximate expenditures to date (November 10, 1995), including state sales tax, are approximately \$126,000, which is 74% of the estimated budget for Task 1. Approximately 1450 hours have been expended on Task 1, to date.

Difficulties Encountered and Corrective Actions Taken:

No difficulties were encountered during the last reporting period.

Work In Progress:

Finalization of comments on all remaining Chapters is occurring, with the deliverable currently at internal QC. Final review deliverables for Chapters A, B, C, D, E, and I have been provided to the NMED. A.T.Kearney personnel have begun a preliminary examination of the QAPP (1995) to determine how NMED comments on this document have been addressed by DOE, and the importance these comments could have on the WAP (Chapter C of the permit application). This was conducted in anticipation of a potential conference call/meeting with DOE on this document, as discussed during the November 9 meeting. A white paper, summarizing findings of this review, will be prepared for NMED. Additionally, we have done a preliminary risk assessment calculation using different (more realistic) gas generation values and headspace concentrations to check DOE's assertions within the permit application, recognizing that this should be a limited exercise at this time pending DOE responses to comments on risk assessment issues. Again, a white paper is being prepared for NMED on this evaluation.

Changes in Key Project Personnel:

No changes to key personnel have occurred. However, due to cost constraints, ICF Kaiser personnel will be used to QC Chapters A, B, and C only; remaining QC will be performed by A.T.Kearney personnel, unless otherwise directed by NMED.

Additional Issues and Topics:

As indicated in our weekly report of October 27, 1995, it is anticipated that additional funding could be required to complete our review, given that DOE's responses to NMED comments could be relatively extensive. A memo outlining this request is attached.

MEMO

TO: Barbara Hoditschek
FROM: Connie Walker
DATE: November 14, 1995
RE: Funding, Task 01
cc: S. Zappe
J. Darabaris

As indicated in our weekly report of October 27, 1995, it appears quite probable that a significant level of effort could be required to review the DOE's responses to NMED's information requests regarding the WIPP Part B permit application. Our original cost estimate for this task did not assume that this level of effort would be necessary, hoping that the application would be more adequate than it proved to be. As a result, we believe additional funding may be required to provide the type of review necessary to adequately evaluate DOE's response. We estimate that it could require up to an additional week per consultant (with a maximum of 9 consultants), to perform this review (which makes sense in light of the level of activity that could be required and tight turnaround time). This could translate to an additional \$30,000, assuming the need for additional meetings in Santa Fe. We wish to bring this to the attention of the NMED so that potential funding issues can be addressed prior to initiation of this review cycle.

As indicated above, these estimates are based upon our assumptions regarding the remaining level of effort necessary to complete the first review cycle, and the anticipated responses from DOE. It has also come to our attention that NMED may not require the DOE to revise the permit application at this time to reflect the information request letter requirements, but to instead indicate how issues will be addressed in forthcoming permit application revisions that address the NMED's NOD comments. That is, this would give DOE the option of stating "how" it will address information requests, with the actual permit application revisions to take place in concert with any outstanding NOD issues that must be addressed. If this process takes place, it is possible that our review of the response to information requests would not be as extensive as originally anticipated. However, it will ultimately be necessary for someone to go through the revised permit application on a point-by-point basis to ensure that all NOD/information request items are appropriately discussed.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions. Our goal is to ensure that you have the appropriate staff available to conduct the review activities, so that you receive the best review possible.