

Environmental Protection Agency

§ 194.25

quality assurance requirements of §194.22.

(4) Provide information which demonstrates that a system of controls has been and will continue to be implemented to confirm that the total amount of each waste component that will be emplaced in the disposal system will not exceed the upper limiting value or fall below the lower limiting value described in the introductory text of paragraph (c) of this section. The system of controls shall include, but shall not be limited to: Measurement; sampling; chain of custody records; record keeping systems; waste loading schemes used; and other documentation.

(5) Identify and describe such controls delineated in paragraph (c)(4) of this section and confirm that they are applied in accordance with the quality assurance requirements found in §194.22.

(d) The Department shall include a waste loading scheme in any compliance application, or else performance assessments conducted pursuant to §194.32 and compliance assessments conducted pursuant to §194.54 shall assume random placement of waste in the disposal system.

(e) Waste may be emplaced in the disposal system only if the emplaced components of such waste will not cause:

(1) The total quantity of waste in the disposal system to exceed the upper limiting value, including the associated uncertainty, described in the introductory text to paragraph (c) of this section; or

(2) The total quantity of waste that will have been emplaced in the disposal system, prior to closure, to fall below the lower limiting value, including the associated uncertainty, described in the introductory text to paragraph (c) of this section.

(f) Waste emplacement shall conform to the assumed waste loading conditions, if any, used in performance assessments conducted pursuant to §194.32 and compliance assessments conducted pursuant to §194.54.

(g) The Department shall demonstrate in any compliance application that the total inventory of waste emplaced in the disposal system complies with the limitations on transuranic

waste disposal described in the WIPP LWA.

(h) The Administrator will use inspections and records reviews, such as audits, to verify compliance with this section.

[61 FR 5235, Feb. 9, 1996, as amended at 69 FR 42583, July 16, 2004]

§ 194.25 Future state assumptions.

(a) Unless otherwise specified in this part or in the disposal regulations, performance assessments and compliance assessments conducted pursuant to the provisions of this part to demonstrate compliance with §191.13, §191.15 and part 191, subpart C shall assume that characteristics of the future remain what they are at the time the compliance application is prepared, provided that such characteristics are not related to hydrogeologic, geologic or climatic conditions.

(b) In considering future states pursuant to this section, the Department shall document in any compliance application, to the extent practicable, effects of potential future hydrogeologic, geologic and climatic conditions on the disposal system over the regulatory time frame. Such documentation shall be part of the activities undertaken pursuant to §194.14, Content of compliance certification application; §194.32, Scope of performance assessments; and §194.54, Scope of compliance assessments.

(1) In considering the effects of hydrogeologic conditions on the disposal system, the Department shall document in any compliance application, to the extent practicable, the effects of potential changes to hydrogeologic conditions.

(2) In considering the effects of geologic conditions on the disposal system, the Department shall document in any compliance application, to the extent practicable, the effects of potential changes to geologic conditions, including, but not limited to: Dissolution; near surface geomorphic features and processes; and related subsidence in the geologic units of the disposal system.

(3) In considering the effects of climatic conditions on the disposal system, the Department shall document in

§ 194.26

40 CFR Ch. I (7-1-06 Edition)

any compliance application, to the extent practicable, the effects of potential changes to future climate cycles of increased precipitation (as compared to present conditions).

§ 194.26 Expert judgment.

(a) Expert judgment, by an individual expert or panel of experts, may be used to support any compliance application, provided that expert judgment does not substitute for information that could reasonably be obtained through data collection or experimentation.

(b) Any compliance application shall:

(1) Identify any expert judgments used to support the application and shall identify experts (by name and employer) involved in any expert judgment elicitation processes used to support the application.

(2) Describe the process of eliciting expert judgment, and document the results of expert judgment elicitation processes and the reasoning behind those results. Documentation of interviews used to elicit judgments from experts, the questions or issues presented for elicitation of expert judgment, background information provided to experts, and deliberations and formal interactions among experts shall be provided. The opinions of all experts involved in each elicitation process shall be provided whether the opinions are used to support compliance applications or not.

(3) Provide documentation that the following restrictions and guidelines have been applied to any selection of individuals used to elicit expert judgments:

(i) Individuals who are members of the team of investigators requesting the judgment or the team of investigators who will use the judgment were not selected; and

(ii) Individuals who maintain, at any organizational level, a supervisory role or who are supervised by those who will utilize the judgment were not selected.

(4) Provide information which demonstrates that:

(1) The expertise of any individual involved in expert judgment elicitation comports with the level of knowledge required by the questions or issues presented to that individual; and

(ii) The expertise of any expert panel, as a whole, involved in expert judgment elicitation comports with the level and variety of knowledge required by the questions or issues presented to that panel.

(5) Explain the relationship among the information and issues presented to experts prior to the elicitation process, the elicited judgment of any expert panel or individual, and the purpose for which the expert judgment is being used in compliance applications(s).

(6) Provide documentation that the initial purpose for which expert judgment was intended, as presented to the expert panel, is consistent with the purpose for which this judgment was used in compliance application(s).

(7) Provide documentation that the following restrictions and guidelines have been applied in eliciting expert judgment:

(i) At least five individuals shall be used in any expert elicitation process, unless there is a lack or unavailability of experts and a documented rationale is provided that explains why fewer than five individuals were selected.

(ii) At least two-thirds of the experts involved in an elicitation shall consist of individuals who are not employed directly by the Department or by the Department's contractors, unless the Department can demonstrate and document that there is a lack or unavailability of qualified independent experts. If so demonstrated, at least one-third of the experts involved in an elicitation shall consist of individuals who are not employed directly by the Department or by the Department's contractors.

(c) The public shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to present its scientific and technical views to expert panels as input to any expert elicitation process.

§ 194.27 Peer review.

(a) Any compliance application shall include documentation of peer review that has been conducted, in a manner required by this section, for:

(1) Conceptual models selected and developed by the Department;

(2) Waste characterization analyses as required in §194.24(b); and