

CLASS A WEST AMENDMENT REQUEST

Request for Information Meeting

Department of Environmental Quality
Multi Agency State Office Building
Conference Room 1015, 195 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah
3:00 P.M., September 01, 2011

I. Introduction – John Hultquist (DRC)

Attendees – Phil Goble, Ryan Johnson, Charles Bishop, Bob Baird (URS), Sean McCandless (ES) Vern Rogers (ES), David Booth (ES), Bob Sobocinski (ES), Mike Lebaron (ES), Tim Orton (ES), Matt Pacenza (Heal-UT), Dan Shrum (ES), Rusty Lundberg (DRC), Renette Anderson (DEQ), Craig Jones (DRC)

II. Objective of meeting: John Hultquist

Briefly discussed the Lean Six-Sigma process and the overall process for agency review of licensing actions. Request for Information (RFI) meetings are to help inform public of agency actions / License amendments, have public meetings during the review process and provide stakeholders the opportunity to raise preliminary questions on submissions, discuss and understand the concerns.

III. Public Comments /Questions

Matt – Energy Solutions in exchange gave up the super cell idea in anticipation of getting the opportunity to convert Class A south to take low level radioactive waste, for engineering reasons that was not viable. They would give back part of Class A volume not used a mini super cell. The Huntsman agreement put in writing an exchange, to give up one thing to have another. The concern is; what are we getting in exchange? A promise? Half of the shift will be in writing in the license? What is the gain and loss of the shift?

John Hultquist – Acknowledged concern and addressed his understanding of Huntsman agreement. The Huntsman agreement does not talk about the cells but the capacity.

Dan- Matt's observation is correct but it is a volume issue. The cell may not be the same as the volume is, John Hultquist agreed with Dan

Matt – not concerned about the issue now but will it still be in effect in 2016? Questioned the capacity?

Other comments – Huntsman's agreement does not give specific numbers. Capacity numbers have been discussed and are online. Matt asked the capacity, license and how it will affect the huntsman agreement be discussed and explained to the public.

IV. Interrogatories

The Licensee and the DRC agreed to have URS Corp. review submission and develop interrogatories.

1. R313-25-6 Description of facility – Figure one was not available or clear, updated layout required.
2. Groundwater Elevation values used in the analysis, clear description required from Energy Solutions. Energy Solutions agreed to give a better understanding of the analysis
3. Buffer Zone – Dave suggested Class A was laid out 1999 – 2000 no records indicating why? Would like to focus on how to prevent it. Bob Baird agreed to assess how it happens to prevent it in the future.

4. Design Criterion for Distortion – Does Energy Solutions understands the concern? Energy Solutions understands the concern, but questioned the request for additional information required for AMEC 2000 and 2005 reference, is it inadequate? Bob Beard clarified the need for additional information. John Hultquist suggested that references can be used but he would like to see further research done on their own.
5. Closure Plan – John Hultquist asked for suggestions on the closure plans. Dave asked for clarification on Part 2, and Part 3, Bob Beard asked for credible deposits as a reasonable basis. John Hultquist stated it is still important for the licensee to demonstrate there is enough material out there for the unit to be built, keeping the costs in mind. Dave agreed they would do their best to address it.
6. Quantities of Radioactive Materials – John Hutlquist requested for clarification on quantities and extend of the radioactivity and radio nuclides that would go in the Class A west cell. There was also no construction quality assurance, quality control manual submitted, changes needed to be reviewed and submitted.
7. Technical analysis Releases of Radioactivity – No additional comments
8. Protection on Inadvertent Intruders – No additional comments
9. Design safety factors – Tables are not clear and consistent, the ratios used do not represent the condition of interest clearly.
10. Rock Cover Design and Rock Design Calculations / Analysis - will update with more recent references
11. Filter Stability/ Filter Permeability Criteria – Interrogatories discusses both paths. Update with more recent references, want to see the strength not the level of stress
12. Perimeter Drainage Ditch Calculations- No additional comments
13. Infiltration and transport modeling – No additional comments - No comments Energy Solutions have covered the issue before, reference material was requested
14. Groundwater depth and Geotechnical analysis.....– No additional comments from Energy Solutions
15. Seismic hazard Evaluation / Seismic Stability and Analysis update - the interrogatory discusses couple potential paths, updated deterministic analysis and a probabilistic analysis. Would like to clarify an updated deterministic analysis would be sufficient. Probabilistic analysis was presented – request was made for energy solutions to send an email request to further pursue the analysis
16. Disposal Site design for Near Surface Disposal – Liner Design & Construction – Definition of configuration required
17. Disposal Site design for Near Surface Disposal- Drainage Juncture and Drainage outlet Design for Perimeter Drainage Ditch System – No additional comments
18. Radiation Dose Rate at the Surface of the cover -
19. Environmental Monitoring –
20. Horizontal Transport and Well Spacing Analysis Input Parameters

21. Records – no additional comments

22. Issuance of Discharge Permit: Best Available Technologies – Monitoring Wells requiring Abandonment and Decommissioning and Lysimeters Proposed for Abandonment – No additional clarification needed.

Questions & Comments

- Request to produce a revised application with the interrogatory responses
- Plan to provide a hardcopy as a clean version
- Matt: Depleted Uranium performance assessment proposed disposing of the waste in class A south, alternative would be in this location, depleted uranium is coming up at all in this analysis or does it remain in the ongoing depleted uranium performance, is it going to be modified with the change in location
Response: DU model is not sensitive to the cell it is in

Meeting adjourned with closing comments from John Hultquist.