

## **Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes**

---



**INL Site Environmental Management**  
C I T I Z E N S   A D V I S O R Y   B O A R D

**Committee:** Group  
**Date:** December 17, 2008 – 09:30 a.m. (MT)

### **Participants**

<b>Board Members:</b>	Robert Rodriguez	Bruce Wendle
	Dick Buxton	Nicki Karst
	R.D. Maynard	Tami Sherwood
	Damond Watkins	Harrison Gerstlaur
	Fred Sica	
<b>DOE:</b>	Bob Pence	Tim Jackson
	Alan Jines	Jack Depperschmidt
	Teresa Perkins	
<b>ICP:</b>	Wendy Savkranz	
<b>State of Idaho</b>	Susan Burke	
<b>Support Staff:</b>	Lisa Aldrich	
	Ceri Chapple	

### **Objective(s) for the Committee Call**

- Technical Briefing of the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Remote-handled Waste Disposition Project, December 2008.

Alan Jines briefed the CAB on the purpose and need for the Remote-handled Waste Disposition Project. He explained that it is made-up of below-grade waste at MFC. They will use the separations process to sort the waste into various waste streams: mixed, transuranic, spent nuclear fuel and low-level. The RH-TRU will be shipped to WIPP and the spent nuclear fuel will be dispositioned. Jines also mentioned that they may bring waste components, sodium bearing waste, from the Hanford site to Idaho to be treated. There is roughly 24 cubic meters of RH-TRU waste to be treated. It will be processed in a hot cell. There are over 900 containers. This project will comply with the Idaho Settlement Agreement deadline of 2018; target date for completion is 2015.

The RH-TRU waste will be treated at either MFC or INTEC. Some of the waste is not mixed and the project could be handled in various phases, possibly treating the un-mixed waste first. There are three options to treating the waste at MFC. The first option is to add an annex to the existing building. Secondly, they could install a mobile hot cell. Finally, they could treat the waste in the existing building. There are two options to treating the waste at INTEC. The waste could be treated at building 659 or at building 666, which is the preferred alternative.

There are transportation issues involved in the RH-TRU waste treatment. The waste is not packaged to meet NRC requirements, meaning it cannot be shipped on public roads. One option would be to close Highway 20 from midnight to 5am for about 1.5hours to transport the waste from MFC to INTEC. The other option would be to use road T-25, which is an existing on-site road that needs some up-grades. Additionally, there are nine archeological sites to consider and negotiate along the on-site road.

R. D. Maynard asked if there would be arrangements made for emergency vehicles. Jines responded that they hadn't gotten that far yet. He explained that although the containers will not be licensed for commercial shipment there wouldn't be a radiation risk associated with them in transport.

## **Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes**

---

Jines explained the characteristics of the HFEF5 containers and how they were stored below grade. The HFEF5 cans are 6.5' tall x 14" in diameter. In the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's the HFEF5 cans were placed into 18" d. liners and dropped into pipes with flanges up to six feet and filled with gravel. Some of the containers may have failed at impact. Some of the containers have corroded. In the 1990's the cans were pulled out of the ground and were placed in 24" d. liners and placed back in the pipes below grade. The RU-TRU disposition project will entail removing the 24" liners from the pipes, put them into casks, ship to INTEC, be processed at the hot cell and will be handled remotely in the preferred alternative building 666.

Building 666 has many advantageous features for RH-TRU processing. The building is equipped with roll-up doors, cranes for remote handling. The lids can be removed remotely, then placed into the hot cell and taken apart. The RH-TRU waste would then be moved to building 659 for processing, then shipped to WIPP. Fred Sica asked if there were loading docks. Jines responded by explaining that there is existing infrastructure and that the building could serve as interim storage for waste during the winter months.

Bruce Wendle asked what type of containers will be in Building 666. Jines explained that there will be a variety, HFEF5, 45 gallon drums, and 24" liners, all meeting the waste acceptance criteria, and those from Hanford will be NRC licensed.

Jines explained that the impacts at MFC and INTEC are relatively the same other than the road issues. Fred Sica responded by saying that he thinks it doesn't make sense to use the site road, with its additional costs, when a public road is available. He added that this is a good opportunity to use the INTEC facility, and wants to know what the CAB can do to show their support. Jines explained that the public comment period goes from 12/17/2008 to 01/17/2009. The CAB is encouraged to participate. He added that the project will likely be moved from the DOE's Nuclear Energy Department to the Environmental Management Department., which may expedite the process for the project. Fred Sica suggested that the CAB support this project with a letter and comments.

Jines commented that the preliminary comments by the tribes were supportive of this project in pulling waste out of the ground. R.D. Maynard asked why AMWTP couldn't process the 317 cubic meters of waste. Jines explained that the waste must be evaluated liner by liner to get a better understanding of the waste contents. Someone suggested that there may be safeguards and security issues in transporting waste from RWMC to INTEC. Jines explained that thirty waste containers had been safely transported previously from RWMC to INTEC.

### **Actions**

- Support staff will mail out the Nuclear Energy Environmental Liabilities RH TRU EA, electronic will be emailed.
- Support staff will schedule another group conference call to discuss the RH TRU EA after initial review.

To review the details of this meeting, call number 1-888-284-7564, pin code # 215587