

Subject: Re: Another WWIS problem

Date: Fri, 19 Jan 2001 13:18:58 -0700

From: Steve Zappe <Steve_Zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us>

Organization: NMED Haz/Rad Materials Bureau

To: Don Hancock <sricon@earthlink.net>



Don -

Let me see if I can provide additional information beyond what you have...

I can perform a container query by site, entering in the disposal date and finding how many drums were disposed of by that date. So I enter RF as the shipper site ID, <=12/27/2000 as the disposal date, and it tells me 2377 records satisfy that query - matching the 2377 emplaced containers on the 12/27/2000 repository report. However, I cannot determine receipt date from the container query - that is on the shipment summary report.

Also, I understand that WIPP has generally designated Thursday as their emplacement day. They accumulate waste received during the prior seven days, and run it down the hole on Thursday.

Note that the last two repository reports were run on Thursday (1/11, 1/18/01). Thinking there might be some lag in the numbers, I queried total RF emplacements for different days and got these results:

1/11/01 - 2503

1/12/01 - 2545 (reflecting emplacement of the 42 received containers on the 1/11 repository report)

1/17/01 - 2545

1/18/01 - 2629 (reflecting emplacement of the 84 received containers on the 1/18 repository report)

It was the 1/11 repository report (not the 1/18 as you thought) showing 2503 emplaced and 42 received. The 1/18 showed 2545 emplaced and 84 received. I am assuming any discrepancy here is that they really emplaced the waste on Friday, Jan 12 instead of Thursday like I thought (see the waste emplacement report - 28 IN containers, 42 RF). Otherwise, the difference between the 1/18 repository report and my query numbers is that we generated the report *while* they were emplacing - if we'd run it at the end of the day, it would probably reflect my query.

Running the repository report today shows no received waste from RF - it's all been emplaced, and it matches my numbers. It also shows the INEEL waste being emplaced. I'll fax today's report to you. I've also generated an emplacement report reflecting the waste emplaced this week that I'll include too. Note that they disposed of a single dunnage drum from IN, so 34 + 1 from IN and 84 from RF = 119 emplaced yesterday.

Let me know if I've missed something in your analysis. Maybe from now on

010118



it would be safer to generate the repository report on any day but Thursday...

Thanks for keeping me on my toes!

Steve

p.s. - regarding shipment reports, they appear to have changed the RF010005 receipt date to 1/14. Still no answer about that one or the two IN shipments you questioned. However, I identified one shipment I failed to make a copy of and provide to you: IN010033, certified and sent 1/8, received 1/10. This one is also included in the fax, along with the revised RF010005 report. Have a good weekend!

Don Hancock wrote:

>

> Steve,

>

> I've noticed another problem in the WWIS, this time the repository report has "lost" 84 Rocky Flats waste drums.

>

> The December 27, 2000 repository report showed that there were 2377 emplaced containers and another 42 received, a total of 2,419, which agrees with other information as of that time.

>

> However, the January 18, 2000 repository report showed that there were 2503 emplaced containers and another 42 received, a total of 2,545 -- or three more shipments than at the end of the year. However, the individual shipment records show that five shipments arrived, totaling 210 containers, between January 4 and 12, so that the total should be 2,629. So where are those 84 drums if they're not emplaced and not received? And it's not just that the repository report is slow (which of course shouldn't be the case) in that it doesn't show the two shipments that arrived on January 12, because the same repository report does include the January 12 shipment from INEEL.

>

> As you can imagine, if shipment and receipt dates are wrong, and the repository report loses 84 drums, I have serious questions about whether there aren't other problems with the WWIS. Is the Emplacement Report wrong? Are the VOC calculations wrong? Etc., etc.

> *****

> Don Hancock

> Southwest Research and Information Center

> PO Box 4524

> Albuquerque, NM 87106

> 505-262-1862

> fax: 505-262-1864

> www.sric.org