



**WIPP Stakeholder Meeting Notes  
Pre-submittal Meeting  
Albuquerque Marriott - November 9, 2017**

In attendance:

**WIPP:**

Rick Chavez  
Bob Kehrman  
Anthony Stone  
Jill Farnsworth  
Josh  
Karen Day  
Michael  
Ron Gill  
Ashley

**Stakeholders:**

Don Hancock  
Steve Zappe  
Scott Kovac  
Joni Arends  
Janet Greenwald

**NMED:** Ricardo  
Maestas David  
Biswell Ernie  
Tellez

Topic to be discussed:

Class 2 PMR Permit Modification Request (PMR) – New Filter Building (NFB)  
Class 2 PMR Permit Modification Request (PMR) – New Shaft #5  
Class 2 PMR Permit Modification Request (PMR) - New Training Program Revision

9:30 Meeting Start

**New Filter Building (NFB) - Presented by Josh**

Questions:

Don Hancock – Said he saw there were 3 stack heights explored. He didn't see an explanation as to which height was chosen nor an explanation as to why that specific one was chosen. Noted that with the stack height chosen, does this make the current stack suspect to not being adequate? Was there a reason that the new stack height was chosen and not just tied into the older (current) stack?

Russell Hardy – Height is needed due to increased air flow volume for the NFB.

Don Hancock – Was concerned that older modeling projections for the current stack should be tied into the new modeling done for future stack height. Also for the modeling, should have used current environmental air flow up to 2016 instead of the modeling period of 2009 – 2013 used. He felt this was not current data and was invalid. Wants proof this is comparable.

The 2009-2013 data may be valid if its more representative of the operational tempo we are expecting to see in the future. It is my understanding that WIPP is ramping up and has yet to fully realize the activity seen before the 2014 incident. A possible compromise would be to use both sets of data from both time periods to quell any potential disagreements with the data. Additionally, the modeling should be included for all stack heights with scientific support for the stack height that is ultimately chosen in the new construction design.

171106.5



Russell Hardy – Noted that as per the figure, two backup generators would be added to support the filter system. Russell was not totally clear if these backup generators would power only the new filtration house or the entire WIPP facility. Although I suspect they would only cover the new filtration house, it should be made clear what they cover, if one generator is sufficient to power the filtration house or if both generators must be used, where will the diesel fuel be stored, how much fuel is stored locally to provide power for what length of time, recommends more information.

Steve Zappe – Questioned the reason for this to be a Class 2. Didn't like the PMR sighting that it could be a Class 1 PMR but chose to make it a Class 2. He felt that was the wrong language to be included in the request. Also noted that it was odd to have this position due to the fact a major process is never a Class 1. Need to rethink that statement that it could be a Class 1.

Don Hancock – noted a typo on page 9 that left out a "2" designator.

Russell Hardy wanted to verify sample ports on the system. Josh verified there will be 3, one WIPP, one for CMERC, and one for NMED at, before, and after filtration on the line. Additionally, CAMS will be located there to monitor any radiological occurrence.

Steve Zappe – Asked how long it will take to switch the system over when construction is complete. Ron Gill noted that conservatively, it should take 1 ½ to 2 months to make the switch. There will not be any underground activities until complete and tested.

Ron Gill – He also noted the use of a tent for hazard/radioactive containment when making the switch thereby limiting potential spread of contamination, inspection of the shaft, and grouting of area around the shaft (which has allowed some infiltration of water to the shaft area). Inspection of the shaft will be recorded. The old filter system will need to be decommissioned and demolished (D&D) to put the contaminated parts into the underground.

Janet Greenwald – Concerned about how much water is flowing into the shaft. It was explained how the water collected is from atmospheric sources and collected by sumps for removal. Estimate about 1 gallon per hour. She requested a copy of any records of the water flow.

Ricardo Maestas – Asked for estimate of the D&D schedule. An estimate of early to late 2021.

Scott Kovac – asked for more information on the Salt Reduction Building. Ron Gill explained that it was similar to commercial systems available which use a membrane to pull out the salt. Should reduce salt dust by 99%. A further explanation of its operation and specification to be included in the PMR.

### **Installation of a New Shaft (Shaft #5) – Presented by Jill Farnsworth**

Questions:

Steve Zappe – The explanation for describing it as a Class 1 PMR when it is a "significant change to the facility". Concerns the complexity of the change. He questioned the selection of this as a Class 2 PMR.

Don Hancock – The new shaft is not needed as there is no requirement for a 5<sup>th</sup> shaft. States they could use existing shafts. In his opinion, the real reason for the shaft is to expand the capacity of the facility.

Thinks this is a Class 3 PMR. Also quoted the Federal DOE budget to Congress, and said that the basis for the new shaft misrepresents the original request.

Ron Gill – stated that the new budget sheet will update the request.

Don Hancock – stated that this PMR is a Class 3 and should not be an individual PMR but should be combined with A Class 3 for additional panel construction. With new panel PMR, this would be appropriate. Also wonders if this is a horse race to the NFB/shaft. Why not combine?

Rick Chavez – expressed that they originally combined the PMR's but that they didn't want one to hold up the other.

Ron Gill – States that 2 separate projects equate to 2 separate federal budget allocations.

Janet Greenwald – Felt it was sneaky to come in as a Class 2 to limit public comment.

Don Hancock – Asked for analysis of need for salt reduction. The PMR does not explain shaft 5 for this purpose. Inappropriate to come in as a Class 2, needs to be a Class 3 with new panels.

Several WIPP representatives – stated that salt reduction is necessary for construction and more ventilation is a good thing in a mine facility.

Don Hancock – Stated that they had this fight in the 80's where 3 shafts were okay but wanted the 4<sup>th</sup>. Wants limit of activities until more ventilation.

Scott Kovac – Read the budget as labeled as an exhaust shaft. A new intake shaft is not functionally equivalent.

### **Training PMR – Presented by Karen Day**

First major change to training. Separated to activities associated with TRU Wastes. Currently it is 186 pages.

Used screening criteria program to cover permit required training. Did identify 21 new job associations but narrowed the training program to cover 6 titles.

Not removing or changing any inspection schedules with this PMR.

Questions:

Russell Hardy – So this reduces the training from 186 pages to 16 pages? Yes.

Karen Day – This is a revamping of required training to be more efficient and reduce overlapping of training requirements.

Don Hancock – Would like to extend the introductory statement on Page 9 to more clearly explain why 21 groups are removed.

Joni Arends – asked why it isn't included as Class 1. Also noted the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) report on the emergency fire vehicles. Also, that public won't have access to program files at WIPP without an IPRA request and should have more transparency not less. Said she did not like that WIPP stated they will do the minimum for worker safety.

Karen Day – said the term is related to minimal requirements in the standards.

Russel Hardy – noted that this change is more general as to industry standards and will allow flexibility to small internal changes.

Steve Zappe – does agree with the class of the PMR.

Joni Arends – asked why focused on TRU personnel?

Karen Day – noted this is more consistent with the DOE complex training plans. They compared other DOE/DOD facilities such as Sandia National Laboratories, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Kirkland Air Force Base, NASA at White Sands, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and other locations. Also noted additions to Live Fire Training and expansions to current training performance for compliance.