



Department of Energy

Carlsbad Area Office
P.O. Box 3090
Carlsbad, New Mexico 88221

JUN 16 1994

Benito
Clayton -
copy to
Barbara H
Susan Merrill
file WIPK



Ms. Judith Espinosa
Secretary
New Mexico Environment Department
P.O. Box 3149
Santa Fe, NM 87504

Dear Ms. Espinosa:

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Transuranic (TRU) Waste Steering Committee Meeting Minutes from the May 10-11, 1994, meeting held in Carlsbad, New Mexico.

When the National TRU Program Office was transferred to Carlsbad, the responsibility of the TRU Waste Steering Committee was also transferred. This was the first meeting of the Steering Committee held under the auspices of the National TRU Program Office in Carlsbad. These meetings are for Steering Committee participants, but I feel that you should be kept informed about them.

If you have questions, please call me at (505) 234-7467.

Sincerely,

Mark L Matthews

Mark L. Matthews, P.E.
Manager
National TRU Program Office

Enclosure

cc w/enclosure:
C&C File
Pat McCasland, NMED

940607



**Minutes of TRU Waste Steering Committee
Carlsbad, NM
May 10 - 11, 1994**

SUMMARY

Attendees: See attached list:

The TRU Waste Steering Committee was given a thorough overview of the National TRU Program Office and its functions and inner workings.

One of the major areas of importance that was introduced to the committee was the *Annual Issue Cycle Process*. This process was developed to identify, prioritize, and feed major TRU waste issues into the budget process. This annual cycle is a vehicle for the generator/storage sites to get issues into the cycle so that they can be discussed with DOE Headquarters.

The draft *National TRU Program Plan* was discussed. This plan establishes the program baselines by which overall progress is measured, and documents agreement regarding scope of work, organizational relationships and programmatic responsibilities among all the participants.

A *logic diagram* for sites' activities was introduced. This diagram shows what the sites need to do to be ready when WIPP opens. This diagram should help the sites work together to obtain funding for what is needed. The first set of diagrams is due in about two months.

A two-hour discussion on the *Performance-Based Waste Acceptance Criteria* (PBWAC) was presented to the Committee. The PBWAC will define the envelope of waste acceptability and Performance Assessment (PA) will define the acceptable volume by waste profile.

A *draft charter for the TRU Waste Steering Committee* was developed at the meeting. The draft will be sent to the committee for further review and comment. Comments are due to Jack Tillman, WTAC, by June 1, 1994, with the revised charter to be distributed to the Committee in early June 1994. The charter will be discussed and finalized at the next Steering Committee meeting in early August 1994.

Executive Session

An Executive Session was held during lunch period on May 11, 1994. One area of discussion during that session was *communications* between the National TRU Program Office and Management and Operating (M&O) Contractors at the

generator/storage sites. Open communications are encouraged. When the M&O contractors are asked to perform some activity that involves time, effort, and money, the request should go through the Operations Office. Information, announcements and general communication may go directly from the NTPO to the contractors, but the Steering Committee representative must be kept informed. The NTPO will keep the TRU Waste Steering Committee Points of Contact informed of all work assignments/requests.

Management of interface working groups was another topic of discussion. The NTPO agrees with the concept of interface working groups, but would like to have more control of their activities. A policy statement will be developed by the NTPO regarding management of the interface working groups. The policy will be to the effect that each interface working group will be re-chartered on an annual basis and plans and milestones for the coming year will be identified at the time of rechartering. The draft policy statement is due June 10, 1994.

The NTPO will designate *Site Managers* (Liaisons) who will be the link between the NTPO and the sites. These Site Managers will make certain that sites' needs and communications are factored into NTPO plans and activities.

A special *Ad Hoc Treatment Working Group* was established during this meeting. This working group will determine impacts on sites if TRU waste is to be treated, evaluate options, list pros and cons, and provide a recommendation on the treatment/ no treatment policy on TRU waste. The group will develop a recommendation/ proposal by early June. This recommendation will be forwarded to Headquarters so that the policy can be re-evaluated.

The Steering Committee generally agreed to hold the committee meetings at the sites on a revolving basis so that each site will host a meeting every two - three years. *The next TRU Waste Steering Committee meeting will be held in early August in Idaho Falls, Idaho.*

DETAILED DISCUSSION

MAY 10, 1994

Introduction

Mark Matthews, Manager, National TRU Program Office (NTPO) opened the meeting by introducing George Dials, Manager, Carlsbad Area Office (CAO), who welcomed the Committee members to Carlsbad. His opening remarks included discussion of the establishment of the CAO and the transfer of the NTPO to Carlsbad. He told the group that the generator/storage sites are CAO's customers.

He announced that INEL had been awarded the *Enhanced Laboratory Program* for the tests to be performed for the Compliance Application. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant will transmit the *Compliance Application* in December 1996 to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The review by the EPA is expected to be completed by December 1997, in time for a Disposal Decision by June 1998. Mr. Dials said that the Disposal Decision Plan (DDP) needs to be resource loaded since the current DDP was not in effect when the current budget was submitted.

National TRU Program Overview

After an overview of the agenda for the two-day meeting, Mark Matthews discussed the National TRU Program (NTP). He told the group that the mission of the NTP is to "integrate the national TRU waste system in order to assure that all TRU waste under the purview of the Department of Energy is effectively and systematically managed from its generation to its disposal." The philosophy of the NTPO is that the generators and DOE HQ/EM are NTPO's major customers, and that the NTPO will: add value and efficiency to the TRU waste management system; solve problems and resolve issues; develop proposed guidance for Headquarters regarding management of TRU waste; and involve stakeholders.

Mark discussed the organization of the NTPO and discussed its responsibilities which include:

- 1) developing waste characterization requirements and methods for TRU waste management;
- 2) ensuring that requirements of regulatory drivers, performance assessments, and performance-based waste acceptance criteria are achieved in the characterization and management of TRU waste;
- 3) integrating technology development and treatment activities at the generator/storage sites;
- 4) developing robust transportation and packaging systems; and
- 5) implementing emergency response and preparedness activities associated with the handling of TRU waste.

Headquarters-NTPO Interface

Wayne Nobles, EM-332, Director, Technical Analysis Division, is the Co-chairman of the TRU Waste Steering Committee. He discussed the interface between DOE/HQ and the NTPO. The transfer of the TRU waste program leadership to the CAO was a decision by Thomas Grumbly, EM-1 and is part of the DOE's overall

decentralization policy.

A *Memorandum of Agreement* (MOA) has been signed with the purpose of clarifying the division of responsibilities between HQ and CAO/NTPO. The MOA states that EM-332 will have the responsibility for policy, guidance and integration with other waste types and other HQ programs. The NTPO will be responsible for the day-to-day waste management activities.

National TRU Program Office Program Plan

Mark Matthews, NTPO, discussed the NTPO Program Plan. The plan describes the NTP, establishes the program baselines by which overall progress is measured, and documents agreement regarding scope of work, organizational relationships and programmatic responsibilities among all the participants. The NTPO Program Plan is an evolving document covering the NTP from initiation to completion, is compliant with DOE Order 4700.1, Project Management System, and will be updated as required. The schedule calls for a completed final program plan by July 30, 1994.

The draft NTPO Charter will be distributed by early June 1994, with the final charter to be complete by June 30, 1994.

National TRU Program Office Activities

Systems Planning and Integration

Joe Lippis, Manager, Systems Planning and Integration (SPI), told the Committee that the draft Charter and an outline of the National TRU Program were among the handouts. These documents are to be reviewed and comments are to be sent to Jack Tillman, Manager, National TRU Programs, WIPP Technical Assistance Contractor.

Joe told the Committee that *Systems Planning and Integration* is broken up into three areas: strategic planning, integration, and quick response. The objectives of the SPI are: 1) to establish an efficient TRU management system utilizing a logic diagram with time-phased critical path; 2) to identify and resolve major TRU issues utilizing an annual cycle process; and 3) to establish stakeholder involvement throughout the TRU waste system and along transportation routes.

Joe also said that the Current State System Description, Volume III, is expected to be issued in June-July with Volumes I and II issued at a later date. The Long Range Integrated Management Plan will become the NTPO Decision Plan that will follow the DDP using site schedules and milestones. Integration functions include providing administrative support and management support to the TRU Waste

Steering Committee and Interface Working Groups.

Technology Development and Waste Characterization

Mark Matthews, Manager, NTPO, discussed the Technology Development and Waste Characterization Functional Area. Mark announced that Laura Pendlebury will be the new Manager for this functional area. The objectives of this functional area are to: develop technology method improvements for TRU activities, develop characterization requirements and methods for TRU waste management, define the inventory, assemble waste characterization data for Performance Assessment model, Performance-Based Waste Acceptance Criteria (PBWAC), and coordinate data with the Federal Facilities Compliance Act.

The *Quality Assurance Program Plan*, Revision A, is out for internal review, and the *Waste Characterization Program Plan* is being revised. The current plan is to issue these documents in final form this fiscal year. *Fourier Transform Infrared Technology* (an online real-time data gathering technique for headspace gas sampling) is being developed at the INEL, and the *Radioassay Performance Demonstration Program Plan* is being developed and coordinated through the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory and the Nondestructive Assay/Nondestructive Examination Interface Working Group.

The Waste Characterization Area at the *Argonne National Laboratory-West* is in "hot operations" and will perform detailed characterization on 44 drums of TRU waste this fiscal year. The Rocky Flats Plant has performed detailed characterization on 44 drums of TRU waste also.

The *Baseline Inventory Report* (the data that will be used for performance assessment calculations) is due at the end of June 1994. The report is currently out for internal review.

Mark told the group that three sites are being funded by the NTPO to develop their Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPjPs). These sites are Hanford, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Savannah River Site.

Transportation, Packaging, and Emergency Response

In the absence of Bob Spooner, Manager, Transportation, Packaging, and Emergency Response, Mark Matthews presented the information for this functional area. The objectives of this functional area are to: 1) provide a safe and efficient transportation system, 2) provide an adequate quantity of Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) certified packages to support the shipment of contact-handled (CH) and remote-handled (RH) TRU wastes, and 3) to provide emergency response training to local, state, and tribal personnel.

Some ongoing and planned activities are:

- 1) to support the TRUPACT-II gas generation testing effort;
- 2) to obtain NRC Certificate of Compliance for the RH cask;
- 3) to perform a Packaging Optimization Study of CH and RH TRU wastes;
- 4) to support generator site shipments;
- 5) to identify carrier contract scope and placement of new contract;
- 6) to maintain cooperative agreements with the State of New Mexico, Western Governors' Association, Southern States Energy Board, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation;
- 7) to continue the emergency response training of state, tribal, and local governments; and
- 8) to evaluate future emergency response training needs based on transportation routes.

There has been a lot of discussion about using the *TRUPACT-II* for shipments containing tritium from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to the Nevada Test Site. The Western Governors' Association has expressed concerns and this activity has been slowed.

For the *RH TRU Waste Program*, the NTPO is looking at the entire picture from a systems standpoint. The generators will be included in developing "user friendly" containers and shipping packages.

Program Assessments and Certifications

Mark Matthews stated that the objectives of the Program Assessments and Certifications (PAC) Functional Area are: 1) to establish waste acceptance criteria and develop certification standards and plans, 2) to conduct certification reviews, surveillances and audits of waste characterizations, and 3) to conduct reviews of other NTP functional area activities.

Some of the current and planned activities include: development of acceptance and certification standards/criteria; provision of guidance to the generator/storage sites; certification review and surveillance activities; and assessment of facility

capabilities.

National TRU Program Site Surveys

Joe Lippis informed the group that the Site Survey Meetings were conducted to determine: 1) the current management of TRU waste, 2) current issues, 3) current or planned activities for TRU waste, 4) costs, schedules, and inventories, 5) sites' unique capabilities; and to familiarize the sites with the NTPO. Site Survey Meetings were held at LANL, SRS, ORNL, RFP, BCL, Mound, LLNL, ANL-E, INEL, NTS, and Hanford.

The issues included:

- methods to determine the final requirements for waste characterization;
- restrictive limits of the TRUPACT-II;
- currently no RH facility at any site is to prepare for waste shipment;
- currently no shipping cask is available to ship RH TRU waste;
- WIPP is not ready to receive RH TRU waste.

Discussion included the following items.

1) Some sites are having a hard time justifying facilities since they have no shipping schedule telling them when to plan to ship to WIPP. The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) is an example. They cannot obtain funding to build a TRUPACT-II loading facility because they don't know when they need to have the loading facility operational.

2) Issues associated with RH TRU waste were discussed:

- The timeframe for shipping RH TRU waste to WIPP after approval of the RH 72B cask fabrication;
- The effect on the RH TRU waste emplacement capacity.

3) WIPP is not the only driver for facilities; the FFC Act and RCRA are also drivers for the sites.

4) The sites are reacting individually to States' requirements. For the small quantities generator sites, a working group is being formed to help solve their problems. These small sites need to move their small amounts of waste to other larger sites.

5) The Site Survey Meetings revealed that the majority of the sites believe some sort of assessment/review needs to be done to keep sites on track.

These assessments/ reviews should not be as intensive as the pre-1991 audits of waste certification plans at the sites.

Individual Site Survey Meeting reports will be prepared and sent to each respective site for review. The information obtained from these Site Survey Meetings will then be compiled into an NTPO Baseline Document. The issues will be prioritized. This baseline document will be updated annually.

Major National TRU Program Office Initiatives

Annual Issue Cycle

Mark Matthews introduced to the committee one of the major initiatives of the NTPO, the Annual Issue Cycle Process. This process was developed to identify, prioritize, and feed major issues in the TRU Waste System into the budget process. This annual cycle is a vehicle for the generator/storage sites to get issues into the cycle so they can be discussed with Headquarters. Discussion of several issues followed.

A discussion on *inventory* ensued. A sensitivity analysis, using current inventory information, is being done for Performance Assessment to determine the most sensitive parameter to repository performance. There are many data calls, and these need to be condensed into one data call that will provide all the information that Performance Assessment and the TRU Waste System needs. We need to maximize the use of the documented process knowledge that the system has for the current inventory, then work on what other information is needed.

Tom Clements stated that the *Quality Assurance Program Plan (QAPP)* will help to clarify what is needed. Many waste forms may not need coring but only headspace sampling. Sites should start looking at what can be done now to start headspace sampling. There is undoubtedly much information available at the sites, from which data can be obtained that will feed into the existing WIPP data. Each site has its own capability to do a lot. Sites need to reassess what can be done now and capitalize on it.

Jeff Williams, EM-332, said that for the short term we need to develop a strategy using *real-time radiography and radioassay* and build on that strategy. For the long-term, we need strategic planning that includes the budget process and EM-32 for analytical laboratory support.

Rich Nevarez, AL, said that the sites had to send in their *Site Treatment Plans* and DOE's policy is still "no treatment" for TRU waste. LANL has a consent order from the State and must submit LANL's plan to treat and characterize the non-compliant TRU waste. This plan is due to the State of New Mexico in March 1995. Some discussion on Site Treatment Plans took place. It was noted that just stating that a site was sending its TRU waste to WIPP is no longer acceptable. A Site Treatment Plan must be prepared; this is a requirement from the FFC Act. The

draft Site Treatment Plans are due to HQ in August 1994.

A discussion ensued of whether HQ should change the *policy of "no treatment" of TRU waste to go to WIPP*. Wayne Nobles said that the first step is to find out the implications at sites if HQ does change this policy. He said that perhaps if TRU waste were treated, the cost of transportation would decrease; but the sites would still have to characterize waste. The impacts of treated waste on WIPP need to be determined.

The letter from the *State of New Mexico to EM-1* regarding mixed waste was discussed. A response is being prepared and will be sent shortly.

An *Ad Hoc Treatment Working Group* was established. This group is to meet by the end of May to determine the impacts on sites if TRU waste is to be treated, evaluate options, list pros and cons, and provide a recommendation/proposal for DOE Headquarters regarding the "no treatment" policy on TRU waste. The group will develop a recommendation/proposal by early June 1994. This will be forwarded to DOE Headquarters so the policy can be evaluated by mid-June 1994.

The Ad Hoc Treatment Group's members are:

Joe Lippis, NTPO - Co-Lead
Jeff Williams, EM-332 - Co-Lead
Rich Nevarez, AL
Stan Massingill, SR

Melody Bell, RFFO
Darrell Hinckley, ID
Dennis Claussen, RL

Logic Diagram

Mark introduced a *logic diagram* for sites' activities that shows what the generator sites need to do to be ready when WIPP opens. This diagram will help the sites to work together to obtain funding for what is needed. The first set of diagrams is due in about two months.

NTPO can try to provide "seed" money to help the sites get started, but the NTPO is not the funnel for *funding*. Each site is responsible for obtaining its own funding for characterization through HQ channels. Currently, INEL and RFP are being funded because they are participating in the experimental program. NTPO wants to provide assistance to the sites to help obtain funding. With the results from the Site Survey Meetings, a recommended strategy can be developed that will establish a template for a plan and a time line for planning.

The Nevada Test Site would like to see a *mobile characterization/certification system*. Development work is being done at Morgantown with Bio-Imaging for a Waste Information Tomography which may have direct application. This mobile

system is in design and development.

Carlos Gonzales, REECo, stated that out of the baseline document, the NTPO can develop a *time line* for certain deliverables - when waste is to be characterized as well as a schedule for shipping waste to WIPP. This would help reduce the guess work at the sites.

An explanation for the relationship between the logic diagram of activities and the strategic plan was requested. The system needs to marry the budget funding cycle with strategic planning. Sites have a tough time getting funding. They need to have guidance in place, and the NTPO needs to feed the same information to EM-32 to be consistent with the sites' requests for funding.

Wayne Nobles discussed the budget planning process at HQ. Sites will be asked to be more productive to get more funding. Funding requirements for the TRU Waste Program needs to be at HQ now.

Dick Lipinski, WHC, would like to see one *team of assessors* using the same checklist to evaluate each site regarding what is in place, what needs to be in place and what is needed at the sites. Using one team would mean that the assessment would be consistent for all sites. Mark Matthews stated that the assessment group would be set up when the NTPO has the personnel.

Melody Bell, RFFO, stated that RFP has supplied a lot of information to the NTPO. RFP has been very active with WIPP activities.

It was stated that the TRU Waste Steering Committee should help guide the TRU program, which led the meeting into the next topic of discussion.

TRU Waste Steering Committee Charter Development

Chuck Wiuff, SNL, was the facilitator for development of the TRU Waste Steering Committee's Charter. She asked the group to help lay a foundation for what the Committee is intended to accomplish. All participants' ideas were listed, addressed and kept, deleted, or combined with other similar ideas. A draft charter will be developed and presented at the next day's session for review, comment, and discussion.

George Dials, Manager, CAO, stated that the NTPO will allocate its funds and that the Steering Committee members should be empowered to make some decisions at

the Steering Committee meetings. Wayne Nobles, EM-332, said that this Committee will make recommendations to EM-1.

Site Presentations

Site representatives that were in attendance at this meeting presented information from their respective sites.

Rich Nevarez, Albuquerque Operations Office

1) One big issue is the characterization of TRU waste to meet the waste acceptance criteria. LANL has limited storage space and they are in the process of building temporary storage buildings at the cost of \$48M. No treatment or characterization capabilities exist, and the FFC Act and designation of other drivers has lowered the priority of TRU waste.

2) LANL has no loading facility for the TRUPACT-II and since there are no dates to have this facility ready, there is no funding for it.

3) Another issue is the lack of guidance for long-term storage in lieu of WIPP. There is no contingency plan.

4) For the small generators, Rich would like to see a mobile unit for treatment, characterization, and certification.

Jim Cunnane, Chicago

Jim Cunnane, CH, listed the names of the contacts for the Chicago Office. Chicago's generators include: Argonne National Laboratory-East, Argonne Laboratory-West, Brookhaven, Ames Laboratory, Princeton, New Brunswick Laboratory, and Battelle Columbus. Previously, the waste was sent to NTS and Hanford. Battelle cannot move its waste that is resulting from the decommissioning project.

Darrell Hinckley, Idaho

1) INEL has the largest volume of radioactive waste with 2.3 million ft³ - about 1.0 million ft³ being low-level waste. The site has about 140,000 containers of which about 1/2 are boxes. INEL has contingency plans in case WIPP doesn't open. There is some pressure from the State of Idaho for INEL to commit to schedules for retrieval.

2) The Enhanced Laboratory Program will utilize the INEL, ANL-W, and WINCO which will do the analytical analyses.

3) INEL is also supporting the gas generation tests for the TRUPACT-II. Hot testing is planned for later this fiscal year.

4) There is a proposed facility for INEL's alpha low-level waste: the Idaho Waste Processing Facility. Phase I is for the alpha low-level and Phase II is for TRU waste.

Joe Ginanni, Nevada

1) The Greater Confinement Disposal (GCD) boreholes are alternatives to WIPP for what cannot be accepted at WIPP. Classified TRU waste has previously been disposed in the GCD boreholes. These boreholes are 10 feet in diameter and 120 feet deep.

2) The TRU waste drums, currently stored on storage pads at NTS, are overpacked. NTS has no characterization capabilities. There is a TRU pad cover under construction.

3) The NTS can dispose of the 10-100 nCi/g non-mixed TRU waste. They can accept it now as a result of NTS low-level performance assessment.

X 4) The State of Nevada has accepted process knowledge as a characterization method. NTS took State personnel on many audits and the State has agreed with the concept of process knowledge.

Mac Roddye, Oak Ridge

1) There are three sites that generate TRU waste at Oak Ridge: Y-12 plant, K-25, and ORNL. ORNL has been receiving Nuclear Fuels Services' non-defense TRU waste. Now about 25% of the total inventory of CH TRU waste at ORNL is non-defense.

2) ORNL packages their waste in stainless steel drums. The largest volume of waste at ORNL is RH TRU waste. ORNL has 300 casks each containing about 100 ft³ of waste.

3) ORNL will start repackaging 2400 drums of CH TRU waste. The goal for repackaging this waste is to reduce volume since many of the drums had very little waste in them.

4) ORNL is conducting a six to eight month study to evaluate alternatives to the Waste Handling and Packaging Plant (WHPP) which is the proposed facility to process RH TRU waste at ORNL.

Tim Melberg, Rocky Flats

1) Residues are currently the biggest problem at RFP. The Colorado Department of Health is the driver for removing the residues by December 1999.

2) RFFO has sent to Headquarters conceptual designs for the facility to remove the actinides from the residues.

MAY 11, 1994

The presentations by site representatives were continued this morning since time ran short the previous day.

Roger Gordon, Richland

1) Hanford has 38,000 drums in bermed storage. This summer a pilot program will retrieve 138 drums from five trenches. This will be done to check the condition and contents of the drums. In 1998, 10,000 drums will be retrieved from Trench 4. For Phase IV of the retrieval program, 28,000 drums will be retrieved. There needs to be a close relationship between WRAP I and the WIPP WAC.

2) Hanford has a lot of remote-handled TRU waste. WRAP Module 2 is the RH TRU waste facility at Hanford. Currently, this facility is on hold while renegotiations are going on with the State of Washington.

3) Currently, Hanford is considering privatizing the WRAP Module 2B which is the alpha low-level waste facility.

4) Hanford has several unanswered letters that were sent to HQ. Copies of these letters were given to the Site Survey Team. One involved whether or not radium and U_{233} can be handled as TRU waste.

Stan Massingill, Savannah River

1) At the Savannah River Site (SRS), characterization is the biggest concern.

2) The first priority at SRS is the long-term safe storage of their drums. SRS has a retrieval project and they are looking into privatizing the retrieval of waste. SRS has six bermed pads of retrievably stored TRU waste.

3) SRS is working on its Site Treatment Plan.

4) SRS would like to see a portable combined characterization facility. This facility would include assay, real-time radiography, computerized tomography, microwave technology, and acoustic technology.

5) Of the 4400 drums that have water intrusion, about 1400 drums have been dewatered.

6) SRS has a small amount of RH TRU waste.

Sam Cheng, Dayton Area Office

1) Sam gave a short history of the Mound Facility. The Mound Facility will soon go under the auspices of the newly established Ohio Operation Office. This change will occur by October 1994. Other-sites that will be managed out of the Ohio Operations Office are West Valley and Fernald.

2) The new mission of Mound is the safe shutdown of Defense Projects. Much of Mound's TRU waste will come from decontamination and decommissioning activities.

3) Mound has no repackaging facility and no capability for opening and sampling of drums. Most of Mound's TRU waste is non-mixed.

Performance Based Waste Acceptance Criteria

Paul Dickman, AL, presented information on the Performance Based Waste Acceptance Criteria (PBWAC). The PBWAC will be used to support the WIPP compliance package. It has to be shown that a system is in place to characterize TRU waste. He said that process knowledge is one analytical method for certain parameters for characterization. The PBWAC will define the envelope of waste acceptability, and Performance Assessment will define the acceptable volume by waste profile. Generator sites are responsible for developing their respective waste profile.

Paul said that the DOE policy is that there will be no treatment of TRU waste to Land Disposal Restrictions, but the policy does not say that DOE will not treat TRU waste.

The Baseline Inventory Report will be sent out for review with a request for sites to fill in tables where applicable.

Sites do not have to wait until 1997 for final requirements; they should follow what is in the Quality Assurance Program Plan. The first iteration of Performance Assessment will tell sites which are the preferred wastes for disposal. These will

go to WIPP first. The 1997 WIPP WAC will tell the distribution of the various waste profiles. The WIPP facility is the disposal operator and will notify the sites which waste to ship and when.

A recommendation was made to put "Performance Demonstration Program" on the next TRU Waste Steering Committee Meeting Agenda.

Communications Management Plan

Mark Matthews gave an overview of the Communications Management Plan. The management plan was distributed and comments on the draft plan have been requested by May 20, 1994.

EM Program Plan

Wayne Nobles, EM-332, presented this concept. This program plan encompasses all the waste types: high level waste, low level waste, TRU waste, mixed low level waste, hazardous waste, sanitary waste, and spent nuclear fuel. Chapter 7 is the TRU waste chapter.

The "New Process" will build upon rather than replace the current process. Each waste type will follow the same steps that the TRU waste system has (future vision, current state, roadblock identification, issue resolution). The product of the "new" process will be integrated and comprehensive. There will be a single Waste Management Program Plan that will integrate cross-cutting and waste type plans into one single document.

An all-waste type meeting will be held in Chicago on May 16, to develop a program plan for each waste type. The program plan will follow the TRU waste program plan. There will be an annual cycle for this program plan.

Small Quantity Generators

Rod Cummings, EM-443, presented the small quantity generators issue. The objective of this presentation was to identify the removal of TRU waste from NRC facilities as a top priority. The Small Quantity Generators' transuranics pose disproportionate financial and legal risks to the EM mission that can be eliminated. Mr. Cummings wants to solicit the Steering Committee for input on priorities, strategies, and next steps. He would also like to identify the NTPO/TRU Waste Steering Committee team players for follow-up actions. The FFC Act equity negotiations may open up interstate transfers of this waste.

At some facilities, small quantities of TRU waste have inhibited operations at NRC

facilities for as long as 10 years. Legal action could be brought against DOE. The NTPO will take an active role in working with HQ to resolve this issue.

Interface Working Groups

Nine interface working groups were discussed. The TRU Waste Steering Committee will have more control of these groups; DOE should have the lead for these groups. A draft policy statement for the interface working groups will be developed by June 10, 1994. A decision was made to include non-WIPP TRU waste in the Small Quantities Generators Interface Working Group.

TRU Waste Steering Committee Charter Development

The draft Charter was presented to the Committee for comment. Comments were made and a revised Charter will be drafted and sent to the participants for further review and comment. The draft Charter will be sent to the Steering Committee representatives with comments due by June 1, 1993. A quick turnaround revision will go back to the representatives in early June, with the Charter to be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting in early August.

Wrap-Up

The next TRU Waste Steering Committee Meeting will be held in early August in Idaho Falls, Idaho. More information will be forthcoming.