



January 30, 1996



MEMORANDUM

To: NGA Federal Facilities Task Force Members
From: Ann Beauchesne
Re: Information and Reminder

Enclosed for your consideration are the following items:

- ◆ The most recent draft of the states' vision for a "State/DOE Dialogue on radioactive waste and materials disposition".
- ◆ A brief summary of the December 5, 1995, meeting on the WIPP site in Carlsbad, New Mexico.
- ◆ A brief summary of the December 12-14, 1995, Commercial Options Analysis Team Meeting.
- ◆ A set of mileage charts based on the MACTEC database dated December 31, 1995. Also attached is a list of major changes showing differences between the October 4 STP database and the December 31 version.
- ◆ The final memorandum that was sent from NAAG to DOE on January 22, along with the legal research on the criminal liability issue.
- ◆ A memorandum dated January 3, 1996, to Senator Dirk Kempthorne from Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Richard Guimond, explaining the final allocation decisions regarding the FY 1996 budget for DOE's Environmental Management program.
- ◆ Comments on DOE's draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) from California, Nevada, and Tennessee.

Also, we have scheduled an initial meeting of the states with major DOE facilities (Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Nevada, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington) on March 19, 1996. This will be followed by a full FFCA Task Force meeting on March 20-21. The two meetings would be separate, and the meeting on March 19 will focus on the states with major DOE facilities and the program decisions affecting them. An agenda and logistical information will be sent to you in a couple of weeks.

Please feel free to call either John or me with any questions (John at 202/624-7881, or Ann at 202/624-5370). We look forward to seeing you in March.



Meeting Summary

11/30/96

Visit of the National Governors' Association FFCA Task Force States with Department Of Energy Officials in Carlsbad, NM

December 5, 1995

The following is a brief summary of the December 5, 1995, meeting of NGA FFCA Task Force States with DOE staff in Carlsbad, New Mexico. The purpose of the meeting was to allow states hosting DOE TRU storage sites to tour the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) facility and to receive a briefing on the National TRU Waste Management Plan. Attachment A includes a meeting agenda and list of state participants.

Tour of the WIPP Facility

The morning portion of the meeting involved a tour of the WIPP site. State attendees thought the tour was extremely informative, and appreciated DOE's efforts in arranging and conducting it.

Meeting Between DOE and the States

The meeting began with an overview by DOE on the Carlsbad Area Office (CAO) and the national TRU program. The bulk of the discussion was devoted to the National TRU Waste Management Plan, which is described in Attachment B. Highlights of the presentations include:

- ◆ The WIPP Disposal Decision Plan still calls for an April 1998 start of operations, pending completion and approval of several items, including a No-Migration Variance from EPA, a supplemental environmental Impact Statement (EIS), a Facility Readiness Safety analysis report, a RCRA Part B Permit from New Mexico, and a Certificate of Compliance from EPA on radioactive constituents.
- ◆ Waste will be transported in the TRUPACT-II system already developed. The first shipping corridor will be INEL—Rocky Flats—Carlsbad.
- ◆ DOE expects a 30-35 year campaign to address all of the waste.
- ◆ Challenges identified include: maintaining the schedule in light of budget constraints, integrating with the generator sites to achieve systematic TRU waste disposal goals, completing waste characterization and experimental program activities, and responding to citizen and political issues.

National TRU Waste System Model

The next session focused on the National TRU Waste Systems Model. The presentation that accompanied this discussion is included in Attachment C. The purpose of the model is to provide a rapid numerical method for evaluating multiple waste management system configurations. It was designed to support the development of a National TRU Plan.

The key scenarios the model will be examining include the following:

- ◆ The baseline scenario: the TRU waste system configuration as it exists now.
- ◆ The Site Treatment Plan Scenario: the complex as defined by the approved site treatment plans.
- ◆ Alternative scenarios: those that involve changing considerations of characterization, treatment, and transportation.

Some of the alternative scenarios that *might* be examined include:

- ◆ Changes to the waste characterization system—excluding or changing requirements for characterization and changing the capability of characterization (e.g., mobile, lab, sampling).
- ◆ Changes in treatment location and configuration—examining centralized, regional, and mobile approaches.
- ◆ Changes in transportation scenarios—examining rail, alternative containers, and Remote Handled (RH) containers.

DOE stressed that the above were examples of alternatives that might be examined, but a final list of alternatives had not been identified. DOE will share this list with the states in late February 1996.

State Comments

States indicated they would like to have an opportunity to review the types of scenarios that would be examined and to comment on results once DOE had narrowed its range of alternatives it planned to seriously consider. Thus, an early activity would involve states commenting on the initial list of alternative scenarios to be modeled.

States did have some comments on DOE's initial plans. First, they questioned why DOE simply did not consider the Site Treatment Plan (STP) scenario as the baseline scenario to avoid controversy. DOE indicated that it would consider changing its alternative scenario designation in response to this comment.

Second, states questioned whether it made sense to look at centralized treatment scenarios, since treatment of TRU waste chiefly involved stabilizing and consolidating the waste for shipment to WIPP in a TRUPACT. Presumably, in a centralized treatment scenario, raw waste would be shipped to a centralized location in something less robust than a TRUPACT. However, it is unlikely that this would be acceptable. In fact, centralized treatment probably would involve first shipping the raw waste in a TRUPACT or equivalent to a central treatment location; unpacking the waste and further consolidating it at the treatment site; and, finally, repackaging the treated waste in a TRUPACT for ultimate shipment to WIPP. The economic benefit of such a scenario was difficult to see.

Waste Acceptance Criteria

Don Watkins of DOE discussed development of the WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC), which is in its fifth generation. In its revisions, the WAC continues to be revised to "widen the envelope" of waste to be accepted at WIPP. DOE expects to have the WAC completed by April

1996. A major component of the system will be the WIPP Waste Information System (WWIS), a waste characterization and certification database. The WWIS will offer three reviews of data before shipment through a characterization data transmittal, a certification data transmittal, and a shipping data transmittal. The presentation on the WAC is contained in Attachment D.

WIPP Permitting Issues (State of New Mexico's Perspective)

The final presentation was given by a representative from the State of New Mexico on WIPP permitting issues (Attachment E). Their handouts contain a summary of the anticipated schedule, which anticipates a draft permit release for public comment by July 1996. The presentation covered several issues of concern, specifically, DOE's plan to rely on acceptable knowledge from generator sites to characterize waste. On that issue, states hosting generator sites invited New Mexico officials to review and comment on all characterization systems and outputs occurring at their sites and to work with them to ensure they—New Mexico—received acceptable information. States present assured New Mexico that they themselves were concerned about the quality of characterization data and would not feel comfortable if they did not know the nature of waste leaving their sites. New Mexico officials appreciated the response and indicated they would like to work with other states as they develop and oversee characterization work.

Next Steps

DOE and the states agreed to the following set of tentative next steps:

- ◆ DOE would provide a more detailed list of alternative scenarios to be examined by the end of January 1996.
- ◆ Preliminary modeling results of the alternatives would be available for states to review in February 1996. States asked DOE to give some indication of likely alternatives to undergo further serious consideration at that time.
- ◆ Additional more refined results would be available for review in the Spring of 1996.

DOE staff indicated that Amber Clay or Don Watkins would be the key contacts for policy issues.