



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

ITP (Salt Disposition) Focus Group

Meeting Record

July 2, 1998

Holley House, Aiken, SC

The following meeting notes are a summary of the specified meeting. Detailed meeting notes can be obtained by contacting Jim Moore, WSRC, (803) 725-5663 or Lee Poe, ITP Focus Group Chairperson.

The ITP Focus Group met on July 2, 1998, at the Holley House, Aiken, SC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the process used to narrow the 130 alternatives to 5 alternatives. ITP Focus Group members in attendance were Lee Poe, Karen Patterson, William McDonell, Mike French and Todd Crawford. Joel Case and Dieter Knecht attended as visitors from Idaho Falls, Idaho. Members of the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations (DOE-SR) in attendance were Howard Gnann, Debbie Long, Roy Schepens and Bill Spader. Members of Westinghouse Savannah River Company in attendance were Steve Piccolo and Jim Moore.

Lee Poe, Chairperson, welcomed those in attendance and asked everyone to introduce themselves. Mr. Poe explained that the Focus Group was an outreach of the CAB Environmental Remediation and Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittee. Mr. Poe reviewed the evenings agenda and then introduced Steve Piccolo, the High Level Waste (HLW) Salt Disposition Systems Engineering Team Lead.

Mr. Piccolo described the process for reducing 130 – 150 suggestions to 18 alternatives, then 4 alternatives. He notified the Focus Group that the short list of alternatives was narrowed down to 4 instead of 5 alternatives. Mr. Piccolo stated the phases of the process to narrow the field from 130 alternatives to 4 were: Phase 1, Identification; Phase 2, Investigation; Phase 3, Selection; and finally the preferred alternative. He stated that the basic assumption was that all the alternatives on the short list would work.

Mr. Piccolo stated that to identify the alternatives, the Team applied brainstorming. During the investigation, the Team did risk identification, risk management and process confirmation. He said they identified 450 risks and confirmed 400, driving site visits. This increased the Team's confidence in the method being used. The Team used weighted values on safety, technical and engineering areas. In checking sensitivity, the Team looked at Level 1 and 2 and lower criteria to determine the sensitivity. Independent reviews were performed by various organizations and these reviews are still in process. He stated that the system modeling looked at the systems they knew and developed detail sheets flow sheets. The process is under configuration control and they identified system interface. In this area, he said that they were a part of the HLW or Solid

Waste system. They determined that whatever the canyon mission is, ITP would take their product as output of HLW and place it into water, grout or glass. The Systems Team would ensure that the product was a qualified disposal form. Mr. Piccolo said that function and requirement confirmation was also considered. . He stated the Team reviewed the short list to see if it met the requirements or they would have to change. He said the 4 alternatives selected required no change in the requirements. He stated that a change in permitting would be required for a couple of the options. He stated that the Team used this method of confirmation for all 130 alternatives.

Mr. Piccolo stated that the recommendation to get from the 4 alternatives to the final 1 would require about 3 to 4 months time, including some laboratory research. In parallel, he said they would be doing an engineering analysis that would take about 3 months. He said they hoped both supported each other. Mr. Piccolo stated that he thought the final decision would be in late September or early October. Mr. Piccolo stated that they felt good about the schedule since the processes in the alternatives selected were familiar processes.

Mr. Piccolo stated the short list consisted of 4 alternatives which were: Direct Disposal Grout, Small Tank Precipitation - DWPF Vitrification, Crystalline Silicotitanate IX - DWPF Vitrification and Caustic Side Solvent Extraction.

Mr. Piccolo stated that in the Crystalline Silicotitanate IX - DWPF alternative, there were a couple of variations. One was to use DWPF, the other was to use a new ceramic waste form. It was a low temperature ceramic. He stated that they preferred DWPF because they knew DWPF, however, there was a large cost saving using ceramic. Mr. Piccolo stated that Caustic Side Solvent Extraction was the same equipment used in F canyon. Mr. Piccolo stated that this would be simpler in terms of prototype because scale up would consider the number of stages of processors instead of worrying if it works. There was some general discussion on the pluses and minuses of the 4 alternatives such as the amount of regulations/permits required and the generation of benzene.

Mr. Piccolo gave a general discussion of getting the long list down to 18 and then down to 4. He stated that they evaluated all the ideas whether they were new or wild. He stated that while some of the alternatives went away, many became hybrids and were resubmitted. He stated that going from 130 to 18 reduced 110 alternatives, however, 98 of those alternatives were combined with the 18 as hybrids.

Mr. Piccolo summarized the risk assessment process that was completed on the 18 alternatives that showed the high, moderate and low risks identified for each alternative. (This is the subject of the July 16 meeting and more details will be provided.) This included Weighted Evaluation Criteria and Mr. Piccolo described how they found the weights. Mr. Piccolo reviewed how future missions, regulatory issues, engineering and cost/schedule criteria were included.

After Mr. Piccolo completed his presentation, Mr. Poe asked the Focus Group if the objective was met, i.e., did Mr. Piccolo and the Team do what they said they were going to do? Most felt that he had. Mr. McDonnell stated that he had the information he needed to review the list of alternatives and see if he would have come to the same conclusion.

Mr. Roy Schepens, DOE-SR, stated that DOE was actively observing the process and would issue a report shortly. Mr. Schepens said they would share the report with the Focus Group. Mr. Schepens said he felt the Team had a fair, objective, disciplined approach and that there was no easy solution.

Mr. Poe mentioned to Mr. Gnann, DOE-SR, that the ITP information needed to get on a home page. Mr. Gnann stated that he would increase his priority on getting this information on the home page.

Mr. Poe adjourned the meeting.

Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.