

DRAFT

ATIC OVERARCHING QUESTIONS

DRAFT**POLICY/PROCESS**

- 1a. How global (INEEL vs. DOE complex) is the role of the ATIC?
- 1b. We need to gain a common understanding of the points Jessie Roberson made. Did she provide clarification of the ATIC's role?
- 1c. Are we going to focus on the 1500 cubic meters of INEEL TRU/Mixed Waste only in evaluating the alternatives to incineration, or are we going to take into consideration their applicability to other wastes in evaluating their priority?

2. How involved are the members of the ATIC to become in their evaluation of technologies? Are we going to rank alternatives, give recommendations on the action plan, or just develop enough understanding of the technologies to communicate with stakeholders? What is our role?

3. What criteria should be used to define acceptable technologies and rank them? What should be the decision process?

4. If good technical enhancements to propriety technologies are developed, what are the tools available to the Department to incentivize a private concern to build these technologies?

5. The EM "Top-to-Bottom" review calls for a re-look at DOE/Contractor relationships. How would DOE R&D on the alternatives be implemented on-site, particularly where technology selection is the sole responsibility of the contractor?

6. Given the existence of the BNFL privatization contract at INEEL, how does EM impact the technology selection process for clean up of the waste previously scheduled for incineration.
 - What prevents BNFL from selecting the most cost-efficient but perhaps not the most desirable (from a stakeholder standpoint) cleanup technology for the waste in question?

TECHNOLOGY

7. We've heard about the eight technologies. We've heard little about the necessary operational support mechanisms for them (i.e., analytical, waste handling, projected pre-treatments). What are the needs and their costs?

- 8a. How will the ATI technologies be proven using actual wastes- test plans, quantitative analysis of all streams, etc.?
- 8b. Why not use real waste as part of any demonstration of technology?

DRAFT

DRAFT**DRAFT**

9. Rank for each ATI technology their risks to the public, workers, and the environment when operating in a less than optimum mode.
10. What is the regulatory stance of each of the ATI technologies and how are each compared to incineration?
11. What are the projected costs/unit treated for each of the ATI technologies versus the same costs for incineration.
12. If chemicals like Regal Oil seem to have the tendency to hold hydrogen, why not use that, or similar material, to spike waste that has too high hydrogen generation to stabilize it for shipment? Why not use other low-tech solutions, such as low pressure hydrogen vacuum extraction or refrigeration before/during shipment?
- 13a. Dispose of MLLW and Mixed Intermediate Level Waste (MILW) at WIPP by combining MLLW and MILW with TRU waste to get around the differences in land disposal regulations and WIPP's less restrictive regulations where this mixing is cost effective. This, of course, would require DOE to reach agreement with regulators. It may provide some funding from this activity to treat higher risk waste.
- 13b. Technology demonstration discussions should include the entire treatment system including primary processing equipment and all needed portions on off-gas and secondary waste treatment. In yesterday's presentations, we heard and saw a little of this but no information on the off-gas treatment, etc. The entire system is important.

STAKEHOLDERS/MEETINGS

14. How do we make meaningful connection with the stakeholders? We appear to be focusing on Idaho/Wyoming stakeholders while talking about incineration/destruction issues (needs) across the complex.
15. Does DOE/EM intend to hold a stakeholder's meeting in the Jackson, WY/Idaho Falls, ID area prior to final selection/approval of cleanup technologies?
16. How are the results of stakeholders conferences going to act out in the real world of "technology" selection?
17. Prepare a table of waste needing treatment and use it to facilitate consistent discussion (keep everyone on the same page). This table should specify for each waste the type and amount, particularly troubling consistency that requires treatment, the location of the waste, etc.

DRAFT

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ADVISORY BOARD
United States Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 5B-171
Washington, DC 20585

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

TO: Perry Holcomb
Fax: (803) 613-1954

FROM: Michelle Lynar
Phone: (202) 586-1010
Fax: (202) 586-0590
E-mail: michelle.lynar@em.doe.gov

SUBJECT: ATIC Questions

DATE: February 28, 2002

PAGES (including this page) 3

As you requested.