



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

ITP (Salt Disposition) Focus Group

Meeting Record

July 16, 1998

Holley House, Aiken, SC

The ITP Focus Group met on July 16, 1998, at the Holley House, Aiken, S. C. The purpose of the meeting was to review the risk process that the engineers used to evaluate the eighteen alternatives. ITP Focus Group members in attendance were Lee Poe, Karen Patterson, William McDonell, Mike French and Wade Waters. Bill Spader attended as a member of the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations (DOE-SR). Members of Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) were Steve Piccolo and Jim Moore.

Lee Poe, Chairperson, welcomed all those in attendance and stated the objective of the meeting was to review the risk evaluation process. Mr. Poe introduced Steve Piccolo, the High Level Waste (HLW) Salt Disposition Systems Engineering Team Lead.

Mr. Piccolo answered questions that several had from the last meeting before starting his presentation.

Mr. Piccolo reminded the group that the purpose of the process was to dispose of the High Level Waste (HLW) salt in the tanks. He reiterated that ITP must take anything that came out of the canyons and send it to an approved waste form. Examples of approved waste forms were the repository, landfill, and alternate waste forms. He reminded the group that ITP was not boxed into HLW only.

Mr. Piccolo stated that to get to the eighteen alternates, the core team had to consider three focus areas: Business, Management and Technical. The processes used in the three focus areas were Weighted Evaluation Criteria Process, Risk Assessment Process and Flowsheet Analysis, respectively. Once the alternatives were evaluated by the three processes, the alternatives were then analyzed using the Team Expertise to come up with the eighteen alternatives.

Mr. Piccolo explained the criterion, definitions and weights of evaluation criterion which were used on all the alternatives for the business focus. Of the six main criterion categories, Technology, Regulatory/Safety/Environmental, and Engineering were given the highest weight during this investigation part of the process.

Mr. Piccolo reviewed the sub-categories under Technology which were Scientific Maturity, Engineering Maturity and Process Simplicity. Mr. Piccolo reviewed some examples of the sub-categories under the Regulatory/Safety/ Environmental and Engineering criterion. Mr. Piccolo

stated that the weighting of the criterion helped define a level playing field for the alternatives by evaluating each alternative with consistency.

Mr. Piccolo then reviewed the Risk Assessment Process that is part of the Management Focus area. He explained the purpose of the risk inventory sheet is to get the thought process started. It is basically a reminder that in a particular area, there is a risk identified. This is recorded with a yes or no.

Mr. Piccolo reviewed the Preconceptual Preliminary Risk Assessment Identification Forms. He explained the numbering system as well as the different categories such as the Statement of Risk, Probability, and Consequences. The core team decided to use .3 as the indicator of high and moderate risk versus the text book indicator of .5 since most of the risks would not trip the .5 threshold. If the risk identified was above the .3, then they were required to do something to mitigate that risk.

Mr. Piccolo reviewed the Level 1 and Level 2 Evaluation Criteria Assessment Form. This form gives the evaluation criterion description and determines the weighted score of the particular alternative by sub-criterion category. The evaluation criterion weighted value is multiplied by the utility function to yield the evaluation criterion weighted score for the alternative.

A question was asked about the final team evaluation on an alternative. Mr. Piccolo explained that the Weighted Evaluation Criteria Process, the Risk Assessment Process and the Flowsheet Analysis processes are pulled together by the team to make the final team evaluation. Mr. Piccolo said that the explanation of how the team evaluated the three processes to select the final "short list" would be explained at the next meeting.

Mr. Poe suggested that in order to be able to review the final 4 alternatives in one day, that each member of the Focus Group would be asked to be a proponent for one of the alternatives. That proponent would be the subject matter expert for that alternative. He also felt that the summary material that they currently had was not enough material to understand a particular alternative. Mr. Poe asked Mr. Piccolo if he could send them more detailed information on each of the alternatives. Mr. Piccolo suggested that next week they get together to determine the amount of information Mr. Poe needed.

Mr. Poe reminded everyone that the next meetings were as follows:

August 6 at the Holley House in Aiken at 7:00 p.m.

The group will develop the criteria they plan to use to evaluate the 4 alternatives.

August 13 at SRS from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The group will perform an in-depth review of each of the four alternatives.

Mr. Poe adjourned the meeting.

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