

Dimarzio Data Request dated 9/16/10

Subject: H Canyon Waste Forecast

Question: There are two references that estimate solid waste forecasts for H-Canyon. Each is attached. The forecasts do not agree at all. I am going to assume the higher forecast in the file H-Canyon waste forecast.pdf is correct, but someone may want to review this to see what the issue is. I guess there is a nuance I am missing. In the other file, the pertinent information is on page 12. Both sources reference the SRS Solid Waste Information Forecasting Tool.

Response: Chandler dated 9/16/10

The PU-EIS forecast includes both the contribution of HB-Line and H-Canyon and includes projections for the facility modifications and the throughput changes that go along with future processing. The H-Canyon summary appears to be an estimate assuming continued operations, given an unknown future. For H-Canyon the projection may be reasonable since contamination of secondary waste may not change. Legacy contamination influences H-Canyon more than process changes, in addition, process changes in H-Canyon are mainly throughput changes of process solution and have little impact on secondary waste. Decisions on FFTF processing would have the potential to possibly increase TRU waste generation for H-Canyon, but only if a decision is made to open and repackage FFTF in H-Canyon.

I though I should give you some more information. The H-Canyon/HB-line waste numbers were somewhat difficult to arrive at because of overlapping NEPA and timing. We already have NEPA coverage for many process changes that can occur between now and 2013 when the Pu EIS is final, but to what degree certain process changes will occur depends on the near term facility funding. Some of the H-Canyon changes are occurring this year, and next, due to the benefit the changes provide near term processing, more will occur if the SNF Amended ROD is signed. If the ROD is not signed, expect everything to stop.

Similar to H-Canyon, HB-Line changes are occurring due to near term processing needs that also can impact projections for waste. As an example, we have been pursuing Technology Development funding to support implementation by 2013 anticipating the Pu EIS, because the technology also supports current operations. If the additional TD funding does not come through, then the implementation work activities will spill over into the period addressed by the Pu EIS and will impact the waste projects for those years, otherwise the waste increase occurs earlier.

Schedules, funding, missions etc. are more difficult to plan now than any other time I remember. Even when we were addressing the DNFSB 94-1 and 2000-1 items and changing missions constantly I had more confidence in planning activities. The SNF and Pu missions should be easier because to their long term consistency, but until DOE makes some decisions, planning is very fluid.