Dimarzio Data Request dated 10/5c/10

Subject: Number of Additional HLW Canisters for SPD SEIS

Question: The data call responses did not clearly list the numbers of additional DWPF canisters that would be generated under each alternative. Please review the assumptions we have made (below), and make any necessary corrections.

Response: Fullerr dated 10/6/10

I agree with 6 MT case and 20 or 48 additional canisters based on neutron poison. 2 MT case and 7 or 16 additional canisters sounds correct. 0.6 MT case and 6 additional canisters sounds high based other numbers. Should be 4.8 or 5 canisters at 8 canisters per MT of plutonium dispositioned, but I don't think one (1) canister in the conservative direction will matter in the long run of the thousands DWPF will make. Mike Chandler is in Oak Ridge this week and will be back on Monday. I would wait and let him comment since he is the one who provided me with the numbers to put in the 6 MT case.

Response: Chandler dated 10/14/10

One reason I provided the reduced number of glass canisters for the 6MT was because most of the difficult and higher canister generating materials were in the 0.6MT group under the Interim Action.

I would use the range of 4 to 6 for the 0.6MT, since we seem to be using a range of canister generation. I would not state below 4 however now that the facility is considering removal of the uranium content of these materials via 1B-Bank and excess gadolinium will have to be added to the process. One reason there are less canisters in the more recent Pu Study was the recovery of the uranium from the combined EU/Pu metals. Prior studies could not consider there was a capability remaining for uranium recovery, when these metals were grouped in the 0.6MT group uranium recovery was viable.

Is there a reason the 0.6MT Pu is being addressed? The completion date of 0.6MT will probably preceded the issuance of the EIS and ROD.