

From: sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 1:13 PM

To: Dimarzio, John A.

Cc: Groome, Chadi D.; drew.grainger [REDACTED]; Nigam, Hitesh; sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov

Subject: Re: Comments on the MOX Facility and WSB Data Call Responses

Attachments: Comments on MOX Response-030508 - MOX responses.doc

Attached is the response for the MOX Facility comments. I expect to have the PDCF responses to you sometime tomorrow and the WSB responses before the end of the week.

Specific to the documents that were requested, I will send the PDCF draft PDSA (from 2005 I believe) to you tomorrow and hopefully I will know by COB tomorrow how quickly we can get the WSB documents to you.

Sachiko

Comments on the January 15, 2008 MOX Data Call Response (Received by SAIC on 1/22/08)

Location	Comment	Response
Page 2	A number of these groups of materials require preprocessing in KIS/CSSC (e.g., oxidation, milling, decladding?) before the materials can be input to the MOX Facility. Please describe the types of processing required for each class of material? We need information on these activities so that environmental impacts can be estimated?	For all cases where additional Pu is sent to MOX, K-Area will be required to repackage some of the materials into smaller quantities prior to shipping. Also if the items are metal then they must be oxidized through the CSSC (or equivalent) furnaces. There is no milling or decladding step. It has not yet been decided whether the material will require packaging to DOE-STD-3013 or packaged in accordance with the interim storage criteria, however for the purposes of this analysis, it should be assumed that it all will be packaged to meet 3013 (CSSC). K-Area can provide more details if necessary.
Page 3, Resources Needed, Steel, 0.46 and 1.4 MT	If the changes in the quantities of steel are significant, please provide an estimate of the additional steel needed.	The quantities of steel will change if a pneumatic transfer is needed for the 0.46 MT of high impurities feed processing, and for the storage ventilation changes. The increase will not be significant.
Page 4, Emission Release Parameters, Stack Flow Rate & Velocity, 1.4 MT	If the changes in the stack flow rate and velocity are significant please provide an estimate of these changes.	It was identified that a study was needed to determine the ventilation changes due to the storage of fuel grade powder. However, since the assumptions are that cans will be shipped when needed by MFFF, it is not anticipated that stack flow rate and velocity changes will be significant.
Page 4, Air Emissions, 0.46 MT	What analysis was done to show that these hazardous air pollutants may approach standards? Attachment B contains no analysis.	The attachment B is a qualitative analysis. A quantitative analysis has not been done because it requires more detailed data from DOE on the cans.
Page 5, Liquid Effluents, 9 MT	Please provide the referenced tritium studies when they become available.	The tritium impact preliminary study is documented in DCS01 ZJJ CG NTE F 61385 rev

		A. Detail studies are not started yet. Those documents have limited rights that will require a confidentiality agreement to be signed.
Page 6, Employment, 1.4 MT	Please provide an estimate of changes in employment.	Changes in employment will be determined after performing the design to handle fuel grade plutonium. Depending on the changes of shielding and automation, the increase may be up to 2 operators.
Page 6, Resources Needed, Gases, 1.4 MT	Please provide an estimate of the additional amounts of gases needed.	It was identified that a study was needed to determine the ventilation changes due to the storage of fuel grade powder. The DCM and KDM are both ventilated in air or dry air, therefore the additional needed gas is just air.
Page 6, Waste Generated, 1.4 MT, Solid Waste	Can we assume that all solid wastes increase by 20% as a bounding estimate, or are the percentage increases different for each waste type?	Assume that solid wastes increase (estimate 10% to 20%) with 20% as bounding
Page 7, Accidents, 0.46 MT and 1.4 MT	Are new/additional safety analyses being performed? Do you have a revised estimate of MAR?	Additional safety analysis will not be performed before we receive a formal request from DOE to process this additional feed. DCS01-RRJ-DS-CAL-H-35610 has not been revised. However, a preliminary evaluation was performed that shows that there will be no change to the accident consequences and IROFS.
Page 8, Table, "Increase per year (person-mrem)"	Is it true that these doses apply only to the years that fuel grade plutonium is being processed?	Yes. Therefore the increase should be defined over only 3 years.
Page 11, AFS 2	Is AFS 2 composed of 0.46 MT WG and 1.4 MT FG plutonium?	These concentrations are the result of the blending strategy for 1.4 MT FG.