13/11

Paul / Mike / Jeanette

SRRU next steps —

Jeff Steele — Mtg DOE EM

~~Navy~~ Naval Reactors

take over to discuss status of waste characterization

No official classification or declassification of waste

— ① DO we have everything they sent

Logistic

— ② 2006 Disc from Rampey —

report 2006 report

I Rampey

2006 → take over of G&H

what was done.

II what do we have from Pad Meshaps

from take over to G&H to present

2010 - did they do what they should have

to determine rest.

2006 → take over

2009 → Meshaps

2010 → revision - did they do what they should have done.

on a rolling basis

Approval Process - Yalila west valley

P.G to get
J. E. →

A) 2006 — change ones
B) 2009
C) 2010 on

Do we have original runs.

P.G. → Master Storage for Master

Wrsday → Shut meeting

— w/o Stack you need
to characterize waste

— Characterize
characterize

Classify

for disposal

P.G. - Should have
been HLW
due to the process

DOE says it is low level waste

10/3

- Reshape
- TYPE B report

2 look for violations

Diffuse emission is dominant dominant source
once stack went down

[They are out of compliance because
no cont air monitoring]

# of HEPA filters went from from 12 to 3

Reid 202 343-9563

Teanette - 732 482 1038

61.94 (c)

61.93 (b) - existing

61.93 (c) new

d
e
e
f

all refer to b as well

Hard to address different sources

John Anderson

61.94 (c)

CAP 88 version 4

new CAP 88

0.1 mrem

b (5)

~~The point source~~

ONE

Define source

Existing source source →

C

9(6)

define

15.00

- JOM Peake -

set up meeting

Sept
Nov
Nov

1

2 spot - spot

(1) We have a NESHAP
co matter which — NESHAP
risk is thru waste characterization
what is there & the risk attributable
to radionuclide - activity risk assessment
exposure assessment - activity
waste classification concern how the waste
is disposed of regardless of the activity
Issue do we need to classify the wastes in
terms of NESHAP - probably no
Probl but when the stack went down we had a
diffuse source. ~~In ma~~ A should ~~it~~ we
be concerned in how DOE manages the
diffuse source in terms of ~~mea~~ contacting
air emissions. Sh if it had X classification
of waste - should that be handled differently from
Y classified waste. Do we need to know this
also?

Though water can we
convert this to a nonmulti-media
matter & then require DOE to

Dec 6,

Paul Jeanette / HQ

TYPE A – did not look at waste
not an

– No culture of safety
unlike west valley

~~Rey stands~~
Rey was 400 grams of PU
1/3 of a weapon

TJ – said there are four questions

Robert Goldsmith → Safety operations of SPRU
K. Krandel →
McKenzie →

JE – deficient report
– insufficient report – for off offsite dose assessment
– JE asked they redo a report

JE Nov 10th Mtg → as a result of the Sept 29 incident
& water issue, P.G. advised JE to go up &
talk about MESHAM & waste classification & inventory

JE → could not tell what dose was

+ No provision for redoing report ∴ violations for a bad report

+ 'When' ~~handed~~ KAPL turned site to SPRU

~~PTE that~~ KAPL had
SPRUs PTE was less than KAPL &
JE says it should have been higher due to demolition

JE We don't know the inventory at SPRU

KAPL inventor is based on filters which is is reliable

P.G. will get 1959 report designating waste streams

Waste should have been High level or TRU waste

Waste originated at Hanford - Yes
Purex extraction - Yes
waste were stored in building H - Yes
states for waste incidental to processing } → NO waste reprocessing

Tom Peake - ~~not~~ Purex process $\xrightarrow{\text{yields}}$ high level waste

Sludge left over in basement ~~of H~~ which adjacent to H

T.P. → there might be some low level waste
P.G → but if it has TRU > 100 nano curies/gram

P.G. if they new about the PU that was there they should have included that in CAP 88

P.G. it was never quantified in 1959 as high level but it ~~sho~~ could have been

P.G. did criticality analyses to see if you have fissile waste

JE - inadequate characterization in H_2 ∴ you can't do a MEOSI

P.G. → don't do anything on site until you can't do any work onsite until you know what is ~~there~~ is the waste inventory
"IR"

TP → evaporators
JE → TYPE B said they thought CE was the problem but the data show Sr was the ~~ke~~ E problem

Regional Appr

Grantwise OPC

T.P. what is the inventory & where is it

F.P.
JE./TP : they want to treat this a demolition & did not care about waste inventory & hazard to public & workers

P.G. → - clearly not in compliance @ time of
- apparently not

NOV -

TG - what was used in CAP 88
- existing info
- past existing info sections

TP → - provide us with additional release
- additional monitors around the facility
- capture all release from future
- point source.

P.G. - also what did they send to energy solutions

P.G. missed inventory :- you have a chance that you are over 10 mrem/yr.

Briefing with Kevin / Jonne / Adolph
Paul / E Jeanette.

PG - explained to Kevin the
August release.

August - Pump failed & spilled 1 gal / ton

While planning for the tent they
found highly contaminated area at the spill.

All inside the tent.

PG → Navy want all contaminated area covered

K. B → → Adolph [illegible]

K. B → → leave RCRA to the state

PG → ① gets get approval for small tent
& No construction

② - get approval for big tent
with vented ventilation

K. B → Property characterization for Road Reshape
tell DOE EM to move