From: Heath, Maurice
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 1:20 PM
To: Miller, Debra
Subject: FW: Follow-up To Blending Presentation

Deb

Can you please add the email below to ADAMS.

Thank you

From: Thomas Magette [mailto:TEMAGETTE@energysolutions.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2009 12:55 PM
To: Bubar, Patrice
Cc: Kennedy, James; Heath, Maurice; Traynham, Brooke
Subject: Follow-up To Blending Presentation

Dear Patty:

The purpose of this email is to answer the question raised by Staff regarding the disposal volume at the Clive site and to correct an error on the same topic in my presentation.

Overall Clive Capacity – In my presentation, I cited 484,656,000 ft^3 as the overall capacity of the Clive site. The question arose as to why the stated volume had changed from that previously cited (150,000,000 ft^3). The larger number was first used by Energy*Solutions* President Val Christensen in his testimony before Congress regarding legislation to ban the importation of foreign low-level radioactive waste. Energy*Solutions* feels that this number best represents the remaining capacity of the licensed site. It represents the remaining capacity of what is known as Section 32, the area owned by Energy*Solutions* and licensed for disposal. While the entire area of the site is licensed, Energy*Solutions* must get license amendments for individual parcels, for example each new disposal embankment, as they are developed. The previously cited capacity, 150,000,000 ft^3, describes only the sum of the individual embankments for which design amendments have been approved or applied for on the licensed site.

Remaining Capacity of Clive for Resin Disposal – The numbers cited in my presentation for the remaining disposal capacity were incorrect for some of the hypothetical cases I presented. For CWF #3 and Class A North, the data failed to properly account for the waste already disposed and instead were incorrectly based on design volume. Also, for all the facilities (CWF #3, CWF #4, Class A North, and Class A South), the data included an erroneous assumption regarding design capacity. The data should have assumed a 16% total design capacity (i.e., disposal volume in the cell is 16% of the designed volume) rather than 16% loading rate for resins. The net effect of these errors is that at the current rate of disposal, CWF #3 likely will be filled within approximately one year (the current disposal rate is higher than the minimum 18,700 ft^3 case presented.) Remaining disposal capacity in the CWF #3 at the rate for the other cases discussed (All Class A, Blended Case 1, and Blended Case 2) would be well less

than one year. Because it still would be possible to dispose of only resins up to the design capacity as discussed, the capacity of the newly licensed CWF #4 is unchanged for that assumption. Also, given our latitude in developing the site, there is no change in the Optimized Case. The net result of these errors is that the range in years for the various cases presented is from under 1 to over 300 years, which I believe is supportive of the case that disposal capacity is not a relevant issue for blending. It also is useful to recognize that I presented a range of hypothetical cases precisely to bound the problem, rather than to identify a specific capacity, which cannot be done.

During the meeting I presented data only for containerized waste. I made reference to the possibility of using the Bulk Waste Facility for the disposal of some resins. Upon further analysis, it is clear that a substantial portion of the resins disposed at Clive could be disposed as bulk waste. Doing so would serve to further extend the life of the facility, also supporting our contention that disposal capacity is not at issue.

I am sorry for any confusion that this may have caused and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Tom

Thomas E. Magette, P.E.
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Regulatory Strategy
Energy*Solutions*
Washington, DC

New Phone number effective December 21, 2009

(240) 565-6148 - Columbia Ofc
(410) 353-0427 - Cell

E-mail Properties

Mail Envelope Properties (E3D0DF334F617344BE38EB00C881B1B303945F8E61)

Subject: FW: Follow-up To Blending Presentation
Sent Date: 1/4/2010 1:20:15 PM
Received Date: 1/4/2010 1:20:15 PM
From: Heath, Maurice

Created By: Maurice.Heath@nrc.gov

Recipients:
Debra.Miller@nrc.gov (Miller, Debra)

Tracking Status: None

Post Office:
HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	17415	1/4/2010

Options
Expiration Date:
Priority: olImportanceNormal
ReplyRequested: False
Return Notification: False

Sensitivity: olNormal
Recipients received: