

NRC Salt Waste Monitoring
Disposal Unit 2 Status Update
June 3, 2010 Conference Call Summary

Attendees:

NRC	SRR	DOE-SR
L. Camper	M. Smith	T. Spears
K. Pinkston	V. Dickert	T. Gutmann
C. Ridge	K. Lancaster	P. Suggs
D. Esh	M. Schmitz	C. Pang
N. Devaser		
C. Mckinney		

Background

A conference call was held with the U. S. NRC to discuss the status of Disposal Unit 2 and activities related to the hydrostatic testing and repairs of disposal cells 2A and 2B. Disposal Unit 2A is currently being filled with water in preparation for hydrostatic testing. Disposal Unit 2B is currently drained of hydrostatic test water and an interior inspection is underway.

Summary

The following activity summary was provided to NRC during the call. Questions and answers discussed intermittently during the summary discussion are captured in the Question / Response section that follows the summary.

Terry Spears began the call by confirming that NRC had received the 2 page brief (Attachment 1, SRR-CWDA-2010-00066, *Disposal Unit 2 Water Tightness Test*) prepared for the call. NRC confirmed that they had received the materials. Spears discussed the repair and rebaseline activities conducted at disposal cell 2B, noting that the areas that had been identified as potential leak sites had been repaired and the repairs seemed to be successful since the repaired areas did not appear to recharge with dampness. Also, Spears noted that the stains on the upper mud mat had been cleaned and rebaselined, and that those areas continued to display dampness.

Spears discussed the current status of hydrostatic testing activities for both 2B and 2A as follows:

Disposal cell 2B has been drained of water and an interior inspection is currently being performed. From a business perspective, the contractor and his sub-tier contractors will enter the cell first for an initial assessment to ensure that the as found conditions are established and if the coating were to be damaged by SRR during their inspection activities this would be clearly distinguishable from conditions for which the contractor is responsible. Representatives of SRR will be allowed to enter after the initial assessment

to observe the conditions of the cell. The contractors are currently performing their initial assessment and we do not have any information as to the interior conditions at this time.

Disposal cell 2A is currently being filled with domestic water in preparation for the hydrostatic test and we anticipate that the filling will be complete sometime today (6/3/10). Upon completion of the filling activities there is a 96 hour test window consisting of a 24 hour hold period followed by 72 hours of testing per the water tightness test procedure.

Spears then discussed the planned activities required to ensure that cell 2B is performing as required by the contract. These activities include performing inspections of the interior of cell, performing an evaluation of the data collected from the inspections, and implementing appropriate repair methods to ensure that the integrity of the coatings is maintained. Finally, based on the findings of the inspections and the repair methods required, we will perform appropriate verifications to ensure that the cell is watertight. Ginger Dickert added that representatives (Rosenberger and Smith) from the Performance Assessment arm of SRR have been intimately involved in the hydrostatic testing activities and will enter cell 2B to observe the condition of the coating.

Finally, Spears noted that we plan to hold the contract for disposal units 3 and 5 to ensure that appropriate lessons learned from the current activities are incorporated into that contract.

Questions / Responses / Comments

Throughout the summary discussions NRC posed questions or requested clarifications as follows:

Q (Camper): Are the repairs that we have performed expected or are they unique to this design?

A (Smith): There are two types of repairs completed to date. The waterstop is a PVC material for which standard repair methods are available so repair of the waterstop material is an anticipated event. Leakage at the epoxy injection tube has been experienced by the tank vendor on similar designs and a standard repair method was used for those sites.

Q (Camper): Is this a standard commercial design?

A (Lancaster): It is modeled after a standard commercial design but enhanced to meet requirements of saltstone disposal cell.

Q (Esh): Does SRS intend to add dye to cell 2A?

A (Spears): Initially, the contractor intends to attempt to meet the original hydrostatic test criteria. That is to say he will check the cell for damp spots on the exterior and water level drop on the interior.

Q (Esh): Does the vendor believe that water is trapped in the construction joints similar to 2B?

A (Smith): Yes. In fact, that assertion has been verified by injecting compressed air in the rubberlite pads at the base of the shotcrete wall on 2A and verifying that water escaped the joint. This occurred before any water was added to 2A for the hydrostatic test.

Q (Esh): How did the pink stains end up on the 2B concrete if not from the dye?

A (Lancaster): The contractor is investigating the possibility that materials used in construction or from a co-located environmental source (such as Soil Tech used for erosion control) may be responsible for at least some of the observed conditions.

Q (Esh): Without a tracer of some sort how will the vendor distinguish between tank test water and construction water?

A (Lancaster): We are considering alternatives such as a tracer particularly if damp spots appear on 2A.

C (Esh): It will be difficult for NRC to consider a hydrostatic test valid without the use of some sort of tracer. Even if damp spots do not appear the rate of evaporation can exceed the rate of accumulation so that a simple visual observation for dampness could lead to a false negative test result. In addition, if use of a tracer is needed, selection of the tracer should consider the materials of construction and local native materials so that a positive result will be conclusive.

Q (Pinkston): Was there evidence of dampness on cell 2A?

A (Lancaster): Yes, and this was apparent before the introduction of water into 2A.

Q (Pinkston): When did we raise a concern with location 2 (from attached sketch) on 2B?

A (Lancaster): We investigated that area when evidence of water was observed but was inconclusive as to the source.

Q (Camper): Do the observed conditions impact the conclusions in the Performance Assessment?

A (Spears): At this time we intend to ensure that the vendor delivers a watertight tank required by the specification. If, at some point, we determine that this cannot be achieved the we would review the Performance Assessment for impacts.