

Return to WMUR. 461-55

WM-39
PDR



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

MAY 27 1981

WM-39

MEMORANDUM FOR: Files

THRU: Ross A. Scarano, Chief
Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch
Waste Management Division

FROM: William M. Shaffer, III, Project Manager
Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch
Waste Management Division

SUBJECT: DOE UMTRAP PROGRAM STATUS REVIEW MEETING (APRIL 15, 1981. DOE-HQ,
GERMANTOWN, MARYLAND)

For 5/11/81

Background

At DOE invitation, Thomas Fleming and myself attended the subject meeting. The meeting was well attended by appropriate DOE staff and other agencies and organizations having an active role in the UMTRAP or an impact on the program. A complete attendee list is not available but Attachment I lists the principal non-NRC attendees. Attachment II is a summary of the status at the four highest priority UMTRAP sites.

Attachment III is the DOE viewgraph handout package from the meeting. I feel both the package and the presentation of it given by Richard H. Campbell, Project Manager, UMTRAP Project Office, DOE-Albuquerque, are an excellent and concise summary of progress in the program to date. The next section of this report discusses what I consider to be the currently most significant UMTRAP milestones, bases, and potential problems. These are based on the presentation, handout, and discussion from the meeting. The final section notes several related questions that were discussed with those present at the meeting.

UMTRAP Milestones/Bases/Potential Problems

1. Current UMTRAP Remedial Action (RA) schedules are based upon availability of Final EPA Cleanup Standards for Inactive Uranium Processing Sites by 10/1/81. There is, however, enough project scheduler flexibility to accommodate a delay in this date to 1/1/82. Beyond that, the overall RA schedules will start to slip. Program life is still geared to 7 years from publication of Final EPA Standards, as required by UMTRCA, and is presently scheduled to complete at the end of FY 1988.
2. The previous four highest priority UMTRAP sites remain the same: Durango, CO; Salt Lake City, UT; Canonsburg, PA; and Shiprock, NM.

8106090 009

4/12

3. The question of what organization in what agency will be ultimately responsible for disposal site maintenance/surveillance (under NRC license) has not been explored and answered. Tentatively, internal DOE staff thinking appears to lean towards some entity within the DOE's national waste management program.
4. The UMTRAP is now considered by DOE to be an MSA (Major System Acquisition). The system is the entire program. Acquisition is the successful completion of the program.
5. Cooperative Agreements have been signed with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the state of Utah. A draft Cooperative Agreement is undergoing review by the State of Colorado. DOE is coordinating this review with NRC staff input.
6. Remedial action schedules for the 9 highest priority sites are currently based on moving the tailings to a new final disposal site.
7. Total UMTRAP cost to complete is estimated at \$474 million (including vicinity properties) in constant 1981 dollars with a state share of this fixed at \$31 million. In escalated (10% rate) dollars, the actual outlays are estimated at \$694 million based on the \$474 million constant dollar estimate.
8. The UMTRAP Project Office at DOE-Albuquerque currently consists of five professional positions (including the Project Manager) and one clerical position and is anticipated by the Project Manager to require five additional professional positions in order to accommodate the ramp-up in program activities in FY 1982 and FY 1983.
9. Program Budget Authority requirements ramp steeply from the \$30 million level in FY 1982 to \$78 million in FY 1983. The steep ramp was identified as a potential problem area requiring strong budget justification documents and a strong internal commitment from DOE to the program.
10. State funding required from two states is disproportionately high (Utah - \$9.4 million, Colorado - \$14.5 million) compared to the rest (average \$0.3 to \$2.0 million per state) due to uneven distribution of sites. This was identified as a potential problem area requiring strong commitment of states to fund their share of the program.
11. The highest priority UMTRAP vicinity site is Fire Station No. 1 at Salt Lake City, Utah. Groundbreaking to begin remedial action is scheduled for May 28, 1981. Remedial Action is estimated now to cost \$870,000. It was noted on one chart that NRC concurrence in the remedial action plan at that vicinity site was expected by 4/3/81. Sheldon Meyers asked if this had been obtained. I indicated that telephone concurrence in the plan, as scoped, was provided by 4/3/81, the formal concurrence letter to DOE was in final form, the accompanying supporting memorandum of justification was in word processing to be put in final form, and that the complete concurrence package would be forwarded in the next few days. The package was subsequently completed and forwarded to DOE on April 23, 1981.

12. The second highest priority UMTRAP vicinity site is the Sewage Treatment Plant at Salt Lake City, contiguous with the Salt Lake City (Vitro) Processing Site. Its priority has been formally raised by DOE-HQ from "medium" to "high." Partial exception from meeting EPA Interim Cleanup Standards may be requested of NRC by DOE. Preparation of the site Radiological and Engineering Assessment (REA) has been initiated. An RA cost estimate is not yet available.
13. At this time, 8 Processing Site EISs (covering the 9 highest priority sites) and 15 Processing Site EAs are planned. Some EAs may be upgraded to full EISs, however, should decisions be made to move tailings and/or incorporate tailings reprocessing. An NOI (with NRC concurrence) to prepare an EIS for the Salt Lake City (Vitro Site) was published April 13, 1981 in the FR.
14. The total R&D budget to support UMTRAP over its programmatic life is \$17.8 million. This is included in the previously noted \$474 million program total.
15. Consideration of tailings reprocessing, as required by UMTRCA, is an uncertain but potentially delaying program aspect. In 1980 letters were sent to site owners, and a notice was published, both soliciting expressions of interest in tailings reprocessing. Both owners and outside firms appear interested but complete and accurate assay data on uranium content of the tailings is not currently available. A program element to obtain this data is underway with results expected by early fall of 1981. In the interim, schedules and plans are underway assuming no reprocessing based on preliminary negative economic indicators. It is felt that estimates to reprocess will result in costs of about \$30/lb. product recovered while the currently weak uranium market is in the \$25/lb. range for virgin yellowcake. It was recognized and discussed that, if the market should strengthen, the economics comparison may shift the other way and reprocessing would be attractive. If that were to happen, the entire program would have to be reassessed to accommodate incorporation of reprocessing on schedules, NEPA process milestones, and funding. I believe it should also be considered that, even at the present status of economic comparison, it may be reasonable for some to question why, from an energy supply policy standpoint, reprocessed uranium were not sought, especially if the economics, while unfavorable, are not significantly so. It might not appear to be prudent federal energy resource management to permanently dispose of large quantities of already concentrated energy resources. If so, it is conceivable that UMTRAP disposal sites could be the open pit uranium mines of the future.
16. The DOE is planning to contract for a Technical Assistance Contractor (TAC) and Remedial Action Contractor (RAC), both by the end of CY 1981. The TAC will be located at Albuquerque and be staffed presumably in the 40-70 position range.

Related Side Questions

1. Dr. Ettliger from Mitre Corporation, the DOE contractor assisting in the development of the National Waste Management Plan, indicated that additional active NRC staff involvement was needed in future development of sections of the Plan treating uranium mill waste disposal. I indicated we would be quite willing to provide it. I subsequently met with Dr. Ettliger and Ms. Sharon Saari, also of Mitre, on April 23, 1981 at NRC-Silver Spring to discuss this further.
2. I pointed out to both DOE and Sandia National Laboratories staff that the NRC staff was participating as a panel member for the May 5-6, 1981 Vitro Site EIS public scoping meetings in Utah, but the Vitro Processing Site Remedial Action Concept Paper (RACP) for the Salt Lake City tailings had not yet been provided to NRC for review and input. A preliminary draft has subsequently been provided and NRC staff comments were provided to the UMRAP Project Office on April 27, 1981. A revised version will be utilized as input to the referenced public meetings and be noted as "Final Draft." It is anticipated that the Final RACP will be published by July 1, 1981.



William M. Shaffer III, Project Manager
Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch

cc: Robert W. Ramsey, Jr., DOE-HQ
(w/Attach. I & II)
Richard H. Campbell, DOE-Albuquerque
(w/Attach. I & II)
Dr. William E. Mott, DOE-HQ
(w/Attach. I & II)
R. G. Page, FCUF (w/all Attach)

ATTACHMENT I
PRINCIPAL NON-NRC ATTENDEES
UMTRAP PROGRAM REVIEW, APRIL 15, 1981
DOE-HQ, GERMANTOWN, MARYLAND

Sheldon Meyers, DOE-HQ, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Waste Management

Robert W. Ramsey, DOE-HQ, Program Manager, Remedial Action Programs

Donald Groelsana, DOE-HQ, Project Manager, Remedial Action Programs

Richard H. Campbell, DOE-Albuquerque, Project Manager, UMTRAP Project Office

William E. Mott, DOE-HQ, Director, Environmental and Safety Engineering Division

Stanley Lichtman, EPA, Criteria and Standards Division, Office of Radiation Programs

John McKiernan, Sandia National Laboratories-Albuquerque

Lester A. Ettlenger, Mitre Corporation, McLean, Virginia

ATTACHMENT II

STATUS OF FOUR HIGHEST PRIORITY UMRAP SITES

<u>State</u>	Pennsylvania	Utah	Colorado	New Mexico
<u>Site</u>	Canonsburg	Salt Lake City	Durango	Shiprock
<u>RA Complete Date</u>	11/85	4/87	6/87	12/87
<u>Cooperative Agreement</u>	Signed	Signed	Draft	Incomplete Draft
<u>State Recommended Disposal Site?</u>	Yes (2)	Yes (3)	Yes (4)	No*
<u>Remedial Action Concept Paper (RACP)</u>	Final Draft	Preliminary Draft	In Preparation	Not Started
<u>Tailings Reprocessing Planned</u>	No	Potential	Potential	Potential
<u>Processing Site RA Cost Estimates</u>				
1981 Dollars	\$13.9 million	\$88.7 million	\$42.9 million	\$25.6 million
Escalated	\$18.0 million	\$126.1 million	\$62.1 million	\$38.9 million
<u>Vicinity Properties</u>				
Potential Number	60	79	N/A	N/A
Designated Sites	26	22	N/A	N/A
RA Cost Estimate	\$7.2 million	\$7.3 million	N/A	N/A

*Indian Land, potential for in-place disposal.

N/A = Not Available at this time.