

FW Cs-137 Storage.txt

From: Owens, Kirk W.  
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 10:54 AM  
To: 'jemh@lanl.gov'  
Cc: Mirsky, Steven M.; 'isaacson@lanl.gov'  
Subject: FW: Cs-137 Storage

Julie,

In response to an exchange regarding OSRP plans, Mike Pearson provided the information in the 4th paragraph below. Other material that was used in the SWEIS indicates that 4 of the RTGs are stored in shafts and 2 are stored above ground. Can you tell me if 2 RTGs are still stored above ground and if the plan is to continue storing them above ground?

Thank you for your assistance,

Kirk Owens  
SAIC  
(301) 601-5611 (voice)  
(301) 428-0145 (fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: mwp@lanl.gov [mailto:mwp@lanl.gov]  
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 9:40 AM  
To: Owens, Kirk W.  
Cc: Leonard@lanl.gov; shelby Leonard; brent Park; john Isaacson  
Subject: RE: Cs-137 Storage

Kirk,

At this point, I am reluctant to set a limit on CMR beyond saying that the huge transportation overpacks that we would use for large quantities of Cs would not be placed there. As I described to you earlier, if they have current NEPA coverage for the materials they are authorized to possess now, then any materials moved to the facility for OSRP would be constrained within those limits. Thus there is no impact. I still believe it should be written that way. I am forwarding my response to you to John, and up the chain for communicating this position.

I believe TA-18 also falls into the same category as CMR in terms of existing NEPA coverage. If they are authorized the presence of the materials now - i.e., Cs-137 or Co-60 by their existing coverage, then OSRP utilization of the facility has no impact.

This was not the case for TA-54, where it is clearly understood that previous NEPA coverage only addressed existing and projected waste volumes.

Planning for Sr-90 storage at TA-54 still assumes placement of these RTGs in shafts. No sources of any magnitude are known and anticipated for management under this plan.

I know that this e-mail does not answer the question you have on CMR, but I cannot commit, today, on any restrictions beyond the currently authorized operational limits for the facility. I will discuss this issue with my management again on Monday for further direction.

Mike

At 07:09 PM 2/8/2006, you wrote:

>Mike,

>

>I know that it is hard when you don't have a piece of paper in front of  
>you with the results, but the problem was not TA-54. Based on the  
>information you provided earlier this week on maximum inventory per  
>container, Al's

>TA-54 accident analysis shows a dose to the MEI on the order of 2-4 rem  
>and to the population of about 100 person-rem. At TA-54, the high  
>population dose was associated with a large above-ground inventory of  
>Sr-90. If you can confirm that Sr-90 would be associated with RTGs and  
>that the operational plan for managing the RTGs is storage in shafts,  
>then the population dose associated with Sr-90 would be greatly mitigated.

>

FW Cs-137 Storage.txt

>CMR Building is where we need some help. You say that Cs in these  
>quantities would not be stored at CMR Building. What quantity of Cs  
>would be considered for storage at CMR -- right now it is the bounding isotope.  
>All we have to work with are the Pu equivalent inventories converted to  
>inventories of each of the expansion nuclides. Can you advise us as to  
>which of those would be stored at CMR Building and any realistic  
>limitations that would be required (i.e., the idea that one couldn't  
>put a lot of containers in the building; what would be a practical limit?).

>  
>As far as TA-18, my understanding based on communications Elizabeth has  
>had with Headquarters is that it is heading for shutdown by 2008. We  
>therefore have not included specific analyses for TA-18. I hope this  
>is not news to you; I was under the impression that this had conveyed.

>Thank you for your help,

>  
>Kirk Owens

>SAIC

>(301) 601-5611 (voice)

>(301) 428-0145 (fax)

>  
>-----Original Message-----

>From: mwp@lanl.gov [mailto:mwp@lanl.gov]

>Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 5:24 PM

>To: kirk.w.owens@sai.com

>Cc: Leonard@lanl.gov; John Isaacson

>Subject: Cs-137 Storage

>  
>Kirk,

>  
>In my haste, I forgot to mention that storage of Cs-137 in these  
>quantities would not be attempted in CMR. If the analysis could be  
>performed for TA-18 and TA-54, Area G, I believe we would have the  
>coverage we need.

>  
>Mike

>  
>Kirk,

>  
>I discussed the Cs-137 recovery potentials and assumed storage  
>configurations. We are comfortable with establishing NEPA coverage for  
>high activity Cs-137 sources at 100,000 Ci. This would be distributed  
>throughout approximately 10 Type B Containers. Operationally, I am  
>sure that the Area G folks would dictate storage in different domes.  
>Do not forget that prior to a recovery of this nature, the Area G  
>Management would be consulted and specific approvals obtained.

>  
>Mike

>  
>M. W. Pearson, CHP

>On-Site Ops Tm Ldr

>Off-Site Source Recovery Project

>N-2 Advanced Nuclear Technology

>MS J552 TA 46 Bldg 231

>PHONE 505-665-0483

>CELL 505-699-9411

>FAX 505-665-7913