

NMED Comments on the DRAFT Class 2 PMR to increase capacity at the RANT facility

1. NMED concurs with the stakeholder comments and questions during the stakeholder meeting on March 14, 2013, with the following exceptions and/or additional comments:
 - a. Closure Plan capacity. 40 CFR 264.112(b)(3) requires “An estimate of the maximum inventory of hazardous waste ever on-site over the active life of the facility...” to be included in closure plans. The current closure plans for TA-54-38 West estimate the total volume of waste that has been and will be stored at the units during the lifetime of the unit. Revise Section 3.0 of Attachments G.16 and G.17 to show the maximum inventory of hazardous waste that will be stored at the units at any given time (e.g., for the indoor unit: 4,950 gallons (90 DE); and for the outdoor unit: 42,570 gallons (774 DE)).
 - b. Construction, addition of second crane, and other physical changes at the RANT. During the meeting, the Permittees stated that the PMR would propose no construction or physical changes to the RANT. The Fiscal Year 2013 First Quarter 3,706 TRU Campaign Status Report, however, states that a second crane has been added to the facility and that there has been construction on the RANT Transportation Center to support the FY2013 shipping schedule. 40 CFR 270.42, Appendix I, Item F.2.a states that a “Modification of a container unit without increasing the capacity of the unit” is a Class 2 PMR. Adding a crane to the RANT facility is a modification of the container unit, and therefore requires a Class 2 PMR. Also, if the cited construction on the RANT Transportation Center is within the Permitted Unit, that also requires a Class 2 PMR. Include this additional information in the PMR, including revised figures. In the future, a PMR must be submitted prior to modifying any Permitted Unit at LANL.
 - c. Part A Application. The Part A Permit Application must be submitted as part of the proposed changes to the Permit (Attachment B) and should show changes in redline/strikeout to facilitate review. Page 14 does not address the two storage units added to Attachment B in the Part A Application of the Permit, and Page 15 mentions them in passing. These units are not associated with the PMR to increase storage capacity at TA-54-38 West, and therefore these modifications to Attachment B of the Permit should be submitted under separate cover as a Class 1 Permit modification to avoid possible delays related to the RANT PMR.
 - d. The impact and necessity of increased capacity on operations at the RANT.
 - i. Page 13 of the PMR states that the reason for increasing the capacity at TA-54 West is to increase the number of TRU waste shipments from the RANT to WIPP (3rd paragraph). Presumably, an increase in storage capacity means there will be an increase in the number of intra-site shipments of waste to the RANT as well. Page 13 also states that the increased shipping operations will not impact traffic volumes (6th paragraph). Resolve this discrepancy and provide updated traffic patterns, volumes, and controls at the RANT facility, including figures as applicable.
 - ii. Page 13 of the PMR states that the current storage capacity allows for five shipments of waste per week, and that the increased storage capacity would

allow for up to ten shipments per week (4th paragraph). The PMR, however, requests more than a 400% increase in storage capacity (from 11,660 gallons to 47,520 gallons). The 4th paragraph also states: "The ability to store a volume of waste that is greater than the number of shipments expected within a week is vital to expediting the loading/shipping of waste to WIPP." Explain why a 400% increase in storage capacity is vital to increase shipment capacity by only 200%. Explain how long pre-loaded shipments are/will be typically stored at the facility prior to shipping. Also explain how long waste containers are/will be typically stored at the RANT before they are loaded into shipping containers.

- iii. The entries in Table 2 of the PMR for Attachment J (pages 20-21) state: "Capacity of the unit was increased to allow the flexibility of managing shipments of larger containers." Page 13 of the PMR states that "the overall plan requires the need for an increase in the number and size of containers allowed to be temporarily stored at the RANT facility." However, the Permittees already store and ship SWBs, and this will not change; the Permittees are proposing to ship more SWBs. Revise the entries in Table 2 to indicate that the increased capacity will allow for more shipments of waste to WIPP, as opposed to shipment of larger containers to WIPP.
2. Attachment A of the Permit should be revised to provide more detailed descriptions of the processes at TA-54 West, including:
 - a. Equipment (e.g., cranes) that is used to load waste containers into shipping containers
 - b. Specific locations on the outdoor storage unit where waste containers are stored
 - c. Traffic flow, patterns, and controls into and out of the facility
3. 40 CFR 270.14(b)(10) requires the Permittees to provide traffic patterns, estimated volume, and controls. Table 1 references application documents that are ten years old, which in turn reference traffic studies that are 10 and 20 years old. It is presumed that these are outdated traffic studies, i.e., there have been changes at the LANL facility since they were conducted, and therefore they are no longer relevant. Provide updated traffic studies or a justification that these older studies are still relevant.
4. Table 1 of the PMR states that the requirements at 40 CFR 270.15(a) and (b) and 264.17(a-c) are addressed in Permit Attachment A, Section A.4.3, and Permit Sections 3.7 and 3.12.1. Permit Section A.4.3 does not, however, address containment at the unit, and Section 3.12.1 simply exempts NRC-certified shipping containers (i.e., TRUPACTs and HalfPACTs) from these requirements. Include a discussion in the PMR describing how the Permittees comply with the above regulatory requirements and the requirements in Permit Section 3.7 at the RANT facility. This discussion must be included in the PMR because waste containers stored at the facility may contain up to 1% free liquid by volume of the container and still comply with the WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria.
5. Page 13 of the PMR states: "The permitted units at TA-54-38 West are container storage units that are used to receive, stage, and assemble payload containers of transuranic (TRU) waste for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)." Page 14 of the PMR states that standard waste boxes and standard sized drums will be stored at the facility (1st paragraph), but the 2nd

paragraph states: "Expansion of the footprint for the TA-54-38 West Indoor Unit is necessary to accommodate larger waste containers inside the building." Attachment G.16, Section 2.0, states that fiberglass-reinforced plywood boxes and B25 boxes are stored in the High Bay. The Permittees have not proposed revisions to remove these types of containers from the language in Attachment G.16. Since these containers cannot be shipped to WIPP, and the Permittees are not authorized to open and repackage waste at TA-54-38 into containers that can be shipped to WIPP, explain why these types of containers are stored at the unit and how they will be ultimately dispositioned.

6. Table 2, first row: Justification column should clarify that *waste* containers stored at TA-54 West outdoor unit are subject to the secondary containment and weather protection requirements in the Permit; only NRC-certified shipping containers (i.e., TRUPACTs and HalfPACTs) are exempt from these requirements. See Comment 4 above.
7. Revised Figure G.16-1 was not included in the DRAFT PMR.