

## John Batherson

---

**From:** Anderson, Amanda <Amanda.Anderson@hq.doe.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2012 9:03 AM  
**To:** John Batherson  
**Subject:** RE: Public Hearing Record Items

Thanks John,

I'll review these with NNSA.

-Amanda

---

**From:** John Batherson [<mailto:JohnB@dnfsb.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2012 8:59 AM  
**To:** Anderson, Amanda  
**Subject:** Public Hearing Record Items

Amanda, hello. Per our conversation yesterday attached find excerpts of questions taken for the record at the recent Y-12 public hearing. Please let me know if you have questions.

v/r

John Batherson  
Associate General Counsel  
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board  
625 Indiana Ave. NW, Suite 700  
Washington DC 20004  
[johnb@dnfsb.gov](mailto:johnb@dnfsb.gov)  
office: (202) 694-7018  
cell: 571 405 4648

**Questions Taken for the Record**  
**DNFSB Public Hearing and Meeting Convened**  
**October 2, 2012**

**Record Item 1:** (Page 47/Lines 12-24)

CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: If you can give me a brief answer, it's fine. If not, perhaps you can take this for the record. Can you name any other DOE projects in which -- multi-billion dollar projects in which you've changed contractors at this stage of the project? If you could give me a brief answer to that now? If not, we'll just take it for the record?

MR. ESCHENBERG: Waste Treatment Plant was one that didn't work out extremely well.

CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Do you have any other examples that pop into mind?

MR. ESCHENBERG: I don't, but we would be happy to take that question for the record.

**Record Item 2:** (Page 80/Line 24 – Page 82/Line 13)

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to follow up along the very same lines with respect to Beta 2E and 9215, but Mr. Erhart, I notice that the facility risk review does say 2030, the language isn't -- doesn't make that a hard date. But what else we just heard you say was we take a look at it every five years. The facility risk review was done this

year in May, so if we wait five years it would be 2017 when we do another facility risk review. And I look at what we're doing now on the design till the time when we expect to be operational in UPF and out of 9212, and so from the time we go get in the final design until the time we transfer all of the -- all of the operations, is going to be a decade, most likely, if not longer.

So is waiting five years, is that prudent with respect to these facilities?

MR. ERHART: That's a good question. One thing I failed to mention in my last -- my last answer was they recently decided to conduct the same review essentially that was done on 9212 with the same visibility with these other two buildings, so I believe in that process that they'll be rolled up with the 9212 status, and presented to headquarters and I believe that might be yearly, as a result of that decision.

Now, I will say that if five years is not the right periodicity, then we'd have the option to go in, especially if something changes, so we have to look at significant changes, but there's -- if the need is there to do another study and to take a look at where we are with those facilities, we'll certainly do that.

MR. SULLIVAN: You can take it for the record, if you like, but I would like to have submitted for the record a response to the Department as to what is the marker for -- what

are we laying down now for a marker for when we need to look at those two facilities again.

MR. ERHART: Yes, sir.

**Record Item 3: (Page 99/Line 3 – Page 100/Line 4)**

MS. ROBBINS: Yes. The SDOR technology, which is Saltless Direct [Oxide] Reduction, has been demonstrated to a TRL of 6, and in that we do have as part of the technology readiness assessment process, questions with regard to nuclear safety. We do have nuclear safety participants on our technology readiness assessment team, and those considerations have been made.

We do plan on testing the safe shutdown mechanisms associated with the Saltless Direct [Oxide] Reduction System as part of startup testing for the facility, and we consider those to be ancillary to the actual process equipment, the actual shutdown mechanisms that will be used, and that they are common industry technology as far as relays and switches and gas supplies.

MR. BADER: Concerns have been expressed to me about that and I think that is something we -- I would like for the record, if you would submit further information on that, please.

MS. ROBBINS: We can do that.

MR. BADER: My understanding is that's necessary to

the successful operation of the SDOR system, and that it challenges it.

MS. ROBBINS: Okay. Yes, sir, we can supply you with a written response.

MR. BADER: Thank you.

**Record Item 4: (Page 101/Line 12 – Page 102/Line 5)**

CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Let me just ask the final question. Where are you right now? I know we have to keep this brief. In the critical design process, you were approaching this fall 90 percent design completion. I know we've discussed what that even means. Now we're talking about a potential -- not a potential -- a re-design of the facility, perhaps raising the roof 13 feet. Where are you right now in terms of the critical decision process? Where are you in terms of getting to that 90 percent design? Are you at 80, 70, 60? Where are you at now?

MR. ESCHENBERG: I would like to take that question for the record, and the reason is that we will be much better informed in 20 days on the impacts of the engineering replan, and then what impacts that may have to our ability to achieve Critical Decision 2 by September, 2013. So within approximately three weeks we will be much better informed to answer that question.

**Record Item 5: (Page 113/Lines 3 - 16)**

MR. HAYNES: . . . I also just want to take one second to mention that you do it through people, and it's a critical resource today, people who actually have nuclear operating and nuclear design experience, and I just want to tell you a little bit about the people around me, so you know who's accountable, what roles they have.

CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: I think we understand that right now, basically who they are. I appreciate that very much. You can submit that for the record, but we have some questions we'd like to do and I think it might be best right now to just move on. Dr. Mansfield.

MR. HAYNES: Yes, sir.

**Record Item 6: (Page 72/Line 22 - Page 73/Line 16)**

MR. BADER: This goes to my other question. Are you comfortable that you know the cause adequately that you can control the risk going forward of having to remove even further processes, as the design continues?

MR. ESCHENBERG: At this point we are. I will tell you that over the course of the next quarter we will be much better informed by, one, the results that of our independent assessment and evaluation of the factors that led to this. Two,

the detailed engineering completion schedule or the two-go engineering completion schedule. And thirdly, although I gave you kind of a higher order of thumbnail sketch of what the structural impacts were and how the individual operations were going to be reconfigured to help accommodate our space-fit challenge, as those details become more clear to me and our design review team, I'll be much more informed and can give you a much more informed answer in approximately 90 days.