

NOV 13 1996

Mr. Bob Slay  
P.O. Box 192  
Beech Island, South Carolina 29842

Dear Mr. Slay:

SUBJECT: Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Recommendation No. 26 on the Chemical Processing Alternative for Spent Nuclear Fuel

Thank you for your submittal of the subject recommendation. This recommendation consisted of three parts, and our response to each is provided below.

1. "...publish a comparison of chemical processing to the alternatives covered in the Technical Strategy for the Treatment, Packaging and Disposal of Aluminum-Based Spent Nuclear Fuel (June 1996)."

As you are aware, the draft report contained a table that included the chemical processing alternative for comparison purposes. This information was later deleted since it was not necessary for a decision on funding priorities among the alternatives. However, for your information, a copy of the original draft table is enclosed with this letter. Please note that the Office of Environmental Management's review concluded that the scoring of the reprocessing alternative in the subject table was not necessary since the purpose of the report was to select the most promising alternatives to reprocessing for further study.

2. "The CAB further recommends that the chemical processing alternative be incorporated as an option in the Ten Year Plan...."

This recommendation was included in recommendation No. 23, part 5, and is addressed in our response to that recommendation.

Mr. Slay

2

NOV 13 1996

3. "...and also as one of the viable alternatives in the Site Specific Spent Nuclear Fuel Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)".

The draft Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Management of Spent Nuclear Fuel at the Savannah River Site contains "Conventional Processing" as an alternative since all reasonable alternatives must be evaluated for a proposed action.

Again, thank you for your recommendation. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me or Len Sjostrom of my staff at (803) 725-5562.

Sincerely,

*Original Signed by E.S. Chapel for*

Mario P. Fiori  
Manager

OPPI:JDB:sl

UA-97-0001

Enclosure:  
Evaluation Results

bc w/enclosure:  
AMEQ (concur) AMEQ (concur)

bc w/enclosure:  
OPPI Reading File  
AMMFS Reading File  
Mgr's Reading File  
*PAT Reading File*

Recommendation No. 26 on the Chemical Processing Alternative for Spent Nuclear Fuel", dated: NOV 13 1996

Table IV. Evaluation Results<sup>1</sup>

Technology	Confidence in Success (30%)	Cost (30%)	Technical Suitability (20%)	Timeliness (20%)	Overall Score
Direct Disposal, in Small Packages	5	7	4	8	60
Direct Disposal, Co-Disposal Packaging	6	10	5	8	74
Press & Dilute (20% enrichment)	6	7	7	6	63
Press & Dilute (2% enrichment)	7	5	6	6	62
Melt & Dilute (20% enrichment)	6	8	7	6	66
Plasma Arc	1	2	6	1	23
GMODS	1	2	7	1	25
Dissolve and Vitrify	4	1	7	1	31
Electrometallurgical	3	5	8	3	46
Processing (Baseline)	10	10	9	10	98

Note 1. Scores based on a multi-attribute evaluation, combining individual scores (ranging from 1 to 10) in each of the four evaluation categories shown. Percentages indicate weight of category to overall score.