

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

Albuquerque Field Office

DATE: SEP 9 1993
REPLY TO
ATTN OF: WMD:MFW
SUBJECT: Minutes from the September 2, 1993, Meeting

TO: Those on Attached List

On September 2, 1993, officials from the New Mexico Environmental Department and representatives from the Department of Energy and its New Mexico sites met to continue discussions on the Federal Facilities Compliance Act and its impacts on the various parties. An attendees list and the minutes of the meeting are attached. The next meeting is expected to be in November or December.


Mona F. Williams
General Engineer
Waste Management Division

Attachments



1663

Addressees

2

SEP 9 1993

Jane Talarico, EM-323, HQ
Pete Siebach, EM-323, HQ
Stan Zygmunt, EM-7, LANL
Paul Schumann, EM-7, LANL
Jon Mack, LAAO
Alice Barr, EM-8, LANL
Tom Vandenberg, Org. 210, SNL/NM
John Guth, Org. 7043, SNL/NM
Jim Seubert, NMED
Susan McMichael, NMED
Stephanie Soddards, NMED
Barbara Hoditschek, NMED
Sue Umshler, KAO
Jim Thompson, ITRI
Sheri George, LAAO/Weston
Mona Williams, WMD, AL



72

The second Site Treatment Plan (STP) meeting with the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) took place in Santa Fe on September 2, 1993 at 09:00 AM. See Attachment 1 for the attendance list. Representatives from DOE/AL, DOE/LAAO, DOE/KAO, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratory/NM were present to provide the NMED Enforcement group with a status update on their FFCA's STPs.

Mona Williams addressed two action items which were taken by DOE/AL at the July 28, 1993, STP meeting.

- 1) DOE/AL will provide to the NMED all appropriate comments on the 180-Day Inventory Report that are received during the public comment period. These comments were transmitted to NMED in August and, in addition, comments from USEPA were transmitted to Jim Seubert of NMED prior to the start of this meeting.
- 2) DOE/HQ/AL is to provide the NMED with information on the state funding breakdown that was presented at the Denver meeting of the DOE Policy Coordinating Committee. This information was transmitted in August along with the information from action item #1.

Funding was the first item discussed on the agenda (see Attachment 2). The information for this discussion centered upon information found in a letter to John Thomasian of the National Governors Association dated August 20, 1993, from Joseph A. Coleman, EM-30, DOE/HQ. A copy of this letter was distributed, prior to the discussion, and can be found as Attachment 3. It was noted by DOE/AL and HQ that money for the described activities in the letter is available and is tentatively scheduled for proportional distribution by October 1, 1993, if work plans are completed by that time.

A question was raised by NMED on whether funding for the state would be available for review of CSTPs, DSTPs, etc. Mona Williams replied "yes, funding will be available for these reviews". However, this funding will only cover activities related to the FFCA and not permitting. It was noted that permitting strategy is very important in STPs and should be covered as a FFCA related activity. This issue will have to be addressed by DOE/HQ.

The next item discussed was the NMED comments on the annotated STP outline which was provided to NMED at the July meeting. Specific comments were provided by Benito Garcia through Jim Seubert and Barbara Hoditschek. The 11 items for comment were:

- 1) There needs to be clarification of terminology and definitions. One example is the term capacity. Does this mean volume, storage, treatment capability or does it imply a funding implication. Please clarify.
- 2) Clarify the meaning of top level assumptions. Does this mean assumptions implied by DOE HQ?

- 3) **Process Knowledge.** How much confidence can the facilities place on this. Can you identify levels of confidence (i.e. extremely high, high, medium high, low, etc.) and assumptions used in this process.
- 4) Discussions of existing treatment technologies and capacities need to be specific and precise. General descriptions are not acceptable.
- 5) R & D should take place, but should not be considered an endpoint. Identify options if R & D does not work. The STP should not be driven by R & D.
- 6) Identify schedules in the CSTP. Mona Williams clarified that milestones and schedules are addressed in the DSTP and not in the CSTP.
- 7) Identify alternatives of treatment options if WIPP does not open. Who is performing this? HQ? AL?
- 8) Not all ER and D & D wastes are to be addressed in the CSTP, only those which are mixed wastes.
- 9) What criteria was used in selecting treatment technologies? State the logic for choosing offsite treatment over onsite. Please clarify the procedures used in making these decisions.
- 10) Does the CSTP include the treatment of residues? How will these residues be managed (i.e. incinerator ash)?
- 11) Overall general comment: Need to be more specific and less generic.

The next discussion covered a brief description of the NM facilities CSTP status.

Los Alamos National Laboratory - Stan Zygmunt presented.

The CSTP is well along and follows the FFCA. LANL is utilizing three major tools or strategies for the development of their CSTP.

- 1) Offsite treatment of Organic Liquids.
- 2) Utilization of the Controlled Air Incinerator.
- 3) Hazardous Waste Treatment Facility and interchangeable skids for treatment of different waste streams.

The decon trailer was identified as up and running. DETOX treatment skid is being considered as an alternative to incineration. The characterization program is 50 percent complete and should be completed by February 1994. A waste prioritization treatment identification plan is being developed and is based on risk of storage, residual production,

- 3) **Process Knowledge.** How much confidence can the facilities place on this. Can you identify levels of confidence (i.e. extremely high, high, medium high, low, etc.) and assumptions used in this process.
- 4) Discussions of existing treatment technologies and capacities need to be specific and precise. General descriptions are not acceptable.
- 5) R & D should take place, but should not be considered an endpoint. Identify options if R & D does not work. The STP should not be driven by R & D.
- 6) Identify schedules in the CSTP. Mona Williams clarified that milestones and schedules are addressed in the DSTP and not in the CSTP.
- 7) Identify alternatives of treatment options if WIPP does not open. Who is performing this? HQ? AL?
- 8) Not all ER and D & D wastes are to be addressed in the CSTP, only those which are mixed wastes.
- 9) What criteria was used in selecting treatment technologies? State the logic for choosing offsite treatment over onsite. Please clarify the procedures used in making these decisions.
- 10) Does the CSTP include the treatment of residues? How will these residues be managed (i.e. incinerator ash)?
- 11) Overall general comment: Need to be more specific and less generic.

The next discussion covered a brief description of the NM facilities CSTP status.

Los Alamos National Laboratory - Stan Zygmunt presented.

The CSTP is well along and follows the FFCA. LANL is utilizing three major tools or strategies for the development of their CSTP.

- 1) Offsite treatment of Organic Liquids.
- 2) Utilization of the Controlled Air Incinerator.
- 3) Hazardous Waste Treatment Facility and interchangeable skids for treatment of different waste streams.

The decon trailer was identified as up and running. DETOX treatment skid is being considered as an alternative to incineration. The characterization program is 50 percent complete and should be completed by February 1994. A waste prioritization treatment identification plan is being developed and is based on risk of storage, residual production,

LDR acceptance, and public acceptance. Treatment technologies for the top two wastes on the list will be initiated each year. There are approximately 500 drums out of 3000 which have no treatment identified.

Sandia National Laboratory - John Guth presented.

The CSTP is nearly complete. Sandia has identified 12 waste streams and are looking at both onsite and offsite treatment. Presently offsite is the only practical route to treat most mixed wastes. However, Sandia is considering the utilization of a LANL skid (DETOX) and the Lead Decon Trailer. Permitting may be an issue in using the LANL skids. Sandia has identified four possible future waste streams.

Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute - Sue Umshler presented.

ITRI has seven drums of mixed waste in the form of scintillation cocktail. ITRI is proposing in their CSTP to move this waste to Sandia for temporary storage until DSSI comes on line. This approach is being taken to eliminate permitting problems for this small amount of low hazard waste. Contracts are presently in place for DSSI to treat the ITRI waste. Lead decon will be approached in the same manner as Sandia, utilization of the LANL trailer though this is a future waste stream. The ITRI CSTP is nearly complete.

The next issue addressed was the movement and acceptance of wastes from facilities throughout the DOE complex and especially within New Mexico. Representatives from NMED explained that a decision on this will come from a higher level possibly the governor's office. Barbara Hoditschek explained that she is concerned about how this is presented to the governor's office. A position paper may be the route to take on this issue; however, in all probability this will become a political issue regardless of the technical or economic bases.

An update on the LANL FFC Agreement was provided by Paul Schumann (LANL) and Jon Mack (LAAO). They explained the public comment period had been extended to September 7, 1993, at the request of USEPA. As of September 2, 1993, the only comments received were NMED's. Date of issuance of agreement is solely dependent upon the comments and the timeliness of their resolution.

The final topic was public participation. Public participation will be handled by DOE until the FSTP is complete. This is when the state must get involved.

Upon adjournment, Barbara Hoditschek made a final comment on the topic of the FFC Agreement. She wanted to make it clear to DOE that the USEPA agreement is not substitute for the FFC Act. The state has the regulatory authority on mixed wastes. DOE/AL and LAAO replied that they understand this and that this fact is why a LANL CSTP is being prepared.

FEDERAL FACILITIES COMPLIANCE ACT

NMED / DOE MEETING

2 SEPTEMBER 1993

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
MONA WILLIAMS	DOE/AL WMD AUBUN NH ST185	8455405
Sheri George	DOE/LAEO/WESTON	665-7202
STAN ZYGMENT	LANL/EM-7	667-2245
TOM VANDENBERG	SNL/UR 6. 210 (505)	844-6362
Sue Umskler	DOE/LAEO	505 845-6671
STEPHEN B. SHAFER	DOE/AL/WESTON (505)	845-4862
PAUL SCHUMANN	LANL/EM-7	665-6214
JIM SEUBERT	NMED/ENFOR/INSP-HRMB	827-4308
Susan McMichael	NMED/DOE	827-0129
Stephanie Goddard	NMED/HRMB Permitting	827-4808
Barbara Heditschek	NMED/HRMB NEPA Permits	827-4308
Jane Talgrico	DOE HQ	301-903-7131
John Guth	SNL/Dept 7043	848-0912
Jan Mack	DOE/LAEO	665-5026
Don Bree	LANL/EM-8	667-6820

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

Albuquerque Field Office

AUG 25 1993

DATE:

REPLY TO: WMD:MFW
ATTN OF:

SUBJECT: Site Treatment Plan (STP) Meeting

TO: Those on Attached List

The next STP meeting between officials from the New Mexico Environmental Department and representatives from the Department of Energy and its New Mexico sites will be held on Thursday, September 2, 1993, at 9:00 a.m. It will be in Suite 4 of the Marquez Building at 525 Camino de Los Marquez, Santa Fe. The following agenda items have been identified for discussion.

1. Funding
2. NMED comments on the CSTP outline
3. Site Discussion on what to expect in CSTP (5 minutes each)
4. Transfer of treatment technology, equipment, and waste between DOE sites
5. Status on LANL's agreement
6. Public participation program


Mona F. Williams
General Engineer
Waste Management Division



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

August 20, 1993

John Thomasian
National Governors' Association
Hall of the States, Suite 267
444 North Capital Street
Washington, D.C. 20001-1572

Dear Mr. Thomasian:

As we discussed on the July 26, 1993, conference call between representatives of DOE, the National Governors' Association (NGA), South Carolina, and Colorado, we have decided to support States' non-regulatory activities associated with the FFCA Act until the submission of final site treatment plans in February 1995. These non-regulatory FFCA Act activities are envisioned to encompass:

- Conceptual Site Treatment Plan review
- Draft Site Treatment Plan review
- Review of other related documents not required specifically by the legislation
- Participation in discussions of related issues, including travel

The process for realizing support is envisioned as follows:

- DOE prepares an amendment to the NGA cooperative agreement based on NGA's estimate of resource requirements by States
- Individual States develop work plans, including detailed cost proposals for the above non-regulatory activities and submit them to the NGA
- NGA reviews and packages the work plans for submission to DOE as a set
- DOE reviews and negotiates final work plans with respect to:
 - level of effort appropriate for scope
 - schedule of activities
 - appropriate labor rates
 - travel appropriate for scope

In the ensuing weeks, DOE will develop more specific guidance for establishing the start date of reimbursements to the States and other appropriate administrative details. Enclosed is a draft outline for the individual State FFCA Act Work Plans.

Draft Outline for State FFCA Act Work Plan

- A. Introduction
- B. Statement of Work and Tasks
 - 1. Conceptual Site Treatment Plan review
 - description
 - schedule
 - estimated cost
 - 2. Draft Site Treatment Plan review
 - description
 - schedule
 - estimated cost
 - 3. Other Related Activities
 - description
 - schedule
 - estimated cost
 - 4. Participation in Issue Discussions
 - description
 - schedule
 - estimated cost
- C. Reports
 - 1. Quarterly Letter Report
 - 2. Annual Summary Report