

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

Albuquerque Operations Office

DATE: APR 03 1994

REPLY TO:
ATTN OF: ERPO:rsh:regmtg.042094

SUBJECT: New Mexico National Laboratories Monthly Status Meeting Agenda and Meeting Notes

TO: T. J. Taylor, Environmental Restoration Program Manager, ES&H, LAAO
J. E. Gould, Environmental Scientist, ESH&CB, KAO

The monthly status meeting for New Mexico National Laboratories will be held on April 20, 1994 at 9:30 A.M., in Albuquerque, New Mexico, at the Geotech conference room. The Geotech office is located at 5301 Central Avenue, N.E. (corner of Central and San Mateo), Suite 1700.

Attached are the meeting agenda (Attachment 1), notes from the March meeting (Attachment 2) and the corrected notes from the February meeting (Attachment 3). Please review the attached meeting notes so that any necessary corrections can be made at the April meeting.

If you have any comments on the meeting notes, agenda, meeting times, or any other issues relating to the New Mexico National Laboratories Monthly Status Meeting, contact Bob Houck at (505) 845-4626.



Karen L. Boardman
Branch Chief
Laboratory ER Projects Branch
Environmental Restoration Project Office

3 Attachments

cc w/attachments:

A. J. Ahlquist, EM-452, HQ
W. F. Spurgeon, EM-452, HQ
R. J. Harris, EM-452, HQ
W. B. Cox, Org. 7581, SNL/NM
D. J. McInroy, EM/ER, MS M992, LANL
K. L. Boardman, ERPO, AL
R. S. Houck, ERPO, AL
L. A. Trujillo, ERPO, AL
K. Sheldon-Chandler, GJPO



12486

4/20/94
APR 28 1994 -
Meeting

Addressees

2

cc /attachments:

B. Driscoll
RCRA Permits Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue
Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202-2733

N. Morlock
RCRA Permits Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue
Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202-2733

K. Sisneros
Water and Waste Management Division
New Mexico Environment Department
1190 St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87503

B. Garcia
Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Branch
New Mexico Environment Department
1190 St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87503

B. Hoditschek
Hazardous and Radioactive Materials
Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
525 Camino de Los Marquez
Santa Fe, NM 87502

S. Alexander
Hazardous and Radioactive Materials
Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
525 Camino de Los Marquez
Santa Fe, NM 87502

Barbara
pls plan to
attend next meeting
Berto

RECEIVED
APR 12 1994

RED CANAL 14

Tc

APR 08 1994

Addressees

3

cc w/attachments:

N. Weber

DOE Oversight and Monitoring
New Mexico Environment Department
1190 St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87503

B. Swanton

DOE Oversight and Monitoring, LANL
New Mexico Environment Department
c/o LANL, MS M993

E. Schumacher

New Mexico Environment Department
KAFB Building 20245 Cubicle 101-AB
F & 4th Streets SE (W of Fire Station)
Albuquerque, NM 87115

Draft Agenda
New Mexico National Laboratories Monthly Status Meeting
April 20, 1994
Albuquerque, New Mexico

- 9:00 am - Review of March 02, 1994 Meeting Notes
- SNL Permit Deliverable Status
 - Building 870 Renovation
 - Public Participation - SNL/LANL
 - LANL Permit Deliverable Status
 - VCA/VCM Review Process
 - Future Land Use Initiatives
 - CAMUs
 - Integration of Closure Plans with Corrective Action
 - Alternate Contracting Strategy Status
 - DOE/EPA Summit
 - Review of Action Items
- 4:00 pm - Adjourn

NEW MEXICO NATIONAL LABORATORIES
MONTHLY STATUS MEETING
March 2, 1994
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- ★ Changes were made to the previous month's meeting notes. The corrected version will be distributed at the next meeting.
- ★ The next meeting date has been set for April 20, 1994.

LANL PERMIT DELIVERABLE STATUS:

- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - In response to an EPA request, distributed a list of "who does what" within LAAO, organized by activity. (LANL/ER) - Quarterly report to be distributed to DOE by March 24, 1994. TA35 - Class I Permit Mod request. EPA comment on deliverables?
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Would like to see some changes; ease some lab burdens regarding monthly reports. Quarterly report - looking through last report, would like to see less volume of data - tabulate data or use a summary. EPA will call if they need more data. Class III Permit Mod - response to permit completed and response has been sent to legal department for review. Response should be back by next week. Some comments that were requested to be added were not added, still meet to look at data. Completed review of OU 293 and OU 1157, EPA to issue one NOD; working with State. NMED comments are in draft form. EPA has started review of OU 1132.
- ★ D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Do we have State comments on 1092 yet. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - No, B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) has draft comments, B. Driscoll working on one set of comments only. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Getting draft comments to EPA; then finalize comments; should not be vastly different. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Satisfy State, satisfy EPA? B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Additional comments that may not pertain to EPA.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Issue separate IWP. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Same with PIP; comments are formally framed. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Will get State comments this week. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Will wait until they get the comments then see what the State says before sending their response. D. Hickens (LANL/ER) - Will revise out some of the detail and will make the changes to subsequent reports. Will address changes next time.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Look at working plans, provide prior to review, would like more schedule detail in work plans. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Would get EPA a detailed schedule baseline on all

work by March 1, 1994. Should have detail on what work in which year. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - When baseline is complete, will get information to B. Driscoll (schedule and Gantt charts). First draft is in Albuquerque's hands now.

- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Will get together and discuss baseline in a separate meeting (first of April). Schedule will cover the next year (12 calendar months). Would like to see more detail in RFI reports also. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - No one to talk about closure plans at this time.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Would T. Taylor go over the stakeholders meeting? T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Trying to develop a land use policy that EPA and the public will accept. Invited approximately (20) people and about ten (10) people showed up; a good cross of types of people. Discussed the use of land, type of people who will use the land, budget setting, land use prioritization, etc. Goals: 1) Guidance on public involvement 2) Interview another set of stakeholders 3) Develop a draft 4) Select a site and run through the process with the draft plan after general public meetings. Questions to keep in mind: 1) Did it work for this exercise 2) Will it work for land use 3) Submit to EPA - goal is to have one process that works; people do not have to be the same. Biggest problem is commitment.
- ★ B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - What is going to happen when SSAB is established? T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - SSAB may catch up to where they are and absorb the process, as want to have one in place in 1994. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Important that your staff understand that a SSAB will be coming along and they will be absorbed; no conflict between boards. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Not sure SSAB will replace this process; current activities could operate in parallel with the SSAB.
- ★ D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - It is inevitable that there will be multiple groups of this type. Other Advisory groups will pop up. SSAB is only one piece of the public participation process and people must realize that they can't be on every committee. An issue, especially with the tribes is who represents who.
- ★ B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Clean, how clean? What is clean - standards? Potential problems? T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - SSAB meeting March 1, 1994, didn't see that in meeting nor in people. People are trying to do things; waiting for people to do something; want things to happen; people tend to drag this out.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Meeting cannot be used. Issues were not really discussed. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Considerable opinion about whatever happens in Sante Fe. Land use is a fundamental concern. Sympathetic with desire to move ahead. Parallel efforts

problems. ATSDR - CDC are doing a health study; establish advisory committee and working on that process right now.

- ★ W. Cox (SNL/NM) - Does not affect Sandia. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - No. Some people are going to have to make choices as to what committee they want to be on because of all of the separate groups. Land use is very important. Sandia - problems looking at the Native Americans, representation may be a problem - people may say they represent a group and that the Tribal Council does not represent a group.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Internal planning meeting throughout March, interview people in April, a draft plan to us for this study. Have to include people that may be excluded through the traditional way. Would like to have a plan done by the end of the year that the public thinks is workable.
- ★ B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Sees potential problems with perception of choosing people for the process. W. Cox (SNL/NM) - Can you offer alternatives? B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Group that was assembled, 'activists', were not among invited. Tried to 'flag' potential problems with types of people who were invited. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - People who walk out need to be involved whether or not they want to be.

SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS METHODS:

- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Concerns that turn-around time for analysis is taking 1 -1 1/2 years and things are being delayed. IWP - screening analysis so good that you may not have to send to lab for analysis. TA21 - reasons for reports being delayed- a majority of samples had to be sent to lab for analysis. Has lab asked for relief from these samples? Screening action levels at TA21 should be decided so no more delays need to be. Can achieve information as good as screening analytical data. Can do a lot more screening and less sampling, which makes a faster turn-around. Always a RAD going to the lab, why spending so much money on RAD? Can reevaluate levels sent to lab. Go to DOE and ask for relief.
- ★ C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Proposal has been drafted to evaluate this in the future. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - No concerns for QA? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Yes - levels are set lower than they need to be, maybe this can be looked at. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Evaluate both quality data, perceive eliminating a lot of sampling.
- ★ J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Related to RAD - can send EPA as information or send through as approval process? Can change work plans without approval for RAD. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - EPA cannot approve or disapprove. C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Has a more reasonable time frame for the future with new contract lab set up.

B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Samples screen on site instead on sending them to lab. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - What hold does the State have over RAD? B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Mixed waste, no more than Feds. If State has real concerns, lab will listen. M. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Would EPA like some type of plan? C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Need some kind of plan - put on agenda for next meeting.

LANL PROPOSAL TO INTEGRATE CLOSURE PLANS WITH CORRECTIVE ACTION:

- ★ B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Concern: IWP work plan the summary on the last page of the third chapter (page 331) - "a proposal to integrate RCRA requirements". 1) Move SWMU into RCRA? D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Go RCRA next to site, sent a letter to State 9/90 asking if it should be possible to integrate the two processes? State felt that on unit P was not doable. Part of TA 54 Area P was used prior to 11/88 for ISWA but no distinct unit. Gave a copy of letter and response back to Area P out to attendees. Makes sense to pursue this possibility of integration even though no positive response has been given.
- ★ B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Area L no understanding has been received? D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Yes, there has been a resolution. After a meeting with the State and several discussions. J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Written or oral agreements? B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Recommend some kind of meeting notes be taken so that some following of decision making can be done.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Not in writing, not an agreement. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Moving from RCRA into ISWA because they have money in budget; putting into permit the schedule and keep them on the same time frame. Case-by-case. Does not make sense to do special cleanings. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Biggest concern that the process is on track. Consistent guidance across the board.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Closure plans - documents complete? T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Action? Action for D. McInroy to look into closure plans. P. Shanley (LANL/ESH-8) - They have been and are using EPA-approved documents. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Will check into. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Talk to S. Alexander. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Detail in area of work plan where to look for information that has already been approved. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Should be able to reference a document; inconsistent from State, from reviewer. Will talk to S. Alexander about what is needed; will be more specific. Only items referenced in IWP are action items.
- ★ Action - B. Swanton will get up to speed (talk to S. Alexander/M. Sides) and see how to respond back at next meeting.

- ★ Correction Action closure issues. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Would hope that Area G, that has one RCRA cell, would not fall under RCRA closure. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Cannot speak to that.

DETERMINATION OF ARCHIVAL DATA QUALITY:

- ★ B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Under the impression that EPA was working out a set procedure or getting a procedure that would spell out what would be in Archival Data. Variety of information in the past, no guidelines. Was a proposal to be done? C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Have a format that is used. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Responding to concerns from staff. C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Concerned about kind of data - analytical or historical interviews? B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Will get back to his staff and will have more information as to what his staff is concerned about
- ★ Action - B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Defer to next meeting and put on agenda.

DESCRIPTION OF ER PROGRAM COST AND SCHEDULE CONTROLS:

- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Brought this subject up last meeting. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Not sure what EPA is asking will do to overview. Handed out a flow chart. Monthly reports by PCS system - summary information. Now get a PTS report.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Believes they have worked out what they need to see. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Has not seen flow chart before. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - report is very good; very difficult to figure out what the EPA needs. J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Guidance has changed. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Monthly meeting with DOE and supply them a summary as to target completion/starts (sent to B. Driscoll last month), thresholds.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Renegotiation of budgets and schedules, how is DOE going to put into effect previous concerns? After negotiation how will DOE make sure budgets will be cut? T. Taylor (DOE/LANL) - Baseline sent to HQ for approval, asking to show deficiencies. Monthly reviews will then be held. Have to respond to AL comments. AWIP schedule of times for DOE/LAAO for various documents still not coming on time from U of California. Can get commitment from everyone's management to commit to these schedules and times; then can get into the field. If system works, then items should not be late to EPA.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Has asked for a three month schedule in his monthly meetings. J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Should we do a document that states methods of control and how we do things for EPA? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Some other departments have had written agreements if schedules are to be extended. Want to know what controls are used so that projects are not extended for years.

- ★ D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Concern is not to worry about cash flow, it is really fundamental efficiencies. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Should see that in the baseline. Meeting on Monday, March 7, 1994, to kick off review. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Baseline will show deficiencies. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Should be able to show EPA by a crosswalk some of the changes that have been made. Some structural items cannot be done anything with to change costs at this time. Asked for a plan to get some of these costs down to cut some of that money. May be a few years process to achieve some progress.
- ★ D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Will see efficiencies throughout the program as they do things better. Action - T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) Writing a summary. U of California coming in next week to hold a meeting to discuss changes/targets for document development.
- ★ K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) - Taking action to summarize issues that come out of the stand down for the EPA. Complex-wide initiative. KAO - the same for last meeting. Sandia - crosswalk of how things were done in the last baseline compared to this year's baseline.

VOLUNTARY CORRECTIVE ACTION PROCESS:

- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Clarify process. C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Sent VCA on Guaje Ponds. Follow format in the IWP. Questions about public part. Set up tours (letter will go to a mailing list of 1800 this week) and notice will be in the paper. Not a formal public comment period but are soliciting comments. March 6, 1994, document is available for public review. Public meeting due in the middle of the month (quarterly meetings).
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Trying to decide how to put a good public plan together. A lot of things can be done without overkill. No monthly meetings but maybe quarterly meetings. Available to the public without big public meetings. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Concerns about what DOE is calling VCAs that the EPA does not call VCA. Problem is our schedules/permits that in the long term are not going to be met over the next years due to monies being used for other activities. Are you meeting schedules?
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Existing or negotiating permits? No way we can meet existing based on the month to be received. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Some resistance to EPA reviewing comments? C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Resistance was to approval only, willing to accept comments. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Responsiveness will be improved in the future. Status of the EPA of projects. Problems in the past should not be problems in the future. EPA should not have to put out an 'NOD' just to get DOE to respond.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Comments vs: NOD; would be better in the perspective. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Tried that; but delays in

responses happened. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - These things should be changing and delays should not be tolerated. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - EPA's responsible to pick clean-up levels, concerns about expediting remediation.

- ★ J. Levings, (DOE/ERPO) - Time frame? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Priority level time frame. Could have some meetings and discuss several at one time. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Could be built into baselines. Will have some VCAs built into the baseline, have others - will go to DOE-AL and ask for more money or take it out of some other budget. Will not delay clean-ups.
- ★ D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Also, where are you doing VCAs? If meet all requirements in permits - ok; changes make an obligation to look at work plans and schedules. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Divert funding - to protect public. C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - What is built into the priority system? D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Communication was a problem. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Formal approval - be a DOE approval? Will send to EPA and have reasonable public input. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Does feel they need their approval also. C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Need to include EPA and communication lines will stay open.
- ★ D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Building trust with public also needs to be kept up. Formal process is very important to go through. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - "Success Stories" is not just the cleaning up of a site, not a bean count, it has a priority. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Does EPA feel that they want to require a phase to pass a plan by you or go out and clean it up then pass it back to the EPA? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Depends on the facility. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - If it does not involve hazardous waste - no obligation to talk to EPA; they can clean it up. Private facility - 1) do not care what their budget is 2) will tell them what the remedy should have been. Hazardous waste - will fall into the permit area somewhere, must be authorized to handle hazardous waste. Want to clean up things and not just study them.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Want to streamline VCAs in the baseline, then if things do come up they will have to seek other avenues of funding and will discuss these VCAs with State and EPA. Seek comments from the EPA but not necessarily approval; EPA will set clean-up levels. K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) - Look at VCAs outside of the baseline, then if one does become available to clean up there would be a list to use the money on. Issue EPA list of VCAs (Sandia/LANL) at next meeting.
- ★ J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Should include what to do with the waste? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Need approval on plans. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Approval on plans or clean-up levels? J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Prioritization should be done by the end of the fiscal year. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - See how the one they have submitted goes, EPA sent comments, DOE will respond.

- ★ K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) - Summary of process? C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) - Would baseline some VCAs, keep to schedule, get additional funding, look at other listed VCAs for accelerated clean-up, come up with plan to take to EPA for any comments until they have been resolved. Agreement on review time frames, 30-day comment period for Sandia. Time frame should be less for the EPA than for the public. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Response back in NOD or comments? D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Does it matter as long as they get a timely response? T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - If VCA put out for public comment, EPA review within 30 days, then if public has something new then they can review it. Review cycle the same for VCAs in baseline and on list.

SITE RANKING SYSTEM AND RESULTING SCHEDULES:

- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Nothing to present. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) - Will put something together and present it next meeting. Will be asking public how they would like to get involved in the next site ranking system schedules. Public participation: State and EPA feel it is important that the public hears comments about site ranking system before EPA "buys in".
- ★ J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - No one is expecting EPA's signature on the site ranking system and stakeholders have been involved from the beginning. Will explain what happened at the meeting tonight. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - General public will be involved in the next go-around on the ranking system. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - DOE wanted to get public involvement, did not make it, and yet they did not make a promise to the public that they would be involved. J. Gould (DOE/KAO) - Now they have something to be involved in; do not before.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Public can still comment during the public comment period. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Is site ranking system all that you are actually going to do with the results of what the public is worried about? J. Gould (DOE/KAO) - The advisory team will be opened to the public. J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Came up with sample baseline, want some recognition of what they did, how they got what they got and give them some comments so they can make an official proposal. Need to know from EPA that they understand what they did and approve it. D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Has problems with time frames and schedules, understand what they did. Need to clear up some basic questions on schedules.
- ★ 1) J. Gould (DOE/KAO) - Letter sent out. Have a meeting tonight to tell public about public participation. Public was represented by the Regulators. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - Won't "proposed" give problems? T. Trujillo (DOE/ERPO) - Addressing concerns about public participation. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6)

- ★ 2) Tech Area 2 - high priority. Terrace Arroyo - high priority. Sandia cannot work to the schedule until DOE approves. If going to revise every year, need 18 months time span.
- ★ 3) OUs vs: SWMU - Sandia moved one into a SWMU. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Guarantee that will be fully funded next year? J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - Thought this had been covered.
- ★ 4) EPA gets concerned about schedules and how long things take. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Started out with the high priorities; next were low priorities, etc. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - High priority need to keep moving through the system. Schedule needs to be advanced.
- ★ 5) B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) - #5 - Thought this was the spirit of this.
- ★ D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Site maintenance - the old system should not be the final system until the public comments are taken. Significant changes should not happen from year to year. Areas may change, thus, resulting in changes in the system.
- ★ K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) - Some concerns - put in a lot of time for the system would like to get systems in place to start tracking baselines. Comments to be input this year or for next year. J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - So EPA will not concur this year?
- ★ B. Doremus (SNL/NM) - Scheduled by OUs. SWMUs spread out. Submit one or three work plans? J. Levings (DOE/ERPO) - One work plan, multiple reports. Clarification of letter after New Mexico has their meeting this afternoon? D. Neleigh (EPA/Reg 6) - Will work on clarification.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Would like them to think about scheduling problems. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - May color code master schedule for her when they send it to EPA. Some middle and low SWMUs may get caught up with the sampling of high priority SWMUs. B. Doremus (SNL/NM) - Will set down and clarify schedule and what things are coming up for EPA.
- ★ Discussion was held regarding public involvement on the ranking system and the meeting to be held on March 2, 1994.

SNL/NM PERMIT DELIVERABLES STATUS:

- ★ 1) Pit - on time
- 2) Mailing list - on time
- 3) Update on site list - Delivered 12/93 to EPA

4) Class II Mod - Relating to site to be added. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) needs to get together with B. Doremus (SNL/NM). N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) - Did B. Doremus get a letter on site-wide?

5) OPs - Submitted through June 20, 1994, given to N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6). Twenty OPs are referenced in work plans; others will be coming but not referenced.

6) NOD response letters sent to N. Morlock.

7) Mixed waste work plan, would N. Morlock take a look at them and see if any problems.

★ Issue: Risk Assessment. 20-80 split on the sampling results going out to the labs (field screening 80%). Sent 20% of those out to the labs. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) - Mobile labs doing the checking. Not sure what W. Cox is questioning. Needs what mobile lab capabilities are. If mobile lab has the same capabilities as an analytical lab, could run a certain percentage through the mobile labs. Document what they want to propose.

Sign-In

David Hickens	LANL-ER	665-4230
DAVID McINROY	LANL-ER	667-0819
David Neleigh	EPA	214/655-6785
Barbara Driscoll	EPA	214/655-7441
WARREN COX	SNL/NM	505 848-0411
COURTLAND FESMIRE	DOE/LAHO	505-665-4718
Ted Taylor	DOE/LAHO	665-7203
Julianne Levings	DOE/AL/ERPO	505 845-6201
Karen Boardman	DOE/AL/ERPO	505 845 4565
John Gould	DOE/KAO	505/845-6089
Pat Shanley	LANL/ESH-8/ATK	505-667-0662
Barbara Doremus	SNL/NM	505-848-0312
Lyle Sheldon Chandler	DOE Support Geotech	(303) 248-7614
Dick Fate	SNL/NM 7585	(505) 848-0408
Bruce Swanton	NMED/LANL AIP	505 672-0447
Steve Zappe	NMED/HRMB	505 827-4308
TONY TRUSILLO	DOE/AL/ERPO	(505) 845-5987
BOB HOUCK	DOE/AL/ERPO	(505) 845-4626
MIKE DU MOND	NMED/AIP/SNL SITE	505/845-5933
Nancy Morlock	EPA	505 214 655-665

Revised Meeting Minutes
Underlined Areas Denote Changes

NEW MEXICO LABORATORY MONTHLY STATUS MEETING
FEBRUARY 2, 1994
DALLAS, TEXAS

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The next meeting for the New Mexico National Laboratories Monthly Status Meeting will be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, March 2, 1994.

I. LANL AND SNL/NM PERMIT DELIVERABLES STATUS

- ★ B. Doremus (SNL/NM/ER) said that the Standard Operating Procedure (SOPs), approximately 45 SOPs, will be done by the end of February, 1994. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) suggested that staggered submittals would be better for reviewing. B. Doremus (SNL/NM/ER) agreed to staggered submittals.
- ★ N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) had a specific question on the Tech Area 3 Notice of Deficiency (NOD) response because the response described geophysical surveys that were not in the original work plan. Agreement to discuss the NOD response for TA-3 at a separate meeting. Gave T. Michael (NMED/HRMB) a handout with the status of EPA reviews and stated that EPA will coordinate comments with NM/AIP staff.
- ★ J. Gould (DOE/KAO) explained that preliminary analytical results for Building 870 disposal site have been received and are being evaluated. Initial indications are that the materials in the disposal area are roofing materials in the fill. KAO/SNL are currently working on letter to N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) that will present the analytical results and the conclusions.

WORK STATION STATUS:

- ★ L. Soholt (LANL/EM/ER) - LANL has set up a telephone connection, however it goes through Minnesota so it is slow. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) has been provided with "Synchronize" software, which should increase the speed of communication through the telephone line. The LANL Facility for Information Management and Display (FIMAD) staff will visit EPA to discuss the options for providing data - phone, tape, or optical disk. The Point-of-Contact is Nancy Marusak (505) 667-5698.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that EPA will not put ORACLE on the LAN unless there is a full time person to maintain it. Therefore, whatever system is established, it must not involve ORACLE on the EPA LAN. The options will be discussed with the FIMAD personnel when they visit Dallas.
- ★ T. Michael (NMED/HRMB) stated that the AIP is hooked into FIMAD in the White Rock Office and everything is going smoothly.

SANDIA WORK STATIONS:

- ★ B. Doremus (SNL/NM/ER) said that SNL/NM is experiencing the same problems as LANL with communication through telephone lines. SNL/NM computer personnel will join the LANL computer personnel on the trip to Dallas to install equipment.
- ★ B. Doremus (SNL/NM/ER) said that Sandia has the station in possession;

its now a matter of paperwork which SNL/NM has committed to work on as soon as possible.

STATUS OF STATE AND EPA REVIEWS:

- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that she just sent out an approval letter for D Building/Hillside sampling and a NOD on the Work Plan for OU 1130. Currently she is working on the Permit Modification. Rich Mayer (EPA/Region VI) may be helping out on the reviews of work plans. T. Michael (NMED/HRMD) said that AIP is currently working on a schedule of which work plans they will review. Bruce Swanton (NMED/AIP) has recognized that unless the reviews are timely, they aren't useful, so they will be selectively reviewing as a high priority the sections of those plans that are for areas with potential for ground water contamination. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that EPA will be incorporating the AIP comments with theirs. K. Bitner (DOE/AL/ERPO) requested a list of documents that AIP will not review, so LANL knows when not to expect comments. T. Michael (NMED/HRMD) committed to providing that list.
- ★ Barbara Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) requested a list of SWMUs that will be deferred to work plans after 1994. Barbara was given such a list at the last monthly meeting, but she needs verification that list was right. It is necessary because these must go into the permit modification so this list must be correct.
- ★ T. Michael (NMED/HRMD) asked if EPA will approve a Class III modification without state concurrence. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that the State needs to concur before Class III modification will be approved.

SANDIA STATUS:

- ★ N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) said that she has received the NOD responses for TA3/5 and Liquid Waste Disposal System Work Plans; Reviews are pending on Septic Tanks and Mixed Waste Landfill. W. Cox (SNL/NM) asked whether Nancy had looked at the letter regarding the listed SWMUs and Operable Unit name changes that was submitted. SNL/NM is waiting for EPA feedback on this information. Nancy Morlock (EPA/Region VI) agreed to discuss this at the afternoon meeting.

PHONE GREETINGS:

- ★ As a general note, please keep updated information on phone greetings. Such as out-of-town, when back, etc. This will facilitate any messages, people know where everyone is, will be back. Clarification of numbers needs to be done. Everyone needs to make sure they check their messages when they are out of town.

CAMU:

- ★ S. Smith (SNL/NM/ER) - Handed out a presentation on SNL/NM proposed approach to CAMU. The material in the handout outlines the CAMU rule, criticism of the rules, responses to rules, references that are in the paper. Sandia's approach to CAMU is two phased. Phase 1 will maximize early cleanups using CAMU in the near-term for storage of investigation-derived waste and waste from Voluntary Corrective Measures (VCM). Phase 2 is the long-term use of CAMU for disposal and allow for innovative treatment of waste, including field demonstration of treatment technologies.
- ★ Benefits of the two-phased approach are: promotes early VCMs, encourages

innovative technologies, avoids continually submitting permit modifications. This approach will allow for gathering of data important to developing the long-term second-phase disposal/treatment CAMU: type/volume of waste, identification of inactive sites, a remote and secure location, adequate space, development of monitoring systems, meeting all EPA criteria, and compatible with all Sandia missions.

- ★ A flow chart of the CAMU process was part of the presentation. If regulators agree with the general approach, SNL/NM will submit a proposal following EPA guidance. Receive comments and then submit a revised proposal. The chart as presented indicated that decision would be made based on cost comparisons. The point was made that decisions should be based on whether the CAMU is protective as well as lower in cost. Discussion of cost benefits/protectiveness could be incorporated into the process followed. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) commented on flow chart that the decision box for EPA comments should be moved down on flow chart. K. Bitner (DOE/AL/ERPO) commented that public participation should be shown on the flow chart. J. Levings (DOE/AL/ERPO) agreed that the Notice of Intent should be shown on the flow chart.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) discussed current status of the EPA/State interactions on CAMUs. The SOP almost finalized that has the initial information to be submitted with a CAMU proposal. When SOP final, will send letter to NMED requesting a discussion on how to implement. EPA hopes to have letter of agreement with New Mexico for CAMU. It is expected that the State will have just as much to comment on CAMU proposals as the EPA. Further, State closure requirements must still must be met.
- ★ S. Slaten (DOE/LAAO) discussed the status of CAMUs at LANL. Currently evaluating four locations: TA-53 lagoons, E-F Site, TA-49, and MWDF. The fewer places to leave contamination, the better.
- ★ Discussion regarding sites. At TA-53, there is some tritium contamination below the lagoons, but it should be gone in 100 years or so. They could be clean closed. There are no RCRA liners; however, with CAMUs do not need them. AT the E-F Firing Site there is a lot of land to be utilized. Additionally, there are surrounding sites with similar firing waste on them that could be consolidated. Another benefit of this site is that it can be accessed without using public roads.
- ★ TA-49 was used for underground hydrodynamics tests which resulted in a large quantity of plutonium, uranium and lead disseminated underground. These materials will be there for a long time because of the dangers involved in removing them and the lack of a disposal site. Therefore, the area has to remain under institutional control and be monitored forever if we cannot treat it. Thus if one area must be controlled and monitored forever, it makes sense to put other wastes there to attain an economy of scale. The disadvantages of this site are: close to Bandolier and would require the use of public roads. Mixed Waste Disposal Facility (MWDF) on Pajarito Mesa was selected as the best site for RCRA disposal facility. One of the selection criteria was that it is a clean site. For a CAMU, that is the biggest disadvantage.
- ★ E. Norris (LANL/EM/ER) noted that if the E-F site is approved as a CAMU, the type and degree of characterization of the site would be different than what is proposed in the work plan that has already been submitted. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) responded that she will proceed as normal with the review, until a CAMU proposal is formally made. S. Alexander (NMED/HRMB) noted that characterization is an important step at any site, including a CAMU, so there should not be any corners cut just because the site is proposed as a CAMU.

VOLUNTARY CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) Explained that on the proposed Voluntary Corrective Action (VCA) for the Guaje Cemetary SMWU, an NOD had been issued. This was unexpected because it is DOE's understanding that a VCA is voluntary and therefore does not require EPA approval. What is the current regional policy on VCAs? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) responded that the sites that are listed in the permit as SWMUs must still be addressed as SWMUs. The region is concerned that VCAs will be done just to avoid doing a CMS. If DOE uses funds for VCAs that subtract from the funding available for scheduled investigations and cause schedule slips, the EPA will enforce against them. An additional concern is that adequate public participation is required before a final solution is determined.
- ★ W. Spurgeon (DOE/HQ/EM-452) stated that the budget is limited to 3% growth and progress in the form of clean ups completed must be shown in order to get continued funding. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that EPA is not against VCAs; but these need to be budgeted and planned such that other critical work is not pushed back.
- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) asked if EPA views it as their responsibility to review and approve VCA plans. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) stated that DOE is taking a risk for not doing Permit Modification before doing VCAs that the remedy selection may not be adequate. There will be supplemental NOD that incorporates comments of the State based regional solidification on VCA issues.
- ★ W. Cox (SNL/NM) asked if an appropriate recap of the discussion is that EPA will provide comments on a VCA plan, but will not approve or disapprove of plan. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) disagreed and said that EPA will review a VCA plan like a work plan and will approve or issue a NOD, or DOE will proceed at risk.
- ★ S. Slaten (DOE/LAAO) asked if EPA could respond with a comment letter rather than a NOD? B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) stated that in the past, a comment letter has not received an adequate or timely response.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that voluntary is only voluntary because that is what you want to do. SWMUs in the permit are required to undergo the whole process of investigation. VCAs are expedited remediations in EPA's view. Informal has not worked in the past and she needs guarantee that it would work in the future.
- ★ W. Cox (SNL/NM) suggested that the work plan can submit the data associated with the VCA and that public will participate before VCA is done. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) said that work plans should be done on all VCAs and work to be done so EPA can comment on them. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) asked if EPA would re-review the VCA process described in the Installation Work Plan so it can be discussed at a future date. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) agreed to do that and said that there needs to be a policy and procedures on VCAs and a way to incorporate VCAs into the work plans and plan them out. J. Levings (DOE/AL/ERPO) - Funding is important. Progress must be shown so the funding can be kept the same or more for the HQ. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Must be "progress" on VCAs. DOE trying to optimize results.
- ★ B. Doremus (SNL/NM/ER) gave N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) a list of proposed VCA sites at SNL/NM based on site prioritization system. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg 6) said that she anticipates receiving VCA proposals for review, what is the schedule? B. Doremus (SNL/NM/ER) said that the schedules will be provided as soon as possible.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- ★ T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) explained that DOE/LANL is inviting group of stakeholders on February 8, 1994, for a brain storming session about good ways to get stakeholders involvement. Facilitated meeting. Then go back and develop a draft stakeholder involvement plan. Would present plan on March 16, 17, 18, 1994, public meeting.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) asked who was the invitation to participate in the February 8 meeting sent to? T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) responded that about twenty various people. The meeting is intended to be a small group, the general plan produced will be presented to the public in March, 1994, that the plan will be finalized.
- ★ S. Alexander (NMED/HRMB) expressed concern that the resulting work of any ad hoc group would be superseded by a Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB). However, his Bureau Chief supports continuing with the effort, the uncertainty in the SSAB not withstanding.
- ★ S. Slaten (DOE/LAAO) introduced the concept of a risk assessment scenario based on Native American Uses of the land. Provided a draft concept paper that describes the need to develop a Native American land use pilot project. It is an internal concept at this time, not formally approached any pueblos. Will possibly take the rest of this calendar year to finalization. The plans are to contact pueblo members to do the interviews about land uses i.e. smoking, religious events, eating, picking pinion nuts, etc. By using Native Americans to do the interviewing, it is more likely that the risk assessment scenario will be based on accurate data. Would like comments on draft concept paper. It is hoped the concept will be introduced to the Pueblos at the next major Accords meeting currently scheduled for February.
- ★ B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg 6) suggested that DOE talk to ATSDR, they are already doing some work in that area. George Pettigrew would be a good contact.