

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

Albuquerque Operations Office

DATE: JUN 17 1994
 REPLY TO: ERPO:jl:agenda.jun
 ATTN OF:
 SUBJECT: Proposed Agenda for Final Joint Monthly Status Meeting and April Minutes

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

Attached is the proposed agenda for the June 22, 1994, final joint monthly status meeting with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the New Mexico Environment Department. The meeting is scheduled to start at 10:00 AM. Joint discussions will focus primarily on a frank exchange of suggestions and lessons learned from conducting past status meetings, and on developing a protocol for calling future joint meetings on topics of mutual concern at both New Mexico laboratories. The joint discussions are planned to end before lunch. After lunch, there will be a meeting to discuss issues specific to the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Also attached are the minutes from the last monthly status meeting held on April 20, 1994 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Please review for accuracy. Comments or corrections can be conveyed to me by phone or at the June status meeting.

If you have any changes or additions to the agenda or questions about this memorandum, please call Julianne Levings at (505) 845-6201. If necessary, a revised agenda can be furnished at the meeting.

Karen L. Boardman

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

2 Attachments

cc w/attachments:

A. J. Ahlquist, EM-452, HQ
 W. F. Spurgeon, EM-452, HQ
 E. S. Merrill, EM-452, HQ
 W. B. Cox, Org. 7051, SNL/NM
 H. J. Jansen, EM/ER, MS M992, LANL
 D. J. McInroy, EM/ER, MS M992, LANL



12504

TK

AGENDA
NEW MEXICO NATIONAL LABORATORIES
MONTHLY STATUS MEETING

June 22, 1994
Dallas, Texas

Status Items	10:00 AM	
- Regulator Summit Meeting		Levings
- EPA/NMED Resource Status		Trujillo
Future of New Mexico Laboratories Monthly Meetings	10:00 AM	
- Lessons-learned/suggestions from previous meetings		All
- Frequency/subject matter for future joint meetings		All
LUNCH	11:15 AM	
LANL-specific Issues	12:00 AM	
- Action item update		Fesmire
- Reconciliation of schedule inconsistencies		Fesmire
- Comment resolution of LANL VCA process		Fesmire
- NOD Comments		Fesmire
ADJOURN	4:00 PM	

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

General Comments:

Changes were made to the previous month's meeting notes (March 02, 1994). The corrected version will be distributed prior to the next monthly meeting.

The next meeting date has been set for June 22, 1994 in Dallas, Texas.

SNL Permit Deliverable Status:

W. Cox (SNL/ER) stated that there were no changes to the current list of permit deliverables and all other deliverables were on schedule. The next deliverables are two work plans due 10/94.

Building 870 Renovation:

J. Gould (DOE/KAO) stated that he would like to set up a meeting in Dallas to discuss the building 870 renovation. He also wanted to discuss VCAs and leave with specific guidance on a process to follow for SNL. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg VI) said she would try to arrange a meeting in the latter part of the week of 4/25/94.

Public Participation:

J. Gould (DOE/KAO) reported that the first site prioritization team meeting was scheduled for all day May 18, 1994. The team consists of three people from Sandia/DOE, three Regulators, including one AIP representative, and six citizens. The citizens were selected by asking for volunteers at the SSAB planning committee meeting. Of the ten that volunteered, six were selected by drawing names at random. Although the original intent was to include three citizens, the consensus from the public was that more members were needed. The annual site reprioritization is expected to require six one-day meetings. Citizens were advised of this time commitment prior to volunteering.

T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) stated that the LANL involvement with the VCA and site reprioritization processes will begin in June 1994 after a major baseline validation effort is complete. He has received suggested changes to the current site ranking questionnaire and requested EPA/NMED participation in evaluating the changes.

LANL Deliverable Status:

D. Hickens (LANL/ER) distributed copies of the permit. He said that four work plans (OUs 1100, 1085, 1136, and 1154) were in final review and all are expected to meet the May 23, 1994 submittal deadline to EPA. He also said that the LANL NOD response for the OU 1093 RFI work plan was submitted April 6, and NOD responses for the OU 1132 and 1157 RFI work plans were on schedule to be submitted by EPA's May 1994 response dates. Notifications of sampling had been sent to EPA and the State for OUs 1098, 1111, 1148, and 1157. On the status of TA-18 in OU 1093, he reported that two monitor wells were drilled and sampled; if on reanalysis of one sample at a lower detection limit, it is still negative for TPH and BTEX, LANL may request a permanent variance on the 200

ppm TPH found in the soil.

B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) completed her review of the Class III modification and has forwarded it to the Director. Some wording changes were made by their EPA legal counsel in the dispute resolution language to achieve consistency with other agreements. There were also some changes made to the SWMU list. With respect to RFI work plans, B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) said she had completed review of OU 1111 and would begin OU 1082 on April 25. She also indicated agreement with the staggered deliverable schedule proposed for OU 1082.

D. McInroy (LANL/ER) discussed the consolidation of three separate deliverables for OU 1114 into one deliverable to be submitted in May 1996, which would provide a substantial cost savings. Per B. Driscoll's request, he agreed to report on the status of this submittal and determine if there were any new SWMUs that would not be covered in the work plan.

D. McInroy (LANL/ER) asked about the status of the IWP since submitting a response to EPA's NOD. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) stated that they were waiting for the State's comments on the IWP to be addressed before proceeding further. She said the EPA wants to make sure the State's issues/comments are covered/resolved since this program will eventually be regulated by them. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) committed to scheduling a comment resolution meeting to address NMED AIP and Enforcement comments quickly. He requested that B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) review these comments/responses, particularly if they would require an NOD.

B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) made a general NOD comment that there was no detailed schedule in any of the work plans; that a baseline master schedule was not adequate; and that she would not approve any of the work plans until detailed schedules are supplied. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) said that the four work plans to be submitted in May would include detailed schedules.

D. Hickens (LANL/ER) said that he was following up on the NOD response received from the NMED for the TA-35 surface impoundment closure plan. B. Hoditschek (NMED/RCRA) said that a NOD was in development for the TA-16 landfill. She said that closure plan issues would be discussed further at the IWP comment resolution meeting.

VCA/VCM Review Process

T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) explained that the DOE/HQ mandated 10% funding hold back could be retrieved for LANL if earmarked for accomplishments. He said they had proposed a list of 20 potential VCAs and 2 deep wells to reclaim these funds. He proposed a parallel process for submitting NEPA environmental checklist(s) to DOE and VCA work plan(s) to EPA and the general public. He also proposed using the local newspaper, site tours, a 30-day comment period, and a quick response to all comments, the same process used on the Cemetery.

B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) asked when a Class III permit modification would be initiated and added that EPA would like to review any public comments submitted. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) proposed two permit modifications per year. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) said she would need to discuss this matter with her management. She stated that a temporary authorization to proceed might be a better solution. She also suggested doing a class II permit modification pending the receipt of funding.

N. Morlock (EPA/Reg VI) said that for Sandia, she would like to see public comments submitted for VCA plans at the same time she is reviewing them. If approved, she would issue a temporary

authorization, and Sandia would have to initiate a Class III permit modification within 30 days, according to their permit requirements. W. Cox (SNL/ER) said that the permit language used the word "encouraged" relative to the 30-day time period. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg VI) requested that VCA plans be grouped together.

K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) asked if the not knowing the amount of funding that will be allotted as a result of the 10% hold back would adversely affect permit funding. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg VI) suggested that the permit modification might include a clause making implementation contingent on funding. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) added that having an approved permit modification might be to DOE's advantage in obtaining VCA funding. She also asked if the money needed to be obligated by the end of May. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) said that VCAs funded this year should be completed in September so that the funds budgeted would get costed this fiscal year.

A discussion of the risk involved in conducting VCAs ensued and centered on EPA's authority to require a site to be re-opened if they do not agree with the final remedy achieved through a VCA. T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) said that some actions have to be done at risk, otherwise the time required to accomplish remediation would take too long. He said there was confidence in the proposed remedies and offered to provide Gantt charts to show how the process would work.

B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) said work could proceed under a temporary authorization that would provide 180 days complete the VCA. She said a class III modification would not hold up work. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) asked if a temporary authorization becomes a final remedy to which W. Honker (EPA/Reg VI) indicated that it did not. He also stated that the EPA does receive some credit for issuing temporary authorizations but more emphasis is placed on class III permit modifications.

A discussion relating the involvement of the public with respect to the temporary authorization process ensued. W. Honker (EPA/Reg IV) stated that some level of public involvement is necessary in this process so that an understanding of public opinion is obtained. He said EPA would like to see the public involvement occur prior to the class III permit modification.

Taylor (DOE/LAAO) suggested a separate meeting to discuss temporary authorizations, public comment, and combining a class III permit modification with a final remedy. D. McInroy (LANL/ER) agreed and added that a "face to face" discussion of this issue would be the most productive format.

Future Land Use Initiatives

J. Gould (DOE/KAO) proposed a public meeting process that would be all inclusive to address existing future land use plans and to obtain public comment on industrial clean-up levels. He would contact EPA before a meeting is scheduled and proposed to begin this process within three months. He said that the existence of a SSAB should not preclude the public from understanding future land use issues.

B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) said that an SSAB should be a major player in land use decisions since it is a public body that would have technical backing. He also thought that the public would not feel fully represented by NMED and EPA and that efforts to get a SSAB in place should be a high priority.

W. Cox (SNL/ER) agreed that the SSAB should be a part of the group that addresses future land use but not the recommending body. J. Gould (DOE/KAO) would like to obtain comments from the

sector of the public that currently uses or owns the land now. He said that the public would also be informed about the clean-up costs associated with the different land use classifications.

T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) said that LANL is co-developing an informal task force on land use with the public that is scheduled for completion in 10/94. He said all planning efforts are to be combined and the goal is to establish a working group on the Hanford model that would consider total facility planning as opposed to just planning of contaminated sites. This proposal would comply with Secretary O'Leary's initiative to complete future land use planning for all DOE facilities by 12/95.

S. Alexander (NMED/HRMB) suggested that a close look be taken at the Hanford success in this area.

CAMUs:

C. Fesmire (DOE/LAAO) said that CAMU proposals for LANL were temporarily on hold while they determine how CAMUs will fit into LANL's overall disposal strategy. W. Cox (SNL/ER) asked if the EPA had finalized the CAMU SOP. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) replied that the final SOP would be distributed and discussed at the CAMU training on 4/21/94.

W. Cox (SNL/ER) asked if the SNL CAMU strategy had been reviewed and if any comments were to be expected. N. Morlock (EPA/Reg VI) replied that a review had not been done but that she would look at it in the near future.

B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) said that the EPA and the State of New Mexico had not yet worked out an agreement on interactions relative to implementing the CAMU rule. She recommended deferring individual CAMU proposals since EPA would not be able to approve a proposal until the agreement is final.

Integration of Closure Plans with Corrective Action:

B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) described a tank located at TA-54 in Area G with commingled wastes. B. Driscoll (EPA/Reg VI) said that NMED has the lead on that unit since regulated units have requirements over and above Subpart S. B. Hoditschek (NMED/RCRA) recommended that following the process for a RCRA unit would be more effective, one clean up for the area. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) summarized: when reviewing combined units with overlapping jurisdictions and regulations, AIP should consult with B. Hoditschek on a case-by-case basis.

Alternate Contracting Strategy Status:

K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) reported the T. Grumbly has set a goal of 20% performance improvement to be recognized by FY 1996. 1200 FTEs have been allocated to the DOE to be distributed to the field organizations submitting proposals that would achieve the 20% cost reduction goal. In order to meet the 20% goal and obtain additional FTEs, DOE/AL is considering the use of private contractors to perform ER work as opposed to the M&O. DOE/AL senior staff will be hearing M&O proposals to meet performance improvement goals on May 11, 1994.

DOE/EPA Summit:

K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) proposed a DOE/EPA/NMED summit meeting. She suggested that the summit meeting address high level issues, such as the allocation of DOE resources to the regulators.

W. Honker (EPA/Reg 6) agreed with the concept of a summit meeting but stressed the importance of having a pre-defined objective for the meeting.

S. Alexander (NMED/HRMB) stated that delays in the ER process will continue unless additional FTEs for the State can be funded. He stated that approximately 5 to 10 additional FTEs per facility are needed. B. Hoditschek (NMED/RCRA) said that any new positions ought to be staffed with experienced people whereas historically, the NMED has been a temporary training ground for consultants.

B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) said that some of the delays in the process could be avoided if document review procedures were enhanced. He suggested that there be more coordination between the document author and the reviewers and a conference between all parties after review is complete. He also said that there should be an incentive to prepare concise documents.

W. Honker (EPA/Reg 6) discussed the status of EPA's ongoing quality initiatives. These included the formation of four focus groups envisioned to have facility representation. Internally, he is looking for ways to streamline the document review process. An EPA/State Corrective Action steering committee is also being considered to coordinate within the five-state area.

State HSWA Authorization

A concern was raised by D. McInroy (LANL/ER) regarding the likelihood of the State reopening EPA decisions once they receive HSWA authority. B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) said that to prevent that, it was very important that the NMED be included in those decisions now so that they could live with them in the future. S. Alexander (NMED/HRMB) said that NMED wanted to avoid revisiting EPA decisions and wanted to be a part of the system.

B. Swanton (NMED/LANL) emphasized the importance of flagging issues with significant consequences and putting results up front where they're easily identified in Phase reports in order to minimize the possibility of revisiting decisions and to maximize the use of limited NMED resources for document review.

Actions:

T. Taylor (DOE/LAAO) - Set up an IWP comment resolution meeting with B. Swanton (NMED/LANL).

NMED and EPA - Generate lists of positions required to conduct future work.

K. Boardman (DOE/ERPO) - Set up a DOE/EPA/NMED summit meeting.

Addressees

2



cc w/attachments:
R. S. Houck, ERPO, AL
J. F. Levings, ERPO, AL
L. A. Trujillo, ERPO, AL

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 Bureau
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 do Los Marquez
Santa Fe, NM 87502

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

RED LABEL 94

Addressees

3

JUN 17 1994

cc w/attachments:

B. Swanton

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

T. Michael

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

W. Mason

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