

file LANL  
94

**MEMORANDUM**

9/15/94

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
XXI

LANL HSWA GEN/MISC IN

TO: Benito Garcia, Bureau Chief

THROUGH: Barbara Hoditschek, Program Manager

FROM: Robert S. (Stu) Dinwiddie

DATE: September 15, 1994

RE: LANL Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement  
Kickoff Meeting Las Alamos High Auditorium  
September 14, 1994

Between 80 and 90 people attended the meeting held at 2:00 pm on the 14th. This number did not include the presenters and or facilitator and workers, this was "public".

There was a court reporter there for the recording and transcription of the proceedings.

Introduction was given by David Rossen of DOE. Mr. Rossen is the director of the SWEIS project for DOE.

The initial speakers that were signed up to speak declined to speak at that time. Those speakers were Bob Watt and Susan Hersberg.

The opening was lead by the SIO of LANL explaining what the SWEIS was and that the meeting was to determine the scope of that document.

**David Rossen** opened the discussion with the comment that the scope of the SWEIS will be determined during the next six to seven weeks. That scope will be based on the input from the public during the upcoming workshops and meetings. Once the scope is determined an NOI will be published in March 1995 and contracts let for the production, and sampling/analysis of the EIS. The cost of the entire project is estimated at 25 million dollars. That 25 million will come from the LANL Overhead budget and will be controlled by DOE. The RFP for qualified contractors was released in the past and there are currently applications that are being considered.

The SIO Office asked what the relationship between scope and cost was.

David could not provide an answer because the scope is unknown at this time. The sampling and analysis would be the most expensive part of the project. Since the public has not determined the scope there can be no estimate of what, how much, when or where to sample.

TL



**Susan Hersberg** then asked what procedures had been decided upon for the decontamination and demolishing of the High Pressure Tritium Lab.

**David** stated that the draft of that plan was released four months ago but that he did not know what the current status was or what changes had been made. He did state that there were "DOE Standards" for Tritium clean up and decontamination.

**Betty Harris** of the LANL staff concerned that the Federal Register ANOI did not address the storage, treatment, disposal safeguards in the areas that she traveled during her daily commute. (TA-67) and desired the safeguards and emergency management of the "exposure" during commuting addressed.

**David** stated that the ANOI was not all encompassing nor was it meant to be. A detailed answer would be prepared before the meetings in Espanola, Santa Fe, and the meetings return to Las Alamos.

**Greg Mello** objected to the first public mention of the Plutonium Storage Facility Expansion from 6.6 metric tone to 25 metric tons being in the ANOI.

**Dianna Webb** of DOE claimed that this was not true that the announcement was made "a while back" to "upgrade the facility"

**Greg** asked where it came from and Diane could not tell him.

**Dianna** then said she would get Greg some answers and that yes the ANOI was the first public mention.

**Pete S.** of DOE HQ then stated that DOE had not eliminated LANL as a "National Low Level Disposal Site".

**Greg** then asked David to write LANL and instruct them to release all "applicable documents" about LANL being a L.L. Disposal Site.

**Earl B.** then stated that there needed to be a lag time from the decision making to the release of information. He would speak with the Lab Director and the staff to see there was cooperation and release of information.

**Steve Shenk(?)** of the L.A. Monitor asked what effect the Galvan Panel would have on the SWEIS.

**David** explained that the Galvan Panel will have recommendations that in effect will be "law" at LANL. NEPA coverage for the recommendations will be considered under separate cover. If the recommendations are vast then the project is back to square one and another draft will be released.

**Ann Pendegrast** a home owner in L.A. Canyon asked at what point the decision/input will be examined for the citizen comments.

**David** stated at the end of the process just prior to the NOI.

**Susan H.** Asked if the CCNS alternative directions for the lab would be seriously considered.

**David** said all plans would be considered.

An unknown male asked how many grams of Plutonium were spilled at the lab.

David stated that a "valid estimate" will be presented in the EIS.

Another unknown male then stated the dogma of impermeability of the tuff and not to worry about the Plutonium.