

Roles, Gary W.

From: Orban, James E. [jorban@doeal.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2005 9:42 AM
To: 'Roles, Gary W.'
Subject: RE: Hey Jim

Gary

Took a couple of days to get the cap volume info - There are several things going on at once. The PA for Area G is being revised and they are doing a cap design for G to meet the PA. Waste Mgt. is working to dispose the TRU waste and also migrating from the current disposal locations further west on the mesa. This will mean closing old facilities, moving offices, digging new pits, etc. Right now, these closures come under the RCRA permit at part 264 closures. ER has a commitment to close off areas at TA-54 that come under RCRA corrective action by 2015. We now have a conceptual design for a cap at about 40% complete. It requires quite a bit of engineering to be able to survive the 1,000 years required for the PA. Consequently, it is different than other caps proposed....maybe because we will have to actually build it and much more thought is going into it. This revised PA is also based on more sophisticated models than in the past.

Currently, the material list for this cap includes:

- Crushed tuff - 514,000 cubic yards
- Imported cap material (crushed tuff from another location) 818,000cy
- Imported clay - 80,000cy
- Imported rock (4" -+ 1") 167,000cy
- Imported rock armor - (d50 4" + 12", -2") 70,000cy
- Imported top soil or soil amendment - 65,000cy
- Pea gravel - 25,000cy
- Surface area for vegetation, mulch and fertilizer - 80 acres

Handwritten notes: 1,372,000 cy (with arrow pointing to 'Imported cap material') and a large curved line.

Based on discussions with folks and my own observations, the State is not eager to accept caps (or much else) based on modeling. There is some discussion about doing an instrumented pilot for this cap at G. If we are able to demonstrate it's efficacy to the State's satisfaction, it is logical to believe that this design would be the design of choice for other MDAs. (this is my opinion as there are no firm plans for a pilot to verify the design at this time)

Want more info....I can link you up with someone at LANL with more info.

-----Original Message-----

From: Roles, Gary W. [mailto:GARY.W.ROLES@saic.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2005 1:28 PM
To: Orban, James E.
Subject: Hey Jim

Yes, LFRG never really goes away. Once a regulator, always one.

As I recall, the reason I bugged you is that we're doing a supplement to the LANL site-wide EIS and we need to consider alternatives for corrective actions and final disposition of several old MDAs. the two basic options are cap and exhume. Regarding capping, we're assuming an ET cap for most of the MDAs were considering, modeled after the cap proposed for MDA H. Regarding MDA G, I understand from talking with some of the RS folks that they want to use something thicker and more exciting. But I can get no further details. Do you have any information about it? Also, there will be some preliminary actions at Area G including D&Ding the TRU operations and busting up the concrete slabs. Any further details?

Sorry to bug you, but we need to move ahead with the document...

Regards.

R