

RAP Meeting Transcribed Flipcharts
May 8, 2012

Board supports RTD (to remove hot spots)
vs (Alt A not Alt 3)
Not into periodically rewetted zone

Make decision interim until technology is proven

Future RI/FS should rely on completed CERCLA doc's (risk) and be based on MTCA

Consistent with WA phosphate policy

Page 1

300 Area Advice Comments

1. "Larry's paragraph" re: Feasibility Study
2. Need more on lcs
3. Use of phosphates – remove this bullet until/unless citation is provided

Page 2

Next Steps
300 Area Advice

1. IMs work with Susan H. (send to lms) to make final cleanup/changes raised at mtg.
lms back to Susan May 11 COB
2. Send to R&C and concurrence May 11

Page 3

Cleanup Integration/Planning

1. Composite performance assessment.
2. GW cleanup across the site.
3. Source of rock/soil CAPs.

4. Use of laboratories.
5. Use of railways.
6. Hot cells.
7. Distance of water (same as #8, "other CIP").

Page 4

Agency – Cleanup Integration

1. MSA – supports integrating infrastructure needs across site.
2. MSA "portfolio" – integrated technical database (P.A.C.E facility).
3. TPA integrates (primary mechanism).
4. Budget (use risk, cost).
5. Sometimes issue with contractors not talking with each other.
6. 2015 Vision (integration mechanism).

Page 5

Other C.I.P

1. What waste will we generate in cleanup? Where will we store it? What are the timelines/schedules? (integration opp.).
2. Integration of workforce between contractors (e.g. shipping waste to ERDF).
3. Groundwater and soil cleanup.

Page 6

Other C.I.P (continued)

4. Safety culture across the site.
5. How RCRA process integrated with DOE process for HLW storage.

6. Upgrades to 242 and ETF to handle HLW, etc.
7. Roads/emergency responses.
8. Water, infrastructure.
9. Tank farms – WTP – area around Central Plateau.

Page 7

Other C.I.P (continued)

10. Waste at CWC and shipment to WIPP.
11. R&D and technology with cleanup leads.
12. GW with human health and environment.
13. MSA and LTS plans (EM and legacy management).
14. Pipelines (across site and O.U.s) / IMUST

Page 8

Next Steps

Cleanup Integration & Planning

1. Email list of topics to RAP for stimulation of more ideas
2. Check w/EIC for “urgency” topics w/agencies
3. Maybe check first w/MSA, then look at GW topic
4. GW-VZ Executive Council – get a presentation on key issues

Page 9

Next Steps – ERDF

(no actions identified at this time)

Page 10

TC&WM EIS Advice
Concepts/Comments

1. Potential for multiple RODs/decisions
2. Ecology hasn't used anything from TC&WM EIS in formulation of draft site-wide permit (future, yes), permit models
3. Comply with laws
4. Protect groundwater values
5. Modeling still insufficient; not completely reliable

Page 11

Next Steps
TC&WM EIS Advice

1. Susan H. → send Dirk document from meeting w/tracked changes
2. Dirk & John H. refine (clear & concise)
→ Back to Susan H. to format & prep handout for TWC. Hand out Wed after joint meeting
3. Wed eve – lms meet to make final draft changes. Susan H. formats and sends to RAP, TWC, PIC for R&C concurrence by Thurs pm

Page 12

For Public Meetings

1. Be clear about why Permit is needed
2. What is included, what is not
3. Entire Permit is not on the CD
4. Carve up topics – more digestible for public → tell them why it matters

Page 13

Next Steps
Site-Wide Permit

1. Post tracking documentation SharePoint
2. Send email to HAB & invite to join on a topic, etc.
3. PIC call – one opp to check status from lms
4. Calendar – SharePoint – Advice development dates

July Issue Manger day?

Page 14

Future Thoughts

1. Don't allow 'releases' to the environment

Page 15

Follow Up

1. Brenda to follow up on state policy re: phosphate
2. Look at prelim CIP and identify other critical topics – HAB RAP members
3. P.A.C.E. (facility that might be good for RAP to see)
-Data Integration Facility
4. Flag CIP topics to BCC & other committees

Page 16