



## FCAB UPDATE

*Week of October 7, 2002*

(Last update was September 9, 2002)

### MEETING SCHEDULE

#### Stewardship Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 10, 2002, 6:30 p.m.

Trailer 1 on site

#### Full FCAB Meeting

Saturday, October 12, 2002, 8:30 a.m.

Crosby Senior Center

#### Chairs Meeting, Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Thursday – Saturday, October 17-19, 2002

### ATTACHMENTS

- Site Transition Framework for Long-Term Stewardship – DRAFT
- FCAB Calendar 2003
- Articles & News Clippings

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Please contact Doug Sarno or David Bidwell at The Perspectives Group

Phone: 513-648-6478 or 703-837-9269 Fax: 513-648-4141 or 703-837-9662

E-Mail: [djsarno@theperspectivesgroup.com](mailto:djsarno@theperspectivesgroup.com) or [dbidwell@theperspectivesgroup.com](mailto:dbidwell@theperspectivesgroup.com)

[www.fernald.org](http://www.fernald.org), or [www.theperspectivesgroup.com](http://www.theperspectivesgroup.com)



## FERNALD CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD CALENDAR 2003

### Time and Location of Meetings

DOE Public Briefing Meetings, Tuesdays, 6:30 p.m., Trailer T-1  
 Stewardship Committee Meetings, Thursdays, 6:30 p.m., Trailer T-1  
 Full FCAB Meetings, Saturdays, 8:30 a.m., Crosby Senior Center  
 FRESH, Thursdays, 7:30 p.m., Venice Presbyterian Church

### OCTOBER 2002

08 DOE Monthly Progress Briefing, *Tuesday*  
 10 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 12 Full FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*  
 17-19 Chairs Meeting, Oak Ridge

### NOVEMBER 2002

14 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 16 FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*

### DECEMBER 2002

No FCAB meetings

### JANUARY 2003

16 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 18 Full FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*  
 23 FRESH Meeting, *Thursday*  
 29-31 SSAB WIPP Workshop, *Carlsbad, NM*

### FEBRUARY 2003

11 DOE Monthly Progress Briefing, *Tuesday*  
 12 Stewardship Committee, *Wednesday*  
 13 Full FCAB Meeting, *Thursday 6:00 p.m.*

### MARCH 2003

13 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 15 Full FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*  
 27 FRESH Meeting, *Thursday*

### APRIL 2003

08 DOE Monthly Progress Briefing, *Tuesday*  
 10 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 12 Full FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*

### MAY 2003

08 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 10 Full FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*  
 22 FRESH Meeting, *Thursday*

### JUNE 2003

10 DOE Tour, *Tuesday*  
 12 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 14 Full FCAB Meeting, *Saturday*

### JULY 2003

8 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Tuesday*  
 9 Full FCAB Meeting, *Wednesday, 6:00 p.m.*  
 24 FRESH Meeting, *Thursday*

### AUGUST 2003

12 DOE Monthly Progress Briefing, *Tuesday*  
 No FCAB meetings

### SEPTEMBER 2003

11 Stewardship Committee Meeting, *Thursday*  
 12 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration, *Friday*  
 13 FCAB Retreat, *Saturday*  
 25 FRESH Meeting, *Thursday*

**PREFACE TO THE  
SITE TRANSITION FRAMEWORK FOR LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP**

This document provides a framework for the transition of a site or portions of a site from cleanup to long term stewardship. The framework is a tool to help facilitate a smooth transition from remediation into long-term stewardship, and provides a checklist approach for affected parties. The goal is to ensure that nothing in the closeout process has been overlooked and that appropriate actions have been completed prior to a site's transfer into long-term stewardship.

This framework identifies specific information and data requirements; however, it is only a framework and should be adapted to accommodate unique site-specific requirements, needs, and documents. Exceptions to the framework are expected and should be worked out on a site basis by the affected and responsible parties. Ideally, this framework should be used as early in the remediation process as possible. Subsequent reviews should be conducted and used to verify that all appropriate steps have been, or will be taken, to close out the site and prepare it for long-term stewardship.

This document does not, in any way, serve as a replacement for, or alternative to, the required regulatory processes. This framework is not intended to impose additional requirements on the owners or operators of the sites. Furthermore, it should not be interpreted as a land transfer mechanism.

The Department of Energy is applying the draft framework on an informal basis to a variety of sites that are scheduled to transition from closure to long-term stewardship (e.g., a FUSRAP site, a UMTRCA Title II site, the Weldon Spring and other closure sites, and continuing mission sites). Upon approval, the intention is to apply the framework on a more systematic basis.

## **SITE TRANSITION FRAMEWORK FOR LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP**

### **I. Authority and Accountability are Assigned and Documented:**

- This section reviews the assignment of accountability and authority for responsible and affected parties for long-term stewardship.
- A. All documents allocating the roles and responsibilities of responsible and affected parties have been approved and signed (e.g., Memorandum of Agreement, Memorandum of Understanding, or Interagency Agreement, Cooperative Agreement).
- B. Each federal or non-federal entity who will be responsible for long-term stewardship activities listed in section I(A) have been identified. Funding sources for each activity have been identified.
- C. Appropriate governmental policies and procedures for managing resources are incorporated into the long-term stewardship plan and agreements.
- D. The legal authority under which long-term stewardship will be conducted has been identified and documented.
- E. Authorities relating to Institutional Controls are discussed in paragraph IV.

### **II. Site Conditions are Accurately and Comprehensively Documented:**

- All documentation identifying site historical uses, characterization, and remedial action, including the Preliminary and Final Closeout Reports have been completed and made available to the public.
- A. The site at the time of closure, including all remedies and remaining hazards, has been described. Examples include:
  1. Physical features of the site, including, site topography, geology, hydrogeology, site and area boundaries, etc.
  2. Locations of active, inactive, and decommissioned buildings, structures, and surface and subsurface infrastructure (e.g., utilities).
  3. Locations of residual hazards and associated engineered and institutional control systems.
  4. Locations of groundwater wells, wastewater outfalls, and air quality monitoring stations. Information has been depicted on-site maps.
  5. For those sites undergoing closure, locations of off-site buildings and structures, important ecological resources, and associated potential receptors in the vicinity of the site.
  6. Characteristics of the remaining contaminants (e.g., radioisotope, activity, and physical form).
  7. If a "No Further Action" has been reached and agreed to, this should also be indicated.
- B. For those sites undergoing closure, a conceptual site model for long-term stewardship has been completed, showing the relationships between existing residual hazards, environmental transport mechanisms, exposure pathways, and human/ecological receptors.
- C. All remedial action documentation has been completed and approved by regulators.

- D. Results of any Natural Resource Damage Assessment, where applicable, performed with associated documentation has been made available. This assessment should discuss the parties' potential environmental liability at the site.

**III. Engineered Controls, Operation & Maintenance Requirements, and Emergency/Contingency Planning are Documented:**

- A. Engineered controls have been identified and documented, information should include:
  - 1. Design and construction drawings, specifications, and completion report.
  - 2. Site physical and geotechnical data.
  - 3. Locations of engineered controls accurately identified and depicted on site maps.
  - 4. Identification of on-going remediation and related waste management activities.
  - 5. Performance history assessments indicating successful operation.
  - 6. A life-cycle cost estimate, including basis and assumptions. The life-cycle cost estimate should be based on best available data, recognizing that in most cases the long-term stewardship activities may be on-going for decades.
  - 7. A master schedule of on-going activities has been made available, including exit criteria outlining when engineered controls are no longer necessary.
- B. Operation & Maintenance (O&M) activities have been documented, funding is in place, and a party has been selected to perform the necessary activities.
  - 1. Surveillance and monitoring requirements have been documented (e.g., scope frequency, reporting, process descriptions, and analytical parameters & methods). This document should allow for changes that are consistent with the selected remedy.
  - 2. The cost, including basis and assumptions, of operations, maintenance and surveillance activities have been determined and documented. The request for funding should be in accordance with applicable budget appropriations procedures.
  - 3. An agreement is in place for performance of all O&M activities.
- C. Emergency/Contingency planning and the authority and responsibilities to implement have been identified.
  - 1. Uncertainties associated with residual hazards, fate and transport mechanisms, exposure pathways, and the effectiveness of long-term stewardship activities have been identified.
  - 2. Scenarios related to each uncertainty have been identified (e.g., failure scenarios).
  - 3. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures to respond to each scenario have been established.

**IV. Institutional Controls and Enforcement Authorities are Identified:**

- A. Land Use/Institutional Controls have been implemented and approved by the regulator. All institutional control components of each implemented remedy are described (e.g., future lands use assumptions upon which each implemented remedy is based, associated land use restrictions).
  - 1. On-site and off-site land uses for each area (property) and its associated land use assumptions have been identified.
  - 2. Procedures for managing, assessing potential changes, and enforcing on-site and off-site (as appropriate) land uses have been documented and are being conducted.

3. Institutional controls established as part of an implemented remedy have been identified.
4. Roles and responsibilities have been outlined for responding to requests to change existing land uses.
5. Procedures have been put in place for periodic review of land uses. Performance history indicating successful operation has been provided.
6. Procedures for management and periodic reassessment of institutional control restrictions are in place.
7. Off-site easements implemented to ensure the protectiveness of the remedy have been documented.
8. Exit criteria outlining when engineered controls are no longer necessary has been documented.

B. Property records (as required by applicable regulations and/or guidance).

1. The site's real estate history has been documented, including identification of former property owners, deed restrictions, or other land use restrictions.
2. Site boundaries and site markers are easily identified and documented.
3. On-site and off-site easements, rights of way, and other property access rights have been established and documented.
4. Water, mineral, and other natural resource rights have been identified.
5. Tribal treaty rights and other U.S. Government obligations have been identified.
6. Areas where long-term stewardship activities will be conducted have been documented in the property records.

**V. Regulatory Requirements and Authorities are Identified:**

- Regulatory requirements regarding residual contamination have been identified. All regulatory documents are maintained and available to the public (e.g., Records of Decision, RCRA Permits and Corrective Action Decisions, Consent Orders, Interagency Agreements, Federal Facility Agreements).
- A. Regulatory decision documents and associated site characterizations have been identified and are either complete or scheduled for completion and are maintained in accordance with regulatory requirements.
  - B. The implemented remedy and associated long-term stewardship activities are certified to be in compliance with all regulatory requirements (e.g., appropriate agreements have been entered into with appropriate regulator).
  - C. Five-Year Review results have been made available. Future five-year reviews, including supplemental analysis of site-wide Environmental Impact Statements, should be planned and consistent with EPA guidance.
  - D. EPA NPL Status and/or RCRA permit status have been clearly indicated (e.g., de-listing, partial de-listing, non-NPL).
  - E. NRC License Status has been established. This should identify the license holder and the development of license transfer plans.
  - F. Locations of documents have been identified and are accessible.

**VI. Long-Term Stewardship Budget, Funding, and Personnel Requirements are Identified:**

- A. A technical baseline document for long-term stewardship programs and activities at the site has been developed.
- B. Funding (consistent with technical baseline).
  - 1. Funds for long-term surveillance and maintenance have been identified and are available or requested.
  - 2. Estimates for the annual funding requirements for long-term stewardship activities, associated oversight, and information management requirements have been derived.
  - 3. Funding assurances have been made based on those estimates.
  - 4. Mechanisms to transfer funds required for long-term stewardship have been established.
  - 5. Funding mechanisms for long-term stewardship activities and regulatory oversight activities conducted by other federal and non-federal entities have been established (e.g., documentation of financial assurance agreements for long-term monitoring and surveillance funding).
  - 6. Estimates required for financial assurance payments have been determined.
  - 7. Authority has been granted to the steward to use, or have access to, funds related to long-term stewardship.
- C. Personnel requirements have been identified (for activities not previously addressed within this set of criteria).
  - 1. Personnel functions and qualifications necessary for the technical implementation and administration of long-term stewardship activities have been identified.
  - 2. A determination for the need of other on-site personnel has been made identifying the specific duties that may be required.
  - 3. A closeout plan for the disposition of excess federal full time equivalents has been developed.
- D. A business close out process has been developed.

**VII. Information and Records Management Requirements are Satisfied:**

- A. The Transfer of Information.
  - 1. Information needed for long-term stewardship has been identified and transferred.
  - 2. Practices and procedures for the collection, evaluation, storage, retrieval, and use of this information have been established (e.g., evaluation of new technologies).
  - 3. Location for storage of information has been identified. Where the information will be placed has occurred.
- B. Information management planning has been performed and is acceptable to the stakeholders.
  - 1. Systems and procedures for the transfer of archival long-term stewardship information in one or more on-site or off-site repositories have been developed.
  - 2. Retention schedules that are appropriate for the management of information for long-term stewardship have been determined.

3. Systems and procedures to establish and facilitate public access to and retrieval of information critical to long-term stewardship are in place. Examples could include, but are not limited to, internet access, local library, on-site information center (e.g., Interpretive Center, Museum, etc.), etc.
4. Classes of LTS information users have been identified and the retention and retrieveability requirements identified and implemented.

**VIII. Public Education, Outreach, Information and Notice Requirements are Documented and Satisfied:**

- A. List of site stakeholders with associated address information has been developed and updated.
- B. Community involvement tools have been developed and are being used at regular intervals (e.g., fact sheets, newsletters, inspection reports, 5-year review results, email notifications, public meetings, etc.).
- C. Costs associated with public involvement have been estimated (e.g., Oversight Committees, meeting locations, etc.). Where approved, any such cost would be included in the funding requests.
- D. Updates of the administrative record/information repository on-site are annually (at a minimum) made available to interested parties.

**IX. Natural, Cultural and Historical Resource Management Requirements are Satisfied:**

- A. A discrete system or process is in place to protect information about sensitive and natural resources.
- B. Biological resources, threatened and endangered species, archeological and cultural resources, Native American treaty rights, and/or other natural and cultural resource issues have been addressed.
- C. Locations and characteristics of natural and cultural resources, needing long-term stewardship, have been identified (e.g., precise locations of cultural and natural resources). A management system is in place and operating successfully.

## **Supporters, opponents make waste initiative most expensive in state's history**

**Date:**Wednesday, September 18 @ 00:00:30 MDT

**Topic:**Valley and State

SALT LAKE CITY (AP) -- Supporters and opponents of the radioactive-waste initiative have put a combined \$1.5 million into the battle, making it the most expensive ballot issue in the state's history.

Financial reports to the state elections office showed Monday that Envirocare of Utah has donated \$1,086,944 to try to defeat the initiative, which the company claims would put it out of business.

Proponents of the Radioactive Waste Restrictions Act reported raising \$434,428 to get the initiative on the Nov. 5 ballot.

The initiative would outlaw "hotter" radioactive waste than is already permitted in Utah, and would raise taxes on the radioactive waste transported to Utah for disposal. Opposition campaign leader Hugh Matheson said, "One company is paying to fight this initiative, which singles them out. But the entire business community and Utah's elected officials are joining the coalition to fight the initiative because they don't want to see Utah become a battleground for corporate warfare by initiative."

This story appeared in The Daily Herald on page A3

## After decades of setbacks, construction begins on radioactive waste plant

*By Linda Ashton, Associated Press*

*Thursday, September 19, 2002*

RICHLAND, Wash. — In a scrubby sagebrush desert not far from the Columbia River, lethal leftovers from the Cold War era are finally about to be cleaned up.

After a decade of fits and starts, construction has begun on a \$4 billion waste treatment complex at the Hanford nuclear reservation, the biggest environmental cleanup project in the country.

Environmental advocates say it's none too soon. At least 67 of Hanford's 177 underground tanks, some of them decrepit and well past their intended service lives, have leaked more than 1 million gallons of radioactive brew into the soil. The waste has contaminated the aquifer, and the tanks are just seven miles from the Columbia River, which borders Hanford.

"There's a lot at stake," said John Britton, a spokesman for Bechtel National, which was hired to rescue the stranded project last year after the previous contractor's cost estimates doubled to \$15.2 billion.

State regulators have squabbled with the Energy Department over the project since the early 1990s, when the department scuttled a plan to turn some of the waste into grout and bury it in sealed containers. The agencies later argued over missed deadlines and uncertain federal budgets, until a kind of detente was achieved.

"Right now our focus is on getting the thing built," said Sheryl Hutchison, a spokeswoman for the state Department of Ecology.

The new plant will turn radioactive waste from plutonium production into more manageable glass cylinders. The process, called vitrification, mixes radioactive waste with glass-forming materials, then melts them at 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit to make a molten glass that is poured into canisters for long-term storage.

The most radioactive glass will end up at some kind of national repository, likely Yucca Mountain in Nevada, where it will take 10,000 years to decay. The less radioactive waste will be buried in trenches in the 560-square-mile reservation here.

But exactly how much of the nearly 54 million gallons of radioactive waste will be turned into glass is still being debated within the Energy Department. The Bush administration wants the agency to study less expensive but still effective ways to treat low-activity radioactive waste.

"There's a lot of concern they'll not empty those tanks," Hutchison said.

Another source of concern is an Energy Department plan to reclassify some highly radioactive residual waste at several sites, including Hanford, which could mean it would be left in the tanks. The Natural Resources Defense Council and two Indian tribes are suing the Energy Department in federal court in Idaho over the plan.

Roy Schepens, the new manager for the Energy Department's Office of River Protection, which is overseeing the project, wouldn't comment on the litigation. But he said he's considering a number of alternatives for low-activity waste, including a technology that uses superheated steam to treat waste and turn it into a cat litter-like substance, and bulk vitrification, where waste is turned into glass in an existing container rather than transferred to one later. Any such plans would have to be approved by state regulators.

For now, the focus is on constructing the plant. In 2005, the plant should be ready for nonradioactive testing, and in 2007, "hot" testing is scheduled to begin.

Crews at a test facility will use safe, simulated waste to find the best way to remove the radioactive mix of liquid, salt cake and sludge from the tanks.

Plutonium was made at the site for more than 40 years for the nation's nuclear arsenal, including the bomb that was dropped on Nagasaki during World War II.

Hutchison said the Energy Department and its contractors are making good progress on the cleanup, which is being closely watched. The legal decree governing cleanup at Hanford sets a goal of retrieving 99 percent of the waste from the tanks, or as much as is technically feasible, and treating the waste by 2028.

"I intend to beat the 2028 date," Schepens said.

**Copyright 2002 — Associated Press**

Any reprinting, rebroadcast or digital transmission of this work without written permission from Environmental News Network, Inc. is strictly prohibited.

4523

Page 1 of 2

September 2, 2002  
Weapons Complex Monitor  
Pages 2 & 3

"CLEANUP CHIEF APPOINTS MANAGERS FOR HER KEY INITIATIVES"

### **CLEANUP CHIEF APPOINTS MANAGERS FOR HER 12 KEY INITIATIVES**

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Jessie Roberson has appointed key managers to oversee 12 special projects designed to restructure the internal operations of the cleanup program and accelerate risk reduction. Roberson met her self-imposed July 30 deadline for deciding on the positions as outlined in a May memo. Nine of the 12 project managers have been appointed thus far (*see chart next page*). The managers learned of their appointments by letter Aug. 5 and are now in the midst of assembling the project team based on the expertise needed for the particular project. A senior DOE manager has been or will be assigned to each project as an advisor.

The Top-to-Bottom review, released in February, emphasized the concept of aligning the cleanup program's procurement, budgeting, project planning and oversight functions to reduce as much real risk as possible in the shortest possible time and therefore reduce life-cycle costs (*WC Monitor*, Vol. 13 No. 6). Each project focuses on a different area of the cleanup program that was identified as needing improvement in the review, including improving EM's contracting process to better identify cleanup objectives and integrating individual site closure plans to eliminate duplication (*see table, pg. 3*). ■

September 2, 2002  
 Weapons Complex Monitor  
 Pages 2 & 3

Page 2 of 2

"CLEANUP CHIEF APPOINTS MANAGERS FOR HER KEY INITIATIVES"

-- 4523

THE "TWELVE" PROJECT TEAMS AND LEADERS		
<i>Project</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Advisor</i>
Getting More Performance from Performance Based Contracts	Charlie Dan, DOE-Rocky Flats	Inez Triay, DOE-Carlsbad
Managing Waste to Reduce Risk (other than SNF and HLW)	Reinhard Knerr, DOE-Carlsbad	Tom Heenan, DOE-Savannah River
Managing Waste to Reduce Risk: SNF	Christine Gelles, EM-33	Keith Klein, DOE-Richland
Managing Waste to Reduce Risk: HLW	Joel Casc, DOE-Idaho	Shirley Ollinger, DOE-Richland
Safeguards and Security: Reducing the Threat at EM Sites	Matt McCormick, DOE-Richland	Mark Frei, EM-30
Long-Term Stewardship for Protection of Public Health and the Environment	Dave Geiser, EM-50	Patty Bubar, EM-20
Integrated Program for Accelerated Cleanup of Small Sites	Cynthia Anderson, DOE-Savannah River	Paul Golan EM-1
Packaging and Transportation to Support Accelerated Risk Reduction	Frank Sheppard, EM-33	Alice Williams, West Valley
Focusing EM Program Resources on Cleanup	Mike Weiss, EM-40	Open
Programmatic Strategy to Accelerate Site Closure	Open	Open
Using Breakthrough Business Processes to Accelerate Risk Reduction	Open	Open
Implementing the NEPA Process to Better Support EM Decision Making	Open	Open

September, 2, 2002  
Weapons Complex Monitor  
Page 9  
"AT FERNALD..... FLUOR CUTS 75 JOBS"

4523

**AT FERNALD ..... FLUOR CUTS 75 JOBS**

Fluor Fernald, the Energy Dept.'s cleanup contractor at the Fernald Site, notified 75 salaried employees Aug. 22 that their positions have been eliminated. In early April, employees in 31 job categories were notified that reductions were necessary to align the skill mix of the workforce with the remaining cleanup work at the site. The layoff, which follows two voluntary and one involuntary

layoff this fiscal year, impacts mostly administrative personnel including those working in maintenance, project controls, records and public affairs. In all, 225 Fluor Fernald salaried employees have left the project since October 2001, putting the current employment level at just over 1,500.