

00001177

4214 RF 93

States Government

Department of Energy

DUE DATE 10-1-93

Memorandum

SEP 22 11 06 AM '93

Rocky Flats Office

ACTION *Hedahl*
DIST. LTR ENC

SEP 21 1993

BENEDETTI, R.L.

BENJAMIN, A.

BERMAN, H.S.

BARNIVAL, G.J.

COPP, R.D.

CORDOVA, R.C.

DAVIS, J.G.

FERRERA, D.W.

FRANZ, W.A.

HANNI, B.J.

HEALY, T.J.

HEDAHL, T.G.

HILBIG, J.G.

KIRBY, W.A.

KUESTER, A.W.

MANN, H.P.

MARX, G.E.

McKENNA, F.G.

MORGAN, R.V.

PIZZUTO, V.M.

POTTER, G.L.

RILEY, J.H.

SANDLIN, N.B.

SATTERWHITE, D.G.

SCHUBERT, A.L.

SETLOCK, G.H.

SULLIVAN, M.T.

SWANSON, E.R.

WILKINSON, R.B.

WILSON, J.M.

Tharoffey

Glover W.

Hutchins

All Direct Reports

Adm Rec

WPD:JJR:10079

Assessment of On-Site Buildings for Storage of Mixed Waste

Harry P. Mann
General Manager
EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.

EG&G
ROCKY FLATS PLANT
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL

In two recent letters (Attachments I and II) the Colorado Department of Health (CDH) voiced concerns over the Rocky Flats Plant's ability to maintain compliance with environmental requirements during the upcoming period of facility transition and economic development. The CDH is especially concerned that Rocky Flats devote adequate planning and facilities for the storage of mixed waste generated during decontamination and decommissioning and environmental restoration. Although there presently exists a requirement under the residue consent order for a comprehensive mixed waste storage plan due October 1994, it is clear that interim steps must be taken to assure that adequate high quality storage capacity is available in the near term.

The Rocky Flats Office concurs with CDH regarding the availability of storage space, and therefore directs EG&G to develop a strategy by October 1, 1993, for preparing a comprehensive plan for storage of regulated waste. The RFO suggests the strategy include options which assesses the use of all potentially available buildings. We ask that your effort in developing this initial strategy list the major actions that will need to take place to transform the buildings to this new use, rough estimates of funding, schedules, and identify any physical, institutional or regulatory issues that may impede this effort. Specific details of this request are outlined in Attachment III.

A. H. Pauole
A. H. Pauole
Acting Manager

3 Attachments

- cc w/Attachments: 3
- X. Ascanio, DP-6.1
- J. Lytle, EM-30
- P. Bubar, EM-30
- W. Bixby, EM-60
- L. Smith, EM-60

- cc w/o Attachments:
- M. Karol, AMFO, RFO
- J. Hartman, AMTER, RFO
- M. McBride, DAMTER, RFO
- T. Lukow, WPD, RFO
- W. Rask, DPD, RFO
- J. Wienand, WPD, RFO
- J. Rampe, RPB, RFO

CORRES CONTROL
PATS/T130G

Reviewed for Addressee
Corres. Control RFP

9-22-93 *[Signature]*
DATE BY

Ref Ltr. #

DOE ORDER # 5400

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION
REVIEW WAIVER PER
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

ATTACHMENT III

The RFO is aware that EG&G is in the process of identifying buildings (in addition to the Centralized Waste Storage Facility) for potential storage space (reference Evaluation of Rocky Flats Building for Waste Storage Capability), but requests that the following items be included/considered in the report.

- Consider planning for both short-term (2-5 years) and long-term options. Long-term storage may require a different type of facility (Ref. Guidelines for Interim Transuranic (TRU) Waste Storage Facilities, DTWI WP 6.01.06, Predecisional Draft, Rev. O, July 1993).
- Identify those buildings that are most likely to be appropriate for storing hazardous, LL, LL-mixed, TRU, TRU-mixed, and residues, while meeting the requirements of DOE Orders and Standards and other Federal and State regulations.
- Expand the assessment to include Building 991 and those that may have been previously excluded due to other programmatic requirements.
- Consider the total volumes of waste, not only current volumes, but those that will be generated in the future as a function of decontamination and decommissioning and environmental restoration (reference Low-Level Mixed Waste Projects). Future storage may include building fabric structures for ER waste within the buffer zone.
- Consider using Building 440 as a baseline in which to address decision assessments such as:
 1. Physical actions, including equipment stripouts and upgrades needed to transform the building;
 2. Any necessary decontamination activities, for either radioactive or hazardous constituents;
 3. Necessary safety-related activities, including establishment of nuclear materials inventory limits and needed safety analysis;
 4. National Environmental Policy Act requirements; and,
 5. Permitting issues.