

1B400



000022874

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.
1700 Broadway, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80290
phone: (303) 831-8100 • telecopy (303) 831-8208

MEETING NOTES

TO: Distribution **DATE:** March 2, 1994
FROM: Philip Nixon
MEMO #: SP307:030494:01 **PROJECT #:** Solar Pond IM/IRA

ATTENDANCE:
Randy Ogg, EG&G
Phil Nixon, ES
Richard Henry, ES
Dave Ericson, EG&G
Lee Pivonka, G&M
Steve Howard, DOE/SMS
Shaleigh Whitsell, PRC
Harlen Ainscough, CDH
Tom Peters, PRC
Scott Surovchak, DOE
Ted Ball, PRC
Alan MacGregor, ERM
Steve Paris, EG&G
Greg DiGregorio, SAIC
Pat Breen, ES
Cindy Gee, ES
Harry Heidkamp, ES
Will Barnard, ES
John Evans, ES
Patricia Corbeth, ERM
Mike Peters, SAIC

DISTRIBUTION:
Attendees
L. Benson, ES
A. Conklin, ES
K. Cutter, ES
S. Stenseng, ES
A. Fricke, ES
T. Kuykendall, ES
T. Evans, ES
B. Cropper, ES
C. Montes, ES
R. McConn, ES
W. Edmonson, ES
~~B. Wallace~~ EG&G (Admin.
Record) (2)
S. Hughes, ES
K. London, EG&G
Martin McBride, DOE
Helen Belencan, DOE
Ted Kearns, DOE/KMI
Andy Ledford, EG&G

DISTRIBUTION (CONT.)
Steve Cooke, EG&G
Joe Schieffelin, CDH
Steve Keith, EG&G
Dave Myers, ES
R. Wilkinson, ES
S. Winston, ES
Kim Ruger, EG&G
Michelle McKee, EG&G
Marcia Dibiasi, IGO
Rich Stegen, ES
Bob Siegrist, LATO
John Rampe, DOE
Kevin Loos, DOE
Frazer Lockhart, DOE
John Haasbeek, ERM
Toni Moore, EG&G
Arturo Duran, EPA
Peg Witherill, DOE
Mark Austin, EG&G

SUBJECT: Weekly Status Meeting

1) Review of Meeting Minutes

It was discussed that the review and comment resolution periods are very tight. Some reviewers are concerned that there is not enough time for a thorough review. Randy Ogg is concerned that ES may not have adequate time to resolve/incorporate all the comments. An extension of the IAG milestone schedule may be considered to allow for a more thorough review period as well as allow extra time to incorporate the closure plan for Building 788.

2) Submittal of the Parts IV and V


Phil Nixon and Alan MacGregor provided the Part IV (Conceptual Design for the Closure/Remediation) and Part V (Post-Closure Monitoring and Assessment) in accordance with schedule. Comments on Part IV are due on March 8, 1994. Comments on Part V are due on March 15, 1994.

3) Comments on Parts II and III

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss comments that the working group had on Parts II and III of the IM/IRA-EA decision document. CDH, EPA, PRC, EG&G, SAIC, and ERM/G&M provided comments. Each group discussed the comments that were considered to be necessary. In general the significant comments were summarized as:

- Harlen asked that the term PRG be changed to Target Action Levels
- The Part II comparison of concentrations to background and the Part III development of Constituents of Concern (COCs) and Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) need to be consistent and the process/methodology needs to be stated clearly. Additional references between sections may be appropriate or the discussion of COCs/PRGs may be moved into Part II before the fate and transport discussion that focuses on the PRGs. In addition, the COC list needs to be re-evaluated and possibly re-calculated based on the current RFI/RI data.
- ES will investigate the need for additional graphics related to mapping non-COC constituents.
- Frazer Lockhart and Harlen Ainscough need to resolve the conflicting DOE/CDH issue of whether the document should reference the Phase I project and the Phase II project specifically.
- The removal or inclusion of organic constituents needs to be reconsidered.
- The differences between the original RFI/RI workplan and the actual plan that was implemented needs to be clearly stated and referenced throughout the document.

- Arturo Duran indicated that DOE may have data to justify that the liners could be delisted and then not classified as hazardous waste. Additional analysis may need to be conducted to satisfy the delisting requirements. EG&G/DOE will discuss the potential for delisting the existing liners in a separate meeting. It was mentioned that the approval of a delisting petition would require at least 6 months, but could take 1 to 2 years. It is important to note that the liners were considered hazardous due to the "derived from" rule. Therefore, a delisting petition may not be required.
- Arturo Duran reminded the working group that the goal is to protect human health and the environment for a 1,000-year period. This might not require that the engineered cover be designed for a 1,000-year period if the contaminants are shown to be immobile. Additional analysis may need to be performed to validate modeling results.
- ES and EG&G need to consider calculating PRG concentrations for soils that are protective of ground water. This was originally a Phase II activity, but the working group is concerned that it needs to be incorporated into the Phase I IM/IRA.
- As appropriate, ES will remove references to agreements that were made with EPA/CDH.
- ES will review the various parts of the IM/IRA-EA decision document to ensure that there is a consistency of information within the different parts.



Philip Nixon, Project Manager