

## Meeting Minutes

**Subjects:** Component Removal, Size Reduction, and Decontamination RFCA Standard Operating Protocol

**Date:** June 29, 2000

**Location:** RFETS, Building 060

**Attendees:** Susan Wilds (RFCAB), Shirley Garcia (Broomfield), John Marler (RFCLoG), Gerald DePoorter (RFCAB), Victor Holm (RFCAB), Mark Aguilar (EPA), John Corsi (K-H), Jeff Stevens (K-H), Dyan Foss, Catherine Madore, and Gerry Kelly

**Objective of the Meeting:** To discuss the public comments on the subject document

**Meeting was chaired by:** Jeff Stevens

**File:** Administrative Record

---

The meeting was an informal roundtable in which everyone asked questions and expressed concerns. The comments will be documented by the person who made them, not in the order they were received.

John Marler

- He pointed out that in Sections 3.5 and 3.6 the activities described are annotated as special circumstances. He was concerned that if those activities were indeed special that it did not belong in an RSOP, which is for routine activities. Jeff responded that it was simply a poor choice of words and those activities are not special, but the section were included to provide more detail on activities that could have more safety and environmental concerns.
- He asked what forum would be used to notify the public that a building has circumstances that are not detailed in the RSOP. Jeff indicated that it would depend on the specific of the circumstance. Activities that have a low potential for hazards to human health and the environment may be addressed at informational meetings. Activities that have a high potential for hazard to human health and the environment may require a modification of separate decision document with a formal public comment period.

Mark Aguilar asked John if he was aware that elevated levels of contamination were discovered in B779 during demolition that were not originally identified in the RLC. John indicated that he was not aware of that. Mark indicated that that kind of information needs to be disseminated to the public. The CAB individuals encouraged that this information be disseminated at monthly D&D meetings.

- He asked if the facility could/would be re-typed if the RLC did not accurately identify the contamination and contamination was identified during the in process characterization. Jeff indicated that there are mechanisms to address that situation and re-typing could occur.



ADMIN RECORD

W-A-004050

- He requested that when a document is referenced if the actual text from that document could be placed in the RSOP. Jeff indicated that is too difficult from a configuration control perspective when it comes to modifying documents.
- He asked about the D&D worker training and indicated that he would like to see videotape of this training or take a tour. Jeff indicated he would take care of it.
- He asked when the next version of the document would be available for comment and when detailed comments should be submitted to reduce the volume of comments in the responsiveness summary. Jeff indicated a new version would be available the third week of July.

#### Shirley Garcia

- She hopes the documents will be dynamic in that it will not require modification for minor exceptions to the techniques and methods. She indicated that notification of the minor exceptions should be all that is required.
- She asked if floor level workers had been given the opportunity to provide input. Jeff indicated that individuals had been given that opportunity.
- She asked if an evaluation has been made on the cost benefit of decontaminating TRU waste to LLW. Jeff indicated that those evaluations were on going and the new baseline assumes some very aggressive assumptions. In addition, new size reduction and decontamination technologies should provide additional opportunities to decontaminate TRU to LLW.
- She requested that when any new technique or method was used that the stakeholders be informed.
- She asked how process piping would be disposition that is under the building. Jeff indicated that this was an ER activity.
- She asked how criticality issues would be addressed. Jeff indicated that these issues are addressed in the authorization basis documents and implemented through the IWCP packages.
- She asked was going to be done with the decontamination water. Jeff indicated that the water would be reused when possible and treated in Building 374 when reuse was not reasonable.
- She asked if the lead shielding was going to be removed from the gloveboxes prior to dispositioning. Jeff indicated that the shielding is currently removed, but a new counter is being investigated that may allow the shielding to remain in place.
- She asked how the hold-up in the piping would be addressed. Jeff indicated that depending on the category of the material it may be removed or left in place and shipped to WIPP.
- She asked how many and where the size reduction facilities would be. Jeff indicated that there is currently one size reduction station in 771 and another is proposed for installation in October. He indicated a size reduction station will also be installed in Building 776.
- She asked what elevated contamination levels meant in the document. Jeff indicated that it was any level over the unrestricted release criteria.
- She asked if the fixative or wrapping could crack when a contaminated item was being lifted. Jeff indicated that the fixatives are very flexible and that the wrapping will be loose enough to withstand lifting, should that be required.
- She indicated the Rashig rings need to be added to the document. Jeff agreed.
- She asked how chemical removal would be addressed. Jeff indicated that most of the chemical removal had been completed, but if chemicals were discovered during

decommissioning that the subcontractor that performed the previous chemical removal would handle the chemical removal.

#### Susan Wilds

- She asked if incentives were given to the foremen for completing work on schedule. Jeff indicated that incentives are proposed for health and safety, incidents, budget, and schedule factors. She indicated that she felt this system of rewards diminished feedback from the workers. Both Jeff and Catherine provided examples of recent feedback regardless of schedule and budget.
- She asked if the gloveboxes could be used as waste containers to reduce the hazard of cutting the gloveboxes up. Jeff indicated that it was a size issue and the entire glovebox would not fit in a waste container, unless the glovebox met SCO/LLW standards.

#### Gerald DePoorter

- He asked how the workers would know how to implement the requirements of the RSOP. Jeff explained the IWCP process and the development of a work package.

#### Victor Holm

- He indicated he would like to see more informational meetings held with the public. Jeff indicated that the Pizza meetings are used for this information exchange.
- He asked how an RSOP would be modified and how often. Jeff indicated that it would depend on the change. Changes that could effect several projects will probably result in a modification to the RSOP. The other changes will be handled through a different mechanism, possibly a separate decision document.
- He asked the cost differential between disposing of low level waste at environcare versus NTS. Jeff indicated the costs were approximately \$40/ft<sup>3</sup> and \$8/ft<sup>3</sup>, respectively. He also asked why RFETS pays so much more for disposal then Fernald. Jeff indicated that he was unaware of the cost difference.