

Topics:

- Silos Project Update
- Video of WRAP Portion of 9/9/98 Cleanup Progress Briefing
- Follow-on to SSAB-Sponsored Low Level Waste Seminar

Attendees:

CAB members:	Lisa Crawford Doug Sarno Bob Tabor Tom Wayner Gene Willeke
DOE:	Nina Akgunduz Mike Jacobs
Fluor Daniel Fernald:	Tisha Patton Sue Peterman
FRESH:	Sandy Butterfield
OEPA:	Kelly Kaletsky

FCAB Action Items:

- The full board will evaluate the recommendations resulting from the Low Level Waste Seminar.

Meeting Summary:

Silos 1 and 2 Update

Nina Akgunduz presented the Committee with the Silos Project Update. The Vendors for Silos 1 and 2 are in the process of receiving approval for the Bench-scale testing, which is to be completed in late November/early December. After approval, the Vendors will begin pilot scale testing. This consists of 72-hour continuous operations performance to be completed by January. During this time, the Vendors will be updating Fernald via weekly conference calls and monthly status reports. The tests are open to the public. The sites and vendors are as follows:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Site</u>
Invitco	Joule-heated Virification	Toledo
Vortec	Non-Joule heated Virification	Pittsburgh
IT Corporation	Cement based stabilization	Oak Ridge
ChemNuclear	Non-Cement based stabilization	South Carolina.

Nina presented a summary of ongoing University/National Laboratories work funded by EM-50 (see attached matrix). Each University/National Lab analyzed physical samples from Silos 1 and 2 using different technologies. The University of Cincinnati (the second box in the matrix) will conduct an independent study of the draft reports from the all the labs and will write a final report consisting of a compilation of the four documents and an Executive Summary. Nina pointed out that these tests were not necessary, however, EM-50 had the funding available and it is a good idea to have independent results to confirm and validate the first screening. The Florida International University report is a rheological and hydraulic report for the accelerated waste retrieval proposals, which is something that the Vendors may find helpful, but will not be in the final report.

The Accelerated Waste Retrieval proposals for Silos 1 and 2 are due September 21, 1998 (FDF granted them a five week extension). The proposals will be reviewed by Fluor Daniel Fernald (FDF) and then given to the Critical Analysis Team who will review the results of the FDF review. The Critical Analysis Team will send a consent package (recommendation of a vendor) to DOE for approval. This process will take between 30 and 60 days, with the Award date in February.

Silo 3 Update

The lessons learned from this process have been very helpful in identifying the material in Silo 3 for the Vendors and FDF. A total of five drums of auger cores have been removed from the silo and three to five more are expected to be removed. The samples help Vendors determine the chemical composition, density and texture of the materials, which in turn, helps determine which extraction process to use. The proposals are due by October 23 and the award is expected by early spring.

Silos Procurement Schedule

September 21, 1998	October 23, 1998	Late November/early December	January 1999	February 1999	Early spring
Accelerated waste Retrieval proposals for Silos 1 & 2	Final Vendors' Proposals due for Silo 3	Bench-scale testing completed	72-hour continuous operations completed for Silos 1 & 2	Award for Accelerated Waste Retrieval for Silos 1 & 2	Award of Vendor for Silo 3

Waste Pits Remedial Action Project Update

The committee viewed the video prepared for the monthly progress briefing. This video is available for viewing at the PEIC. Doug and Lisa identified their concerns about the lack of disclosure regarding the temporary shutdown of the waste pits project over safety concerns. The group recommended sending a strong message to DOE that these types of events need to be explained in a public forum and the incident will be further discussed at the full CAB meeting.

Follow-on to SSAB-sponsored Low Level Waste Seminar

Doug described the process used at the Seminar and noted that 16 recommendations were developed as a result. Each SSAB ranked each issue based on how important they believed the issue would be to their SSAB whether or not their SSAB was likely to support such a recommendation (5 is most important, 1 is not important). It was decided that the full Board should evaluate each issue and identify the issues for which the FCAB should take a leadership role.

