

Meeting Minutes
Unit Managers Meeting: 2101-M Pond
Federal Building, Room 176
Richland, Washington

Meeting Held January 10, 1991

2101-M Closure Plan, Unit Managers' Approval

Clifford E. Clark Date: 2/11/91
Clifford E. Clark, Unit Manager, DOE-RL, ERD

Megan E. Lerchen Date: 2/12/91
Megan E. Lerchen, Unit Manager, Ecology

Not Present Date: _____
Daniel L. Duncan, Unit Manager, EPA Region X Program Manager

Not Present Date: _____
Joseph E. Thrasher, WHC, Contractor Representative

PURPOSE: Monthly status report.

Meeting Minutes are attached.

- Attachment #1 - Meeting Summary of Discussion and Commitments
- Attachment #2 - Meeting Agenda
- Attachment #3 - Commitments/Agreements Status List
- Attachment #4 - Attendance List

9
2
1
2
6
3
9
1
3
7
4



Distribution:

M.J. Anthony RL (A6-95)
W.H. Bodily KEH (E3-33)
E.A. Bracken RL (A6-95)
R.M. Carosino RL (A4-52)
C.E. Clark RL (A5-15)
W.G. Cox WHC (S5-65)
D.L. Duncan EPA (HW-124)
K.R. Fecht WHC (H4-56)
C.J. Geier WHC (B2-19)
R.D. Izatt RL (A6-95)
G.W. Jackson WHC (R2-29)
R.N. Krekel RL (A5-15)
R.J. Landon WHC (B2-19)
R.E. Lerch WHC (B2-35)
H.E. McGuire WHC (B2-35)
R.G. Mcleod RL (A5-19)
M.A. Mihalic WHC (L4-88)
S.M. Price WHC (H4-57)
F.A. Ruck III WHC (H4-57)
H.T. Tilden PNL (P7-68)
M.A. Wasemiller WHC (H4-55)
E.A. Wiley Ecology
B. Woods EPA

GSSC RCRA UMM File, A4-35

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD (2101-M) [Care of EDMC, WHC (H4-22)]

Washington State Department of Ecology Nuclear and Mixed Waste Library, Mail Stop PV-11

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, WA, HW-124

Please send comments on distribution list to K. Knox, 376-4726.

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 7 5

Attachment #1

2101-M Pond
Unit Managers Meeting
Meeting Held January 10, 1991

Summary of Discussion

1. Cliff Clark (DOE) introduced Sandra Trine (DOE) who will be taking over many of the closure unit manager meetings.
2. The Postclosure Section of the Closure Plan was discussed as preliminary information pending formal comments from Ecology (Megan Lerchen).
 - o ~~where~~ ^{MSJ} references are made to out-of-date EPA design guidance documents. There are some impacts from this such as the size of the lifts to be compacted.
 - o The schedule for testing cover materials allows over a month for identifying a testing laboratory. Clarification was made that this laboratory is for determining soil properties.
 - o Present height of lifts is 12 inches, although guidance documents recommend six inches after compaction and eight to nine inch lifts before compaction.
 - o No reason was given for use of Siberian wheat grass as a vegetation cover. If mixes of vegetation being used are those recommended by the Department of Agriculture or the Soil Conservation District, then this should be so stated.
 - o Sampling requirements. Many of these items appear to have been covered already in EIIs (which were not listed in the meeting), and if they can be used, they should be.
 - o On page II-14 of Ecology's copy, line 38, there are three things described, and the next line says, "The former is known as primary consolidation and the latter is secondary." This should be clarified.
 - o On page II-16 of Ecology's copy, line 7, there should be a reference given for "dried silky flax."
 - o In the section regarding Cover System Permeability, it states, "For convenience the term 'permeability' is used in this document as equivalent to 'hydraulic conductivity.'" Ms. Lerchen will object to substituting a term that means something else to shorten a longer term and suggested it could be shortened to "conductivity." DOE/WHC representatives agreed that terms will be used in their correct technical sense and one will not be substituted for another.
 - o There is a statement regarding "erosion damage that results in the loss of an average of two tons per acre." A time frame for this should be given.
 - o On page 22 of Ecology's copy, second paragraph, the subject of vegetative cover condition is addressed. Ms. Lerchen inquired as to what the natural vegetative cover percentage is for undisturbed

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 7 6

soil after two years. WHC (Fred Ruck) noted that 10 percent does not sound like very much to a lot of people and agreed that there needs to be information to compare with the natural cover.

- o The question was raised by Ms. Lerchen regarding bench mark integrity as to how placement might be affected by the sitewide resurveying effort and when the sitewide resurveying will take place. Work on the sitewide survey is awaiting funding, and is expected to cost \$300,000 to \$500,000 for reestablishment of bench marks and \$3 million to \$5 million for the entire sitewide survey.
- o Figure 2-9 is related to groundwater. It was agreed that the logic of Figure 2-9 is unclear in the way it is presented, and it will be revised.
- o In the section on Statistical Analysis, the paragraph after the list of bullets states that analytical data will be analyzed against the downgradient data. Ms. Lerchen would like to have historical data shown for those wells. A data base has been established and should be used.
- o Figure 2-10, which says, "nondetects greater than 50 percent, yes/no," does not follow the text.
- o The paragraph on Correction of Settlement and Displacement states that, "Minor damage will be repaired with hand tools," but it is not clear when, and there also is no indication of any increase in monitoring until the repairs have taken place. It was clarified by WHC that the last sentence in the paragraph which says, "Maintenance activities will take place within 90 days of discovery," refers to all maintenance and not just to major erosion damage repairs. Ms. Lerchen suggested that a change in the order of sentences might make the meaning clearer.
- o It was noted by Ms. Lerchen that statements regarding what training may be required all contain the phrase "may include," which can mean that training so listed may not be included. WHC (Mark Wasemiller) stated that the reason the word "may" is used is that some determinations of required training are not fully developed.
- o Referring to the material regarding Ground Water Samples, Ms. Lerchen suggested that it should have not only "collection," but "packaging" of samples.
- o In "Training for Emergency Response," the ~~mandatory~~ 40-hour training was not included.
- o The professional engineer certification should be consistent with other Closure Plans. Ms. Lerchen suggested checking with Sue Price to make sure that the documents are consistent.

ACTION ITEM: Confer with Sue Price and determine that engineering certifications are the same in Closure Plans and Part B applications as well as the Interim Status Closure Plans. Action: Fred Ruck.

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 7 7

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 7 8

- o Under Appendix F, Evaluation of Cover Design Performance, Figure F-1 is ~~not~~ too large a scale to be useful except for comparison purposes.
- o Reference is made in Appendix F to EPA 1982. A check should be made to see if this is the most current guidance.
- o In Appendix F there is an evaluation of soil erosion which uses the assumption of noncrusted soil. However, the surface conditions at the McGee Ranch are described as crusted. WHC (Mark Wasemiller) stated that noncrusted is a worst-case scenario. Soil in this location could be crusted with application of water, and there is a significantly smaller degree of wind erosion with crusted soil as opposed to noncrusted.

3. The sampling plan has been approved by Ecology. I.T. Corp. will be available for nonradioactive laboratory work. Sampling is expected to begin by the end of February 1991. WHC will give Ecology five working days notice for sampling oversight. DOE (Cliff Clark) requested Ecology to send a letter that Ecology is in agreement with the sampling plan and should go ahead with it.

ACTION ITEM: Send a letter to ~~WHC~~ ^{DOE-RL} stating agreement with the sampling plan and instructing ~~WHC~~ ^{DOE-RL} to proceed with sampling.
 Action: Megan Lerchen ^{DOE-RL}

4. The next meeting will be held on February 12, 1991 at the Washington Department of Ecology offices in Kennewick, Washington.

Attachment #2

2101-M Pond
Unit Managers Meeting
Meeting Held January 10, 1991

Agenda

1. Ecology comments on the Postclosure Section
2. General Discussion on Notice of Deficiency Comments
3. New Business

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 7 9

Attachment #3
Unit Managers Meeting: 2101-M Pond
Meeting Held January 10, 1991

ACTION ITEM

COMMITMENTS/AGREEMENTS STATUS LIST

6-25-90:3 DOE will send a letter to Ecology which will outline a proposed method to resolve the issue of the inclusion of new data in plans. Also included will be a proposed time schedule for the Closure Plan and Sample Plan. Action: Cliff Clark.

OPEN

7-11-90:1 Send Ecology a copy of all of the data set used in the development of the soil background model strategy. Action: DOE/WHC

7-11-90:2 The reference for a study which compared intake values for and comparing rats LD₅₀ v.s. mice. The reference originates from Reference Organisms Condition in the Ecosystem Toxicity section. Action: Jim Hoover.

1-10-91:1 Confer with Sue Price and determine that engineering certifications are the same in Closure Plans and Part B applications as well as the Interim Status Closure Plans. Action: Fred Ruck.

OPEN

1-10-90:2 Send a letter to WHC stating agreement with the sampling plan and instructing WHC to proceed with sampling. Action: Megan Lerchen.

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 0 0

Attachment #4

2101-M Pond
Unit Managers Meeting
Meeting Held January 10, 1991

Attendance List

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
J.A. Burger	SWEC	509-376-2636
C.E. Clark	DOE-RL	509-376-9333
W.G. Cox	WHC	509-376-1978
D.J. Hoff	WHC	509-376-2606
J.D. King	SWEC	509-376-9709
M.E. Lerchen	Ecology	206-438-3089
F.A. Ruck III	WHC	509-376-9876
M.A. Wasemiller	WHC	509-376-9808

9 2 1 2 6 3 9 1 3 8 1