

## **Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes**

---



**Committee:** Clean/Close INTEC  
**Date:** September 11, 2006 – 10:00 a.m. (MT)

### **Participants**

**Board Members:** Willie Preacher, Committee Co-Chair  
Dick Buxton  
Lila Gold

**DOE-ID:** Shannon Brennan  
Nicole Hernandez

**Idaho Cleanup Project:** Lori Cahn

**Support Staff:** Lisa Aldrich

### **Objective(s) for the Committee Call**

- Recommendation for Operable Unit 3-14 (Tank Farm Soils)

### **Recommendation for Operable Unit 3-14**

Willie's Draft—Alternative 2b-Capping and Monitoring.

The preferred alternative 2(b) Capping and Monitoring that DOE has indicated they prefer has some concern. Capping may not completely inhibit the recharge in this area. Even though the recharge zone near the tank farm will be capped and monitored there is also a concern of recharge upstream of the cap. There may be some seasons where heavy snows and spring thaws may have the possibility of overflows of the Big Lost River north of the INTEC Facility. This overflow recharge may allow the spread of contaminated soils or contaminated plumes to advance further. We would like to see the information or modeling done which may address this concern.

If this is to be the chosen alternative we would also like to see periodic reporting of this alternative to determine if it has minimized or stopped the spread of contamination. If it fails, then a review to determine if there may be new or other technology available to accomplish the task.

### **Comments received from CAB members regarding the draft recommendation**

Doug Weir—There is no downside to Willie's thoughts. If capping does not work, it will cost a ton of money to try something else.

Bruce Wendle—I think I heard in our recent phone conference that DOE was going to put a cap over the buildings as well as the ground itself. This makes me wonder if there is much technology concerning a cap over existing buildings. I don't know if I heard this right or not but would certainly have some questions about it if this is the straight scoop. Also, like Willie, I would have some questions about the monitoring of this area after being capped. What information does DOE have on the possible overflow of the Big Lost River? Certainly we need to know if this contamination has been halted and the plumes isolated.

### **Questions and Answers**

Hernandez commented about "capping may not completely inhibit the recharge." DOE understands that the 10-acre area is not the entire area where the northern perched water is recharged from. The proposed plan includes additional infiltration controls to ensure meeting the RAO of 8 piC/L for strontium-90 in the aquifer. These actions should reduce recharge by 50%. Hernandez referred the committee to the report "Methods to Reduce Infiltration Controls," referenced in the proposed plan.

Preacher asked about the Big Lost River. Cahn answered that the model accounted for all the historical flows for the Big Lost River and didn't confine the water to the river bed. In addition, the model already assumes for historical flow and accounted for flooding and over flowing its banks.

## **Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes**

---

Preacher asked about the review over a period of time. Cahn answered that there will be continual monitoring of the perched and groundwater wells. The work plan after the record of decision will document the monitoring requirements and identify trigger points (a point where it is not following along the model).

Buxton asked about the discussion of strontium's half-life. Cahn answered that it is approximately 30 years and was included in the modeling. The modeling accounts for continual decay. Buxton suggested that they discuss it more. Cahn said that detailed discussion is in the feasibility study. Preacher asked what the half-life of technetium and iodine is. Cahn said it was longer, but didn't have the exact number.

Preacher asked if they will monitor leaking when they start doing sodium-bearing waste transfers and ensure there is not leaking in the valve boxes. He additionally asked if transfers will be made by pumping, steam jets, or air lifting. Cahn said this is not here area, but she knows they have used jets. Preacher commented that this could be another source of contamination if valves leak.

Gold asked if Wendle's question (above) had been answered about there being a cap over the buildings. Cahn said per page 16 of the proposed plan, there will be no cap over the buildings (see legend on figure).

Preacher asked about whether Hanford was using a treatment technology. Cahn said Hanford is using a calcium phosphate coated with citrate into the aquifer. They have a different situation, since their aquifer is shallow and sandy; completely different from ours. The lab side is looking at ways to trap strontium.

Preacher asked who monitors besides DOE. Cahn said the USGS, State of Idaho Oversight, Stoller and sometimes EPA and the State will concurrently test with DOE. Preacher asked what the aquifer contamination is. Cahn referred him to the fact sheet handed out at the July 2006 meeting which shows a conceptual diagram of the contamination currently beneath INTEC. Preacher asked why the plume is receding. Cahn said mostly because the source is gone. There is constant mixing and diluting and also decay.

### **Actions**

- Preacher to prepare the draft recommendation for the committee to review with a draft-final recommendation presentation to the full board at the meeting.