

Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes



INL Site Environmental Management
C I T I Z E N S A D V I S O R Y B O A R D

Committee: Stimulus

Date: June 4, 2009 -3:30 p.m. (MT)

Participants

Board Members: John Bolliger R. D. Maynard
Fred Sica Robert Rodriquez
Tami Sherwood Bruce Wendle
Willie Preacher

DOE-ID: Bob Pence
Nicole Hernandez

CWI: Lorie Cahn
Lynn Schwindimen

Support Staff: Lisa Aldrich
Ceri Chapple

Objective(s) for the Committee Call

- Discuss EE/CA for TSF-07 Disposal Pond at Test Area North
- Determine whether a recommendation should be developed

The conference call concerned the work proposed at the TSF-07 disposal pond at Test Area North (TAN). The proposal suggests using the stimulus money to perform Alternative #2. The proposed alternative is to remediate at least .2 acres and up to 3.2 acres of contaminated soil. The soil will be screened to determine whether it could be disposed of at the Idaho CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF) or if it would need to be disposed of off-site. The contaminants of concern are Cs-137 and Ra -226 for human health risks, and tetrahydrofuran, mercury, arsenic, and thallium as ecological risks. Institutional controls will be maintained until the site can be released for unrestricted residential use, no later than 2095. The proposed project will begin in July.

Bruce Wendle asked why the cost is so much more for containment as opposed to removal and disposal. Lynn Schwindimen responded, explaining there are ecological concerns with containment. A feasibility study was performed with a residential scenario. The containment scenario would require a special kind of CAP and then would require long-term monitoring, all costing significantly more than disposal and removal.

R.D. Maynard asked how deep the contamination is. Mr. Schwindimen referred him to page 5 of the EE/CA. He said that it is around 12" and the Cesium doesn't travel easily. The main concerns are that there are some areas where the Mercury levels were higher than the acceptable levels and that the Cesium wouldn't go away by 2095, hence the proposal of removal and disposal.

R.D. Maynard asked if the contaminated soil can be stored at the ICDF. Mr. Schwindimen answered that they will not know that until they can sample the soil. There may be continued costs for storage and treatment and those costs were factored into the costs of alternative #2.

Willie Preacher inquired how the depth of the mercury was determined. Mr. Schwindimen answered that is yet to be determined. They will need to send the soil samples to the lab to determine if the mercury goes to depth. However, in 1988-1989 the soil was sampled to depth (1'-2') and mercury was not found. The only samples found in 1988-1989 that exceeded risk base levels were surface samples.

**Citizens Advisory Board
Committee Minutes**

Tami Sherwood asked how the waste will be buried at ICDF, Mr. Schwindimen explained that it will be treated and buried within CERCLA Waste Criteria and Regulations. The waste will be placed in a lined landfill, with leak detection systems, the waste criteria will be determined and they will stay within those limits.

Willie Preacher wondered if accepting the waste from the TSF-07 Disposal Pond at the ICDF will open the door to more/ other waste. Mr. Schwindimen answered that the ICDF only accepts waste that meets CERCLA Criteria.

The Nicole Hernandez requested that the CAB discuss the EE/CA and if they reach a consensus to write a recommendation in support of the proposal.

Actions:

- Lisa and Fred will work together to draft a Recommendation to send to the full-board for comment.

To review the details of this meeting, call 1-888-284-7564, playback code 215587.