

200 Area End State Work Shop



August 10-11, 2004

Shirley Olinger



Welcome to the Second Workshop To Discuss Hanford End States

- *100 Area Workshop Held June 23 and 24th*
- *Today's workshop is on the 200 Areas*
- *300 Area Workshop to be held in the future
realigning with the City of Richland study and the
focused feasibility study on uranium in the 300 Area*



Drivers

- *DOE and the Regulatory Agencies are faced with a number of near term cleanup decisions and would like public, stakeholder and Tribal input*
- DOE would like to articulate end states as accurately as possible in near term acquisitions (2006)
- The Tri-Party agencies created a Hanford End States IAMIT to assist in developing a clear picture of the Hanford site when cleanup is complete.
 - A three dimensional description of the site (i.e., air, surface, soil/groundwater)
 - Illuminating structures, operations or waste left on-site, as well as contamination sources, pathways, expectations for land use and institutional controls at the conclusion of Hanford cleanup.



Background

Numerous public interest initiatives have provided perspectives on Hanford end states. These include the

- Future Site Use Working Group (FSUWG) (1992),
- the Tank Waste Task Force (1993),
- NEPA activities associated with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) (1999), and the
- Exposure Scenarios Task Force sponsored by the Hanford Advisory Board (2002)



Looking Forward

- These initiatives identified a range of acceptable end states for the Hanford site.
- More detailed end state definition is needed
 - to better focus remediation decisions and
 - support the many key decisions that need to be made in the next several years.
 - support near term acquisitions(2006)
- *The intent of the agencies is to build upon the principles and outcomes of these earlier public processes as well as add detail and clarity for cleanup.*



Process Overview

- Hold a workshop to provide background information and have focused discussions on pertinent questions
- Summarize results and make available for review and comment on website
(http://www.hanford.gov/docs/rbes/ES_Index.cfm)
- Use information to revise DOE's Risk Based End State Vision for Hanford
- Hold Public/stakeholder meeting(s) (early fall)
- Consider input received as Tri-Party agencies make cleanup decisions in the 200 Areas



Today's Focus

- Several Questions are being posed to solicit your input and values
- These questions are associated with the following three breakout groups:
 - Central Plateau Uses & Activities
 - Buried Waste and Contaminated Soils
 - Process Facilities and Buildings



Central Plateau Uses & Activities (Exposure Scenario Development)

Based on the possible post-cleanup land uses, the following end state related questions (primarily focused on the time frame of 50 years into the future and beyond) can be discussed:

- What **range of activities** could workers and/or visitors be involved in within the core zone?
- Outside the core zone?
- Should other alternative activities (beyond those consistent with the assumed land uses) be considered for comparison or other purposes?
- Based on the desired land-use and exposure scenarios, what types of **institutional controls** are appropriate, and over what time frames?



Buried Waste and Contaminated Soils

For **Solid & Liquid Waste Sites End States** CERCLA requires that decisions be made using 9 criteria. In weighing these criteria:

- If waste is left in place under an engineered barrier, what factors affecting public acceptance must the Tri-Parties consider?
- If waste must be removed for treatment and disposal, what factors affecting public acceptance must the Tri-Parties consider?
- What other options should be considered by the Tri-Parties and when is it appropriate to consider them?
- How would these considerations change depending on location inside or outside the core zone and could these decisions affect how the core zone is defined?
- If data collection activities are purposely focused on defining the highest levels of contamination, how important is additional detailed characterization information in making these decisions? How does this change for different end states or hazards?



Processing Facilities, Buildings, and Structures

For **Contaminated Facility End States:**

- What end-state do the stakeholders envision for the various classes of facilities on the Central Plateau?
- If facilities are left in place (i.e., fully standing) versus demolished and removed, what factors affecting public acceptance must the Tri-Parties consider?
- Under what situations would you think it appropriate to remove, treat and dispose of some or all of the waste within and/or under the facility and what factors must the Tri-Parties consider regarding consolidation and isolation of waste within the facility to make it a viable option?
- If a canyon facility is left in place or is partially demolished, can additional waste be placed in it? What factors must the Tri-Parties consider?
- How would the dose rates and hazards to workers affect these decisions?
- If data collection activities are purposely focused on defining the highest levels of contamination, how important is additional detailed characterization information in making these decisions? How does this change for different end states or hazards?



Summary

- *We want to*
 - *Build on what we have heard in the past*
 - *Focus on 200 Area specific cleanup questions*
 - *Hear public, Tribal and stakeholder expectations on the kind of activities that might occur in the 200 Areas in the future*