FUSRAP	
	2.3

## DOE/ORO FORMER SITES RESTORATION DIVISION (EW-93) DATE PROCESSED BY PDCC 05/1/193

FSRD () COMM TYPE ()	iT	1G 1
SAIC SENSITIVE		
COMM REF 93-384		
ADMIN RCD		

103861

SUBJECT NFS - Installa tion	of Final Cap	ADMIN F	ICD
FROM SPAY	TO Callahan		COMM DATE5 /10 /93
ADDR CODE L CLOSES CON		158	COMM DATE
SUBJECT CODE 7720 AFFECTE			
	RESPONSE TRACKING INF	ORMATION	
ACTION DESCRIPTION:			
OWED TO.	PRIMARY:		
(ORG)TARGET DATE	CLOSING CCN	COMPL DATE	(ORG)
SECONDARY:	SECONDARY: OWED BY:		
(ORG)TARGET DATE / /	CLOSING CCN_	COMPL DATE/_/	(OAG)
MESSAGE:			CLOSING WEF

DIRECTOR, FSRD:			W/A	W/O			_ 1	V/A Y	<b>7/</b> 0			****	
DEP. DIRECTOR, FERD:	L Prior	1	_		PROGRAM MANAGER: J. I	Ong 3	NC			PROGRAM MANAGER: Q How	<del></del>	W/A	-W
SITE MANAGER:	W. Sery	<del> </del>	-	1	DEPUTY PROGRAM MGR: J. Wild	<b>3</b>	vc			DEPUTY PROGRAM MGR.: P. Crow			L
	D. Ader	1			PROGRAM ADMIN: R. WH	gra 8/	vc	$\neg \uparrow$				-	<u> </u>
	S. Cange	FSPD			PROJECT MANAGER: T. Garge	- S	vc			R. Herbs	+		
	P. KIA	FERD		1	M. IO	m 84	c			W. Wagn	+		
	T. Pany	FSRD			T Pagers	on SA	rc		Ч	PROJECT MANAGER: 8. Ued			-
PROJECT SUPPORT GRP.	M. Noe	PSHD	$-\downarrow$		MGMT, SYSTEMS: R Tuck		-	+	-	G. Paley	+		
	J. Hert	PSRO			C. He	_	+	+	$\dashv$	C, Hickey	+	$\perp$	1
		PSAD	$\dashv$	$\bot$	K. Rent	_	<del></del>		$\dashv$	E McNames CONSTRUCTION	ВРМ		
G	Herbnen	FSAD	$\bot$		SECRETARY S. Hippings	-	+	+	_		BFC		
	L. Marz	PONO			TECH DEV. W Mone	_	<del></del>	+	┰	ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY	DET		_
		FBRO	$\perp$			320	+		+	ENGINEERING	BFT	T	-
IECRETARY: M. Selber	M. Dyke	FSAD	_[	T		┼—	╁	+	-	ENVIR TECH	BET		
SRD CHRON FILE				$\vec{I}$		+-	-	-	4	THEMEIDANAM ATAD	RET		_
SAD NOTEBOOKS		T		7		+-	├	+-	_	GEOTECH	CPT	+	
EADING FILE				7		┼—	<u> </u>	-	J.	THOM STRAW & HE	BEH	+	7
OE/PACD: French	Sletnink (	200		+		<del> </del>	<u> </u>	$oldsymbol{ol}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$	L	SAFFTY & HEALTH	BFH	-+-	<u>-</u> -
OEMO: J. 1	Vegoner [	ж	$\top$	$\top$		<u> </u>		<del> </del>	L	ENVIR COMPLIANCE	BEM	+,	,
			+	╅				<u> </u>	L	WASTE MOMI!	BEH		$\dashv$
			+	+	MAEBERLINE			$oldsymbol{ol}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$	24	OCUREMENT		- -	_
NLI AJ.	Dvorek A	WL	-	+	MACBERLINE	DET			74	CUECT ADMINISTRATION	PA PA		4
Α.	Galster A	ML	+-	+	ITES: 150 NP88					CHNICAL REPORTS		+-	-
G. M		ML	+-							OJECT AUTOMATION	TR	-	_
D. D	unning A	NL	+-	_	17/118 MOOLESEX					OJECT CONTROLS	AU		_
		NI	+-	_	7 /138 WISS/MISS/INPO CTR					MMUNITY BELATIONS	FC	+	
t CE:	On	_	+-	_	9 COLONIF (CISS)					AUTY ABBUMANCE	CA	1_	
INL:	OR		+-		0/163 LATTY AVE/SLAPS					CREAD FILE TOTAL	QA	1	
22				<u> </u>	OMIN RCD			1 2.1	PDC		NFSS		

OLD 11 1362.2

(00/Z00/)

PLEASE RETURN TO PDCC FOR CORRECTIONS



## Department of Energy

Field Office, Oak Ridge
P.O. Box 2001
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831— 8723

May 10, 1993

Ms. Kathleen C. Callahan Acting Deputy Regional Administrator U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region II 26 Federal Plaza New York, New York 10276

Dear Ms. Callahan:

## NIAGARA FALLS STORAGE SITE - INSTALLATION OF FINAL CAP

The purpose of this letter is to discuss the installation of the final cap on the Waste Containment Structure (WCS) at the Department of Energy's (DOE) Niagara Falls Storage Site (NFSS). The site is currently being managed by DOE's Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). The on-site containment structure currently holds approximately 4,000 cubic yards of K-65 residues beneath a far larger volume (approximately 250,000 cubic yards) of rubble and soil generated by past cleanup activities at NFSS.

Over the past several years, both EPA and DOE have researched alternative approaches for final management of the K-65 residues present at this site. In particular, discussions have been focused on identifying appropriate regulatory compliance requirements for management of these residues. Both the high level waste standards developed under 40CFR191 and the uranium mill tailings standard; presented by 40CFR192 have been reviewed as potential models for permanent residue management. This review has resulted in a few key findings. Specifically: neither of these regulations are strictly applicable (legally) to the residues; implementation of either approach would yield protective remedies; compliance with the 40CFR192 standards can be accomplished on site; and compliance with 40CFR191 standards requiring 10,000 years of containment would be difficult to prove a priori at the NFSS site.

As a practical consideration, there are currently no facilities in existence which meet the standards of 40CFR191. While DOE is attempting to establish such facilities, actual disposal capacity is not anticipated for several years. When opened, these facilities will no doubt be dealing first with a significant backlog of truly high level wastes present at sites other than

The costs that would be incurred in removing the K-65 residues from their present location in the waste containment structure, storing and eventual future disposal would be on the order of \$100 million. Additionally, expected worker exposures while exhuming and storing the K-65 residues away from their present embedment would be significant.

DOE has monitored the NFSS site since the emplacement of the residues six years ago. Data collected indicates that the facility is successfully isolating the residues even with only an interim cap in place. Annual reports compiling the data have been provided to EPA Region II. The interim cap is designed for a limited service life of 25 to 50 years. Installation of a final cap compliant with 40CFR192 standards would upgrade its service life to 200 to 1,000 years and increase its environmental protectiveness by increasing the thickness of the covering material from approximately 4 feet to over 10 feet. After installation of the final cap, the entire facility will be monitored and maintained perpetually by DOE. Installation of a final cap would not preclude access to the residues if deemed necessary or appropriate at a future date.

Funds appear to be available in the near term for installation of the final cap, but delaying implementation until later funding years will result in activities at NFSS competing with funding for implementation of major Records of Decision at other FUSRAP sites in Maywood and Wayne, New Jersey, Tonawanda, New York, and St. Louis, Missouri. This will increase fiscal pressures should anticipated funding levels for FUSRAP become a reality. In addition, local sources for clay material may become available in the near-term that will allow DOE to realize substantial savings for the cost of installing the cap. All of this provides fiscal incentives to install the final cap now instead of waiting.

In summary, DOE believes that installation of the final cap would improve the overall environmental protectiveness of the WCS while not limiting possible future actions regarding the K-65 residues. Considering this and the fiscal incentives identified above, DOE believes it is in the best interest of all concerned parties to proceed with the installation of the final cap.

Please contact us if you have any concerns with the management strategy outlined above for NFSS. Absent any technical basis for concern, DOE intends to implement the Record of Decision with regards to installation of the long-term cap. If you have any questions concerning this decision, please contact me at (615) 576-1830.

Sincerely,

William M. Seay, Acting Director Former Sites Restoration Division

cc: R. W. Hargrove, EPA II

J. W. Wagoner II, EM-421, TREV II