

---

# Environmental Program Information

## Introduction

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is committed to operating in a manner that preserves the quality of the environment. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) leads this effort in the areas of environmental compliance and accountability. This chapter begins with a description of LLNL's integrated Environmental, Safety, and Health (ES&H) Management System, and continues with the discussions of Work Smart Standards, missions, and activities of EPD and its three divisions. Performance measures (PMs) used by DOE to evaluate the Laboratory's environmental protection efforts are then summarized. The bulk of the chapter is devoted to an account of LLNL's activities and progress in waste minimization and pollution prevention in 1997. Following descriptions of current issues and actions in the environmental programs arena, this chapter concludes with a brief discussion of spill response and EPD environmental training.

---

## Integrated Environmental, Safety, and Health Management System

Protecting people and the environment is the most important consideration in day-to-day operations at LLNL. Attention to environmental, safety, and health factors is fully integrated into the Laboratory's research programs and operational culture. This integrated management approach requires accountability at all levels of the organization, project planning with protection in mind, and excellence in program execution. The ES&H Program at LLNL employs a process of assessing hazards and the environmental implications of our work; designing and implementing standards-based methods intended to control risks; and complying with the applicable ES&H regulations. This process is implemented using a graded approach, which increases the level of risk management as the hazard increases. An overview of the Laboratory's ES&H Program and a general description of how the Laboratory manages ES&H activities can be found in *The Environmental, Safety, and Health Program at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory* (LLNL 1996a).



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

In October 1996, the Department of Energy issued DOE Policy 450.4: Safety Management System Policy. This policy provides a formal, organized process whereby employees plan, assess, and improve safety in their work. In this policy statement the term “safety” is used comprehensively to include environment and health. The policy was developed taking into consideration various consensus management standards such as International Standards Organization (ISO) 14000, Voluntary Protection Program (VPP), and Recommendation 95-2 from the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board. Embracing ISO 14000 by using the major components of the standard, while not adopting it in total, allows flexibility in various management systems while not requiring adoption of a standard for adoption’s sake. This policy lets the field of ISO 14000 develop such that if documented cost benefits can be demonstrated (in a command and control environment), a facility could elect to utilize the standard in total through its integrated safety management system (ISMS). Integrated ES&H management systems are defined as having five functions: to define the scope of work, analyze hazards, develop and implement standards-based controls, perform work, and provide feedback and improvement. The current LLNL ES&H management process reflects requirements of these five functions. Therefore, to satisfy the DOE’s ISMS requirement, LLNL’s primary task will be to update our guidance documents and formalize the standard set through the Work Smart Standard Closure Process. Additionally, documentation of our ES&H management system will be updated to reflect the concepts defined in ISMS. Implementation of a fully documented ISMS is scheduled to begin in 1998.

---

## Work Smart Standards

In 1997, LLNL and DOE’s Oakland Operations Office inaugurated a Work Smart Standards (WSS) process, whereby safety professionals from both organizations identify hazards and establish standards of operation appropriate for the particular work environment. WSS will improve both safety and the working relationship between the DOE and LLNL and are expected to become part of the DOE contract with the University of California. DOE made the use of an environmental, safety, and health management system a policy (DOE Policy 450.4), an acquisition regulation (48 CFR 970.5204-2), and a contract requirement.

The WSS process (DOE M450.3-1) requires an understanding of the work, an analysis of the hazards associated with the work, and the selection of standards from which hazards controls are developed. LLNL has traditionally identified and controlled hazards to protect the LLNL staff, the public, and the environment, but the WSS process differs from the past in that responsibility for selection of appropriate and necessary



standards is in the hands of both the DOE field office and LLNL. This process empowers the Laboratory and local DOE staffs, through consensus, to focus on the work being performed and to select sitewide environmental, safety, and health standards that are based on the actual work being conducted and its associated hazards and threats to the environment. Significant progress has been made so far; work and associated hazards have been defined for practically all activities, and appropriate standards have been selected. Efforts are now under way to select additional requirements for management processes to better link project planning and execution with the standards providing protection to people and the environment.

Standards are approved at the management level closest to the work. Others cannot approve the set, require concurrence, or second-guess the standards selected. The LLNL Director and DOE Oakland Operations Office Manager will approve the final set of sitewide standards. Reaching agreement with DOE on new work-based standards will align the Laboratory with industry practice; establish common environmental, safety, and health expectations for DOE and the University of California; and facilitate the tailoring of requirements to streamline and increase the effectiveness of management at the Laboratory. Existing ES&H methodologies and documentation will support the completion of the process.

Meeting new expectations for integrated ES&H management at the Laboratory will take several years, but the selection of WSS is expected to be completed in 1998. The WSS approach coupled with enhanced, integrated management promises further safety improvements and lower costs.

---

### Environmental Protection Department

The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) is the lead organization for environmental support to operations at LLNL. It is responsible for environmental monitoring, environmental regulatory compliance, environmental restoration, and hazardous waste management in support of the Laboratory's Programs. EPD prepares and maintains environmental plans and guidelines, provides environmental guidance and support to Laboratory personnel, informs management about pending changes in environmental regulations pertinent to LLNL, represents the Laboratory in day-to-day interactions with regulatory agencies, and assesses the effectiveness of pollution control programs.



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

EPD monitors air, water, soil, and foodstuff; evaluates possible contaminant sources; and models the impact of LLNL operations on humans and the environment. In 1997, 24,380 samples were taken from air, sewage, ground water, surface water, soil, sediments, vegetation, and foodstuff. Almost 263,000 analytes were tested. These numbers represent a slight increase in the number of samples taken and a slight decrease in the number of analytes tested, compared to 1996 values. The type of samples collected at a specific location depends on the site and the potential pollutants to be monitored; see the specific chapters of this report for discussions of each environmental medium.

A principal part of EPD's mission is to work with LLNL programs to ensure that operations are conducted in a manner that limits environmental impacts and is in compliance with regulatory guidelines. EPD helps LLNL programs manage and minimize hazardous, radioactive, and mixed wastes; determines the concentrations of environmental contaminants remaining from past activities; cleans up environmental contamination to acceptable standards; responds to emergencies in order to minimize and assess any impact on the environment and the public; and provides training programs to improve the ability of LLNL employees to comply with environmental regulations.

LLNL programs are supported by EPD's four Environmental Support Teams (ESTs). The ESTs are integrated into the Environmental, Safety and Health Teams (ES&H Teams) at the Laboratory through the Environmental Analyst who chairs the ESTs. Each EST includes representatives from environmental specialties within the Operations and Regulatory Affairs Division (ORAD), along with a field technician from the Hazardous Waste Management (HWM) Division. Some ESTs also include a representative from the Environmental Restoration Division (ERD), the ES&H Teams, or the organizations supported by the ESTs. These teams evaluate operations, determine potential environmental impacts, and provide guidance on environmental regulations and DOE orders for existing and proposed projects. ESTs assist programs in planning, implementing, and operating projects and in understanding and meeting their environmental obligations. When permits are obtained from regulatory agencies, ESTs aid the program in evaluating the permit conditions and implementing recordkeeping requirements.

---

## ***Operations and Regulatory Affairs Division***

ORAD currently consists of eight groups that specialize in environmental compliance and monitoring and provide laboratory programs with a wide range of information, data, and guidance to make more informed environmental decisions.



ORAD prepares the environmental permit applications and related documents for submittal to federal, state, and local agencies and provides the liaison between LLNL and regulatory agencies conducting inspections; tracks chemical inventories; prepares National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and conducts related field studies for DOE; oversees wetland protection and floodplain management requirements; coordinates cultural and wildlife resource protection and management; facilitates and provides support for the pollution prevention and recycling programs; teaches numerous environmental training courses; coordinates the tank environmental compliance program; conducts compliance and surveillance monitoring; and provides environmental impact modeling and analysis, risk assessment, and reporting.

ORAD also actively assists in responding to environmental emergencies such as spills. During normal working hours, an Environmental Analyst from the ORAD Environmental Operations Group responds to environmental emergencies and notifies a specially trained Environmental Duty Officer (EDO). EDOs are on duty 24 hours a day and coordinate with LLNL's ES&H Team and other first responders or environmental specialists.

---

### ***Hazardous Waste Management Division***

All hazardous, radioactive, and mixed wastes generated at LLNL facilities are managed by the Hazardous Waste Management (HWM) Division in accordance with state and federal requirements. HWM processes, stores, packages, solidifies, treats, and prepares waste for shipment and disposal, recycling, or discharge to the sanitary sewer.

As part of its waste management activities, HWM tracks and documents the movement of hazardous, mixed, and radioactive wastes from waste accumulation areas (WAAs) located near the waste generator to final disposition; develops and implements approved standard operating procedures; decontaminates LLNL equipment; ensures that containers for shipment of waste meet the specifications of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and other regulatory agencies; responds to emergencies; and participates in the cleanup of potential hazardous and radioactive spills at LLNL facilities. HWM prepares numerous reports, including the annual and biennial hazardous waste reports required by the state and federal environmental protection agencies (see Appendix C). HWM also prepares waste acceptance criteria documents, safety analysis reports, and various waste guidance and management plans.

HWM meets regulations requiring the treatment and disposal of LLNL's mixed waste in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Facility Compliance Act. The schedule



## 3 Environmental Program Information

---

for this treatment is negotiated with the State of California and involves developing new on-site treatment options, as well as finding off-site alternatives.

HWM is responsible for implementing a program directed at eliminating the backlog of Legacy Waste (waste that is not presently certified for disposal). This effort includes a large characterization effort to identify all components of the waste, as well as a certification effort, which will provide the disposal site with appropriate documentation.

---

### ***Environmental Restoration Division***

The Environmental Restoration Division (ERD) was established to evaluate and remediate contaminated soil and ground water resulting from past hazardous materials handling and disposal and from leaks and spills that have occurred at the Livermore site and Site 300, both prior to and during LLNL operations. At both the Livermore site and Site 300, ERD investigates field sites to characterize the existence, extent, and impact of contamination. ERD evaluates and develops various remediation technologies, makes recommendations, and implements actions for site restoration. ERD is responsible for managing remedial activities, such as soil removal and ground water extraction, and for assisting in closing inactive facilities in a manner designed to prevent environmental contamination.

As part of its responsibility for CERCLA compliance issues, ERD plans, directs, and conducts assessments to determine both the impact of releases on the environment and the restoration activities needed to reduce contaminant concentrations to protect human health and the environment. ERD is responsible for interacting with the community on these issues. Several public meetings are held each year as required in the ERD CERCLA Community Relations Plans. To comply with CERCLA ground water remedial actions at the Livermore site, ERD has to date designed, constructed, and operated five fixed ground water treatment facilities and associated pipeline networks and wells, seven portable ground water treatment units (PTUs), and two soil vapor extraction facilities (see Chapters 7 and 8). At Site 300, ERD has designed, constructed, and operated two soil vapor extraction facilities, and three ground water extraction and treatment facilities.

ERD is actively designing, testing, and applying innovative remediation and assessment technologies to contaminant problems at the Livermore site and Site 300. ERD provides the sampling and data management support for ground water surveillance and compliance monitoring activities.



Performance Measures Summary

Since 1992, the contract the University of California has to manage and operate LLNL for DOE has contained performance objectives, criteria, and measures. Four of these performance measures (PMs) evaluated LLNL’s environmental protection activities in 1997. The status of these measures is described in this report at the location referenced in **Table 3-1**.

**Table 3-1.** DOE environmental protection performance measures.

PM designator	Performance measure	Location in this report
1.5.b	Radiation Dose to the Public  Public radiation doses to the maximally exposed individual from DOE operations will be measured or calculated and controlled to assure that doses are kept as low as reasonably achievable.	Chapter 12: Radiological Dose Assessment; section on Radiological Doses from 1997 operations.  Chapter 2: Compliance Summary section on National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants.
1.5.f	Occupational Safety and Health Findings and Violations  Hazards are recognized during Occupational Safety and Health assessments, and serious and imminent danger situations are appropriately mitigated.	Chapter 2: Compliance Summary, <b>Table 2-8</b> .
1.5.g	Process and Solid Waste Generation (Waste Reduction and Recycling)  The Laboratory continues to progress towards meeting the DOE’s pollution prevention goals for the year 2000.	This chapter, section on Waste Minimization/Pollution Prevention.
1.5.i	Environmental Releases  The Laboratory controls occurrences of environmental releases exceeding regulatory or permitted levels imposed by local, state, or federal agencies.	Chapter 2: Compliance Summary, <b>Table 2-9, Table 2-12</b> .

In their evaluation of LLNL’s fiscal year 1997 self-assessment, DOE and UC gave LLNL an average score of exceeding expectations for the environmental performance measures for the reporting period. Data for calendar year 1997 will be included in the annual self-assessment and evaluation conducted August through October 1998.





# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

## DOE Pollution Prevention Goals

The Secretary of Energy has committed the Department to the following Pollution Prevention (P2) goals, which are to be achieved throughout the complex by December 31, 1999, using 1993 as a baseline:

1. Reduce total releases and off-site transfers for treatment and disposal of Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) 313 toxic chemicals from routine operations by 50%.
2. Reduce the generation of radioactive waste from routine operations by 50%.
3. Reduce the generation of low-level mixed waste from routine operations by 50%.
4. Reduce the generation of hazardous waste from routine operations by 50%.
5. Reduce the generation of sanitary waste (after recycling) from routine operations by 33%.
6. Divert 33% of sanitary waste from all operations for recycling.
7. Increase the affirmative procurement of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-designated recycled products to 100%.

Progress toward achieving these goals is reported annually to the Secretary of Energy in LLNL's *Annual Report on Waste Generation and Waste Minimization Progress*.

The DOE's *Pollution Prevention Program Plan 1996* (U.S. Department of Energy 1996b) establishes six immediate priorities, due to be implemented by fiscal year 1998, which will help DOE Headquarters, the Operations Offices, and the sites focus resources on the most critical aspects of DOE's P2 program.

The six priorities are to: (1) establish senior management commitment to P2 implementation, (2) set quantitative, site-specific waste reduction and recycling goals, (3) institute performance measures, (4) implement cost-saving P2 projects, (5) design P2 into new products, processes, and facilities, and (6) ensure that site programs comply with federal, state, and DOE requirements.

LLNL prepared a P2 Plan, which meets the requirements of (1) DOE Orders 5820.2A and 5400.1; (2) RCRA, Sections 3002(b) and 3005(h); and (3) Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. This Plan is reviewed annually and updated every three years; it was last updated and submitted to the DOE in May 1997 (Celeste 1997). The Plan reviews past and current pollution prevention activities and states the objectives of LLNL's waste minimization and pollution prevention efforts.





The P2 Program at LLNL is an organized, comprehensive, and continuing effort to systematically reduce solid, hazardous, radioactive, and mixed-waste generation. The P2 Program is designed to eliminate or minimize pollutant releases to all environmental media from all aspects of the site's operations. These efforts help protect public health and the environment by reducing or eliminating waste management and compliance costs, resource usage, inventories and releases of hazardous chemicals, and civil and criminal liabilities under environmental laws.

In accordance with EPA guidelines and DOE policy, a hierarchical approach to waste reduction (i.e., source elimination or reduction, material substitution, reuse and recycling, and treatment and disposal) has been adopted and is applied to all types of waste.

---

## Waste Minimization/Pollution Prevention

LLNL is required by the UC Contract performance measures 1.5.g to annually review its waste generation for P2 opportunities and to propose implementation projects. Previously, waste streams at LLNL were evaluated in terms of the total quantities of waste generated. However, the waste streams of greatest concern are not necessarily those having the largest volume. Each process that generates waste must be considered, as well as the individual characteristics of the components within each waste stream.

LLNL continues to use a weighted ranking system to better rank the waste streams and to improve the prioritization of waste minimization efforts. The methodology assigns to each waste stream three weighting factors in addition to a factor based on quantity of waste generated annually. The three additional weighting factors use the following criteria: cost, waste type (which includes compliance and liability considerations), and operational aspects (such as routine vs nonroutine). This is discussed in *A Comprehensive Opportunity Assessment for Pollution Prevention at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory* (Celeste et al. 1997).

In general, the 20 waste stream components having the highest priority (ranked by summing the four weighting factors) are entirely different from the top 20 source codes ranked by quantity only. For example, transuranic waste (TRU)/TRU mixed and low-level wastes, which are problematic at LLNL, are now ranked as having the highest priority, though their relative quantities are somewhat low.

Routine waste generation by waste category, from 1993 through 1997, is shown in **Table 3-2**. In fall 1997, DOE/OAK expressed concern that the quantity of waste that LLNL reported for 1993 may not have been tracked and recorded as accurately as the waste quantities that were reported using criteria that was developed after 1993.



# 3 Environmental Program Information

Additionally, since 1994, LLNL has reported the waste quantities using new, improved technologies and procedures. Waste volumes for the years 1994 through 1997 were plotted using regression analysis to estimate the amount of waste generated in 1993.

Those new values for the years 1993 to 1997 are shown in **Table 3-2**. The trend from 1993 on shows a dramatic reduction in all waste categories, which is the result of a proactive P2 program at LLNL.

**Table 3-2.** Waste generation totals, 1990 to 1997 (in tons).

Waste category	1993 (Baseline)	1994	1995	1996	1997
Low-level radioactive	256	181	136	91	68
Low-level mixed	34	26	36	23	21
Hazardous	628	368	368	360	240
Sanitary	2600	2246	2246	2001	2017
LLNL totals	3518	2821	2786	2475	2346

**Table 3-3** presents the percent reductions for 1997 compared to the 1993 baseline. Decreases in radioactive and hazardous waste generation in 1997 have already met the 50% reduction goal for the performance measure.

**Table 3-3.** Waste reduction, 1997.

Waste category	Reduction 1997 vs 1993 (%)
Radioactive	73.4
Mixed	38.2
Hazardous	61.8
Sanitary	22.4

## ***Nonhazardous Solid Waste Minimization***

In 1997, LLNL sent 3795 tons of nonhazardous waste, including routine and nonroutine, (designated sanitary waste in the above tables) to a landfill. The routine portion was 2016 tons and the nonroutine portion was 1779 tons. The breakdown is shown in **Table 3-4**.



**Table 3-4.** Nonhazardous landfill totals (in tons) in 1997.

	1997 total
<b>Routine</b>	
Compacted	1958
Industrial (TWMS) <sup>(a)</sup>	58
Routine subtotal	2016
<b>Nonroutine</b>	
Construction demo (non-compacted)	1734
Industrial (TWMS)	45
Nonroutine subtotal	1713
LLNL total	3731

<sup>a</sup> TWMS is the acronym for the HWM's Total Waste Management System.

**Diverted Waste**

The total waste diverted from landfills in 1997 was 323,461 tons. The difference between this year's total and that for 1996 is predominantly due to an increase in soil reuse on site. The reuse of soil on site and soil that is used at the landfill for daily cover (317,122 tons total) has increased more than 25-fold over last year, and we continue to use asphalt as road base material at the landfill (3020 tons). The waste diversion summary is shown in **Table 3-5**.

**Table 3-5.** Waste diversion summary table for 1997.

Description	Cumulative 1997 total (tons)
Asphalt	3020
Batteries	35
Cardboard	108
Compost	516
Diverted soil	317,122
HWM recycled materials	63
Magazines/newspapers/phone books	6
Metals	1,980
Paper	313
Tires, scrap	39
Toner cartridges	7
Wood	252
LLNL diversion total	323,461



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

For 1997, the total of the diverted waste and nonhazardous waste sent to landfill was 327,256 tons. The recycling rate for nonhazardous waste is calculated by dividing the diverted waste by the total of the landfill plus the diverted waste total. This results in a recycling rate of 92% for the nonhazardous waste for 1997. This far exceeds the DOE-stated goal of achieving a 33% recycling rate of nonhazardous waste by December 31, 1999.

For LLNL's UC contract, the goal is to reduce the routine nonhazardous (compactible and industrial) waste (tons) by 33% by December 31, 1999. As shown in **Table 3-4**, LLNL generated 2016 tons of nonhazardous waste in 1997.

LLNL has been required by California Law to reduce nonhazardous solid waste by 50% between 1990 and 2000. Significant reductions have already been achieved; this waste stream has been reduced by 28% since 1990.

In fiscal year 1997, LLNL received a National DOE P2 award for its achievements in solid waste recycling of construction and demolition debris.

---

## ***Source Reduction and Pollution Prevention***

The Laboratory formally surveyed its operations for opportunities related to source reduction and pollution prevention in 1995. Annually, effective as of fiscal year 1996, the Laboratory will continue to survey on-site operations for opportunities to eliminate, reduce, recover, or recycle potential pollutants to all media, including air, water, soil, sediments, and biota.

## ***Toxic Reporting Inventory Information***

At LLNL only one chemical, Freon 113 (1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane, also known as CFC 113), is tracked and reported as part of the Toxic Release Inventory for 1997. This reporting is required by the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act. All other chemicals are in quantities below the threshold reporting levels or are in a form that does not require reporting.

Freon 113, which is used in parts cleaning operations and as a coolant or refrigerant, is an ozone depleting substance whose consumption and production is slated for elimination by the year 2000. For this reason, the replacement and recycling of Freon 113 is a high priority at LLNL.



---

By the end of 1997, Freon 113 had been replaced in all but one parts cleaning operation. Many Freon 113 cleaning operations were replaced with ultrasonic and aqueous cleaners. Additionally, other coolant and refrigerant options have been explored.

---

### ***Implementing Cost-Saving Pollution Prevention (P2) Projects***

Pollution Prevention Opportunity Assessments (PPOAs) are conducted before the implementation of Pollution Prevention (P2) projects. The purpose of PPOAs is to characterize waste streams and identify those P2 options that can be cost effectively implemented. After a process has been selected for evaluation, the PPOA team contacts program personnel for a series of information gathering meetings, including walkthroughs, demonstrations, brainstorming sessions, and individual discussions. Included in the LLNL PPOA methodology is a return-on-investment calculation and cost assessment of the options for all PPOAs. Results or recommendations are developed in cooperation with program personnel and are thus technically evaluated for cost, return on investment, technical feasibility, and feasibility of implementation.

The DOE provides competitively allocated funding to P2 projects through the High-Return-on-Investment P2 Program. This program encourages proposals for the implementation of P2 projects that provide a high return on investment through reducing waste and associated waste management costs. LLNL participates in this program to obtain funding for cost-effective P2 implementation projects. To date, High-Return-on-Investment projects worth over \$2.5 million have been proposed to DOE, and LLNL has received over \$1.9 million in funding for these projects. LLNL additionally uses return on investment calculations and estimates of project cost-effectiveness to prioritize P2 projects for resource allocation and implementation at the Laboratory.

---

### ***Review of New Processes or Experiments***

Many organizations at LLNL use a “front end” review process that applies to new programs, projects, or experiments that could have a significant impact on the environment. In this review process, the initial hazardous materials projected to be used are identified, and concentrations of both the starting materials and the wastes produced are estimated. The possibility for chemical substitution, process changes, and recycling is then addressed. If an opportunity for P2 is identified, the Pollution Prevention Group will assist the generator evaluate the options. Researchers and project managers are encouraged to implement alternatives that are less hazardous or nonhazardous.



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

In general, P2 activities are covered by the pertinent directorate's P2 Plan. New activities are reviewed to identify possible P2 techniques. Projects and experiments performed by LLNL are evaluated for P2 opportunities. All personnel are encouraged to implement reasonable P2 opportunities that have been identified.

---

## ***Design for Environment***

In general, any means of accomplishing the goal of minimizing environmental life cycle impacts can be thought of as an element of design for environment, a concept that involves developing an understanding of and consideration for minimizing environmental impact over the lifetime of a project, and mitigating potential environmental impacts by overlaying this understanding directly onto the design of the project. Design for environment is a fairly nascent field, with a number of methodologies and definitions. Federal facilities are now required, under Executive Order 12856, to apply life-cycle analysis and total cost accounting principles to the greatest extent practicable when estimating P2 opportunities. Both of these can be considered elements of a new federally funded facility. In addition, Executive Order 12873 requires federal facilities to implement P2 by giving preference to the purchase of environmentally preferable products. In light of these developments, traditional methods and tools employed for management and accounting may not be sufficient or effective enough in and of themselves to meet the requirements of Executive Order 12856.

The Pollution Prevention Group, in conjunction with the National Ignition Facility (NIF) project management, completed a design-for-environment evaluation of the opportunities within the NIF Project. Recommendations were made for focused studies and projects in the construction, operation, and design and development phases of the NIF project that will have the most immediate impact in areas of greatest concern to project management (such as P2, environmental compliance, and cost). Approximately 20 potential study areas were identified. Implementation of recycling programs in the construction of the NIF, the development of a Pollution Prevention Plan for the NIF, and implementation of aqueous cleaning concepts in the design for parts and optics cleaning are currently under way. The NIF Pollution Prevention Plan will include Pollution Prevention Opportunity Assessments (PPOAs) on the predicted waste streams identified in the Preliminary Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). The PPOAs are aimed at developing waste minimization options prior to the operational phases of the NIF.



Additionally, P2 measures that are technically and economically practicable are being considered in the design of the Site 300 Contained Firing Facility (CFF). Lists from architectural information exchanges and from P2 design documents are provided to the CFF design team for evaluation. The CFF project has an individual designated as the P2 coordinator for the project.

---

### ***Implementing P2 Employee Training and Awareness Programs***

Pollution prevention awareness information, which covers all disciplines, is disseminated in documents such as the *Pollution Prevention Plan* (Celeste 1997) and *A Comprehensive Opportunity for Pollution Prevention at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory* (Celeste et al. 1997); posters and videos at events such as Earth Day; training and orientation; conferences and workshops; membership on LLNL committees; and formal presentations to groups such as the Environmental Safety & Health (ES&H) Working Group's Environmental Subcommittee.

Pollution prevention awareness is promoted through *Newsline* (LLNL's weekly newspaper) articles and administrative memos. The Pollution Prevention Group has developed a Web site to electronically distribute P2 information and also prepares brochures that briefly describe the P2 program at LLNL.

The Pollution Prevention Group conducts monthly reviews of the HWM's Total Waste Management System (TWMS) database. This database tracks waste generation, and it affords the Pollution Prevention Group the opportunity to identify potential problem waste streams for each directorate and address issues in real time.

---

### ***Current Return-on-Investment Projects***

Some of the Pollution Prevention Opportunity Assessments led to the preparation of high return-on-investment P2 project proposals in 1997. Major return-on-investment projects that were completed, were ongoing projects, or began in 1997 are listed in **Table 3-6**.





## 3 Environmental Program Information

**Table 3-6.** Return-on-investment projects in 1997.

Operation	Project
<b>Completed or in progress</b>	
Microwave digestion equipment	Replace acid-digestion methods
Technical Information Department digital photography equipment	Install digital imaging components
Photomicrographs, Building 321	Install electronic imaging system
Ultra-high vacuum	Remove low-particulate with nonhazardous solvents
Wet-chemistry photography for ETM	Install electronic imaging system to replace wet chemistry photography
Mobile nondestructive analysis waste sampling	Reduce number of samples collected
High explosives water recycling system	Install wastewater recycling systems for Site 300
Uranium cutting tools	Continue research on methods to produce high-quality machine cutting tools capable of dry machining
Spent garnet	Collect for reuse in on-site nonstructural concrete
Metal plating shop rinse water disposal	Replace with cold evaporator for rinse water recycling
Cooling towers modification	Modify to reduce sludge production
Freon 113 parts cleaning removal	Replaced with ultrasonic cleaning unit
Arc spark spectrograph	Replaced with laser ablation spectrograph
<b>Funded in 1997</b>	
Solvent-based parts washers	Replaced with aqueous-based small parts washers
Machine shops coolant	Installed with cold evaporators for coolant recycling

### ChemTrack

ChemTrack, a computerized chemical inventory system, is an important tool for ensuring compliance with SARA Title III and California Business Plan reporting requirements and for improving the overall management of hazardous materials at LLNL. ChemTrack tracks chemical inventories at LLNL through the use of bar codes, laser scanners, hand-held bar code scanners, and customized software. ChemTrack enhances LLNL's ability to obtain the toxic release information necessary to complete SARA 313 submittals. ChemTrack currently has an inventory of approximately 175,000 chemical containers ranging from 210-L drums to gram-quantity vials.



---

In addition, ChemTrack includes a chemical locating service that allows LLNL researchers to find and share chemicals. This minimizes the need to purchase new chemicals, thereby reducing procurement costs and the generation of hazardous waste. ChemTrack data is used by various LLNL organizations to improve emergency response capabilities and management of Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs), to more closely track specific high-hazard chemicals and other regulated substances, and to screen selected LLNL facilities for preliminary hazard analyses.

---

### Current Issues and Actions

Many current issues and actions are described in this report according to chapter subjects. This section lists several not covered elsewhere.

---

### ***ATSDR Assessment***

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is a federal public health agency whose mission is to prevent exposure and adverse human health effects and diminished quality of life associated with exposure to hazardous substances from waste sites, unplanned releases, and other sources of pollution in the environment. As part of this mission, ATSDR is mandated by Congress to conduct Public Health Assessments (PHAs) at sites such as LLNL, that appear on the National Priorities List. In 1997, ATSDR conducted site team meetings to identify site-related health concerns for evaluation as part of the PHA review process. ATSDR worked with the California Department of Health Services to draft two health consultations related to Livermore site operations, which will likely be part of the final PHA for LLNL. The first draft health consultation report assessed concerns related to the discovery of plutonium at levels above background in Big Trees Park, Livermore. The second draft report assessed the potential impacts on water quality of the municipal water supply that serves the city of Livermore and identified private wells located in the vicinity of LLNL. Although neither draft report identified any health risks, each report made several recommendations for further action. LLNL is working with ATSDR to resolve comments on the reports and to identify appropriate follow-up activities.



## 3 Environmental Program Information

---

### ***Integrated Safety Management Evaluation of LLNL***

Integrated Safety Management is an approach to safety management in which safety is systematically integrated into management and work practices at all levels so as to protect the public, workers, and the environment. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Oversight evaluated LLNL's system of Integrated Safety Management (ISM) in 1997. The review included the DOE Oakland Office (OAK) and its prime contractor, the University of California (UC). This evaluation was the most recent in a series of evaluations conducted at DOE facilities by DOE Headquarters. Overall, the evaluation team identified the successful features of LLNL's safety management system as well as pointing out several areas for improvement.

Between September and November of 1997, the 25-person evaluation team spent approximately 6 weeks at DOE Oakland and LLNL intensively reviewing safety management. The review included the Plutonium Facility, Hazardous Waste Management facility, and the National Ignition Facility construction project as well as topical areas such as radiation protection and chemical and explosive safety.

The Safety Management (SME) team found that DOE/OAK, LLNL, and UC had clearly defined safety and management policies and performance expectations at the top levels of the organization. All three are committed to implementing ISM and have effectively partnered to continuously improve safety performance. Many of the essential elements of safety management have been implemented, including clear roles and responsibilities, mechanisms for contractual and individual accountability, an appropriate balance between safety and mission-related priorities, and effective identification of requirements. The team reported that LLNL had a good model for facility management and a mature matrix-management system. They also noted that many initiatives are under way to improve safety. These elements of safety management are reflected in the safe conduct of many mission related activities and work.

The SME team found that four of the seven safety principles were being followed, two needed improved implementation, and one was borderline. No areas were identified as being significantly weak. Implementing policies, procedures, and work functions was the area requiring the most improvement. In particular, greater emphasis was needed in the planning and control of work at the worker level. Improvements in this area, as well as a strengthened commitment to safety at lower levels, were considered key to reducing injuries and accidents. The team also noted the need for improved procedures to ensure the timely classification and reporting of emergencies.

The three partners, LLNL, DOE/OAK, and UC, plan to build on existing safety program strengths while fully implementing ISM over the coming year. Employee input will be sought in developing the mechanisms necessary to improve injury/accident



performance, and pilot programs will be used to demonstrate their effectiveness before LLNL-wide implementation. Additionally, tighter safety controls will be put into place for the authorization and oversight of work performed by subcontractors.

---

### ***Miniature Optical Lair Explorer***

In 1994, the Operations and Regulatory Affairs Division (ORAD) developed and began using the Miniature Optical Lair Explorer (MOLE) to perform biological assessment studies at Site 300. The MOLE is a miniature tracked vehicle with a tiny camera that allows scientists to investigate subterranean tunnel systems of special-status wildlife species to determine animal presence and numbers. At LLNL, surveys for the San Joaquin kit fox, burrowing owl, and American badger are done before startup of ground-disturbing activities in order to ensure their protection, if present.

The MOLE was used successfully at LLNL in 1997 to survey for the presence of several special-status species with subterranean habits: the burrowing owl, American badger, California tiger salamander, and California red-legged frog.

In addition, improvements were made to the MOLE, including head-mounted virtual display of the camera image and a reduction in field battery pack weight from 8 to 3 lb. Further development and use of the MOLE will continue in 1998.

---

### ***Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Studies***

In 1995, LLNL led a team of researchers from LLNL and four University of California campuses in a collaborative study of underground contamination from leaking underground fuel tanks (LUFTs). The study, performed for the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), found that once fuel leak sources have been removed, fuel contamination generally does not spread far from the leak site. Given time, naturally occurring microbes in the soil and ground water will usually break down most of the pollutants before they can reach a source of drinking water. On the basis of this study, the SWRCB is revising its overall ground water cleanup policy, ranking cleanup sites by their risk to drinking water sources, and selecting appropriate cleanup techniques based on risk.

One of the important recommendations of the study was to identify a series of LUFT demonstration sites and to form a panel of experts made up of scientific professionals from universities, private industry, and federal and state regulatory agencies. This



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

panel would provide professional interpretations and recommendations regarding LUFT evaluations and closures at demonstration sites.

As a result of this recommendation, ten Department of Defense (DoD) sites were selected in 1996. Site selection was coordinated through the California Military Environmental Coordination Committee Water Process Action Team. Sites were selected to represent each branch of the military services with bases in California, as well as a number of Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) and the diverse hydrogeologic settings in California where fuel hydrocarbon contaminant cleanup problems occur. The sites selected and their corresponding RWQCB regions are: Army Presidio at San Francisco, San Francisco RWQCB; Barstow Marine Corps Logistic Center, Lahontan RWQCB; Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, San Diego RWQCB; Castle Air Force Base, Central Valley RWQCB; China Lake Naval Weapons Center, Lahontan RWQCB; El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, San Diego RWQCB, George Air Force Base, Lahontan RWQCB; Port Hueneme Naval Construction Battalion Center, Los Angeles RWQCB; Travis Air Force Base, San Francisco RWQCB; and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Central Coast RWQCB.

Recommendations will be made by the Expert Oversight Panel formed as part of the demonstration project for an appropriate risk-management strategy at each site and the set of actions needed to achieve site closure, based on the concept of developing conceptual models that identify potential hazards associated with sources, pathways, and receptors. The recommendations will also include site-specific findings regarding natural attenuation potential and discussion with regulators.

To date, all sites in the Demonstration Program have been reviewed and site specific recommendations submitted to each site. A Final Program Report is due to be released in August 1998.

As part of LLNL's continuing leaking underground fuel tank studies, an 18-month study evaluating impacts of the fuel oxygenate, Methyl *tertiary*-butyl ether (MTBE) has been completed and submitted to the California State Water Resources Control Board. The study concluded that:

- MTBE is a frequent and widespread contaminant in shallow ground water throughout California. Of the 32,409 leaking underground fuel tank sites recognized in the state, hydrocarbons are known to have impacted ground water at 13,278. A minimum estimate of the number of MTBE-impacted sites in California is greater than 10,000.



- MTBE plumes in ground water behave differently from other semi-water-soluble fuel components such as benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX).
- Evidence to date indicates that MTBE is not significantly biodegraded in ground water. Assuming resistance of MTBE to biodegradation, concentrations of dissolved MTBE in ground water will eventually diminish sufficiently to meet regulatory concentration goals because of dispersion, although the time it may take to diminish may be significantly longer than for the more biodegradable BTEX compounds.
- MTBE has the potential to impact regional ground water resources and may present a cumulative contamination hazard because of the chemical's apparent resistance to biodegradation and its mobility. With a compound that appears both ubiquitous and stable, water resource management on the regional scale will become increasingly important.
- Leak prevention is a critical requirement for the continued use of MTBE to ensure future protection of drinking water resources.

### ***Initiative to Improve VOC Cleanup Process by Using Historical Case Analysis***

The goal of this initiative is a nationwide historical case evaluation that uses a large number of cases to identify common volatile organic compound (VOC) release conditions that pose low risks and can be managed with minimal effort and cost, versus release conditions that pose higher risks and warrant larger expenditures of money. The key to this initiative is a cross-cutting evaluation of the large amount of VOC case data that is available.

As part of this initiative, two groups have been formed: a Working Task Force (WTF) and a Peer Review Panel (PeerRP). The WTF will focus on technical issues of historical VOC case data collection and analysis and prepare draft findings and conclusions based on the data analysis. The PeerRP will review key deliverables; raise technical issues; and review and comment on draft findings, conclusions, and any recommendations. WTF includes members from the DOE, DoD, U.S. Navy and Air Force, U.S. EPA, California Regional Water Quality Control Boards, and the Western Governors Association Working Group on Interstate Technology and Regulatory Cooperation.



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

Data collection continues, initial data analysis has begun, and the PeerRP and WTF are formed and are meeting regularly. Data collection should be complete by June 1998, findings and conclusions should be prepared by September 1998, and recommendations should be prepared by December 1998.

---

## Spill Reporting

The federal government and the State of California have several distinct statutory and regulatory provisions that require responsible persons to report releases or threatened releases of hazardous materials or pollutants into the environment. DOE has also established various Orders that require reporting of incidents to DOE Headquarters. These provisions have varying requirements regarding the types of releases that must be reported, the timing of the report or notification (immediate and follow-up), the content of the report (e.g., source of the release, nature of the material, and the quantity released), and the particular agencies that must be notified. Many releases must be reported under more than one provision, and compliance with one provision will not necessarily satisfy another applicable provision.

---

## Response to Spills and Other Environmental Emergencies

All spills and leaks (releases) that are potentially hazardous to the environment are investigated and evaluated. The release response process includes identifying the release, shutting off the source (if safe to do so), eliminating ignition sources, contacting appropriate emergency personnel, cordoning off the area containing the released material, absorbing and neutralizing the released material, assisting in cleanup, determining if a release must be reported to regulatory agencies, and verifying that cleanup (including decontaminating and replenishing spill equipment) is complete. Environmental analysts provide guidance to the programs on preventing spill recurrence.

To maximize efficient and effective emergency environmental response, EPD established a 7-days-a-week, 24-hours-a-day, on-call rotational position entitled the Environmental Duty Officer (EDO). Specialized EDO training includes simulated accidents to provide the staff with the experience of working together to resolve environmental issues within the regulatory structure. The on-duty EDO can be reached by pager or cellular phone at any time.





During normal work hours, Laboratory employees report all environmental incidents to the Environmental Operations Group (EOG) environmental analyst assigned to support their program area. The EOG environmental analyst then notifies the on-duty EDO of the incident and together they determine applicable reporting requirements to local, state, and federal regulatory agencies and to the DOE. The EDO and the EOG environmental analyst also notify and consult with program management, and have 7-days-a-week, 24-hours-a-day access to the office of Laboratory Counsel for questions concerning regulatory reporting requirements.

During off-hours, Laboratory employees report all environmental incidents to the Fire Dispatcher, who, in turn, notifies the EDO and possibly the Fire Department. The EDO then calls out additional EPD support to the incident scene as necessary, and follows the same procedures as outlined above for normal work hours.

Environmental Training

Major efforts are ongoing to provide LLNL employees with training on environmental topics aimed at improved compliance. Training tasks address both specialized training for environmental professionals and training in a variety of environmental topics for employees at all levels throughout LLNL. Courses presented by EPD’s Training Section are listed in **Table 3-7**.

**Table 3-7.** EPD training courses.

Hazardous Waste Generation and Certification	RCRA Facility Management
Hazardous Waste Generation and Certification Review	RCRA for EWSF
Emergency Response for Environmental Duty Officers	New Hire Orientation
Waste Retention Tank Management	Petroleum Product Storage Tank Management
Waste Accumulation Area Operations	Hazardous Waste Sampling
Hazardous Waste Transportation	Identification of Hazardous Material
Storm Water Pollution Prevention	Low-Level Waste Generation and Certification
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance	SARA/OSHA Refresher Training
Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Training	SARA/OSHA Field Experience
TRU Waste Generation and Certification	Packaging and Shipping Operations
Placarding: Hazardous Waste Transport	Environmental Duty Officer Briefings
Radioactive Materials	Waste Management Unit OJT
Separation for Highway Transportation	Air Source Management



# 3 Environmental Program Information

---

## LLNL's Other Environmental Programs

While EPD plays a central role, every directorate at LLNL is responsible for environmental compliance and minimizing the impacts of its operations. Several directorates have taken particularly noteworthy steps in this direction. These include the plans for Defense Nuclear Technologies Program's Contained Firing Facility at Site 300 that will move explosive tests inside a facility where the debris is contained, the Laser Program's efforts to design the National Ignition Facility to have minimal environmental impact, Engineering's Metal Finishing Group's efforts to reduce waste and substitute less hazardous chemicals in many of their processes, and Education Program's efforts to enhance environmental education.

Integral to LLNL's environmental research is the Environmental Programs Directorate that conducts multidisciplinary research to assess and mitigate environmental and human risk from natural and man-made hazards and to develop and demonstrate new tools and technologies for environmental restoration. This work includes studies in the design, analysis, and testing of advanced waste-treatment technologies; in-situ environmental remediation using natural and engineered processes; pathway, dosimetry, and risk analysis of radioactive and toxic substances; atmospheric dynamics; subsurface imaging and characterization; and seismic processes.

---

## Contributing Authors Acknowledgment

Major contributors to this diverse chapter were John R. Celeste, Sabre J. Coleman, Winifred A. Burks-Houck, C. Susi Jackson, Constance E. DeGrange, David Rice, Stephanie S. Goodwin, David W. Short, and James S. Woollett, Jr.