



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management & Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Record

October 23, 1997

North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, SC

The Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met on October 23, 1997, at 6:30 p.m. at the North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, South Carolina. SRS CAB members attending were P. K. Smith, Bill Adams, Bill Lawless and Karen Patterson. Members of the public who attended were Mike French, Sam Booher, Lee Poe, E. F. Orlosky, Regina Orlosky, Ann Lorenz, Gary Hohmann, C. G. Reynolds, Martha Ebra, Mary Lou Curfs-Adams, Russ Ferrara, Bill Boettinger, Murray Riley, Todd Crawford, Anne Roe, and Carl Mazzola. Gerri Flemming from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Lisa Gibbons, Marian Woolsey, Jim Buice, Dave Hepner, and Gary Little also from DOE-SR attended. The Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) attendees were Bob Lorenz, Pete Fledderman, Al Mamatey, Dale Bignell, and Gail Jernigan.

P. K. Smith, Co-Chairperson of the RM&FU Subcommittee, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the meeting and asked participants to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith then introduced Marian Woolsey to discuss the latest schedule and plans for the Accelerating Cleanup: Focus on 2006 Plan.

Ms. Woolsey discussed the most recent plan and budget schedule. The Environmental Management (EM) fiscal year (FY) 1999 Budget is due at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on October 30, 1997. The next DOE-SR submittal for the Focus 2006 Plan is due on November 26.

Between November 26 and December 18, the sites are to finalize and revise the Project Baseline Summaries (PBSs). PBSs are the background records to support the Focus on 2006 Plan by providing the details for each project. The Draft EM 2006 Plan is scheduled to be released to Congress and to the public for a 45-day public comment period during February 1998. The National and Initial 2006 Plans should be released mid-1998.

Lee Poe asked if the National Plan was written after the sites submitted their plans or if the documents are prepared simultaneously. Mr. Poe stated that he would have expected the site

plans to be written first, then summarized as the National Plan. Ms. Woolsey explained that all the documents are written at the same time.

The November 26 submittal is to include a description of the site goals, end states, future use, stewardship, strategies, prioritization, scope, cost, schedule, regulatory compliance, and response to stakeholder comments. Each site is also to submit 4 graphics as follows:

- A completion profile to illustrate the expected lifecycle cost and expected completion date for each project
- Disposition maps to show the EM-managed contaminated media, waste, and material from current state to final disposition
- Critical Closure Path to identify present activities, sequence, and schedule that are the earliest projected closure for major sites
- Site End State/Land Use Maps to indicate planned EM activities and land use now, at the end of 2006, and final end state for major sites.

Ms. Woolsey told the participants the Land Use Performance Measures for the plan are:

- Land Available for Alternative Future Use
- Historical Land Released for Alternative Use (pre-1997)
- Historical Land Released for Public Use (pre-1997)
- Land Intended to be Released for Public Use
- EM Encumbered Land (Remaining - following the site closure date)

She also reviewed the DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ) requirements for the PBSs. Mr. Poe asked several questions about risk, safety, and health. He explained that he expected the risks to decrease as closures were completed. For example, Mr. Poe used the High Level Waste (HLW) Program by saying as each waste tank was emptied and closed, he expected the risk from HLW would decrease. Jim Buice, DOE-SR, explained that the site evaluated the risk for each activity before, during, and after as each activity is performed. Mr. Poe commented that there should be an annual risk evaluation.

Sam Booher asked if the future use maps are based on the CAB recommendations on future use. Mr. Buice assured him that they are. Gail Jernigan also added that the Strategic Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and future use plans are integrated. The Comprehensive Plan is based on the Strategic Plan and both used comments from the Future Use Report and the CAB recommendations on future use. Mike French expressed an interest in the technology development and employment levels in the plans.

Participants asked if the schedule would allow this subcommittee the opportunity to review the information before it was sent to DOE-HQ on November 26. Ms. Smith suggested that SRS provide copies of documents before a review meeting. Someone else suggested the meeting should be set up as soon as possible so comments could be incorporated early in the process. Mr. Buice explained that DOE-SR welcomes public input into the planning process and that a meeting would be scheduled for the public to review the documents. He also told the group he

would have to let them know when the meeting would be because he was unsure as to when the site documents will be available.

Mr. Poe also asked the participants to review the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), Hanford, and Rocky Flats draft documents. He felt subcommittee members should review how the other sites are addressing national needs.

Dave Hepner, DOE-SR, then began the discussion of the TNX asset reuse. He explained that DOE-SR plans to find a management and operating contractor for TNX. This manager will solicit proposals from private industry and universities for ways to use the facilities at TNX. TNX will be used as the "anchor" as a multi-purpose pilot plant to be used for commercial operations and to demonstrate cleanup technologies. DOE-SR would serve on the Board of Directors for the manager and approve tenants. Land uses would include light industrial with preferably no digging. The manager would act as a leasing agent, provide landlord functions, and provide infrastructure. The manager would charge rent, and DOE-SR would receive a percentage of the rent as owners of the land. Todd Crawford asked if Savannah River Technology Center (SRTC) activities would continue at TNX. Mr. Hepner explained that microbiology, bioremediation, and other developing technologies would continue at TNX and be used as leverage to attract industries and universities to the area.

Mr. Hepner also explained the need to work with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC). He told the group that he hopes the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Assessment (EA) will be issued by November 3 to begin the 30-day public comment period. If there is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) as a result of this EA, a solicitation will be prepared and DOE will begin to identify industrial partners. Mr. Poe asked if the FONSI would include an analysis of the impacts of shutting the area down, as well as the impacts from the proposal for asset reuse. Mr. Hepner assured him the EA evaluates both impacts.

Bill Lawless asked if the proposal was for the entire TNX area; Mr. Hepner explained that it did. Mr. Lawless then asked about the present contamination at TNX. Mr. Hepner told the participants that 85% of the cleanup of this area has been completed and the remaining portion to be remediated is the groundwater. He also explained that there is currently air stripping and other groundwater remediation activities being done now, and that there will be some buildings that cannot be used.

In response to a question about environmental permits, Mr. Hepner told the group that each commercial and/or university partner would be responsible for their own permits. However, they also could contract with Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) to provide this service. This would include any waste water, National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES), or hazardous waste permits. He went on to explain that DOE-SR wants to maintain current Research and Development activities such as the Americium/Curium Vitrification Project, a demonstration project for the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF). He further explained there are suppliers who are looking at the warehouses at TNX.

Mr. Lawless explained the CAB became interested in privatization activities with the Consolidated Incineration Facility. He said the CAB had some concerns about DOE oversight and wanted assurance environmental regulations would be met. He told Mr. Hepner that he believed the TNX proposal had addressed the concerns the CAB might have had.

Mr. Hepner explained that the TNX asset reuse is not privatization. Any company or university that might contaminate the area will be responsible for cleanup and each company will be required to have regulatory approval and permits. Someone asked what was the relationship between this proposal and the Southeastern Technology Center and the Savannah River Region Diversification Initiative (SRRDI). Mr. Hepner said he would find the answer to these questions.

Bob Lorenz, WSRC, began his review of the 1996 Environmental Report by commenting that SRS complies with all environmental regulations, as well as following all DOE orders, Best Management Practices, and the ALARA Principle (As Low As Reasonably Achievable).

Murray Riley asked where the public could look at this report. Mr. Lorenz explained the report has been released to the press and copies were available in the DOE Reading Room at the University of South Carolina-Aiken Library. He also told Mr. Riley that copies were available upon request.

Mr. Lorenz reviewed the following highlights from the report:

- Radiological emissions continue to decline.
- Radiation dose to the public is small and continues to decline.
- Releases of toxic chemicals continue to decline.
- NPDES compliance exceeded 99.7 percent.
- SRS complied with 100 percent of Clean Air Act regulations.
- No notices of violation were issued to SRS in 1996.
- No fines were incurred.

When asked why the NPDES compliance was not 100 percent, he explained that occasionally various locations had samples that exceeded limits for fecal coliform from the new sanitary waste facility, pH values, etc.

Mr. Lorenz explained radiological and non-radiological effluent monitoring and radiological environmental surveillance. He told the group that the radiological environmental surveillance program is to monitor all radiation exposure pathways to demonstrate compliance with applicable standards, assess radiation exposure to the public, and assess effects, if any, on the local environment. He discussed the locations of the monitoring equipment and how many samples collected and analyzed.

He told the participants that the tritium releases continue to decline because reactors are not operating, the Replacement Tritium Facility (RTF) has been operating for a year, and tritium operations have improved. Someone asked how far tritium travels before complete mixing with the Savannah River. Mr. Lorenz said that usually tritium is usually mixed in the river within 20-30 meters, and tritium is completely mixed in the river where Highway 301 crosses the Savannah

River. Someone else asked if tritium is naturally occurring, and Mr. Lorenz replied that there is natural tritium, but most tritium found in the global environment is from weapons testing from the 1960s.

The 1996 dose to the maximally exposed individual (someone who would be exposed the most by drinking 2 liters of water from the Savannah River, eats fish, grow vegetables at the border of the site, etc.) is as follows:

Individual dose

Liquid	0.14 mrem
Air	0.05 mrem
Total	0.19 mrem

Drinking water dose

Beaufort-Jasper, South Carolina	0.06 mrem
Port Wentworth, Georgia	0.06 mrem

Sportsman Dose

Fish	0.14 mrem
------	-----------

Deer and Hogs

Maximum	21 mrem
Off site	14 mrem

Mr. Poe remarked on the difference of the drinking water dose at Beaufort-Jasper and the sportsman's dose. He said he would expect the difference to be greater.

Mr. Lawless asked Ms. Smith to have this presentation for the full CAB. Since the November meeting agenda is already full, Mr. Lawless and Ms. Smith decided this presentation could be given at the January meeting.

Mr. Poe asked if this subcommittee had a specified time for comments from the general public on subjects not on the agenda. He stated that the Nuclear Materials Management Implementation Plan did not have sufficient public comment. This plan had been discussed at the Joint Risk Management and Future Use and Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee meeting in Beaufort on September 22. Mr. Poe urged DOE to distribute the plan for further public comment. He also told DOE he did not believe there had been adequate public comment on the SRS Strategic Plan. After further discussion, the meeting was then adjourned.

NOTE: To save costs for duplicating and mailing, handouts from the meeting will no longer be included in the distribution of the meeting notes. If you wish to have a copy of any of the handouts, please contact Gail Jernigan at 952-6969 or 800-249-8155.