



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Subcommittee

Meeting Record

December 8, 1998
N. Augusta Community Center
North Augusta, SC

Citizens Advisory Board

Bill Lawless
Kathryn May
Karen Patterson
Wade Waters
Todd Crawford

Stakeholders

Peter Gray
Lee Poe
Bill Willoughby
Doug Jones
Kyle Findley
Brian Eisele
Murray Riley
Bill McDonell
Brandon Haddock
Russ Messick
Kim Cauthen
Shelly Sherritt DHEC
Keehna Frasier DHEC
Craig Marriner DHEC
Jeff Crane EPA
Ken Feely EPA

DOE/Contractors

Larry Ling DOE
Howard Gnann DOE
Thomas Johnson Jr. DOE
Phil Prater DOE
Mike Simmons DOE
Gerri Flemming DOE
Paul Sauerborn WSRC
Jim Moore WSRC
Gerry Stejskal WSRC
Kelly Way WSRC
Mary Flora WSRC
Bill Rajczak BSRI
Bob Aylward WSRC
E.B. Hart BSRI
Phil Crotwell BSRI
Joe Price WSRC
Jeff Newmann WSRC
Chris Bergren BSRI
Paul Huber BSRI
Elmer Wilhite WSRC
Mike Griffith WSRC

The following summary was recommended by Bill Lawless, ER/WM Subcommittee Co-Chairman as a new approach to capture the main topics of discussion in a short concise manner and to identify the immediate issues and actions.

Public Comment: Bill Lawless opened the meeting by asking for any public comments. There were none.

Issues: none

Action: none

Schedule Status: Mr. Lawless asked for a review of the ER/WM Subcommittee schedule. Topics to be reviewed at the upcoming meetings were presented by Mr. Sauerborn and discussed by the attendees.

Issues: none

Action: Confirm target dates for meeting presentations to assure full agendas for upcoming meetings.

FPIT Directed Teams (FFA process): Jeff Crane from the EPA Region IV presented a status of the Federal Facility Agreement process improvement team (FPIT). The FPIT was established to resolve programmatic issues for the Environmental Restoration Program and includes team members from Environmental Protection Agency, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, Department of Energy, and Westinghouse Savannah River Company. In the area of Groundwater Remediation, Mr. Crane explained the team expectation is to return usable ground waters to their beneficial uses wherever practicable, within a reasonable timeframe and given the particular circumstances of the site. When restoration of groundwater to beneficial reuses is not practicable, EPA expects to prevent further migration of the plume, prevent exposure to the contaminated groundwater, and evaluate further risk reduction.

Issues: Adequate time should be allowed to address FPIT issues completely.

Action: Another update in February, with a possible motion.

MWMF Southwest Plume Interim Action Discussion: Ed McNamee stated that the Interim Action was a plan to reduce the discharge of tritium into Four Mile Branch (FMB) until the long term plan is implemented. The Interim Action would include the following actions: surface drainage enhancements; modification to the engineered ditch; flow restrictions along the Old F-Area Effluent streams; Recirculation wells to address the Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC); Passive VOC remediation (ie. Phyto remediation such as plants, Bio-vent such as bacteria); Surface water monitoring plan.

Issues: Risks to health are not quantified for the no-action scenario or for any plan remediation.

Action: Develop a draft motion and interact with public focus group and regulators. An Extension of time requested of DHEC is in progress.

In Tank Precipitation: Larry Ling, DOE/HLW, provided a status of the High Level Waste Program. He began his presentation on Alternative Salt Disposition to replace ITP. Mr. Ling stated that the DOE Independent Project Team Leader met with Greg Rudy, SRS Manager to discuss the alternatives. The Team Leader agreed with the Westinghouse recommendation of small tank In Tank Precipitation (ITP), but suggested since this technology is not certain, that SRS also pursue ION Exchange. He also said that Westinghouse will continue to study the direct grout Saltcrete option.

A Supplemental EIS is planned for the first of the year. The SRS team will meet with Mr. Rudy and with the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management in early January 1999.

Issues: Will grout be acceptable to the regulators and the public. Will money being taken from ITP as a tax cripple the ITP replacement technology study. Will the direct grout method prevent cs-137 availability for can-in-can pu vitrification.

Action: Actions: DOE-SR will continue to advise ERWM subcommittee on ITP replacement technology and budget.

Tank Closure Program: Mr. Ling discussed the status of the Tank Closure Program. SR informed the acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management on Oct. 30, 1998 of its decision to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement prior to closing additional high level waste tanks. The Notice of Intent

will be published in the Federal Register in December 1998. Public Scoping meetings are planned for January 19 in Columbia and January 14 in North Augusta. Three contractors are being considered.

Issues: Will the cost of an EIS impede the tank closure program? The public and the regulators question the decision to do an EIS now.

Secondary Issues: the closure of tank 16's annulus; closure of the first four-pack

Action: Requests for the meeting minutes from the National Tank Closure Program workshop. Follow-up presentation requested in April on NRC ruling on incidental wastes and DOE Order 435.1. Motion planned for the CAB on the EIS in January.

Motions: Mr. Gnann and Mr. Lawless presented background on a possible three-site HLW motion. Mr. Lawless stated that a year ago, the board recommended that the West Valley vitrified high level waste be shipped to SRS for storage. This move would provide a number of benefits to SRS, including a HLW shipping and receiving facility to be built at SRS. This move would clarify transportation issues and allow WV to be shut down. He noted that the motion split the board and barely passed and DHEC was opposed to it. An alternative suggestion or addition to this motion was the Hanford cesium and strontium capsules coming to SRS for reprocessing, since Hanford has no processing facilities. SRS could process the cesium and strontium and vitrify in our HLW canisters. In exchange, Hanford would store our canisters and SRS would not have to build a new Glass Waste Storage Building. Mr. Gnann explained that the high level waste EM Integration effort is a complex-wide look at all DOE waste streams, and that SRS plays only a small part. Many ideas have been brainstormed and discussed including the one that Mr. Lawless just outlined. No final determination has been made, and the Department is still looking at the most cost-effective process. The EM Integration team meets once a quarter to discuss the best solution for all the sites. Mr. Lawless and Mr. Gnann indicated it would be too premature at this time to consider bringing forth a motion. Mr. Gnann offered to work with the subcommittee in quantifying the issues.

Issues: Canisters would have to be moved twice, once to Hanford, and again to Yucca. Enhancing safeguards by moving the wastes directly to Yucca must be considered.

Action: Status in February.

Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.