



SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

November 1998 Meeting Minutes

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

November 17, 1998 8:30 a.m.
Adam's Mark Hotel
Columbia, S.C.

Members Present

Bill Adams	Lane Parker	<u>Ex-Officio Representatives</u>
Arthur Belge	Karen Patterson	Tom Heenan
Tom Costikyan	Lola Richardson	Ann Clark
Ken Goad	P.K. Smith	Julie Corkran
Bill Lawless	Ed Tant	Jeff Crane
Ann Loadholt	Wade Waters	Jim Brownlow (alternate)
Jimmy Mackey	Beaurine Wilkins	
Kathryn May	Becky Witter	
Barbara Murphy		

Members absent were Bill Donaldson, Mary Elfner, Brendolyn Jenkins and Maria Reichmanis. Currently, there are four Board vacancies. The Department of Energy (DOE) Designated Federal Official present was Tom Heenan. Mike Schoener served as the Facilitator.

The meeting was open to the public and posted in the Federal Register in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Key Decisions Made by the Board

A request that DOE provide the CAB a priority list based strictly on health and safety risks to workers, the public and the environment, in addition to the traditional list prepared under the present budget system was unanimously accepted by the Board.

The Board unanimously adopted a motion supporting the process for selection of an alternative technology to high level waste salt disposition

The SRS CAB ranked seventeen issues identified at a Low Level Waste Seminar held in August 1998.

The Board unanimously adopted a recommendation that SRS, EPA and SCDHEC provide dedicated representatives and technical support to the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground public focus group.

A letter supporting Nevada Test Site CAB comments on intermodal transportation was approved.

The SRS CAB recommended that if DOE selects SRS as the East Coast regional low-level waste disposal site, the SRS CAB would be supportive if six conditions (described below) are met.

The Board recommended that DOE give its most careful consideration to the entire National Academy of Sciences study of treatment options for spent fuel. The Board noted particular areas of emphasis.

Approval of Minutes

The September 1998 meeting minutes were approved with no changes.

Agency Update

Tom Heenan of DOE presented a revised Operations Update slide (see attached). These changes were made to incorporate comments received during the September Board meeting. Mr. Heenan also noted progress in 1998 and announced an upcoming meeting for DOE managers regarding environmental management integration. Julie Corkran of the Environmental Protection Agency announced that intern Laurie Hunt is working on her Masters degree in public health at Emory and will return in the spring. Jeff Crane of EPA provided a memorandum of guidance regarding land use controls at Federal facilities. Ann Clark of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control provided a brochure regarding the agency noting that the Department has 6000 employees and only twenty percent are regulatory. The brochure is intended to aid citizens in their interactions with SCDHEC.

Risk Management & Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair P.K. Smith read a draft motion regarding low risk items taking funding precedence over higher risk items that may pose greater risk to human health and the environment (see attached). The motion requests that DOE provide the CAB a priority list based strictly on health and safety risks to workers, the public and the environment, in addition to the traditional list prepared under the present budget system. DOE is requested to provide a justification of the differences between the two lists as well. Bill Lawless moved the Board accept the motion and Becky Witter seconded. P.K. Smith provided further explanation regarding why this was a concern to Board members. She emphasized that they were not targeting any specific program, however regulatory drivers tend to drive the priority list, not risk. The motion was accepted unanimously.

Ms. Smith also discussed the upcoming schedule of the Risk Management Working Group and encouraged CAB members to attend these meetings. She also discussed a review of the SRS Comprehensive Plan. The following individuals will review various aspects of the Plan:

Facilities Plan	Lee Poe
Infrastructure Plan	Todd Crawford
Natural Resources Plan	Dave Christensen
Cultural Plan	Becky Witter

The public comment period ends January 31, 1999. The local plan will be submitted to DOE-Headquarters on February 28, 1999.

Low Level Waste Seminar Action

Mike Schoener provided background information on the Low Level Waste Seminar held in August 1998 in Las Vegas, Nevada. He noted that participation was limited to site specific advisory boards and that 50 individuals had participated from ten boards. Seventeen issues regarding low level waste disposal were identified during the seminar and each of the boards was asked to rank these issues according to whether they could support, support with caveats, or not support the various issues. (A special session to review these issues was held on Monday, November 16. The majority of SRS CAB members were in attendance and a meeting summary is attached.) Karen Patterson read each of the issues (see attached) and noted the ranking decided upon in Monday's special session. Ms. Patterson noted that the letter transmitting these issues would clearly state that the CAB does not consider this information thorough enough to develop specific recommendations, but does consider this list a good place to start further

discussions. Becky Witter moved the Board transmits the issues ranking to the Nevada Test Site and Jimmy Mackey seconded the motion.

Bill Lawless had a number of concerns and although he agreed with the choices the SRS CAB had made in ranking the issues, the issues had not been reviewed in a public domain. He was also concerned that this may dilute other messages previously provided by the SRS CAB. The Board voted to transmit the issues with fourteen in favor, two opposed and one abstention. It was determined that the transmittal letter would be provided in draft to the full CAB for comment. Bill Lawless noted he might submit a minority report, depending on the transmittal letter. (The letter addressed Dr. Lawless's concerns and he withdrew his intention to submit a minority report.)

Environmental Remediation & Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittee

Salt Disposition Focus Group

Wade Waters provided background information regarding the formation of a focus group to review the process for selecting an alternative technology for high level waste salt disposition (see attached). Initially, 130 alternatives were considered. This list was narrowed to 18 and then to four alternatives. Steve Piccolo of Westinghouse Savannah River Company provided a definition of the problem with salt disposition and the process for identifying solutions (see attached slides). The In-Tank Precipitation facility (ITP) at SRS was to remove cesium and other radioactive components from waste salt solutions in high level waste tank farms. However, this process created high rates of benzene and ITP operations were suspended. A Salt Disposition Team was charged with selecting a replacement technology. Mr. Piccolo discussed the multidiscipline engineering team, the system approach utilized by the team, and team recommendations on a primary and backup alternative technology. Small Tank ITP and Crystalline Silicotitanate Ion Exchange are the primary and alternative technologies being recommended. **Wade Waters presented a motion supporting the review of the replacement process and agreement with its recommendations and observations. Bill Lawless moved the Board accept the recommendation and Karen Patterson seconded the motion. The Board unanimously adopted the recommendation.**

Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground Focus Group

Mike Griffith of Westinghouse Savannah River Company gave a briefing regarding the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground (ORWBG) (see attached). The ORWBG is a 76-acre inactive landfill disposal area for solid radioactive wastes at SRS. Approximately 7,125,000 cubic feet of waste was disposed and about 90 percent of this waste volume is general low level radiological waste, such as paper, coveralls, protective clothing, etc. The Burial Ground also contains 22 inactive underground solvent storage tanks. A low permeability soil cover was placed over the ORWBG in early 1998 to reduce worker risk, reduce contaminant migration to groundwater, and reduce potential soil erosion and spread of contaminants while stabilizing the surface of the ORWBG. The Burial Ground is now in process for final remediation. The SRS CAB formed a public focus group to evaluate and recommend means of speeding up the schedule and review remediation alternatives. **In a draft motion read by Subcommittee Co-Chair Kathryn May, the subcommittee recommends that SRS, EPA and SCDHEC provide dedicated representatives and technical support to the focus group to ensure effectiveness. Jimmy Mackey moved the Board accept the recommendation and Karen Patterson seconded the motion. It was accepted by a unanimous vote.** Karen Patterson and Lee Poe will lead focus group activities.

Intermodal Transportation Environmental Assessment Bill Noll of DOE gave a brief description of an Intermodal Transportation Environmental Assessment. The assessment addressed transportation of low level waste to the Nevada Test Site (NTS). The NTS CAB requested that truck routes be re-routed to avoid the Boulder Dam and downtown Las Vegas. Intermodal transportation utilizes both rail and trucks and would address the NTS CAB concerns. The assessment determined that intermodal transportation would be preferred. **Bill Lawless read a letter supporting comments made by the NTS CAB on the**

Intermodal EA. Although this will have not impact on SRS, Dr. Lawless expressed the need to the support the NTS CAB on such an important issue. Lane Parker moved the Board accept the draft letter and Kathryn May seconded the motion. The Board unanimously adopted the motion.

Waste Management Programmatic EIS- Low Level Waste

Sonny Goldston of British Nuclear Fuels Limited provided a presentation regarding low level waste and mixed low level waste disposal options (see attached). He provided a description of each of these types of wastes and discussed why DOE needs to make disposal decisions. The preferred alternative for disposal is to select two to three regional disposal sites following consultation with stakeholders. This alternative was provided in the May 1997 Waste Management Programmatic EIS (WMPEIS). Six candidate sites combined have the capability to dispose of existing and projected low level waste for the next 20 years. Mr. Goldston discussed the criteria DOE is using to review alternatives as well as six options for low level waste and three options for mixed low level waste.

David Wilson of SCDHEC was provided an opportunity to make comment. Mr. Wilson stated the CAB was being put in an unfair position since DOE had not put its preferred disposal option on the table. He stated SRS has already disposed of more low level waste than any other site in the country and commercially, South Carolina is receiving wastes from 35 other states. He was concerned that DOE is forcing a National Environmental Policy Act decision without bringing all issues to the table. He stated that stakeholders would be better served by meaningful input after DOE intentions are known and noted it's too early to make specific recommendations.

Karen Patterson read the subcommittee's motion regarding the WMPEIS (see attached). Following a great deal of discussion regarding the timing of Board input, the Board adopted the motion by a vote of 14 in favor and one abstention. The SRS CAB recommended that if DOE selects SRS as the East Coast regional disposal site, the SRS CAB would support this if the following actions occur:

1. Oak Ridge takes SRS hazardous waste for incineration in the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) incinerator.
2. SRS Mixed Low-Level Waste is disposed offsite and out of state.
3. A site other than SRS takes SRS Special Case Low-Level Waste for disposal.
4. Adequate funding is provided to SRS and its state regulator to manage and dispose of eastern regional LLW, the bulk of which is the Oak Ridge Low-Level Waste coming to SRS under Option (3).
5. That disposition of other SRS wastes is equitable. (Examples are shipment of Pu-239 and Pu-238 in economically acceptable amounts per package wastes to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico and the shipment of SRS vitrified High Level Waste to Yucca Mountain Nevada for disposal.)
6. If DOE and the State of South Carolina reach an agreement on the disposal of eastern regional LLW, the bulk of which is Oak Ridge Low-Level Waste, at SRS, this agreement could include a framework similar to one drafted by the State of Nevada and the Nevada Test Site that allows DOE-SR to share regulatory oversight with the State.

Public Comments

Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center

Mr. Rogers stated his opposition to mixed oxide reprocessing and stated the effect of holding the public hearings regarding this issue in North Augusta was to marginalize public comment. He stated that DOE was taking a costly path that will likely be rejected by the public and then they will blame environmental activists when the approach is unsuccessful.

Patricia McCracken, Augusta, Ga. resident

Ms. McCracken stated her concerns about shipping low level waste to Utah and asked to see reports of low level waste disposal. She also requested information from CRESP.

Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair Tom Costikyan announced that the SRS Spent Fuel EIS and the Nonproliferation Study were delayed. He introduced George Klipa of DOE to give a presentation regarding the Nuclear Materials Processing Needs Assessment (see attached). Mr. Klipa discussed the purpose of the assessment which is to identify any additional nuclear materials that may require SRS canyon facilities for stabilization or disposition prior to canyon decommissioning. He described three categories of missions for canyons (firm, proposed and potential) and discussed issues identified with current plans. An integrated DOE disposition strategy is necessary to assure current, projected and future processing needs are met in a cost effective, low risk manner, he said.

Mr. Costikyan also presented a draft motion regarding a National Academy of Sciences Study of Treatment Options for Spent Nuclear Fuel (see attached). It recommended that DOE give its most careful consideration to the entire NAS report and several points in particular. Bill Lawless moved the Board accept the recommendation and Lane Parker seconded. The motion passed with 16 in favor and one abstention by P.K. Smith.

Mr. Costikyan also asked Tom Heenan to address the Board regarding its purview. Mr. Heenan very briefly discussed his role as a Designated Deputy Official, the significance of the SRS CAB being an EM board and the need to remain within the confines of its charter. Although the Board is not chartered to review issues related to defense programs, the Board can receive information regarding environmental impacts of any proposed new missions, he said. Mr. Heenan was responding to inquiries made by Mr. Costikyan regarding timely education on tritium and future missions.

Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation

Lynn Waishwell of CRESP provided an overview of the organization (see attached). She discussed CRESP goals which are to answer basic questions about conditions at former nuclear weapons sites; use this information to identify and evaluate risks; and promote better, safer, and more cost effective cleanup decisions nationwide. Ms. Waishwell discussed the makeup of CRESP which is comprised of approximately 120 researchers, and discussed the independent nature of the organization. The major benefit of CRESP is to develop data to facilitate a balanced, efficient, cost-effective regulatory program for site cleanup and risk reduction, she said.

Lynn Fahey McGrath of CRESP discussed different types of risks and how to integrate these risks. She stated that some framework is needed to assist with risk-based prioritization, which currently is not done well. Currently, there is a good understanding of risks associated with contaminated sites, she said. She stated science has played an important role in clarifying risks and discussed scientific research conducted by CRESP.

David Kosson of the CRESP Remediation Task Group provided examples of CRESP projects that focus on SRS groundwater remediation activities. He discussed tools for characterizing and reducing uncertainty in contaminant transport modeling and tools for improved use of geographic information systems.

Facilitator Update

Board Facilitator Mike Schoener summarized the Site Specific Advisory Board Evaluation results and noted that CAB comments were due on the draft report by December 15. He also discussed changes to the recommendation status report. He presented plans for a process retreat of CAB members on January 8-9 in Charleston, S.C. and asked for a show of hands from those who could commit to attend. All CAB

members agreed. At a minimum, the retreat will address board logistics; focus areas and subcommittees; outreach activities; agency interface; and performance measures, he said.

Outreach Subcommittee Report Subcommittee Chair Lane Parker thanked Wade Waters and Laurie Hunt for staffing the CAB display at an October 3 Coast Festival in Brunswick, Ga. He also thanked Monica Finney, CAB administrative support for staffing the display at the October 31 Sister-to-Sister Expo in Augusta, Ga.

Administrative Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair Beaurine Wilkins announced that the subcommittee had completed the 1999 membership review and would be conducting phone interviews of candidates in December. All candidates will be provided to the Board and Agencies at the January meeting, she said. She noted the lack of candidates in several stakeholder categories, particularly public officials, and encouraged members to seek potential candidates.

Education Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair Karen Patterson introduced David Hoel of the National Environmental Training Office (NETO). The NETO is located at SRS to improve and maintain consistent environmental management training for DOE complex-wide. He provided a course list of Environmental Restoration courses available and noted that CAB members could participate in training. Karen Patterson had approached him regarding environmental laws and regulation training for the SRS CAB. He noted this training could be tailored to meet the needs of the SRS CAB. Ms. Patterson stated the course would likely be offered in February in conjunction with the national SSAB Chairs meeting to allow other boards to benefit as well if there is interest.

SEMA/Decisionmaker Forum Participation

Ann Loadholt and Karen Patterson both provided presentations regarding the SRS CAB and environmental management integration at two conferences. They briefly commented on the meetings and were encouraged by comments received regarding the presentation from conference participants.

Administrative Items

Jimmy Mackey and Wade Waters will attend a Technology Deployment Workshop and the Oak Ridge SSAB meeting on December 1-3, 1998.

Public Comments

Ruth Thomas- Environmentalist, Inc.

Ruth Thomas of Environmentalist, Inc. in Columbia, S.C. provided written comments (see below).

Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center

Mr. Rogers noted the US Commission and Civil Rights and how environmental racism is being addressed in litigation. He commended the efforts of Representative James Smith and Congressman Bill Clyburn to reach solutions that are favorable to citizens. He also stated he was impressed with the dedication, seriousness and character of the SRS CAB.

The following public comments were made on Monday, November 16 at 6:30 p.m.

Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center

Mr. Rogers discussed his concerns with Mixed Oxide (MOX) reprocessing. He also questions if "we"

know the characteristics of the Rocky Flats wastes being shipped to SRS and noted iodine releases in Oregon and Idaho.

Christine McKowski, Columbia, S.C. resident

Ms. McKowski stated she had recently relocated from Chicago and she is opposed to plutonium energy. She stated that MOX is not only relevant to SRS but affects the entire general public in South Carolina and Georgia. She implored the CAB to make this a public issue and give it a public forum and not just look at the benefits of this mission.

Brett Bursey, SC Progressive Network

Mr. Bursey stated that concern has spread about mixed oxide fuels. He said the CAB has a position unlike others. He stated the meeting in North Augusta regarding surplus plutonium disposition was scripted and 500 WSRC employees received a paid day off to attend. He stated that the CAB is in the best position to raise this issue- a very abrupt and major change in the US Energy Policy. He noted an executive order by Jimmy Carter which prevented the Barnwell facility from opening and called for further public hearings regarding plutonium disposition.

Claude Gilbert, Columbia, S.C. resident

Mr. Gilbert stated his concerns regarding reprocessing. He noted that Japan had been caught falsifying records, that leukemia cancer rates are high in France, and that contamination at Sellafield in England is more than Three Mile Island. He stated these problems were not a worldwide coincidence nor do they receive widespread publicity.

Lee Poe, Aiken, S.C. resident

Mr. Poe noted that CRESPP had responded to questions posed by the Risk Management & Future Use Subcommittee, and that although long in coming, the results were here and he encouraged everyone to read them. He also suggested that the Risk Excellence Notes by the Centers for Risk Excellence and the CRESPP newsletter be made available to all members of the public.

Kenneth Sajwan, Savannah State University

Dr. Sajwan introduced himself and two students stating they would be following SRS CAB activities and had received a grant from DOE regarding community awareness about environmental radiation.

Handouts

- SRS CAB Meeting Agenda, November 17, 1998
- November 1998 Operations Update, Tom Heenan, DOE
- Draft Motion, Selection of HLW salt Disposition Alternatives, Wade Waters, SRS CAB
- Citizens Advisory Board, November 1, 1998, Steve Piccolo, WSRC
- Draft Motion, Risks and Funding, P.K. Smith, SRS CAB
- Master Copy, LLW Seminar Suggestions, Karen Patterson, SRS CAB
- Motion, Closure of the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground, Kathryn May, SRS CAB
- Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground, Citizens Advisory Board Briefing, Rod Rimando, DOE
- Draft Motion, Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
- Low Level and Mixed Low Level Waste Disposal Options, Sonny Goldston, BNFL
- Draft Letter to Mr. Carl Gertz from Ann Loadholt regarding Intermodal Transportation
- Nuclear Materials Processing Needs Assessment Presentation to the SRS CAB, George Klipa, DOE
- Draft Motion, National Academy of Sciences Study of Treatment Options
- CRESPP, David Kosson, Lynne Fahey McGrath, Lynn Waishwell, CRESPP
- Example CRESPP Projects to Improve SRS Decisions, David Kosson, CRESPP
- National Environmental Training Office Course List, David Hoel, DOE
- SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

- SRS CAB Public Involvement Calendar
- Monthly National Environmental Policy Act Report
- October/November Highlights

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

**SRS Citizens Advisory Board
Low-Level Waste Seminar Issues Ranking**

November 16, 1998

Columbia, SC

The SRS CAB met at the Adam's Mark Hotel in Columbia, SC. on November 16, 1998, to discuss the Low Level Waste Seminar that was held in Las Vegas, NV on August 16-18, 1998 and one of the seminar's action items. The action item included dialogue on the barriers and/or challenges to DOE's decision-making process regarding low-level waste (LLW) disposition as identified by the LLW Seminar participants and the suggestions that were developed for overcoming and/or resolving them. Each of the site-specific advisory boards (SSABs) in attendance were then asked to hold individual site meetings where SSAB members could participate in ranking the 17 items under consideration.

The following were in attendance at the special session:

CAB Members

Lane Parker
Ed Tant
Tom Costikyan
Bill Adams
Jimmy Mackey
Wade Waters
Barbara Murphy
Becky Witter
Lola Richardson
Ann Loadholt
Karen Patterson

Stakeholders

Todd Crawford
Harry Rogers
Lynn Waishwell
Sonny Goldston

DOE/Contractor

Helen Villasor
Dawn Haygood
Bill Noll
Gerri Flemming, ADDFO

Mike Schoener, the SRS CAB facilitator explained that the 17 items were categorized into five groups relating to the following considerations:

- economic
- environmental/safety
- equity, inter-state, tribal and environmental justice
- system-wide considerations
- transportation

Mr. Schoener provided an explanation of the process and mentioned that not all SSABs may be participating in the ranking process or providing a response as requested. However, Mr. Schoener said that while the SRS CAB is supporting Environmental Management Integration (EMI), the collection of responses is merely what the SRS CAB thinks collectively on the LLW issues. Nevertheless, it was made clear that the SRS CAB members believed the information provided was not specific enough to fully understand the expectations set forth at the seminar in Las Vegas.

Mr. Schoener passed out suggestion and summary assumption sheets associated with each of the 17 items under discussion and explained that the SRS CAB review each item and decide if he or she would support, not support or might support the item under certain conditions. Mr. Schoener then said that a compilation of SRS's rankings would be prepared along with a cover letter and sent to the Nevada Test Site merely as feedback. Once again, it was mentioned that the letter should contain a statement that the information was not specific enough to fully understand the issues.

There was a great deal of discussion regarding each of the 17 suggestions provided to overcome barriers/challenges and Board members had difficulty interpreting the meaning of many of the statements. The Board chose to support six suggestions; chose not to support seven suggestions and might be able to support four of the suggestions.

(A summary of the SRS CAB ranking of issues is below.)

SRS Citizens Advisory Board
November 16-17, 1998
Adam's Mark Hotel
Columbia, SC

Mr. Chairman and members of the SRS Advisory Board (CAB).

My name is Ruth Thomas. I am representing Environmentalist Incorporated (E.I.), a state-wide citizens organization.

I am glad for this opportunity to meet with you. Last evening, I attended the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee meeting. I was pleased to find the group was very open to the questions and comments of representatives of public interest organizations and individuals as well.

We agree with the statements which were made in favor of looking at the overall picture in regard to everything that is going on at the Savannah River Site (SRS) and what is proposed in the future, while at the same time recognizing that there is a need to separate out particular issues for consideration.

The more E.I. knows about CAB and its various subcommittees and the more the CAB members know about E.I., the better able we will be able to develop a working relationship. Reading various documents, minutes of CAB's meetings, Department of Energy's (DOE's) reports, has helped us to formulate a plan for beginning to share information.

On selecting an issue on which such a plan would focus, we took into consideration the existing nuclear activities, remediation projects and those being proposed. For the following reasons, we chose the proposal to fabricate mixed-oxide fuel at the SRS.

Because this is planned for the future and is not already taking place,

Because the use of plutonium in reactor fuel was the subject of extensive study in the 1970's. The record of evidence brought out exists in the transcripts of federal proceeding, including:

uranium and plutonium fuel cycle hearing proceedings related to recovering plutonium at the Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant,

Because E.I.'s researchers are familiar with the evidence contained in the records of all these proceedings due to the organizations being a full party to each one of them.

Because mixed-oxide fuel facilities are experimental.

Because of the nature of plutonium, the long period over which it remains deadly, the special care and containment requirements necessary to prevent its escape, and the problems associated with using this lethal substance in an experimental technology.

Because of the unsuitable geological and hydrological conditions of the SRS site in regard to the presence, production, and use of radioactive materials, particularly plutonium. (Shallow water table, temperature inversions, for example have been pointed out as problems by geologists with the National Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Department of the Interior.)

The first steps in developing a working relationship between E.I. and CAB and it's subcommittees:
Exchange of information - We have minutes of the July 28, 1998 CAB meeting, DOE's Environmental Impact Statement (Draft) Surplus Plutonium Disposition, and handouts from the subcommittee meeting, etc.

We request additional information:

- CAB and/or subcommittee's comments on DOE's draft EIS – Surplus Plutonium Disposition
- Reports related to hydrology and geology of SRS
- Reports related to health effects, methods of detection, and migration of plutonium.
- List of persons who gave presentations, and had input to CAB, and to subcommittees regarding mixed oxide proposal, including affiliation, education, and work experience of each.

CAB and subcommittees requests for information from E.I.

- What do you want to know about us, about the history of E.I.?
- What questions do you have regarding our research, our activities?
- What questions do you have about our advisors, researchers, where to find the records of the proceedings and other evidence we are familiar with?

In conclusion, I would like to hear more questions, comments and suggestions on a process for sharing information and developing a working relationship.

Ruth Thomas
Environmentalist Inc.
1339 Sinkler Rd
Columbia, SC 29206
803-782-3000