SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

May 4, 1999
North Augusta Community Center
N. Augusta, SC

The Environmental Remediation and Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittee met on Tuesday, May 4, 1999 at 6:00 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center in North Augusta, SC. Attendance was as follows:

CAB Members	Stakeholders	DOE/Contractors
Bill Lawless, Co-Chair	William McDonell	Gerri Flemming, DOE
Karen Patterson	Brendon Haddock	Kelly Way, WSRC
Wade Waters	Jim Pope	Coleman Miles, BSRI
Jimmy Mackey	Lee Poe	Sherri Robinson, DOE
Lola Richardson	W. Cross	Paul Huber, BSRI
Earnest Marshall	Todd Crawford	T. Gutmann, DOE
Ken Goad	Paulette Fix	Cliff Cole, BSRI
Murray Riley	Mike French	Tom French, WSRC
	Eric Brown	Peter Hudson, BNFL
	Jerry Devitt	Sonny Goldston, WSRC
	Bill McDonnell	Kim Wierzbicki, BSRI
Facilitator		R. Cordani, WSRC
Mike Schoener		Len Sjostrom, DOE
	Regulators	Elmer Wilhite, WSRC
	Leigh Beatty, SCDHEC	Donnie Helton, WSRC
	None, EPA	Rod Rimando, DOE
		Joao Cardoso-Neto, BSRI
		Ed McNamee, BSRI
		Jerry Morin, WSRC
		Angelia Adams, DOE
		W. Nate Ellis, DOE
		K.R. Johnson, BSRI
		Helen Villasor, WSRC

Agenda Review: Mike Schoener opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda, inviting introductions, and asking for public comments.

Public Comments: Sonny Goldston expressed his appreciation to the subcommittee for inviting the Solid Waste Division back to make a presentation at this meeting on the Solid Waste System Plan and its

preferred options for low-level waste (LLW) disposal. However, Mr. Goldston explained that the presentation is being postponed to allow DOE-HQ ample time to provide the states and stakeholders with the Mixed Low Level Waste (MLLW)/LLW Preferred Options for disposal identified in the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (WMPEIS). Mr. Goldston said that the MLLW/LLW Preferred Options for LLW and MLLW disposal would be issued in the *Federal Register* after meetings were held with the Governors of the effected States. The meetings with the Governors' offices were expected to take place in early May 1999. The Record of Decision would be issued no earlier than 30 days from the *Federal Register Notice* of the Preferred Option. The Preferred Option may contain language that agrees with Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Recommendation No. 72. If the Preferred Option stipulates otherwise, stakeholders will be able to provide input as soon as the *Federal Register Notice* is issued within the 30 days period. If necessary, a letter requesting an extension of the 30 day period will be sent to DOE-HQ to ensure stakeholder involvement in the ROD process.

Actions: Mr. Goldston agreed to provide the CAB with a review of the LLW/MLLW Preferred Options at the full Board meeting in Savannah, GA on May 24-25, 1999. Karen Patterson will coordinate with Helen Villasor in the event an extension letter on the public comment period will be required.

Eric Brown, a technical consultant from Brown Horizons in Augusta, GA, introduced himself to the subcommittee and discussed an Internet website that he has created on SRS's D-Area Oil Seepage Basin Project. Mr. Brown provided the URL for the website, which is *http://members.tripod.com/~EBHORIZONS/D-Area.html*. Mr. Brown invited participants to view the website and provide him with any comments or recommendations they may have. Hard copies of the website were also distributed to the attendees by Mr. Brown. In closing, Mr. Brown thanked Bill Lawless and Paul Sauerborn of the WSRC Public Involvement Team for their support during construction of the website.

Actions: Bill Lawless asked Jimmy Mackey to provide Mr. Brown with feedback on the website and also requested that Brendolyn Jenkins foster Mr. Brown's progress on the technical support Mr. Brown provides to the CAB.

Schedule Review: Mike Schoener provided an overview of the subcommittee's issues matrix and discussed the upcoming schedule for the next meeting which will be held on May 24, 1999 at the DeSoto Hilton in Savannah, GA. Topics will include a status report on the NRC Ruling of Incidental Waste and a review of the MLLW/LLW RODs. Draft motions on the NRC Ruling, SRS Technology Management Plan, TNX Operable Unit Feasibility Study Scoping, the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground CMS/FS and RCRA Permit, and Independent Scientific Peer Review Proposal/Contract will also be discussed.

Recommendation Review: To address a required action that the subcommittee review open and pending motions to determine if closure is warranted on a periodic basis, Mike Schoener provided the following review of the CAB recommendations that originated from the ER&WM Subcommittee:

- 83 total recommendations, 59 from ER&WM
- 13 pending recommendations, 11 from ER&WM
- 35 open recommendations, 30 from ER&WM
- 35 closed recommendations, 30 from ER&WM

Bill Lawless thanked Mike Schoener for the report and said that this action Mr. Schoener has initiated is a positive benefit to the CAB's work.

Facility & Asset Disposition Program: Angelia Adams briefed the subcommittee on the DOE-SR Facility and Asset Disposition Program by first discussing the two recommendations the CAB has submitted to DOE. Recommendation No. 44, July 1997, which addresses the decommissioning of the Heavy Water Components Test Reactor (HWCTR) and Recommendation No. 49, November 1997, which addresses the dispositioning of excess and surplus facilities at SRS.

In reply to Recommendation No. 49, Ms. Adams said that CAB had been briefed on the SRS Risk Rating and Priority Ranking System Development on January 12, 1998. Continuing with her status report, Ms. Adams said that 128 inactive facilities were risk ranked and prioritized, detailed hazard assessment for the top ten facilities in FY98 were completed. For FY99, $4.5 M was included for risk mitigation. On March 31, 1999, 19 facility assessments were ranked, and final reports and risk mitigation actions for FY00 funding have been developed. A list of the top ten risk ranked inactive facilities was also provided to the subcommittee. Ms. Adams concluded her presentation by noting that activities are continuing to address CAB recommendations 44 and 49 and that the SRS Facilities and that the Asset Disposition Program is being actively managed to prioritize and mitigate hazards and minimize mortgage costs associated with these facilities.

Issues: There is a lack of understanding on risk scores over 100; a lack of funding to go on with the dismantling; and ensuring the facilities are safe enough to withstand an unexpected closure of the site, particularly if institutional controls are lost way out in the future.

Actions: Ensure that a type of mitigation continues to be placed in DOE's closure plans, define risk versus hazards, identify a safe line, i. e., a percentage maximum risk score, continue with the pilot program of zero dollar contracts where subcontractors are paid in collected assets rather than dollars when a facility is dismantled, provide the CAB with an update on the SRS Facility and Asset Disposition Program in the fall, including a response on risk scores.

SRS Technology Management Plan/Emerging Technologies for High Level Waste: Sherri Robinson, DOE-SR Office of Technology Development, explained that DOE has an intensive effort underway to integrate a management technology plan designed to highlight and capture in one document, the technology plans of the six operating divisions of WSRC that include High Level Waste (HLW), Solid Waste (SW), Spent Nuclear Fuels (SNF), Nuclear Materials Disposition (NMD), Facility Disposition (FD) and Environmental Restoration (ER). Ms. Robinson then introduced Tom French, who presented background on SRS's Technology Integration Plan. However, Mr. French first told the group that the purpose of his presentation was to obtain feedback from the CAB on the current approach to the development of a SRS Technology Integration Plan and Program and to determine if "it's the right thing to do".

Mr. French identified the Environmental Management (EM) roadmap priorities and the projected example completion dates of projects such as HLW Tank Closure and Vitrification, SW Management. Watershed Cleanup, and Stabilization of Nuclear Materials (non-proliferation). Mr. French explained that technology can impact SRS's mission by reducing cost, reducing long-term risk and shortening schedules by focusing on high priority needs and high impact projects. Some of the benefits that Mr. French outlined are the extension of the technological implementation horizon, a consistent implementation approach that avoids duplication of effort, a basis for budget management and the provision of a baseline from which to measure performance. Mr. French concluded his portion of the presentation by emphasizing that the plan and program needs to be implemented; however, technology implementation needs must be earmarked in the budget/planning process. Draft copies of the plan were distributed and Mr. French said he felt a responsibility to come back and ask the stakeholders to review the document and provide input as soon as possible. At the same time the draft plan is being reviewed by the stakeholders, WSRC will finish gathering input from SRS's operating divisions so that a final plan and program could be issued by June 1999.

In support of the SRS Technology Management Plan, Jerry Morin of SRS's HLW Technology Program presented five examples of technology, which have been or are under development to support the HLW Program. Dr. Morin said that some of DOE's investment in these technologies includes leveraged funding from the DOE Office of Science and Technology. Some of the technologies highlighted by Dr. Morin included waste retrieval and closure technology by using new Swedish FLYGT mixers versus long-shaft slurry pumps; pitbull pumps versus centrifugal and diaphragm pumps, robotic tank crawlers rather than a water brush and water mouse; optimizing glass waste loading by at least five percent; and safety technology of using durable filter media in place of paper high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters. In

conclusion, Dr. Morin added that the SRS Technology Management plan will integrate HLW technology planning within SRS and that an integrated program will strengthen the site's ability to compete for technology funding.

Issues: Lack of commitment and milestones in the SRS Technology Management Plan, as well as a lack of contingency planning. Funding needs to be earmarked and leveraging techniques need to be applied to keep funding for technology from slipping in the budget process.

Actions: Explore all avenues for possible monetary sources. Develop a draft motion with recommendations to assist in strengthening the SRS Technology Management Plan. The draft motion should include definite commitments on technology development/adaptation/implementation and financing, obtaining formal approval by division managers and the Director of the Savannah River Technology Center, and obtaining approval from regulators to "buy in" to technology planned at an early stage.

TNX-Area Operable Unit (OU) Feasibility Study Scoping: Cliff Cole presented the discussion topics on the TNX-Area OU which included the location of TNX at the site, the unit organization chart, background operation history, the remedial action objectives for constituents of concern (COCs), and alternatives. The remedial units of the TNX-Area OU include the TNX Burying Ground, Old TNX Seepage Basin, New TNX Seepage Basin, TNX Vadose Zone and TNX groundwater. Mr. Cole explained that the TNX Area was formerly used as a pilot-scale testing/evaluation facility to support the SRS mission. An interim action of air stripping began in 1996 and 70 million gallons of solvent were treated and 60 pounds of solvent were removed. Since 1996, Mr. Cole said that the contaminant levels dropped significantly. Mr. Cole added that continued operations would reduce the trichloroethylene (TCE) to the maximum control limit (MCL) in the floodplain by 2006. In conclusion, Mr. Cole discussed operational histories, remedial action objectives and alternatives for each of the remedial units, and presented a summary of costs for each of the alternatives.

Issues: Determine if the plume underneath TNX is reaching the Savannah River; identify treatment actions underway now; identify the source of boron contamination; determine if institutional controls with monitoring will be required; and determine if a no action alternative would pose a hazard to people long after the site is closed.

Actions: Cliff Cole to provide Lee Poe with an explanation of what happens to the VOCs that are released through the stack. Develop a draft motion to be presented at the full Board meeting on May 25 to address the TNX-Area OU Feasibility Study Scoping. Ensure that the TNX presentation to the full Board on May 25 is reduced to just ten minutes; focus less on alternatives; provide more pictures; and introduce what TNX is doing now.

Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground (ORWBG) Focus Group Interim Status: Lee Poe, lead of the focus group provided a report on the history of the group which is comprised of members of the public, CAB, DOE and Site stakeholders and South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulators. Mr. Poe said that the group has been chartered by the ER&WM Subcommittee and CAB (through Recommendation No. 71) to evaluate risk from the ORWBG. The group's charter was expanded to review and comment also on CAB Recommendation No. 75. Mr. Poe's update included a brief discussion on the ORWBG Corrective Measures Study (CMS)/Feasibility Study (FS) and Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Permit draft motions.

Mr. Poe introduced Ed McNamee who provided briefings on the CMS/FS and the RCRA Permit, which contains four parts. Mr. McNamee explained that the RCRA comments must be provided to SCDHEC by May 27, 1999 and that the Environmental Restoration Division would also be reviewing the permit at the same time as the stakeholders. Mr. McNamee reminded the participants that the RCRA Permits states that once groundwater standards are selected the plume associated with the ORWBG area must be

"captured and treated to the groundwater protection standards" as the draft permit is currently written. All further discussion on the draft motions was deferred to the ORWBG Focus Group meeting, which will be held the next day, May 5, 1999 at the Aiken Federal Building in Aiken, SC.

Issues: None.

Actions: Identify authors of RCRA Permit and determine if they can attend the Focus Group Meeting on May 5, 1999.

Final Public Comments: None.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

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