



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Record

January 12, 1999
N. Augusta Community Center
North Augusta, S.C.

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on Tuesday, January 12, 1999, 6:30 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Department of Energy (DOE) responses to CAB Recommendations #58 and #70, receive a budget review, an update on National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) activity and receive public comment. Attendance at the meeting was as follows:

CAB Members

P.K. Smith
Wade Waters
Maria Reichmanis

Stakeholders

Lee Poe
Bob Overman
Mike French
Todd Crawford
Gail Jernigan
Jennifer Hughes, DHEC

DOE/Contractors

Jim Buice, DOE
Don Scott, DOE
Steve Baker, DOE
Gary Little, DOE
Virginia Kay, DOE
Joan Baum, DOE
Bill Rajczak, BSRI
Shelia McFalls, WSRC
Donna Martin, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC

P. K. Smith, Chairperson, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. She reviewed the agenda and then opened discussions on the DOE - Headquarters (HQ) response of CAB Recommendation #58, "Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure (ACPC)". Disappointment was expressed in the tardiness of the response time and the general vagueness of the answers from DOE-HQ.

Ms. Smith reviewed CAB statement #1 of CAB Recommendation #58 that expressed CAB disappointment that the documents were neither planning or budget documents. DOE-HQ disagreed with the statement that the document does not contain management commitments and linkages to the Federal Facility Agreements. The general subcommittee discussion of the DOE-HQ response to #1 was that it missed the mark. The intent of the public comment was that the ACPC should be a living document in which issues would be addressed and future decisions defined. It was felt that these were not done. It was mentioned by Jim Buice, DOE, that the Project Baseline Summaries (PBS) needed to be reviewed with the ACPC in order to get a clear picture. He stated that the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) requirements were addressed in the PBS's. Virginia Kay, DOE, mentioned that the integration of DOE complex activities was in its infancy. Since the ACPC had been published, there has been considerable effort generated on integrating complex wide activities.

Ms. Smith reviewed CAB statement #2 that stated that costs of facility Decontamination and Decommission (D&D) costs were not included in the ACPC. DOE-HQ responded that all D&D costs were not included in the ACPC because final end states for some facilities have not been determined. The subcommittee conclusion was that DOE-HQ should be developing end states so that D&D costs could be determined. Time frames for completion of end state development should be defined. There was concern that the credibility of the cost numbers in the ACPC was low because total costs were not included. Joan Baum, DOE, mentioned that the site was in the process of developing end states for facilities.

Ms. Smith reviewed CAB statement #3 that stated that the cost of landlord responsibility beyond 2028 should be included since the EM program costs to 2070 are considered. DOE-HQ responded that those costs were not included because responsibility for these wastes is expected to be transferred to a non-EM landlord program at that time. The subcommittee conclusion was that just because EM may not be the landlord beyond 2028, didn't mean that they were relieved of responsibility of management the site and determining total costs.

Ms. Smith reviewed CAB statement #4 that stated that with limited funding, there should be more emphasis on hazard containment/control and less on hazard removal/ elimination through out the DOE complex. It was observed that due to the long delay in receiving an answer from DOE-HQ, the group had some difficulty remembering exactly the meaning of their concern. It was stated that the emphasis should be on the total DOE picture, not just EM. It was stated that the public does not differentiate between the color of money. The scope of the ACPC should be broadened to include the total complex. If the strategy is not available now, then DOE-HQ should have stated that it would be addressed in future iterations.

Ms. Smith reviewed CAB statement #5 that stated that contingency costs should be developed for major "show-stoppers". DOE-HQ responded that contingency cost were not included because of the considerable amount of resources required. The general subcommittee discussion was that with as large a program as EM, it was unbelievable that there were no contingency plans. It was stated that it was assumed that a contingency plan was politically unacceptable because the cost would be too much. Mr. Buice stated that coming up in April and June, the ACPC would be updated with more realistic numbers.

Ms. Smith reviewed CAB statement #6 that said each facility, waste site, should have a description of the end state. DOE-HQ responded that in order to maintain a high-level view of the EM cleanup program, DOE-HQ had not included an end state description of each release site, waste site, and facility. The subcommittee discussed that if this document was a paths to closure, the public shouldn't be left sitting in the middle, end states should be determined.

It was observed that the public concern was with responses from DOE-HQ, not DOE-SR. There was a request to either have James Owendoff, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, or Martha Crosland, Acting Director for the EM Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability, come down to the site so that the public could express their concerns. It was felt that DOE-HQ was not listening to the public.

Ms. Smith opened the discussion on the DOE-SR response to CAB Recommendation #70, "Risks and Funding". DOE-SR stated that they are willing to work with the citizens to facilitate a clearer understanding of how the Site uses risk as factored into decision- making. The subcommittee comments were that DOE-SR has shown by experience that they are willing to work with the citizens in the budget process. Mr. Buice stated that with the fiscal year (FY) 2001 budget process and ACPC being developed around April, that DOE would work closely with the public to make sure there was an understanding of how the budget and ACPC were developed. Mr. Buice also pointed out that there were many more factors than just risk that needed to be considered. Ms. Kay stated that DOE would focus on disagreements between the Integrated Priority List (IPL) and public concerns. The subcommittee stated there were two areas of concern expressed. One was that money was being spent on inconsequential activities while important activities were being neglected. The other concern was that the prioritization process determined risk based on no funding for one year. It was felt that this process worked in some cases, but did not work in others.

Ms. Smith said if anyone had any comments on either of the recommendations they should forward them to her or Jim Moore. Comments should be submitted within a week. From the comments, a draft letter would be written and distributed for review.

Ms. Smith introduced Mr. Jim Buice for a budget review. Mr. Buice stated that he would review FY 1998 and 1999. He stated that since the last budget update, most of the scope was the same and there was just a slight change in the funding. FY 1998 actual spending was \$1.4 billion while FY 1999 is slated for \$1.5 billion. The Environmental Management (EM) budget for FY 1999 is \$1.3 billion. Backup data was reviewed which supported the total funding. Major scope accomplishments were reviewed for both FY 1998 and FY 1999. Some major scope accomplishments in FY 1998 were: regulatory requirements were fully met, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board commitments were met, tritium recycle requirements and new tritium source milestones were met, and the Spent Nuclear Fuel Receipt and management activities were provided. Major scope accomplishments were reviewed by program. In FY 1999, much of the same scope would be continued as well as project activities initiated for plutonium immobilization, MOX and Pit Disassembly and Conversion. When asked about FY 2000, Mr. Buice stated that the budget would remain about level through FY 2000. He stated that Congress would be releasing the FY 2000 budget around the first of February. There would be a budget "roll-out" probably at USC-Aiken and individuals would be notified when that event occurred. Lee Poe requested DOE-HQ supply copies of their presentation in advance of the meeting so that they would be able to read the numbers presented in the satellite telecast. Jim Buice said that DOE-SR would supply copies of their presentation and would attempt to get copies of the DOE-HQ presentation.

Ms. Smith introduced Donna Martin, WSRC, for a review of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) activities. Ms. Martin stated that NEPA was enacted in 1969. This law requires Federal agencies to prepare an environmental impact statement for any major federal action that may "significantly affect the quality of the human environment". Ms. Martin explained the difference between an Environmental Assessment (EA) and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). There are currently two EA's in progress at this time: Wetland Mitigation Bank Program and Repair of Pond B Dam. Ms. Martin reviewed the EIS process. A 1999 EIS timeline was reviewed showing the approximate time of the various states of the EIS process as well as the public comment period. Explanations of the various EIS's were also reviewed. Upcoming NEPA meetings are as follows:

High Level Waste Tank Closure scoping meetings:

Thursday, January 14 2:00 - 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
North Augusta Community Center
Tuesday, January 19 2:00 - 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn Coliseum, Columbia
Public scoping period ends February 12

SRS Spent Nuclear Fuel Draft EIS public meetings:

Thursday, January 28 1:00 - 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn Coliseum, Columbia
Tuesday, February 2 1:00 - 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 - 9:00 p.m.
North Augusta Community Center
Public comment period ends February 8

There were questions on which document was used to base the decision to produce tritium at the Tennessee Valley Authority's Watts Bar and Sequoyah. Ms. Martin stated that the Record of Decision (ROD) developed in 1995 was the basis for the decision. It was asked if a new EIS would be needed for the remaining High Level Waste (HLW) tank closures. Ms. Martin felt they would need new EIS's. When questioned, Ms. Martin stated that a Categorical Exclusion was used when there was an immediate action that could cause harm or an insignificant event. When asked about the status of the In Tank

Precipitation (ITP) EIS, Ms. Martin stated that it was currently in the Manager's office and she thought it would be available next month.

Ms. Smith asked for public comment. Mr. French stated that at the CAB meeting in Columbia that Mr. Heenan stated that future missions could be discussed. Mr. French wanted to know the status. Ms. Smith stated that the subject was not really discussed at the CAB retreat. She stated she would get an answer back to Mr. French.

Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting since there were no other comments.

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