



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Waste Management Committee**

#### **Meeting Summary**

March 11, 2002  
Aiken Federal Building  
Aiken, SC

---

The Waste Management Committee (WMC) met at the Aiken Federal Building on March 11, 2002. Attendance was as follows:

#### **CAB Members**

Wade Waters\*  
Bill Willoughby\*  
Perry Holcomb\*  
Gerald Devitt\*  
Murray Riley  
William Lawrence\*  
Jean Sulc

#### **Stakeholders**

Rick McLeod, CAB Technical Adv.  
John Meyers  
Jim Pope  
Russ Messick  
Karen Patterson  
Doug Leader  
Lee Poe  
Mike French  
Richard Herold  
Brandon Haddock  
Bill Lawless  
Bill McDonell

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Ray Hannah, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE  
Howard Pope, DOE  
Tom Gutman, DOE  
Peter Hudson, BSRI  
Marshall Looper, WSRC  
Steve Pye, WSRC  
John Pierpoint, WSRC  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Susan Cathey, WSRC  
Kelly Way, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Helen Villasor, WSRC

\*Denotes members of the Waste Management Committee.

Bill Willoughby, Waste Management Committee Chair, opened the meeting promptly at 7:35 p.m. and welcomed the attendees. Mr. Willoughby asked those who arrived after the Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF) Focus Group meeting to introduce themselves. Before introducing Teresa Haas, Mr. Willoughby asked for public comments.

#### **Public Comment**

Lee Poe said that at the CAB Combined Meeting on February 26, 2002 at the Partridge Inn he listened to the discussions on how DOE could capitalize on the \$800M Cleanup Reform Appropriation, what is taking place in the process, what the schedule is, and as a result, he reached three conclusions. The first is that it is useless to discuss five percent of the budget unless the base budget has been established; second, the budget currently will allow only 100 canisters to be produced at the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) instead of the 250 scheduled canisters; and third, there will be no funding to ship any transuranic (TRU) waste from SRS. Mr. Poe also added that the budget for Environmental Restoration at SRS is down by 30 to 40 percent. Based on this information, Mr. Poe said that if presentations were going

to be made this evening, DOE was not being fair to its stakeholders. Mr. Poe emphasized how strongly he felt about asking stakeholders to make comments when they do not have the information they need. Mr. Poe said that it was absolutely necessary to know the base budget for 2003 and added that since the Hanford site had already received \$433M, it was his opinion that the entire exercise was useless.

### **Update on Cleanup Reform Appropriations Proposal Initiatives Opening Comments**

Teresa Haas provided opening comments on the Proposal Initiatives by saying that the brief presentations would focus on how the CAB input from the February 26, 2002 CAB Combined Committee meeting was used. Ms. Haas emphasized the importance of the stakeholder input that was provided on the initiatives and thanked those who had participated in the February 26 meeting. Ms. Haas added that DOE-SR and WSRC greatly appreciated the helpful comments. Ms. Haas explained that representatives from both the Solid Waste and High Level Waste Divisions were present to discuss implementation of the comments and that other meetings were being scheduled to address additional initiatives pertaining to Nuclear Materials and Environmental Restoration.

Ms. Haas also explained that while the February 26 meeting was just the first opportunity for stakeholder participation in the initiatives, there would be other opportunities for the public and the CAB to work on additional initiatives as they are being developed. However, Ms. Haas said it was important to note that the first occasion had been time critical because the initial proposal initiatives were being developed in parallel with the congressional appropriations schedule.

### **Solid Waste Cleanup Reform Appropriations Proposal**

Peter Hudson provided an overhead slide with the stakeholder comments that were made in relation to the initiatives developed by the Solid Waste Division (SWD). For the first SWD initiative, which is to expedite TRU waste shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), Mr. Hudson said that for the seven comments made by the stakeholders, each one had been included in the proposal. The stakeholder comments are as follows:

- Send TRU waste to WIPP and out of South Carolina
- Restore base funding
- Accelerate Ship to WIPP Program
- Consider further enhancement to HANDSS-55 facility as currently planned
- Acquire new assay equipment
- Send TRUPACT II to SRS as soon as possible to get TRU to WIPP (SRS should be a high priority)
- Push reduction in time dictated for shipping model

In response to several questions regarding this initiative, Mr. Hudson said that while there have been some delays on the HANDSS-55 facility, they are recoverable. Mr. Hudson also noted that funding for HANDSS-55 is coming from EM-50. When Bill Lawless asked if this funding was being considered in the baseline, Mr. Hudson said that it was not. Mr. Hudson explained that the budget is not yet fixed; however, it is important to remember that the initiative is basically directed toward reducing risk at SRS.

Mr. Hudson then discussed the second Solid Waste initiative, which is cost effective/risk reducing alternatives to incineration of PUREX waste. For example, Mr. Hudson said the CAB input suggested that stabilizing and burying PUREX is not as good as an alternative as CIF; it may cost more over the long term; the current proposal does not include long-term surveillance and maintenance costs; and CIF is permanent. In the action/response to the CAB's input from the Solid Waste Division, Mr. Hudson said that stabilization is less expensive than CIF and it adequately protects the environment. The CAB's concern over the viability of the alternative has been addressed by securing South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC's) agreement that CIF can be retained as a standby and will not be "closed" until ten percent of the organic PUREX has been successfully treated.

In response to the second CAB comment that alternatives to incineration which are effective, safe and cost effective should be considered, Mr. Hudson said that SWD agreed and it was included in the proposal.

In closing, Mr. Hudson discussed other CAB comments that were captured at the February 26 meeting. They included retrofitting CIF to handle higher concentrations and less dilution to burn faster, and also to consider restarting CIF. Mr. Hudson said that both comments were included in the assessment of the alternatives.

### **High Level Waste Cleanup Reform Appropriations Proposal**

Susan Cathey, High Level Waste (HLW) Program Manager, updated the group on the proposals for the HLW program outlined at the February 26 meeting in Augusta.

The first general topic discussed was "Expedite HLW Sludge and Salt Processing". Ms. Cathey presented the items and the HLW responses as follows:

<b>CAB Input</b>	<b>Action/Response</b>
1. Get on with low curie salt processing.	Included in Proposal
2. Low curie salt to grout is good.	Included in Proposal
3. Accelerate waste removal.	Included in Proposal
4. DWPF can production should be maximized.	Included in Proposal
5. DWPF can base should be 250 not 100.	250 can production rate is included in proposal - however it was not included in the base budget, which was previously sent to Congress.
6. Getting rid of waste in old style tanks should be highest priority.	Waste from Old Style tanks are removed as soon as possible in the proposal.
7. Integrating salt and sludge processing is good and important. These initiatives should not be separated.	Included in Proposal
8. The redefinition of key radionuclides in DOE Order 435.1 will be important and will help salt processing. Provides relief from Intruder analysis.	Included in Proposal
9. Consider if there is anything else that you could do to expedite salt and sludge processing?	No other items could be developed, however we will continue to incorporate new ideas as the program progresses.
10. New Salt Processing contractor/facility will require interface between WSRC, DOE and ???. Concern on adequate funding.	The interface will be monitored when the new contractor is on board.
11. Takes too long to get contract written and construction done, i.e. procedures and procurements.	Efforts will continue to make contracts more timely.
12. Evaluate processing of Solid Waste (CIF) waste streams in Saltstone	As streams become more defined they will be evaluated for inclusion in Saltstone.

Bill Lawless asked about item #5 as it relates to closing tanks and the budget. Ms. Cathey indicated that, at this time, funding has not been determined. Ms. Cathey is proposing to produce 250 cans a year, but this number was not included in the base budget.

Mr. McDonnell asked about the tank closure costs. Ms. Cathey answered that it costs between \$18-20M to empty and close a tank. Ms. Cathey said that what SRS will be able to do will depend on the amount of the \$1.1B that will be allotted to the site.

Ms. Cathey then moved to the second topic "Expedite Tank Closure and Processing Facility Closure". The results to date are as follows:

<b>CAB Input</b>	<b>Action/Response</b>
13. Getting rid of waste in Tanks should be highest priority.	Included in Proposal
14. Goal should be to close tanks and get on with it.	Included in Proposal
15. "Batching" closure of a number of tanks together makes sense (it's ok to leave empty tanks waiting for closure).	Included in Proposal
16. Think about closing F-Tanks first.	Included in Proposal
17. Determine the extent and nature of contamination in tanks and tank annuli.	Included in Proposal
18. Consider a Corrosion Protection Mechanism.	Corrosion Protection is always evaluated prior to any processing.
19. Consider when liquids should be added to the tanks when waste is removed to determine Tank condition above liquid level.	Once waste is removed, the tank condition is not important unless it is slated for re-use. Any tanks that are slated for re-use will be evaluated.
20. Consider other closure techniques within the bounds of the current EIS.	Closures techniques will be developed that stay within the bounds of the current EIS.
21. Consider grouting of annuli.	Grouting of annuli will be considered as a closure technique.
22. Evaluate future re-use of tanks (e.g. MOX)	Tank conditions are routinely evaluated.
23. Small tank for MOX waste vs. continuing to use existing tanks (acid stream)	The Proposal includes the evaluation of a number of options that could be developed to handle future processing of excess materials and waste.

### **Waste Management Recommendation Review**

Bill Willoughby provided a review of open and pending CAB recommendations pertaining to Waste Management that was conducted with Kelly Way and Helen Villasor on February 5, 2002. Based on the definitions of the status of recommendations, Mr. Willoughby presented information on CAB recommendations pertaining to the Solid Waste Program as follows:

- Close CAB Recommendations 103, 119 and 129.
- Keep CAB Recommendation 27 open.
- Keep CAB Recommendation 126 pending.

CAB Recommendations pertaining to High Level Waste Program as follows:

- Close CAB Recommendations 12, 14, 15, 43, 51, 69, 95, 137.
- Keep CAB Recommendations 13 and 138 open.
- Keep CAB Recommendations 105, 135 pending.

Mr. Willoughby asked the attendees to review the data sheets and provide any comments on the suggested changes to Helen Villasor before the April 23, 2002 CAB meeting.

Before closing the meeting, Mr. Willoughby thanked everyone for coming and especially for his or her endurance. Mr. Willoughby said while it was a long evening of meetings, a lot of work had been accomplished and he appreciated everyone's full support.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

Bill Willoughby adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

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