



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Environmental Remediation & Waste Management Subcommittee**

#### **Meeting Record**

**October 7, 1997**

---

The CAB ER & WM subcommittee met on October 7, 1997 at the Aiken County Public Library in Aiken, SC. CAB members present included, CAB ER & WM subcommittee Co-chair Kathryn May and CAB member Karen Patterson. Todd Crawford, technical consultant to the CAB also attended. Attending from DOE-SR were Thomas Johnson, Tom Treger, Mike Simmons, Gary Little, and Gerri Flemming. Michael Moore attended from the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC). Attending from WSRC/BSRI/BNFI were Sonny Goldston, Mary Flora, Gerry Stejskal, Bob Aylward, Ken Rowland, Paul Huber, Phil Crowell, Bill Rajczak, and Anne Roe. Public attendees included Russ Messick, Mike French, Greg Peterson, Doug Moore, Peter Gray, and Patricia McCracken. Gerri Flemming attended as the Associate Designated Deputy Federal Official, ADDFO.

Kathryn May opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Thomas Johnson discussed the status of the Heavy Water Components Test Reactor (HWCTR) project. Mr Johnson explained that Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) had completed their review of the bids and had provided a recommendation to the Department of Energy - Savannah River (DOE-SR) regarding the subcontract award and corresponding site activities to dismantle HWCTR. The \$18.7 million forecasted for HWCTR dismantlement had included three years of field activities with the associated subcontractor direct costs, WSRC direct charges, and management and overhead costs. Mr. Johnson said that \$4.5M was available for HWCTR in fiscal year (FY)98 but that no funds were available for HWCTR in FY99. Therefore, DOE was directing WSRC not to award the subcontract for decommissioning HWCTR.

Mr. Johnson said there was a pending action to transfer the responsibility for clean-up of non-defense sites (including HWCTR) to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. He noted that the DOE would now direct WSRC to perform final stabilization actions at HWCTR and prepare the facility for long-term storage. In addition to these actions, the \$4.8 million available in FY98 would be used in part to install groundwater monitoring at the facility. Kathryn May asked Mr. Johnson to keep the Subcommittee informed. Ms. May noted that since years may pass before the final disposition is determined and new data or technologies may be available in the future that the HWCTR issue should be revisited by the CAB and the public.

Pete Gray gave a presentation to again make the case for entombment of HWCTR in the future. Mr. Gray discussed the costs for entombment of HWCTR in terms of a comparison he had made with the entombment cost estimates listed in Table 6 of the HWCTR Analysis of Removal Alternatives document and his own cost estimates.

Mr. Gray covered the individual estimates for each of the 20 tasks listed in Table 6 of the HWCTR Alternatives document with his own estimates. Mr. Gray's presentation included the difference between the HWCTR Alternatives document entombment estimates and his own estimates. Mr. Gray noted that he is not a cost engineer and some of his estimates may be low, although he believes many of the estimates contained within the HWCTR Alternatives document were excessive. Some of the major differences Mr. Gray discussed between the HWCTR Alternatives document entombment estimates and his own estimates were differences in the premises for the need for or extent of work required on individual tasks; as well as differences in cost.

A discussion of the cost differences followed. Mr. Johnson noted that SRS was required to meet requirements such as OSHA and other regulations which increased the cost of work done on-site. In summary, Mr. Gray said he favored entombment because it will cost less, result in lower worker radiation doses, contain radioactive waste better, and will be a good prototype for the production reactors.

Tom Treger gave a presentation on the SRS Results Management Team (RMT) which was established in 1995 to achieve the commitments which came out of "Breakthrough" meetings. Breakthrough meetings were held with DOE, WSRC, EPA and SCDHEC in 1995 to develop commitments which would accelerate remediation of the Site. Todd Crawford asked who were the members of the RMT. Mr. Treger explained the members were Tom Heenan and Cynthia Anderson from DOE, Camilla Warren from EPA, Ann Ragan from SCDHEC, and Dick Harbert from WSRC/BRSI. He noted that these commitments had been achieved and the RMT had also improved the overall interactions between agencies, supported the development of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Process Improvement Team (FPIT) and the FFA Implementation Plan (FIP). Mr. Treger explained that since the RMT's work was largely accomplished the path forward was to establish a "Core Team" from the three agencies to continue monitoring the ER program's performance and addressing obstacles as they develop. This Core Team will be made up of Keith Lindler and Keith Collinworth from SCDHEC, Camilla Warren and Jeff Crane from EPA, Cynthia Anderson and Brian Hennessey from DOE, and Chuck Spencer and Phil Crotwell from WSRC/BSRI. Lastly, Mr. Treger noted that the RMT had dealt with policy type issues and had delegated the details of work issues to the FFA Process Improvement Team. Mr. Treger said the issues the FPIT was working on were many of the same issues the CAB was interested in and by coordinating the Subcommittee and FPIT schedules, the two groups could support each other.

Bob Aylward gave a presentation on the the FFA Process Improvement Team (FPIT). Mr. Aylward explained the FPIT members included representatives from EPA, SCDHEC, DOE and WSRC who met monthly to work on standardizing protocols and improving FFA related work practices at the day-to-day working level. He said the team was originally formed to improve regulatory document quality by developing standard scoping protocols and templates for environmental documents. The standardized protocols are published in the FFA Implementation

Plan (FIP) after they are developed so that everyone working in the ER program can follow the same protocols. Mr. Aylward noted the FPIT's role had evolved to include identifying, prioritizing and resolving technical issues as they arise. As new issues are identified they are recorded on the FPIT Bin List. The Bin List contains a listing of needed actions/protocols to be worked by the principal team members (FPIT) or to be worked by technical personnel (Design Team) and approved by the FPIT.

Mr. Aylward covered the FPIT Bin List Schedule containing 16 items which the team is or will be working on. The first issue Mr. Aylward discussed was the Early Response Action Strategy. This is an effort to develop and define a clear strategy for identifying and then determining if an early clean-up action is possible at a unit. Todd Crawford asked if this strategy format was similar to a decision tree. Mr. Aylward said it was exactly like a decision tree and it allowed a path or process to be followed to determine if early action was warranted. Kathryn May requested a diagram be provided to explain the Early Response Action Strategy and Mr. Aylward said one would be provided when the topic was discussed in detail with the Subcommittee. Mr. Aylward also discussed the Groundwater Remediation Strategy, Ecological Risk Assessment Strategy, Deed Restrictions and Notifications and other items. Kathryn May asked if there was a priority ranking to the items included on the FPIT Bin List and a more detailed description of what the items included. Mr. Aylward said there was a listing of the items by their relative priority and he could provide the priority listing with a summary description of the items at the next Subcommittee meeting.

In summary, Mr. Aylward said as items on the Bin List are completed additional information would be provided to the subcommittee. He said the two highest priority items were the Early Response Action Strategy and the Groundwater Remediation Strategy.

Mike Simmons gave an update on the Savannah River Laboratory (SRL) Seepage Basins. Mr. Simmons said the joint agreement with DOE, EPA and SCDHEC and the support from the Subcommittee and Focus Group had resulted in a 50% reduction in the original schedule to clean up the SRL Seepage Basins. He said the radioactively contaminated vegetation had been cut down and placed in the basins until final disposition plans are determined. Mr. Simmons said the combined document which includes the Baseline Risk Assessment, Feasibility Study and the Proposed Plan is 55% complete and is due to be delivered to EPA and SCDHEC on December 3, 1997. Mr. Simmons said the remedial alternative for the SRL Seepage Basins has not been determined. Mr. Simmons said the next steps were to continue working on the document and to reconvene the focus group in late October or early November. Mr. Simmons asked what timing would suit the Subcommittee for reconvening the Focus Group and said he will work with them on the date.

Trish McCracken expressed concern during the public comment session that CERCLA was not followed for HWCTR. Kathryn May requested that information explaining the CERCLA process and HWCTR documents and drawings be sent to Ms. McCracken for her evaluation.

Kathryn May closed the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

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