



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Old Rad Waste Burial Ground Focus Group

Meeting Record

December 8, 1998
N. Augusta Community Center
North Augusta, S.C.

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Environmental Remediation and Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittee Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground (ORWBG) Focus Group met on December 8, 1998, at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S. C after the completion of the normal ER&WM Subcommittee meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to determine a date for the next meeting. Also a concept of how to form the scope, given the extent and complexity of the burial ground issues, was presented as a strawman for our group to consider individually in preparation for determining the scope of the review at the next meeting. At the next meeting, the purpose will be to reach a consensus on what the group would accomplish over the next year. Attendance was as follows:

<u>CAB Members</u>	<u>Stakeholders</u>	<u>DOE/Contractors</u>
Karen Patterson	Lee Poe	Gerri Flemming, (ADDFO)
Bill Lawless	Bill McDonell	Phillip Prater, DOE
Kathryn May	Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC	Mike Griffith, DOE
Wade Waters	Jeff Crane, EPA	Ed McNamee, WSRC
	Todd Crawford	Don Toddings, WSRC
	Ken Feely, EPA	Mary Flora
	William Willoughby II	Elmer Wilhite, WSRC
	Keehna Frasier, SCDHEC	Jim Moore, WSRC

Karen Patterson, ORWBG Focus Group Administrative Lead, stated that the purpose of the meeting was to determine a date for the next meeting as well as give some thought as to the purpose and scope to be determined at the next meeting. Ms. Patterson emphasized that the Focus Group should have the benefit of looking at the big picture which meant looking at the groundwater as well as the interim action on the surface unit being considered. Ms. Patterson asked Lee Poe, Technical Lead, to express his thoughts on the focus of the group.

Mr. Poe stated that he felt the Focus Group should look at the burial grounds both strategically and holistically. He felt the first question that should be asked is what happens if nothing additional is done. What is the consequence? Mr. Poe presented an example of a model that could be used or modified to address that question. The model divided time into three sections and addressed specific factors. The model is as follows:

With present Burial Ground Conditions:

<u>Factors:</u>	<u>Present:</u>	<u>100 years:</u>	<u>500 years:</u>
-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------------

Type Control:	Institutional Control	Limited Control	None
Consequence (To Whom)	Off Site GW @ Seep Line Savannah River	Ground Water Four Mile Branch Savannah River Aquifer	CAB Members
Inhabitants:	None	Limited Intruder	Intruder
Constituents of Concern:	----(Defined as those causing health consequences)----		
Uncertainty:	----(Document levels of uncertainty)----		
Determine Mitigation: (What should be done to lower the risk to acceptable limits?)	---- (Determine mitigation where health consequences are determined)----		
Cost of Mitigation:	---- (As mitigation is determined, document the cost)----		

Mr. Poe stated that the objective of the Focus Group should be to show scientifically what needs to be done at the burial grounds and what the costs might be. What is the real risk and the cost to mitigate that risk? The effort should reflect an understanding of the regulatory requirements, the groundwater quality, the general consequence to the population and yet be attainable. The study will show timing of improvements to groundwater quality. The Focus Group will need good support from the site such as geo-chemists and transport experts.

In the discussions, Jeff Crane stated that there is considerable uncertainty in evaluating the data. He said the group would have to make assumptions related to the type/amount of material buried. He cautioned against sampling or digging out the material. Bill McDonell and Mr. Poe agreed that characterization would be a best SWAG based on historical records. It was stated that the uncertainty should also be noted and recorded. Shelly Sherritt questioned the consequences to the Savannah River and Four Mile Branch. She asked if contamination would be considered from only the burial ground source or other contributors. This raised the question of how broad a view should be considered. Ms. Sherritt stated that if there is risk from other sources and the burial grounds tipped the scales, then that would be important. William Willoughby II stated that in the Broad River, the natural water exceeded the drinking standards on occasion. Todd Crawford asked if that meant they would be considering the F&H Groundwater Plume as well as others. Mr. Crane asked if additional data would be required. Mr. Poe stated that no, in order to meet the schedule of completion within nine months, they would need to use the data that are available and not do additional characterization of the burial ground.

Dr. McDonell asked what group would do the technical analysis. Mr. Poe stated the technical people at the site would be used. Elmer Wilhite stated that there are enough data available to draw conclusions and move ahead.

Mike Griffith suggested that the site be allowed to go through the Feasibility Study with the Focus Group showing the scenarios and answering questions. Dr. McDonell asked if the scenario of not doing anything was used. Mr. Griffith said it is being determined. Mr. Poe expressed concern that the information in the Feasibility Study is not what the citizens are looking for. Dr. McDonell and Mr. Poe stated that they have yet to hear about any real risk to real people under any timeframe. Mr. Prater stated that the burial ground had been around a long time and there is some nasty stuff buried there. While the groundwater plume moves slowly, it is important to know what will happen later, especially if institutional controls are surrendered.

Mr. Prater suggested that the Focus Group should understand the process and see what is driving the key values. He suggested the Site be allowed to bring the process to the Focus Group so they could see how it was assembled. The Focus Group could let the Site know what they missed. It could be examined from another angle. Mr. Prater stated that they would bring graphs of the groundwater and surface unit pathways for the Focus Group to review. Once again, Dr. McDonell asked if the process looked at the consequence to people from a 'no action' case. Mr. Prater stated that this 'no action' analysis had been

done and it is a part of the information he would bring to the Focus Group for information. Mr. Poe proposed that the Savannah River Site (SRS) present the Feasibility Study at the next meeting. Mr. Poe stated that he would like the presentation to address the discussions they were having at this meeting, i.e., Is there a real risk or not? If there is a real risk, what should be done to mitigate it? What is the real risk if nothing is done?

Ms. Patterson, after discussion, proposed the following meeting schedule:

January 4 5:00 p.m. Location: Aiken Federal Building, Aiken

- Determine Goals, Objectives and Scope of the ORWBG Focus Group

January 11 1:00 p.m. Location: Burial Ground at SRS

- Review of Feasibility Study with emphasis on real risk and mitigation
- Note: This date is tentative until coordination of schedules.

Copies of the Focus Group members and minutes from the November 10 meeting were distributed.

Ms. Patterson adjourned the meeting.

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