



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Record

April 21, 1998

N. Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S.C.

The Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met on April 21, 1998, at 6:30 p.m. at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S.C. The topics discussed were the SRS budget review and the RM&FU Subcommittee draft recommendation on the Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure (ACP). P. K. Smith attended as a member of the CAB. Todd Crawford attended as the technical representative to the CAB. Members of the public in attendance were: Mike French, Bill Gerken, Bill McDonell, Sam Booher, Laurie Booher, and Murray Riley. Kim Newell attended as a representative of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC). Gary Little of the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Members of DOE-SR in attendance were: Jim Buice, Don Scott and Steve Baker. Members of the Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) were: Matt Zimmerman and Jim Moore.

P. K. Smith, Chairperson, welcomed all those in attendance, reviewed the evenings agenda and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. P. K. Smith asked if there was any public comments and Sam Booher requested to speak.

Mr. Booher was concerned about the habitation at the sites when they close down. He was concerned with what would happen to the wildlife habitat on the site in the future; that this issue was not addressed in the Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure (ACP), and had not been raised and brought to the public. He was concerned about both the endangered and threatened species designated federally and by the states. It was later proposed that this item be added to the draft CAB recommendation.

Mr. Booher was also concerned about the name change from Buffer Zones to Industrial Support Zones in the Future use Plan. He said this change allows for warehouses, administration and storage buildings to be built in the old Buffer Zones as opposed to only the Industrial Zones. Mr. Crawford asked about the status of the Future Use Plan. Jim Moore stated that it had been sent to DOE-HQ for comment.

Mr. Booher was concerned about the lack of public participation in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Wetland Mitigation. He was concerned that this MOA was approved by the Site Operations Manager as well as other agencies and sent to DOE-HQ without public input. DOE-HQ has since sent the MOA back to the site requesting that it go through the

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Mr. Booher had a meeting with several site representatives and Dr. Jack Mayer on this subject. Mr. Booher requested that the RM&FU Subcommittee make a recommendation to the CAB on support for Dr. Mayer's initiative to modify the MOA to exclude the Industrial Support Zones and only allow building in the Industrial Zones. Mr. Booher was also concerned that the program being written to restore 16 bays was going to be very costly and lengthy when he felt that the only action needed was to plug the dikes and the bays would fill in naturally. There was no other public comment.

P. K. Smith introduced Mr. Jim Buice, DOE-SR, who gave a budget review. Mr. Buice stated that the fiscal year (FY) 1998 budget was \$1,406M and the FY 1999 budget was \$1,490M, a difference of \$84M. When asked, Mr. Buice stated that he did not foresee any acceleration of programs from FY 1999 to FY 1998. He stated that the FY 1999 budget fully complies with regulatory requirements, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board commitments, tritium recycle requirements, new tritium source milestones, Spent Nuclear Fuel Receipts, commitment of shipments of Transuranic (TRU) waste to WIPP for disposal and sustains essential infrastructure and support activities. Mr. Buice stated that there was \$33M contingency in the FY 1999 budget for modifications to the In-Tank Precipitation (ITP) facility. When asked if the disposition of waste generated from new missions was included in the budget, such as MOX fuel, Mr. Buice stated that it was not. He stated that if a new mission is proposed for SRS, there is a group managed by Mr. Maher that looks into the impacts of that new mission. It was stated that there was concern about TRU waste from the stand point of (1) ability of WIPP to meet the schedule of receiving waste, (2) length of time that it will take TRU waste to be disposed of, and (3) concern about unresolved problems related to shipping all the TRU waste for disposal. Mr. Buice and Mr. Zimmerman stated that the ACP pointed out the time period on disposal of waste and that SRS could only rely on the current schedule as published by DOE-HQ on the shipment of TRU waste from SRS to WIPP. Mr. Moore stated that anyone interested should attend the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittee meeting on April 27 where TRU waste would be discussed.

Mr. Buice handed out the Integrated Priority List that was being forwarded to DOE-HQ for FY 2000. He stated that the target for FY 2000 was \$1,170M which is \$267M short of total SRS requirements. When asked, Mr. Buice stated that a review of manpower impacts had not been reviewed at this time.

P. K. Smith stated that Todd Crawford had written a draft CAB recommendation on the ACP that would be reviewed first and then the specific comments on the public comment matrix would be reviewed to see if anything else needed to be added. Mr. Crawford stated that he spent most of his time reviewing the SRS ACP and very little time on the National ACP.

Comments on the individual items are as follows.

Comments - General

Item 1. It was suggested this item be re-written to state that since the ACP says it is not a plan and not a budget document, that it should state that they are at least management commitments.

It was also noted that the cover letter should include a thank you to DOE and WSRC for all the work and the big improvement on this ACP from the last draft.

Item 2. It was suggested that this be re-written to state that the ACP includes facility deactivation but does not include facility decontamination and decommissioning.

Item 3 and 4. No change.

Item 5. Agreed to keep this item in but suggested that "Credible" be added as a first word and that the specific references in the second sentence be indicated as examples. It was also suggested that this may be the subject for another meeting where some direction is given by the Subcommittee on how contingency plans could be added to the ACP with some logic and limitation.

Item 6. No change.

Item 7. Change the first sentence to show that the documents appear to just consider legacy wastes.

Item 8 and 9. No change.

It was suggested that an additional item be added concerning Sam Boohers concern on the lack of reference in the National and the Site ACP on the ecological habitats and threatened or endangered species and protection of the site after they are closed.

Comments - Specific

Item 1 through 4. No change.

The comments included in the public matrix were reviewed and no additional items were added to the recommendation.

P. K. Smith stated that once Todd Crawford has incorporated all the comments into the draft CAB recommendation, she would write a cover letter to be sent to DOE-HQ by May 1. The letter would state that these are the CAB RM&FU Subcommittee comments and that a formal recommendation would be sent after being reviewed and approved by the full CAB at their May 19th meeting.

P. K. Smith asked if there were any other public comments. Since there were none, the meeting was adjourned.

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