



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee**

#### **Meeting Record**

**May 6, 1998**

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

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on May 6, 1998 at 6:00 p.m. at the North Augusta Community Center in North Augusta, S. C. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Emergency Preparedness Program. The members of the CAB in attendance were P. K. Smith, Kathryn May, Brendolyn Jenkins, Karen Patterson, Lola Richardson, and Bill Lawless. Mike Schoener attended as the CAB facilitator. Todd Crawford attended as the technical representative to the CAB. Gerri Flemming and Gary Little from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Jim Hardeman and Bill Slocumb attended as members of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Jeff Crane attended as a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Members of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control were Sandra Threatt, Thomas Brown, Ann Clark, Joy Powell, Michael Moore, Ronald Kinney, Myra Reece, and Jennifer Hughes. Members of other local and state emergency management agencies included: Burke County - Earl Porterfield, Georgia - Gary Gregory and Patrick Cochran, Barnwell County - John Angil, and South Carolina - Bob Duggleby. Members of the public included David Freshwater, Jim Pope, Murray Riley, Tim Jannik, Lynn Waishwell, Russ Messick, G. Devitt, Bill Gerken, Val Bergren, Mike French, Reed Hodgins, and Chris Bergren. Members of the DOE-SR were Len Sjoström, Amy Poston, Roger Rollins, Christina Edwards, Jerry Nelsen, Mike Simmons, Philip Prater, Garl Bultz, Brian Hennessey, and John Merrick. Members of Bechtel Savannah River, Inc. (BSRI) were Paul Huber, Cliff Cole, Bill Rajczak, and Howard Hickey. Members of the Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) were Steve Glover, Gerald Blount, Jim Lightener, Dennis Hadlock, M. Morgenstern, Gail Jernigan, Debra Foutch, Sam Formby, Doug Shull, John Glacke, Ron Malanowski, Ron Steve, Bob Weatherby, Allen Dancy, Bill Littrell, Elmer Wilhite, Helen Villasor, Jack Hammond, Bob Lorenz, Gerry Stejskal, Paul Sauerborn, Jim Moore and Ken Boucher.

P. K. Smith, Chairperson of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee, welcomed all those in attendance. Because of the large number of participants, Ms. Smith asked only the CAB members to stand up and identify themselves. Ms. Smith reviewed the agenda for the evening. The meeting was then opened for public comment. Craig McMullin, WSRC, with the Facility Decommissioning and Decontamination (FDD) Department, who is the over site manager of Duratek, stated that they were in the process of identifying new waste streams and would like to address the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittee during the July time frame. Bill Lawless, Co-Chairperson of the ER&WM Subcommittee agreed

that if Kathryn May, the other Co-Chairperson could work it out, that was fine. Ms. May agreed. There were no other public comments.

Before introducing the first speaker, Ms. Smith introduced the facilitator that would monitor the time for the RM&FU Subcommittee portion of the meeting. The facilitator, Mr. Mike Schoener, is the new CAB facilitator and is the president of MAS Consultants Inc. firm in Aiken. Ms. Smith stated that if the presentation on Emergency Preparedness could not be completed within the time allotted, there were two options. They were (1) move into the other room and finish the discussion or (2) meet at another time. Jim Hardeman stated that they had an appointment in the early morning and would have to leave early. They preferred to come back at another time. Ms. Smith then introduced the presenter on Emergency Preparedness, Mr. Len Sjostrom, DOE-SR.

Mr. Sjostrom stated that in the interest of time, he would like to summarize the first three items to allow more time to get to the forth item. The first item was the Annual Emergency Preparedness Exercise. Mr. Sjostrom stated that the lessons learned from the practice exercise on January 28 were applied to the February 25 exercise. Action plans were developed on the deficiencies. The evaluation teams stated that "SRS has an overall sound and mature Emergency Management Program." On item 2, the Courtesy Notifications, Mr. Sjostrom pointed out the three types of notifications: Regulatory, Emergency and Courtesy. Mr. Sjostrom stated that they keep the states informed of non-emergency and emergency events. He stated that they have had positive feedback from South Carolina and Georgia on recent non-emergency event notifications. The third item was Emergency Response Organization Pager Tests. Mr. Sjostrom indicated that in late 1997 there was a degradation in test response however, sufficient Emergency Response Organization (ERO) personnel were available to activate the Emergency Operations Center. Based on lessons learned and increased management attention, the current responses now meet expectations. He stated that on April 27, 1998, there was an actual "Alert" due to an hydrochloric acid spill at TNX. The ERO was activated within the one hour time frame required.

Mr. Sjostrom started the discussion on item 4, Emergency Preparedness: Technical Basis, by defining some terms. The terms were for the Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ), the Emergency Preparedness Hazards Assessment (EPHA) and the Ingestion Pathway Zone (IPZ). Mr. Sjostrom gave a brief history perspective of the activity at the SRS. He stated that in 1996, SRS hazards no longer supported EPZ's beyond the site boundary. He stated there were ongoing discussions with South Carolina and Georgia regarding changes in the SRS Emergency Preparedness Technical Basis. Mr. Sjostrom stated that most issues were resolved but there were still three noteworthy issues. They were (1) Analysis of waterborne releases and ingestion pathway projections, (2) Coverage of security incidents by EPHAs, and (3) Impacts of the DOE Emergency Classification System on South Carolina and Georgia responses.

In reference to the waterborne releases and ingestion pathway projections, Mr. Sjostrom stated that SRS remains committed to providing information to the states needed for timely recommendation to affected counties. He said they would continue to evaluate the need for additional information and analysis to support SRS, South Carolina and Georgia emergency preparedness. In addition, he stated they would maintain the existing SRS 50 mile ingestion pathway zone and the program for notification of South Carolina and Georgia environmental health agencies and down stream water treatment plants and industry.

In reference to the security incidents, Mr. Sjostrom stated that EPHAs should encompass security incidents. The current issue is whether the EPHAs need further validation of coverage of security incidents. He stated the path forward will be to maintain existing EPZs, while expanding discussions of EPHAs pending satisfactory disposition of issues. He stated they would revise SRS documentation and analysis to improve emergency preparedness and communications between SRS, South Carolina and Georgia, and continue discussions.

In reference to the DOE Emergency Classification System, Mr. Sjostrom stated that the current Emergency Classification System can sometimes imply overly severe off site consequences. This could result in overly conservative responses by off site authorities under some circumstances. Mr. Sjostrom stated that the path forward would be to work with South Carolina, Georgia and local authorities to develop emergency notification procedures to clearly define the severity of off site consequences and appropriate response actions.

Mr. Sjostrom introduced Mr. Jim Hardeman who is manager of the Environmental Radiation Program in the Environmental Protection Division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Hardeman stated that he had two missions. They were monitor radiation material and analyze incidents and report to the Governors office or the Emergency Response Management Department. Mr. Hardeman stated that he was going to come to the meeting with a sixteen page presentation about why he felt strongly about the waterborne releases and ingestion pathway projections, but felt that his staff and DOE at SRS were closer to being on tract to resolving the issues. He stated that SRS is a complex place. They had looked at over 21 EPHA documents and 700 different accident scenarios. He said there were a diverse range of activities and a wide range of chemical and radiation hazards. He stated if there was an accident tonight that he had no doubt they would be able to respond to the incident. He said that however, there is a lot of bureaucracy which causes barriers that keep us from working as a team. Mr. Hardeman felt that it was more prudent to look at scenarios ahead of time than wait until 2:00 a.m. Sunday morning. He stated that in December 1991 there was a liquid release so we know incidents can happen. He felt the benefit of building the scenarios was that it would help in team building and aid all of us in decision making. Mr. Hardeman presented a slide showing the EPZs which was the same slide that Mr. Sjostrom reviewed earlier. Mr. Hardeman pointed out one of the EPZs which included Plant Vogtle. He stated that Georgia piggy backed the Plant Vogtle zones onto the SRS EPZ. Mr. Hardeman stated that he saw no tangible benefit to reduce the EPZs at SRS.

Mr. Sjostrom had earlier introduced Ms. Sandra Threatt with the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC). Ms. Threatt stated that her job was comparable to Mr. Hardemans. She was responsible for providing the Governors office of South Carolina with prompt action plans involving incidents. Ms. Threatt stated that her goals were to improve avenues of communication between South Carolina, Georgia and SRS while increasing the awareness of the public concerning perceived threats. She stated that their department had reviewed over 400 incident scenarios for EPHAs. Mr. Thomas Brown, SCDHEC, gave a review of the SCDHEC process for technical review of the scenarios. It was pointed out that in modeling the data using SRS HOTSPOT and the SCDHEC Rascal 2.1 and Rascal 2.2, that there was no significant difference in the results.

At the end of the presentations, there were several questions. It was asked, what can the CAB do tonight to help resolve the issues. Mr. Hardeman stated that a couple weeks ago they seemed to be at loggerheads but now they seemed to be on the right track. He felt that the role of the CAB would be to continue to monitor the situation. Mr. Hardeman stated that there could not be much involvement due to the political situation. In response to the question, "What kind of assurance can you give us that if an incident did occur that Georgia, South Carolina and SRS would work together to resolve the incident?" Mr. Sjostrom stated that there were policies and programs in place and that we have already demonstrated that we can work together and resolve incidents. Mr. Hardeman stated that they all have the same common goal. He stated that in a real emergency response, the us versus them concept evaporates. When asked why SRS would want to get rid of the 10 mile zones and keep the 50 mile zones, Mr. Sjostrom stated that mainly it was a matter of having the resources; dollars, time and people. When asked about the scenarios, Mr. Sjostrom stated that the vulnerability assessments address security scenarios rather than operational or natural phenomenon incidents. They are way out scenarios and many have been classified. The consequence value is not intended to be used for emergency planning. They have been requested to change assumptions to include more realism so the scenarios can be used. When asked if they were linked, Mr. Hardeman stated that no they weren't. He stated that there was a wide band between the EPHAs and the extreme security scenarios. Mr. Hardeman stated that they would like SRS to consider more moderate vulnerability scenarios. Mr. Sjostrom stated that he agreed with Mr. Hardeman and Ms. Threatt that they needed to continue to work together. He stated that SRS did not want to take any action unless Georgia and South Carolina were comfortable. Someone stated that they had an uncomfortable feeling about the differences between Georgia, South Carolina and SRS. It was stated that while they were uncomfortable that the issues did seem mild and fixable. It was asked if the three could come back to the CAB Subcommittee by the end of the next 3 months and report that the issues have been resolved. Mr. Sjostrom stated that they could not have the issues resolved within the next 3 months because there was additional analysis required. Mr. Lawless asked Mr. Sjostrom, Mr. Hardeman and Ms. Threatt to see if they could adjourn to another room and let the CAB Subcommittee know the timing that the issues could be resolved.

At this time, P. K. Smith adjourned the CAB RM&FU Subcommittee. Mr. Lawless proceeded to start the ER&WM Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Sjostrom, Mr. Hardeman and Ms. Threatt adjourned to discuss timing of resolution of the issues.

Mr. Sjostrom, Mr. Hardeman and Ms. Threatt responded later that they agreed unanimously that they could not predict a completion date for resolution of the issues. They agreed to come back to a RM&FU Subcommittee meeting in September to give an update.

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