



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Record

August 19, 1998

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

The Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on August 19, 1998 at 6:00 p.m., North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S. C. The purpose of the meeting was to receive a budget review, an update on the Comprehensive Plan and a review of items of interest for SRS on the National Environmental Policy Act. Members of the CAB attending were P. K. Smith and Wade Waters. Other members of the public attending were Mike French, Lee Poe, Dave Christensen, Carl Mazzola, Murray Riley and Todd Crawford. Gerri Flemming from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations (DOE-SR) attended as the Federal Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Jennifer Hughes attended as a representative of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. Steve Stine attended as a representative of the USDA Forest Service. Members of DOE-SR attending were Jim Buice, Steve Baker, Jerry Nelsen and Chuck Borup. Members of Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) were Chris Noah, Gail Jernigan, Mike Nelson and Jim Moore.

P. K. Smith, Chairperson, welcomed all those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith reviewed the agenda for the evening and then introduced the first speaker, Jim Buice, DOE-SR.

Mr. Buice stated that the purpose of this budget review was to update the subcommittee on the fiscal year (FY) 1998, 1999 and 2000 budget as well as show the magnitude of the budget, the trending and work that will get completed. The review gave a budget summary and details by project. Mr. Buice stated that the FY 1999 budget went to Congress in February 1998. He expects the appropriation bill to be signed when Congress comes back into session in September. The FY 2000 budget was submitted to DOE-HQ in the spring of 1998. Mr. Buice stated that the FY 1999 and 2000 budget was a project approach. The budget is divided into Post 2006 Completion projects and Site/Project Completion projects. Funding can be adjusted between projects in each group, but not between the two groups. For the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) and Commercial Light Water Reactor (CLWR) there is a place holder in the budget of \$157 million (M). If the decision is to use the CLWR, then \$35M is projected for SRS. The \$35M would be designated for the Tritium Extraction Facility. If the decision is to use APT, then \$74M is slated for SRS. More funding will be needed for SRS if the APT decision is selected.

Mr. Buice reviewed the Line Item Construction Projects. He stated that capital and operating dollars can not be moved from one to the other. On specific items, APT was not funded FY 2000. Total In-Tank Precipitation (ITP) costs are not funded. The Americium/Curium (Am/Cm) stabilization is not funded.

Mr. Buice reviewed major accomplishments for FY 1998 by program. Some examples are:
Environmental Restoration:

- Met all 119 enforceable regulatory milestones on or ahead of schedule.
- Over half (244) of the current 477 waste sites are complete or in the remediation phase.

Solid Waste:

- Retrieved 3,200 transuranic (TRU) waste drums from earth buried storage
- Vented over 3,000 TRU waste drums into safe conditions
- Met all waste stream commitments identified in the Site Treatment Plan
- Reduced SR hazardous legacy waste by 35%

High Level Waste:

- Complete Tank 29 waste removal on 6/30/98
- Poured 220 sludge-only canisters at the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) as of 8/13/98
- Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF) burned 953,152 pounds of waste as of 8/13/98 of which 60% was radioactive

Nuclear Materials and Facility Stabilization:

- Repackaged 100% of existing plutonium (Pu) metal in FB Line vault through the bagless transfer system
- Complete stabilization of Taiwan Research Reactor Fuel
- Stabilized 7% of SRS Spent Nuclear Fuel

Spent Nuclear Fuel:

- Received 2 shipments of Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel for interim storage at Receiving Basin for Offsite Fuels (RBOF) and L Basin

Defense Programs:

- Completed construction of loading line 6 and began loading of ACORN reservoirs
- Worked off the backlog of reservoir surveillance testing resulting from the shutdown of Mound operations

Mr. Buice reviewed major work highlights for FY 1999 and FY 2000. He also reviewed unfunded requirements for FY 2000. While the funding target for FY 2000 is \$1,423M, there is

an additional funding requirement of \$281M above target. Some specific activities that are unfunded in FY 2000 are operation of F-Canyon and FB-Line, Am/Cm vitrification, Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) and Salt processing technical upgrades (ITP alternative).

The unfunded activities have corporate crosscutting impacts as follows:

- Inability to operate F-Canyon and FB-Line impacts ability to dissolve and purify Rocky Flats scrub alloy and Pu baring fluorides and convert these into metals for interim storage
- Inability to fund K-Area storage upgrades will impact ability to receive Rocky Flats Pu in the near term
- Inability to fund APSF (vault) could impact downstream ability for SR to receive and store materials from others, e.g., Richland.

Mr. Buice stated that the following actions and additional funding requests were forwarded to DOE-HQ for FY 2000:

- Assume no pension contribution requirement until FY 2001
 - Restores F-Canyon operations (\$30M)
- Assume additional efficiencies
 - Restores Am/Cm vitrification effort (\$14M)
- Additional funding needed:
 - APSF vault (\$47M)
 - Spent fuel alternative technology (\$4M)
 - Spent fuel transfer and storage service (\$17M)
 - K-Area Pu storage (\$26M) Salt processing upgrades (\$26M)

Discussions from Mr. Buice's presentation resulted in the following action items:

- Copies of the presentation on Am/Cm given on February 6, 1998 is to be forwarded to participants. Concern was raised that Am/Cm problem was a budget issue, not a technical issue. The February 6 presentation addressed the issue and identified it as a technical issue. Presentation is attached.
- On September 15, at the next meeting, a presentation is to be made on the additional funding items needed for FY 2000 and Am/Cm. The presentation would address the technical risks, both locally and nationally, if these items don't get funded. The concern was two fold: (1.) There appeared to be low risk items funded while there were high risk items (Am/Cm) not funded and (2.) It appears that the unfunded items were picked because these items are ones that DOE-HQ really wants and would fund them.
- Consideration for CAB recommendation on SRS unfunded activities in FY 2000.

P. K. Smith introduced Mr. Chuck Borup, DOE-SR, who gave an update on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Borup reviewed the old version planning pyramid verses the new version pyramid. The only major difference was the addition of the Mission Implementation Plans that are on the same planning level as the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Borup reviewed the planning sections that included the plan components. It was suggested that the plan components be divided amount the members so each component could be specifically reviewed. The assignments were as follows:

- Facilities Plan – Lee Poe
- Infrastructure Plan – Todd Crawford
- Natural Resources Plan – Dave Christensen

No one volunteered for the Cultural Resources Plan.

It was also decided that a first draft of the plans would be distributed at the RM&FU Subcommittee meeting on Monday, September 28.

P. K. Smith introduced Gail Jernigan for a presentation of the items of interest to SRS in the National Environmental Policy Act. Items of interest were: Tritium Production:

- APT Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) released on 12/97; Final EIS delayed.
- Commercial Light Water Reactor (CLWR) Draft EIS expected August 1998.
 - Public meeting is scheduled for first of October in Aiken area.
- Tritium Extraction Facility (TEF) Draft EIS released 5/98; Final EIS delayed.
 - DOE Secretary Bill Richardson committed to decision on the primary technology (APT or CLWR) by the end of the year.

Nuclear Materials:

- SRS Spent Nuclear Fuel Draft EIS is on hold.
- Surplus Plutonium Disposition Draft was released 7/98.
 - Expect the Final EIS in January 1999; ROD is expected in February 1999

. Supplemental Analyses:

- APSF and Building 105-K – Determined no Supplemental EIS needed.
- Defense Waste Processing Facility – Will determine if Supplemental EIS is needed for the ITP replacement process.

Near-Term Environmental Assessments (EA):

- Wetland Mitigation Bank Program – Will analyze potential consequences. Expect draft to be completed in September 1998.
- A-01 Outfall Constructed Wetlands – Will analyze effects of construction of a wetland to treat discharges. Project is being rescoped, delaying release of draft EA.

Future Environmental Assessments:

- Cask Shipping Facility – Will analyze effects of construction and operation of a facility to receive canisters from West Valley and ship SRS and West Valley canisters to final repository.
- Pond B Dam Repair Project – Will evaluate consequences of repair to dam at Pond B.

NEPA/Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Integration:

- Chemicals, Metals, and Pesticides (CMP) Pits NEPA Value Impact Assessment
 - Using NEPA values in the CERCLA process
 - Will be a reference to Proposed Plan on Interim Action Proposed Plan under CERCLA.

NOTE: Several questions required follow up action for answers. (**Answers were obtained on August 20 and are included in the minutes below.**) They were:

- For the Waste Management Programmatic EIS's, what is the schedule?
 - **The Waste Management Programmatic EIS Records of Decision (ROD) for High Level Waste, Low Level Waste, and Low Level Mixed Waste (3 separate RODs) are all for December 1998.**
- Once the ROD has been announced on the Surplus Plutonium Disposition EIS, does DOE plan to write site-specific EIS's for each of the 3 facilities, (pit disassembly, immobilization, and MOX)?
 - **The Surplus Plutonium Disposition EIS is not considered programmatic. It is tiered from the Storage and Disposition of Surplus Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Programmatic EIS. It is considered site-specific and there are no plans for subsequent EIS's to address site selection or other alternatives which the Department believes are adequate addresses in the Surplus Plutonium Disposition EIS.**

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

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