



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Record

September 15, 1998
Holley House, Aiken, S.C.

The Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on September 15, 1998 at 6:00 p.m., Holley House, Aiken, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to receive an update on Emergency Preparedness, a review of the FY 2000 budget and review a draft CAB recommendation. Members of the CAB attending were P. K. Smith and Wade Waters. Other members of the public attending were Mike French, Lee Poe, Ernie Chaput, Elizabeth Baker, David Matthews, Ed Somers and Charlie Pittman. Gary Little from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Sandra Threatt and Thomas Brown attended as members of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC). Jim Hardeman attended as a member of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR). Roy Windham attended as a member of the South Carolina Emergency Preparedness Department. Members of DOE-SR attending were Len Sjostrom, Jim Buice, Steve Baker, Jim Folk, Bill Pearson, John Merrick, Roger Rollins, Brian Hennessey and Sachiko McAlhany. Members of the Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) were Bob Steadman, Dennis Hadlock, Wayne Davis, Mary Flora, Steve Piccolo, Chris Baker 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, Len Sjostrom, DOE-SR. Ms. Smith stated that Sandra Threatt, SCDHEC, and Jim Hardeman, GDNR, would follow Mr. Sjostrom.

Mr. Sjostrom gave a brief background on the joint RM&FU and Environmental Remediation and Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittee meeting on May 6, 1998 at the North Augusta Community Center. He noted the noteworthy issues he would be reviewing would be the analysis of waterborne releases and ingestion pathway projections, coverage of security incidents by Emergency Preparedness Hazards Assessments (EPHA) and impacts of the DOE Emergency Classification System on South Carolina and Georgia Responses. Mr. Sjostrom stated that a path forward and plan of action for each issue was developed with the completion date expected to be April 1999.

Mr. Sjostrom stated that for the waterborne releases and ingestion pathway projections, additional documented information and analyses will be provided to enhance pre-planning efforts.

Mr. Sjostrom stated that the need was identified for additional analysis to evaluate more realistic scenarios for emergency planning purposes. The result of the analysis will be incorporated into the EPHAs.

He stated the DOE Emergency Classification System would be changed to include improved notification procedures and DOE will maintain the current SRS Emergency Planning Zones (EPZ).

Mr. Sjostrom stated that SRS will continue to work closely with the states of South Carolina and Georgia to ensure the concerns are adequately addressed and that open lines of communication continue to exist.

Ms. Sandra Threatt, SCDHEC, stated that the path forward presented by Mr. Sjostrom looked very good. She reiterated that there have been no problems when actual emergencies occurred. Most problems occur during the drills.

Mr. Jim Hardeman, GDNR, stated that he felt there had been significant progress with the state of South Carolina and SRS since the last meeting. He stated that there were 31 open issues at the last meeting and they have closed out all but 12 of them. Mr. Hardeman stated that there were still some risk concerns related to large spills of supernate and natural disasters in several simultaneous facilities. Mr. Hardeman stated that the courtesy notification process was working great. He stated there were several opportunities to use it and it was outstanding. Someone stated that they were surprised that the EPZ's for SRS are the same now as they were 10 years ago when SRS was running reactors. They were also amazed that SRS needed the same EPZ as the commercial reactors. Mr. Hardeman stated that the original EPZ's were adopted in 1983 related to production reactors. He stated that with the demise of the production reactors there is a different set of hazards which may or may not be less significant. Mr. Hardeman stated that the jury was still out on that decision. He stated that EPZ's were not only technical in nature, but also political. It was asked if they were working with other agencies in understanding EPA's. Mr. Hardeman stated that yes, they would take whatever time necessary to make sure everyone's comfort level was satisfactory and that all concerns were addressed.

Ms. Smith stated that with all the questions answered and the agencies and SRS working together, that there would be no need to have these individuals come back to another meeting. Mr. Mike French mentioned that we may want to hear from Mr. Sjostrom in April or May for a two minute presentation letting all know that everything has been worked out. Ms. Smith thanked all those with the Emergency Preparedness group for attending, presenting and answering questions. Ms. Smith then introduced the next speaker, Mr. Jim Buice, DOE-SR.

Mr. Buice stated that after his presentation at the August 19 meeting, he had been requested to come back to the subcommittee to explain the items low on the priority list. Mr. Buice introduced several DOE-SR program people whom he said were there to help answer any technical questions. They were Sachiko McAlhany, Nuclear Materials Stabilization Division (NMS), Jim Folk, Spent Fuel Management Division (SFM), Bill Pearson, High Level Waste Division (HLW), and Brian Hennessey, Environmental Restoration Division (ER).

Mr. Buice explained that at the August 19 meeting, the initial target for SRS was \$1,173M. Since that time, there has been an increase of \$125M, making the base case \$1,299M. There is also an over target case of \$1,337 for an increase of \$163M. He stated there is a high confidence level that the base case of \$1,299M is the expected funding for FY2000. The dollars represent Environmental Management (EM) work, not Defense or Material Disposition. The \$1,299M is the submittal to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Mr. Buice presented a summary level breakout of the EM FY2000 Integrated Priority List (IPL). The summary indicated the dollars needed for each item, the cumulative totals and the target levels. The target level funding designated for SRS identifies the items to be funded on the IPL. The summary items were broken down into individual projects and the required funding for each project. The heart of the material that Mr. Buice reviewed was the scope identified for each summary level item. As an example, at the top of the IPL is the Minimum Surveillance & Maintenance All Facilities requiring \$696M. This item supports activities required to control existing material, waste, and facilities in a safe, stable condition. No remediation, stabilization, or disposal is included unless safety related. Activities include: Continue tank chemistry monitoring for minimization of tank corrosion, Maintain and operate control rooms to monitor alarms for tanks and waste storage equipment, Monitor all tanks for residual material for safe storage, Monitor inventory to prevent unwanted reactions, accumulation of solids or explosive gases, Fire Protection, OSHA requirements, Operate and maintain security systems, radiation monitoring, and maintain breathing air systems to name a few. Mr. Buice stepped through each item explaining the scope included in each summary item. Questions were asked by members of the public to help clarify and understand. Those concerns/questions and answers with more interest are as follows:

- Why is DHEC still funded under DOE Program Support? Mr. Buice stated the purpose is to help in the cleanup effort for document reviews.
- Concerned that since ER projects are subject to negotiation once per year, lower risk ER projects in the future are bumping out higher risk projects that should be funded. Also concerned that it appears that ER was funded to a level of effort and the higher risk projects that were non-ER were bumped in favor of ER level of effort. Mary Flora stated that when the Federal Facility Act (FFA) was signed in 1992, that there has been an attempt to schedule at least 5 to 8 field starts per year in order to achieve clean up as required by the FFA in 30 years. Mr. Ernie Chaput stated that back in 1994/1995, the ER program was at \$60M to \$70M per year. He stated that the State became upset because sites such as Fernald and Rocky Flats were receiving far more funding for ER work than SRS. The State felt that there was an equity issue and they wanted to see parity. There was no written agreement, but it was felt the State had a case and so there was a step increase so SRS would be more in line with other sites. Brian Hennessey stated that the FY1999 and FY2000 milestones were already negotiated with the regulators but FY2001 was in the planning stages. Mr. Poe requested that the subcommittee makes a motion that DOE-SR stress those projects that the stakeholders think are more important such as americium/curium stabilization and In-Tank Precipitation (ITP) be moved up on the IPL and low risk ER projects be moved down on the list.
- Concerned that the place holder of \$33M for the ITP Alternative is below the cut line for the base case. Questioned where the funding would come from for the alternative. Bill Pearson stated that if funding was not available by asking for additional funds, based on the schedule, the Defense Waste Processing Facility can go for six years with sludge only canisters. Funding and the alternative would need to be in place by the sixth year. The issues would be space limitations in the tank farm and regulatory milestones to empty the tanks.
- Concern that funding for Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) was at the bottom of the list and unfunded. There were discussions that most of the funding for D&D activity was concentrated at other sites that were in the process of closing.

Mr. Buice mentioned that DOE-HQ had a validation peer review on the activities in each category of the IPL involving all the sites. This was an independent external validation team from all the sites. They reviewed the categories in the IPL for consistency and SRS came out very well. This validation effort substantiates credibility for the SRS IPL.

Ms. Smith handed out a draft motion that was developed by Todd Crawford after the August 19 RM&FU Subcommittee meeting. With the increase in funding, she asked if the motion should be changed to ask DOE-HQ support in meeting the additional funding needs. All agreed that since the OMB or Congress has not approved the funding that the motion was still relevant and should be reworded.

Ms. Smith thanked everyone for attending the meeting and since there were no other comments, the meeting was adjourned.

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