



SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

March 1999 Meeting Minutes

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

March 22-23, 1999 8:30 a.m.
USC - Aiken Conference Center
Aiken, S.C.

Members Present

Bill Adams	Barbara Murphy	<u>Ex-Officio Representatives</u>
Arthur Belge	Lane Parker	Tom Heenan
Tom Costikyan	Karen Patterson	Ann Clark
Ken Goad	Maria Reichmanis	Julie Corkran
Brendolyn Jenkins	Lola Richardson	Myra Reece
Bill Lawless	P.K. Smith	
Ann Loadholt	Ed Tant	
Jimmy Mackey	Wade Waters	
Kathryn May	Beaurine Wilkins	
	Beaurine Wilkins	

Members absent were Bill Donaldson and Mary Elfner. Currently, there are four Board vacancies. The Department of Energy (DOE) Designated Federal Official present was Tom Heenan. Mike Schoener served as facilitator.

The meeting was open to the public and posted in the Federal Register in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Key Decisions Made by the Board

Recommendation 79 addresses the FY2000 Budget and asks that DOE request an additional \$55 million above the FY00 budget request for salt feed preparation and DWPF and urges DOE to work aggressively with South Carolina regulators and elected officials to ensure waste management goals are met. [Recommendation #79](#)

Recommendation 80 supports proposed remedial actions at the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit and recommends that these actions be accepted as final for the soil and vadose zone.

Recommendation 81 requests specific considerations be made when developing the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Alternatives to the In Tank Precipitation (ITP) Process.

Recommendation 82 asks DOE to maximize the use of treatment and storage facilities across the DOE complex for the management of high level wastes and specifically requests DOE to provide sufficient funding to maintain SRS canister production at a rate of 250 per year.

Recommendation 83 endorses cleanup actions at the Chemicals, Metals and Pesticides Pits and recommends that criterion established within this proposed plan defining "a point of diminishing returns" be completed for all SRS units undergoing remediation.

Six new members and all incumbents were (re)elected to Board membership in 1999-2000.

Approval of the Minutes

The January 1999 meeting minutes were approved with no changes.

Agency Update

Ann Clark of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) noted that her agency continues to monitor SRS activities and will watch how new mission work affects cleanup. Julie Corkran of the Environmental Protection Agency noted that the three agencies met in March and shared a commitment to outreach in regards to cleanup and environmental justice (EJ). She stated DOE is recognized as a leader in cleanup and hopefully will become a leader in outreach in EJ downstream of SRS as well. Tom Heenan of the Department of Energy provided the Operations Update (see attachment). He also noted the announcement by Judge Penn to allow waste shipments from Los Alamos, New Mexico to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (see attached news article). He also provided a DOE News Release (see attached) regarding the contract to design a MOX Fuel Plant at the Savannah River Site (SRS).

Public Comments

Karen Patterson thanked DOE-SR for its proactive approach to informing the SRS CAB of a groundwater plume in the A/M Area. She noted another Board's surprise regarding a similar issue and the late notification they received.

DOE-SR Manager Update

Greg Rudy, DOE-SR Manager, provided letters of appreciation to outgoing Board members Mary Elfner and Bill Donaldson. He then provided an update on SRS activities. Mr. Rudy discussed five focus areas that drive SRS operations, noting that safety is the first and foremost priority at SRS (see attachment). Technical capability and performance along with community, state and regulatory relationships are also key to SRS operations, he said. He discussed the need to maintain facilities and infrastructure as well as a motivated and skilled workforce. He also talked about cost effectiveness, watching over taxpayer dollars and improvements in the budget process to eliminate cost overruns. Mr. Rudy discussed how the overall objective of SRS to reduce the global nuclear danger has remained but changed into three dimensions: national defense; nonproliferation; and environmental management. He stressed how SRS is uniquely qualified to handle new missions and how these missions drive the site into three program areas: stockpile stewardship; nuclear materials stewardship; and environmental stewardship.

Dose Reconstruction Project

Bob Meyer of the Risk Assessment Corporation (RAC) provided a review of Phase II of the SRS Dose Reconstruction Project (see attachment). He discussed the phased approach to the project, including document reviews and calculations of quantities of contaminants released from SRS in the past. He discussed releases of radionuclides and chemicals to air and water and provided comparisons of RAC and SRS estimates of releases. Mr. Meyer concluded that a few areas on site (reactors, processing canyons, M Area and power plants) were responsible for most releases to the offsite environment and the largest releases occurred during the early years of site operations. Future phases of the project now have an adequate basis to calculate dose and risk to people who have lived near the site, he said.

Discussion and questions from Board members revolved around why some radionuclides were of more concern than others; how accurate monitoring data was in the early years; how weather patterns are

accounted for; and how other industry releases will be accounted for in calculating dose to persons living near SRS.

Issues Matrix

Tom Heenan presented an issues matrix (see attached) that outlined upcoming issues for public involvement by the SRS CAB. He highlighted the following top issues for consideration by subcommittee:

Environmental Remediation (ER)& Waste Management Subcommittee

- Major ER Activities such as the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground Closure and F&H Area Pump and Treat Systems
- Transuranic Waste Program, including shipments to WIPP and the repackaging program.
- SR Technology Management Plan that defines the SR technology process, from initial research to technology deployment, with emphasis on the end user

Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee

- Progress of the melt and dilute project for SRS spent nuclear fuel
- Yucca Mountain Viability Assessment and Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- Environmental Management Integration for nuclear materials and proposed disposition paths

Risk Management & Future Use Subcommittee

- Budget Development and Integrated Priority List
- Paths to Closure strategy that describes how the DOE Complex will accelerate cleanup
- Alternative Salt Processing Technology for High Level Waste
- EM Integration Activities

Risk Management & Future Use Subcommittee Report

P.K. Smith, Subcommittee Co-Chair provided a status update on the Risk Management Working Group, which was formed to analyze and understand risk management at SRS (see attached). She described the mission and objective of each of the four teams established and provided a list of members with a meeting schedule and upcoming topics for discussion.

Ms. Smith also presented a draft letter to Mr. James Owendoff regarding DOE-Headquarters response to Recommendation 58 of the CAB (see attached). The letter conveyed concerns that the response provided to Recommendation 58 did not address the Board's issues. For instance, the Subcommittee stated the public would be better served if plans, regulatory commitments, decisions, budget, etc. were found in one document such as the Paths to Closure (PtC). The lack of future non-EM and landlord costs in the PtC were also an issue. **Karen Patterson moved the Board submit the draft letter to Owendoff and Bill Lawless seconded. The Board agreed by a unanimous vote.**

Wade Waters, Subcommittee Co-Chair presented a draft motion regarding the Fiscal Year 2000 Budget (see attached). It recommended that an additional \$55 million be requested for FY2000 to permit expedited development and evaluation of alternatives for ITP salt feed preparation process; and to operate the Defense Waste Processing Facility at 250 canisters per year. Bill Lawless moved the Board accept the recommendation and Brendolyn Jenkins seconded. Minor modifications were made to the motion, including a statement that this request be above the current FY2000 budget request and that DOE should continue to work aggressively with the State of South Carolina regulators and elected officials to ensure waste management goals are met. **The recommendation was adopted by a vote of 17 members in favor and two abstentions.** P.K. Smith

abstained due to her employment in the High Level Waste Division at SRS and Bill Adams abstained due to uneasiness with current motion language.

Facilitator Update

Mike Schoener provided an update on the upcoming Transportation Seminar to be held May 20-23, 1999, in Cincinnati, Ohio. Interested Board members were asked to submit their names for participation. Mr. Schoener also provided a review of recommendations and pending responses. He noted the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground Focus Group will review agency responses to Recommendation 75 regarding interim actions at the Burial Ground.

Environmental Remediation & Waste Management Subcommittee Report

Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (MCB/MBP)

Mike Simmons of DOE provided a presentation on the (MCB/MBP) and interim remedial actions proposed for this waste unit (see attachment). The Metals Burning Pit is a cleared area (400 by 400 ft) that was used as a burning area for lithium-aluminum alloys, scrap and cuttings from A/M Area operations. The Miscellaneous Chemical Basin is an old borrow pit used for disposal of waste solvents and used oil. Mr. Simmons provided photos and discussed constituents of concern at both locations. He also discussed proposed remedial actions which include excavation of soils to four feet deep and offsite disposal in a licensed landfill at the MBP; and excavation to a one-foot depth and offsite disposal at a licensed landfill for the MCB. Both units would be backfilled to grade. Mr. Simmons also addressed vadose zone and groundwater proposed cleanup actions, which include passive and active soil vapor extraction and recirculation wells with targeted deployment locations. Estimated total costs are approximately \$4.1 million.

Lola Richardson read the subcommittee motion that supports the proposed actions and recommends they be accepted as final for the soil and vadose zone (see attachment). Karen Patterson moved the Board accept the motion and Becky Witter seconded. The motion was adopted with minor edits by a vote of 17 in favor and one abstention by Lane Parker due to the nature of employment with the labor union.

SEIS High Level Waste Salt Disposition Alternatives to ITP Process

Larry Ling and John Reynolds of DOE provided a presentation (see attachment) on plans for a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on High Level Waste Salt Disposition Alternatives to the In Tank Precipitation Process. Larry Ling provided background information regarding the high level waste system and the need for this SEIS which addresses processing the salt stream portion of the system. In 1995 an ITP Process was initiated to process this salt portion and was shut down in 1996 to address significantly greater than anticipated generation rates of flammable benzene. A chemistry program was initiated to develop a comprehensive understanding of the benzene and results indicated that ITP could not be operated cost effectively in its current configuration. A systems engineering team was chartered to perform a structured evaluation and identify a solution for salt disposition. The alternatives are presented within the SEIS. In addition to the NEPA-required No Action alternative, the following three alternatives will be reviewed: small tank precipitation; non-elutable ion exchange; and cesium encapsulation in grout. John Reynolds provided an explanation of all alternatives. Currently, there is no preferred alternative.

Wade Waters presented the subcommittee motion (see attached) which states concerns about cesium encapsulation in grout, noting this alternative would not be favored unless fully justified. The motion also requests that:

- life cycle costs for all options be considered

- the probability of intruders gaining access to HLW facilities be evaluated total curie content and concentrations be compared for all known radioactive low-level burial grounds country-wide with the curie content in Saltstone at SRS for all three alternatives
- an evaluation of the impact of cesium encapsulation in grout on the proliferation resistance of HLW canisters be conducted

Bill Lawless moved the Board accept the motion and Jimmy Mackey seconded. The motion was adopted with 16 members in favor and three abstentions. Karen Patterson abstained because her company will propose to conduct the SEIS; P.K. Smith abstained due to her new reassignment in the High Level Waste Division at SRS, and Lane Parker abstained due to his affiliation with the labor union.

Waste Management Programmatic EIS Record of Decision for High Level Waste

Maria Reichmanis read the subcommittee motion regarding the Waste Management Programmatic EIS Record of Decision for High Level Waste (see attached). The motion recommended that DOE maximize the use of treatment and storage facilities across the DOE complex for management of high level wastes. Specifically, it recommended:

- that DOE provide a current review of all its sites to determine whether capability use is at an optimum
- that DOE provide sufficient funding to maintain SRS canister production at last year's rate of 250 per year
- that DOE analyze the cost benefit of optimum use of the DOE complex before constructing any new facilities
- that DOE assure the Board that all funds saved by closing West Valley early be transferred to SRS for building HLW shipping facilities.

Tom Heenan noted that DOE had determined there to be no economic benefit to an early shutdown of West Valley and transfer of 300 HLW canisters to SRS. Wade Waters moved the Board accept the motion and Jimmy Mackey seconded. Much discussion pursued regarding the last point of the recommendation. Brendolyn Jenkins moved the Board amend the motion to remove #4. Seven members were in favor, 10 opposed and two members abstained. The original motion was adopted with 12 members in favor, five opposed and two abstentions. P.K. Smith abstained due to potential conflict of interests regarding her employment. Ann Loadholt also abstained stating she was uncomfortable with her level of knowledge regarding the issue.

Chemicals, Metals and Pesticides Pits Interim Action Proposed Plan

Karen Adams of DOE provided an overview of the Chemicals, Metals and Pesticides (CMP) Pits (see attachment). This unit consists of seven unlined pits that received chemicals, metals and pesticides from 1971 to 1979, when they were backfilled. SRS initiated a remedial action in 1984 to excavate the wastes, however elevated levels of some contaminants remain in the pits. Significant contamination remains in the unsaturated soils and groundwater. An adjacent area known as the Ballast Area where fluorescent light ballasts containing polychlorinated by-phenyl is also being addressed in the Interim Proposed Plan. The plan calls for removal of the ballast area soils for treatment and offsite disposal; soil vapor extraction and installation of an asphalt cover over the pits to limit infiltration; and air sparging to reduce concentrations of the "hot spot" of groundwater contamination under the vadose zone.

Ken Goad presented the subcommittee motion in support of the proposed actions. It also requests that definitions of "points of diminishing returns" for soil vapor extraction be completed for all sites at undergoing remediation at SRS. Karen Patterson moved the Board accept the motion and Becky Witter seconded. The motion was adopted by a vote of 18 members in favor and one abstention by Lane Parker.

Executive Committee ReCap

Ann Loadholt provided a recap of discussions held during the Executive Committee meeting the day prior. She reminded Board members of spokesperson responsibilities; conflicts of interests; and provided excerpts from federal travel regulations. She also noted attendance and implored the Board to make efficient use of its time. She noted an Educational Proposal presented by Karen Patterson in which two-hour courses will be offered in conjunction with full Board meetings to provide an overview of the various programs at SRS. These will serve as educational tools for new members and refreshers for current members.

Outreach Subcommittee Report

Lane Parker provided a recap of the Outreach Subcommittee meeting held on the day prior. He noted new initiatives including a video, speakers bureau, point-of-contact list, and media contacts for feature articles. He also announced that the Outreach Subcommittee would meet in April/May prior to the next full Board meeting and conduct a short meeting in conjunction with the May Board meeting as well.

Budget Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair Jimmy Mackey presented the Board's final Fiscal Year 1998 Budget and the Fiscal Year 1999 Budget through the end of January (see attached). Board members remarked that the Budget was reduced in FY99. It was noted this is due to costs savings realized by reduced advertising.

Administrative Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair Beaurine Wilkins conducted annual membership elections. The following individuals were elected to two-year terms in 1999-2000.

William Adams, Hilton Head, S.C.	Kathryn May, Martinez, Ga.
Tom Costikyan, Dataw Island, S.C.	Lane Parker, Graniteville, S.C.
Melvyn Galin, Savannah, Ga.	Murray Riley, Aiken, S.C.
Kenneth Goad, Aiken, S.C.	Perjetta Smith, North Augusta, S.C.
Georgia Leverett, Augusta, Ga.	Charleen Townsend, Savannah, Ga.
Earnest Marshall, Decatur, Ga.	William Vogelee, Savannah, Ga.
Jimmy Mackey, Beaufort, S.C.	Beaurine Wilkins, Augusta, Ga.
	Becky Witter, Savannah, Ga.

Administrative Items

Allison Johnson of Schofield Middle School was the March Essay Contest Winner. Fifty-four essays were submitted regarding why the environment is important and the students role in protecting the environment. James Makin won second place and Lauren Alexander placed third. All were honored during the SRS CAB Public Comment Session on Monday, March, 22, 1999.

Handouts

DOE News Release, dated March 22, 1999
Breaking News from AP, dated March 22, 1999
Operations Update, March 1999, Tom Heenan, DOE
News Article dated March 8, 1999, Lane Parker, CAB
Savannah River Site Update, March 1999, Greg Rudy, DOE
SRS Dose Reconstruction Project, Robert Meyer, Risk Assessment Corporation

Community Summary, Robert Meyer, Risk Assessment Corporation
Issues for SRS Citizens Advisory Board Consideration, Tom Heenan, DOE
Risk Management Working Group Task Teams Status, P.K. Smith, CAB
Draft Letter to Assistant Secretary James Owendoff, P.K. Smith, CAB
Draft Motion Fiscal Year 2000 Budget for SRS, Wade Waters, CAB
Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (MCB/MBP), Mike Simmons, DOE
Motions on MCB/MBP, Lola Richardson, SRS CAB
SRS High Level Waste Salt Disposition Alternatives to In Tank Precipitation, Larry Ling, DOE
Motion High Level Waste Salt Disposition Alternatives to In Tank Precipitation, Wade Waters, CAB
Motion Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Maria Reichmanis, CAB
Chemicals, Metals, and Pesticides Pits Interim Action Proposed Plan, Karen Adams, DOE
Motion Chemicals, Metals and Pesticides (CMP) Pits, Ken Goad, CAB
SRS CAB Fiscal Year 1998 and 1999 Budget Summary, Jimmy Mackey, CAB
Letter from Lewis Shaw, SCDHEC to Ann Loadholt, dated March 14, 1999, Rec. 75.
Letter to Ann Loadholt from three parties, dated March 2, 1999, Rec. 76.
Excerpts from Federal Travel Regulations, Ann Loadholt, CAB
Monthly NEPA Report
1999 SRS CAB Activity Calendar
SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

**Special Budget Stakeholder Session
Questions and Answers
USC-Aiken Conference Center
March 22, 1999 at 6:15 p.m.**

A special stakeholder session was held on Monday, March 22, 1999, at the USC-Aiken Conference Center to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions of David Huizenga, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Materials/Facility Stabilization for the U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. John Pescosolido and Jim Buice provided a presentation regarding the SRS Budget for FY2000 (see attachment). Below is a summary of the questions and answers discussed during the special session.

Stakeholder: What percent of the site's budget is for Environmental Restoration work?

Jim Buice: Ten percent.

Stakeholder: How many DWPF canisters will be filled in FY00?

John Pescosolido: 200 canisters are the requirements for the Site Treatment Plan, which is what the site hopes to fill.

Stakeholder: We have been asking for a contingency plan for the Paths to Closure and the previous documents. I hope the PtC will show what the contingency plan is if DOE-HQ does not fund to the planning case.

Dave Huizenga: DOE-HQ has no commitment to fund the planning case. The SRS profile is not the worst there is.

Stakeholder: We have tried to help you by lobbying to Congress for more money. Congress allocated the money, but DOE-HQ did not give all the money to SRS.

Huizenga: While Congress did pass some plus-ups in the SRS budget, they did not allocate more money for EM. To be fair, the plus-ups were added and then that difference was divided among the various DOE field offices. While SRS did not get all the money they wanted or felt they needed, SRS was in better shape than those sites that did not get plus-ups.

Stakeholder: What will happen when the other sites close and the plutonium comes to SRS? Will we get additional funding?

Huizenga: DOE-HQ recognizes the need to spend money at SRS for the plutonium vaults.

Pesco: Once Fernald and Mound close, the idea is to take the money, which had been used for these site, back to the sites which are still operating.

Huizenga: We believe this is realistic.

Stakeholder: Will Fernald and Mound have budget cuts?

Huizenga: No, they are getting money to close their sites.

Stakeholder: So we're paying for the closure of these sites?

Huizenga: No, once these sites are closed, there will be money available for the other operating sites.

Stakeholder: DOE just paid a \$288 million fine to the utilities for not taking the fuel rods from these utilities. Is there a fund for these fines or are we paying for that also?

Huizenga: There is no special fund for paying fines.

Stakeholder: What about SRS's budget for FY 00?

Huizenga: SRS is getting enough money for Environmental Restoration work, to run the canyons and DWPF, and get by with infrastructure. However, if we can save \$1 billion to close Rocky Flats in four years or sooner, the extra money will be to help sites like SRS. We are aware of the issues at SRS. But we have to ask ourselves, does this make sense? We are struggling. We want to meet the goal of early closure of DOE sites to justify to Congress and to build credibility by showing Congress that we can close some sites. What is the cost for Material and Storage Operations at SRS?

Pesco: \$600 million.

Huizenga: And SRS wants \$250 million above the target for the planning case. DOE-HQ has not agreed to the site's priority list. We have it and are reviewing it. I must admit that it is an unacceptable case: no cans for DWPF, for example.

Pesco: The site's position is that it is better to fund development of the Alternate Salt Technology so that we will have feed for DWPF in the future.

Stakeholder: So you think this is a wish list?

Pesco: No, this tells a solid story to get the attention of the EM, the Secretary, Office of Management and Budget, the President, and Congress. We have spelled out the real impacts.

Huizenga: Every site is telling the same story. Other sites have regulatory commitments that they will not be able to meet without additional funding. We have more needs across the complex than we have money.

Stakeholder: This seems to be a one-sided story. SRS is not able to meet its commitments, and DOE is continuing to bring in materials from other places. It seems to be all one-way. SRS is trying to help the complex.

Huizenga: SRS gets 20 percent of the EM budget.

Stakeholder: And 25 percent of the mission.

Stakeholder: My concern about the PtC is that it is for EM only. We should be looking at other funding sources from DOE also. What about Defense Programs, etc? We want to know about the DOE total budget. What about the funding for the plutonium missions? We would like to see these included in the PtC.

Huizenga: The plutonium folks were just down here (at SRS). Did they talk about their budget?

Stakeholder: No, there weren't any discussions about plutonium budgets.

Huizenga: They should have discussed their budget, too. I will talk to them about this.

Stakeholder: The CAB figures that it will take an additional \$30 million to increase the production of DWPF canisters from 100 to 200. Is this funding available for DWPF canisters?

Pesco: We have enough funding for 200 canisters for FY 2000. In 2001 we could use the money for 200 canisters, but we would run out of feed for DWPF in 2003. We think it is more prudent to spread out the work for DWPF and invest some money in the development of

an alternate processing for the salt in the sludge. We've listened to the CAB and have upped the production of canisters to 200 in 2000.

Stakeholder: How much money for the Accelerator from DP in 2000?

Pesco: About \$7-8 million.

Stakeholder: I want to commend you for looking at this problem as a multi-year problem, not just a single year. We want to hear how you did this. What was the process?

Pesco: It probably would be valuable for you to know the process we used to develop the outyear budget priority list.

Huizenga: And SRS wants \$250 million above the target for the planning case. DOE-HQ has not agreed to the site's priority list. We have it and are reviewing it. I must admit that it is an unacceptable case: no cans for DWPF, for example.

Huizenga: I know that there is concern about meeting the Environmental Restoration commitments at SRS. At Rocky Flats because they felt they needed additional funding, they worked out a deal with the regulators to postpone the ER work for several years. This gave them additional funds for nuclear material stabilization and waste management activities. Hanford did something similar. I am not suggesting that you do that at SRS, but we do need to think creatively, in case SRS does not get the additional \$250 million you say you need.

Stakeholder: We have been thinking creatively. However, when we solve one problem, the money seems to be taken away to be sent to another site.

Huizenga: The ITP situation is unfortunate. If SRS wasn't spending the money on developing an alternative for salt, then you would not be in the shape you are in now. You would have an additional \$100 million for DWPF. You got a plus-up of \$25 million for work in K Area. Rocky Flats asked for an additional \$14 million for transportation issues and was told to absorb it as there wasn't enough money. This will be a difficult next few years.

The special session concluded at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Huizenga joined the Risk Management & Future Use Subcommittee of the SRS CAB to continue to address questions.

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