



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

June 7, 1999
North Augusta Community Center
North Augusta, SC

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on Monday, June 7, 1999, 6:00 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to receive an update on Emergency Preparedness, discuss Carolina Bays, a Team C Report from the Risk Management Working Group, Risk Summaries and public comment. Those in attendance were:

<u>CAB Members</u>	<u>Stakeholders</u>	<u>DOE/Contractors</u>
P.K Smith	Mike French	Len Sjostrom, DOE
Earnest Marshall	Lee Poe	Virginia Kay, DOE
Murray Riley	Sam Booher	Christina Edwards, DOE
William Vogele	Jennifer Hughes, DHEC	Dennis Ryan, DOE
	Chris Baker	Dave Wilson, USFS
	Sam Formby	Rebecca Sharitz, SREL
	Sandra Threatt, DHEC	Chris Barton, SRI
	Bill Slocumb, GA DNR	Bob Stenner, PNNL
	Russ Messick	Lynn Wike, WSRC
	Todd Crawford	Jack Mayer, WSRC
	Paulette Fix	Gary Wein, SREL
	Roger Rollins	Jim Moore, WSRC
	Barty Simonton, GA DNR	Vernon Osteen, WSRC
	Roy Windham, SC EPD	Greg Peterson, WSRC
	John Angil, Barnwell County Emergency Mgt.	Beth LeMaster, USFS
		Mark Bollinger, DOE-Chicago Operations Office

P. K. Smith, Co-Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. She then reviewed the agenda and introduced the first speaker, Christina Edwards, DOE.

Ms. Edwards reviewed the background noting the briefings provided to the CAB Subcommittees on May 6, 1998 and September 15, 1998. Ms. Edwards noted that the major emergency planning issues that were noted at the first meeting had been resolved. The remaining noteworthy issues were: Analysis of waterborne releases and ingestion pathway projections, Coverage of security incidents by Emergency

Preparedness Hazards Assessments (EPHAs), and Impacts of the DOE Emergency Classification System on South Carolina and Georgia responses.

Basically, three spin-off issues remain. One issue involves the waterborne releases and will be evaluated and recommendations provided by the end of FY2000; one issue involves the ingestion pathway projections and will be complete by the end of FY 1999; the third issue involves the coverage of security incidents and will be completed by the end of FY 2000. Ongoing discussion will continue on the Emergency Classification System to ensure the actions taken address the States' needs.

The issue that resulted in the initiation of the Subcommittee presentations was that SRS intended to reduce the current Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) to the site boundary based on changes to the SRS missions and the results of the EPHA analysis. DOE has decided to maintain the current SRS EPZ unless the States choose to pursue an EPZ reduction.

There was a lot of discussion on the scenarios used in the emergency planning and the reasoning. The States were asked to give comment on their satisfaction of the results. Both States stated that they were satisfied with the work that had been and will be performed.

Ms. Smith asked the Subcommittee if they felt this issue had been covered satisfactorily and if there were additional items. With no comment, Ms. Smith said she would review the comments sent in on the Rating Sheets. Based on those comments, she would determine if additional presentations would be needed.

Ms. Smith introduced Dennis Ryan, DOE, to discuss the Carolina Bays. Mr. Ryan introduced Dr. Rebecca Sharitz, SREL, and Christopher Barton, SRI. He stated that they would make their presentations and after that, he would be available to answer any questions.

Dr. Sharitz gave an excellent and detailed review of the Carolina Bays at SRS. Carolina Bays are isolated elliptical shallow depressions that hold water gathered from precipitation. The shapes are uniform and lay in the northwest to southeast direction. The bays are located in the coastal states of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. There are approximately 250,000 bays. No one knows the age, how they were formed or if they were formed at the same time. It appears the oldest is 40,000 years old. Bays that have remained natural or have been restored are very plant and animal species rich, some having over 300 identified species.

There are approximately 400 bays or bay like depressions located on SRS. Of these 400, approximately 19 or 6% were destroyed at the time of construction of the site. There are about 150 not functioning as Carolina Bays. A Carolina Bay, Bay 93, was used as a case study for ecological restoration. Based on the case studies, 20 bays have been identified, out of which 16 will be restored by year 2003 and four will remain as they are.

Rainbow Bay, which is about 2 ½ acres, is monitored daily. It is the longest continuous study of species and wetlands anywhere in the world.

Christopher Barton, SRI, discussed the Carolina Bay Restoration Project, stating that the objectives of the project were as follows:

- Establish replicated sets of restored Carolina Bays and associated uplands.
- Determine if restored systems are moving toward planned endpoints by assessing trends and rates of change in biotic and abiotic metrics and comparing these to control or undisturbed bays.
- Assess how land management practices influence animal and plant species or communities.
- Determine if planting trees and/or herbaceous species is a necessary management technique for the reestablishment of desired wetland species.

Some discussion items on the Carolina Bays were as follows:

- When asked about the plans for restoration of Carolina Bays after year 2003, it was stated there were no plans at this time. Future activity would depend on current studies.
- When asked if there were any Crete artifacts found during restoration of the Carolina Bays, it was stated that the presenters did not know since the archeological personnel reviewed the bays for artifacts.
- When asked how the ozone level effected the Carolina Bays, it was stated that changes in climate could change characteristics of the bays.

Ms. Smith asked Lee Poe to present the Risk Management Working Group Team C – Non-Risk Decisions – report. Mr. Poe reviewed the background and status of Team C. He stated that Team C concluded that many decisions not involving risk are made at SRS, some balance risk and others are independent of risk. Since Team C doesn't contribute directly to the Risk Management Working Group activity, Team C activities are complete and the Team will be terminated.

Ms. Smith asked Virginia Kay, DOE, to present the risk summary review. Ms. Kay stated that since there was so much interest in the Risk Summary reports prepared by the Center for Risk Excellence, two members of the Center visited SRS to meet with the stakeholders. Ms. Kay introduced Mark Bollinger, DOE – Chicago Operations Office, and Bob Stenner, Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL). Ms. Kay stated that in the handouts, there was a response from DOE-SR and the Center on the Risk Summary CAB Recommendation Number 84. In addition, the letter from Al Alm, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, creating the Center for Risk Excellence was included in the handouts.

Mark Bollinger reviewed the background of the Risk Summaries. The purpose of the Risk Summary documents is to tell the site story on risk and hazards at a very high level so that individuals such as those in Congress can understand the sites current plans and risk. Mr. Bollinger complemented the SRS stakeholders for their comments. He said the recommendations were the best from any site because they were constructive. He said while every site is different, the emphasis is to have a general framework but maintain flexibility. One of the challenges was to determine the level of effort on the charts included in the Risk Summary.

Mr. Bollinger stated that they had decided to make the Risk Summary reports for SRS a pilot program. They were going to concentrate on SRS with the objective of completing the pilot Risk Summaries by the late summer. They would take a particular waste such as high-level waste and develop the Risk Summary. It was recommended that two hazards, a high-level and a low-level waste be considered. He said that they planned on coming back at the end of September for a working review. It was suggested that they forward a draft before the final example to get early feedback from the stakeholders.

Bob Stenner spent some time reviewing the Relative Hazard Calculation Methodology. He stated the purpose of the graphs was to give a high level visual picture as a quick read so the site story could be understood.

Ms. Smith asked if the responses from DOE and the Center for Risk Excellence were sufficient for the Subcommittee to close out Recommendation number 84. There was agreement that the Recommendation could be closed out.

Ms. Smith asked if there were any public comments. There were four as follows:

Lee Poe: Mr. Poe stated that during one of the presentations, the Subcommittee was challenged to not ask questions, but to question the speakers after the meeting. But the speakers had left the meeting. Mr. Poe felt that when speakers are invited, they should stay around after the meeting to answer questions.

Sam Booher: Mr. Booher said, "DOE says they are proud of their openness and communications with the Subcommittee on Wetlands Mitigation and Carolina Bays. I have been waiting to hear feedback specifically from the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). I expressed myself to NEPA on the Mitigation Bank. Tonight, I'm handed a document and told the Mitigation Bank has been finalized. I asked what my recourse was. I was told my only recourse was to hire a lawyer. I feel there is no line of communication and I feel I have been let down. I would like a meeting with Greg Rudy."

Jack Mayer, WSRC, pointed out to Mr. Booher that Mr. Booher had a meeting with NEPA and that Mr. Booher sent in his comments and the comments were answered.

Mr. Booher said he made comments at the May 11 meeting but hadn't heard back from NEPA. {Note: The notes of the May 11 meeting have been reviewed. "In the meeting, Ms. Donna Martin, in response to Mr. Booher, stated that the Wetlands Mitigation Bank EA was not final at this time to be distributed, but that the Site Manager had signed the document. Mr. Booher was told if he still had concerns he should call 1-800-7292 or call Donna Martin or Greg Peterson." On June 9, Jim Moore, WSRC, explained that based on the minutes of the May 11 meeting, the NEPA personnel would not have been expected to contact Mr. Booher since his question had been answered in the May 11 meeting.}

Mike French: Mr. French recalled the CAB meeting at the USC-Aiken Campus on March 22 and 23 where Dave Huizenga, DOE-HQ, responded to CAB concerns on the Paths to Closure document. Mr. French recalled that Mr. Huizenga indicated he would respond back to the CAB. Mr. French asked if we had received any response back from Mr. Huizenga. Mr. French was told that no response had been received. {Note: The notes of the March 22 meeting in which Mr. Huizenga attended have been reviewed. In that meeting, Mr. Huizenga apologized if the Subcommittee didn't think they received appropriate answers and he would take the Subcommittee's concerns back to DOE-HQ and cover the correct individuals involved. On June 9, Mr. Moore explained to Mr. French that the notes indicated that Mr. Huizenga would not respond back to the CAB.}

Earnest Marshall: Mr. Marshall told the Subcommittee that he had contacted the Georgia Public Service Commission and the Georgia Governor's Office and that someone from those organizations would be attending the next CAB meeting.

Since there were no other public comments, Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting.

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