



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Combined Committee Meeting**

#### **Summary**

April 25, 2000  
North Augusta Community Center  
North Augusta, SC

---

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board held the first of three planned combined committee meetings on Tuesday, April 25, 2000, at the North Augusta Community Center. Mike Schoener facilitated the meeting. A list of public attendees is attached. The following CAB members attended:

#### **CAB Members**

Bill Adams  
Sallie Connah  
Tom Costikyan  
Ken Goad  
Perry Holcomb  
Brendolyn Jenkins  
William Lawrence  
Jimmy Mackey  
Lane Parker

Karen Patterson  
Maria Reichmanis  
Lola Richardson  
Murray Riley  
P.K. Smith  
Wade Waters  
Beaurine Wilkins  
Carolyn Williams  
Bill Willoughby

#### **Ex-Officio Members**

Tom Heenan, DOE  
Ann Clark, SCDHEC  
Julie Corkran, EPA

The following CAB members were not in attendance during the morning session: Mel Galin, Georgia Leverett, Kathryn May, Jean Sulc, Charleen Townsend, Bill Voge and Beckie Witter.

The purpose of the morning session was to begin work developing a CAB Work Plan. Mike Schoener discussed what a work plan is, why it is needed and how to develop the plan. The Work Plan is a working document developed and used by the CAB to establish the focus and annual priorities for the Board. This will allow all Board members to be more involved in setting the direction of the Board, help to prioritize resources and control the establishment of focus groups.

Sam Booher commented that he feared NEPA actions would not make it to the workplan. Mike Schoener explained that the work plan is a guide and not meant to put the CAB in a box. To assist the committees in preparing the initial workplan, Tom Heenan, Assistant Manager for Environmental Programs and Designated Federal Official for the CAB provided an overview of issues for CAB consideration over the next year (see attachment). Mr. Heenan discussed the following issues by committee:

#### **Environmental Remediation**

- Major ER Activities -i.e. closure of Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground (ORWBG)
- Technology Deployment
- Natural Remediation Approaches (i.e. Phytoremediation, Bioremediation)

- Other ER Activities (i.e. public participation in unit specific activities)

## **Waste Management**

- Transuranic Waste Program (Ship to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, TRU Waste Certification Facility)
- Offsite Transportation of Low-Level Waste and Mixed Low Level Waste for Treatment & Disposal at Commercial Facilities
- Solid Waste Program Activities (LLW Sort & Segregation Facility, Solid Waste System Plan)
- DOE Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement
- High Level Waste (HLW) Tank Closure
- Alternative Salt Processing Technology for HLW
- Glass Waste Storage EA

## **Nuclear Materials**

- Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 2000-1, 94-1 and DOE Response
- Integrated Nuclear Materials Stewardship Plan
- Long-term Nuclear Materials Storage Facility
- Melt and Dilute Pilot Project for Spent Fuel

## **Strategic & Long Term Issues**

- Budget Development/Integrated Priority List (Fiscal Year 2000, 2001 and 2002)
- Long Term Stewardship
- Technology Development
- NEPA Updates/Status

Ann Clark of SCDHEC suggested the following issues for CAB consideration:

- Transportation protocols
- RCRA/Government Performance Results Act
- House Bill 3907- External Regulation of DOE by NRC and OSHA
- Cultural Resources and Tribal Policies available for comment from DOE-HQ

Mike Schoener asked those present to break out into committee and identify the top three priority items for the next six months; three other items for review over the next six months and three items for consideration in the second half of the next year. He also requested that the Committee identify any focus groups that may be needed. Mr. Schoener stated he would take the information developed and prepare a draft workplan. This draft will first be provided to committee chairs, then the Executive Committee and finally the full CAB prior to the full Board meeting in May.

The committees identified the following issues:

## **Environmental Remediation Committee**

### June through December 2000

1. Total Maximum Daily Loads for Mercury for Savannah River Basin
2. Outfall Toxicity Testing
3. RCRA/Government Performance Results Act
4. ORWBG Focus Group (Issues pending, updates, focus group closure plan, ISPR status)

5. Intergrator Operable Unit Program (Steel Creek Rev. 1 Workplan, Rev. 0 Savannah River Floodplain Swamp Workplan and Fourmile Branch Rev. 0 Workplan)
6. TNX Operable Unit Corrective Measures Study/Feasibility Study (CMS/FS)

January through June 2001

1. Reactor Areas Groundwater Briefing
2. TNX Outfall Delta, Lower Discharge Gully and Swamp CMS/FS
3. Phytoremediation

**Nuclear Materials Committee**

June through December 2000

1. DNFSB Recommendation 2000-1 and 94-1 and DOE's Implementation Plan Response
2. Long Term Nuclear Materials Storage Facility
3. Integrated Nuclear Materials Stewardship Plan
4. Melt and Dilute Technology Pilot Project
5. External Oversight of DOE Facilities
6. Surplus Fissile Materials Nonproliferation and Disposition Activities

January through June 2001

1. DNFSB Recommendation 2000-1 and 94-1 and DOE's Implementation Plan Response and Long Term NM Storage Facility
2. Integrated Nuclear Materials Stewardship Plan
3. Surplus Fissile Materials Nonproliferation and Disposition Activities

**Strategic & Long Term Issues Committee**

June through December 2000

1. Budget Review
2. Strategic Plan/Comprehensive Plan
3. Stewardship
4. Facility Disposition Program
5. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
6. Technology Development

January through June 2001

1. Budget Review
2. Strategic Plan/Comprehensive Plan
3. Stewardship

**Waste Management Committee**

June through December 2000

1. Alternative Salt Processing Technology
2. Consolidated Incineration Facility
3. Tank Closure
4. Glass Waste Storage Building EA (status of EA -RFPs)
5. HLW Evaporator (2H)
6. Transportation Protocols and LLW/MLLW Transportation EA

#### January through June 2001

1. Transuranic /Pu - 238
2. MLLW/LLW Shipments
3. 232-F H3 - conservatism of the Performance Assessments/Composite Analysis

#### **Afternoon Session**

Mike Schoener, CAB Facilitator, introduced Jim Buice, DOE, as the speaker for the budget overview. Mr. Buice stated that the first five pages of his handout referenced the FY 2001 budget rollout. He stated that the CAB had previously reviewed this and he would not spend time on it unless there were questions. Mr. Buice said for FY 2001, the site was submitting a budget amendment to Congress in the amount of \$48 million.

The budget amendment to Congress is a zero sum case. Dollars added must balance dollars subtracted to make a zero sum increase/decrease. Funding would be added to the following applications:

- Pu 3013 Stabilization Capability + \$31.0 million  
This funding would be added to meet the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) commitments. This was supported by a CAB recommendation at the March Board meeting.
- F Area and H Area Stabilization + \$11.0 million  
This also considers DNFSB commitments for Americium/Curium (Am/Cm) stabilization acceleration.
- Solid Waste Activities + \$6.0 million  
This considers shipping transuranic material meeting the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant as well as support for treatment and storage of Low Level Waste and Hazardous Waste and surveillance and maintenance for the Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF).

The sources for this funding are as follows:

- High Level Waste Removal - \$10.0 million  
It is projected that there is enough sludge feed for the Defense Waste Process Facility (DWPF) to operate for several years at a production rate of 200 canisters/year. Therefore, preparing more sludge for vitrification would be postponed.
- Consolidated Incineration Facility- \$18.0 million  
This facility was originally built to reduce benzene generated as part of the HLW vitrification process, and volume reduce LLW and D&D wastes. No benzene is being produced, and no D&D waste has been generated, therefore, CIF has been used only to reduce low level and Purex waste. This is an expensive way to volume reduce or eliminate these wastes. At this time, SRS is planning to place CIF in standby mode. The Site is currently discussing permitting issues with the State. There was discussion regarding suspension of CIF activities and concern expressed by CAB members that CIF had not been fully utilized. CAB members also cautioned DOE regarding loss of the SCDHEC permit, questioning whether CIF may likely be needed in the future to handle benzene, and there is no guarantee that the incinerator would be re-permitted.

- High Enriched Uranium Blend Down- \$10.0 million  
The site is working with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to get TVA to use Highly Enriched Uranium in their power generation facilities. In order for TVA to use the material, the Highly-Enriched Uranium must be blended down to Low-Enriched Uranium. Due to administrative issues, this project has not developed quickly enough to utilize the full amount of funds initially planned for FY01, thus making \$10 million available for use elsewhere on site.
- Four Mile Branch Project - \$10.0 million  
It was explained that the "Fourmile Branch Project" does not refer to the Fourmile IOU Project, or only to a subset of operable unit projects within the Fourmile Branch Watershed, but multiple operable units across several watersheds. DOE considers that there are more cost effective ways to complete the work as scheduled. Julie Corkran, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), was concerned that regulatory compliance agreements would be missed if this funding were reduced. She asked if she could meet with someone working with the Federal Facility Act (FFA) to discuss the issue. Jim Demass, DOE, said he would get with Ms. Corkran.

There was discussion concerning funding for the infrastructure for the site. The site is still deferring \$5 million in FY 2001 related to infrastructure projects.

Mr. Buice reviewed the current FY 2002 Integrated Priority List. The first page was a summary rollup and the following pages gave more detail to the summary. DOE-SR will meet with DOE-Headquarters (HQ) in late May to review the budget needs for FY 2002. SRS has a requirement of \$1,330 million versus a target of \$1,178 million. Those items below the target figure would be deferred projects if the site receives the target funding. Mr. Buice walked through some of the projects on the list explaining that the top six items on the summary list are projects that protect and maintain the site in a safe stage, such as fire protection, security, infrastructure, etc. One half of the budget is used to do base work to address risk. It was pointed out that some of the detail items did not match up with the summary rollup. Mr. Buice said he would issue an updated IPL to those attending the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.