The Waste Management Committee (WMC) met on Monday, May 22, 2000, at the DeSoto Hilton, Savannah, GA. Attendance was as follows:

**CAB Members**  
Wade Waters  
Lola Richardson  
Georgia Leverett  
Karen Patterson  
William Lawrence

**Stakeholders**  
Lynn Waishwell  
Rick McLeod

**DOE/Contractors**  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC  
George Mishra, DOE  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
Soni Blanco, DOE  
Charlie Anderson, DOE  
Larry Ling, DOE  
Howard Gnann, DOE  
Dale Ormond, DOE  
Ray Hannah, DOE  
Bill Noll, DOE  
Kelly Way, WSRC

Wade Waters opened the meeting by asking for introductions and public comments. None were received.

**Transuranic (TRU) Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Permit Modification:** Dale Ormond briefed the committee on the TRU Drum Visual exam requirements. He detailed the purpose, the visual exam process, the number of drums selected, the highest risk, and the most costly characterization process. Lola Richardson, motion manager for the WIPP RCRA Permit Modification Motion reviewed the draft motion background and the recommendation portion of the draft motion. In essence, the CAB does not believe that the current DOE permit modification request goes far enough in its attempt to rectify the miscertification and visual examination issue. The CAB would like to see DOE request a change in the initial assumed miscertification rate of 11% to 1%. Concern remains that the RCRA Permit requires too much visual, x-ray, and intrusive examination to assay the container contents. These assays are unnecessary and pose a danger to SRS workers.

**Issues:** None.

**Actions:** None, there were no changes to be made to the motion.

**Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF):** Ray Hannah briefly brought the committee up-to-date on the CIF issues and status. He outlined the Site Treatment Plan (STP) Commitments for PUREX and non-
PUREX waste. Presently, DOE-SR is developing a path forward to suspend operations. DOE believes that STP PUREX commitments can be met by re-starting in Fiscal Year 2006 (FY06). The CAB and the WM committee take issue with the fact that no information was provided the CAB on the following: the conclusion to suspend operations; an alternative treatment for PUREX; an investigation on any waste streams that could possibly be incinerated; the re-permit situation with SCDHEC; the affect a shut down would have on employees; and the fate of incinerable mixed waste complex wide. After discussion with committee members and DOE, Wade Waters proposed writing a letter to Greg Rudy, Manager, DOE-SR, from the CAB, outlining the CAB’s concern in place of submitting a recommendation.

**Issues:** None.

**Actions:** Send Greg Rudy, Manager, DOE-SR, a letter to outline concerns. Follow-up with a CIF workshop, June 5, 2000, in order for the CAB and the public to discuss issues, questions, and options with DOE and the regulators. Kelly Way to draft CIF letter to present at full CAB meeting Tuesday, May 23, 2000.

**Glass Waste Storage Building Alternative Environmental Assessment (EA):** Soni Blanco, DOE, briefly outlined the status of the EA, the schedule, and the request for bids from the vendors. She emphasized that the public comment period is still open. Also, because interested vendors submitted technical questions and asked for the answers in writing, DOE extended the Request for Proposals (RFP) bid date until August 1, 2000, while they formulate the answers. Georgia Leverett, motion manager for the Glass Waste Storage Building EA, read the background information and the recommendation portion on the draft. The committee had only minor editorial comment and change.

**Issues:** The committee has questions that are not answered in the current EA. Examples: What are the environmental impacts associated with the construction and disposal of the storage casks by the vendor and the impacts of the surface loading from the storage pad on the groundwater under the proposed facility? What is the chemical toxicity of the DUO used in making the casks and in the cask failure scenario? The committee wants to be fully informed and involved in the decision-making process.

**Actions:** DOE to present a summary of the RFP submittals, and provide the most current information on cost schedule and technical comparison to the WM committee by July 25, 2000. Kelly Way and Rick McLeod to make editorial corrections to motion.

**Commendation on Vent & Purge:** Wade Waters, after discussion with several committee members and SRS employees, asked that the committee not proceed with this commendation. Even though it is true that SRS used an innovative approach to the vent & purge problem, compiled an outstanding safety record during the project, and were prudent in the use of taxpayer funds; this, in essence, is their job. Even though the committee appreciates this tremendous effort, they agreed to cancel the commendation. Sonny Goldston iterated that the WM Committee and the CAB deserved much credit because of their involvement from the start of the project and their Recommendations 4 & 11.

**Issues:** None.

**Actions:** None.

**Selection of HLW Salt Processing Alternative Amendment to Recommendation No 112:** Wade Waters, Motion Manager for the Salt Processing Alternative amendment, reviewed the background and the recommendation portion of the draft motion. The WM Committee and the CAB believe the main focus must be selection of a Salt Processing Alternative technology as quickly as possible, but they also believe it is imperative that potential impacts from delays be addressed, identified, and discussed. They propose development of a decision tree that outlines how and when schedule slippage will be addressed. The committee is concerned that schedule slippage would affect tank space needs and regulatory commitments, and would like an update to the Focus Group by July 30, 2000.
Issues: None.

Actions: None.

There were no public comments. Wade Waters adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

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