The SRS Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Waste Management Committee (WMC) met on Tuesday, December 10, 2002, at the Federal Building in Aiken, SC. The purposes of the meeting were to hear a presentation on Glass Waste Storage Building #2; discuss CAB Recommendation #13; and hear public comment. Attendance was as follows:

**CAB Members**
- Bill Willoughby
- Jerry Devitt
- Perry Holcomb
- Murray Riley
- Meryl Alaloff
- Judy Barnett
- William Lawrence

**Stakeholders**
- Lee Poe
- Bill McDonell
- Mike French
- Karen Patterson
- Chuck Foster
- Leon Chavous
- Rick McLeod*
- Russ Messick
- Kelly Hunter

**DOE/Contractors**
- Charlie Anderson, DOE-SR
- George Mishra, DOE-SR
- Virginia Kay, DOE-SR
- Tom Gutmann, DOE-SR
- Kim Sidey, DOE-SR
- Julie Petersen, DOE-SR
- Kelly Way, WSRC

* *CAB Technical Advisor

Bill Willoughby welcomed those in attendance and then updated the group on several issues. He informed the group that he plans to separate the High Level Waste (HLW) topics and Solid Waste (SW) topics at the WM Committee meetings. Each meeting would support only one division—either SW or HLW. He indicated that this might mean two WM Committee meetings a month in addition to the Focus Group meetings.

Mr. Willoughby then asked for introductions.

**Glass Waste Storage Building**
Kim Sidey, Project Manager for the Glass Waste Storage Building (GWSB), explained that he intended to provide a thorough review of the GWSB background, need, and acquisition strategy and a discussion of CAB recommendation #13. He explained that "acquisition strategy" simply means how Savannah River (SR) acquires an asset on site.

He reminded the group that SR is required to meet Site Treatment Plan and Federal Facilities Agreement commitments. These commitments include closing all "old-style" HLW tanks by 2022, closing the HLW system, and completing Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) by
2028. The Savannah River Performance Management Plan accelerates this schedule by eight years with the closure of the HLW System and completion of DWPF processing by 2020.

Mr. Sidey moved on to cover the GWSB #2 scope. The current plan is to replicate to the extent possible the GWSB #1 design, but with a current code of record, and at the same time, deleting non-essential or redundant features by incorporating Lessons Learned. SR intends to use the same Shielded Canister Transport (SCT). Some changes include using passive ventilation features and eliminating the administration area.

Mr. Sidey continued with the GWSB Statement of Work. Obviously, GWSB #1 will be used as the starting point or baseline for the design of Building #2. The design will be upgraded to the current code of record. The structure of the building vaults below grade will remain largely unchanged because they have worked well. Areas from GWSB #1 that have been found to be redundant or unnecessary will not be included in GWSB #2.

Mr. Sidey explained the active cooling feature in GWSB #1. An active vault cooling system was installed in GWSB #1 because the potential for contamination from the canisters was originally uncertain. After extensive measuring and monitoring, no contamination was found. In addition, the HEPA filters have been examined and no contamination has been found. Therefore, contamination is not an issue, and a passive cooling system will be sufficient for GWSB #2. Also, because no fans will be required, no backup power will be necessary. The operating ventilation system above the vault will be designed to remove only diesel combustion fumes. The GWSB #2 major upgrades are mainly seismic.

Mr. Sidey showed slides of the proposed location of GWSB #2 and added that the second building is a little larger than #1. He showed the early construction pictures of #1 and pointed out the vast amounts of rebar and the thickness of the walls and base. He explained how the precast-panel canister supports are put in place and pointed out the numerous safety features.

Mr. Sidey explained all of the alternatives that were considered. Safety, cost of construction and maintenance, transportation cost, radiation exposure risks, and failure analysis were all considered. Before GWSB #1 was ever built, 18 other designs/concepts were considered. Several existing, empty facilities at the site and variations of the original design were examined for the building #2. After consideration of the current schedule and a study of the life–cycle costs, a GWSB #2 was deemed the best alternative.

Mr. Sidey outlined the acquisition strategy. DOE hopes to use a small business contract to design and build the GWSB #2. With this proposal, DOE-SR would be the project manager and the US Army Corps of Engineers would be the construction manager. When asked why small business was being considered, Mr. Anderson stated that this project is driven by the President’s agenda. Approval of this project was contingent upon DOE’s negotiating with small businesses. DOE-SR will evaluate the project as it progresses.

When asked about the benefit of the government managing the project, Mr. Sidey answered that DOE-SR is required to lower the acquisition costs and has chosen to use the Corps of Engineers. Mr. Anderson made two points. This project isn’t a nuclear process; there are no contamination
or security issues. This is a good case to allow other companies with this expertise to build GWSB #2. Mr. Sidey added that since DOE-SR knows the costs of Building #1, and because WSRC has done a thorough estimate of project costs, SR knows what the bid should be. Mr. Poe emphasized that the government’s job is oversight, not project management.

Mr. Sidey outlined the project schedule and need for GWSB #2. The building must be in place by October 2006. It was noted that the schedule is tight, and that this issue needs resolution. He added that DOE-SR has presented this scenario to Congress, the regulators, and the public.

Mike French commented that the closure date for the GWSB #1 was far too close to the projected GWSB #2 availability date to be acceptable. He believes it would be of major concern if DWPF had to be shut down because there was no storage space available for filled canisters. Consequently, he strongly recommended that DOE develop a detailed contingency plan A.S.A.P. to avoid any major potential problem in this area. Mr. French questioned if DOE had considered temporary dry pad storage containers similar to those used by commercial nuclear facilities for their spent fuel? He also suggested that DOE respond to this recommendation to develop a contingency plan and brief the Committee on their progress by April 15, 2003.

Mr. Sidey and the Committee reviewed the status of CAB recommendation No. 13. It seems as though all conditions have been met in order to move this recommendation to closed except to "review the design and the changes in operations with independent scientific peer review (ISPR)." Mr. Sidey told the group that the project has recently undergone a comprehensive external Independent Review by the Office of Project Management. Also, per DOE project guidance, additional independent reviews will be conducted throughout the life of the project, and the NEPA analysis is complete for this design.

Mr. McLeod questioned the value of an ISPR since SR has operating experience. Mr. Willoughby suggested that Recommendation 13 be closed and another recommendation written that defines the group’s concept of ISPR. The group decided to leave 13 as it is for the present, and to write another recommendation. The group also asked for clarification and a presentation in 3-6 months.

**Action**

Questions: Lee Poe asked if the volume of HLW continuing to rise. Also, he asked how SR intends to start-up a building with no heat convection. "How does it start drawing with no heat or force?"

Another presentation in 3-6 months.

Mr. Willoughby adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

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