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Nuclear Materials Committee

Jean Sulc, CAB Chair and Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee member, welcomed the group on behalf of NMC Chair Jerry Devitt who was unable to attend the day’s meeting. She reminded the membership that at the last meeting they had passed Recommendation No. 188, "Plutonium (Pu) Disposition". She said DOE has responded that as requested by the Board, DOE will provide a status update to their Pu plans by July 26, 2004. Ms. Sulc advised the committee that the next NM committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 28, 2004 at the Aiken Federal Building at 5:00 PM.

Status of Nuclear Materials at SRS

According to Ms. Sulc, the presentation was one that the NM Committee requested to help the Board understand what nuclear materials are left at SRS, and their current disposition status. She said that although the committee has no specific recommendation to present at this time, they feel it is important to bring this information to the CAB’s
attention to lay the foundation for future recommendations that the NM Committee may propose for the Board’s consideration.

Sachiko McAlhany opened the presentation by thanking the Board for the opportunity to continue to update them on the status of nuclear materials at SRS. She said that while significant progress has been made in stabilization efforts, there are still some issues that have yet to be fully resolved. She introduced John Dickenson as the program’s speaker and restated DOE’s commitment to keep the Board informed of the progress made with the materials.

Mr. Dickenson began his presentation (see attachment) with a review of the overall mission of the SRS Nuclear Materials Management Program, and the associated programmatic drivers for the reduction or elimination of the potential risk associated with legacy nuclear material. He then provided a briefing on each of the site’s storage and processing facilities that support this mission.

According to Mr. Dickenson, SRS has completed approximately 89 percent of the assigned scope of materials requiring stabilization. To meet this scope, Mr. Dickenson stated 42 out of the 43 required operational restarts have been completed. He stated the last startup is associated with the stabilization of Neptunium in HB-Line, which is scheduled to begin later this year. Mr. Dickenson highlighted the remaining material stabilization milestones and compared the due dates established by the Secretary of Energy to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) with the programmed completion dates established by SRS. In each case, SRS anticipates completing the remaining stabilization efforts ahead of the due dates.

He then offered the specific details of each of the Environmental Management (EM) owned materials requiring stabilization at SRS and their current disposition path. Mr. Dickenson acknowledged that while progress has been made in stabilizing legacy nuclear materials, there remain several key disposition decisions that have yet to be made. He explained that FB-Line is continuing to package Pu into 3013 containers. According to Mr. Dickenson, the storage of Pu from Rocky Flats as well as the Pu stabilized and packaged at SRS will continue to be stored on an interim basis until a final disposition decision is made by DOE Headquarters (HQ).

Another key decision anticipated from DOE Headquarters will be the determination of how to disposition spent nuclear fuel (SNF). Mr. Dickenson reminded the committee that the consolidation of all onsite SNF into L-Basin has been completed. He stated that any future receipts of offsite domestic and foreign SNF would also be stored in L-Basin pending future disposition to a federal repository.

Mr. Dickenson and Ms. McAlhany fielded numerous questions from the Board. When asked about the impact of deactivating FB-Line prior to the establishment of an alternative 3013 capability in 235-F, Mr. Dickenson explained that the transition would be made in full compliance with the requirements. He stated that an alternative surveillance capability would be established before it would be removed from FB-Line. Ms. McAlhany further explained that the only lag would be the ability to replace a can should Pu in an existing 3013 container fail the surveillance requirements. When asked if it was time critical to re-establish the canning capability, Ms. McAlhany said it was not. She stated that if such a problem existed, the strategy would be to open the can and stabilize the material by dissolution in another facility.

In summary, Mr. Dickenson stated that progress has been made since 1995 and as a result, a significant reduction in risk had been achieved through the SRS Nuclear Materials Management Program.

**Waste Management Committee**

Harold Rahn summarized the draft Modified Salt Waste Disposition Strategy recommendation (see attached). The WM Committee is deeply concerned about potential delays in implementing the modified salt waste disposition strategy; their long term effect on completion of HLW cleanup by 2019; and their short term effect on availability of the skilled work force specific to these projects. Therefore, the motion recommends that SRS identify the impacts on costs and schedules of delaying Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) design activities and present the findings to the SRS CAB by July 26, 2004. It also requests SRS implement as much of the modified salt waste disposition strategy as the FY 04 budget will allow and asked DOE-HQ to provide funds necessary for SRS to begin to implement the modified salt waste disposition strategy, such as design and construction-related activities.
Mr. Willoughby commented on the mention of $188.6 million in funds. The implication of the motion to Mr. Willoughby is that DOE-HQ is holding funds. Mr. Willoughby’s understanding was that these funds were not being requested by Congress. Mel Galin offered his observation. This money has a vast number of political implications and has caused issues to be raised. He mentioned that in a conversation with Jessie Roberson (Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management), she explained to him that DOE wasn’t promoting the legislation change because they would rather go through the court process. She indicated that Congress is not in favor of giving this money to SRS. Mr. Galin suggested that SRS request the money and continue to progress outside the lawsuit.

Discussion followed on the release/request of these funds and each of the three parts of the draft recommendation. The group agreed that work can be done at SRS in spite of the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) lawsuit.

The group discussed Jean Sulc’s letter (see attachment) to the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) regarding the Transuranic Waste Baseline Inventory Report (BIR). Sonny Goldston, WSRC, noted that the public hearing has been delayed from June to July. Mr. Goldston explained that DOE plans to withdraw its request regarding the Hanford waste being sent to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Ms. Sulc told the group that she still plans to send the letter.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Interim Action Proposed Plan at the C-Area Groundwater (CRGW) Operable Unit

Bob Blundy, WSRC, stated that the purpose was to present the status and proposed interim action technology for the CRGW operable unit and that the interim action has been available for public comment since March 17, 2004. Mr. Blundy pointed out that there were several alternatives considered before two approaches surfaced. The two currently being considered for public comment were soil vapor extraction (SVE) at a cost of $7,108,000 and seven years operating time, and Electric Resistance Heating (ERH) with SVE at $4,790,000 and less than one year operating time. The SRS Core team approved the ERH with SVE as the preferred alternative for cleanup.

The Core Team chose this preferred alternative for several reasons, including shorter operating time; greater removal efficiency; lower costs; and the area of vadose zone contaminated is smaller and easier to treat. Mr. Bundy explained that ERH consists of six input electrodes and one neutral electrode; current flows between electrodes; soil is heated resistively until approximately the boiling point of water; soil moisture becomes an in-situ source of steam; and all electrodes paired with an SVE well. Mr. Blundy stated that heating vaporizes and releases the volatile organic compounds, and the contaminant vapors are withdrawn from soil by SVE wells and treated at the surface.

The interim Record of Decision, Revision 1, is to be submitted by June 1, 2004. Remedial action field start is expected by September 30, 2005, and start-up testing should begin April 5, 2006, with completion in August of 2007. Mr. Blundy concluded that if ERH proves successful at CRGW, it has potential for other SRS deployments.

Karen Patterson asked if this would be considered a final action. Mr. Blundy stated that this interim action addresses the source cleanup, the final action for the entire plume will take place at a later date. Dorene Richardson asked if the ERH would destroy the microorganisms in the soil. Mr. Bundy stated that she was correct, however, the microorganisms will return to the area as the soil cools to a normal temperature. Mel Galin asked if this technology would be deployed at other locations at SRS. Mr. Blundy stated that should this deployment prove to be as successful as anticipated, then other areas would be considered (i.e. Reactors, Chemical-Metals-Pesticides Pits, A-14 Outfall, etc.).

Perry Holcomb presented a draft motion regarding facility disposition (see attached). The motion recommended that DOE-HQ and DOE-SR closely review its deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) prioritization policy/strategy, emphasizing that the D&D focus should be on risk mitigation and reduction and not merely on reducing the site "footprint." It also asked that by July 27, 2004, DOE-SR provide the CAB and the general public additional details on its D&D prioritization activities. Specifically, life cycle costs for continued housing of evicted staff and those for D&D of the buildings (730-M and 742-A) should be provided along with projected life cycle cost savings from elimination of the structures. Capital costs for replacement of these buildings was also requested. Mr. Holcomb
agreed to change the name of the draft motion from a "Common Sense Approach to D&D" to "Prioritizing D&D activities."

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee

William Lawrence, Chair, commented on the two workshops that were held in April, one on the Performance Management Plan (PMP) and the other on the Risk Based End State (RBES) Vision Document. He thanked the site for the informative workshops. From the workshops, two draft recommendations were developed. Since both documents were crosscutting the various CAB committees, the draft recommendations were general in nature and were sponsored by all the committees. More specific recommendations may be developed by the individual committees.

Darryl Nettles agreed to be the motion manager for the PMP recommendation (see attached). In an effort to strengthen the PMP process the motion recommended that SRS develop a section on accountability in the PMP and discuss how key assumptions will be periodically revalidated. It also asked DOE-HQ to work aggressively with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to ensure the licensing of Yucca Mountain to meet the PMP objectives and requested that DOE-HQ prioritize waste acceptance for SRS vitrified high level waste and spent fuel. In addition, the motion asked DOE-HQ to provide a schedule and implementation plan for the SRS shipments. There was brief discussion and several modifications required by the Board Technical Advisor.

Bill Vogele presented the draft RBES recommendation. This motion endorsed the RBES process and offered nine recommendations in an effort to strengthen the document. The Board expects a progress report on each of the following recommendations on or before September 27, 2004:

1. SRS provide additional information about the risks, both human health and environment, associated with the end states proposed.
2. SRS clearly articulate the plan and approach for reaching public acceptance of the end state visions.
3. SRS develop a RBES outreach effort to educate the general public on the difference between perceived risks to human health and the environment and actual risks associated with SRS end states.
4. Regarding future land use, DOE-SR and DOE-HQ pursue Congressional Authorization to provide perpetual federal ownership and responsibility for SRS’s fixed boundaries.
5. SRS include a discussion on how historic preservation, cultural resource management (CRM) goals, and continued National Environmental Research Park (NERP) designation are integrated into the SRS end state vision and how SRS will implement them.
6. SRS evaluate alternative disposal options for Pu-238 contaminated waste so that the risks associated with handling and shipments are protective of human health and the environment.
7. SRS continue to develop "area" risk assessment methodology and protocols protective of human health and the environment.
8. SRS determine and evaluate the risks of in situ decommissioning in lieu of demolition
9. DOE-HQ request and work with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to revise the high level waste federal repository glass durability specifications to allow an increase in waste activity loading above the current specifications.

No public comments were received and the meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.
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Approval of the Minutes
The meeting minutes of the March 2004 meeting were approved with no changes.

Outgoing Member Recognition
Jean Sulc recognized Alice Doswell for two years of service as the Deputy Designated Federal Official and presented her with a plaque of appreciation from the SRS CAB.

Agency Update
DOE Site Manager Jeff Allison introduced Bill Spader as the new Deputy Designated Federal Official. Mr. Spader noted he looks forward to continuing the strong and open relationship set forth by his predecessor. He provided highlights regarding the budget noting the budget request was $1.38 million in FY04 and there is a shortfall of $51 million. Mr. Spader noted several initiatives undertaken in order to resolve the budget issue and balance the books. He noted some of the actions are administrative and scope deferrals. However, to capitalize and save money, WSRC is taking some work back from subcontractors, such as janitorial services. Mr. Spader also discussed beryllium found in a laundry facility in F Area.

Mr. Spader noted that the Savannah River Technology Center had obtained National Laboratory status. He closed by stating he was very excited to be here in this capacity. He stated he values input by people not so close to the work and recognizes that it inevitably creates a better solution to problems. Upon request, Alice Doswell provided an explanation of the intent of Senator Graham’s proposed legislation regarding entombment of residual waste, which would allow a residual amount to be classified so that it does not have to go to the federal repository.

Dawn Taylor, EPA, noted their first meeting with Bill Spader was very positive and they appreciated him maintaining open lines of communication. She also noted a change in upper management at EPA, stating that John Johnston was moving to the RCRA Programs Branch and Annie Godfrey was now serving as Acting Branch Manager.
Shelley Sherritt, stated that SCDHEC is very proud that two tanks have been closed at SRS and SCDHEC supports Senator Graham’s proposal because it embodies principles by which these two tanks were closed. She clarified that by definition, the rule making process would include public review and comment. Tank closure requires radionuclides to be removed to the maximum extent possible, said Sherritt. She stated the essential elements for SCDHEC are state buy-in to the closure process (what will be left in the tanks, removing as much as possible) and allowance of stakeholder input in the process.

Chair Update
Jean Sulc provided a briefing regarding the recent Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs Meeting held in Washington, D.C. in late April. Ms. Sulc stated that Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson attended the meeting and asked for ideas regarding the use of $188 million portion of the High Level Waste (HLW) Proposal at SRS. Ms. Sulc also commented that there was a Transuranic Waste presentation and that Inez Triay, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, had attended and answered questions regarding the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant proposed permit modification. She relayed that Hanford had desired to ship eight small packages of high level waste to WIPP and did not anticipate the problems it would create. It appears that now Hanford may withdraw that request, she said.

Ms. Sulc also discussed the 8A contract status, noting there had been a few minor changes to the workscope and that the board would review the Request for Proposals. She stated there should be a discussion opportunity with the chosen 8A firm in June and a contract award in July.

Ms. Sulc announced that the Executive Committee had decided no changes were needed in the recommendation format. The Executive Committee also recommended the CAB send a congratulatory letter regarding the designation of the Savannah River National Laboratory. Ms. Sulc also encouraged CAB members to be thinking of questions to be asked regarding transition to other programs and public involvement. She noted the next Chairs meeting will be in Washington hosted by Hanford. There was also discussion at the Chairs meeting regarding the next SSAB workshop with the topic regarding public involvement. Ms. Sulc stated the Executive Committee agreed the SRS CAB should participate.

Facilitator Update
Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). Nine recommendations are pending, 25 open and 154 closed. Mr. Schoener discussed guidance for formal transmittal of CAB recommendations, stating that during the Chairs meeting it was clarified that the Boards can only provide advice via DOE and not directly to regulatory agencies. A process for transmittal will be provided for discussion during the July CAB meeting. Mr. Schoener also noted that the SRS CAB will hold an Education Retreat September 10-11 in Charleston, S.C. and promised more details during the July CAB meeting.

Strategic & Legacy Management
Darryl Nettles presented a draft motion on the SRS Performance Management Plan (see attached). As presented the day prior, the motion recommended that SRS develop a section on accountability in the PMP and discuss how key assumptions will be periodically revalidated. It also asked DOE-HQ to work aggressively with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to ensure the licensing of Yucca Mountain to meet the PMP objectives and requested that DOE-HQ prioritize waste acceptance for SRS vitrified high level waste and spent fuel. In addition, the motion asked DOE-HQ to provide a schedule and implementation plan for the SRS shipments. Murray Riley moved the Board adopt the recommendation and William Lawrence seconded. The motion carried by a vote of 14 members in favor. Perry Holcomb and Barbara Paul abstained from the vote noting they had reservations that have not been answered and were not for or against the motion.

Bill Vogele presented the draft RBES recommendation. This motion endorsed the RBES process and offered nine specific recommendations in an effort to strengthen the process. The Board requested a progress report on each of the recommendations on or before September 27, 2004. Dorene Richardson moved the Board adopt the motion and Harold Rahn seconded. The motion passed by a vote of sixteen members in favor and one abstention by Perry Holcomb, who stated he still has concerns about the recommendation, but does not wish to impede the work of the CAB.
Administrative Committee
In Meryl Alalof’s absence, Perry Holcomb briefly discussed a proposal to amend the bylaws, which he had proposed to the Administrative Committee. Mr. Holcomb had suggested that the following sentence be added to Article VI, Section 6.5 of the bylaws: "Members may not expound their views at the expense of others. The presiding officer shall be responsible for maintaining proper participant decorum throughout the meeting and will immediately redirect those in violation of this code of conduct."

Harold Rahn moved the Board adopt the motion and Gloria Williams-Way seconded. Perry Holcomb then moved to table the motion and Bill Vogele seconded. Twelve members were in favor of tabling the motion and one opposed.

Waste Management Committee
Bill Willoughby presented the Draft Final Report of the Consolidated Incineration Facility Focus Group (see attachment).

Harold Rahn suggested that CAB members send letters to Senator Graham supporting his proposed legislation as individual citizens.

Harold Rahn summarized the draft Modified Salt Waste Disposition Strategy recommendation presented the previous day for consideration and the comments which had been incorporated (see attached). The WM Committee is deeply concerned about potential delays in implementing the modified salt waste disposition strategy; their long term effect on completion of HLW cleanup by 2019; and their short term effect on availability of the skilled work force specific to these projects. Therefore, the motion recommends that SRS identify the impacts on costs and schedules of delaying SWPF design activities and present the findings to the SRS CAB by July 26, 2004. It also requested that SRS implement as much of the modified salt waste disposition strategy as the FY 04 budget will allow and asked DOE-HQ to provide funds necessary for SRS to begin to implement the modified salt waste disposition strategy, such as the design and construction-related activities. Karen Patterson offered changes to the comment section and there was further discussion regarding terms and whether restore or request was the correct terminology. Bill Vogele moved the Board adopt the motion and Murray Riley seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 17 members in favor.

Jean Sulc presented the final letter (see attachment) to the NMED regarding the TRU Waste Baseline Inventory Report. By a show of hands, the CAB agreed to send the non-technical public comments.

Public Comments
Former CAB Member, Beckie Dawson welcomed the CAB to Savannah.

Annie Godfrey, EPA expressed her thanks to Alice Doswell and noted they had been recipients of a Notable Achievement Award at HQ due to relations between DOE and regulators.

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee
Perry Holcomb presented the draft motion "Prioritizing D&D Activities at SRS" (see attached). The motion recommends that DOE-HQ and DOE-SR closely review its deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) prioritization policy/strategy, emphasizing that the D&D focus should be on risk mitigation and reduction and not merely on reducing the site "footprint." It also asked that by July 27, 2004, DOE-SR provide the CAB and the general public additional details on its D&D prioritization activities. Specifically requested were the life cycle costs for continued housing of evicted staff and those for D&D of the buildings (730-M and 742-A) along with projected life cycle cost savings from elimination of the structures. Capital costs for replacement of these buildings was also requested. Bill Vogele moved the Board adopt the motion and Leon Chavous seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 16 members in favor and one abstention by Bill Vogele.

Deletion from the National Priorities List
Kim Cauthen, WSRC, provided a presentation regarding deletion of SRS waste units from the National Priorities List (NPL)(see attachment). He stated that deletion of waste units from the NPL publicly proclaims the successes of
the SRS cleanup program. Units are bundled into an area closure to streamline and consolidate documents. Area Records of Decision use screening tools and evaluate residual risks after remedial action and use site specific risk scenarios based on the anticipated end state. Mr. Cauthen discussed the accelerated area Record of Decision schedule and area closure schedules. He provided an explanation of the NPL, which is a listing of facilities across the United States that have legacy contamination in the environment that must be addressed. The NPL determines which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of the human health and environmental risks associated with a site. It notifies the public of sites EPA believes warrants further investigation.

Mr. Cauthen discussed what the NPL means to the public. It serves as identification of the worst waste sites in the country. It is available for review by EPA and seeks public input in the remediation process. It also seeks public input in the deletion of waste sites from the list. EPA’s intent is to get completed waste sites off the NPL. Remediation is complete when all site cleanup goals have been met and the site is protective of human health and the environment and operations and maintenance are all that remain. Deletion does not end responsibility. Regulatory requirements under CERCLA, RCRA and the FFA do not change due to deletion. Recently discovered waste sites can be added to the remaining NPL listing or just addressed under the FFA. Also, five year remedy review is still required as well.

F&H Area Groundwater Annual Update

Ed McNamee stated the purpose of the presentation (see attachment) was to provide a status on progress of F&H Area Groundwater and to demonstrate the potential success of the new barrier wall deployment in lieu of Pump-and-Treat. As Mr. McNamee pointed out, the Constituents of Concern are many and include the majority of the periodic table.

F&H Areas are in the central part of SRS. The purpose of deploying the barrier wall system is to reduce the tritium flux at Fourmile Branch, which is a stream that leads to the Savannah River. Mr. McNamee stated that the Pump-and-Treat operation has been used for years as a means to capture the tritium as it moved toward Fourmile Branch. However, as of late this process has lost effectiveness and was still costing a million dollars per month to operate, hence the barrier wall approach.

Mr. McNamee stated that the barrier wall effectiveness would be enhanced by the geological tan clay formation in the treatment areas. This would allow for the barrier walls to help concentrate the contamination for easier removal to the surface. The barrier walls run for 2,700 linear feet with an average depth of 70 feet. The deep soil mixing equipment can mix effectively at depths of 120 feet. The equipment will use a commercially available mix called Impermix, which has low permeability; is less diffusive than bentonite grout; and is resistant to degradation in acidic environments.

The wall when completed will be a minimum of 2 feet thick. Once the wall is in place base injection consisting of sodium hydroxide at a target zone 10 feet above the tan clay would raise the pH and reduce the mobility of the constituents of concern allowing for a more efficient capture rate. The schedule of the project calls for the following:

- Pilot scale test, April – June 2004
- F-Area Wall, June – October 2004
- H-Area Wall, October 2004 – March 2005
- Install F-Area Base Injection, October 2004 – June 2005
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