



SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

**SRS Citizens Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
November 15-16, 2004
Augusta Towers Hotel & Conference Center
Augusta, Ga.**

Monday, November 15, 2004, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Leon Chavous
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Mel Galin
Cassandra Henry
Perry Holcomb
Bill Lawless

Stakeholders

Mike French
Tracy Carroll
Todd Crawford
Pete Arrowsmith
Harold Cahill
Art Domby
Sam Booher
Charles Utley
Dan Battleson
Robert Rider
Melinda Rider

William Lawrence
Wendell Lyon
Bob Meisenheimer
Karen Patterson
Murray Riley
Jean Sulc
Bill Vogele
Bill Willoughby
Gloria Williams Way
Carolyne Williams

Regulators

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC
Annie Godfrey, EPA
Kim Newell, SCDHEC

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Shelley Sherritt, SCDHEC
Dawn Taylor, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Roger Rollins, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Tony Polk, DOE
Karen Adams, DOE
Bert Crapse, DOE
Doug Hintze, DOE
Brian Looney, WSRC
Rich Edwards, WSRC
John Dickenson, WSRC
Mike Logan, WSRC
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC
Joe Carter, WSRC
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Kelly Way, WSRC
Tiajuana Cocknauer, USFS-SR
Karen Vangelas, WSRC
Gerald Blount, WSRC

Waste Management Committee

Rich Edwards, WSRC Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) River Protection Project Waste Treatment Plant Project Manager, reviewed key dates of the treatability studies (see attachment). Since 1996, SRNL has been conducting treatability studies with radioactive Hanford samples in support of Hanford's Waste Treatment Plant. In June 2004, Washington State Ecology questioned the residue being shipped back to Hanford from these studies. They stated the residue was not subject to the sample exclusion policy. Washington Ecology proposed a fine to DOE of \$270,000.

Mr. Edwards reviewed the specific procedures, training and controls used by SRNL in performing the Hanford samples. Because of the notice by the Ecology department, questions concerning the studies need to be in writing so the attorneys can review the answers before they are distributed. Several questions were asked at previous meetings and the written questions and answers were included in the CAB package at the meeting. A draft motion (see attached) on the subject was reviewed by Bob Meisenheimer. After much discussion, the motion was modified for Board consideration the next day.

Nuclear Materials Committee

Jerry Devitt, Nuclear Materials Committee (NMC) Chair, opened the meeting stating the NMC has been tracking the progress of the work in F-Canyon for several years. He said his committee had recently learned about a project for

repackaging TRU waste in F-Canyon. As a result, the NMC worked with the Waste Management Committee to draft a recommendation for the Board's consideration. He introduced Sonny Goldston and Mike Logan to provide a presentation as background to the draft recommendation.

Sonny Goldston opened the presentation with a reminder that the success of the waste shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) was focused on shipping 55-gallon drummed waste. While this is still ongoing, the major challenge is the non-drummed waste such as the large black boxes. He said this waste requires that it be repackaged before it can be placed into a shipping container. He said Mike Logan, F-Canyon Complex Manager, is responsible for the pilot project where two of the large black boxes are now being repackaged into Standard Large Boxes, which are the inner containers for the TRUPACT III shipping containers.

Mr. Logan said canyon deactivation is proceeding slightly ahead of schedule and explained that the TRU Black Box Repackaging Pilot Project is staged in the warm canyon truckwell. By limiting the pilot project to only two of the black boxes, the work could be scheduled to prove the feasibility of the repackaging concept without impact to the F-Canyon deactivation schedule. According to Mr. Logan, another advantage is that by using an existing facility rather than building a new one, this pilot project is being conducted in a cost-effective manner.

He said the boxes selected contained waste that has been characterized as similar to other waste generated in F-Canyon. His personnel are very familiar with how to safely handle this type of waste and this work will not add to the source term remaining in the facility. Procedures call for strict contamination control methods and all job control waste generated by the repackaging efforts would be packaged into the Standard Large Boxes. Mr. Logan said that upon completion of this project, a site evaluation would be conducted to determine the best option for accelerating the disposition of legacy TRU waste.

Karen Patterson, NMC Vice Chair introduced the draft recommendation. She said the committee members felt that while H-Canyon may be a likely facility to continue the black box repackaging effort, they did not want any interruption of H-Canyon's mission. She said they would propose the site consider developing an integrated schedule so that both repackaging of TRU wastes and H-Canyon activities can continue without significantly impacting the overall schedules of either program. Committee members believe that an early identification of a dedicated facility for repackaging black box contents is important.

Upon discussion, minor changes to the draft recommendation were made and it was agreed that a final draft would be submitted to the full Board at the next day's meeting.

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Monitored Natural Attenuation/Enhanced Attenuation (MNA/EA) for Chlorinated Solvents Technology Alternative Project: Karen Adams, DOE, and Brian Looney, WSRC, provided a presentation (see attachment) in response to CAB Recommendation #175, which called for periodic updates of the project. The MNA/EA project goal is to facilitate closure of contaminated sites using passive cleanup technologies and cost-effective monitoring strategies. Monitored Natural Attenuation is defined as managing all or part of a contaminated plume in soil and groundwater by utilizing the existing decontamination and attenuation mechanisms of the natural system and documenting the resulting attenuation capacity. Enhanced Attenuation is defined as managing all or part of a contaminant plume in soil and groundwater by initiating and/or augmenting natural and sustainable decontamination and attenuation mechanisms and by resulting attenuation capacity. A sustainable enhancement is an intervention that continues to operate until such time that the enhancement is no longer required to reduce contaminant concentrations of fluxes. A Technical Working Group consisting of DOE, ITRC, CABs, regulators and stakeholders, Universities, Industry, Federal Agencies, and End-Users was formed to further study the MNA/EA project and subteams are looking at mass balance (quantifying natural attenuation capacity), enhanced attenuation concepts, increased natural attenuation capacity and strategies for characterization and monitoring.

Mr. Looney stated that the summary of joint DOE and ITRC end product and strategy is improved technical and regulatory support for implementing natural attenuation and related strategies. Mr. Looney stated that through fiscal year 2005, funding from the government, 75% of which goes to Universities, National Labs, Small Business, technical business and 25% to SRNL. Mr. Looney stated that it is hoped that in fiscal year 2006, the funding would be picked up by the ITRC in order to foster the use of this science.

TNX Operable Unit

Perry Holcomb, Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee Chair, provided background information for the draft motion regarding the TNX Operable Unit (see attachment). Mr. Holcomb stated that the SRS CAB questions if the proposed interim action to remove "hot spots" of uranium, thorium, and their respective daughters of decay

from the TNX OU is necessary, especially in light of the projected cost of \$1.7 million as determined by the EE/CA for that unit. The following are not only the CAB's concerns but those also expressed by public stakeholders:

- How well can this mostly wetlands area, now scheduled for an interim action, be characterized by soil samples taken eight years ago, in 1996? Can the "hot spots" really be in the same locations?
- How well can the TNX OU be characterized by soil samples taken near the surface (0' to 4') when most of the TNX OU is subject to flooding by the Savannah River and to storm water runoff from heavy rains, especially when the constituents of concern were in a highly soluble chemical state (nitrates), and the pH of the aqueous phase was low enough to retard their hydrolysis to insoluble hydrous oxides.
- How well can the TNX OU be characterized by samples for which the uranium and thorium daughter radionuclides with the greatest risks, thallium-208, bismuth-212, bismuth-214, and lead-214, were not reported by the gamma pulse height analyses of these samples?
- How well can the TNX OU be characterized by gamma pulse height analytical results that carry modifiers that note contamination of laboratory reagent blanks by the constituents being analyzed or noted that the result is an estimated one?

The stakeholders believe that a realistic examination of all the facts in this proposed interim action, especially in light of the foregoing concerns, would show the "No Action" alternative to be a much better choice, both economically and because of the small exposure risk, $3.1E-05$ maximum, involved, a cancer risk to humans for which cleanup decisions can be administratively made.

For comparison, the future casual trespasser, the object of exposure in the TNX OU, would have a cancer risk some twenty times greater ($7.0E-04$) from breathing the radon-222 naturally present in the atmosphere from the decay of primordial uranium-238 in the earth's crust.

Following discussion and minor modification of the motions, Mel Galin suggested the draft motion be separated into two separate motions- one addressing the TNX Operable Unit proposed interim action and one addressing the Federal Facility Agreement process and early stakeholder involvement. This was agreed to by Mr. Holcomb, who stated he would present two draft motions the next day.

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee Report

Historic Preservation Update

Todd Crawford with Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness (CNTA) reviewed the plans and status of the SRS Heritage Center. While the initiative only began 16 months ago, there has been amazing progress. The Programmatic Agreement was signed on July 8, 2004, the architects Lord-Aeck and Sargent visited the site May 13 and the Aiken City and County Councils along with Barnwell and Allendale counties and another eight cities in the Central Savannah River Area signed a resolution showing community support.

Locations for the potential Heritage Center are currently being reviewed. Several areas on site were considered – Building 703-47A, 742-A and 105-C. Of these, 742-A is the building preferred. To help fund the Center, a non-profit Heritage Foundation, Inc. has been established. The next step is to pursue grants. An Artifacts Selection Team continues to work at the site to find and select artifacts. A Heritage Tourism Committee has been formed and a Board of Directors is currently being considered.

While excited about the progress, Mr. Crawford assured the CAB there is still a large amount of work to be completed. He offered suggestions on how people can help such as identifying and selecting artifacts, becoming a Founding Member of the SRS Heritage Foundation, watch for the web site and stay in touch with Walt Joseph and himself.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Update

Bill Payne, WSRC Environmental Services Section, reminded the Board that this report is an update of his visit July 23, 2003, when the CAB adopted recommendation #165. Mr. Payne wanted to update the CAB on compliance and cost issues concerning the SRS NPDES permit. The new permit took effect December 2003. This permit has a very low discharge limit for copper, lead and zinc. He reminded the CAB that one part per billion is equal to one drop of water in a 22,000 gallon swimming pool, one penny in 10 million dollars or one second in 32 years.

Mr. Payne reviewed a table showing the metal limitations comparing the old limits to the new limits. Where many of the old limits had no limit, the new permit now required a limit. As requested in the CAB recommendation, SRS negotiated the compliance schedule with SCDHEC. Since the last presentation to the CAB, the site has developed a team of site personnel to analyze, evaluate and select compliance options for the 11 outfalls under this new permit. From this group, two outfalls have been eliminated from the list. Mr. Payne reviewed the recommended options for each of the nine outfalls remaining. The preferred options fall into various categories: discharge to the wetlands treatment facility, route to the Central Sanitary Wastewater Treatment Facility, relocate the outfall, route to an ash basin and cooling tower basin and install a peat bed.

The cost estimate to SRS for this work was initially \$50 to 60 million. Because of the hard work of the team, the cost is now projected to be around \$7 to 8 million. The site continues to work with SCDHEC to find appropriate and less costly solutions. It was noted during discussions that SCDHEC is not at fault for developing this new permit but is merely following the federal guidelines.

Public Comments

The following membership candidates provided introductions: Tracy Carroll, Art Domby, Harold Cahill and Peter Arrowsmith.

Sam Booher, Augusta, Ga.

Mr. Booher commented that the public looks to the CAB as their voice. He stated that eventually the Three Rivers Landfill will leak and the Board should be concerned. He commented that he has obtained five Memorandums of Agreement and met with the site manager regarding the landfill. Mr. Booher commented that the site manager has turned over threefold since that time. He is concerned about a lack of continuity. He informed the Board that there is a requirement for escrow for the landfill, but that he has looked deeply into the matter and found that the escrow is being used to pay salaries of the people who work at the landfill. He is concerned about the eventual cleanup of the landfill and who will be funding the cleanup. Mr. Booher also commented that bug people have been brought in from all over the world to the Three Rivers area and asked that the CAB look into this issue.

Mel Galin, CAB Member, Savannah, Ga.

Mr. Galin commented that the Appellate Court had reversed the decision of the lower court regarding the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing and now SRS can proceed with emptying the high level waste tanks. He also commented on a letter from the Site Specific Advisory Boards to Acting Assistant Secretary Paul Golan regarding the need for a national forum (see attachment).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Tuesday, November 16, 2004, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Leon Chavous
Gerald Devitt
Mary Drye
Mel Galin
Cassandra Henry
Perry Holcomb
Bill Lawless
William Lawrence

Wendell Lyon
Robert Meisenheimer
Karen Patterson
Barbara Paul
Murray Riley
Jean Sulc
Bill Vogeles
Bill Willoughby
Carolyn Williams
Gloria Williams-Way

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Shelley Sherritt, SCDHEC
Dawn Taylor, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Jeff Allison, DOE
Steve Gomberg, DOE
George Klipa, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Kevin Smith, DOE
Keith Wood, WSRC
Jack Devine, WSRC
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC
Joe Carter, WSRC
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Tiajuana Cochanaur, USFS
John Dickenson, WSRC

Stakeholders

Pete Arrowsmith
Manuel Bettencourt
Harold Cahill
Art Domby
Joe Ortaldo
Mike French
Lee Poe
Cy Bannick
William Stanley
Ellie Galin
Louis Zeller
Dan Battleson

Regulators

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC
Annie Godfrey, EPA

SRS CAB members Danielle Mackie, Darryl Nettles, Dorene Richardson, were unable to attend. The meeting opened with Bill Spader, DOE, serving as Designated Federal Official. Mike Schoener served as facilitator and Rick McLeod, Board Technical Advisor, was present as well. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Approval of the Minutes

The meeting minutes of the October 12, 2004 meeting were approved with no changes.

Agency Update

Bill Spader, DOE, noted that he has asked Gerri Flemming, DOE, to sit at the table permanently to become fully knowledgeable and familiar with CAB Administration. Mr. Spader also mentioned organizational changes. Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham has announced his resignation and will be staying on until his successor is named. He also announced that Mark Frei will replace Gene Schmidt as Director of Business Operations. Sandra Waisley will be backfilling for Mark Frei. She previously worked with the Site Specific Advisory Boards. Mr. Spader also noted DOE is now moving forward to implement new requirements in support of salt waste disposition and working closely with SCDHEC. The Risk Based End State Vision will now be referred to simply as the End State Vision, an outcome of the October workshop with the Governor's Association. Mr. Spader also addressed the Cultural Resource Management Plan, noting it has been provided and is expected to be approved by the end of November. Chairman Hobson visited SRS on October 28 along with other representatives for a tour. He concluded that more research is needed for Modern Pit Facility. Mr. Spader commented that a T Area Closure Ceremony was held November 1 to recognize the completion of D&D activities in T Area, a significant milestone that signified the transition to soil and groundwater remediation. Mr. Spader concluded by noting SRS is still operating under a continuing resolution, in effect through November 20.

Dawn Taylor, EPA, noted that the agencies began negotiations on Appendix E of the Federal Facility Agreement. She also noted some high level officials of EPA will be touring the site on December 7. She announced that DOE

has renewed a grant to EPA allowing them to continue support of accelerated cleanup and M Area is the next area being scoped for closure. She also introduced her manager, Annie Godfrey, who will be filling in for Ms. Taylor during maternity leave.

Shelley Sherritt, SCDHEC, noted she would forward a copy of the minutes from the October Risk Based End State workshop to the CAB. She also noted her interpretation of the Circuit Court turnover of the Court of Appeals regarding the Waste to Incidental to Reprocessing, noting it was a timing issue. She stated SCDHEC is glad another avenue is available to move forward with tank closure in the Defense Authorization Bill. Ms. Sherritt also discussed accelerated cleanup, noting it was difficult to maintain the aggressive pace, however they hope to maintain this pace in the outyears. Ms. Sherritt noted that as long as DOE is requesting the money needed for cleanup, then this would satisfy SCDHEC.

Public Comments

The following candidates for 2005 membership were present and made remarks regarding their backgrounds: Art Domby, Manuel Bettencourt, Peter Arrowsmith, Harold Cahill, Joe Ortaldo and Ellie Galin.

Chair Update

Jean Sulc noted that the Executive Committee had discussed the transmittal of CAB recommendations, noting the CAB would continue to make recommendations to DOE and provide copies to the agencies. Ms. Sulc also noted the CAB will be using 2005 to develop a process to look at the evolution of this CAB. She also mentioned the letter regarding the request for DOE to host a National Forum and noted the Board would be heavily involved.

Facilitator Update

Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). Eleven recommendations are pending, 29 open and 159 closed. The Board is awaiting three responses from DOE. Mr. Schoener also provided a brief update of parliamentary procedure utilized by the Board as a refresher regarding Board motion management.

Waste Management Committee

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program Update

Steve Gomberg, DOE-Headquarters Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM), provided a program update (see attachment). Mr. Gomberg noted national policy established by Congress that eventually led to a joint resolution approving the Yucca Mountain site for development as a repository. The program mission is to manage and dispose of high level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel in a manner that protects health, safety and the environment; enhances national and energy policy; and merits public confidence. Spent nuclear fuel is currently located at 125 sites in 39 states. Mr. Gomberg discussed waste inventories, receipt and acceptance. A Memorandum of Agreement between Environmental Management and OCRWM addresses DOE spent fuel and HLW and sets general requirements for payment of fees and overall responsibilities for acceptance by OCRWM. The MOA identifies three key documents: Waste Acceptance System Requirements, Integrated Acceptance Schedule and the Integrated Interface Control.

Mr. Gomberg also discussed specifics for the Savannah River Site. SRS plans to produce up to 5,100 canisters of HLW from the Defense Waste Processing Facility. Yucca Mountain also plans to accept canisters of intact aluminum-based spent fuel from SRS. Surplus weapons plutonium was evaluated for Yucca Mountain, however the can-in-canister ceramic form has been discontinued and is no longer being considered. Mr. Gomberg discussed national transportation issues, including rail in Nevada. He then discussed the repository disposal concept, the surface facility layout, waste package configurations, the subsurface emplacement concept and the co-emplacement disposal concept. Mr. Gomberg provided an overview of repository licensing, which includes three reviews by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. There is an electronic repository with all licensing information available on the internet. He concluded by discussing the current status of Yucca Mountain. The Court of Appeals rejected all but one of five challenges to statutory/regulatory framework. The 10,000-year protection standard was affected and EPA is working on what to do and may repropulgate the rule, which could cause a one or two year delay. NRC has to determine if it can complete certification without the long term standard in place. The OCRWM budget for FY2005 is uncertain. The Presidential request was \$880 million and the current house mark is \$131 million.

Board members questioned the schedule for opening Yucca Mountain; current plans for final closure of Yucca Mountain, which is for the repository to remain open for 100 years to keep it ventilated; transportation safety; seismic activity near Yucca Mountain; and whether anyone is looking at the scenario of leaving commercial spent fuel at their current sites. Board members also questioned cooperation with tribal governments. Mr. Gomberg noted there are approximately 50 tribes that DOE will work with and they have actually been quite cooperative. Board members also questioned if DOE was looking at alternatives to Yucca Mountain if it is unable to open and space issues. DOE is focused on the Yucca Mountain repository, but will also have to look at the need for a second repository in future years.

In the interest of time and due to the numerous questions, it was determined that further questions could be provided to Mr. Gomberg for response via the board administrator and they would be included in the record.

Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) Treatability Study Impacts

Bob Meisenheimer presented the committee's draft motion regarding SRNL Treatability Study Impacts (see attachment). The motion recommends that DOE, in concert with regulators investigate and incorporate procedures that will allow SRNL to continue to provide treatability studies and other investigative work for other DOE sites, while at the same time ensuring that any residues generated during sample testing be returned to the originating site with the sample residuals. It also asked SCDHEC to provide a status update on its evaluation of the treatability study exclusion to the CAB on or before January 25, 2005. The motion also requests DOE's written assurance that the treatability study procedures used were appropriate to insure that the sample residues returned to Hanford were not contaminated with any SRS-based contamination in the SRNL's high level cells or in other SRNL or SRS handling facilities. It also requests that in the future, DOE-SR estimate the volume and type of residue to be generated by any treatability or similar study and provide written notification to the appropriate state regulatory agencies on how the return of samples and residue will be handled before any work begins at SRS. Jerry Devitt moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion carried by a unanimous vote of eighteen members in favor. Two members were out of the room during the vote.

WM/Nuclear Materials Committee

Two committees jointly sponsored a draft motion regarding repackaging of Transuranic (TRU) waste black boxes (see attachment). Karen Patterson presented the draft motion. A facility in F Canyon was used successfully in a pilot project to prove that repackaging of high activity TRU waste black boxes can be accomplished in a safe and cost effective manner. However, this facility was only available to support disposition of two boxes. The SRS CAB is concerned about what facilities will be available to repackage the contents of the remaining large black boxes. The motion presented recommended that DOE evaluate the use of H-Canyon or another appropriate existing facility to repackage the high activity TRU black boxes. It also asked DOE to continue to use E-Area as much as possible for low activity waste black boxes as well. The motion requested a planning update and proposed timeline by February 28, 2005, to assure the Board that the entire inventory of legacy TRU wastes, including those in black boxes are removed by 2008.

Bill Voegel moved the Board adopt the motion and Wendell Lyon seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote in favor.

Administrative Committee Report

The following amendments were offered for Board consideration and approval:

Section 2.2 Objectives (page 4)

- b) Options to resolve difficult issues faced by the DOE's Environmental ~~Restoration and Waste Management~~ Program, including but are not limited to contamination, site specific cleanup criteria, risk management, budget prioritization, management effectiveness, cost versus benefit analysis, environmental acceptability, economic development, future land use, and strategies for site waste management, ~~and~~ disposal facilities, and nuclear materials.

Bill Lawless moved the Board adopt the modifications to Section 2.2 and Karen Patterson seconded. This section of the bylaws were amended by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Section 5.1 Creation of Committees (page 7)

In addition to the committees mandated by these bylaws, the Board may from time to time create additional standing or ad hoc committees with such powers and duties as the Board may prescribe. Participation may be drawn both from the Board and the public at large. ~~Final selection of committee members shall be made by the chair of the committee.~~

Bill Vogeles moved the board adopt the proposed modification in Section 5.1 and Karen Patterson seconded. This section of the bylaws was amended by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Section 5.6 Committees (page 8)

~~With the exception of the Executive Committee, the Board shall appoint a chair to the following committees on an annual basis. The authority, duties and powers of the various committees are set forth below but may be limited or increased from time to time as the Board may decide. All duties and responsibilities previously encompassed by the Budget, Membership Replacement, Bylaws and Nominations/Elections Subcommittees shall henceforth reside within the Administrative Committee.~~

Mary Drye moved the board adopt the proposed modification in Section 5.6 and Carolyn Williams seconded. The amendment was approved by a unanimous vote of 18 members in favor.

Section 6.9 Voting Elections and Proxies and Board Recommendations (page 10)

a) Voting during Elections: Except as may otherwise be specified in these bylaws, all elections shall be held and ~~all questions~~ decided by a majority vote of the voting Member present in person or by an official absentee ballot at any meeting of the Board, where a quorum is established. Each Member of the Board shall be entitled to one vote; however, ex-officio Agency representatives to the Board shall have no voting privileges. During any election, ~~or at any special meeting of the Board~~ each voting Member shall be entitled to vote in person or by official absentee ballot ~~proxy duly appointed by instrument in writing,~~ signed and dated by such Member. Such ~~proxy~~ official ballot shall be delivered to the Board Administrator ~~Chairperson(s) or a designated representative~~ prior to the meeting and shall remain sealed until the time of the election. ~~No voting by proxy shall be permitted at regular meetings of the Board.~~

Bill Lawless moved the Board adopt the proposed modifications to Section 6.9 a and Barbara Paul seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 18 members in favor and one abstention by Perry Holcomb.

b) Voting on Board Recommendations to the Agencies: In the event that a Board recommendation or report to the Agencies is approved by less than a unanimous vote, those Board Members representing the dissenting minority may voice their dissent collectively or individually by a minority statement(s) that shall be included in the text of the report. Neither proxy voting nor absentee voting is permitted on board recommendations to the agencies during regular meetings of the Board.

Bill Vogeles moved the Board approve the rewritten Section 6.9b and Murray Riley seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 19 members in favor.

Section 8.2 Duration (page 12)

~~The Board shall initially be established for five years at which time the Board and the Agencies shall in the annual status report for that year, mutually assess the desirability for continuing the Board. Such an assessment shall conclude that the Board be abolished or that the charter be renewed for an additional five years. This assessment shall be repeated every five years for the life of the Board.~~

Karen Patterson moved the Board delete Section 8.2 as obsolete and William Lawrence seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 19 members in favor.

Section 6.6 Attendance

A Board Member absent from two ~~unexcused~~ consecutive or three total Board meetings in a calendar year shall be considered for dismissal, upon recommendation by the Administrative Committee.

William Lawrence moved the board modify Section 6.6 regarding attendance and Gerald Devitt seconded. The section was amended by a vote of 18 members in favor and one abstention by Barbara Paul.

Following the Bylaws Proposal, Ms. Alalof presented the 2004 final budget summary (see attachment). Ms. Alalof also provided notebooks containing the applications and interviews of all candidates for 2005 membership.

Bill Lawless was elected to fulfill the unexpired portion of term of Vice Chair during 2005.

Public Comments

Louis Zeller, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League (BREDL)

Mr. Zeller stated he wanted to address the Risk Based End State process, noting that BREDL is opposed to this process. He stated this is a back door change to statutes. He attended the workshop in Chicago in October. He stated that he is in agreement that DOE has ridden rough shod over public participation to accomplish accelerated cleanup. He noted he had problems with variances from regulations and statutes and stated that once upon a time Federal Facility Agreements were to fulfill the law and cleanup standards. He stated all that has changed is a change in the name from RBES to End States and this is unacceptable. Mr. Zeller stated there are rules and procedures which allow for practicable deviations when you get between a rock and hard place. He referred to earlier discussion regarding the Washington Department of Ecology stating he believed the changes in state law follow logically with the Graham amendment. Mr. Zeller also inquired about responses to questions submitted on September 1, 2004, to SCDHEC by Joe Whetstone and requested a copy.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Jim Heffner, WSRC provided an overview of the SRS 2003 Site Environmental Monitoring Report (see attached). The purpose of environmental monitoring is to characterize and quantify contaminants; demonstrate compliance with applicable standards; calculate radiation exposures to the public; and to assess the effects, if any, on the local environment. Mr. Heffner discussed state and federal regulations and program requirements; effluent monitoring versus environmental surveillance; contaminant pathways; and the types of surveillance samples taken. Over 10,000 samples and 30,000 analyses are performed annually. The SRS 2003 airborne and liquid releases, as well as all potential radiation doses from the site, were well below applicable regulatory standards. Krypton was the highest airborne radionuclide emission, however it was not a large dose contributor since it is not retained. Tritium was the only nuclide regularly detected in air beyond the site boundary and the only manmade nuclide regularly detected in water in the Savannah River. Although present and measurable, tritium is well below standards. The annual dose to the maximum exposed individual is 0.19 mrem from SRS. The Sportsman Dose is higher at .58 mrem for fish and 15.6 mrem for the maximum onsite hunter, primarily due to cesium. The site's airborne and liquid releases to the environment continue to decline. For 2003, the radiation dose to the public living near SRS is well below DOE's 100-mrem/year standard. The downriver water consumer is well below EPA's 4-mrem/year standard. Board members questioned if SRS monitored wetlands; the Krypton source (H Canyon); and whether the Environmental Advisory Committee still reviews the report, which they do.

Perry Holcomb, FD&SR Committee Chair, presented a draft motion regarding the TNX Operable Unit (see attachment). The motion recommends that DOE reexamine analytical protocols for characterization of SRS waste sites to ensure all contaminants of concern important in the risk analysis for each site are quantified and that before the Record of Decision becomes final, they revisit together with EPA, SCDHEC and stakeholders all pertinent information regarding the TNX Operable Unit. There was discussion regarding when the Board wanted to revisit the information regarding the TNX OU. Bill Lawless moved the board adopt the motion and Murray Riley seconded. Bill Lawless commented that the agencies need to justify the decision for the interim remedial action. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote of twenty members in favor.

Mr. Holcomb presented a second motion regarding the Federal Facility Agreement Process and early involvement of stakeholders (see attachment). The FFA Implementation Plan's Public Participation section states, "The SRS intent is to begin public participation in the remedial process as early as possible." The Board believes and supports this statement and therefore recommends that DOE present to the SRS CAB on or before January 25, 2005, and annually thereafter, a list of planned CMS/FS or EE/CA remedial actions for the upcoming calendar year and work with the SRS CAB and stakeholders to identify all sites that warrant early and continued public involvement. It also asked that DOE present a timeline to revise the FFA Implementation Plan to incorporate the revisions to the public

participation process based upon SRS CAB and stakeholder input. Following several minor modifications, Bill Voegle moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion carried by a unanimous vote of twenty members in favor.

Nuclear Materials Committee

Charles Nickell, WSRC, provided an update on the HB-Line Neptunium project (see attached). The HB-Line mission is to receive Idaho uranium shipments and plutonium/uranium scrap from F Area storage for processing and shipment of Neptunium oxide to Argonne West. Previous missions include production of Neptunium Oxide for NASA for space flights. The current inventory contained in the H Canyon tanks is 4600 gallons to be processed for the NASA program. Mr. Nickell briefly described the seven-step Neptunium process. HB-Line converts high purity Neptunium solution to oxide. Mr. Nickell discussed the preparations for initial operations of the project, which is currently eleven months ahead of schedule. The Startup Project was completed 9 months ahead of schedule and \$10 million under budget, a successful and smooth startup. Future plans for HB-Line is support of FB-Line deinventory; support for the campaign to stabilize unirradiated SRS fuel; support for the campaign to stabilize Enriched Uranium scrap material stored at SRS and stabilization of excess SRS radioactive sources and standards. Mr. Nickell summarized by stating that SRS will satisfy Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 94-1 Neptunium commitments and since work was accelerated, HB-Line is supporting additional initiatives.

Board members questioned the outyear operations of the HB-Line, which are currently scheduled through 2010; and why the plutonium operations had been moved to Argonne West.

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee

William Lawrence, S&LM Committee Chair, announced upcoming Historic Preservation meetings, which he attends on behalf of the CAB. He also thanked the site for a recent tour of SRNL.

Public Comments

Louis Zeller, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League

Mr. Zeller noted the 2003 Environmental Report and requested to see the original data for the report. He also referred to the findings of another report "Under the Cloud" and for Board input regarding this report, which was to be provided by Perry Holcomb.

Murray Riley, CAB Member Aiken, S.C.

Mr. Riley closed the public comment session with a reminder about safety during the holiday season. He related a story regarding his daughter and implored board members to be watchful and alert.

Handouts

SRS CAB November 15-16, 2004 Agenda

Hanford Treatability Studies, Richard Edwards, WSRC

SRNL Treatability Study Impacts, Bob Meisenheimer, CAB

Hanford Treatability Studies Questions and Answers

TRU Black Box Repackaging Pilot Project in F Canyon, Mike Logan, WSRC

Repackaging of TRU Waste Black Boxes, Karen Patterson, CAB

TNX Operable Units and the FFA Process, Perry Holcomb, CAB

Monitored Natural Attenuation, Karen Adams, DOE

Savannah River Site Heritage Center, Todd Crawford

SRS National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit Compliance, Bill Payne, WSRC

SRS Gold Metrics

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program Update, Steve Gomberg, DOE

SRNL Treatability Study Impacts, Bob Meisenheimer, CAB

Repackaging of TRU Waste Black Boxes, Karen Patterson, CAB

Draft Revision 2-Summary of Proposal to Amend the SRS CAB Bylaws

SRS CAB Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Summary

TNX Operable Units, Perry Holcomb, CAB

The FFA Process-Early Involvement of Stakeholders, Perry Holcomb, CAB

Overview of the SRS 2003 Site Environmental Monitoring Report

HB-Line Neptunium Update, Charles Nickell, WSRC

SRS CAB Calendar

NEPA EIS Report