



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee

Performance Management Plan Workshop Meeting Summaries

**North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, SC
April 12, 2004**

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Strategic and Legacy Management (SLM) Committee held a workshop on April 12, 5:00 p.m., at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, SC. The purpose of the workshop was to receive information and give comments on the soon to be released draft Performance Management Plan (PMP) and hear public comment. Those in attendance were:

CAB Members

- William Lawrence*
- Bill Vogele *
- Meryl Alalof*
- Wendell Lyon*
- Jean Sulc*
- Darryl Nettles *
- Bill Willoughby
- Perry Holcomb
- Leon Chavous

Stakeholders

- Bill Mottel
- Lee Poe
- Mike French
- Ernie Chaput
- Rick McLeod
- John Abbott
- Ben Rusche, GNAC

Regulators

- Dawn Taylor, EPA
- Shelly Sherritt, DHEC

DOE/Contractors

- Charlie Anderson, DOE
- Kevin Smith, DOE
- Charlie Hansen, DOE
- Ron Bartholomew, DOE
- Roger Rollins, DOE
- Jim Buice, DOE
- Sachiko McAlhany, DOE
- Helen Belencan, DOE
- Tony Polk, DOE
- Teresa Haas, WSRC
- Joe Carter, WSRC
- Paul Huber, BSRI
- Bob Pride, BSRI
- Dwain McMullin, WSRC

Lyddie Broussard, WSRC

Jim Moore, WSRC

*Members of the SI Committee

** Carolyn Williams, Lola Richardson, Darryl Nettles, and Gloria Williams-Way, members of the SLM Committee were unable to attend.

Jean Sulc, CAB Chair, welcomed those in attendance. Ms. Sulc introduced the facilitator, Dwain McMullin.

Dwain McMullin, WSRC, explained the objective of the meeting and reviewed some general ground rules. He explained that to get copies of the PMP and submit comments, please notify Jim Moore, 742A, Room 182, Savannah River Site (SRS), Aiken, SC, 29808, or at the e-mail address: jim02.moore@srs.gov.

SRS Environmental Management (EM) Program PMP Revision and Lifecycle Update:

Charlie Anderson, Deputy Manager for Cleanup DOE, gave a background on the development of the PMP explaining that the original PMP did not contain all the work to complete the EM mission at SRS. This revised PMP is a comprehensive plan for finishing the EM cleanup work at SRS. It reflects the latest risk-based end states. Mr. Anderson pointed out the unforeseen problem of the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) lawsuit.

The revised PMP is organized according to the new Project Baseline Summary (PBS) structure. The major assumptions were reviewed explaining that the EM Cleanup Project end date is targeted at 2025. Regulatory commitments will be met (excluding the delay by the WIR), all work required to complete the cleanup is included, no facility or scope transfer between EM and other DOE program offices will occur before 2025 and SRS will remain under Federal control. Programmatic interfaces were also included in the PMP revision.

Some major milestone dates in the PMP are that H Canyon will be ready for deactivation in 2011, all plutonium will be dispositioned by 2017, High Level Waste (HLW) disposition mission complete by 2019, the last canister of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) will be shipped to Yucca Mountain in 2020, the final remedial action of facilities Deactivated and Decommissioned (D&D) will be in 2025 with the EM missions complete by 2025.

The PMP is expected to be released on April 22. The public comment period will end May 21 with the final PMP approved July 30, 2004.

**Nuclear Material Stabilization Spent Nuclear Fuel:
PBS SR-0011 A, B, and C, PRS SR-0012 and HQ-SNF-0012X**

Sachiko McAlhany, Nuclear Material Stabilization Projects DOE, reviewed the Nuclear Materials lifecycle scope breaking it down into processing facilities, storage facilities, and SNF. The processing facilities, F-Canyon and FB-Line, will have complete project closeout by 2006. H-Canyon and HB-Line operations will be complete by 2010 and ready for deactivation by 2011.

The storage facilities are K-Area Materials Storage and Building 235-F. The surveillance of plutonium (Pu) storage containers will be in accordance with the DOE 3013 Container Standard and Surveillance Plan. A Pu disposition capability needs to be developed while the remaining heavy water will be transferred offsite.

For SNF in L-Area, the site will continue to receive and store Foreign Research Reactor Fuel through 2014 and Domestic Research Reactor Fuel through 2019. A Transfer and Storage Facility for packaging fuel into canisters and storage will be constructed. The Federal Repository at Yucca Mountain is assumed to be available to receive SNF by 2011 with shipments complete by 2020.

The risks are programmatic-based and amount to the availability and timing of the Federal Repository and acceptance of SNF. Extensive coordination will be necessary with all parties including the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), Tennessee Valley Authority, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Office of Nuclear Energy, and the Office of Radioactive Waste Management.

Solid Waste Infrastructure:

PBS SR-0013

Charlie Hansen, Assistant Manager Waste Disposition Project DOE, reviewed the lifecycle scope for Solid Waste (SW). This program receives, stores, treats, and disposes of legacy and newly generated Low-Level Waste (LLW), Mixed LLW (MLLW), Transuranic (TRU) Waste, Hazardous Waste (HW) and Sanitary Waste.

All legacy TRU waste will be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) for final disposal. Low activity TRU shipments will be complete September 2006. High activity TRU shipments will be complete by December 2008.

All legacy LLW, MLLW and HW will be treated and/or disposed. Legacy LLW, MLLW and HW will be reduced to zero September 2006. Organic PUREX will be treated by 2007. F-Canyon PUREX will be completed by September 2006. The closure of the Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF) is to-be-determined.

Liquid Waste Disposition and Waste Solidification:

PBS-SR-0014C, 14X

Charlie, Hansen, Assistant Manager Waste Disposition Project DOE, reviewed the Liquid Waste Disposition and Waste Solidification lifecycle scope. This program receives HLW generated from canyon activities. It retrieves, treats and disposes of approximately 37 million gallons of liquid, high-level radioactive waste stored in 49 underground tanks and segregates non-HLW from HLW whenever possible. The end state closure is projected to be 2019.

Some of the key planning assumptions discussed were the uncertainty created by the Idaho Federal District Court ruling should be resolved by January 2005 and path forward implemented by October 2005, funding will be available in October 2004 for salt disposition and tank closure activities, SWPF preliminary design starts imminently and facility is on line by March 2009, tank closure activities will resume October 2005, modified 0.5 Ci/gal Saltstone Facility will be on line

by October 2005. Some of the end state assumptions are that the Glass Waste Storage Building #2 will be available by June 2006, the new canister shipping facility will be ready to ship canisters beginning in 2010, the Federal Repository will be ready to receive SRS canisters in 2010 and the final shipment of Defense Waste Processing Facility canisters will occur by 2020.

Facilities Deactivation and Decommissioning:

PBS SR-0040

Helen Belencan, D&D Project Manager DOE, reviewed the lifecycle scope for all the D&D facilities. There are 966 units left to D&D with 47 units having been complete for a total of 1013 units. There are two possible decommissioning end state alternatives for SRS facilities, demolition or in-situ disposal. The specific end state is considered by the physical condition, structural factors and location.

An assumption is that SRS will remain under federal ownership and its boundaries remain unchanged. Therefore no residential use of SRS will be permitted and the industrial worker risk-based end state will be 10^{-4} .

Facility D&D uses a graded approach with the use of four models to determine the extent of D&D. The models go from a high complexity Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis model to a lower complexity Simple Model.

The previous PMP considered only 72 facilities for demolition while the current revised PMP considers all facilities. To support the 2025 EM closure, deactivation, decommissioning and Area closure activities in some areas will have to overlap. There are also extensive interfaces required between the Soil and Groundwater Projects group, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the CAB and the general public.

Soils and Groundwater Remediation:

PBS SR-0030

Tony Polk, Federal Project Director DOE, reviewed the Soils and Groundwater Project (SGP) lifecycle scope. There are 515 identified waste units of which 306 are complete. By 2025, all inactive release sites will be remediated controlled and/or monitored to ensure protection of human health and the environment.

Some key planning assumptions include cost effective holistic remedies implemented consistent with the integrated D&D Plan and the Risk Based End States (RBES) Document, area-by-area remediation strategy to bring closure to whole areas, area completions consistent with the latest approved Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA), principles, concepts and goals of the Memorandum of Agreement for Achieving and Accelerated Cleanup Vision (July 8, 2003) will be implemented, and the project will include post-closure costs for waste units through 2025.

Changes from the previous PMP include the area closure approach, D&D and SGP integration, National Priority List (NPL) deletion and the RBES vision. Risks include the identification of any new release sites, full characterization and any required remediation of media under slabs or foundations and integration with scheduled D&D activities. SGP will handle these risks by using

the Tri-Party Core Team approach to identify protective, streamlined, risk reducing and cost effective remedial processes.

Interfaces include working with the EM Facilities Decommissioning Project, waste disposition, stakeholders and regulators and transition to the Office of Legacy Management and Long Term Stewardship.

Safeguards and Security:

PBS SR-0020

Ron Bartholomew, Director, Office of Safeguards, Security and Emergency Services DOE, reviewed the lifecycle scope of the Safeguards and Security (S&S) Program. As facilities are reduced, the S&S requirements will reduce. After special nuclear materials are removed from SRS, the S&S EM support will be for site access control and property protection. Site access control and property protection will continue through 2025 when the remaining site activities are transferred to the appropriate Program Office.

New technologies will be used to minimize the reliance on security manpower. Also, improvements described in the new Design Basis Threat (DBT) Implementation Plan will be completed by Fiscal Year (FY) 2006. The DBT schedule and costs are dependent on completion of Vulnerability Assessments.

Interface for special nuclear material safeguards and security is with the Assistant Manager for Nuclear Materials Stabilization Project. The S&S will provide support for NNSA missions at SRS and will transition to the new landlord when the EM mission is completed at SRS.

Non-Closure Mission Support and Community and Regulatory Support:

PBS SR-0100 and PBS SR-0101

Jim Buice, Director, Budget Division DOE, reviewed the lifecycle of both the Non-Closure Mission Support and Community and Regulatory Support. Both of these PBS's constitute a conglomeration of many activities. The Non-Closure Mission Support is accomplished through a multitude of DOE direct contracts, grants and agreements. Support activities consist of water, medical, archaeological research, forest management, training and other critical support services. Critical support activities will continue through 2025. Beginning in 2026, the remaining support activities will be transferred to either the Office of Legacy Management or other Program Secretarial Office.

The Community and Regulatory Support is accomplished through multiple DOE direct contracts, grants and agreements. The activities create a culture of public trust and confidence in the site's cleanup program. Support activities consist of environmental monitoring, emergency management, document reviews, technical assistance, taxes and stakeholder involvement. These activities will continue through 2025.

Continued support for the above programs will be at a level consistent with identified requirements. As programs are complete, activities will be reduced. Every effort will be made to minimize requirements for these programs/functions in order to maximize available EM

resources on accelerated cleanup. The strategy will be to select the most cost effective and efficient approach to meet these requirements.

The initial PMP did not incorporate these support requirements. The interface with all other EM programs/projects will be critical as there is a close correlation between the support requirements and the completion of the various EM programs/projects.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lawrence thanked everyone for attending, and with no additional public comments, the meeting was adjourned.

Public Comments and Questions on the PMP:

During the discussions, individuals made comments and asked questions concerning the projects. The following are the public comments and questions captured on the flip-chart:

- Major Oversight – Lack of communications between the public and other organizations besides Environmental Management, i.e., National Nuclear Security Administration, etc. Is there anyway to get input with the public on NNSA? – Lee Poe
- To whom is the site planning to transfer the heavy water? – Bill Willoughby
- Is anyone at the Savannah River Site (SRS) doing anything in relation to Nuclear Material, High-Level Waste (HLW) and Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) in case the repository is not ready on schedule? – Lee Poe
- What is being done to make the assumption that the repository will open on schedule come true? – Rick McLeod
- What makes SRS feel comfortable that SRS is going to get the budgets that are planned? – Mike French
- When will the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) be able to see the budget profile and integration, life cycle cost, etc.? – Mike French
- What is being done now to assure material is acceptable to Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Yucca Mountain? – Lee Poe
- Commercial storage at Yucca Mountain may take precedence over SRS material. What are we doing to get priority and assure technology acceptance? – Jean Sulc
- How is the site integrating the PMP and the budget? – William Lawrence
- The date needs to be established on the Consolidated Incineration Facility and not left as To-Be-Determined (TBD). – Lee Poe
- What is the impact on the schedule for:
 - New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED) permit modification on the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)?
 - Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR)? – Jean Sulc
- How do the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) view the permit change for Saltstone? – Perry Holcomb
- What happens if the site doesn't get the funding in October? – Mary Drye
- Who needs to be satisfied with the plans in the PMP? – Murray Riley
- The CAB Waste Management Committee needs to schedule time for discussion on the HLW issue before the public comment on the PMP runs out. – Lee Poe, Bill Willoughby

- On the Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) plan, how many facilities fit the respective four models? The Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis does not include alternatives to meet the goal on the major production facilities. There needs to be a fifth model for the major production facilities that includes the alternatives. – Lee Poe
- What is the schedule for the stream operating units? – Lee Poe
- Will there be a decrease in support for infrastructure towards the end of the period (2025)? – Lee Poe
- Is there a process for determining the end state for the CAB? – Jean Sulc
- For sale ability of the PMP to the public, the PMP should show how risk decreases as the site scales down. – Lee Poe
- In the assumption of government control in perpetuity, all government is not the same. The most appropriate branch of the government needs to be selected to control the SRS. A law/regulation should be obtained for oversight. – Lee Poe

Action Items:

Lee Poe requested a CD and Hard Copy of the PMP – Jim Moore - COMPLETE

Bill Willoughby requested a CD of the PMP. – Jim Moore - COMPLETE

Public comments received at the meeting will be placed in the public comment matrix. – Jim Moore - COMPLETE

Lee Poe and Bill Lawless requested a presentation on the HLW alternative path before the public comment period is closed for the PMP. – Kelly Way - COMPLETE

Revised slides for the Safeguards and Security presentation (as well as the Soils and Groundwater Remediation presentation) would be available at the Risk Based End State Workshop April 13. – Jim Moore - COMPLETE