



SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

September 25-26, 2006

Savannah, Ga.

Monday, September 25, 2006, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Manuel Bettencourt
Tracey Carroll
Leon Chavous
Gerald Devitt
Arthur Domby
Mary Drye
Mercredi Giles
Judith Greene McLeod
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman

Stakeholders

Jack Roberts
Tim Dangerfield
Perry Holcomb
Jean Sulc
Mitch Morgan
Mindy Mets
Omid Mothed

Ranowul Jzar
Bill Lawless
Wendell Lyon
Jimmy Mackey
Madeleine Marshall
Robert Meisenheimer
Joseph Ortaldo
Karen Patterson
Barbara Paul
Alex Williams
Gloria Williams -Way

Regulators

Eddie Wright, EPA

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC
Robert Pope, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Kevin Smith, DOE
Yvette Collazzo, DOE
Helen Belencan, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
Larry Snyder , DOE
Sheron Smith, DOE
Nick Delaplane, DOE
Wade Whitaker, DOE
Dawn Gillas, DOE
Tony Polk, DOE
Michele Ewart, DOE
Keith Wood, WSRC
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC
John Dickenson, WSRC
Dave Freeman, WSRC

Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee

Deactivation and Decommissioning (D&D) Program Update

Helen Belencan, DOE, stated the purpose of the presentation (see attachment) was to update the CAB on the SRS D&D project. Ms. Belencan stated that there have been major accomplishments in the program noted by the following:

- 228 buildings demolished to date (the footprint reduced by more than 2.3 million square feet)
- decommissioning work completed in F,T,D,M,E,G areas
- significant radiological and industrial challenges safely overcome
- first area closure planned for this fall
- partnership with SCDHEC and EPA working well

Ms. Belencan noted the areas of emphasis to date as T Area, M Area, D Area and F Area. T Area was the first area closure completed in September 2006. D&D of all heavy water production facilities at D Area is complete. In F Area, workers have completed decommissioning of the 247-F complex six months ahead of schedule. Ms. Belencan noted the significant ongoing work, but stated that the pace will now change. The enormous amount of D&D in the past three years was because SRS had an abundance of excess facilities, which are now nearly all gone. The focus now is on being in lock-step with the soil and groundwater cleanup program, with the common goal of area completion. Ms. Belencan stated that the CAB support is essential and appreciated, and without it, the D&D work could not have been done.

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee

Planning for Replacement of Steam Plants at SRS

Larry Snyder, DOE, provided a presentation regarding planning for replacement of steam plants at SRS (see attachment). He explained that \$200 million had been spent on infrastructure improvements in the 1990's. The steam plants are the last of the infrastructure to be replaced. Plans are to replace the powerhouses for A-, D-, and K-Area. The existing A-Area Powerhouse was built in 1953 and currently provides steam to the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL), Savannah River Ecology Laboratory (SREL), a few administrative support buildings remaining in A-Area, and the Dynamic Underground Stripping (DUS) project. It contains two 60 thousand pounds per hour (Kpph) coal fired boilers and costs approximately \$4.7 million annually to operate. The current demand is 40 Kpph versus a future demand of 15 Kpph.

The D-Area Powerhouse was built in 1953 and currently provides steam to nuclear and industrial activities in F-, H-, and S-Areas. It is a co-generation facility and makes approximately one half of the Site electrical demand. South Carolina Electric and Gas supply the other half. It contains four 330 Kpph coal fired boilers and steam production costs approximately \$13.0 million annually. The current demand is 120 Kpph versus a future demand of 100 Kpph.

K-Area powerhouse was built in 1992 and currently provides steam to K- and L-Areas for heating during the four month winter season only. It contains one each 30 Kpph and 60 Kpph oil fired boilers and costs approximately \$1.3 million annually to operate. The current demand is 8 Kpph, the same as the future demand.

A- and D-Area Powerhouses are over 50 years old and are well past their economic lives. K-Area Powerhouse is not cost effective in its current seasonal use mode and with the volatility of the price of fuel oil. Regulatory drivers, age, and condition will require significant upgrades for continued operation. Steam demand will remain for the current and future missions, but will be reduced over time. Capital funding for new facilities will not be available. Third party financing is the primary alternative available to fund replacement projects. Mr. Snyder reviewed the history of the Powerhouses and the background of the funding initiative.

The current plan is to pursue and Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC) for replacement of the existing powerhouse facilities in A-, D-, and K-Areas. This is a contract with a third party to construct energy efficiency improvements and operate/maintain the facilities. The guaranteed energy and operations savings are used to fund "mortgage" payback to contractor for up to 25 years. Detailed baselines must be established to verify savings/payments each year. The ESPC requires Congressional notification for tasks with cancellation costs of more than \$10.0 million.

The current plan for A-Area Powerhouse is to negotiate a new task order under existing WSRC contract with Honeywell-Sempra Energy Services. This is approximately a \$14.0 million project, uses alternative fuels (wood chips) and is to be completed by July 2008. The finance period is approximately 9 years. The potential savings are approximately \$1.5 million annually. WSRC will operate the facility. Honeywell-Sempra has submitted a final proposal. The target date to award the contract is November 22, 2006.

The current plan for D-Area Powerhouse is to negotiate a new task order under a regional "super" ESPC. A new powerhouse would be constructed close to F/H-Areas and would use

alternative fuels. The site plans to coordinate with the U.S. Forest Service and Three River Landfill Authority as possible sources of fuel. This should be complete by late 2009 with an estimated cost of \$20 to \$30 million. Requests for expressions of interest have been sent to nine ESPC vendors with a due date of October 16, 2006.

The current plan of K-Area is to combine with D-Area replacement task order under the “super” ESPC. Electric boilers would be used in K- and L-Areas due to the small seasonal demand. This should be complete by late 2009. Requests for expressions of interest have been sent to nine ESPC vendors with a due date of October 16, 2006.

DOE Budget – Stakeholder Participation Consistency

Jimmy Mackey reviewed the draft motion regarding stakeholder participation in the budget process (see attachment). The recommendation requested consistent budget briefings and tried to express a timeline. After much discussion and modifications, it was voted that the draft recommendation would be forwarded to the CAB for review and approval.

Waste Management Committee

Joe Ortaldo, Vice Chair, noted two presentations on the agenda and explained that Tony Polk, DOE Acting Director of the Waste Disposition Programs Division, would give the presentations. Mr. Ortaldo also noted that the Waste Management Committee sent a letter to Jim Rispoli, DOE, and Anna Bradford, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), asking them to streamline the Waste Determination Process (see attachment). In addition to the letter, a draft motion was developed to be reviewed. He apologized for not getting the letter and draft motion out to the CAB members in their meeting package. The Waste Management Committee meeting occurred after the packages had been mailed.

Liquid Waste Disposition Process Plan (LWDPP):

Tony Polk, Acting Director of the DOE Waste Disposition Programs Division, provided the first of two presentations regarding Liquid Waste activities (see attachments). He explained that the LWDPP has three major elements. They are the salt waste treatment and disposal, the sludge batch preparation and processing, and tank closures. It also defines the near term LW disposition activities. The following major programmatic changes are incorporated in the document: 26 month delay in start of the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF), delays in start of salt waste disposition, limited tank processing space and length of reviews and approvals of the waste determination documents. Priorities through fiscal year (FY) 2012 are identified.

The plan addresses the following basic criteria:

- Ensure safe operations of LW facilities
- Continue sludge feed to the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF)
- Salt waste treatment and disposal near term via use of the Actinide Removal Process (ARP) and the Modular Caustic Extraction Unit (MCU)
- SWPF startup in FY2012 to process majority of salt waste
- Tank closures to meet the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) commitments except for tanks 18 and 19
- Tank working space management

The following are the major changes since the Interim Processing Plan. They are:

- SWPF startup will be 9/30/11 vs 8/31/09
- Deliquification, Dissolution, and Adjustment (DDA) startup will be 7/30/06 vs 1/30/06
- 3116 process for tank closure documentation is 24 months vs 18 months
- Tank 50 used for high-level waste vs for Saltstone feed tank
- ARP/MCU startup will be July 2007 vs February 2008
- H Canyon operations will be through FY 2013 vs FY 2011
- DWPF canister rate is 186 vs 230 through FY 2014
- SWPF reaches full processing rate in one year vs four years
- SWPF full process rate is 5.9 million gallons vs 5.7 million gallons
- Tank 48 will be available in FY 2010 to support Tank Closure

Some of the key performance milestones for salt waste treatment and disposal are:

- Planned to initiate salt disposal via DDA processing 7/1/06. DDA will be complete by third quarter FY 2007.
- ARP and MCU construction will be completed by 10/1/07 and salt waste treatment and disposal will be initiated. Operations will be complete the third quarter FY 2011.
- SWPF construction will be complete and startup on 9/30/11.
- Tank 48 will be recovered via treatment of organics by 1/1/10.
- Tank 50 will be available for high-level waste by 1/1/10.
- Saltstone vaults will be constructed to meet disposal requirements. Vault 2 will be constructed 10/1/08, Vault 3 4/1/10 and Vault 5 10/1/11.
- Tank 25 will be converted to 2F Evaporator Drop Tank by 7/31/07.
- Tank 19 closure will be 10/31/07.
- Tank 18 closure will be 3/28/08.
- Tanks 5 and 6 closure will be 9/30/10.
- Tank 4 closure will be 9/30/11.

- Tank 12 and 16 closure will be 9/30/12.
- Tank 8 closure will be 9/30/13.
- Tank 14 and 11 closure will be 9/30/14.
- Tank 15 and 23 closure will be 9/30/15.

The Liquid Waste Risk Management Plan for Project Baseline Summary (PBS) - SR-0014C issued July 2006 incorporates the DPP risks. The near term DPP risks include:

- Failure to receive required permits to initiate salt disposal on schedule
- Legal impediments
- Degraded evaporator performance
- Delays in 3116 Determinations for tank closure
- Tank 48 treatment technology failure
- Integration of new facilities into existing infrastructure
- DWPF processing rate impacts from high aluminum and/or ARP/MCU feeds
- Inability to develop and deploy tank and annulus cleaning technologies

The current actions and issues include writing the permit language for Saltstone, Tank 48 material disposition by 1/1/10, ARP/MCU feed preparation, SWFP Critical Decision 2 to 3 preparation, path forward for Tank 18 and 19 and path forward for Section 3116 Determinations.

Liquid Waste Risk Management Plan

Tony Polk explained that risk is a measure of the potential inability to achieve overall project objectives with scope, cost, schedule and technical constraints. The risk components are 'likelihood' and 'consequences'. Project risk management is the process of risk identification, analysis, handling and monitoring.

In September 2004, a Risk Assessment Report was issued for the Liquid Waste program. The report summarized and presented results of a review of individual project risk and vulnerability assessments. The current Risk Management Plan incorporates the Salt Processing Program Risk Analysis. It updates and expands the scope of the assessment to include the entire PBS-SR-0014 scope through completion. It assesses potential opportunities and groups risk by category and near-term/short-term impacts. A Monte-Carlo simulation was used to obtain an 80 percent probability cost contingency. An action item list was generated from the risk database which identifies the organizations responsible for implementing risk handling strategies. A 'risk-o-meter' is a management status tool to provide a condensed 'snap shot' of the project risk management status at any point in time.

The assessment process has four distinct steps: Identification, Grading, Handling and Impact Determination. To develop these steps, a risk assessment and opportunity team was established and comprised of both DOE and contractor personnel with diverse knowledge and expertise.

For Risk Identification, the following actions were taken:

- Identification and review of risk documents issued since the last update
- Review of Planning, Integration and Technology issues tracking database
- Review the Future Projects database
- Brainstorming

The risks and opportunities were graded according to likelihood and consequences using established criteria for the program. The impacts of the cost and schedule on the scope were determined and risk-handling strategies were developed to eliminate or reduce the likelihood or consequences of the risk. The impacts of implementing the risk-handling strategies were determined. The residual risk after implementation of the risk-handling strategies was determined and captured in the contingency analysis. The risk-handling strategies were then incorporated into the project baseline.

Twelve categories of risks with 42 High, 22 Moderate, and 21 Low risks and resolution of 13 risks were identified. Four opportunities were identified, validated and graded. The contingency analysis was based on 80 percent confidence in project completion and resulted in \$209 million of cost contingency through 2012. Overall contingency analysis resulted in approximately \$13 billion for the project life cycle from 2006 to 2031. Mr. Polk reviewed the various WSDP high risk categories giving the probability and worst consequence.

In summary, Mr. Polk explained that DOE intends to actively manage the risks and monitor implementation of risk handling strategies monthly. A database will be maintained to track issues to be evaluated and incorporated into the next Risk Management Plan revision.

Bill Lawless reviewed a draft motion regarding Standard Reviews for Public Meetings (see attachment). There were numerous add-ons and modifications to the recommendation which were all discussed. After discussion, it was voted to send the draft recommendation to the CAB for review and approval.

Tuesday, September 26, 2006, Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof
Donna Antonucci
Manuel Bettencourt
Tracey Carroll
Leon Chavous
Gerald Devitt
Arthur Dombay
Mary Drye
Mercredi Giles
Judith Greene McLeod
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman

Stakeholders

Jack Roberts
Charlie Hansen
Perry Holcomb
Jean Sulc
Mitch Morgan
Mindy Mets

Ranowul Jzar
Bill Lawless
Wendell Lyon
Jimmy Mackey
Madeleine Marshall
Robert Meisenheimer
Joseph Ortaldo
Karen Patterson
Barbara Paul
Alex Williams
Gloria Williams -Way

Regulators

Eddie Wright, EPA
Kim Newell, SCDHEC

Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE
Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC
Robert Pope, EPA

DOE/Contractors

Jeff Allison, DOE
Rick Arkin, DOE
Kevin Smith, DOE
Yvette Collazzo, DOE
Helen Belencan, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
Larry Ling , DOE
Sheron Smith, DOE
Nick Delaplane, DOE
Wade Whitaker, DOE
Dawn Gillas, DOE
Terry Spears, DOE
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC
John Dickenson, WSRC
Frank England, WSRC
Rick Sprague, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC

SRS CAB members Cynthia Gilliard and Wade Waters 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 July 24-25, 2006, were approved with no changes.

Agency Update

Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC, announced that Chuck Gorman has taken a new job with the Bureau of Water. She also discussed high level waste issues. SCDHEC's main objective is seeing high level waste treated in accordance with Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) schedules. SCDHEC is concerned about how the 3116 consultation process takes place and how it aligns with the compliance schedule. They want a timeframe that supports closure of the tanks within the FFA schedule. Ms. Sherritt also addressed salt waste processing saying everyone's wants to know where's the permit? Ms. Sherritt commented that DOE does have a good plan for SWPF and SCDHEC believes it balances objectives with the SCDHEC objective- minimizing residual remaining in SC. She noted commitment to implement the plan on schedule, which calls for a lot of disposal to happen up front. SCDHEC believes the plan is a good plan, but it needs to be carried out in totality. SCDHEC won't move forward with a permit that is shortsighted. Treatment has to happen on time in order for the plan to be effective. Ms. Sherritt discussed SCDHEC efforts to obtain a letter of commitment from DOE and stated that as of late on September 25, the agencies had hit a snag in discussions. Ms. Sherritt noted that DOE has gone above and beyond in the Battelle commitment shipping more than the 1000 cubic meters of SRS TRU waste required by the agreement. She noted this achievement as an example of what can happen when there is cooperation.

Rob Pope noted that Dawn Taylor has been detailed to a RCRA section chief position and Ken Feely has been detailed over as FFA Project Manager. He gave an update on project work telling the Board to keep an eye out for the M Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines Proposed Plan. M Area is the next area to be completed. P Area is in the throws of full investigation and EPA hopes to see the P Reactor Proposed Plan shortly. EPA is interested in hearing what the public thinks about it since it will set the precedent for the remaining reactors. T Area is basically complete with a golf course like cap and the D Area Ash Basin is almost complete as well. Mr. Pope announced that DOE had made changes to the game pathway, lowering it to 30 mrem following recently issued internal DOE guidance. This is more protective than in the past.

Jeff Allison, DOE Site Manager, apologized for missing the last meeting as he was on vacation. Mr. Allison noted that changing CAB administration has been very difficult. The CAB is use to certain ways of doing business and there have been lots of different reactions, however DOE and the CAB have worked well together over the ensuing months and the important thing is that DOE is in a good position to provide excellent DOE support of the CAB. Mr. Allison also noted that Terry Spears was promoted to Assistant Manager and Larry Ling was promoted to Salt Process Manager. He announced that Kevin Smith is leaving SRS to be the Deputy Manager at Y-12 Oak Ridge Site. He also noted that SRS has completed closure of F Area, which many

refer to as our Rocky Flats. It had a lot of chemical and nuclear hazards and it is a tribute to the workers who closed the area. Bill Lawless asked Mr. Allison to justify why the CAB staff was being removed. Dr. Lawless commented that DOE's credibility has been damaged significantly. Mr. Allison responded that he thinks DOE has a good team in place and asked the CAB to give them a change to demonstrate their ability. Mr. Allison stated the Board will not see a lot of substantive changes.

Bill Spader emphasized good communication as the foundation of an effective relationship. He made a personal commitment to enhance open communications and noted that the primary point of contact for the CAB will be Gerri Flemming. He also introduced Sheron Smith as a valuable addition to team. Rick McLeod will continue as Technical Advisor through a new contract with V3 Technical Services. Mitch Morgan, President of V3 Technical Services and Mindy Mets who will serve as Meeting Coordinator were also introduced. Mr. Spader noted that WSRC will continue to support the transition through November.

Mr. Spader also announced that DOE intends to extend the WSRC contract up to 18 months as they continue to work on the rebid. Mr. Spader also provided operational updates, noting work in H Canyon with highly enriched uranium through 2011 (dependent upon funding). He also noted Plutonium Vitrification as the preferred alternative in the existing K Area facility and discussed how all parties are working diligently to achieve successful outcome regarding high level waste issues. Mr. Spader summarized a recent CDC report which calculated maximize doses due to SRS operations to be significantly lower than the average to area residents. Mr. Spader also noted the deinventory of F Area Materials Storage as a key accomplishment allowing this facility to downgrade to a Category 4 facility. Another key milestone was the completion of the last neptunium processing required by DNFSB Recommendation 94-1.

Rick Arkin, National Nuclear Security Administration, provided a brief update, noting the Tritium Extraction Facility has completed an NRC review and is expected to go operational in December. DOE has not had the ability to extract tritium since 1998, but will be able to this summer. Site preparation for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Facility is well under way, however the budget is the real controversy. DOE is committed to removal of 34 metric tons to a non proliferant condition. Mr. Arkin also noted that DOE is looking forward to the future – Complex 2030. NNSA will be holding a public hearing Nov. 9 at the North Augusta Community Center to solicit comment from the citizens and elected officials and allow the public an opportunity to contribute their thoughts and feelings about where DOE goes in the future.

Public Comments

Joe Whetstone, Beaufort, S.C.

““I want to take this opportunity to thank Shelly Sherritt of DHEC for meeting with Ruth Thomas, Mary Kelly, Leslie Miner, Dell Isham, & me on Tuesday, August 22 in Columbia to discuss our concerns about the current DOE HLW tank closure plans at SRS. One of the problems cited during the meeting was the inadequate tank space for continuing DWPF operations at full capacity while waiting on SWPF to come on line. Another tank space need mentioned was current canyon activity. On Friday August 25, in an e-mail, I asked Shelly if she would explain the tank space need for current canyon activity. Her response was as follows: “I asked DOE for projections about canyon processing and did not receive a response. Canyon processing of nuclear materials is not something we have authority to regulate; therefore, I can't require a response. I don't have any info that helps except the general knowledge that the canyon is expected to have some output to the High Level Waste tanks. Shelly” -the following Monday, August 28, I sent the following e-mail to Jim Moore and Paul Sauerborn and copied Shelly. “Jim and Paul- When I read various documents on the need for space in the HLW tanks at SRS – Canyon output seems to be one reason space is needed. What activity in the canyon(s) requires HLW tank space? Considering the desire to keep the tank closure on schedule and to operate DWPF at maximum capacity, why can't this canyon activity be slowed or temporality stopped until SWPF is brought on line? Why can't more resources be focused on SWPF by slowing or temporality stopping canyon activity?” After a week and no response, I forwarded the question I sent to Jim & Paul to Joe Carter, along with the following: “Joe, It has been about a week since I posed this question and I've received no response whatsoever. I find it hard to believe that this is a difficult question to answer. Are you willing to shed any light on this?” Joe Carter responded shortly as follows: “Joe, I just spoke with Jim Moore and he has referred your question to DOE for an answer. I am no longer the technical advisor for HLW issue and as I have been out of the job for several months now, I don't have the latest plans for H Canyon and DWPF operations. Therefore, I am unable to provide you an answer myself.” Since CAB's duty is to keep the public informed can CAB answer this question- “What activity is taking place in the SRS canyons that requires HLW tank space?” The primary reason for bringing the lack of a response to my question to the CAB's attention today is the same point expressed by The Augusta Chronicle editorial entitled “What's DOE trying to hide?” The last sentence of the editorial says it well. “Until the DOE deals straight with the public on sensitive SRS cleanup issues, the public has good reason to wonder what the agency's trying to hide.””

Perry Holcomb, North Augusta, S.C.

Mr. Holcomb asked the Board to raise their hand if they knew what CIF stands for. He said he was looking for answers through Waste Management committee and hoped to get an update on CIF, the Consolidated Incineration Facility, and legacy purex organic. He asked if the Board has noticed the change in semantics-DOE has not said high level waste- it's now Liquid Waste. Mr. Holcomb said at the last Waste Management Committee, he asked who was responsible for change and Ginger Dickert said they were. He said he thought this was an infantile approach.

Chair Update

Karen Patterson provided a brief summary of the Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs meeting held September 5-9 in Santa Fe, New Mexico. (see attachment).

Facilitator Update

Mike Schoener provided a recommendation status (see attachment). There are four recommendations pending, 26 open and 207 closed. He also presented the agenda for the Education Retreat to be held in Charleston, S.C. October 12-13, 2006.

Administrative Committee Report

Mike Schoener discussed the procedure to amend the bylaws and Meryl Alalof presented the following proposal to amend the bylaws:

Section 3.2 Terms of Appointment

The terms of office for Members of the Board shall consist of 25 two-year terms with new appointments made annually on a staggered schedule as the Members' terms of office expire. Terms of office for Members shall be two years. ~~After a lapse of two or more years, a board member may be re-elected.~~ A Member shall serve no more than three consecutive terms of office. Current Board members will be subject to all selection criterion and re-elected by the full Board as set forth in Section 3.3.

Wendell Lyon moved the Board adopt and Mary Drye seconded. There was considerable discussion regarding the need for the change and whether board members would support the change. Some argued that the CAB was merely bringing its mission and bylaws in alignment with the DOE charter, while others expressed strong sentiments regarding the need to leave the bylaws as is. Art Dombay made a motion to amend the proposal, which was seconded by Gloria Williams-Way, however the motion to amend failed by a vote of five members in favor and 15 opposed. Mercredi Giles and Judy Greene-McLeod abstained due to confusion over the issue. The original proposal to amend also failed by a vote of 14 in favor and seven opposed.

Strategic & Legacy Management Committee

DOE Budget – Stakeholder Participation Consistency

Concerned that they have not had an opportunity to provide meaningful input in the FY 2008 budget process, Jimmy Mackey presented a draft motion regarding the disparity and need for a more consistent and effective budget participation process across the DOE complex (see attachment). The SRS CAB still has major concerns about the lack of a current SRS stakeholder budget participation process which include a site priorities listing, planned key accomplishments and over-target activities. The motion asks DOE-SR to reestablish a consistent involvement process in the planning and formulation aspects of the SRS budget. More specifically, it recommended that beginning with the FY09 budget process and continuing with all future outyear budgets, DOE-SR provide a briefing to the SRS CAB in March of each year on the status of the fiscal year budget currently being formulated for the SRS. The motion also asked that DOE-HQ reconfirm the length of the budget embargo period and provide potential alternatives to shorten this period to provide stakeholders more time to provide meaningful input in the budget process. Alex Williams moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 21 members in favor.

Historic Preservation Update

Nick Delaplane, DOE, provided an update on historic preservation activities at SRS (see attachment). The law requires that all Federal agencies consider the impacts to historic properties in all their undertakings. Specific regulations are contained in 34 CFR Part 800 and others. Compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act is done in three steps: inventory resources; evaluation of SRS buildings for National Register eligibility; and mitigation of adverse effects to historic properties. The Historic Preservation process is an integrated process for all SRS activities. The program is conducted in accordance with the SRS Cold War Built Environment CRMP. Mitigating actions include, but are not limited to: photography; oral histories from employees and retirees; written documents describing historical contribution and processes; preservation of artifacts; and preservation of structures. DOE signed a “Letter of Intent” for use of Building 742-A by the SRS Heritage Foundation for a museum. The Historic Preservation Advisory Team holds bimonthly meetings with SHPO and the SRS Heritage Foundation. Quarterly Heritage Tourism meetings are held and open to the public.

WSRC continues review and approval of projects and work packages with potential impact to historic structures to ensure the historic fabric of SRS is not adversely impacted. The Thematic Studies for T & M Area have been completed as had the Tritium Recordation Study. The A

Area study has been drafted and the D Area study is fifty percent complete. Future mitigation documentation includes the Reactors Thematic Study and the Separations Thematic Study by FY 08-09. The SRNL and Infrastructure studies are expected by FY2010.

DOE is making progress on a Curation Facility. They have hired a curator, named Caroline Bradford, whose past work experience includes the Matheson Museum, Gainesville, FL; the D.C. Booth Historic National Fish Hatchery, Spearfish, SD and experience in cataloguing collection of scientific instruments. Future curation activities include continuing to receive and store artifacts; development of a curation plan; development of a quality assurance plan; artifact processing; a detailed design for the curation facility; and modifications to Building 315-M. Mr. Delaplane concluded by noting that NHPA requirements are established in site work processes; artifact collection is ongoing; public stakeholder involvement is well established and FY06 accomplishments lay the ground work for future activities.

Public Comments

Joe Whetstone asked that a letter regarding the elimination of funding for MOX and support for immobilization be added to the CAB Website.

Ranowul Jzar asked about the transfer of Environmental Justice from Environmental Management to Legacy Management.

Nuclear Materials Committee Report

Rick Sprague, WSRC, provided a status of the Nuclear Materials Management missions and a current status of construction projects in the K Area Complex (see attachment). The deinventory of the F Area Materials Storage Facility was a major accomplishment for WSRC. FAMS was deinventoried and downgraded. This was achieved through a smart, focused approach to safely reduce the inventory of FAMS through best disposition alternatives. It was completed well ahead of schedule and allows for significant redeployment of personnel to other critical SRS missions. It also realized significant cost savings and cost avoidance. Materials were consolidated into the K Area Complex eliminating the need for system upgrades to FAMS.

The K Area Complex stores plutonium and has a continuous monitoring program of Pu in 3013 containers inside 9975 packages. It also provides interim storage of HEU ingots pending disposition. KAC completed the preparation, cropping and shipment of excess unirradiated fuel to H Canyon. Full packaging and transfer of HEU ingots to offsite vendors or interim storage is being conducted pending final disposition. The KAC facility underwent stringent, well-documented earthquake and structural upgrades in preparation for reactor restart and was chosen to be the Category 1 Facility for consolidated materials. Mr. Sprague discussed the various projects to provide KAC with all necessary enhancements for excellence. He discussed the Storage Vault Project; the K Area Fire Protection Modification Project; the K Area Interim Surveillance Project; and the 3013 Container Surveillance and Storage Capability Project; and the Plutonium Disposition Project.

Mr. Sprague summarized by noting that KAC is continuing a legacy of safe, disciplined operations; KAC is the only Category 1 facility at SRS and meets all enhanced Safeguards and Security Requirements; Pu management capabilities will be located in the KAC; and FAMS deinventory was completed, resulting in substantial cost savings.

Board members asked questions regarding contingency planning if Yucca Mountain does not open; criticality in the glass waste storage building; retrofitting K Area for Pu vitrification; and safety and design issues. They also discussed SRS as the safest place in the nation to store plutonium.

Waste Management Committee

Standard Review Plan Public Meetings

In light of recent articles highlighting DOE's legal concerns about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Standard Review Plan process and based on DOE's contention that NRC's role should be more of a consultation role versus a role of licensing, certifying and regulating DOE, Joe Ortaldo presented the draft motion recommending that DOE and NRC ensure all meetings to review the important issues dealing with closing high level waste tanks are conducted in public (see attachment). Also acknowledging SCDHEC concerns about the potential lengthy Waste Determination documentation process and the impact such delays could have on the tank closure process, the motion recommended that DOE work with NRC and SCDHEC to reduce the overall consultation timeframe and/or innovatively complete the consultation in a manner that supports compliance with the FFA schedules. It also recommended that DOE conduct a preliminary performance assessment for tank groups ahead of waste removal so that after waste removal, waste determinations for tanks may be conducted more quickly.

Finally, the motion requested that DOE, NRC and SCDHEC make a joint presentation to the SRS CAB in November 2006 on the roles and responsibilities and meeting processes of each agency in the Section 3116 process and asked that they provide an overview of how much efficiency can be achieved by standardization processes to comply with FFA schedules (such as teams to jointly write documents). Jimmy Mackey moved the Board adopt the motion and Meryl Alalof seconded. The motion was adopted unanimously with 22 members in favor.

Salt Process Update

Terrel Spears, DOE, provided an update regarding the Salt Waste Treatment Program (see attachment). The enhanced preliminary design was completed on schedule on September 14, 2006. The geotechnical field work is underway and independent design review started September 18, 2006. External independent review is slated to start in November and request for approval of the project cost and schedule baseline is expected by February 2007. Limited construction is planned to start in February 2007. Mr. Spears discussed Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction (MCU). SRS has completed installation of process area tanks, decanters and contactor skid; poured the contactor enclosure roof and installed roof mounted equipment. They have completed shielding structure with receipt of 84 cell covers and construction in 90% complete. Mr. Spears also provided an update on the Actinide Removal Process where equipment and jumper remotability testing has been completed. Mr. Spears noted Saltstone Processing Facility enhancements and discussed the Disposition Processing Plan programmatic objectives. These objectives include safe operations; tank closure that meet FFA commitments; sustained Defense Waste Processing Facility operations; high capacity salt waste processing through the Salt Waste Processing Facility and nuclear material stabilization.

Mr. Spears noted the keys to success in SRS tank space management, which in the near term is to provide concentrate receipt space for evaporator systems operations; by 2011 to provide additional waste tank space through other approaches; and beyond 2011 to provide high capacity salt waste processing through SWPF operations. Mr. Spears discussed the implementation elements of these keys to success, and the scope of technology development needed.

Mr. Spears provided a status update of Tank 48 and discussed the following actions expected during the next quarter:

- Initiate Saltstone Facility processing
- Initiate Tank 25 deliquification to prepare ARP/MCU feed
- Complete Tank 48 technology testing and treatment selection
- Continue waste removal from Tanks 5 and 6

- Continue closure activities for Tanks 18 and 19
- Proceed with SWPF final design
- Complete SWPF Independent Design Review
- Complete SWPF geotechnical field work
- Complete SWPF External Independent Review of cost and schedule

Mr. Spears summarized by noting that SRS is investing in infrastructure for effective waste disposition and tank closures; they are making strong progress in the field in implementing infrastructure projects; DOE is working with the State to obtain necessary permits; and SRS is preparing to initiate processing upon receipt of permits.

Board members asked numerous questions about the presentation and expressed frustration with the permit process regarding salt waste. The CAB decided to draft a letter to all principals involved expressing said frustration. Mr. Meisenheimer presented draft language for the letter. Bill Lawless moved the Board agree that the Waste Management Chair and the CAB Chair write a letter expressing frustration with the lack of progress resolving the salt permit process issues. Mary Drye seconded the motion.

Shelly Sherrit stated she understands the frustration and feels it keenly. She said it's harder to imagine anyone wants to move ahead more than SCDHEC and DOE. The result of such a letter would likely be a media flurry that would distract attention away from working on the issues. A letter at this point really won't add to their incentive to accomplish that. Board members commented that they just want to know what is the real agenda and is someone using this issue to get what they want. The Board agreed that if the permit was issued before the October 17 Waste Management Committee meeting there would be no need for the letter.

The motion passed by a vote 16 members in favor to 5 opposed. Ranowul Jzar abstained stating she did not agree and patience is a virtue. *(The draft permit was issued in early October, therefore the WM Committee did not submit a letter.)*

Handouts

SRS CAB Agenda, September 25-26, 2006

SRS D&D: In Step with Area Completion, Helen Belencan, DOE

Planning for Replacement of Steam Plants at SRS, Larry Snyder, DOE

DOE Budget-Stakeholder Participation Consistency, Draft, Jimmy Mackey, CAB

SRS Liquid Waste Disposition Processing Plan, Tony Polk, DOE

Radioactive Liquid Tank Waste Stabilization and Disposition Risk Management Plan, Tony Polk, DOE

Standard Review Plan Public Meetings, Draft, Bill Lawless, CAB

Letter to James Rispoli and Anna Bradford, dated September 21, 2006

Letter from EM Site Specific Advisory Board to James Rispoli, dated September 8, 2006

SRS Gold Metrics, dated August 2006

SSAB Chairs Meeting Trip Summary

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary

SRS CAB Education Retreat agenda

SRS CAB 2006 Self Evaluation Survey

Summary of Proposal to Amend the Bylaws

Status of Historical Preservation Activities at SRS, Nick Delaplaine, DOE

Nuclear Materials Management Program Update, Rick Sprague, DOE

Standard Review Plan Public Meetings, Final Draft, Joe Ortaldo, CAB

Salt Waste Treatment Program Update, Terrel Spears, DOE

SCDHEC Letter to Karen Patterson, dated September 20, 2006

SRS CAB Calendar

National Environmental Policy Act Monthly Status Report