SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation

Committee Meeting

North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC

June 6, 2006

The Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee (FD&SR) met on Tuesday, June 6, 2006, 5:00 PM, at the North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC. The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the SRS D&D Program Update; 211-F Outside Facilities EE/CA and receive public comments. Attendance was as follows:

CAB Members	**Stakeholders**	**DOE/Contractors**
Bob Meisenheimer	Jack Roberts	Chris Bergren, BSRI
-Cynthia Gilliard	Leroy Godfrey	de'Lisa Bratcher, DOE
- Wendell Lyon	Perry Holcomb	Wade Whitaker, DOE
- Mary Drye	Murray Riley	Helen Belencan, DOE
Manuel Bettencourt		Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Joe Ortaldo		Mary Flora, WSRC
-Mercredi Giles		Bill Erickson, DOE
Tracey Carroll	**Regulators**	Mary Bennington, DOE
Alex Williams	Jim Barksdale, EPA	Michael Graham, BSRI
-Leon Chavous	Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC	

- FD&SR committee members ** CAB technical advisor*

Welcome and Introduction:

Mary Drye, Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked that they introduce themselves.

D&D Program Update: Helen Belencan stated the purpose of the presentation was to update the CAB on the most recent D&D accomplishments and report on implementation of Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Appendix K. Ms. Belencan pointed out that there are some 1013 facilities with near term deliverables. From 2003-2006 240 excess facilities were identified, over a 310 square mile site, only 23 facilities remain. Key accomplishments include all T-Area facilities equaling 167,000 square feet. M-Area is the next area with nearly 367,000 square feet.

D-Area has 35 facilities with one left to go equaling 170,000 square feet will be demolished by the end of 2006. 247-F (Naval Fuels) finished six months ahead of schedule accounting for 110,000 square feet. Significant ongoing works of D&D are:

- 211-F Canyon auxiliaries
- 211-3F Waste Truck Unloading
- 230-H B-G Incinerator
- 221-1F A-Line

Ms. Belencan turned the talk to Appendix K of the FFA. Ms. Belencan noted that the Appendix was developed to address EPA and SCDHEC concerns over Soil & Groundwater and Deactivation & Decommissioning integration. The regulators wanted to document decisions made regarding D&D projects and to facilitate area completions. Ms. Belencan stated that two new parts were added to the FFA

- Section XL – Decommissioning Facilities
    - Which defines decommissioning as the first post-operational stage for the facility, when residual hazards are eliminated permanently or reduced to a safe condition
    - Establishes DOE as the lead agency for preparing and finalizing decommissioning activities with EPA and SCDHEC
    - Describes the disposition path for all decommissioned facilities – essentially "track" decisions made on decommissioning projects
- Appendix K
    - Appendix K-1: Facilities planned for decommissioning (presently all 1013 EM facilities)
        - Facilities use decisions not subject to dispute
    - Appendix K-2: Facilities the agencies agree will not require further evaluation or response action during area closure – these are typically facilities decommissioned using the "simple model"
    - Provides a linkage to Appendix C for facilities that may warrant response action – Integrated Sampling Model or EE/CA Model projects
        - Appendix C contains the list of RCRA and CERCLA units (i.e., waste sites) that need investigation and a cleanup Record of Decision

- These facilities become “sub-units” of the Area Completion scope

Ms. Belencan noted the Implementation plan of Appendix K:

- March 14, 2006: FFA Modification to include Appendix K was approved
- May 13, 2006: Facility listings for appendix K-1, K-2 and C-4 submitted
    - K-1 is a comprehensive list of EM facilities planned for decommissioning 3013 facilities
    - K-2 is the list of decommissioned “Simple Model” facilities that require no further evaluation during area completion equaling 303 facilities
    - C-4 is the list of decommissioned facilities that may warrant response action during area completion equaling 44 facilities

In conclusion, Ms. Belencan stated that Appendix K implements the 2003 Memorandum of Agreement in context of the FFA; and enables SRS to proceed with Area Completion, with regulator confidence that all potential releases/risks will be addressed.

211-F Outside Facilities EE/CA: John Reynolds noted that the purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview of the Removal Site Evaluation Report and Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (RSER/EECA) for Decommissioning of Outside Facilities, 221-F. Mr. Reynolds pointed out that the EECA is the highest level of involvement and engineering detail used by the D&D Program in Decommissioning a Facility. Mr. Reynolds stated that 211-F was constructed in the early 1950’s to provide support for the 200-F area processing operations, which included the storage of bulk chemicals; reprocessing of the secondary streams from the canyon processes; and the receiving/processing and transferring of Low Activity Waste and High Activity Waste reprocessed through the canyon for Plutonium (Pu) recovery. The 211-F operations continued through the start of F-Canyon deactivation in 2002. Deactivation of 211-F has been sequenced as required to support canyon deactivation and is scheduled to complete in July 2006.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the EECA is divided into two parts:

- Outside Section (OS) - Chemical Storage Facilities, Water Handling Facilities, Acid Recovery Unit, General Purpose Waste Tanks and Evaporators, Segregated Solvent Facilities, Tank 805 Cell, Tank 820 Cell, and Recycle Sump.
- Waste handling Vault (WHV) – Underground concrete cells containing Tanks 800, 801, 804, 808, and 809.

The OS when investigated for contaminants found that Cesium-137 is the primary radiological contaminants of concern. Arsenic and iron are the primary chemical contaminants of concern. Mr. Reynolds stated that a streamlined risk assessment was used and identifies the risk and potential groundwater impacts associated with the configuration and contamination present before decommissioning starts; based on the results, chemical and radiological contamination were found above the CERCLA action levels; however, none of the contaminants of concern were projected to have an impact on groundwater. Mr. Reynolds stated that one the risk analysis was complete, removal action alternatives were developed whose purpose is to determine the appropriate end state of the contaminated concrete slabs, stainless steel lined areas, and underground structures of the OS to minimize risk to human and the environment. Mr. Reynolds pointed that to be eligible for comparison and analysis, alternatives must meet threshold criteria of overall protection of human health and the environment and compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs).

Three Alternatives were compared for the OS:

1.) No Action

2.) Partial D&R, Decontaminate, Backfill, and Cover with Concrete

3.) Completely Remove the Facility and Backfill

Upon completion of the three alternatives above, number two was chosen which meets the threshold criteria of overall protection of human health and the environment and complies with ARARs. It satisfactorily all removal objectives for effectiveness and implementability, and meets the requirements of the risk based disposal of bulk PCB waste as prescribed in 40 CFR 761.62(c). A sampling and analysis plan is necessary to verify removal objectives, sampling and analysis will be performed pursuant to a sampling and analysis plan approved by EPA Region 4; in addition, quantified residual contamination concentrations will be evaluated to ensure that the risk to the future industrial worker is accurate including those areas not sampled for streamlined risk.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the same approach was used on the WHV. The WHV section, often referred to as the 800-series underground tanks, is an area that consists of five underground tanks housed in a concrete structure 48feet wide by 60 feet long by 34 feet deep. The vault consists of six cells with removable covers. The concrete floor of the vault is sloped toward a sump. The sump is located in the sixth cell of the vault. The contamination is Iodine 129, Cobolt 60, Cesium 137; there are no chemical contaminants of concern. Based on the results of the streamlined risk assessment results, the chemical and radiological contamination was found above the CERCLA action levels; Iodine 129 was the only contaminant projected to have an impact on groundwater based on the screening tools.

Four alternatives were compared for the WHV:

1.) No Action

2.) Fill Cells, Replace Cell Covers, and Cover with Concrete

3.) Remove Tanks, Decontaminate Cells, and Cover with Concrete

4.) Completely Remove WHV (Tank and Cells) and Backfill

Alternative two was the preferred alternative. The response action protects human health and the environment without attaining a level or standard equivalent to 40 CFR 264.310, closure and post closure ARAR.

Mr. Reynolds stated the following implementation schedule:

- Issue EE/CA for Public Comment — June 2006
- Complete Comment Resolution — July 2006
- Issue Action Memorandum — July 2006
- Complete Decommissioning — January 2007

Public Comment: None

Adjourn:

Mary Drye adjourned the meeting at 6:50 P.M.