

Summary Notes – July 12, 2016  
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)  
Nuclear Material (NM) Committee SPECIAL Meeting

The NM Committee held a special meeting on Tuesday, July 12, 2016, 4:30 – 8 pm, at the New Ellenton Community Center in New Ellenton, SC. It was also streamed online via and posted to the CAB website and YouTube Page. The purpose of this special meeting was to discuss two draft recommendations and two position statements crafted by the committee. There was also time set aside for public comments.

Attendees

<p><u>CAB:</u></p> <p>Gil Allensworth Susan Corbett Dawn Gillas David Hoel Virginia Jones, <i>phone</i> John McMichael Larry Powell Harold Simon Nina Spinelli Mary Weber</p>	<p><u>DOE/Contractors / Others:</u></p> <p>Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR Pat McGuire, DOE-SR Jim Giusti, DOE-SR Avery Hammett, DOE-SR de’Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR Kim Cauthen, SRNS Kristin Huber, SRNS Tina Watson, Time Solutions James Tanner, Time Solutions</p>	<p><u>Agency Liaisons:</u></p> <p>Kevin Baird, SCDHEC</p> <p><u>Stakeholders:</u></p> <p>Karen Patterson, SCNAC Rick McLeod, SRSCRO Art Domby, Public Mike Johnson, CNRA Joe Ortaldo, Public Rose Hayes, Public Ed Burke, Public Laura Lance, Public Gary Dexter, Public Michelle Edgar, Public Suzanne Rhodes, LWVSC Dara Glass, BWXT Jesse Young, Don’t Waste Aiken Harry Shealy, CVSC Wilkin Byrd, CVSC Will Williams, EDP Brant Hunt, Public David Matos, Public</p>
---	---	--

Committee Welcome: Larry Powell, Committee Chair  
Mr. Powell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Committee Discussion

Draft Recommendation: “Improving H-Canyon Throughput”

Dawn Gillas, Committee Vice-Chair and Recommendation sponsor, read the draft into the record. Mary Weber, Committee Member, stated that she needed more context to understand the purpose of the document. Ms. Gillas replied by giving some examples of what the Recommendation could do for improving processing in H-Canyon. Nina Spinelli, CAB Vice-Chair, recommended adding a “Discussion” section that would outline a few of the examples Ms. Gillas had noted to clarify context. After discussion of the edits, Ms. Gillas stated that the purpose of the Recommendation was to encourage DOE to get the material processed and off-site.

#### Public Comment

Laura Lance, Public, asked if the German fuel would be processed in H-Canyon. Ms. Gillas replied that it would, with changes. She also noted that the purpose of the Recommendation included support for making H-Canyon process changes (due to differences in input) more flexible and efficient.

#### Committee Vote

A motion was made to move the draft position statement from committee to the full board for a vote. Vote: 6 Yes, 2 No, Abstentions not requested. Motion carried.

#### Committee Discussion

Draft Position Statement (Revised from June 2016 meeting): "Interim or Long Term Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Waste"

David Hoel, Committee Member and draft sponsor, read the position statement into the record. The position statement was up for renewal or replacement, and the discussion needed to lead to a decision to take to the full board for a vote.

Committee members put forward their thoughts on the content of the draft and what changes needed to be made. A discussion followed on the nature and intent of the draft and whether the draft needed to specifically call out commercial SNF as the issue.

#### Public Comment

Art Domby, Public; Karen Patterson, Public; Suzanne Rhodes, LWVSC; and Rose Hayes, Public all concurred that it was vital to note that the fuel in question was commercial. In addition, these individuals noted the consent-based siting strategy implemented by the DOE recently. Mr. Domby suggested that, instead of commercial, stating "non-DOE-origin fuel" would be less confusing and more accurate.

Mr. Ed Burke, original position statement author, gave a bit of background on the position statement. He reiterated the initial concern that interim storage led to permanent storage, such that, once the material arrived at SRS, it would stay there. The position statement was an attempt to express that concern, however, DOE could not confirm any permanent plan, because of the nature of the government budget and funding process. Ms. Rhodes agreed with Mr. Burke and stated, "Congress is the problem here."

Rick McLeod, SRSCRO, noted that the interim storage facilities the consent-based siting process was reviewing were privately owned and not any DOE complex sites as previously noted.

Following the public comments, Mr. Hoel reviewed the edits suggested throughout the committee discussion and public comments.

#### Committee Vote

A motion was made to move the draft position statement from committee to the full board for a vote. Seconded. Vote: 6 Yes, 3 No, 0 Abstain. The motion was carried.

Mr. Powell, Committee Chair, adjourned the meeting until 5:50 pm.

#### Committee Discussion

Draft Position Statement: "Proposed Acceptance and Disposition of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Containing US-Origin Highly Enriched Uranium from the Federal Republic of Germany"

At meeting resumption, David Hoel, Position Statement sponsor, read the position statement into the record for consideration by the committee.

Gil Allensworth, Committee Member, noted his disagreement with the statement. Dawn Gillas, Committee Vice-Chair, requested documentation on several points raised in the statement, particularly the language “proliferation resistant.” Ms. Gillas also noted that, despite its final form, the material in question was of US origin, and there was a material requirement to repatriate it.

Susan Corbett, Committee Member, asked whether the SNF was technically considered commercial, since the original material was used to generate electricity on the grid in Germany.

Nina Spinelli, CAB Vice-Chair, noted several language edits for consideration.

Ginny Jones, Committee Member, noted her support for the position statement and reminded everyone that it would be re-evaluated in one year.

#### Public Comment

Karen Patterson, Public, noted that Congress was really responsible for some of the problems given their funding process.

Rose Hayes, Public, requested that the CAB review their legal standing as a board.

Suzanne Rhodes, LWVSC, submitted a written statement and requested clarification on the differences between commercial and research reactor spent fuel.

Jeff Allender, Public, suggested several edits to the position statement.

Harry Shealy, CVSC, submitted a written statement and commented that he opposed the proposal and supported the position statement.

Rick McLeod, SRSCRO, questioned the need for the position statement given that no decision has been made by DOE to date. Mr. McLeod believed the statement was premature.

Art Dombly, Public, stated he also believed that the statement was premature and requested the Committee focus on the EA. He then suggested that the German SNF and cost recovery could be used to accelerate existing H-Canyon operations rather than slow them down or distract from them.

George (?), Public, agreed with Mr. McLeod and Mr. Dombly that the statement was premature as he believed there was not enough information to support it as currently written.

Jesse Young, Don't Waste Aiken, and David Matos and Laura Lance, both members of the Public, noted their support for the position statement.

#### Committee Vote

Motion made to move the position statement out of committee to the full board for consideration. Seconded. Vote: 5 Yes, 3 No, 1 Abstention. Motion carried.

#### Committee Discussion

##### Draft Recommendation: “German Spent Nuclear Fuel”

Gil Allensworth, Recommendation Manager, read the draft document into the record. The discussion began with Nina Spinelli, CAB Vice-Chair, who asked a procedural question. Jim Giusti, DOE-SR, responded that the content of the recommendation was under the CAB scope. Dawn Gillas, Committee Vice-Chair, noted her support for the Recommendation with one edit. Ms. Gillas requested that language regarding the EIS process be removed, because an EIS will happen as part of the NEPA process. Ms. Gillas felt the Recommendation language was not necessary.

Susan Corbett, Committee Member, noted her opposition to the Recommendation. Mary Weber, Committee Member, asked a follow-on procedural question. Mr. Allensworth discussed why he preferred to generate a Recommendation rather than a Position Statement on the topic. And, finally, Ms. Spinelli requested a presentation on the Atoms for Peace program with updates for the past decade to help the CAB re-contextualize the program. Pat McGuire, DOE-SR, supported Ms. Spinelli's request for an updated presentation. Additionally, Mr. McGuire stated that implicit in the many discussions over the years of the Atoms for Peace program was the idea

that Germany could ask for help from the US at any time, and it would receive that help from the United States. Mr. McGuire noted that they are asking now.

Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR, when asked for a timeline, stated that the testing (which must be completed and evaluated before a decision to accept the SNF can be made) would take an anticipated 24 – 36 months for completion.

Ms. Gillas asked that the Atoms for Peace presentation include a discussion of GTRI (Global Threat Reduction Initiative). Pat McGuire agreed.

Ms. Corbett asked how the material would be processed through H-Canyon. Ms. Maxted replied that an ancillary process would take place inside one existing cell within H-Canyon.

Larry Powell, Committee Chair, asked for clarification that the nuclear materials would not be accepted until the testing was complete and their results evaluated. Ms. Maxted confirmed that was the case.

Ginny Jones, Committee Member, noted her opposition to the Recommendation via telephone.

#### Public Comment

Karen Patterson, Public, asked what would happen if both the position statement and the Recommendation were passed. Tina Watson, CAB Facilitator, stated that the Recommendation would take precedence over the Position Statement. In a follow-up question, Laura Lance, Public, asked the difference between a Recommendation and a Position Statement. Larry Powell, Committee Chair, stated that the Recommendation required a response in action, and a Position Statement did not. Ms. Lance noted her opposition to the Recommendation.

Rose Hayes, Public, noted her strong opposition to the Recommendation. She stated that she agreed with the first part of the first sentence of Recommendation #3.

Gary Dexter, Public, noted his opposition to accept German SNF and to the Recommendation.

An unidentified member of the public noted that if the material was able to be processed, then it could be considered a proliferation issue. He suggested that the Recommendation include a cold demonstration of the process to the board prior to final decision by the DOE.

#### Committee Vote

Motion made to move the Recommendation out of committee to the full board for consideration. Seconded. Vote: 5 Yes, 4 No, 0 Abstention. Motion carried.

Larry Powell, Committee Chair, adjourned the meeting.

The next NM Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 9, 2016 at 4:30 – 6:20 pm, at the New Ellenton Community Center in New Ellenton, SC.

The online recording of this meeting can be located on the CAB website: [cab.srs.gov](http://cab.srs.gov)