

Summary Notes – August 8, 2017  
 Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)  
 Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee Meeting

The NM Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, from 6:30 – 8:20 pm, at the Department of Energy Meeting Center in Aiken, SC. It was also streamed online via YouTube and posted to the CAB website and YouTube channel. The purpose of this meeting was to receive updates on the Point of Contact status. There was also time set aside for committee discussion and public comments.

Attendees:

<u>CAB:</u> Susan Corbett Tom French Dawn Gillas David Hoel Douglas Howard Dan Kaminski Larry Powell Earl Sheppard Nina Spinelli Mary Weber Bobbie Williams	<u>DOE/Contractors/Others:</u> Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR James Tanner, S&K Federica Staton, S&K Chelsea Gitzen, S&K	<u>Agency Liaisons:</u> Thomas Rolka, SCDHEC  <u>Stakeholders:</u> Dave Fauth Joe Ortaldo Chuck Messick John Plodinec Laura Lance James Marra Jeff Allender
--	--	---

Committee Welcome: Larry Powell, NM Chair

CAB member Powell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Point of Contact Status Update: Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR

Ms. Maxted reported the status of each project: sustained operations for all NM. 80 bundles are scheduled for FY 18 and 200 have been processed since the start of the campaign. H-Canyon experienced a potential safety issue – degradation of concrete up to 2-3 inches and analysis is being done on this issue. Safety analysis states that safety controls provided adequate protection of employees, members of the public, and the environment. L-Area continues operations, as well as 235-F and neither have no real changes to report.

Q&A Session

CAB member Kaminski asked if the 2-3 inches mentioned was the depth of the degradation, to which Ms. Maxted replied that is correct. She further noted this is the exhaust tunnel where air goes to get to the sand filter, and the tunnel is about 10 x 10 feet. CAB member Kaminski asked if the degradation could be described. Tony Polk, DOE-SR, responded that the wall is scaling/peeling back – mostly this is the walls which are affected but also the ceiling. There is exposed rebar. This is all occurring closer to the canyon. This degradation was previously known and monitored every other year through cameras and robot-retrieved core samples. The reason behind the degradation occurred due to residue contamination and nuclides. CAB member Kaminski asked how radioactive this duct is, to which Mr. Polk responded that he didn't know.

CAB member Gillas asked if core samples had been taken, to which Mr. Polk noted the affected areas had been filled in and don't compromise the integrity of the duct.

CAB member Sheppard asked if the coating was sprayed, a skin coat was used or epoxy. Mr. Polk responded that a mechanism was put through to seal with epoxy or concrete inside and outside of the duct.

CAB member Hoel asked what the odds are of collapsing and noted collapsing occurring at other sites. Mr. Polk replied that they are small to none – the traffic over it is restricted even though loads are ok according to analysis and the structures at SRS underground are very different than those at other sites which are constructed with wood and earth and could not withstand an earthquake like SRS structures can.

CAB member Corbett asked if there is a long term affect anticipated, which Mr. Polk responded to by saying it was put into operation in 1954 or 1955 and yes acid has an effect on all materials including concrete not to mention this degradation was noticed a number of years ago. CAB member Corbett asked if the material would be replaced. Mr. Polk responded that last year or the year before they started looking for replacement material but it will be a number of years before it'd be a problem was thought after previous analysis. He then estimated there's 6-8 options for alternative materials.

CAB Member Kaminski asked if the canyon inside contains degradation, to which Mr. Polk answered that the dissolver and tanks have had degradation in past similar but have been repaired and there's no issue within the canyon itself. CAB member Kaminski asked if there's a sacrificial catalyst being looked at. Mr. Polk replied that is not as practical as other options.

CAB member Gillas asked regarding disposition of non-aluminum fuel – if any of the corresponding CAB recommendations have been addressed. Ms. Maxted replied that yes they have been.

Committee Discussion: Plutonium Program Overview/Update

CAB member Powell began discussion on this presentation.

CAB member Gillas noted that this was a good presentation but she hasn't seen how long it'll take and the number of shipments as well as how long it'll take with given alternatives. She noted the CAB needs a better idea – including if MOX happens or not and best processes. Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR, noted that those topics are included in next year's work plan.

CAB member Gillas asked how long it would take to get all the plutonium off of the site. CAB member Hoel answered that the National Academy was commissioned by DOE to determine if the remainder can be disposed of by WIPP. CAB member Gillas asked if it doesn't what happens which should be added to the CY 18 work plan and the CAB needs an end game if there is one. Mr. Polk answered that it becomes different to discuss what goes where which is undetermined, but increased production can be done and analysis provided to the CAB.

CAB member Corbett agreed with CAB member Gillas.

CAB member Howard asked what the hold up is – referring to CAB member Gillas' questions. CAB member Gillas answered that the government is concerned but this is a very complex issue and how long to store these materials being too long is relative. CAB member French noted that the CAB is an EM SSAB so they can only talk about EM, non-MOX-able material.

Mr. Mikolanis noted that non-MOX-able material is something the CAB can explore and add to their work plan.

**Ms. Maxted noted that EM's life cycle is 2046 for 6 metric tons which has been shipped according to their evaluation.**

Draft Recommendation:

**"Oppose Receipt of German SNF for Treatment & Storage in the U.S."**

**CAB member Powell reintroduced this draft and made some suggestions in wording which were accepted.**

**After some additional discussion, the recommendation related to discontinuing SRNL research was removed. This recommendation was motioned to be forwarded to the next full board meeting, which was seconded and passed nine to one.**

Public Comment

None.

~Meeting Adjourned