

Meeting Minutes
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) – Full Board Meeting
Hilton Garden Inn – Augusta, GA
July 23-24, 2018

Attendance – Monday, July 23rd, 2018

CAB
Gil Allensworth
Carlos Cato
Brian Chemsak
Betty Cook
Susan Corbett
David Eisele
Thomas French
Dawn Gillas
Jim Guille
Charles Hilton
Eleanor Hopson
Douglas Howard
Ashley Jacobs
Dan Kaminski
Narinder Malik
Gregg Murray
Larry Powell
Bob Smith
Joyce Underwood
David Vovakes
Mary Weber
Bobbie Williams

DOE/Contractors
Zack Todd, DOE-SR
Jim Folk, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
Jennifer Nelson, DOE-SR
de'Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR
Amy Boyette, DOE-SR
Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR
Mike Budney, DOE-SR
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristin Huber, SRNS
Mtesa Wright, SRNS

Agency Liaisons
Sean Hayes, GADNR
Kyle Bryant, EPA
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Grace Anne Martin,
SCDHEC
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC
Gregg O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC
Krista McCann, SCDHEC

Stakeholders
Tom Clements, SRS Watch
Colin Demarest, Aiken
Standard
Larry Brede, Jacobs
Mark Ellison, Jacobs
Jarrett Rice, Bechtel
Michael Gruh, Bechtel
Martha Ruthven, Rep. Joe
Wilson SC-02
Nancy Bobbit, US Senator
Isaakson
David K. Smith
Joe Ortaldo

CAB Chair Update: Gil Allensworth, CAB Chair

Mr. Allensworth summarized the recent FY 19 budget which was awarded by the house and senate, pointing out the fact that SRS was one of the only larger sites receiving significantly less than what was requested.

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

Mr. Tanner reviewed the meeting rules and agenda. He also summarized the new Code of Conduct introduced by EMSSAB.

Agency Updates

Michael Budney, Site Manager, Department of Energy – Savannah River (DOE-SR)

Mr. Budney provided an update on various projects and events on site related to the EM purview of the CAB.

Q&A Session

Mr. Allensworth asked if Terry Spears, former Deputy Site Manager, had retired. Mr. Budney answered yes, he did. Mr. Allensworth continued by asking if he would be replaced and if so, when that would happen. Mr. Budney replied that he would be replaced and very soon.

Ms. Gillas asked regarding the review of operations for the best value of the taxpayers; if there will be any written report of results summarizing that evaluation and what the different factors were which were taken into account. Mr. Budney responded that he will have to get back with the CAB with a response because the NNSA owns this review and he did not know if they had plans to publicize it. Ms. Gillas further asked if this would set up a framework for EM support of NNSA functions on site. Mr. Budney answered that EM missions will continue and that will not be changed including LW, D&D, etc. but he noted it's a question of alternatives proposed which include three. One of these three options he noted includes NNSA taking over the site

landlord duties including absorbing SRNL as well as maybe absorbing H-Canyon as part of that. He further added that another option would be to use a separate contractor to do other work instead of the M&O. And the third option he mentioned he could not release at this time. Ms. Gillas continued on again to note that if the NNSA is taking over H-Canyon operations the SRS CAB would be extremely interested in that because that is a major site function. Mr. Budney added that he could not speak to whether or not the NNSA wants to do that, but long-term planning for that facility is currently taking place. He also noted SCDHEC is involved.

Ms. Williams asked if there had been any notices of violation. Mr. Budney replied no.

Shelly Wilson, South Carolina Department of Health & Environmental Control (SCDHEC)
Ms. Wilson provided an update regarding general projects under the SCDHEC purview and DOE-SR collaboration.

Q&A Session

No questions were asked.

Sean Hayes, Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GADNR)
Mr. Hayes summarized GADNR current projects as well as coordination of activities with DOE-SR.

Q&A Session

Ms. Hopson asked clarification questions which Mr. Hayes answered.

Kyle Bryant, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Bryant summarized EPA and DOE-SR current projects as well as coordination of activities. He further noted that Jon Richards will be attending the SRS CAB full board meeting in September.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if any regulations related to DOE-SR have been done away with as other EPA regulations have been recently, or if any regulations which were removed affect anything related to SRS. Mr. Bryant responded that he will take that question back to Jon Richards and provide an answer at a later date.

Mr. Kaminski asked if the SWPF cancelled update presentation would be rescheduled for September. Mr. Tanner answered that the schedule will be adjusted, and the CAB will be kept updated on when that presentation will be given.

Mr. Vovakes asked if the regulatory changes announced the previous week with regards to coal ash waiving requirements for monitoring groundwater, easing pollution standards and groundwater monitoring standards for several substances affect what's going on at SRS. Mr. Bryant again replied that he will take that question back to Jon Richards and provide an answer at a later date. Ms. Wilson added that even if EPA changed something, the state would have to accept those changes as well. She asked if Mr. Vovakes could provide specific changes to her so she can answer whether or not there is an impact in SC.

Committee Updates

Administrative & Outreach Committee Update: Eleanor Hopson, Chair
Ms. Hopson summarized the current activities of the AO committee.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation: Joyce Underwood, Chair
Ms. Underwood noted there had been discussion to collapse the FDSR committee during the Executive Committee meeting, but upon further discussion they realized this was a discussion for the full board. She also noted the goal isn't to remove the committee but in two years there have not been any recommendations made to DOE. She continued by noting that this could be fixed by updating the work plan for FDSR. She further noted that the hour devoted to the cancelled SWPF presentation the following day of the full board meeting would now be devoted to discussing this topic. Mr. Allensworth reiterated what Ms. Underwood said, and added that if FDSR were to be eliminated, the scope would possibly be absorbed by another committee.

Mr. Murray asked if this would be a topic for AO committee. Ms. Hopson responded that there would not be enough time to add that to the discussion. Mr. Allensworth added that as it was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting earlier that morning, the consensus was to avoid having this discussion in another committee vs. the full board.

Nuclear Materials: Larry Powell, Chair
Mr. Powell summarized the current recommendation statuses for NM.

Strategic & Legacy Management: Dan Kaminski, Chair

Mr. Kaminski summarized the current recommendation statuses for SLM and included an update on the pending BPS committee recommendation.

Waste Management: Dawn Gillas, Chair

Ms. Gillas summarized the current recommendation statuses for WM and the previous WM committee meeting.

Draft Recommendation Discussion

Ship Low Activity Glass Logs to WIPP

Mr. Gillas summarized the history behind this recommendation and read it in its entirety while making minor corrections along the way.

Mr. French asked if national efforts should be mentioned, which Ms. Gillas accepted. Mr. French suggested getting with Ms. Wilson to add that information.

Ms. Corbett expressed her dislike for this recommendation and noted that this recommendation would add to the waste which would stay permanently at SRS until a permanent repository is created. She also spoke on behalf of the local New Mexico community stating they did not want this to happen. She went on again to note that this would require a change in permitting. Her solution which she suggested was to keep the low activity glass logs until a permanent repository is built.

Mr. Malik suggested sticking with local waste and re-classifying it.

Ms. Gillas corrected Ms. Corbett, noting that Carlsbad, NM locals do want WIPP to continue to take in waste, but locals in Santa Fe, NM do not. She further noted that she worked for WIPP when it opened in the 80's and is experienced with the local community's feelings regarding the facility. She also noted that with regards to reclassification WIPP is only open for TRU waste and anything sent to them gets it out of SC which is safer as well as permanent storage and makes more sense than temporary storage at SRS.

Ms. Underwood asked clarification questions, which Ms. Gillas answered.

Mr. Allensworth noted that he spoke with numerous members in the Carlsbad, NM community and CAB members across the EMSSAB all would like more shipments to be sent to WIPP. He went on to note they along with WIPP employees "want to step up for the nation."

Mr. Murray suggested encouraging government officials to provide transparency regarding the classification of HLW.

Ms. Gillas noted that sending materials to WIPP is much less expensive than sending the same materials to a permanent repository if one is created in the future.

Mr. Malik asked for an update on Yucca Mountain. Mr. Tanner answered that falls under the Office of Nuclear Energy and not EM.

Ms. Underwood asked additional clarifying questions which Ms. Gillas answered.

Mr. Hilton asked if there is a law defining WIPP shipments and if it states there is no science behind the classification of waste. Mr. Folk replied with a definition of HLW and noted that it's processed SNF which has been through reactors, and misclassification is not what's occurring since this is a very specific definition.

Ms. Corbett asked what laws and permits would need to be changed for this recommendation to come to fruition, and for those to be added to the recommendation. Ms. Gillas responded that this information is already included in the recommendation and anything else would be something for DOE to evaluate and include in their response. Mr. Kaminski added that many aspects of recommendations which are not available to the CAB to know but are internal to DOE are included in the DOE response which should not be on the burden of the CAB to provide as volunteers with limited access to internal details.

Ms. Corbett suggested asking DOE-SR for a presentation on the logistics and internal details such as permitting and law changes with regards to sending logs to WIPP. Ms. Gillas added that is the entire point of the recommendation. Mr. Tanner also added that DOE is responsible for figuring out how to accomplish the recommendations put forward by the SRS CAB.

Ms. Williams noted she feels this is a win-win for WIPP and DOE-SR.

Ms. Gillas also added she would be changing all the mention of logs to canisters.

TRU Shipments to WIPP

Ms. Gillas summarized this recommendation and its history. She then read it in its entirety and provided more background information.

Mr. Eisele asked what the issue is with regards to getting more TRU shipments to WIPP. Ms. Gillas answered that there are multiple sites waiting on their own shipments, and DOE-SR is in that line with the rest. She noted she did not have an exact number of shipments. Mr. Folk added the plan was for 10 shipments for the year, and one will be sent shortly. He also added there's about 115 in total remaining to ship as part of the Legacy Management program. Mr. Eisele then asked if TRU packs are a problem. Mr. Folk replied that it isn't a material problem, it's that other sites are also waiting for shipments and are subject to regulatory requirements. Since SRS has shipped most of the TRU waste available to WIPP, it has received a lower priority level.

Ms. Gillas asked if WIPP is fully operational and back to the capacity they were before the shutdown. Mr. Folk responded that they're open but not functioning at the capacity they were pre-shutdown and he was not sure if they would ever be back to that point in the future.

Mr. Malik asked if requirements had changed since WIPP re-opened. Mr. Folk answered there have been changes to their Documented Safety Analysis which means all materials need to be re-certified. Mr. Malik asked if these changes have impacted the cost to ship to WIPP. Mr. Folk replied not really from a cost perspective, and the program used for this purpose is used for other purposes on site.

Restart the SRS/INL SNF Exchange

Ms. Gillas summarized this recommendation and its history. She then read it in its entirety and provided more background information. She made minor edits as she read the recommendation.

Mr. Eisele asked if the curies and weight of exchanged materials from either side should be mentioned. Ms. Gillas noted that was not necessary and the physical properties of the fuels was the determining factors.

Ms. Corbett asked if the material received by SRS in the exchange would be processed and stored on site at SRS in the tanks. Ms. Gillas responded that is correct and the original plan states the entirety of the exchange would add about 300 canisters while there are 4,100 to go.

Mr. Guille asked why the program was not implemented and if that reason still exists. Ms. Gillas answered that politics is the reason why and that has not changed since.

Public Comment

Tom Clements from SRS Watch summarized the status on the MOX program. He also provided his opinion on the TRU Shipments to WIPP recommendation and his research on that topic.

Joe Ortaldo, a SRS retiree and former CAB member, made the suggestion to implement the current draft recommendations which were just discussed. He also suggested including SRS performance in recommendations with regards to budgeting, since the site is such a high performer compared to other sites across the complex historically.

END OF DAY 1, July 23rd, 2018

CAB
Gil Allensworth
Carlos Cato
Brian Chemsak
Betty Cook
Susan Corbett
David Eisele
Thomas French
Dawn Gillas
Jim Guille
Charles Hilton
Eleanor Hopson
Douglas Howard
Ashley Jacobs
Dan Kaminski
Narinder Malik
Gregg Murray
Larry Powell
Bob Smith
David Vovakes
Mary Weber
Bobbie Williams

DOE/Contractors
Jim Folk, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Zack Todd, DOE-SR
David Bender, DOE-SR
Emilie Sidelinger, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
Jennifer Nelson, DOE-SR
Jeff Bentley, DOE-SR
Pat Suggs, DOE-SR
Tony Polk, DOE-SR
Nicolai DeFeo, DOE-SR
de'Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR
Amy Boyette, DOE-SR
Karen Adams, DOE-SR
Randy Clendenning, DOE-SR
Scott Nicholson, DOE-SR
Mike Budney, DOE-SR
Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristin Huber, SRNS
Mtesa Wright, SRNS
Ted Millings, SRNS
Mark Schnitz, SRR
Dr. Gene Rhodes, SREL

Agency Liaisons
Sean Hayes, GADNR
Kyle Bryant, EPA
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Grace Anne Martin, SCDHEC
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC
Gregg O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC
Krista McCann, SCDHEC

Stakeholders
Tom Clements
Ginny Jones
Louis Walters
Larry Brede, Jacobs
Mark Ellison, Jacobs
Michael Graham, Bechtel
Gary Benda, Avantech
Tricia McCracken

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

Mr. Tanner reviewed the meeting rules and the agenda for the day.

Presentation: D Area Ash Project – Karen Adams, DOE-SR

Ms. Adams provided an annual update on D Area remediation activities.

Q&A Session

Mr. Howard asked what the lifespan of the material used is. Ms. Adams answered she did not have that information but will provide it to the CAB. Mr. Howard then asked what the future plans are for the borrow pit. Ms. Adams replied that when the project is finished, the borrow pit will be returned to nature after it is modified to prevent erosion. She further noted that any left-over material will be used for other future projects in that area.

Mr. Powell asked if anything was removed from the ash basin. Ms. Adams responded that the north inlet basin was left open for water management and is still open with the cap close to being completed. She went on to say there is ash still in there and coal fines & ash is being taken to Three Rivers Landfill. Mr. Powell asked if the contaminants are water soluble. Ms. Adams confirmed they are not. Mr. Powell asked if other similar areas around the nation are doing the same remediation in similar situations. Ms. Adams answered she was in contact with Duke in NC which had a significantly larger area(s) needing remediation.

Mr. Vovakes asked clarification questions on a specific photo which Ms. Adams replied to. Mr. Vovakes then asked if the contamination risks could be quantified. Ms. Adams responded that it is a risk of contaminants in the groundwater from coal ash as well as other areas.

Ms. Corbett asked if there are also mercury and lead in substantial amounts in coal ash. Ms. Adams answered they do not see those contaminants in their soil or groundwater associated with these facilities. Ms. Corbett then asked why that is because in other locations coal ash is well known for containing a lot of lead, mercury and arsenic. Ms. Adams replied she would get back to her but did not know the answer. Ms. Corbett continued on by asking what the plan is to re-cap the surfaces when the liners need to be replaced. Mr. Johnson, Associate Deputy Manager noted the industry standard for the life expectancy of the liner is 700-1,000 years. Ms. Corbett then asked what the name is for the liner and the company who sells it – also if there is a patent on this liner. Ms. Adams committed to getting those answers after the meeting. Ms. Corbett continued on yet again to ask if

this liner prevents no further migration of the coal ash and its contaminants to migrate into the groundwater. Ms. Adams responded yes, that is correct.

Ms. Underwood asked clarification questions about a photo provided during the presentation, which Ms. Adams answered.

Mr. Malik asked what the ph of the coal ash is. Ms. Adams noted she did not know the answer, but the Ph of the remediated water and soil is from the coal. Mr. Malik asked what the compaction was before the liner was placed on the ash. Ms. Adams replied they had to compact the coal ash as well as test it and the moisture content, but she did not know specifics. Mr. Malik then asked what is the soil thickness on top of the liner. Ms. Adams responded there is a 20-inch soil cover on top of the geosynthetics. Mr. Malik asked if mowing on the landfills have been scheduled. Ms. Adams answered that those responsibilities are with the post-closure care team members with SRNS. Mr. Malik continued on again to ask what was the groundwater quality under the ash basin. Ms. Adams replied it was a low ph due to VOCs and tritium from a gradient source and not the basins themselves.

Mr. Allensworth asked for an explanation of the next ash remediation project starting in 2019. Ms. Adams responded that it's smaller and ash related in P Area, with a title of Dubarton Bay. She continued to note the ash was slated to be put in the P Area Ash Basin which was closed during recovery. She further noted while this occurred an overflow area was discovered. She also noted there is 15 acres which is vegetated, and some of that ash will be taken to Three Rivers Landfill.

Mr. Cato asked if the micro-drain system is a visual inspection system and what type of ongoing maintenance does it require. Mr. answered that when the micro drain and liner are installed the seams are welded by melting them together and a destructive test was conducted along with another test where air was blown along the seams to ensure none would be able to escape. She added that samples of these welds were tested both on and off site.

Presentation: Pollination Activities – Dr. Gene Rhodes, SREL

Dr. Rhodes provided a very detailed presentation regarding pollination activities on site.

Q&A Session

Ms. Weber asked if the CAB had already made a recommendation on planting pollinator-friendly plants on top of caps. Mr. Tanner replied that DOE did not want to plant on top of the caps for fear of roots penetrating through it. Dr. Rhodes added that there are plants with shallow roots to avoid this, and SREL has conducted research into options for this type of project.

Mr. Guille asked for an explanation on colony collapse. Dr. Rhodes responded that he does not specialize in entomology and could not provide more information regarding colony collapse other than that it exists, but he is happy to find out and send information after the meeting.

Mr. Powell noted he is a bee keeper and encouraged everyone else to consider becoming one. He continued by noting that the use of pesticides is very prevalent in his area and it greatly affects the pollinator population since it kills a great deal more than just pests. He then asked if anyone on site is responsible for regulating the use of insecticides. Dr. Rhodes notes there are people who track the use of pesticides for permitting purposes since SRS is only permitted to use a certain amount of certain types on site. He continued by noting there is a committee which oversees the wetlands on site and how they are treated as well as pesticides or herbicides used there.

Ms. Corbett asked if there had been an assessment of how many pollinators live on site. Dr. Rhodes noted this is difficult to track but there is no comprehensive list of findings, and the research had not yet been published. Ms. Corbett asked if SREL had planned to study radionuclides which can be found in pollen. Dr. Rhodes answered that he had not planned on it but would look into it.

Ms. Underwood asked some clarification questions which Dr. Rhodes replied to.

Ms. Hopson asked if there is any way the water gardens lands could be increased through additional grant funding since it's part of a learning program for youth or will potentially be in the future. Dr. Rhodes responded there are also outreach programs through SREL and the US Forest Service for youth, and additional funds other than grant funds are used by SREL and USFS. Ms. Hopson asked if other local industries have contributed as well.

Mr. Howard asked where the worst spot during the pollinator's migratory route is. Dr. Rhodes admitted he did not but could make an educated guess, which for central US migrators that area is very agriculturally focused so there is no fringe habitat left for pollinators. Other areas he noted would be those which have been heavily treated with pesticide. Mr. Howard then asked if there is a global policy to aid pollinators in thriving or if solely the USA has a nation-wide policy. Dr. Rhodes answered he did not know for sure but could again make an educated guess, which is that the more developed countries probably do have similar policies in place while the under-developed countries probably do not.

Mr. Powell added that Whole Foods had recently removed products in their stores temporarily which were dependent on pollinators to emphasize this issue.

Presentation: 235-F Deactivation – Randy Clendenning, DOE-SR

Mr. Clendenning provided a detailed annual update of the 235-F Deactivation project.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked how many TRU shipments will this generate. Mr. Clendenning did not know the answer since it depends on the loading which can be put in the drums, and currently he is seeking approval to go higher which would take a lot less drums.

Ms. Underwood asked clarification questions which Mr. Clendenning answered.

Ms. Corbett asked if the material is spread out vs all in one place. Mr. Clendenning replied most material is in cell one and two as well as their wing cabinets. Ms. Corbett then asked if the material is flammable. Mr. Clendenning responded no, that the material does emit decay heat, so it could start a fire if there were flammable material around it. Ms. Corbett continued by asking how much is in the budget for 2019 to continue working on this project. Mr. Clendenning answered the budget for 2019 is around \$500,000. Ms. Maxted added it's about \$4 million.

Mr. Eisele asked regarding fixative and controversy when it was first introduced, has there been feedback or buy in from both DOE and the DNFSB and regulators on that solution. Mr. Clendenning replied they had not approached the regulators about the fixative because he doesn't believe there's anything that would drive them to do that and the board hasn't raised any issues but if they did, it would be premature since they haven't completed any testing and they're unsure if it's ok to use. He continued by noting nobody had brought forward any issues that he was aware of thus far. Mr. Eisele then asked if they'd be leaving some in the building. Mr. Clendenning responded maybe. Mr. Eisele continued by asking if they'll be asked to clean it all up. Mr. Clendenning answered that they would clean as much of it up as practical, according to the law of diminishing returns.

Mr. Powell asked how long it will take to get the building to a point where everyone is happy with it being as clean as it's gonna get. Mr. Clendenning replied they will finish up with everything they've planned to do as far as physical work is concerned by the middle of 2020. Mr. Powell then asked when that point is reached will they shut the power off, close the doors and what will happen after that to maintain the building. Mr. Clendenning responded that one of the things they're just beginning to talk about is the concept of at some point is it worth taking the building cold and dark and cutting the power to it, including how much dark and how much cold considering there's a lot of sheet rock and carpet in there and if the HVAC is cut there could be problems down the road which would have nothing to do with the plutonium. He further noted they're just starting to think about that and at this point he did not know where they'd end up on that. He also noted he did not know at the top of his head what the date is for the D&D folks, but he believes F Area will be done at the same time when it comes time to close it and when they're done with that building and moving on to closing F Area the 600-lb gorilla in the room will be the canyon. Mr. Mikolanis, Co-DDFO, added that the short answer is that the campaign Mr. Clendenning is briefing the CAB on is not the entire inventory of the entire building and there are other places in the facility where materials are located including the HVAC system where there are some deposits among a couple of other places in the facility. He also added that DOE initiated this cleanup activity in response to a recommendation from the DNFSB; in 2012 they wrote to the Secretary of Energy saying this building was one of the more significant hazards on site to the workers and the public and SRS needed to pay attention to it. He further added that this project's goal is to de-inventory this part of the building, and they haven't even begun conversations with regulators regarding a final closure strategy which will be part of the larger F Area closure plan.

Ms. Weber asked how and where materials removed during this project are being stored. Mr. Clendenning answered that when those materials leave the 235-F building they'll be packaged for shipment and then will be sent to the solid waste area where they'll basically be stored awaiting shipment to WIPP. Ms. Weber then asked if there are materials which have been removed already. Mr. Clendenning replied that was trash and not combustibles, and when he said they removed combustibles that was out of the rest of the building not where the plutonium is like offices, machine shops, other facilities, cafeteria full of particle board cabinets. Ms. Weber continued by asking again if there was nothing that was packaged for shipment out of what was already removed. Mr. Clendenning responded no, it was disposed of as waste.

Mr. Howard asked what type of manpower has been assigned to this project. Mr. Clendenning answered 20 people, 5ish a handful on the crew.

Ms. Williams asked why the fire alarm and detection system were installed, specifically if there were none in there previously. Mr. Clendenning replied that the system in place previously was not up to current standards and not working properly, so instead of repairing it they replaced it.

Ms. Gillas asked if there are any plans to deal with the material in FA Line. Ms. Maxted responded that a lot of that material has been removed from the site and F Canyon hasn't changed since Ms. Gillas has been there. Ms. Gillas then noted there was a

lot of loose oxide in there and asked is that facility being maintained to keep that out of the environment. Ms. Maxted noted there is surveillance and maintenance in place in F Canyon as well as 235-F and all of their facilities in order to maintain safety.

Presentation: Price Anderson Act & NQA 1 Standards – Scott Nicholson, DOE-SR
Mr. Nicholson provided a presentation on the Price Anderson Act & NQA 1 Standards.

Q&A Session

Ms. Corbett asked if the Price Anderson Act covers transportation issues related to the transportation of nuclear waste. Mr. Nicholson answered yes and that depends on the event and whether or not it's a nuclear safety issue or if there's an injury, and it does get into department of transportation rules depending on how it's being transported – they would evaluate the events. Ms. Corbett then asked if there's a liability per accident. Mr. Nicholson replied if it falls into PAA space it depends on severity level one through three, whether it was nuclear safety, worker safety and health. Ms. Corbett continued on by asking if that means transportation accidents are not covered by the PAA. Mr. Nicholson responded yes and no depending on how it's contracted out to the individual moving the materials, who was in control of the material, what rules and regulations are they under. Ms. Corbett continued on yet again by asking what the limits to liability are, specifically are there set monetary limits. Mr. Nicholson answered yes, and it's based on a contracted amount, but he did not have that figure in front of him and would get it after the meeting.

Mr. Kaminski asked how the current suppliers are doing and if score cards are kept regarding their performance and if so, how poorly they've been rated in recent years. Mr. Nicholson replied yes, there is a qualified suppliers list that contractors keep and validate every so often kicking some off the list occasionally, which is a rigorous process. Mr. Kaminski asked if Mr. Nicholson was aware of any fines or penalties in recent years. Mr. Nicholson responded yes there have been, but he did not know the dollar amounts. He further noted that there has been a retaliation case which is public knowledge and was upheld and a consent order was issued on that. He also noted the site went into an operational pause a couple years ago for nuclear safety issues and there was a fine associated with that. He continued on by noting they had an enforcement letter on an individual that hurt their shoulder once they got through with the investigation they decided to pull that back, so in summation, two or three that he could think of off the top of his head within the last five years.

Mr. Vovakes asked if PAA covers more than just subcontractors and contractors. Mr. Nicholson answered that other employees would not fall under PAAA, but there are other programs that would protect a federal employee for instance if there was an event or injury that happened.

Mr. French asked some clarification questions regarding fees and amounts of fees. Mr. Nicholson replied to them.

Mr. Guille asked how many NTS reports per year on average are there. Mr. Nicholson responded that he did not have that number but would provide it after the meeting. Mr. Guille also asked how long does it take to close an NTS report. Mr. Nicholson answered typically it depends on the corrective actions, but they could be open as long as a year or a year and a half. Mr. Guille then asked regarding NQA certification if DOE acts as the certifying agency. Mr. Nicholson replied the chief engineer acts as the certifying official and has gone through the NQA 1 school class and the contractors have their own, both certifications are done independently and are transportable wherever it's federal or contractor certification.

Mr. Murray asked how many of these events does the average contractor have in a year. Mr. Nicholson responded that willful malicious events he estimates at zero, and events that actually trip the investigation he will need to check the database for and respond after the meeting, but he would estimate one or two per year depending on the size of the contractor.

Mr. Howard asked with regards to document control, if that relates to classified documents. Mr. Nicholson answered it could be classified or something like procedures for maintenance activity, this is to ensure contractors are working with the right documents. Mr. Howard then asked for an example of a violation in this area. Mr. Nicholson replied he could not recall any document control issues, but he would be happy to go back and look.

Mr. Malik asked how many PAA fines have been levied on WSRC, SRNS and SRR. Mr. Nicholson responded that for the M&O and LW contractors he knows of three over the last three to four years. Mr. Malik then asked are they closed and if they did their root cause analysis, to which Mr. Nicholson answered yes and they should be closed by now but there may be issues that are ongoing. Mr. Malik continued by asking if the site is dealing with NQA 1 2009. Mr. Nicholson replied currently they've implemented 2008/2009 which is the current version, and they just had an amendment to 10CFR851 the worker safety health rule which potentially may bump them up to later revisions which is currently being evaluated. Mr. Malik also asked is there a time limit for when an NCR needs to be closed. Mr. Nicholson responded that they track that time, and they do not like to see them stay open more than 180 days, and currently the average is about 20.

Ms. Corbett asked if the contractors are held fiscally responsible. Mr. Nicholson answered no, that falls back onto DOE who would then fine the contractor a smaller amount. Ms. Corbett then asked if worker exposure is covered under PAA, to which

Mr. Nicholson replied yes. Ms. Corbett also asked in the event of an incident requiring major cleanup, would that also be covered under PAA. Mr. Nicholson responded that it should be, depending on the cause of the accident. Ms. Corbett continued on yet again by asking who determines compensation amounts. Mr. Nicholson answered that the office of enforcement makes that decision.

Presentation: Interim Salt Processing (TCCR & ARP/MCU) – Pat Suggs, DOE-SR

Ms. Suggs presented an update on the TCCR, ARP & MCU projects on site.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik asked how SRS will manage the cesium contaminated cartridges from the TCCR process control skid. Ms. Suggs answered that they will have up to 10 years and two ways to disposing of that ion exchange media; they could grind it up and put it into DWPF glass and they're looking at alternative paths for disposition off-site perhaps to a disposal facility. Mr. Malik then asked if it's transferred off-site, will it be placed in a radioactive contaminated landfill. Ms. Suggs replied she doesn't know where they would go with it, but it would be shielded and would go to an authorized disposal facility.

Mr. Howard asked regarding MCU ventilation modifications implemented to increase system availability and reduce worker radiological exposure mentioned in the presentation, what is the difference in exposure now vs before those modifications. Ms. Suggs responded that she did not have that figure.

Ms. Gillas asked how the ion exchange columns would be ground up. Ms. Suggs answered that has been done in one of their tanks before several decades ago and transfer it into a sludge pack.

Mr. Hilton asked since 4,166 canisters have been processed out of 8,000+ left to go and 16% of the tanks have been closed, is the count of canisters accurate. Ms. Suggs replied that when closing tanks, some of the material that needs to be removed is the solid/sludge/etc. so there is not a direct linkage to the canisters processed and the number of tanks closed.

Mr. Vovakes asked if all programs presented are funded by PBS 14C. Ms. Suggs responded yes.

Mr. Folk, Co-DDFO, asked Ms. Suggs to talk about the TD money involved with the TCCR process. Ms. Suggs noted that early on since this was considered a prototype they received money to build it through technology development.

Mr. Kaminski asked regarding premature failure of valves reported the following year, if they lasted as long as projected and if a post mortem investigation is being done. Ms. Suggs answered that vibrating contactors can be rebuilt and repaired.

Public Comment

Tricia McCracken voiced appreciation for the ample information provided at CAB meetings, then expressed numerous opinions not related to SRS or any EM purview.

Voting

Recommendation #351: Savannah River National Lab Funding

Mr. Allensworth asked for a motion to open this recommendation for voting for closure, which was granted and seconded. The motion was closed with a majority vote: 21 yay.

Recommendation #352: Glass Waste Storage

Mr. Allensworth asked for a motion to open this recommendation for voting for closure, which was granted and seconded. The motion was closed with a majority vote: 21 yay.

Recommendation #353: Defense Waste Processing Facility Additional Failed Equipment Storage

Mr. Allensworth asked for a motion to open this recommendation for voting for closure, which was granted and seconded. The motion was closed with a majority vote: 21 yay.

Draft Recommendation: Ship Low Activity Glass Logs to WIPP

Mr. Allensworth asked for a motion to open this recommendation for voting, which was granted and seconded. The motion was passed with a majority vote: 19 yay, 2 nay.

Draft Recommendation: TRU Shipments to WIPP

Mr. Allensworth asked for a motion to open this recommendation for voting, which was granted and seconded. The motion was passed with a majority vote: 20 yay, 1 nay.

Draft Recommendation: Restart the SRS/INL SNF Exchange

Mr. Allensworth asked for a motion to open this recommendation for voting, which was granted and seconded. The motion was passed with a majority vote: 20 yay, 1 nay.

Discussion

Ms. Underwood began the discussion by reiterating the CAB mission statement. She further added that the committee work plans should reflect this, and although some presentations are interesting can they generate a meaningful recommendation. She additionally made note of the fact that since she was on the FDSR committee, it has not made any recommendations. She researched activity in the past for FDSR and found that it waxes and wanes but with 354 recommendations in 22 years which is about 15-16 per year on average with some years producing less than 10 and other years producing more than 20. She also added she feels it's prudent to consider the fact that the four committees the CAB has now have been in place since 2004 and before those there were five other committees which came and went, but maybe those would be a better direction. She then asked if the committees as they are now address the work scope of the DOE organizations they're meant to serve, and if not, how might the CAB realign its committees and work in the coming year.

The board discussed the productivity of the FDSR committee and concluded that it still serves a useful function.

~Meeting adjourned

All presentations are available for review on the SRS CAB's website: cab.srs.gov