

Meeting Minutes
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) – Full Board Meeting
Partridge Inn – Augusta, GA
November 26th & 27th, 2018

Attendance – Monday, November 26th, 2018

<p><u>CAB</u> Gil Allensworth Carlos Cato Brian Chemsak Betty Cook David Eisele Thomas French Dawn Gillas Charles Hilton Eleanor Hopson Douglas Howard Dan Kaminski Narinder Malik Gregg Murray Larry Powell Robert Smith Joyce Underwood David Vovakes Mary Weber Bobbie Williams</p>	<p><u>DOE/Contractors</u> Zach Todd, DOE-SR Jim Folk, DOE-SR Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR de’Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR Amy Boyette, DOE-SR Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR Michael Budney, DOE-SR Avery Hammett, DOE-SR Maatsi Ndingwan, DOE-SR Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR Angelia Holmes, DOE-SR Jennifer Nelson, DOE-SR James Tanner, S&K Chelsea Gitzen, S&K Federica Staton, S&K Gene Rhodes, SREL Kristin Huber, SRNS Karen Vangelas, SRNS Ted Millings, SRNS Kerri Crawford, SRNS Amy Meyer, SRNS Ken Cheeks, SRNS Teresa Eddy, SRNS Joel Cantrell, SRR Rich Edwards, SRR Larry Ling, SRR</p>	<p><u>Agency Liaisons</u> Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC Grace Anne Martin, SCDHEC Gregg O’Quinn, SCDHEC</p> <p><u>Stakeholders</u> Ed Wannemacher, BWXT Jim Marra, CNTA Malcom Phillips Janie Scott, GA WAND</p>
--	---	---

CAB Chair Update: Gil Allensworth, CAB Chair

Mr. Allensworth announced upcoming chair nominations for committees in January at the full board meeting. He also asked for members and committee chairs to encourage committee meeting attendance. He then reminded everyone in attendance about purpose and purview of the SRS CAB.

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

Mr. Tanner reviewed the meeting rules and agenda.

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. Howard asked regarding the SRS deer hunt, if the number of deer killed was tracked. Mr. Budney answered yes, but he did not have that number with him. He further added that he would get it to the CAB following the meeting. Mr. Howard then asked if wild hog numbers are also tracked during hunts, to which Mr. Budney replied yes, and noted that hunters are permitted to take their kills home with them, with the exception of hogs due to liability reasons related to the potential for hog-related illnesses.

Mr. Eisele asked how many shipments are yet to come from the Canadians and if shipments are planned for the winter of this year. Mr. Budney responded **that shipments are ongoing and they’re halfway through the operation. Mr. Eisele asked how**

many are yet to go. Ms. Maxted answered that there are currently two Canadian campaigns – **liquids and TRM, then there's the NRU and NRX**. She then asked if Mr. Eisele was interested in NRU/NRX numbers, to which Mr. Eisele replied yes. Ms. Maxted continued by explaining that there are about 50 shipments remaining in that campaign.

Mr. Hilton asked regarding the 25 canisters in the plutonium downblend program if DOE-SR could convert that to pounds. Ms. Maxted responded that the 3013 containers are being used which can have up to 4.4 kg of plutonium inside. She further noted that most of the DOE-SR 3013 containers are not at that level.

Mr. Malik asked if DOE-SR is way behind since DWPF has only poured three canisters, or on schedule, and how many are anticipated to be poured in FY 19. Mr. Folk answered that the forecast for the year is about 44 canisters for this fiscal year. He then acknowledged that DOE-SR is a **little behind primarily because they're linking DWPF canister pouring with MCU production, so as MCU comes back online and starts generating more feed over to DWPF they'll be cranking up DWPF to match that production rate.**

Ms. Gillas asked what the status is regarding pre-work for processing HFIR cores. Mr. Budney replied that a report is being created which will go up to EM1 and explain the options available for the material going forward, but that decision on how it is operated long term is above EM, above NNSA, and will be a DOE-wide decision because it involves science and answering questions like do we process all of the material in the basin, NE, Title 50 US code requires that **canyon be kept open, so there's a lot of things at play in there about would we process it all or to store it some other way. They don't know the answer yet. He** continued by adding that they lay out all of the options for leadership who then makes those decisions. Ms. Gillas then asked how NE is involved with disposition of the fuel in the basin. Mr. Budney responded that some of it comes from them originally, **so it's a question of what do these other organizations have in the future that they might want to send to DOE-SR and how DOE-SR would dispose of it.** Ms. Gillas noted that she did not remember any of the fuel being owned by NE. Ms. Maxted corrected her, stating that all of the domestic research reactors are under the NE program. Ms. Gillas then stated that she was unaware that NE had to have input into the disposition of materials in the SRS basin. Mr. Budney also corrected her, stating **that it's not the disposition once it belongs to DOE-SR, but if H Canyon and L Basin are shut down, what would they do with HFIR cores. He added that's why they all play into it and NE may have some other equities like that which would play into the decision of what DOE-SR does long term.**

Mr. Allensworth asked how funding is for SDU 8 & 9. Mr. Budney answered that there was about \$7.5 million funded for those **projects in FY 19's budget, which was a reduction, but they do plan to put it back in and keep the projects on track for FY 20.** Mr. Allensworth then asked with regards to SWPF testing, is there a target date for when the facility will be fully functioning. Mr. Budney replied that it would be up and running late in CY 19 but a specific date could not be provided since a baseline change proposal is still being negotiated.

Ms. Boyette stated in response to an earlier question from Mr. Howard, that 199 deer, 36 hogs and 11 coyotes were hunted during the annual hunting event & season on site. She then continued by adding that over 2,000 hogs have been removed by the Forest Service and their contracts this last fiscal year.

Ms. Hammett noted that the largest fish caught in the fishing tournament as Mr. Budney had asked for during his update, was just over nine pounds.

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

Mr. Powell asked regarding the definition of HLW being considered for a change, where and how would that impact the ability to dispose of waste. Ms. Wilson responded that it may impact those details which is a specific question SCDHEC has brought to DOE, but to her understanding this will mean more options will be available for waste disposal.

Committee Updates

Administrative & Outreach Committee Update: Eleanor Hopson, Chair

Ms. Hopson echoed the announcement made by Mr. Allensworth regarding committee chairs and vice chairs at the January full board meeting. She also announced that there are outreach opportunities for members to volunteer for at public SRS tours for 2019. The last announcement she made was when and where the next AO meeting would be held.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation: Joyce Underwood, Chair

Ms. Underwood provided an update on the draft recommendation Pollinator Management Program.

Nuclear Materials: Larry Powell, Chair

Mr. Powell summarized the current recommendation statuses for NM, and announced when the next NM meeting will be held.

Strategic & Legacy Management: Dan Kaminski, Chair

Mr. Kaminski summarized the current recommendation statuses, activities and the update provided at the last SLM meeting, as well as announced when the next SLM meeting will be held.

Waste Management: Dawn Gillas, Chair

Ms. Gillas **noted she wasn't able to attend the previous WM meeting and neither were multiple CAB members since a quorum** was not met and the meeting had to be canceled for October although Mr. Malik, the vice chair, was present. She took the opportunity to ask that **members of the WM attend the next meeting, which she noted she won't be able to attend. She also added** that there will be three recommendations discussed at the next WM meeting.

Presentation

Presentation: DWPF & Glass Waste Storage Status – Joel Cantrell, SRR

Mr. Cantrell provided a presentation on the topic of the DWPF facility update as well as Glass Waste Storage Building & program status.

Q&A Session

Mr. Eisele asked regarding slide 4, if the green line which is listed as proposed could be further explained. Mr. Cantrell answered that sludge slurry includes not one drop of water into the glass, so the recycle has to be sent back to the tank farm. He further noted several million gallons are sent back every year of water back to the tank farm which is fed to the 2H Evaporator for space management. He also added that 3H Evaporator is used for sludge batch preparation.

Mr. Hilton asked where Melter 1 is located. Mr. Cantrell replied that it is currently being stored in the failed equipment storage vault which was built with two storage positions, since the melter is contaminated with HLW and there is no approved path for permanent disposition of HLW. Mr. Hilton then asked if there are plans in place to build a Melter 5 and Melter 6. Mr. Cantrell **responded that they're currently working through plans to build and buy another melter storage box.**

Ms. Underwood asked regarding the rail system, how long did it take to get it to operational status, so they could use it. Mr. Cantrell answered probably six weeks. **Ms. Underwood then asked if there's any benefit to maintaining the rail system in that area or would it be fine to have a six-week delay.** Mr. Cantrell replied that the time it takes to deinventory the melter, remove all of the components and to get the packages ready. **"So refurbishing the rail system isn't a critical path in that outage so it's typically ok to let it wait, which saves the expense of maintaining it all of the time."**

Mr. Malik asked why latex paint is sprayed on the failed melter. Mr. Cantrell responded that it's different than Melter 1 in that they decided to approach the job differently, the intent was to place the lid on the melter outside of the building. He further **added that in a contamination control world, they were taking a box which wasn't yet closed out of the building itself, then** putting the lid on, so they wanted to apply a fixative to secure all of the contamination on the top of the melter which was also draped with plastic then paint was sprayed down on top of that. Mr. Malik then asked if the amount of water received from the tank farm is one gallon, then four or five gallons are returned. Mr. Cantrell replied that he was not sure of those numbers, but he did know that the amount of water sent back is more than received originally since the system uses a steam-atomized **scrubber, and steam is used to decontaminate the melter off gas to ensure they're not releasing materials** into the environment. Mr. Malik continued on by asking if there are any plans to build an evaporator on top of DWPF. Mr. Cantrell responded that the current plan is to do close-coupled operations with the tank farms and continue to use 2H Evaporator for recycle management.

Ms. Gillas asked that without double stacking in GWSB 2 the current modified positions will take the current operations into 2029. Mr. Cantrell answered that is correct. Ms. Gillas then asked how far operations are into modifying positions to double **stack in GWSB 2 in the future. Mr. Cantrell replied that they're in the conceptual design phase since it's configured differently** requiring a different plug modification – tungsten or lead inserts vs hollow.

Mr. Vovakes asked why DWPF is the only classification plant in existence in the US. Mr. Cantrell responded that West Valley in Buffalo, NY, operated as a test facility and was proof of principle for reprocessing and performed vitrification of the waste that they generated, but because it was a test facility they only produced about 225 canisters and the facility has since been decommissioned. He went on to add that at the Hanford Site, they plan to vitrify their waste as well in the waste treatment plant which is still **under construction and won't be in service for some time. Mr. Vovakes then asked regarding slide 17,** specifically the shield plug replacement – if it is a concrete plug being replaced with a steel plug. Mr. Cantrell answered yes. Mr. Vovakes went on again to ask if that would be used with every position, to which Mr. Cantrell replied yes, they all have to be replaced with a cast-iron plug which is about 1/5 as expensive.

Mr. Cato asked what the current plan is for the lifespan of Melter 3. Mr. Cantrell **responded that it's the main melter which is planned to go into SWPF operations with, and they've planned what will happen in case it fails during SWPF startup. He further added that it's estimated Melter 3 and Melter 4 will carry the site through the completion of the LW mission.**

Ms. Underwood asked **if the modified positions are ahead of what's needed currently. Mr. Cantrell answered that they are and they want to be ahead of themselves so that they can empty positions in order to provide workers with enough space to work safely.** Ms. Underwood asked how many positions they are ahead **of themselves. Mr. Cantrell replied they're about 8 rows** ahead of themselves typically in a given vault to keep line of sight where the workers are working. Ms. Underwood then continued by asking what the yearly amount of radiation exposure dosage is. Mr. Cantrell responded that the federal limit is 5,000 mrem per year, DOE has an administrative limit of 2,000 mrem per year, and SRR has an administrative control of 5 mrem per year per person.

Mr. Smith asked regarding slide 12, the materials removed from the floor of the melt cell, how were those disposed of. Mr. Cantrell answered that as glass contaminated waste, there is not an approved path for permanent disposal, so they have **containerized those glass shards and they're stored with Melter 2 for a future permanent disposition.**

Ms. Gillas asked if the latex is being sprayed on any HLW glass, to which Mr. Cantrell replied no.

Ms. Williams asked how the melter got to 717 F. Mr. Cantrell responded that the new melter was delivered originally by truck, and the melters come in partially assembled with an outer shell and a dome. He added that they would separately install all of the refractory, separate heaters, electrodes, roof, so they procure large parts and then field final assembly at F Area. Ms. Williams continued by asking if any robots were used to remove the old melter, to which Mr. Cantrell answered yes.

Mr. Powell asked regarding removing canisters the method being used **wasn't working so an alternative had to be found, what** that was in reference to. Mr. Cantrell replied that it was just for the floor plugs.

Mr. Vovakes asked regarding Melter 4, on slide 15, if Melter 3 continues to function until 2030 would it just sit there waiting until it goes into service. Mr. Cantrell responded yes. Mr. Vovakes then asked if Melter 3 failed today, what would happen. Mr. Cantrell answered that Melter 4 would be accelerated for readiness.

Recommendation Discussion

Draft Recommendation: Solar Generated Power Use at SRS

Mr. Malik provided a detailed background as to why this recommendation was created. He then read the recommendations section.

Ms. Weber made some grammatical suggestions for the background section, which were accepted. She then suggested changing the word utilities to site utilities.

Public Comment

Jim Marra spoke about the proposed change by DOE to re-classify HLW.

Bill Lawless asked if Ms. Wilson was present, noting that she was, and then noted he had planned to use his time for public comment to complain about SCDHEC not mentioning the proposed change by DOE to re-classify HLW, however the previous public comment noted she had already covered that topic. He then asked Ms. Wilson to repeat her comments on the topic, which she did. He then asked if DHEC is in favor of changing the re-classification. Mr. Tanner noted that public comment periods are not meant to be used as a question and answer period. Mr. Lawless then expressed his opinions on the topic.

END OF DAY 1, November 26th, 2018

Attendance – Tuesday, November 27th. 2018

CAB
Gil Allensworth
Carlos Cato
Brian Chemsak
Betty Cook
David Eisele
Thomas French
Dawn Gillas
Eleanor Hopson
Douglas Howard
Dan Kaminski
Narinder Malik
Gregg Murray
Larry Powell
Robert Smith
Joyce Underwood
David Vovakes
Mary Weber
Bobbie Williams

DOE/Contractors
Jim Folk, DOE-SR
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
deLisa Carrico, DOE-SR
Amy Boyette, DOE-SR
Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Zach Todd, DOE-SR
Jennifer Nelson, DOE-SR
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristin Huber, SRNS
Amy Meyer, SRNS
Doug Fleiss, SRNS
Elay Saldivar, SRNS
Larry Ling, SRR
Natalie Herrington, SREL

Agency Liaisons
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Grace Anne Martin,
SCDHEC
Gregg O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Katherine Kane, SCDHEC
Thomas Rolka, SCDHEC

Stakeholders
Colin Demarest, Aiken
Standard
Ed Wannemacher, BWXT
Jim Marra, CNTA
Kristin Fields, Techlaw Inc.
Chuck Messick
Robte Ingham
Janie Scott, GAWAND
Suzanne Rhodes, LWVSC
Jimmy Winkler

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

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

Presentations

Presentation: Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER) – Maatsi Ndingwan, DOE-SR
& Karen Vangelas, SRNS

Ms. Ndingwan introduced the ASER presentation, which Ms. Vangelas then provided.

Q&A Session

Mr. Howard asked regarding the five NOVs from 2017, why two were not self-disclosed. Ms. Meyer answered that one of the two were identified during a SCDHEC inspection for air monitoring, the other was found on a report submitted to SCDHEC; they found a deficiency. Mr. Howard then asked if any random members of the public are checked for radiation exposure on a regular basis. Mr. Jannik, SRNL, replied that there are radiation dosage limits, but members of the public are not tested at random.

Mr. Powell asked regarding slide 20, what were the volatile organic compounds which were mentioned as removed and how did they get there. Ms. Vangelas responded that it was primarily trichloroethylene, some tetrachloroethylene, and a few others she did not know. She went on to say, **“if Mr. Powell would read chapter 7 of the ASER of the report.”** Which implied that would answer his questions. Mr. Powell continued by asking if those materials were solvents, to which Ms. Vangelas answered yes. Mr. Powell then asked if they were basically dumped out on the ground when the employees were finished using them, so they then made their way into the groundwater. Mr. Mikolanis replied that the solvents were used in M Area back when they were fabricating fuel and left the area in sumps which caused leaks into the foundation and eventually the groundwater which is most of where the releases were.

Mr. Smith suggested regarding slide 20, that the statistics related to the volatile organics be overlapped with that of the **radiation in harvested wildlife since they're directly related. Ms. Vangelas corrected him, stating that the two statistics were** totally different since VOCs do not have a radioactive component.

Mr. Vovakes asked regarding slide 9 which discusses page 5 of the ASER summary where five NOVs are documented for 2017, later referenced in the ASER as a significant increase, why this increase occurred. Ms. Ndingwan responded that she would not **compare the two since they're really apples and oranges, and the self-**disclosures which were made were done so in good faith to ensure the conditions of the permit were met. She further noted that there were no fines or penalties.

Mr. Eisele asked if the fish sampling includes Savannah River or solely bodies of water on site. Ms. Vangelas answered that sampling is done in Savannah River, but not in any on-site body of water.

Mr. Malik asked regarding the drinking water NOV, how much the fine was. Ms. Vangelas repeated the earlier comment, that no fine was given for any of the NOV's. Mr. Malik asked what the reason for the NOV. Ms. Ndingwan was replied that the number of samples taken did not meet their requirements; they collected 10, however, 15 were required which she attributed to a personnel resource issue. **Mr. Malik then continued by asking if they've improved the procedures, so this does not happen again in the future, to which Ms. Meyer responded yes.**

Mr. Allensworth asked what the maximum dosage would be for a member of the public who isn't nearby a DOE EM site. Ms. Ndingwan noted that just from being in this area the average person holds a 300 mrem dosage from natural sources like cosmic rays, radon which is naturally occurring, and the environment.

Mr. Kaminski asked how SRS compares to industrial sites regarding statistics depicting contamination etc. Ms. Wilson answered that SRS is unusually large which is different than typical industrial sites since that poses a unique set of challenges.

Ms. Cook asked regarding slide 8, is the fuel stored underground being used. Ms. Meyer replied yes.

Presentation: Environmental Management Systems – Maatsi Ndingwan, DOE-SR & Ted Millings, SRNS

Ms. Ndingwan introduced Mr. Millings as well as his presentation, which Mr. Millings then provided.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik asked if the site is required to do re-certification each year. Mr. Millings responded that the site is required to conform with it every three years. Mr. Malik then asked if the water is monitored before it reaches the oyster shells, and what the difference is regarding contaminants before and after reaching the shells. Ms. Eddy answered that storm water outfalls are in place where samples are collected which are downstream of the oyster shells. She added that if they were to see an influx in contaminants they would then test the oyster shells and further upstream.

Ms. Underwood asked how many pounds of oyster shells are being used. Mr. Millings replied that they're within a couple of swells within one area currently, beyond that he did not have any additional information but committed to provide it later. Ms. Underwood asked where they're received from. Ms. Meyer responded that they come from Charleston. Ms. Underwood continued by asking if they were purchased, to which Ms. Meyer answered yes. Ms. Underwood asked yet again if there was a way to source the shells from local restaurants in order to cut spending. Ms. Meyer replied that they could look into that. Ms. Underwood asked once more how the 11 tons of tires were recycled. Mr. Millings responded that they were recycled on site and probably given to AMERESCO for use. Ms. Underwood finished by asking if the tires could be used for asphalt or similar ways. Mr. Millings answered that he was not aware of such use, but he would check on that information and provide it to the CAB after the meeting. Ms. Hammett added that AMERESCO operates an independent tire recycling plant off-site and that's one of the uses of the tires.

Mr. Kaminski asked what specific recommendations or input from the CAB this presentation was intended to garnish. Mr. **Millings replied that he wasn't looking for that feedback. Ms. Ndingwan added that they weren't necessarily looking for those things, but if the CAB thought of something or would like to know more about a topic, they would love to hear it.**

Mr. Murray asked how many people are involved in the assessment of NOV's and correcting them, how long that takes and what that process is like. Mr. Mikolanis responded that in 2017 when that recent NOV occurred, DOE noted the uptick in NOV's very early into the cycle. He added that they brought it to the attention of the contractor who collected people together, went through what had happened, investigated causes, as well as potential solutions for each specific NOV. He continued by adding that when DOE brought the trend of NOV's to the attention of the contractor, they implemented two external reviews, brought in experts to observe as well as provide feedback, and a number of corrective actions and opportunities for improvement were identified as a result. He added yet again that the NOV rate dropped significantly as a result.

Mr. Howard asked how many hours the training mentioned in the presentation takes. Mr. Millings answered that the initial training takes forty-eight hours and the refresher training takes about two to four hours.

Presentation: Plutonium Disposition Options – Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR

Ms. Maxted provided a very detailed presentation regarding the plutonium disposition options at SRS, as well as an overview of K Area including an update on operations.

Q&A Session

Mr. Cato asked what the source of the plutonium is. Ms. Maxted replied that it's defense material that was used in the DOE complex. Mr. Cato then asked if it's still being sourced. Ms. Maxted responded that she could not answer that question since it's an NNSA program.

Ms. Gillas asked how many shipments to WIPP would come out. Ms. Maxted answered that she would provide the exact math after the meeting, but for the EM life cycle of the site they will be continuing until about 2046.

Mr. Vovakes asked if there's no activity with uranium. Ms. Maxted replied that it's stored in drums and they don't really know the true disposition path of that right now so it's being stored.

Mr. Powell asked if the ultimate goal is to empty K Area, to which Ms. Maxted responded yes. Mr. Powell then asked if there **will be a point in time where there's more** material leaving the site than coming in, and if shipments to WIPP have begun from K Area. Ms. Maxted answered that shipments have not begun from K Area to WIPP, but the materials which were downblended in HB Line have been shipped. Mr. Powell then asked Ms. Maxted to specify if that material came from K Area, **to which she replied yes. Mr. Powell continued on by asking if we're at a point now where more material is going out than** coming in, to which Ms. Maxted responded yes.

Ms. Weber asked if there's a possibility that DOE would switch back to the other process of dissolving. Ms. Maxted answered that was a decision above her pay level, but she did not think so based on the H Canyon mission which is currently in place since WIPP was determined as the best possible option.

Mr. Howard asked regarding the plutonium and how it's brought into the site, if that's determined by the origin. Ms. Maxted replied that is correct and also noted that the destination comes into play as well.

Mr. Smith asked regarding slide 16, why WIPP is allowed to create their own classification. Ms. Maxted responded that as part of their permit requirements and agreements with the state of Nevada as well as their EPA, they have their own certification team and their own crew which does the RTR and looks at all of the acceptable knowledge to find out what material is being put in there – part of their EMS. Mr. Smith then suggested that to save on cost the SRS employees are already qualified for those tasks. Ms. Maxted noted that there is a program where individual sites can get their employees qualified to do that, but right now SRS chooses to use their system and support. She further added that is why no shipments have gone out of K Area yet, so they can create a backlog and get the WIPP team out to assess their materials as much as possible at one time, since as she put it they can assess faster than SRS can downblend. Mr. Smith then continued by asking if the filter at the top of the interim canisters is so **there's no pressure build, to which Ms. Maxted answered yes.**

Ms. Wilson asked how DOE documents prior to downblending that the material is not a mixed waste. Ms. Maxted replied that is part of the characterization which WIPP does. She added that SRS also makes that determination before any further plans for the material is made.

Presentation: EM Performance Metrics – Zach Todd, DOE-SR

Mr. Todd provided a presentation regarding EM performance metrics as it relates to SRS goals for the past year.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked how many foreign and domestic shipments were received at SRS according to the presentation timeline. Ms. Maxted noted she was going off of her memory, but she estimated foreign was at the 15-17 range because of the Canadian campaign, and about **12-15 domestic. Ms. Maxted also added that in response to Ms. Gillas' earlier question, there are an** estimated 600 shipments to WIPP left in the SRS life cycle.

Mr. Cato asked what the purpose is of the foreign shipments and what is the disposition path for them. Ms. Maxted responded that both types of shipments are for nonproliferation which, as she explained, are comprised of US-origin material which was loaned to other countries for their use and peaceful research; part of the return program. **She added that they're stored in L** Area and eventually will be processed through H Canyon for the remaining uranium which will be used for TVA commercial electrical production.

Mr. Eisele asked regarding cleanup status, what the plans are for Par Pond which was mentioned during the presentation. Ms. **Holmes answered that she's not sure but will provide the information to the CAB after the meeting.**

Mr. Vovakes asked, "how many performance goals and measures were there in 2017, how many did DOE-SR achieve their target, and how many missed the target." Mr. Todd asked for specifics since there are hundreds of performance-based goals. Mr. Vovakes noted that he was specifically asking about those accountable to EM and DOE. Mr. Todd said that he didn't **have** the answer, but he would provide it after the meeting. Mr. Vovakes then asked if performance measures align with DOE and EM targets. Mr. Todd replied yes. Mr. Vovakes went on to ask how these targets are formed, who owns them, and are there consequences for missing them. Mr. Todd replied that a lot of things play into developing these targets such as regulatory commitments, system plans, and any delays or budget issues which are addressed through a change control process. He also added that contractors are incentivized to meet regulatory commitments etc. to earn an awarded fee. Mr. Budney added as well **that he's personally accountable for the goals set in these metrics which reflects on his performance. Mr. Vovakes finished by** asking for the same metrics for FY 17 for comparison, which Mr. Todd committed to providing if possible.

Mr. Murray asked how many sites are left to be decommissioned. Ms. Holmes responded that there were over 1,200 facilities in **their D&D scope and they've completed 292 of those.** Mr. Murray then asked if the facilities left at the end of the list are **particularly tough which is why they're being done last.** Ms. Holmes answered that **there will be some very difficult ones when operations are closed in the center of the site – canyons and reactors.** She added that there are more benign waste units and ash basins which will be completed later. She further added that budgeting is a factor in D&D.

Ms. Williams asked when a building is decommissioned, why is the concrete pad foundation left. Ms. Holmes replied that in some cases, the slabs are a protective layer in case of sewer lines or process sumps. She further noted sometimes sewer lines are grouted, and the foundation is still left.

Mr. Kaminski asked if Tank 1, Tank 13 and Tank 14 are the next to be closed. Mr. Folk responded that most of the old-style tanks are leaking – not actively. He further noted they keep the water level below the lowest known leak sites, and yes these are the primary focus currently along with tanks which are in or near the groundwater level. He continued by adding that Tank 15 which is closest to be next on the list for closure.

Presentation: National Environmental Research Park – Dr. Gene Rhodes, SREL

Dr. Rhodes provided an extremely detailed presentation about the origin of NERPs and the NERP located at SRS.

Q&A Session

Mr. Howard asked regarding the Fukushima fallout, if SREL is working with them to find out the survivability of the plants and animals which were affected, to which Dr. Rhodes answered yes. He went on to mention details and noted that **large mammal dosimetry collars are being used to map the region's radiation contamination, and experts from that area are planning a visit soon to the states for furthering collaboration.**

Ms. Hopson asked if prescribed burns are done annually. Dr. Rhodes replied that it is annually and as prescribed. Ms. Hopson **then asked if any animals are lost during this process.** Dr. Rhodes responded that **he couldn't answer that for sure, but they do know that most of the organisms living on site lived with fires before the site was inhabited.**

Presentation: Solid Waste Program, Naval Waste & WIPP Update – Kerri Crawford, SRNS

Ms. Crawford provided a presentation on the solid waste program, naval waste and a WIPP update.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked **why there's a target in FY 18 when there was shipping done in FY 17.** Ms. Crawford answered that they have no control over when WIPP will approve their containers.

Mr. Malik asked how often is the RCRA permit renewed for storage facilities. Ms. Meyer replied that she believes it's every five years but will have to confirm it after the meeting. Mr. Malik then asked about the management of PCB. Ms. Crawford responded that **RCRA permitted storage is also for PCB storage, and if they're LLW then they're disposable on site, if not, they're sent off site.**

Ms. Underwood asked why meter measurements are being used. Ms. Crawford answered that's the volume and waste is disposed on a volume basis, and cubic meters works well for that – solid materials. She further explained that liquids are characterized by gallons, and sometimes kg measurements are used as well; it all depends on the waste.

Mr. Allensworth asked **what is WIPP's capability, specifically if no one else is shipping to WIPP could they accept our 720 cubic meters in a year.** Ms. Crawford replied yes. Mr. Allensworth then asked **what's the longest anything has sat in E Area awaiting shipment?** Ms. Crawford responded that she wasn't sure but would have to look that up.

Mr. Howard asked if DOE decides to change the waste definition, what type of impact would it have. Ms. Crawford answered that it could certainly have an impact in solid waste, making materials which are considered HLW to be reclassified and removed from SRS.

Ms. Wilson asked **if there's waste in storage** that was generated more than one year ago. Ms. Crawford clarified that was for TRU waste. Ms. Wilson then asked if that includes mixed TRU, to which Ms. Crawford replied yes. Ms. Wilson continued by asking if DOE-SR has any waste which was from the resumption of WIPP characterization which was generated more than one year ago. Ms. Crawford responded that since 2014 waste has been accumulating, **but she didn't know if any of it was mixed TRU** but she assumed so.

Ms. Meyer responded to Mr. Malik's earlier question regarding how often RCRA permits are renewed for storage facilities – there is a 10-year time frame with regards to those permits.

Presentation: Mercury in the Liquid Waste System – Rich Edwards, SRR

Mr. Edwards provided a presentation regarding mercury in the LW system.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik asked **how surplus mercury is managed when it's not in the canyons**. Mr. Edwards answered that there is no unused mercury just sitting there, it's fed back into the canyon.

Mr. Howard asked if the strategy for the removal of the mercury was tested, and how that strategy came about. Mr. Edwards replied that the amount of **mercury inside that vessel was assessed and sampled to verify that it's indeed being deposited in** that vessel. Mr. Edwards added that they also found that the mercury is quite clean, so the strategy is to pump it out of that vessel and put it into a mercury purification cell to assess it further to determine exactly how clean it is. He added yet again that they would then decide on a disposal path.

Mr. Kaminski asked what the capacity is for the long-term system with regards to how many kg over a period of time will it collect. Mr. Edwards responded that the vessel holds about 10,000 gallons so they can collect quite a bit of mercury and operate the system to pull out those quantities on a regular basis. He added that the capacity is matched to whatever the need is.

Public Comment

Suzanne Rhodes stated her disapproval that SRS materials does not take priority at WIPP and how something should be done to change it. She then expressed her happiness to hear that mercury is no longer released into the local environment.

Voting

Draft Recommendation: Solar Generated Power Use at SRS

Mr. Tanner summarized the changes made to this draft the previous day.

Mr. Allensworth read the draft recommendation in its entirety. He then asked for a motion to vote on this recommendation, which was made and seconded. The draft passed with 17 yay.

~Meeting adjourned

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