

Summary Notes – April 17, 2018  
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)  
Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee Meeting

The NM Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018, from 4:30 – 6:20 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> Gil Allensworth Betty Cook Susan Corbett David Eisele Tom French Dawn Gillas Charles Hilton Douglas Howard Dan Kaminski Narinder Malik John McMichael Larry Powell Mary Weber Bobbie Williams	<u>DOE/Contractors/Others:</u> Jim Folk, DOE-SR Tony Polk, DOE-SR James Tanner, S&K Federica Staton, S&K Chelsea Gitzen, S&K Kristin Huber, SRNS Kallie Metzger, SRNL Bob Sindelar, SRNL	<u>Agency Liaisons:</u> None  <u>Stakeholders:</u> Joe Ortaldo
---	--	--

Committee Welcome: Larry Powell, NM Chair

Mr. Powell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

DOE Response: Recommendation #350

Oppose Receipt of German SNF for Treatment and Storage in the US  
 Mr. Powell asked who responds to recommendations since the site manager signs it. He continued asking if one site manager would have a different answer than another. Mr. Tanner answered that SME's provide responses to recommendations, which are then edited or expanded on by AM's, OEA, DDFO's and finally the site manager. He also noted the responses would still be similar under new leadership. Mr. Powell then asked if anyone wanted to send this recommendation back to DOE again.

Mr. Malik suggested keeping this recommendation open.

Mr. Tanner noted that if there are follow up questions needed for clarification that can be provided but he does not think that's the issue, and Mr. Powell really just wanted a different answer which Mr. Powell confirmed.

Ms. Gillas noted that leaving this recommendation open is moot and a waste of everyone's time just to get the same answer.

Mr. Allensworth asked what the purpose would be of leaving this recommendation open. Mr. Powell replied that there would be no purpose, but he admitted he was attempting to get a

different answer than the one that was given. He also noted the CAB could always re-open it or write a new similar recommendation.

Mr. Malik noted he would be happy to close this recommendation because DOE provided an answer.

Mr. Powell asked what the next steps are for this response, to which Mr. Tanner responded that a vote to forward this response to the full board to close was the next step.

#### Committee Discussion: Draft Recommendation – SRS INL Exchange

Ms. Gillas summarized the topic of her draft recommendation and read it in its entirety. She further provided a background as to why she created this draft recommendation, and noted she had not given it to CAB support with enough time prior to this meeting so it could be included in the agenda or discussed, but it would not be available for editing, discussion and voting until the next committee meeting.

#### Point of Contact Status Update: Tony Polk, DOE-SR

Mr. Polk reported the status of each project under the NM committee purview.

#### Q&A Session

Mr. Malik asked what is the number of shipments received from Canada and who pays for it. Mr. Polk answered there have been nearly 40 shipments in total and less than 100 are planned. He added that once the current outage which was planned is finished receipts of shipments will begin again, and the Canadians pay for the shipments.

Ms. Gillas asked how many HFIR cores are in each batch, to which Mr. Polk replied that two batches contain about nine total HFIR cores.

#### Committee Discussion: Management and Disposal of DOE SNF

Mr. French asked if Maxcine Maxted who is this committee's POC would present the site's position on this topic during the next full board meeting, to which Mr. Tanner replied yes. Mr. French then noted that if any CAB members have a question they are free to email him since he has a POC at the organization responsible for this presentation (NWTRB). Mr. Allensworth asked Mr. Tanner if this was ok, to which Mr. Tanner answered that he prefers any CAB members send questions to CAB support so they can contact their designated POC and make sure answers are provided through follow up if necessary.

Mr. Kaminski read his notes from when this presentation was given at the previous full board meeting.

Ms. Gillas noted under the presentation's listed key observations is the fact that SRS "indefinitely" suspended INL exchange which she had not heard before. Mr. Polk replied that he was not familiar with the NWTRB and Ms. Gillas is correct about a discussion existing to continue or re-start the INL exchange which was accepted to be examined in the future, and promised to keep the CAB updated as discussions continue.

Ms. Corbett asked what is a multi-purpose canister and what is the life expectancy. Mr. Polk responded that they are dual use for storage, they're totally sealed and disposed in a repository. Ms. Corbett then asked if they're currently in use. Mr. Sindelar answered that they're working towards developing these canisters, but they have already been designed and Hanford has an

overhead counterpack multi-purpose canister in use which is not useable at SRS. He further added if this type of canister is found as being defective, they could oversleeve it.

Mr. Allensworth noted that on April 30<sup>th</sup> the CAB will have a tour of L Basin.

Committee Discussion: H-Canyon and Aluminum Clad HEU

Mr. Allensworth began discussion by noting his take-away from this presentation is that H Canyon is a big deal, and the presenter noted, "if we lose H Canyon we become on par with third world countries in terms of processing SNF." He further noted that at the upcoming EMSSAB chairs meeting, topics like this will be discussed and he feels CABs need to let DOE EM know how important H Canyon is for processing SNF. He also noted he feels that the NM committee should make a recommendation in strong support of H Canyon. Ms. Gillas added that Recommendation 348 includes this suggestion which was just passed last year. Mr. Allensworth noted he feels the SRS CAB should do it again and ever year because it's that important.

Mr. Powell suggested the SRS CAB should recommend building a new H Canyon since it is indispensable and will need to be replaced at some point.

Mr. Kaminski noted that DOE needs \$30 million about the continuing resolution funding to make improvements in H Canyon, and \$800 million would be saved if fuel is processed here at H Canyon.

Mr. Malik asked if F Canyon could be set back up for use. Mr. Mikolanis replied no, that would be cost prohibitive. Ms. Gillas added that is exactly what the SRS CAB does not want to happen with H Canyon.

Mr. Powell noted that after 100 years concrete starts to deteriorate.

Mr. Eisele noted that the AROD from 2013 included 1,000 bundles and 2,000 HFIR cores, and a new dissolver online that can currently dissolve is in place. Mr. Polk added that from a planning standpoint DOE continues to maintain H Canyon and there are limiting factors in doing so. He further noted that H Canyon is robust and flexible, also it is likely to be in use well into the future with proper upkeep, care and maintenance. He also added that other things are being considered as Mr. Eisele mentioned, and other materials will need to be dispositioned. He continued by adding SRS is currently working to look across the complex to find out what needs to be dispositioned and how it needs to be dispositioned. He then noted that if a future facility was constructed, it would probably be different than H Canyon, meaning it would be mobile vs stationary, modular vs a behemoth, it would have a significantly smaller footprint. He went on to note that such a facility is currently nonexistent.

Ms. Corbett noted H Canyon produces a lot of waste, including LW which is kept in tanks. She went on to say that plutonium is separated and may never go anywhere and there are releases at this facility such as tritium. She finished by adding there are heavy metals involved in the process. Ms. Gillas corrected her by noting the plutonium created during this process isn't even close to being weapons grade. She further noted that about 300 glass logs would be added through further processing, and there is currently about 4,000 total so that would not be a significant increase.

**Ms. Gillas motioned for a vote on this recommendation to forward it to the full board for closure, which was seconded and passed with a majority vote.**

Public Comment

**Joe Ortaldo stated his support of the discussion about H Canyon and suggested two stances for the SRS CAB: support of H Canyon and asking for more info from DOE and what could be done to or with H Canyon.**

~Meeting Adjourned