



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee**

#### **Meeting Summary**

August 30, 1999  
Aiken Federal Building  
Aiken, SC

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on Monday, August 30, 6 p.m. at the Aiken Federal Building, Aiken, S.C. The topics of discussion were the Year 2000 (Y2K) status, Paths to Closure draft, stewardship, Land Use Control Assurance Plan (LUCAP), National Environmental Policy Act update and public comment. Those in attendance were:

#### CAB Members

P.K Smith  
Wade Waters  
Murray Riley  
Karen Patterson  
Brendolyn Jenkins  
Mel Galin

#### Stakeholders

Jerry Devitt  
Sam Booher  
Thomas Rolka, DHEC  
John Austin  
Paula Austin, SAIC  
Russ Messick  
William Willoughby II  
Chasiti Kirkland

#### DOE/Contractors

Jim Buice, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE  
Don Scott, DOE  
Steve Baker, DOE  
Brian Hennessey, DOE  
Drew Grainger, DOE  
Kathy Hatcher, WSRC  
Gerry Stejskal, WSRC  
Shelia McFalls, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC

P. K. Smith, Co-Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. She reviewed the agenda. Wade Waters, Co-Chair, requested that the LUCAP be included on the agenda as an additional item. Ms. Smith polled the participants and the item was added to the agenda under stewardship. Ms. Smith then introduced Kathy Hatcher for her presentation.

Kathy Hatcher stated that by now everyone was aware that the Y2K problem is a real problem. She stated that her department was responsible for Y2K coordination of all the SRS programs for the Department of Energy Savannah River (DOE-SR), Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC), and Wackenhut Services, Inc. (WSI).

Ms. Hatcher reviewed the history of the Y2K program that started in 1996. In 1997 an inventory was completed on everything that had a chip at SRS. If an instrument or piece of equipment had a chip, it was suspect or guilty until proven innocent. Everything at SRS with a chip was tested. There was also an SRS procurement clause that required everything purchased be Y2K compliant. The drivers for the program were safety and health, security, continuity of business and oversight. Most commercial businesses have continuity of business as the major goal.

The Y2K program review was very extensive and comprehensive. It started with the normal systems such as process and business systems, networks, hardware and site applications. It progressed to interface

and exchanges, DOE-HQ systems, data archiving, warehouses and embedded systems. From there it moved to reviews of our material and service providers including sole sources vendors, business support vendors, just-in-time vendors, and technical support vendors.

The government set an aggressive goal of March 31, 1999 for the sites to meet their Y2K reviews. SRS thought they would miss about 155 systems but ended up missing only 18 systems out of 1429 systems by the March 31 date. Of the 1429 systems, 418 were essential and 1011 non-essential. As of August 30, 100 % of the essential systems are compliant. Only one non-essential system is non-compliant but should be compliant by September 30, with hopes of September 15. The cost estimate of the program from fiscal year 1997 to fiscal year 2000 is \$43.1 million. There have been a lot of internal verification as well as external reviews.

A three volume set Business Continuity and Contingency Plan was sent to DOE-SR and will be transmitted to DOE-HQ. This included 98 individual system contingency plans. Every infrastructure on site was required to have a contingency plan. Every division as well as WSI and DOE-SR had to write a plan on what they would do in the event of the loss of infrastructure.

The Y2K Program Office will be monitoring site and world events prior to January 1, 2000. Since the site is 17 hours behind the first country to hit January 1, 2000, there will be some warning of potential problems. In preparation, as a purely precautionary measure, there will a partial activation of the Emergency Response organization, some divisional and departmental "command centers" and safety system verification checks on January 1 and 2. There will be a Y2K Communications Tabletop Drill on September 8, 1999.

P. K. Smith requested that Don Scott give his presentation on the SRS Path to Closure (PtC) document. Mr. Scott stated that his presentation would look at the changes in the PtC from 1998 to 1999. He stated that the document had been mailed out to some selected public about two weeks ago. Public comments are due back by September 3. DOE-HQ will publish a National PtC and each site will produce its own PtC. Mr. Scott handed out a listing of the key components.

Mr. Scott stated there were 87 Project Baseline Summaries (PBS) in the PtC. The three main regulatory drivers were the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), the Federal Facility Compliance Agreement (FFCA)/Site Treatment Plan and the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) Recommendation 94-1. Site planning assumptions include the health and safety of public, plant workers and the environment will not be compromised. Funding requirements will reflect meeting all compliance and regulatory agreements and stakeholder concerns and comments will be addressed.

Mr. Scott stated that everyone is aware that funding is tight and it gets worse after fiscal year 2000. Funding needs exceed projection by \$200 to \$300 million/year in the near term. Mr. Scott reviewed the changes in the assumptions as well as the new scope. He stated that the Life Cycle Cost in the PtC increase by \$6,180 billion dollars from 1998 to 1999. Most of this increase was attributed to the changed assumptions and new scope. Some of the new scope included: security investigations, the Independent Waste Handling Facility, Depleted Uranium Storage, K Area Stabilization Project, Heavy Water, Alternate Salt Removal, Facilities Deactivation and infrastructure. Mr. Scott also mentioned other potential subsequent events which would effect the budget such as the potential Americium/Curium cost increase, TRU Waste Compaction and accelerating close out of the F Canyon.

Some questions and answers on the PtC were as follows:

- *Question:* Sam Booher stated that he felt the driver for the purpose of having the SRS site in place should be included in the PtC as well as some DOE directives and the Site Strategic Plan. *Answer:* Steve Baker, DOE, mentioned that not all the drivers were included on Mr. Scott's list, only the regulatory drivers.

- *Question:* P. K. Smith asked when the Site was going to get out of the do-loop between the F-Canyon versus the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility?  
*Answer:* Don Scott said that they were still working on a decision, but there is plenty of time to arrive at a decision.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Scott to lead off the discussion on long term stewardship. Mr. Scott stated that a lawsuit was filed by the National Defense Resource Council (NDRC) which resulted in DOE having to do a study on long term stewardship. The draft is due in one year. Public participation will be required. DOE is waiting for guidance from DOE-HQ. Mr. Scott said that this plan would have a greater effect on those sites that are closing by 2006. This plan will include both physical and institutional controls.

Ms. Smith read the Oak Ridge End Use Working Group Stewardship Committee definition of stewardship. She stated there would be a meeting on October 25 – 28 to discuss four stewardship topics:

1. What needs to be done?
2. Who does what?
3. How will information be tracked?
4. How will it be paid for?

Some questions/answers and comments on stewardship were as follows:

- *Question:* How is the Comprehensive Plan different from the Long Term Stewardship Plan and why can't the plans be combined?  
*Answer:* The Long Term Stewardship Plan will be included in the Comprehensive Plan.  
*Comment:* Sam Booher: Please let me know when the meetings will be.  
*Answer:* Don Scott said he thought there is a meeting on December 7 but wasn't sure of the location.
- *Question:* Will the hook up be a conference call on site?  
*Answer:* Don Scott said he wasn't sure but he would look into it.  
*Comment:* Sam Booher stated that if there was a meeting in Oak Ridge, the SRS representatives should state that all plans should take stewardship into account just like SRS does but don't have a separate Plan.  
*Answer:* P. K. Smith requested Mr. Booher to send his response via e-mail.  
*Comment:* DOE-HQ should look at all plans and put them together and not have the same words in each different report. *Comment:* Brendolyn Jenkins thought there was a benefit for all the Advisory Boards getting together as a group with a united thought.

P. K. Smith requested everyone to review the definitions of stewardship and to send in any comments they may have on stewardship. She requested they be sent to Jim Moore and her.

Ms. Smith asked Brian Hennessey, DOE, to give an explanation of LUCAP. Mr. Hennessey stated that the LUCAP is a response to an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region IV policy of April 1998. The EPA driver is to request of federal facilities, including SRS, what controls the facilities will use to protect people from contaminants over the years. The document provides for an annual certification of continued compliance with land use controls by the SRS Manager. Mr. Hennessey stated that the annual certification by the Manager, DOE-SR, would be included in the FFA Annual Progress Reports. The LUCAP has not been issued for final approval and remains a working draft. It applies only to areas that are waste units that have institutional controls as part of the selected remedy. The LUCAP contains little text and a lot of maps. LUCAP does not specify the duration of government control of SRS property, it does not establish a land use plan for SRS and it does not establish policy on government control of land. After a Record of Decision (ROD) on a project, the site will be required to prepare a LUC Implementation Plan (LUCIP) detailing the controls that will be used to prevent unwanted exposure for that project.

Some questions/answers and comments during discussion were:

- *Question:* Is a LUCAP required in other regions?  
*Answer:* Yes.
- *Question:* When is the report due?  
*Answer:* The Revision 0 was submitted to the regulators in August 1998 and revisions are currently ongoing. SRS is the first site to submit a draft.
- *Question:* Has the document seen public comment?  
*Answer:* No.
- *Question:* When is it available to look at?  
*Answer:* Expect to have it in the next month or two.
- *Question:* Is a LUCAP required at the Department of Defense (DOD) site?  
*Answer:* Yes.  
*Comment:* Sam Booher: requested a copy for review before it is signed off.

Ms. Smith asked Drew Grainger, DOE, to give his presentation on the NEPA update. Mr. Grainger stated that NEPA was enacted in 1969 and explained the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. There are four EAs in process at this time, they are Repair of Pond B Dam, Interim Remediation Measures for the Mixed Waste Management Facility, Offsite Treatment and Disposal of Low-Level and Mixed Radioactive Waste and Construction and Operation of the Low Enriched Uranium Transfer and Loading System at SRS. The following EISs are in process:

- SRS Spent Nuclear Fuel Final,
- Closure of High Level Waste Tanks at SRS Draft,
- Salt Disposition Alternatives Draft,
- Surplus Plutonium Disposition Supplemental,
- Surplus Plutonium Final,
- Programmatic Waste Management, and
- Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Waste at Yucca Mountain EIS.

Mr. Grainger stated that NEPA information can be obtained by the SRS Homepage ([www.srs.gov](http://www.srs.gov)), the SRS Environmental Bulletin, advertisements in the local newspaper, the NEPA toll free phone line at 1-800-881-7292, or call or page Mr. Grainger at (803) 725-1523 or 725-page, 16219.

Ms. Smith reminded everyone of the all day program on Y2K in building 766H on August 31. She also asked everyone to respond on stewardship by Wednesday, September 1. Ms. Smith suggested that the subcommittee wait until information is obtained on stewardship from other sites before taking a position or making a recommendation on stewardship. If individuals send in comments on stewardship, P. K. said she would make a formal response by September 3.

Jerry Devitt reminded everyone of the Center for Risk Excellence meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 1 at the Aiken Federal Building. William Willoughby suggested that the information in the Risk Summaries be included in the PtC, especially the chemical information.

With no other comments, Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting.

***Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.***