



## SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

### SRS Citizens Advisory Board Approved Meeting Minutes

March 27-28, 2006

Columbia, S.C.

#### Monday, March 27, 2006, Attendance

##### SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof  
Donna Antonucci  
Manuel Bettencourt  
Tracy Carroll  
Leon Chavous  
David Dawson  
Gerald Devitt  
Arthur Domby  
Mary Drye  
Mercredi Giles  
Judith Greene-McLeod  
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman

##### Stakeholders

Jack Roberts  
Tom Clements  
Mary Kelly  
Ben Rusche  
Bill Willoughby

Ranowul Jzar  
Wendell Lyon  
Jimmy Mackey  
Madeleine Marshall  
Robert Meisenheimer  
Joseph Ortaldo  
Karen Patterson  
Barbara Paul  
Wade Waters  
Alex Williams  
Gloria Williams-Way

##### Regulators

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC  
Art Collins, EPA  
Carolyn Hagerback, EPA

##### Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE  
Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC  
Al Frazier, GADNR  
Robert Pope, EPA  
Dawn Taylor, EPA

##### DOE/Contractors

Jeff Allison, DOE  
Kevin Smith, DOE  
Doug Hintze, DOE  
Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Becky Craft, DOE  
deLisa Bratcher, DOE  
Nick Delaplane, DOE  
Bill Clark, DOE  
Jeff Stevens, BNFL  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC

#### Strategic and Legacy Management Committee

Jimmy Mackey, Chair, explained that he wanted to make sure the CAB was aware that on February 22, 2006, Charlie Anderson, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM) at DOE-Headquarters (HQ), designated the Savannah River

National Laboratory (SRNL) as the EM Corporate Laboratory. The letter stated that the SRNL has multiple, unique technical capabilities that can be used to assist sites in meeting cleanup requirements. It can perform and manage targeted technical assistance or technical solutions in the high-level waste, groundwater and soils, and other technical areas. He stated it was good news for the lab and he thanked DOE-HQ for recognizing SRNL's unique expertise.

### Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Update

Jim Buice, DOE SRS Director Budget Division, explained that the fiscal year (FY) 2007 budget went to Congress in early February (see attachment). The 2007 budget will take effect on October 1, 2006. Congress is currently having hearings on the budget with the hopes of passing the Appropriations Bill by October 1, 2006. As we speak, guidance on the FY 2008 budget is being reviewed and preliminary budget items are being sent to DOE-HQ for inclusion.

There are five basic components to the budget. They are materials to disposition; waste to disposition; deactivation and decommissioning; areas to closure and mission support. The site EM priorities are as follows:

- Continue Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) production of vitrified HLW canisters
- Continue interim salt waste activities
- Initiate construction of Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF)
- Complete design and initiate construction of 3013 Container Surveillance and Storage Capability in K-Area Material Storage facility
- Initiate operation of the K-Area Material Storage facility for interim surveillance of stabilized materials
- Continue environmental remediation efforts
- Continue shipping of Legacy High Activity TRU Waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)
- Continue implementation of security upgrades

The total budget for the site for FY2007 is \$1,631 million. The EM portion is \$1,154 million however, if you add the \$164 million for Safeguards and Security, the total comes to \$1,378 million. Defense Programs is \$173 million, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is \$77 million. Safeguards and Security Program for EM is \$164 million and National Nuclear Security Administration is \$13 million. Other programs amount to \$50 million.

Mr. Buice presented several different breakdowns of the \$1,378 million EM budget. These included both the construction line items as well as the project breakdown. Mr. Buice explained that the site was required to control the projects to the funding levels in the Appropriations Bill. If changes in funding are required, the site has to go back to Congress to get approval. The Site Manager does have authority to move funds associated with projects up to \$5 million.

Significant changes from the FY2006 budget to the FY2007 budget were reviewed as well as the reason for the change. The changes are as follows:

- Nuclear Materials Stabilization and Disposition (SR—0011B) Down \$33.7 million
- Nuclear Materials Stabilization and Disposition (SR-0011C) Down \$33.2 million
- Solid Waste Stabilization and Disposition (SR-0013) Down \$26.6 million
- Radioactive Liquid Tank Waste Stabilization and Disposition (SR-0014C) Up \$32.6 million
- Soil and Water Remediation (SR-0030) Up \$9.7 million
- Project Baseline Summary (PBS) 40 Nuclear Facility D&D Down \$56.6 million
- PBS 40B Nuclear Facility D&D – 2012 Up \$3.7 million
- PBS 40C Nuclear Facility D&D – 2035 Up \$12.5 million

#### President's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Shortfall

Jimmy Mackey reviewed a draft motion regarding the FY07 budget shortfall (see attachment). In the background section, it was requested that the total amount for Hanford be included for total dollars. During discussion of the recommendation, some of the discussion points were as follows:

- Concern that if the CAB asked for more funding, could the site spend it.
- Concern that by pushing activity from FY2007 to the out years that funding would not be available in the outyears and therefore commitment dates would be missed.
- Concern that the recommendation should be requesting necessary scope increases.
- Concern that the recommendation was not requesting more funding for SRS.
- Concern that critical shortfalls were not known.

After much discussion, several modifications were made to the draft motion be presented for full board consideration.

#### *Waste Management Committee*

##### SRS Transuranic (TRU) Waste Update

Manuel Bettencourt explained the background on the draft motion regarding SRS transuranic waste (see attachment) and provided historical information about the TRU waste program. It was noted that the impact of the FY 2007 budget was not included in the specifics of this motion. Mr. Bettencourt noted that the last three recommendations in this motion were not tied to funding. After a short discussion, the draft motion was approved for full board consideration.

Mr. Meisenheimer requested that Sonny Goldston, WSRC, brief the CAB about a drum of TRU waste that was found over the plutonium (Pu) acceptable limit. Mr. Goldston explained

that some of the TRU waste material packaged from FB Line in the 1980's resulted in a limit violation. During normal processing the drum was discovered. Other drums were then checked to see if there were other limit violations. Some were found and have been identified. He explained that Mr. Meisenheimer was concerned that this finding would delay the shipping schedule. Mr. Goldston explained that the bottleneck in the program was getting the prohibited items out of the boxes and not the characterization process. He also explained that this was not an unusual event.

### High Level Waste (HLW) Systems Approach

Mr. Meisenheimer reviewed the draft HLW Disposition Program Systems motion (see attachment). He said that he would like to change the title to SWPF Decision – HLW Disposition Program Systems since the letter was referring to the SWPF decision. Several modifications were made to the motion following discussions.

### *Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee*

#### Integration of D&D and Soil and Groundwater – Appendix K Modification to the FFA

Mary Flora, WSRC, provided an overview of the D&D process and Appendix K of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA). Ms. Flora stated that on May 22, 1995, EPA and DOE issued a joint policy on decommissioning DOE facilities under CERCLA. The policy addressed an agreed upon approach for decommissioning surplus DOE facilities consistent with the requirements of CERCLA, which encourages streamlined decision-making and establishes that decommissioning will be conducted as non-time critical removal actions unless the circumstances at the facility make it inappropriate. On May 22, 2003, EPA, SCDHEC and DOE created a Memorandum of Agreement, which established the concept of Area Completion as the strategy for achieving 2025 completion. The Memorandum integrated decommissioning into the process, and provided a means for SCDHEC and EPA to participate in the decommissioning process.

Ms. Flora explained that Appendix K is new to the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), developed to address EPA and DHEC concerns over S&GW and D&D Integration, which allows documentation of decisions made regarding D&D to facilitate Area Completion. Two new parts were added to the FFA: Section XL – Decommissioning Facilities: Appendix K and Section XL: Decommissioning Facilities. This Section defines decommissioning at the first post-operational stage for the facility, when residual hazards are eliminated permanently or reduced to a safe condition. It also establishes DOE as the lead agency for preparing and finalizing decommissioning documents and coordinating all decommissioning activities with EPA and DHEC. It describes the disposition path for all decommissioned facilities and essentially “tracks” decisions made on decommissioning projects.

Appendix K is comprised of 2 lists (K-1 and K-2), which is where the “tracking” is done.

Appendix K-1 are facilities planned for decommissioning (presently all 1013 EM facilities)

where facility use decisions are not subject to dispute. Appendix K-2 list facilities the agencies agree will not require further evaluation or response action during area closure. These are typically facilities decommissioned using the “Simple Model.” It provides a linkage to Appendix C for facilities that may warrant response action – Integrated Sampling Model or EE/CA Model projects. Appendix C contains the list of RCRA and CERCLA units (i.e., waste sites) that need investigation and cleanup Record of Decision. These facilities become “sub units” of the Area Completion scope.

In conclusion, Ms Flora stated that Appendix K implements the 2003 Memorandum of Agreement in context of the FFA and supports Area Completion. It resolves regulator concerns on D&D implementation and integration processes, tracks and institutionalizes decisions with no additional enforceability and no milestones for D&D. All this enables SRS to proceed with Area Completion, with regulator confidence that all potential releases/risks will be addressed.

Following a request for public comments, the meeting adjourned at 5 p.m. No public comments were provided.

### **Tuesday, March 28, 2006, Attendance**

#### SRS CAB Members

Meryl Alalof  
Donna Antonucci  
Manuel Bettencourt  
Leon Chavous  
David Dawson  
Gerald Devitt  
Arthur Domby  
Mary Drye  
Mercredi Giles  
Cynthia Gilliard  
Judith Greene-McLeod  
Kuppuswamy Jayaraman

#### Stakeholders

Tom Clements  
Bill Willoughby  
Mary Kelly  
Dell Isham  
Chris Timmers  
Charlie Hansen  
Tom Burns  
Bernard Manning  
Ian Headley

Ranowul Jzar  
Wendell Lyon  
Jimmy Mackey  
Madeleine Marshall  
Robert Meisenheimer  
Joseph Ortaldo  
Karen Patterson  
Barbara Paul  
Wade Waters  
Alex Williams  
Gloria Williams-Way

#### Regulators

Kim Newell, SCDHEC  
Stan Clark, SCDHEC  
Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC  
Art Collins, EPA  
Carolyn Hagerback, EPA  
Eddie Wright, EPA  
Eric Owens, SCDHEC

#### Ex-Officio Members

Bill Spader, DOE  
Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC  
Al Frazier, GADNR  
Robert Pope, EPA  
Dawn Taylor, EPA

#### DOE/Contractors

Jeff Allison, DOE  
Rick Arkin, DOE  
Kevin Smith, DOE  
Terry Spears, DOE  
Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Becky Craft, DOE  
deLisa Bratcher, DOE  
Nick Delaplane, DOE  
William Poulson, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC

Paivi Nettamo  
Ben Rusche  
Jack Roberts

Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
David Burke, WSRC  
Tiajuana Cochnauer, USFS  
Mark Mahoney, WSRC  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC

SRS CAB members Bill Lawless and Tracy Carroll were unable to attend. The meeting opened with Bill Spader, DOE, serving as Designated Federal Official. Mike Schoener served as facilitator and Rick McLeod, Board Technical Advisor was present as well. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

### **Approval of the Minutes**

The meeting minutes of January 23-24, were approved with one minor change.

### **Nuclear Materials Committee Report**

*(The agenda was altered to accommodate the travel schedule of Mr. Anderson)*

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Charlie Anderson provided a presentation regarding the Nuclear Materials Disposition Consolidation & Coordination Committee. Mr. Anderson commented that he was involved with this committee due to his experience with nuclear materials in EM and NNSA and one of the key things to remember is that this committee is looking at issues across the board for all of DOE. He was appointed chairman of the committee on Nov. 15, 2005. The committee was established last February and was previously chaired by Megan Watts. Mr. Anderson stated one of his first objectives was to make the committee much leaner, so they reconstituted to a core group of those organizations that own materials and have a vested interest and then included advisors from General Counsel, Public Affairs, NEPA, etc... The Executive Steering Committee is made up of Mr. Anderson, David Garman and Linton Brooks. Once recommendations come forward, these people have the authority to execute these recommendations. Although there have been many studies about nuclear materials, historically, the recommendations are never executed, he said.

The NMDCC meets monthly, sometimes twice a month and there are several subgroups working on different issues. The committee started meeting the first of December. Mr. Anderson commented they brief the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) on a monthly basis. There is a new charter for the committee. Mr. Anderson said the approach is by scientific method. Mr. Anderson commented that this may sound simple, but you make five points. First define the problem. He commented they had a lot of solutions searching for problems instead of vice versa. He wanted to identify the problem that needs a solution. Second, list all known pertinent facts and source documents without trying to make judgements or solve problems. What are all the facts? He stated that this has been extremely

interesting particularly when looking at costs. He stated this was where the committee ran into problems last year. There was a lot of analysis done that led to many questions about cost. Mr. Anderson stated there were a lot of order of magnitude of numbers and they needed to make sure they had credible numbers. He commented this had been difficult because they thought there would be more source documents and it turned out there was no basis for some of the numbers. Mr. Anderson stated that third, list all the alternatives, then conduct cost evaluations of the viable alternatives and then end up with a recommended path forward.

Mr. Anderson noted that near term issues are consolidation of excess plutonium 239 by 2008; disposition of uranium 233 from Oak Ridge National Laboratory; removal of surplus material from Y-12; removal of surplus material from Los Alamos National Laboratory; removal of all category 1 and 2 materials from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; removal of materials from Sandia National Laboratory by 2008; removal of surplus weapons pits from Zone 4 at Pantex; and consolidation of Pu238.

There are other special nuclear materials that do not fit these categories and there are other reports and efforts being done to look at these areas. Mr. Anderson commented the committee is integrating their efforts with these other efforts, using uranium 233 in Oak Ridge as an example. He discussed security requirements for these materials and the cost associated with protection of the materials. Mr. Anderson noted that as he listed through the issues, that is basically how DOE determined the priorities. Most of the safety issues are being taken care of. Taking care of the Pu239 at Hanford and the U233 at Oak Ridge will instantly save DOE significant amounts of money, in security costs.

Mr. Anderson commented that the committee will be successful when there is an implementation plan approved for every one of these issues. The driver is a strategic plan for all nuclear materials management. There will be an overall strategic plan that will basically have addendums that are the implementation plans for each of these dispositions and materials types.

Mr. Anderson responded to questions about the NEPA Supplemental Analysis for Plutonium Disposition commenting that a supplemental analysis may be appropriate, but that evaluation is still being conducted. He stated that the options for Pu239 not only get into NEPA analysis, but also into two public laws. The amended ROD earlier had established SRS for disposition but canceled the immobilization plan. Mr. Anderson commented that ultimate disposition really guides nuclear materials decisions. They do not want to move these materials twice.

Mr. Anderson commented that there are a number of databases listing all the materials and they are going through them and grouping materials into 4 categories: Disposition Known and Documented (Can provide source documents, ROD); Known but Not Documented; Multiple Paths-more than one alternative or disposition path; and the "Just Don't Know" or Unknown category.

Karen Patterson asked Mr. Anderson to discuss why this is important to SRS. SRS has a strong CAT 1 facility for special nuclear material. K Area Materials Storage is where a lot of

plutonium was consolidated and stored to support deinventory of Rocky Flats. Concurrently, there were decisions for SRS being the disposition site for surplus plutonium for the complex. The MOX Facility and the Plutonium Immobilization Plant (to take other material that cannot go through MOX) were approved to process this material and place it in DWPF canisters, making it unattainable for terrorists. This was driven largely by interactions by the State Department between the U.S. and Russia. The agreement was to get 50 metric tons off both sides of the market. It turned out the U.S. only had 34 metric tons. Mr. Anderson further explained the forms of plutonium remaining in the U.S.

Mr. Anderson also responded to questions about the NMDCCC, which consists of DOE employees only since there are classified discussions; the status of the Russian cooperation regarding the program; and the attributes of SRS for plutonium storage and consolidation. He responded to questions regarding the disposition big picture, emphasizing security and noting that regardless the quantity of material, security must be provided. He briefly discussed transportation issues and noted the difference between defense materials and commercial materials. Discussion turned to spent nuclear fuel and Yucca Mountain.

Mr. Anderson concluded with a comment on Pu 239 consolidation by 2008, noting the driver is the time schedule on implementing increased design basis threat, which is required by the end of 2008. That is the driver for places where DOE knows they do not want to end up with CAT1 facilities. Ideally, DOE would like to have materials disposition before taking on the increased costs associated with design basis threat requirements. He commented that the SRS KAMS is a robust facility, but at Hanford, there has to be a new plant built in order to meet the increased requirements.

### Agency Updates

Jeff Allison, DOE-SR Manager, welcomed new members and provided an update on personnel changes at SRS, noting that Terry Spears had been named Assistant Manager for Waste Disposition. With regard to the acquisition strategy, Mr. Allison noted DOE is moving forward, putting together integrated schedules to get to selection and drafting acquisition plans. He commented on DNFSB concerns (March 3 letter) about contract acquisition strategy. The DNFSB is concerned about DOE oversight of contractor to SRS and was also concerned that DOE had not aggressively implemented a new DOE order. The Board expressed concern about breaking up the M&O contract into two site contracts as well, but Mr. Allison explained that the liquid waste program is the highest risk at the site and DOE-SR wants one contractor dealing with largest risk at site without being burdened by other issues at the site.

Shelly Sherritt, SCDHEC noted changes to the FFA and provided an update on high level waste activities. She also commented on the FY07 budget. Ms. Sherritt noted that the FFA is a cleanup agreement and the vehicle the State uses to oversee cleanup at SRS. It includes enforceable milestones. She noted that D&D is now included in the FFA and it is important to recognize the link between D&D and the area cleanup approach. Regarding HLW activities, Ms. Sherritt noted that the State is focused on two main objectives- tank closure and

minimizing residuals in SC. SCDHEC is concerned about two events that could hinder these objectives –the delay in SWPF and implementation of Section 3116. She commented that SCDHEC is working with SRS on ways to mitigate the impacts. SCDHEC has been looking for a commitment from SRS to get SWPF constructed and to get the funding in place to get the facility ready by 2011. She stated this commitment from DOE is important to make the whole strategy work. Regarding the FY07 budget, Ms. Sherritt commented that the 07 budget is enough to meet regulatory commitments, but the site is taking a big hit on D&D. She stated that future cuts would likely impact the outyear schedule and SRS would not be able to sustain these hits year after year. Kim Newell, SCDHEC noted a non-regulatory program for land and air monitoring around SRS that mimics the site environmental monitoring program. One of the objectives is to help the public understand and know that what the site is reporting is true. SCDHEC is now implementing coastal monitoring as well.

Al Frazier, Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GADNR) noted that his agency would like to be considered a full partner with NRC and SCDHEC regarding monitoring for the HLW program under 3116. He read from a memo from Dr. Couch of GADNR to Chairman Diaz of the NRC asking that Georgia be deemed an affected state in this matter and considered a full partner. Mr. Frazier commented on an interesting driver, the Governor announced a new customer service incentive to start July 1, being launched to ensure when citizens of Georgia ask a question about how SRS is affecting them, that GADNR can be responsive. Mr. Frazier commented that GADNR needs to be able to generate data that they have compiled through a sampling program and they need to ensure clean air, clean land, and healthy living.

Dawn Taylor, EPA, noted that addition of Appendix K to the FFA as a significant achievement. She commented that EPA is looking for the list of facilities by end of April. She also noted that EPA recently approved Appendix D and E of the FFA as well. She commented on the need for D&D efforts and area closure to proceed in lock step. Ms. Taylor also discussed P Area and monthly meetings being held to discuss this area closure. She commented that public participation is planned for this summer. Ms. Taylor introduced Arthur Collins, who replaced Annie Godfrey in the federal oversight section.

Bill Spader, DOE, commented that the FY07 budget will in fact support DOE-SR commitments. He commented that DOE does recognize D&D has to work with area completion strategy. Mr. Spader commented that SRS is continuing to work closely with SCDHEC, the Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council, and the DNFSB, leading to the start of SWPF. Mr. Spader commented that on February 7, SRS started the Modular Repackaging Program, which is important to the TRU program. It repackages transuranic drums that currently have WIPP noncompliant items. The plan is to process 2000 drums using the new unit. Mr. Spader also commented on a Tank Cleaning Technical Exchange being held in Atlanta, noting SRS is going far and wide to look at technologies for cleaning tanks. Mr. Spader further commented on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) initiative and the Center for Hydrogen Research at SRS.

### **Public Comments**

### Tom Clements, Greenpeace International

Mr. Clements noted he is from Georgia although he now live in the Washington, D.C. area. He stated he wanted to comment on one issue that really jumped out at him this morning- the revelation that plutonium will be consolidated by 2008. He stated it was not said that this would happen at SRS, but we all know that the KAMS facility may well receive from Hanford due to costs, upgrades and the design basis threat. Mr. Clements referred to a CAB recommendation noting that the CAB asked that no additional shipment be sent to SRS until five percent of the existing quantity has been disposition successfully. He noted this put the CAB in opposition to DOE's effort to get the material out of Hanford. Mr. Clements stated he had been working on this for 15 years and we still do not know where plutonium is going and where it will be disposition. He stated it is really shocking that at this point we still do not know which plutonium is going down which track. He said he hopes DOE is sincere, but the Russian program really has not moved. And this GNEP initiative has emboldened the Russians to pursue the new breeder reactor which the U.S. has said in the past it would not fund. Their light water reactor program is going no where. So if the program at SRS is on similar track, then the MOX is not on track and DOE is not going to disposition five percent by 2008. He stated this is a huge dilemma and DOE will likely be trucking Hanford plutonium down here to SRS just like the Rocky Flats plutonium – his interpretation of what will happen. Mr. Clements thanked the Board for consistently asking DOE questions about this. The public has been asking these questions for over a decade, he said. He commented this program has had no oversight and Congress has advocated this role. He encouraged the CAB to keep up the work trying to get answers from DOE.

### Chair Update

Karen Patterson noted her view of her role as CAB Chair. She stated that basically, the Chair of the CAB is an administrative position, to ensure the issues committees and issues-based chairs have an easy time doing their jobs. She stated she would not have taken this job if she had to give up her technical role on the Board. Ms. Patterson commented that when she is in committee meetings, she is acting as person in committee, as 1/25<sup>th</sup> of the CAB. Donna Antonucci commented she sees herself as a support person for the Chair. She is very interested in public involvement.

### Facilitator Update

Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). There are two recommendations pending, 30 open and 195 closed. Mr. Schoener announced that an Education Retreat would be held October 12-13 in Charleston, S.C. He also presented the SRS CAB Public Comment Policy (see attachment).

### Strategic & Legacy Management Committee

Concerned that the President's budget for FY07 will be insufficient to meet the goals for accelerated clean up of the SRS, the SRS CAB recommended that DOE-SR present how the

President's FY07 Budget will affect or impact accelerated cleanup goals; identify potential impacts to current workforce levels (operational, technical and management); and provide a list of EM programs impacted, especially those committed to in the FFA. They further recommended that DOE-HQ request appropriate Congressional actions to provide SRS FY07 funding levels to rectify any shortcomings identified. The Board also asked DOE-SR to present to the SRS CAB potential secondary funding sources to offset the FY 07 shortfall and they asked to be given the opportunity to once again be involved early on in the budget process. They requested these actions be taken by May 22, 2006. Wade Waters moved the Board adopt the recommendation and Gerald Devitt seconded. The motion passed unanimously with 23 members in favor.

### **Administrative Committee Report**

Meryl Alalof presented a proposal to amend the bylaws that had been tabled during the January CAB meeting for further consideration by the Administrative Committee. The proposal was presented as follows:

#### **Section 7.4 Individuals Ineligible for Board Membership**

b) In general, *current* employees of *the Agencies* are not eligible for membership on the Board. However, an employee of *an Agency DOE* contractor may qualify for Board membership if such employee successfully shows that his/her presence on the Board would not result in a conflict of interest. In any event there shall be no more than *two total* membership positions on the Board held by employees of *Agency* contractors at SRS.

Leon Chavous moved the board accept the proposed amendment and Mary Drye seconded.

The motion carried with 22 members in favor and one abstention by Kuppuswamy Jayaraman, who cited ignorance regarding issue as his reason for abstaining.

Ms. Alalof also presented a summary of the SRS CAB FY06 budget expenditures to date (see attachment).

### **Public Comments**

#### **Tom Clements, Nuclear Watch South**

Mr. Clements commented on the HLW draft motion. He stated it raised a few concerns and strikes him that being concerned about the environment and the impact of this program, DOE says 3-5 million curies would be grouted and permanently left in place during the interim process before SWPF starts up in 2011, so it seems to him it would be a good thing to ask how many curies of radiation per year DOE plans to grout and leave in place. He questioned what happens if SWPF does not startup in 2011. Can we expect further delays and what if they don't come up with the technology, he asked. This has very disturbing implications as to what would happen with the material. Mr. Clements stated he had not heard at this meeting that there was a firm commitment that SWPF would start up in 2011. He stated he is concerned

about how much more material may go into the grout if it is delayed. He also questioned the endurance of grout, admitting he didn't know much about this, but someone needs to ask DOE about the durability and longevity of the grout itself. There may not be a lot of research on this, he added. Lastly, Mr. Clements commented on the monitoring program as they put more material into grout and asked what that actually consists of. He questioned the groundwater impacts from that storage facility. Mr. Clements read a statement "DOE is currently developing a revised implementation approach to interim processing strategy that will address the tank space needs," in the CAB resolution. He stated he was not sure what all the drivers are for needing more tank space. Obviously, the tanks are old and they need to receive wash back into tanks, and be able to move wash around due to leaks and such, but with GNEP coming, where will the waste go from any demonstration facility or from F Canyon if it were chosen as an alternative, he asked. He stated he is curious if one of the drivers is a new program that will increase the waste burden at SRS at a time when we still don't have solutions to the materials we have here now. Mr. Clements commented that if GNEP does move and there is a large facility, then there will be a massive amount of waste from a thousand metric ton facility that would be generated and obviously, we would need new tanks and lots of spent fuel would come into the state, but the demonstration facility, a 20-ton facility with commercial light water reactor fuel would have high level waste impacts and the CAB needs to be asking about that.

Bob Meisenheimer, CAB Member

Mr. Meisenheimer commented on CAB concerns regarding SWPF and promised keep track of information.

Joe Ortaldo, CAB Member

Mr. Ortaldo commented on NRC involvement in grout performance and performance monitoring at SRS.

Tiajuana Cochauer, USDA Forest Service

Ms. Cochauer introduced Keith Lawrence as the new USDA Forest Service Manager at SRS.

**WSRC Liquid Waste Operations**

Bill Poulson, WSRC Executive Vice President, provided an overview of WSRC Liquid Waste Operations, the mission of which is to safely dispose of legacy waste, stabilize waste tanks and close the remaining 49 tanks. He discussed the SRS liquid waste system from the tank farm to sludge and salt processing to the Defense Waste Processing Facility and ultimately disposal in a federal repository.

There are two tank farms that hold approximately 37 million gallons of waste. Waste removal prepares tanks for closure. SRS is using innovative approaches, such as waste on wheels to

remove waste. Currently, there are active operations in progress on four tanks. Two tanks have been closed and two more are ready for closure. The Defense Waste Processing Facility stabilizes the highest risk waste at SRS into canisters about 10 feet tall by two feet in diameter. It began operations in 1996 and to date, more than 2000 canisters have been produced. Mr. Poulson discussed the Glass Waste Storage Buildings at SRS. The buildings have sufficient capacity to handle the next 10-12 years of DWPF production.

Mr. Poulson discussed interim salt processing disposition. Two steps are planned. Deliquification, Dissolution and Adjustment is planned to startup in July 2006 to separate liquid and solid phases. Cesium stays with the liquid and is processed through DWPF. Actinide Removal Processing is being constructed in an existing facility and is scheduled to come on line in 2007 to provide high efficiency removal of radionuclides such as plutonium, neptunium and strontium. The Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit will remove cesium from salt waste for disposition through DWPF and is scheduled to come on line in 2007.

Mr. Poulson responded to questions regarding similarities between the MCU and SWPF technology; information exchange; and when sludge would no longer be available for DWPF pending the SWPF coming online. Sludge processing will become an issue in 2008. Board members also questioned the need for new tanks at SRS. Karen Patterson questioned the firewall between WSRC working on MCU and Parsons working on SWPF since they could be future competitors. As a taxpayer, she wanted to ensure the MCU and SWPF processing were the same. Mr. Poulson responded there is an exchange of information -visiting and using the same vendors and same prototypes so that both parties have the benefit of what's been found during vendor tests. Bill Spader commented there is a sharing of information among the various companies and there is a benefit of MCU relative to the design of SWPF. Ms. Patterson stated that the fact that MCU works doesn't necessarily mean SWPF will work. Mr. Spader agreed that scale up is always a tough issue, but it does not preclude learning from a smaller scale facility. Terry Spears, DOE, commented that the caustic side solvent extraction processes are the same. This was a technology developed in the DOE labs for cesium removal and built into the design of the SWPF and is the exact same part of the MCU and DOE has recognized over the years to opportunity for collaboration between WSRC and Parsons, which is mutually beneficial to SRS. Joe Ortaldo noted that MCU will demonstrate the basic technology with real waste. Terry Spears commented that MCU is 1/6 of what the SWPF will deliver long term, so it will get less radioactivity out, but this technology allows DOE to move forward with salt disposition while they wait on SWPF.

### **Waste Management Committee Report**

Manuel Bettencourt presented the draft motion regarding transuranic waste (see attachment). In an effort to ensure that the SRS TRU program stays on track and the removal of all legacy TRU wastes from SRS occurs by 2013, the SRS CAB recommended that DOE-HQ commit the necessary funding for the large box characterization equipment to be operational by the end of FY 2007 and report the status of the funding and required operator training. They also asked DOE-SR to identify ways to increase the packing efficiencies of TRUPACT-II containers

system wide. The Board also recommended that DOE-HQ continue to work on ways to increase the overall operational efficiencies (including effective utilization of space) of WIPP and that DOE-SR provide an update to the SRS CAB to make them aware of potential operational bottlenecks at WIPP which may impact SRS TRU waste shipments. They requested the above actions as well as for DOE-HQ to arrange for appropriate personnel to present the status of SRS equipment certification and SRS operator certification by October 1, 2006. Wade Waters moved the Board adopt the motion and Gloria Williams-Way seconded. The motion carried by a unanimous vote of 23 members in favor.

Bob Meisenheimer presented a draft motion titled SWPF Decision – HLW Disposition Program Systems (see attachment). As DOE is currently developing a revised approach for interim salt processing that will address tank space needs and work on closing the gap associated with the SWPF and delays necessitated by design changes, the SRS CAB asked DOE-SR to recommit to starting up the deliquification, dissolution, and adjustment (DDA) process by July 1, 2006, and recommit to closing tanks 18 and 19 by the end of FY07. They recommended that DOE-SR adopt quantitative risk and cost-benefit analysis procedures and documentation as part of the decision making in HLW management and that DOE adopt a systems approach in decision making in HLW management, performing risk and cost-benefit analyses on all affected systems influenced by that decision.

The SRS CAB also recommended that DOE-SR consider other possible options for increasing tank capacity during the period prior to operation of SWPF. Such options could include replacing Tank 50, the Saltstone feed tank, with an above ground storage tank and returning Tank 50 to high level waste service. Finally, the Board recommended that DOE commit to sufficient funding for satisfactory completion of the SWPF project and the key corollary HLW treatment operations. Jerry Devitt moved the Board adopt the motion and Gloria Williams-Way seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 23 members in favor.

### Handouts

SRS CAB March 27-28, 2006 Agenda

Environmental Management FY2007 Budget Request, Jim Buice, DOE

President's FY07 SRS Budget Shortfall, Jimmy Mackey, CAB

HLW Systems Approach, Robert Meisenheimer, CAB

SRS TRU Waste Update, Manuel Bettencourt, CAB

Integration of D&D and Soils and Groundwater Appendix K, Mary Flora, WSRC

SRS Gold Metrics

SRS CAB Recommendation Summary Report

SRS CAB Policy Regarding Public Comment Periods

Final President's FY07 SRS Budget Shortfall, Jimmy Mackey, CAB

WSRC Liquid Waste Operations, Bill Poulson, WSRC

Summary of Proposal to Amend the SRS CAB Bylaws, Meryl Alalof, CAB

SRS CAB FY06 Budget Summary, Meryl Alalof, CAB

Final SWPF Decision-HLW Disposition Program Systems, Robert Meisenheimer, CAB

Final SRS TRU Waste Update, Manuel Bettencourt, CAB

NEPA Report