



# **October 1994 Meeting Minutes**

## **SRS Citizen's Advisory Board**

**Aiken, S.C.**

---

### **Members Present**

Members present were Julie Arbogast, Anne Brown, Lenola Cooks, Thomas Costikyan, Brian Costner, Myles Grant, Thomas Greene, Rachael Harper, Alice Hollingsworth, Thelonius Jones, Walter Jones, William Lawless, Ann Loadholt, Kathryn May, Mildred McClain, JoAnn Nestor, Lane Parker, Kamalakar Raut, Robert Slay, Patricia Tousignant and Beaurine Wilkins. Ex-Officio Representatives were Thomas Heenan, Steve Richardson, Ann Ragan and Camilla Warren.

Members absent were Harry Jue, Andrew Rea, P.K. Smith and Moses Todd. Jeff Crane of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Myra Reece of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) were not in attendance. The Department of Energy (DOE) Designated Federal Official present was Thomas Heenan.

This meeting was open to the public and posted in the Federal Register in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

### **Key Decisions Made by Board**

The Board approved its first recommendation to DOE. In summary, it stated that significant environmental documents, such as the site's annual environmental report, should receive an appropriate level of independent technical review before being published.

The Board accepted the first draft of the operating guidelines for the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee.

Two new issue-based subcommittees on the Environmental Remediation Program/Health Effects and Nuclear Materials Management/Health Effects were established.

The Board declared the position held by Moses Todd vacant.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the August 23 and September 27, 1994, CAB meetings were approved with minor changes.

## **Agency Updates**

Camilla Warren reported that EPA had been invited to the Consortium for Environmental Risk Evaluation workshop held Oct. 18 and 19 in Phoenix, Arizona, but due to budget constraints, did not attend. She also stated that EPA had commented on a recent report issued by the General Accounting Office on a national strategy for cleanup. She stated that her office was working closely with Tom Heenan's staff on regulatory and compliance schedules. Camilla Warren also stated she was working with the Federal Facilities Dialogue Committee. She stated she works with one group, which focuses on cleanup, priorities and funding, and that Mildred McClain works another part of the committee, the stakeholder involvement group.

Ann Ragan of SCDHEC reminded the Board of the many environmental impact statements available for public comment and asked Board members to look at the broad scope of these documents and how they will affect all issues at SRS. (A list of EIS schedules was distributed later in the meeting. See attached)

She also reported that Records of Decision for the TNX Groundwater and D Area Oil Seepage Basin waste units were to be signed by Oct. 30.

Tom Heenan of DOE referred the Board to a calendar of upcoming public participation activities, noting the Future Use Workshop to be held Nov. 1 in North Augusta, S.C. He stated this was an important workshop that will aid in finalizing the public involvement process for future use issues at SRS. He said a calendar of public involvement events would be provided to the Board monthly (see attached).

## **Strategic Plan for Spent Nuclear Fuel**

John Jicha, Director of the Office of Spent Fuel Management at DOE-Headquarters, gave an overview of the Strategic Plan for the Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Program (see attached). He said that DOE is working to establish an effective stakeholder involvement process in this program. Mr. Jicha discussed the amount of SNF in the United States and where it is located. He also discussed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews that drive the program. He presented a path forward for DOE-owned SNF and the NEPA activities associated with this strategy.

Mr. Jicha stated the mission of the SNF Program is to safely, reliably and efficiently manage DOE-owned SNF and to prepare it for permanent disposal. He also discussed the objectives of the program and the key issues involved. He asked for feedback from the CAB and said DOE welcomes their involvement in the program as well as their ideas for involving more stakeholders.

For a summary of the questions and answers during this presentation, see Appendix A.

## **Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative**

Susan Payne, executive director of the Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative (SRRDI) gave an overview of the organization and stated the mission of SRRDI is to promote, coordinate and partner with existing agencies to ensure economic diversification in a two-state region and to support an expanded mission for SRS. She discussed how a 1993 SRS Workforce Restructuring Plan affected the region and how SRRDI helps provide a solution for regional problems. She stated SRRDI is a private, non-profit, economic development agency consisting of 22 members who were politically appointed. She stated DOE provided \$6 million in funding to SRRDI.

Susan Payne discussed SRRDI community projects, such as the Southeastern Technology Center, which will study waste remediation technologies; the Savannah River Research Campus, which will conduct hydrogen research; and the Barnwell Center for Materials Management, which will consider recycling of contaminated stainless steel. She also provided examples of how SRS can work with local counties in solving problems. She stated the Augusta Water Works experienced problems with low oxygenated water that couldn't support fish or life systems and that through access to SRS technologies, this problem was solved using water lilies and wetlands. She also discussed the Three Rivers Solid Waste Authority and how this group, which represents nine local counties, is working with SRS to build a waste management park at the site to research landfill problems, particularly the large number of tires which pose unique problems. She asked the CAB to encourage technology transfer and to add economic development to its consideration and decision-making process.

For a summary of the questions and answers during this presentation, see Appendix A.

### **Motion Submitted by Thelonius Jones**

Thelonius Jones requested that Board members endorse Governor Carroll Campbell's position regarding foreign spent nuclear fuel at SRS. South Carolina has sued DOE to stop incoming shipments until ultimate disposition of the fuel is addressed. He made a motion the Board provide a recommendation to DOE that SNF not be brought to SRS for interim storage for fear that it would become permanently stored there, and, in effect, SRS would become a dumping ground for SNF. Beaurine Wilkins seconded the motion. Several Board members wanted more definite information regarding Governor Campbell's position and stated they were uncomfortable endorsing a position without a clear understanding of the specifics regarding the Governor's position.

Brian Costner offered an amended motion that the SRS CAB is concerned about SRS potentially becoming a repository for SNF, therefore the CAB should recommend DOE expedite its strategic planning efforts for SNF management with an emphasis on enhancing public participation and addressing technical questions regarding options for SNF management and disposition. Tom Greene moved to table the motion until the Governor's office could be contacted for more information. Julie Arbogast seconded the motion. The motion was tabled by a vote of 14 members in favor, two opposed and four abstaining. *(Following the meeting, Mr. Jones asked that this motion remain tabled since the Board created a Nuclear Materials Management subcommittee which would focus on SNF issues.)*

## **Motion Submitted by Bill Lawless**

Bill Lawless stated his belief that the CAB recognizes the value of independent technical review of documents as a means of improving quality and credibility. **He moved the CAB recommend that significant environmental documents produced by SRS, such as the Site's annual Environmental Monitoring Report, receive an appropriate level of independent technical review before being published as final. He stated, in this regard, the independent review of the Environmental Monitoring Report provided by the Westinghouse Environmental Advisory Committee should continue. He moved that to permit DOE to claim satisfactory independent technical review, the independent technical review panels should formally state their approval to publish the documents as final.**

Bill Lawless stated he had revised his motion to recognize ongoing independent peer reviews at SRS but to make them more formal. Dr. Todd Crawford, a retired SRS employee, answered questions about the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC), which was formed in 1983 to provide technical input to SRS focusing on environmental issues. He stated the EAC had been involved with the Environmental Report for 10 years, reviewing the document prior to publication, but that no formal approval had ever been made.

Board members questioned funding for independent peer reviews and questioned who selected the scientists that participated on review panels. Pat Tousignant stated that the organization controlling the purse strings may have control over the results of a review. Bill Lawless stated there were many tough issues, but that he was trying to get the principle formalized and funding could be worried about later. Following clarifying questions, **Tom Greene seconded the motion.**

Mildred McClain stated that community people and African Americans should not be precluded from review panels. Thelonius Jones stated he was concerned about the independence of review panels.

**Bill Lawless' motion carried with a vote of 13 in favor, none opposed and seven abstaining.**

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

Brian Costner, chairman of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee, presented draft operating guidelines for this subcommittee (see attached). He stated several revisions had been made following the previous evening's subcommittee meeting. He asked for feedback from the CAB, stating he was looking for a strong sense of how the Board wanted this subcommittee to operate prior to the Nov.1 Future Use Workshop, since an important part of that workshop would focus on public involvement and the role of the CAB in the future use decision-making process.

Mr. Costner discussed membership of the subcommittee and how it is limited to members of the CAB by the Federal Advisory Committee Act. He stated that 95 people were on distribution to receive information about this subcommittee and that the majority of these people were in the Aiken/Augusta area and had attended at least one subcommittee meeting. He discussed how the

meetings would be recorded, voting procedures, the role of the chair and the gathering and sharing of information.

Mr. Costner then discussed developing possible CAB recommendations and stated that by the end of 1995, the sites must provide Tom Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, with stakeholder options for future use. He said the goal of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee is to develop a slate with a proposed set of recommendations for future use of SRS and bring this to the Board. He stated one way to accomplish this was by forming a working group which would be for information exchange only and involve non CAB members from the general public who want to participate. He stated the subcommittee of CAB members would actually craft recommendations and bring them before the Board.

Camilla Warren stated that it should be made clear to the general public participating in a working group that they can always make independent recommendations to the agencies. She said they should be encouraged to provide their own comments.

Bob Slay stated his concern about subcommittees creating working groups and said that if all subcommittees operated in this manner, it would be difficult for the CAB to operate. Rachael Harper said she liked the idea of the working group and this was the intent of the original charter. Julie Arbogast stated she thought working groups were headed in the right direction. Lane Parker said he liked the idea and the fact that it encouraged public participation.

Mildred McClain questioned funding for working group members and stated she did not want to see African Americans or any community precluded from participating due to financial constraints.

Much discussion revolved around the issue of how this subcommittee is to report through the Education Subcommittee and whether issue based subcommittees should stand on their own. Some Board members felt too many subcommittees would become cumbersome. A decision was made to allow for a discussion on the definition of the relationship between subcommittees at the next Board meeting.

**The Board was in favor of incorporating the use of working groups by subcommittees by a show of hands with nine members in favor, seven opposed and four abstaining.**

**Walter Jones moved that the Board accept the first draft of the Risk Management and Future Subcommittee Operating Guidelines. Lane Parker seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 13 members in favor, none opposed and five abstaining.** Final approval of the guidelines will be sought at the next Board meeting.

## **Education Subcommittee Report**

Tom Costikyan and Kathryn May presented three issues that were proposed by the Agencies for CAB consideration (see attached). Mr. Costikyan and Ms. May then presented issues discussed by Board members at the CAB Retreat held Oct. 1-2, 1994. They then presented four issues which the Education Subcommittee recommended for CAB consideration.

Mildred McClain stated she thought health effects was missing from the list of proposed issues and felt this was a very important issue, especially to the African American community. She stated the titles of the proposed issue-based subcommittees did not attract disenfranchised communities interest or involvement. She said although the implication is that health effects and risk management would be considered by all subcommittees, she would feel more comfortable if either the titles reflected health effects in an easily understood manner, or a separate subcommittee be created that dealt solely with health effects. The Board agreed to add health effects to the titles of the proposed issue-based subcommittees.

The Board discussed the recommended Environmental Remediation Program and Long Range Vision issue. Several Board members felt that this issue should be selected since it is a focal point of the CAB's charter. Others felt the Long Range Vision portion of this issue is related to the Future Use Subcommittee's work and should be separated from the Environmental Remediation Program issue.

**The Board decided by a show of hands to focus on two new issues, the Environmental Remediation Program and Long Range Vision and Nuclear Materials Management (new titles to be developed as discussed above).** Thirteen Board members favored the Environmental Remediation Program, eight the Waste Storage/Disposal/Treatment issue and fourteen favored Nuclear Materials Management.

**Lane Parker moved that subcommittees be established for the two issues of focus. Walter Jones seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to establish subcommittees for the Environmental Remediation Program and Long Range Vision and Nuclear Materials Management.**

**JoAnn Nestor moved that Long Range Vision be reassigned to the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee. Lane Parker seconded the motion. The motion carried with a unanimous vote in favor.**

## **Bylaws Subcommittee Report**

Rachael Harper, chairperson of the Bylaws Subcommittee, stated she assumed there would be a third reading of the Bylaws before final approval and asked Board members their opinion. The majority thought they were voting on approval of the minutes following the second reading which was to include changes discussed at that meeting. Rachael Harper then presented two changes to the Bylaws as discussed on August 23. **Tom Greene moved that the Bylaws be reprinted in final with the changes. Myles Grant seconded the motion and it carried with a unanimous vote by the Board.**

## **Membership Replacement Subcommittee**

Beaurine Wilkins, chairperson of the Membership Replacement Subcommittee, stated they were in the process of determining the proper criteria for replacing Moses Todd. She also stated that one Board member had missed three consecutive meetings and would be contacted to determine

if he is still interested in serving. She also asked for a show of hands of Board members who had elected two year membership terms.

Mildred McClain said it was the intent of the original charter to have 10 African Americans serving on the CAB. Rachael Harper said the Bylaws called for at least eight African Americans. Board members agreed to discuss this issue following the meeting.

**Tom Costikyan moved that Moses Todd's position be declared officially vacant. Tom Greene seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.**

## **Nominations and Elections Subcommittee**

Subcommittee chairperson Ann Loadholt said the Board needed to appoint a permanent chair and vice chair. Ms. Loadholt said procedures must be in place to do this and requested time on the next meeting agenda to present operating procedures. She asked members interested in chairing the Board to please let the subcommittee know and cautioned them about the time and availability requirements that go with the job.

## **Budget Subcommittee**

Tom Greene, chairperson for the Budget Subcommittee, reported that a request for proposals was released by Westinghouse Savannah River Company to procure a facilitator for the Board and that resumes were due shortly. He stated he, Bob Slay and Mildred McClain would review the resumes.

## **Administrative Items**

Bob Slay stated that each DOE site specific advisory board had been asked to choose one representative to help DOE-Headquarters develop evaluation criteria for the boards. He stated that he and Mildred McClain had discussed this and if there were no objections, Anne Brown would represent the CAB. There were no objections.

Bob Slay also stated that there was now a mechanism in place to deal with compensation and for Board members to see Virginia Gardner of DOE to make application for compensation. He stated all other boards are in the same position regarding the compensation issue.

## **Public Comments**

Commentor: Bob Overman

Mr. Overman discussed his concerns with the Receiving Basin for Offsite Fuels at SRS and stated there was much radioactivity which could potentially be released to the environment. He said the way to deal with the problem is to remove the source and get fuel rods out of the water in the basin. He said these fuel rods should be processed, the waste be made into glass logs at the Defense Waste Processing Facility and other elements stored according to their chemical elements. He stated that chemical problems require chemical methods to resolve them and stated

that there has been no mention of reprocessing DOE-owned SNF. He said the problem the governor's office has with SRS accepting SNF is that SRS is only going to store rods and there is no mention of reprocessing.

Mr. Overman was informed that a Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee had been created to deal with SNF and related issues.

## **Handouts**

- "Spent Nuclear Fuel Program Strategic Plan," visuals, DOE, John J. Jicha.
- "Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative Fact Sheet," Susan Payne.
- "Draft Operating Guidelines SRS Citizen Advisory Board Subcommittee on Risk Management and Future Use," Brian Costner.
- "Citizens Advisory Board Education Subcommittee Report," visuals, Tom Costikyan and Kathryn May.
- 1994 Land-Use Baseline Report.
- "What is Spent Nuclear Fuel?" Fact Sheet.
- "Summary of CERE Workshop, October 18-19, Phoenix, AZ" Bill Lawless and Brian Costner.
- Savannah River Operations Office Strategic Plan, September 1994
- Calendar of Public Involvement Events
- Summary of Environmental Impact Statement Activities

## **Appendix A**

### **Strategic Plan for Spent Nuclear Fuel**

#### Questions and Answers

Q. How many different types of spent nuclear fuel exist?

A. There are 90 to 150 different types of nuclear fuel.

Q. Why is there such a large range?

A. Because a number of components were developed for specific types of reactors. It depends on the cladding, history and different materials involved.

Q. Are they all organic and could some be burned?

A. Some have organic compounds, such as graphite fuel, and could be burned. Many activities are being developed to look at how to treat the fuel.

Q. Why would you want to reprocess spent fuel?



A. Some type of treatment will be necessary for certain fuels before they could be put into dry storage. If we can put it into a form to be placed in the ground, we want to do so, but we want to avoid multiple treatment of the spent fuel.

Q. Are the fuels at SRS degrading?

A. Yes, some are. The plutonium targets are a good example. They are subject to National Environmental Policy Act review to see if these materials at risk should be processed or stabilized in some other way so they can go into interim storage pending a permanent repository.

Q. Does the reprocessing of spent fuel potentially create fuel for future power generation? Is that a possible incentive?

A. No, it's not the incentive. The incentive is a waste management incentive of how we get these fuels in a stable form to be stored in the interim.

Q. It is not a candidate for use in a reactor?

A. No. However you could separate the highly enriched uranium for use in the commercial sector, but it is not a strong driver since uranium is available at low cost. This is being considered and evaluated.

Q. Your strategic plan for spent fuel relies on the assumption that the capacity for dry storage exists, but is this technology even available?

A. With some fuels, dry storage has clearly been demonstrated. Commercial dry storage is ongoing across the country. There is a question on aluminum-based fuels. There are years of experience in the United Kingdom and Australia with aluminum-based fuels but we have to demonstrate the technical basis here for our fuels.

Q. The strategic plan hinges on the geological repository and there is a great deal of debate about the repository. If the citizens are successful in preventing that repository, what is the alternative for final disposition?

A. I think this site is the example of what the alternative is with the Defense Waste Processing Facility and the development of borosilicate glass, which provides a very stable long-term safe form until a permanent solution is identified.

Q. If the canyons were started today how long would it take to reprocess the 13 percent of the SNF you think should be reprocessed?

A. An initial assessment concluded 5-6 years. There are controlling factors that impact the timeframe.

Q. How large is the repository for all spent fuel? You said DOE-owned SNF would take up about 10 percent of the repository.

A. There is a legislative limit on the capacity of a first repository, not a technical limit. Congress has limited the first repository to 70,000 metric tons until a decision is made regarding a second repository. By the year 2010, the commercial fuels will exceed that limit. That is why Congress will probably address and debate this issue in the coming year.

### **Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative**

#### Questions and Answers

Q. Did you have to meet certain criteria to get funding?

A. We are setting that criteria now. DOE has provided \$6 million in funding.

Q. Are labor groups represented on your Board?

A. No.

Q. Why aren't labor groups involved?

A. There is not a position for labor unions or organizations, but that doesn't mean they cannot become involved.

Q. How were the five counties involved with this initiative identified?

A. The counties were mandated by federal legislation, according to SRS employment.

Q. Where will the Three Rivers Solid Waste Authority waste management park be located and what will be done there.

A. The park would be located at SRS. It would receive waste from nine counties. The idea is to establish a disposal and research site. This concept is still being studied; it is not definite yet.