



September 1995 Meeting Minutes

SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

Beaufort, S.C.

Members Present

Members present were Thomas Costikyan, June Fogle, Alice Hollingsworth, Thelonius Jones, Bill Lawless, Ann Loadholt, Mildred McClain, Larry McKinney, JoAnn Nestor, Kamalakar Raut, Andrew Rea, Bob Slay, P.K. Smith, Pat Tousignant, Beaurine Wilkins and Vernon Zinnerman. Ex-Officio Representatives were Tom Heenan and Ann Ragan.

Members absent were Anne Brown, Lenola Cooks, Thomas Greene, Walter Jones, Kathryn May and Lane Parker. Currently, there are three Board vacancies. Camilla Warren and 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 DOE Designated Federal Official present was Tom Heenan.

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

J. Walter Joseph of Aiken, S.C. served as the CAB Facilitator.

Key Decisions Made by Board

The Board reached consensus on a nine-part recommendation regarding the future uses of the Savannah River Site.

Following the results of an independent scientific peer review, the Board recommended implementation of Phase I of the F&H groundwater remediation project.

The Board recommended the three agencies cooperate to reach consensus on the development, implementation and annual update of a long-term comprehensive strategic plan to remediate SRS.

Bill Donaldson of Tybee Island, Ga. and Kevin Reed of Martinez, Ga. were elected as replacement Board members.

Kathryn May was named co-chair of the Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Program Subcommittee and Vernon Zinnerman was elected chairperson of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the July 25, 1995 Board meeting were approved with minor changes.

Walt Joseph, Board facilitator discussed a special session held Monday, September 25 from 1-5 p.m. in which Board members identified concerns and issues and then prioritized issues by dot voting. He said that members discussed ways to improve Board operations and identified solutions to the top five concerns. The following were noted as the top five issues for resolution: lack of member commitment; lack of trust; too few members doing subcommittee work; representation of Board views; and respect for fellow Board members.

Risk Management & Future Use Subcommittee Recommendations

Walt Joseph presented the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee recommendation since a chair for this subcommittee would not be elected until later in the day. He discussed the Vision, an eight-part recommendation, an additional separate recommendation and a map (see attached).

The Board discussed the various components of the recommendation. Following discussion regarding requirements for cleanup to residential standards, the Board decided to strike the third bullet under part (3) of the recommendation. The Board also decided to strengthen the recommendation by replacing the word "should" with "shall" where appropriate.

Much discussion pursued regarding part (8) and actively promoting recreational opportunities. There was question whether the Board should be suggesting specific activities. The Board decided to take out descriptive language, condense the first two bullets in part (8) and delete the third bullet. Bullet one now reads "Current recreational activities can and should be expanded" and bullet two states "Other recreational activities should be considered with appropriate restrictions."

Walt Joseph presented the ninth part of the recommendation stating it was to be a stand-alone recommendation, however following the most recent subcommittee meeting, it was to be consolidated into the overall nine-part recommendation. He stated that part (9) grew from comments received at public meetings. Discussion revolved around how the government would trace former residents and how individuals could prove they were descendants of former landowners. There was also discussion regarding the definition of former owner and the need to be more specific. For clarification, the Board decided to change "former residents" to "former landowners (1950-1952)" and deleted the bullets beneath this section of the recommendation.

The Board recognized the contributions of two citizens, Todd Crawford and Dave Christensen, for their work with the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee and thanked Vernon Zinnerman for taking on an active role when the subcommittee was without a chairperson.

Following public comments, **Vernon Zinnerman moved the Board accept the nine-part future use recommendation as amended. Ann Loadholt seconded the motion. The Board unanimously adopted the nine-part recommendation regarding future uses of SRS and the subcommittee agreed to meet at a later date to revise support documentation for Board approval and transmittal in late November.**

Public Comments on RM&FU Subcommittee Recommendation

Brian Costner of the Energy Research Foundation in Columbia, S.C. asked for clarification on what the Board was intending to present to the agencies. At this time, Mr. Costner was told that the Vision document would be revised and transmitted with the nine-part recommendation by the end of October. *(It was determined later the Board would be sending the two-page recommendation and that the support documentation would be revised to reflect the nine-part recommendation at a later date.)*

Mr. Costner stated that one of his concerns had been the degree of balance between economic development and environmental protection issues, but that with the many changes that had taken place in the past 24 hours, the language had improved. Mr. Costner asked if he could submit written comments regarding the recommendation and was told he could if he provided them quickly. He then made a few verbal comments that the Board seemed to be deciding the degree to which the recommendation should be a policy recommendation or more prescriptive. He said he preferred using "should" rather than "shall" in the recommendation because of the degree of detail work that has gone into a number of elements of this recommendation. In particular, he mentioned the degree to which the Board members have discussed and come to an understanding of these issues and that it is more appropriate for the Board to be making a policy-level recommendation.

For instance, Mr. Costner stated the fundamental premise of this recommendation is that the federal government should maintain ownership of the full SRS property. He said this call, which currently belongs to the Department of Energy, brings about questions concerning what role the Board wants the federal government to play. He said the government is responsible for much of the contamination at SRS and asked the Board if it believes it is the federal government's responsibility as stewards of the land to try to remediate it. He again cautioned the Board about using the word "should" instead of shall in appropriate locations throughout the text. He said the detail work should be left to others.

Also of concern to Mr. Costner was the inclusion of language asking that a third of the site property be within an industrial zone. He said a prescriptive map was being sent along with the recommendation that essentially draws industrial lines and cautioned the Board to be careful about presenting a map that says this is how things should be. He cited examples of areas within and without the industrial zone that were not appropriately located. He stated that traditionally about ten percent of the site land has been impacted and said he hoped the Board would make it clear that within those industrial zones, the first preference for the location of new facilities ought to generally be as close as possible to areas that have already been impacted. He said he hoped it is also made clear that when there is no existing contamination within an industrial

zone, that ecological and environmental standards are not lowered because a map shows this area falls within an industrial zone.

Todd Crawford said he had been heavily involved with the development of the recommendation and recognized how it has evolved. He said that although there has been a great deal of wordsmithing, the general intent has remained the same. He said he still strongly supports it and that many of Mr. Costner's concerns just expressed were covered by the support documentation to the recommendation. Mr. Crawford pointed out the last sentence of part 2 of the recommendation as reworded was too prescriptive, and he felt the original wording was more appropriate.

Environmental Remediation & Waste Management (ER & WM) Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Co-chair Bill Lawless presented comments on a draft Risk Report to Congress (see attached) stating that all Board members had received a copy of this document by mail and that his subcommittee had prepared written comments. He asked the Board to approve and forward the comments as Board-endorsed. Pat Tousignant moved the Board forward the comments as written. Larry McKinney seconded the motion. The Board decided to forward the comments by a unanimous show of hands.

Bill Lawless then presented a draft scope of work for technical assistance support (see attached). Mr. Lawless stated technical assistance was necessary to provide independent reviews of the many topics being researched by the ER&WM Subcommittee, as well as the other issue-based subcommittees. Discussion revolved around such issues as how experts will be determined and the need to receive technical assistance from a variety of sources. Board members discussed evaluation criteria and determined that two scopes of work were probably appropriate for the Board's needs- one to provide independent scientific advice and another to provide peer reviews. The Board voted to table the draft scope of work for further subcommittee consideration by a vote of nine in favor, one opposed and three abstentions.

Dr. Joel Massmann of the University of Washington presented the Draft Final Report for the Independent Scientific Peer Review of Groundwater Remediation Technologies-Evaluation of Proposed Groundwater Corrective Actions at F and H Area Seepage Basin (see attached). (The final report is due October 15, 1995.) Dr. Massmann discussed the development and intent of the draft and final report; the makeup of the review team, the statement of work for the review, the proposed corrective action phases; and the review team's recommendations regarding the proposed actions (see attached slides). He provided a description of the groundwater contamination at F and H Areas and an explanation of the mechanics of the proposed groundwater treatment technology. He also discussed Renate Kimbrough's (one of the review team members) perspective regarding health effects stating that if there is no on-site exposure, no on-site effects, and no human health effect, then there is no need for corrective action based on health risk calculations.

Dr. Massmann concluded with the review team recommendations, essentially to proceed with the design and construction of the water treatment plan as currently proposed with the exception that

any treatment process whose sole purpose is salt removal be eliminated from the water treatment system in Phase I, and a test of the effects of salt injection on aquifer permeability and injection well efficiency be conducted. Also, while SRS should proceed with Phase I, the Site should evaluate with the regulators, various ways to meet the intent of the environmental regulations to determine Phase II remediation goals, he said.

Following Dr. Massmann's report, Bill Lawless introduced two motions for the Board's consideration (see attached). **Ann Loadholt moved the Board adopt Motion 1 to implement Phase I of the F&H groundwater remediation project. Larry McKinney seconded. The motion passed with 14 members in favor and one abstention.**

JoAnn Nestor moved the Board adopt Motion 2 that the three agencies cooperate to reach consensus on the development, implementation and annual update of a long-term comprehensive strategic plan to remediate SRS. Alice Hollingsworth seconded. Discussion revolved around current plans, such as the Federal Facility Agreement and the need for an overall strategic plan. Ann Ragan of SCDHEC stated the Board was asking the agencies to duplicate a current document in the first section of this motion and may be making a request beyond SCDHEC's ability to participate in the second section. She did not want the Board to be surprised by the agency's response if this recommendation passed. **The motion passed with 11 Board members in favor, two opposed and three abstentions.**

Agency Updates

Tom Heenan of DOE reported that both reviews called for in the Board's Recommendation No. 4 are underway. He said the waste drum retrieval project review would begin in early October and the blue ribbon panel had been established and would have its initial meeting on Nov. 13. He also announced that the site-specific Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Record of Decision had been signed and SRS was proceeding on a middle path. He said a Waste Management Programmatic EIS had been approved by the Secretary and was currently available for a 30-day public comment period. He invited Board members to attend an Oct. 17 videoconference regarding the EIS and stated an issue paper had been provided to the Board.

Ann Ragan of SCDHEC stated the agencies were close to reaching agreement on ER priorities under dispute in the Federal Facility Agreement. She stated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act permit had been issued following a public meeting and would be effective Oct. 1. As a point of interest, she also discussed other federal facility Restoration Advisory Boards (RABs) operating in South Carolina. She said three Boards were currently operating at Charleston Naval, Myrtle Beach Air Force Base and Shaw Air Force Base. She encouraged the Boards to learn from one another and attend RAB meetings if possible.

Facilitator Update

Walt Joseph announced that Joan Moser had been hired to provide administrative assistance to the Board. He also stated he was attending all issues-based subcommittee meetings to provide a liaison between the three subcommittees. He also asked Board members to distribute CAB brochures and membership applications.

Membership Replacement Election and Subcommittee Report

Two replacement Board members were elected by silent ballot. **Bill Donaldson of Tybee Island, Ga. was elected to fill the position of general public stakeholder representing the politically or economically disadvantaged (previously held by Myles Grant) and Kevin Reed of Martinez, Ga. was elected to fill the vacant position previously held by Julie Arbogast as a labor representative.**

Nominations/Elections Subcommittee Report

Kathryn May was named co-chair of the Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Program Subcommittee and Vernon Zinnerman was elected chairperson of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee.

Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee Report

Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee Chair Tom Costikyan reminded the Board that the subcommittee is currently conducting research regarding plutonium disposition. He said the subcommittee was preparing to provide comments on an upcoming environmental impact statement that addresses this issue. He then briefly described the current inventory of plutonium pits, how they are being stored and options for disposition. He said that due to the technical and global nature of this issue, the subcommittee hoped to quickly identify a technical advisor to assist in explaining risks and uncertainties to aid in preparing recommendations for Board consideration.

Administrative Items

Mildred McClain and Bob Slay will step down as Board Chairpersons as of January 1996.

JoAnn Nestor reminded the Board an annual report was required by the Bylaws and the Education Subcommittee was tasked with developing this report.

Public Comments

The following public comments were received during the September 26 public comment session:

Charles Powers, Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation

Mr. Powers stated he had been attending CAB meetings and had discussions with the various issue-based subcommittee chairs and hopes to listen, learn and provide useful recommendations to DOE regarding stakeholder participation. He said the consortium provides two functions, one being operational and the other a peer review function. *(Mr. Powers was invited to present at the next CAB meeting.)*

The following public comments were received at the September 25 public meeting:

Bob Newman, Fripp Island, S.C.

Mr. Newman stated he had attended an early nuclear materials management subcommittee meeting, heard about the handling of plutonium and received a fair amount of background. He suggested that although unpopular, it would be interesting to ask DOE-Headquarters for a list of facilities built but never used for their intended purpose. He stated that Hanford had proposed start-up of a 20-year old plant and understood SRS had a similar facility called Saltstone. He suggested that until it is decided what is to be done with spent nuclear fuel (a valuable energy source), it should first be decided where it is going and why. He said a cost benefit analysis should be conducted. Mr. Newman further stated that protection of the environment and national security cost money and that a contractor should have finite objectives, budgets and schedules. He said that if they do not then DOE should get rid of them.

George Minot, Hilton Head Island, S.C.

Mr. Minot took exception to the fact that he was not properly notified of the Board's activities. He strongly suggested the Board look for better ways of getting the word out. He also asked for and was provided an update regarding a current shipment of spent nuclear fuel rods. He was told there was to be a briefing to the governor's office the next week and that the shipment's expected port of entry was Sunny Point in Wilmington, N.C. and then transfer by rail to SRS in late Oct. to early Nov.

Handouts

- SRS Citizens Advisory Board Meeting Agenda, September 26, 1995
- SRS CAB Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee Recommendation slides
- Draft Vision, Future Land Use - Savannah River Site
- Comments on Department of Energy Environmental Management Draft Risk Report to Congress, Bill Lawless
- Draft Scope of Work, SRS CAB Technical Assistance Support, Bill Lawless
- Draft Final Report, Independent Scientific Peer Review of Groundwater Remediation Technologies slides, Dr. Joel Massmann
- Draft Final Report, Independent Scientific Peer Review of Groundwater Remediation Technologies dated September 16, 1995.
- ER&WM Subcommittee Motion 1 dated September 26, 1995, Bill Lawless
- ER&WM Subcommittee Motion 2 dated September 26, 1995, Bill Lawless
- CAB Recommendations Summary
- SRS CAB 1995 Membership Solicitation Campaign
- EIS Citizens Advisory Board Monthly Report
- SRS CAB Public Comment Tracking Database Summary
- Letter from Thomas P. Grumbly dated September 1, 1995, with List of Questions and Answers, National Stakeholder's Budget Conference
- U.S. DOE Draft Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Summary dated August 1995