



# **JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING OF THE RISK MANAGEMENT AND FUTURE USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEES**

OF THE

SAVANNAH RIVER SITE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

**MEETING SUMMARY  
MAY 13, 1996  
SAVANNAH, GA.**

---

A joint subcommittee meeting of the Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) and the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (ER&WM) Subcommittees of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) was held on May 13, 1996, at 7:00 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Savannah, Georgia. CAB attendees included Bill Lawless (co-chairman of the ER&WM Subcommittee), Bill Donaldson, Arthur Belge, Deborah Simone, Karen Patterson, Anne Brown, and Ann Loadoadt; other attendees included Jun Yin, Xavier University, Reginald Gougis, Xavier University, Bill Serban, Xavier University, Chequita Webb, Xavier University, S. Duplantha, Xavier University, Macklin Price, Xavier University, Sally O'Connor, Xavier University, Alan Benzar, Todd Crawford, and Dave Christensen. The representatives from the regulatory agencies included Keith Collingworth, (South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control [SCDHEC]), Jeff Crane (Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV [EPA-IV]), and Camilla Warren, EPA-IV. Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) attendees were Clay Jones, Gail Jernigan, Kim Wierzbicki, Coleman Miles, Leslie Huber, and Chris Noah. Designated Federal Officials for the Department of Energy were Brian Hennessey and Gerri Flemming.

Bill Lawless started the meeting by asking all attendees to introduce themselves. He then turned the meeting over to Chris Noah who gave a presentation on future land use activities at SRS. These activities include:

**Paulownia:** A private company is looking at possible locations at SRS to grow fast-growing trees. They may decide to collocate with the Three Rivers Authority Solid Waste Project.

**Enviro-Comp:** A private company is planning to use low-yield trees for their wood chip and composition board project. This research and development project is currently on hold as the

company is looking at alternative, non-SRS sites.

**Accelerator for the Production of Tritium:** This is one of the options being considered in the Tritium Supply Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. A decision for this alternative has not been made. Eight possible sites at SRS are being considered.

**International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER):** This multi-government project is considering the United States and the Savannah River Site as a possible location for its fusion demonstration and testing project. Other countries which are being considered are Canada, Japan, and countries in Europe.

**Huma-Soil:** This private project which was to use municipal solid waste for composting has been canceled.

**U.S. Aquaculture:** This private company was considering locating at SRS farm and process fish. The company has since changed hands and the new owner has no interest in this project.

**National Environmental Research Park designation:** The entire SRS is currently designated as a NERP through an executive order and there is pending legislation to designate the site as a NERP.

**Department of Energy projects:** MOX fuel, excess pit storage, containment building for mixed waste, and radioactive waste processing facility These projects are under consideration and preliminary investigation by the Department of Energy.

**"Co-gen" facility** Studies are being made on the A-Area Powerhouse to determine the feasibility of generating electricity while reducing solid waste.

**SEG (Scientific Ecology Group):** Portions of H, P, and M Areas are being investigated by SEG and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory for a possible radioactive waste reduction facility.

Bill Donaldson asked where the accelerator might be located in relation to the CAB's Future Use Map. Dr. Noah told the group that of the eight sites, three of the sites are in the DOE-designated industrial areas and six are within the CAB-designated industrial areas. In response to the questions, Dr. Noah explained that the ITER will only import technology from other countries; this is not a waste management project. Ann Loadholdt told the group that the "visitors center" is welcome in Barnwell County. Mr. Donaldson suggested that the site hold a "business fair" with local chambers of commerce to try to recruit new industries to the site and area. Since Kamalakar Raut did not attend the meeting, the CDC Health Studies Update was postponed to the next Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee meeting.

Bill Lawless introduced the next topic on the agenda by explaining that CAB Recommendation Number 2 broadly defined the site into two major areas for defining cleanup standards: industrial and residential. CAB Recommendation Number 8 expanded the areas to

include industrial, residential, recreational, research and development, etc. On April 2, 1996, Todd Crawford wrote a letter responding to DOE, EPA, and SCDHEC's responses to Recommendation Number 8. Dr. Crawford went over each of the points in his letter.

Keith Collingsworth explained that SCDHEC was looking at industrial zones for remediation standards and had not considered future industrial development activities at SRS. After some discussion, EPA and SCDHEC representatives said that the key for cleanup standards is institutional controls. When asked what types or kinds of industrial controls would be sufficient, they replied that only Congress could pass laws that would define the level of industrial controls and future use necessary to meet the requirements in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).

While recognizing that some of SRS waste sites will be remediated to industrial standards, the regulators maintain that a baseline risk assessment for both industrial and residential uses will continue to be required for each waste site at SRS, regardless of the location. They explained that CERCLA has nine criteria for determining cleanup levels and to evaluate these nine criteria, they need the information from a baseline risk assessment with residential remediation standards. Several participants asked the regulators about the added cost of performing additional baseline risk assessments. The regulators replied that they believed that there was minimal additional cost since the data would have been collected for the industrial baseline risk assessment; and for the residential baseline risk assessment, the numbers would be "plugged" in the model. They also stated that industrial remediation standards require some cleanup.

The regulators told the group that the CERCLA process requires public involvement and that this public involvement should include information as to what types of contamination are at the waste site, what are the risks, what is the cost of remediation, etc. SCDHEC representatives stated that the state holds other industries to certain standards for remediation and must hold federal lands to the same standards.

Brian Hennessey asked how does the baseline risk assessment for recreational standards compare to the residential standards. The regulators explained that with a residential use scenario, there is more exposure for the receptors; this exposure is also assumed to be more frequent than other scenarios over more time. Residential scenarios assume the highest amount of exposure for a population for the longest period of time. Industrial standards assumes that a receptor will be exposed eight hours per day with fewer days per year. Recreational standards vary depending on the type of recreational activity.

Participants queried the regulators on groundwater remediation. SCDHEC representatives explained that all groundwater is treated as if it were drinking water. They assume that all groundwater will discharge to surface water and that land use does not preclude groundwater remediation. Groundwater remediation requires that first the migration of the contamination must be stopped. One participant asked why was a future use map needed. Clay Jones explained that DOE is trying to preserve the site land. He further clarified this by saying that when a new land use is proposed and DOE is looking for a site, the first preference is to place

future industrial uses in current industrial areas. However, if there is not a suitable location within the current industrial areas, then possible locations are chosen while considering environmental impacts on wetlands, etc. For example, for the location of the landfill, many possible locations were examined. The final location was chosen after reviewing regulatory requirements and Three Rivers Authority specifications. Dr. Crawford said that the CAB Recommendation Number 8 Map had a large industrial area set aside. Land outside this area would have limited industrial development.

The participants concluded that all points of view were close. Throughout the discussion there had not been any problems with "what is the right thing to do." Discussion had been on the "how to" meet everyone's needs. The representatives from EPA and SCDHEC and the members of the CAB and public agreed that the cleanup standard would be as stated in CAB Recommendation Number 2 and that future development for industrial activities would be as stated in Recommendation Number 8. Camilla Warren agreed to write a letter to Todd Crawford, with a copy to the members of the CAB, to document the regulators' position which is to use Recommendation Number 2 as the basis for remediation standards. Everyone also agreed that the results of this discussion should be included in the Management Action Plan (MAP). The regulators believe that the CAB has been helpful in this process.

Dave Christensen suggested that members of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee and the CAB should be advocates for future industrialization. After additional discussion, Bill Lawless adjourned the meeting.

**Note: Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling the SRS CAB toll free number at 1-800-249-8155.**