



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Nuclear Materials Management Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

November 15, 1999
Sheraton Hotel
Charleston, SC

The Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) Nuclear Materials Management (NMM) subcommittee held a meeting on Monday, November 15, 1999 to review a Department of Energy (DOE) response to a CAB recommendation on canyon utilization and melt and dilute technology, to hear a brief summary on the K Area Material Storage (KAMS) project and to address the path forward for a recommendation on the Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

CAB Members

Tom Costikyan
Barbara Murphy
Ken Goad

Stakeholders

Tom Rolka, SCDHEC
Jim Brownlow, SCDHEC

DOE/Contractors

Charlie Anderson, DOE
Donna Martin, WSRC

Recommendation Response

As the first item on the agenda, Tom Costikyan, NMM chair, reviewed the recent DOE-SR response to Recommendation #100 on canyon utilization and the melt and dilute technology. Costikyan said he was satisfied with the response although it did not directly address the CAB's request for a formal statement from the Secretary of Energy not to close the canyons until the melt and dilute technology was proven. The response did say David Huizenga stated at the August 26 CAB NMM subcommittee meeting that the H Canyon capability would remain until the melt and dilute technology is demonstrated. The response also stated that canyon schedules would be updated and approved by the Secretary in 2000. In addition the DOE response highlighted a recent Statement of Principles signed by Secretary Richardson and Governor Jim Hodges

KAMS

Charlie Anderson, Manager, Nuclear Materials Disposition Division, DOE-MSF provided a brief update on the KAMS project, as a precursor to the formal presentation to the full CAB the next day. Costikyan first asked Anderson to define the objectives of the Actinide Storage and Packaging Facility (APSF) and if KAMS plus the 235-F Building were intended to replace APSF. Costikyan then referred to several Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) reports stating concerns with the KAMS/235-F Building storage.

Anderson said SRS personnel decided the construction of APSF should be reevaluated when DOE announced that SRS was being considered for three plutonium disposition missions. In review of the proposed missions and the costs of redesigning APSF, one alternative was to look at the 235-F Building combined with triple stacking of containers in KAMS. Anderson said the 235-F Building could be modified to have the capability to convert metals into oxides (PUSAPS-plutonium stabilization and packaging system).

Anderson emphasized the KAMS project provides for storage only up to 10 years. Material stored there would be treated and placed in DOE-approved 3013 storage containers, which then would be placed in a

9975 shipping container. Anderson said he believes the DNFSB prefers that SRS have a more robust storage facility, like an APSF, if SRS begins supporting the plutonium missions. Anderson did say the Surplus Plutonium Final EIS was being released on Friday, November 19 and that SRS was the preferred site for all three disposition missions. *Credit for a storage facility at SRS (proposed APSF) was not included in the EIS, he added.*

Talking specifically about KAMS, Anderson said it was envisioned to help de-inventory Rocky Flats so that the site could be closed and save DOE \$1.3 billion per year. As stated earlier, KAMS is for storage only. The APSF would have included a conversion system to change plutonium metal to oxide. *As stated earlier, Anderson said the 235-F building could be modified to have the conversion capability.* The advantage of 235-F, if DOE chooses that route, is that 235-F is separate from F Canyon and has separate security features, avoiding any connection or proliferation issues with F canyon. *In addition, the potential for flexible storage space of non-3013 material was not available in APSF. Anderson said more storage positions could be added in K Area for 3013s and in 235-F for non-3013 material. Anderson said additional storage capacity was available in successful storage facilities in the U.S.*

In closing, Anderson said the decision to use or not use 235-F/KAMS will be made in the spring of 2000, after the cost estimate and dose rate comparisons are provided to DOE by the contractor.

Yucca Mountain DEIS Recommendation

Costikyan referred to the November 2 joint subcommittee meeting when the No Action Alternative was presented by Gene Rollins of Dade Moller and Associates. If all assumptions were correct, Costikyan said the No Action Alternative (both scenarios), which extended to a 10,000 year time frame, did not reveal major consequences. Costikyan said he had difficulty accepting the No Action Alternative, and said it should not be an option to not opening a geologic repository. He also said he did not believe the hypothetical numbers should be used in developing a recommendation from the CAB.

At the conclusion of the November 15 NMM subcommittee meeting, Costikyan reminded the group of a December 14 joint subcommittee meeting at the North Augusta Community Center and said Yucca Mountain DEIS recommendation development would occur at that time.

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