SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground Focus Group

Meeting Summary

March 15, 2000
Aiken Federal Building
Aiken, SC

The Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground Focus Group (ORWBG FG) met on Wednesday, March 15, 2000 at the Aiken Federal Building in Aiken, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Phase I draft Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) report. The ISPR is being conducted by the Education, Research and Development Association (ERDA) of Georgia Universities to estimate human health consequences to individuals at several locations in contaminated streams related to the ORWBG. Attendees included:

CAB Members	Stakeholders	DOE/Contractors
Karen Patterson	Bill McDonell	Jim Moore, WSRC
Murray Riley	Lee Poe**	Mary Flora, WSRC
Jimmy Mackey*	Todd Crawford	Ed McNamee, BSRI
Bill Lawless	Jerry Devitt	Jim Cook, WSRC
		Elmer Wilhite, WSRC
		Don Toddings, WSRC

*Administrative Lead of the ORWBG FG
**Technical Lead of the ORWBG FG

Karen Patterson opened the meeting with introductions and reviewed the agenda. Lee Poe reviewed the purpose for the ISPR and provided an overview of the report, noting that the ORWBG FG should provide comments to the ISPR team. Mr. Poe noted that the report was extremely technical and appeared to need additional information to satisfy the terms of the contract. In a discussion led by Mr. Poe, the participants noted that several areas of the report required additional clarification. The group agreed that the comments generated at the meeting should be compiled for the group's review and then relayed to the ISPR team for clarification. It was also agreed that near-term follow-up communications with the ISPR team should occur to ensure the ISPR team clearly understands the comments. The group's discussion resulted in the following comments that were sent to the ISPR team on March 16, 2000:

- Were decay rates considered in determining the constituent concentrations?
- Why was only 1 location used for the concentrations when more locations were requested (see description in Subtask 1 of the ISPR Scope of Work)?
- What transport distance was used to determine the concentrations? (i.e., it appears the distance used by the ISPR Team is greater than the actual distance)
- Why were the Kd values different from those used by SRS?
- Why is the calculated tritium release profile different from measured release values, e.g., see Tritium flux curve by Gerald Blount (slide 7 in the ORWBG Groundwater Contamination briefing provided to the ISPR team on January 5, 2000)?

- What is the assumed location and source data for the stream flow rate of 2.14 x 107 cubic meters/year?
- Reasonable comparison of calculated tritium concentration and measured concentrations seems fortuitous and perhaps inappropriate. Care should be used to ensure the model is valid as compared to measured concentrations. For instance, if the stream location assumed above is Four Mile Branch Monitoring Station 7A, then the tritium concentration obtained from 1998 SRS Environmental Monitoring Report and listed on page 10 of the draft ISPR report (from 1998 data, not 1999 data), assumes transport of tritium from other locations instead of the calculated value of the ORWBG only. Based on monitoring data, the ORWBG is 63% of the total for tritium only (for details, see the Annual Environmental Monitoring Report)
- Why don't the graphics provided appear Gaussian? (see tritium and plutonium 239 flux to the water table curves)
- It would be helpful if the report were to be presented in language that is more understandable to the general public. We understand this is the draft of Subtask 1 results, however it was difficult to read and we recommend that the final report, developed to fulfill Subtask 3, contain the additional information we've identified above.

Mr. Poe agreed that he would lead discussions surrounding the technical communications between the ISPR Team and the ORWBG FG. The meeting was adjourned.

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