SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Combined Committees Meeting

Meeting Summary

February 27, 2001
Holiday Inn West
Augusta, GA

The following were in attendance at the February 27, 2001 Combined Committee meeting held at the Holiday Inn West, Augusta, GA:

CAB Members

David Adcock
Meryl Alalof
Walter Becker
Nancy Ann Ciehanski
Gerald Devitt
Mel Galin
Ken Goad
Perry Holcomb
Brendolyn Jenkins
Vera Barnes Jordan
J.G. Long
Jimmy Mackey
Karen Patterson
Maria Reichmanis
Lola Richardson
Murray Riley
Heather Simmons
Jean Sulc
Bill Vogele
Wade Waters
Carolyne Williams

Stakeholders

Lee Poe
Mike French
Carl Overcash
Cy Banick
Mary Drye
Don Moniak
Brandon Haddock
Sybil Lay
Loretta Loftiss
Melinda Holland
Dusty Houser
Lynn Waishwell
Greg Peterson

Regulators

Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC
Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC
Sharon Cribb, SCDHEC

DOE/Contractors

Tom Heenan, DOE
Gerri Flemming, DOE
Cynthia Anderson, DOE
Sachiko McAlhany, DOE
Soni Blanco, DOE
Angelia Adams, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
George Mishra, DOE
Shirley Smith, DOE
Patrick Jackson, DOE
Joe D'Amelio, DOE
Priscilla Wilson, DOE
Jim Demass, DOE
Howard Gnann, DOE
Ray Conaster, WSRC
Mike Dunsmuir, WSRC
Paul Huber, BSRI
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Clay Jones, WSRC
Mary Flora, WSRC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Donna Martin, WSRC
Helen Villasor, WSRC
Roger Duke, WSRC
Jimmy Miles, WSRC

David Yannitell, WSRC

John Paveglio, BNFL

Tiajuana Cochnauer, Forest Service

Ron Beul, BSRI

Janet McClearen, BSRI

Mike Schoener, CAB

SRS CAB Members Sallie Connah, Beckie Dawson, William Lawrence and Bill Willoughby were not in attendance. The objective of the meeting was to receive a thorough review of SRS programs.

Mike Schoener facilitated the meeting. He also opened the meeting with a brief presentation of the final SRS CAB 2001 Workplan (see attachment). Tom Heenan of the Department of Energy also provided a brief status regarding the shipment of transuranic waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan , noting that SRS is standing by ready to ship as soon as final approval is received from Carlsbad, New Mexico. The WIPP audit was completed and closed and all corrective actions performed and SRS is prepared to ship within 2 weeks of New Mexico Environmental Department and Environmental Protection Agency approval, he said.

<u>New Contract Features</u>

Tom Heenan, DOE, discussed elements of the new SRS M&O contract stating it had been extended on January 5, 2001 for six years (see attachment). The total value of the contract is $8.4 billion and includes two missions: Environmental Management and National Nuclear Security Administration. Mr. Heenan noted that the overall scope of the contract is unchanged and the WSRC partnership is unchanged, however the contract is now more incentive-based. The new contract provides for meeting all commitments to program sponsors and outside agencies by achieving base and stretch targets. A base target is the minimal level of acceptable performance and a stretch target goes beyond expectations. It is challenging, yet achievable and financial incentives are offered for high productivity and delivery on the job. The fee will be based on the contractor's performance and measured against defined expectations.

Clay Jones discussed more specific features and advantages from the contractor's perspective. He noted the following key features that are different: a multi-year business and performance focus; emphasis on product versus process; stability and the presumption of flat EM funding; and continuity. Changes in the contract are related to WSRC's overall management challenge and its approach. How WSRC earns money and specific contract terms/requirements are different, he said. Mr. Jones emphasized that WSRC's commitment to safety, protecting human health and the environment, performance excellence, solving DOE issues and the company's commitment to employees and stakeholders will remain the same.

Mr. Jones stated that the 2020 vision for SRS is:

- **Nuclear Materials Stabilization missions completed with facilities deactivated**
- **Pu disposition facilities and the Defense Waste Processing Facility in final phase**
- **Most environmental remediation completed**
- **Solid Waste shipments to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and National Repository ongoing**
- **Site transitioned to NNSA missions, with comprehensive NNSA support for tritium program**
- **Other new missions underway**

Mr. Jones further discussed the EM management challenge noting a $1.3 billion funding gap that hopefully can be significantly reduced through cost savings initiatives, program reconfigurations and privatization opportunities. Responding to questions, Mr. Jones stated that if the budget that is assumed does not come to pass, then program baselines will have to be renegotiated. Funding and other assumptions built into the contract are beyond WSRC's control, he said. Stakeholders requested copies of the new contract and the project baseline summaries.

Environmental Restoration Program Overview

Cynthia Anderson, DOE, presented an overview of the ER Program at SRS (see attachment). Ms. Anderson noted that the Program drivers were the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permits, Consent Decrees and Settlement Agreements, and other laws such as the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, etc. Ms. Anderson indicated that the FFA was a three party agreement between the Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. She stated that 289 of 515 sites were resolved and another 51 are in the remediation phase of cleanup.

Current activities in 2001 are: Dynamic Underground Stripping in A/M area, the Savannah River Laboratory Seepage Basin, F-Area Mixed Waste Management Facility – Phytoremediation, F/H Areas Groundwater Treatment Units, and the K-Area Reactor Seepage Basin.

Ms. Anderson pointed out that under the New Site Contract, the following projects were identified: Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground unit consolidation and closure, the refinements in the area of In situ Grout Jobs, Dynamic Underground Stripping continued deployment at the M-Area Basin and the

A-14 Outfall, and new cost effective approaches to the F&H Groundwater Treatment Units. Technology opportunities were identified in the following areas: Natural Remediation, Long Term Monitoring, Phytoremediation, Non-Invasive DNAPL characterization and treatment and Long Term Covers for Humid Environments.

Lee Poe asked that the public be allowed early public comment on new deployments involving Phytoremediation before the FFA required public comment periods. Ms. Anderson stated that she would work with Jimmy Mackey (CAB ER Committee Chairman) to bring those issues to the public through his Committee. Karen Patterson questioned the use of the Dynamic Underground Stripping system stating that if the soil was heated to the boiling point in order to get Dense Non-Aqueous Phased Liquids out thus leaving the ground sterile, what would happen to the microorganisms in the effected area. Ms. Anderson stated the microorganisms would move back into the area as the soils cooled to a temperature that would support them. Wade Waters suggested that with the deployment of the use of Phytoremediation at the MWMF, an air monitoring system be set up in that area to monitor the amount of tritium being released into the atmosphere.

Nuclear Material Stabilization and Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Programs

Sachiko McAlhany, Program Manager, DOE-SR Material and Facility Stabilization (MSF) provided presentations on the two programs within the MSF Division: the Nuclear Material Stabilization Program and the Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Program.

The first presentation focused on the Nuclear Material Stabilization Program and the program mission that involves stabilizing, storing and controlling nuclear materials remaining from the Cold War. She discussed eight project baseline summaries.

The F Canyon (NM01) annual budget is $210 million, which covers FB Line and 235-F Vault Operations. The budget changes from year to year, McAlhany explained. Some of the upcoming activities in NM01 include dissolving the remaining inventory identified for F Canyon, complete vitrification of americium/curium by FY06, packaging all metal into inner DOE Standard 3013 storage cans by FY08.

Concerning the americium/curium, McAlhany said DOE has not determined a disposition path although send the material to Oak Ridge has been an option. The goal is to vitrify the material and store it for programmatic use or ensure that the vitrified form meets disposition criteria for the geologic repository. The americium/curium could be used for medical purposes.

Don Moniak, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, asked if the Oak Ridge office will make the decision on whether the americium /curium will be sent to Oak Ridge. McAlhany said the decision is being made at DOE-HQ. The Undersecretary is also putting out a call to see if other organizations would be interested in the material.

H Canyon activities (NM02), with an annual budget of $160 million, will include: the Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) blend down program to support a potential agreement between DOE and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), starting up Phase II of HB Line to conduct plutonium and neptunium conversion to oxide, and dissolving irradiated SRS reactor fuel tubes through 2008.

McAlhany said the Secretary of Energy has signed the TVA/DOE interagency agreement. The TVA signature is expected the last week in March. SRS plans to send the neptunium to Oak Ridge for thermal electric generators

The NM03 Nuclear Materials Storage Project with a budget of $65 million will include the expected closure of the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF). She added that funding for the K Area Materials and Storage (KAMS) facility will come from the SF01 baseline in the Spent Nuclear Fuel Program.

Don Moniak asked if SRS had a facility that met a 50-year storage capability. McAlhany said 235-F does meet long-term storage and DOE is looking at making changes to KAMS to extend its storage time. She added, however, that improvements in packaging are also required to meet the long-term storage.

Concerns about costs of upgrading 235-F as opposed to building a new facility were voiced. McAlhany said there is a range of $150 - $250 million for retrofitting 235-F. Costs for the APSF were reaching $450 million

Dealing with the TVA agreement, Lee Poe said the Tennessee Valley Authority was requesting comments on a *Federal Register* notice dealing with the HEU agreement. Poe suggested that the CAB NM committee provide comments. In addition, he suggest that the CAB NM committee look at the americium/curium project and to look at potential cost reductions affiliated with operations of F and H Canyon.

About $100 million per year (NM04) will be used to upgrade the canyon exhaust for both canyons. The annual budget of $10 million in NM06 will be focused on installing a plutonium stabilization and packaging system in 235-F, allowing DOE to begin stabilization operations as early as 2005. The actual procurement, installation and startup of the system will be funded under NM09 with a total project cost of $196.5 million. Design of the 235-F Stabilization and Packaging System will be funded under PED with a total cost of $53.3 million.

DOE will fund the construction and operation of facilities for the interim storage of depleted uranium under NM07 at $50 million per year.

Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Program

The Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Program consists of primarily four activities:

provide safe and secure interim storage for DOE "legacy" materials; support DOE complex-wide mortgage reduction initiatives; support National Non-proliferation initiatives and treaties; develop and demonstrate non-separative aluminum-clad SNF stabilization technology.

As mentioned earlier, McAlhany said the KAMS activities are being funded from the SNF program. SF01 consists of an annual budget of $30 million to complete and operate KAMS for plutonium receipt and storage and to complete de-inventory of K Basin by FY02.

L Area activities will consist of continuing basin operations, including consolidation of fuel inventories to L Area. In addition some of the $40 million annual budget of SF02 will be used to complete the Alternate Technology Program and to begin Transfer and Storage Facility (TSF) design. Dam restoration for Pond B dam will also be funded.

McAlhany said both foreign and domestic fuel will be consolidated in L Area. About 3000 fuel assemblies have been received to date (100 casks). SRS will have received most of the fuel assemblies by FY09.

About $15 million is the annual budget for SF03. This funding is dedicated to the Receiving Basin for Offsite Fuel (RBOF). DOE plans to de-inventory RBOF by the end of FY06. The urgency of moving out of RBOF is to save maintenance costs, she said. Ray Conaster, WSRC, added that it would cost less than $1 million to cease RBOF operation while it take approximately $10 million to maintain per year. The majority of costs is the bundling of rods.

A question was asked if SRS had non aluminum-clad fuel. McAlhany said SRS did have stainless steel and zirconium-clad fuel that will be shipped to Idaho National Environmental Engineering Laboratory for dry storage. Only aluminum-clad fuel can be processed at SRS.

Moniak asked for the amount of aluminum-clad fuel at SRS. McAlhany said SRS has 15 metric tons of aluminum-clad fuel and 20 metric tons of stainless steel fuel.

The Alternate Technology (SF06) and TSF project (SF09) are funded with a total project cost of $300 million. The L Experimental Facility (LEF) will be turned over for startup and testing in FY02. Conceptual design will be completed for the TSF.

Waste Management Committee Chair Report

Wade Waters, Chair of the Waste Management Committee first reviewed items of interest from the HLW program, including the Salt Processing Project, Tank Farms, Glass Waste Storage Building, and the Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Waters also discussed some of the activities that the Salt Process Focus Group has been working on, and extended his appreciation to members of the Focus Group who were seated in the audience for their hard work and diligence in following the Salt Process Selection Process.

Next, Mr. Waters reviewed the Transuranic (TRU) Waste Program led by the Solid Waste Division (SWD). In preparation for the first shipment of Ship to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), Mr. Waters said SWD is to be commended for having achieved a highly successful audit by the Carlsbad Field Office. Upon receipt of certification from the New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED), SRS is ready to commence shipping to WIPP.

Mr. Waters also highlighted other SWD program activities including: the Orphan Waste (a waste with no direct disposal path), activities to gain certification to ship low-level waste to the Nevada Test Site, low-level waste disposal in trenches, and the suspension of operations at the Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF), which is also being followed closely by the CIF Focus Group. Mr. Waters also highlighted Transportation as a Waste Management Committee issue because of its tracking of the Mound Site's waste coming to SRS, packaging of PU238 waste for transportation to WIPP, and hydrogen gas technology.

Mr. Waters closed his brief by noting that copies of the *Solid Waste Division 2000 Annual Report* had been provided to each member of the CAB and thanked Dr. Sam Kelly for sharing this important information with the CAB. Mr. Waters also extended an invitation to all attendees to participate in a site tour of the Waste Management Facilities on March 6, 2001.

Mr. Waters then introduced John Paveglio, SWD Manager of Program Management. Mr. Paveglio said he was presenting in behalf of Mr. Virgil Sauls, DOE Director of Waste Operations Division, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Solid Waste Program Review

Mr. Paveglio stated that the mission of the SWD is to provide exemplary, high quality, and cost-effective solid waste management services in support of DOE missions at SRS and across the complex. In addition, Mr. Paveglio said that while SWD is accomplishing its mission, it is also protecting human health and the environment. Mr. Paveglio also emphasized that the treatment and disposal of waste is a team effort, i.e., working with DOE-HQ and other sites across the complex.

Noting that the Fiscal Year 2001 budget was just a "small piece of the pie", Mr. Paveglio said it was important for the CAB not only to see the numbers so it can glean an idea of the size of the SWD program, but also see firsthand how much work had been accomplished by being cost-effective and proactive in its approach to doing more work with less money. For that cost-effective trend to continue, Mr. Paveglio highlighted the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) and said that SWD is trying to find other waste streams that can use the facility and is also considering restarting the Saltstone Facility. In addition, SWD is looking at mobile vendors and the cost to determine if running a batch process is the most cost-effective method of doing business.

Jimmy Mackey asked Mr. Paveglio if the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)-permitted outfalls at ETF have any mercury issues. Mr. Paveglio said he did not have the specific answer with him but would get back to Mr. Mackey with the answer. Don Moniak asked if there was any information available concerning the liquid low-level waste from Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX) production going to ETF. Mr. Paveglio said he would be happy to get the information if it was available and provide it to Mr. Moniak at a later date.

Speaking about CIF next, Mr. Paveglio said that after processing 3,156 gallons of raw PUREX in Fiscal Year 2000, the facility has been safely placed into a suspension mode. However, SWD is now hard at work seeking alternative treatment methods for the PUREX waste stream. As another example of team effort, Mr. Paveglio said that the DOE-HQ Mixed Waste Focus Area is sharing resources to offset the cost of finding an alternative treatment method.

Mr. Paveglio provided a baseline overview of the scope of work related to the low-level waste (LLW) stream and explained that the SWD objective is to reach a steady state (disposing of legacy waste) by 2006. Low-level waste is waste that is radioactive but not high level or TRU waste. Currently, SRS LLW is being disposed in engineered concrete vaults or trenches; however, some waste will be shipped to the Nevada Test Site. Don Moniak asked if SRS was using "Exemptions" to reduce its inventory of LLW. Mr. Moniak explained that "Exemptions" are used to reclassify

waste. Mr. Paveglio said he could not say for sure that SRS had "Exemptions" and would investigate the matter further and get back to Mr. Moniak with an answer at a later time.

SWD also treats LLW at the Sort-Segregation Facility and the Supercompactor. Mr. Paveglio emphasized again the cost-effective business approach SWD used in obtaining the Supercompactor at no cost, except for shipping. When the Supercompactor arrived at SRS, maintenance work was performed, an enclosure was built around it, lighting and ventilation equipment was found in excess around the site and used in place of buying new materials. In response to Jimmy Mackey's question if new vaults and trenches will be needed to reduce inventory, Mr. Paveglio responded that studies are included in baseline planning now and are being included on the Integrated Priority List.

In the TRU program, Mr. Paveglio said that the Carlsbad audit was a significant achievement for SWD since the division spent the least amount of money than any other site in the DOE complex and had the best audit results. In terms of the Mound waste, 1500 drums of TRU waste will be coming to SRS, but in return for receiving this waste, 3000 drums will be shipped to WIPP. Mr. Paveglio also described the HANDS-55 project, which is equipment designed to identify the contents of older TRU waste drums that have no "pedigree", and the Category-2 Facility that will be needed for waste identification that cannot go to HANDS-55. Don Moniak asked where the high-activity alpha waste from MOX would be disposed. Mr. Paveglio explained that the MOX waste stream had not yet been officially forecasted; however, he noted that the solid portion of the MOX waste would eventually go into SWD's planning.

In the Mixed Waste Program, Mr. Paveglio said that SWD will be treating all legacy waste and is planning for another Mixed Waste Treatment Facility. Jimmy Mackey asked if there is a chance for CIF to restart to treat the incinerable waste. Mr. Paveglio replied that SWD was in the process of meeting with DOE to switch waste that was originally targeted for CIF. For Hazardous Waste, Mr. Paveglio noted that SRS is treating an appropriate amount of Hazardous Waste to be in compliance with the permit, but will increase the treatment rate as necessary to work off the legacy waste.

In the Sanitary Waste Program, Mr. Paveglio emphasized that recycling is the secret to the program's success. For example, SRS's white paper is sent to the North Augusta Material Recovery Facility (MRF) for sorting. Perry Holcomb asked who is paying the tipping fees for sending the waste to MRF. Mr. Paveglio said that he was not certain who was paying, but he would obtain an answer and respond to Mr. Holcomb at a later date. Mr. Paveglio then discussed the pelletizer approach, which is to take incinerable waste such as white paper, and make pellets to replace the need for coal for power generation. Don Moniak said that it was wrong for SRS to continue saying that it does not contribute to emitting mercury to the air, when reports say that paper pellets would do so.

In closing, Mr. Paveglio said Waste Minimization performance at SRS is an important part of the Pollution Prevention (P2) Program. Mr. Paveglio said he could recite all of the awards that have been achieved in this program, from the Closing the Circle White House Award to DOE National Pollution Prevention awards. However, while the awards are commendable, Mr. Paveglio emphasized that performance is the most important feature of P2. In Fiscal Year 2000, 14,000 cubic meters of waste was avoided. By working with site generators, SWD ensures that waste is packaged correctly at the source to save cost and volume.

<u>High Level Waste Program Review</u>

Sonitza Blanco opened her presentation by stating that the mission of the High Level Waste Division (HLW) is to store, treat and stabilize SRS's legacy of radioactive waste. In addition, Ms. Blanco highlighted one of the program's leading issues, which is to close aging HLW facilities and

place them in a low surveillance mode until final disposition. Noting that HLW has 35 million gallons of radioactive waste stored in tanks at H and F Areas, Ms. Blanco said that is the responsibility of HLW to ensure that the integrity of the tanks and equipment is properly maintained in order to support DOE's HLW mission.

Using a chart to track the HLW System, Ms. Blanco said waste from Tank Farm storage and Evaporators moves along transfer lines to waste removal and pretreatment, whereby the sludge is sent to extended sludge process and the salt is sent to salt processing. High level precipitate is slurried to the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), while low level filtrate is sent to the Saltstone Facility for final processing with grout and stored in vaults. Ms. Blanco then explained that currently, the evaporators are the principal source of reducing the volume of HLW. When asked how many of the evaporators are currently working, Ms. Blanco said, one (i.e., 1H, with 3H being the new evaporator with cooling problems in its drop tank, and 2H currently in a cleaning process).

Discussing safe production at DWPF, Ms. Blanco highlighted HLW's canister production, which is 17 percent complete at 1,064 canisters. Ms. Blanco explained that after the waste goes through the chemical process and it is mixed with frit, it goes to the melter. When melted at about 1150 degrees Farenheit, the waste is poured into canisters that are ten feet high and two feet wide: average production is one canister per day. To date, Ms. Blanco said that over 4.0 millions pounds of glass has been vitrified through the world's largest HLW melter, which is located at SRS. HLW's regulatory commitment is to reduce its complete inventory by 2028. Mel Galin asked why the production of canisters appears to have dropped off. Noting that there has been some facility outages, Ms. Blanco responded that one of the problems appears to be the pour spout. However, Ms. Blanco said the pour spout insert continues to be modified as the program progresses, and noted that these DWPF improvements are a result of teamwork within the division. Another reason for the slowdown is that over time, HLW must change batches. In response to another question related to reduced production, Ms. Blanco said HLW has enough feed to last until 2010. With three million gallons of HLW left to process, the division is anxiously waiting for Salt Processing to come online. When Don Moniak asked if HLW was essentially reserving sludge until Salt Processing comes online, Howard Gnann responded that the program is trying to balance the process.

Ms. Blanco outlined the HLW budget overview by Project Baseline Summary (PBS) and said the Fiscal Year 2001 – 2006 goals are to:

- **Produce 1150 canisters at DWPF**
- **Provide additional glass waste storage**
- **Provide 18 million gallons of space gain in F and H Tank Farms**
- **Return Tanks 49 and 50 to HLW service**
- **Operationally close Tanks 18 and 19**
- **Prepare Sludge Batch 3 for DWPF (Tank 7)**
- **Waste Removal Project**
- **Collect and treat 20 million gallons per year at ETF**
- **Continue layup of Saltstone Facility until Salt Processing Facility startup or until a decision is made to process and dispose of Tank 50 material in Saltstone**
- **Complete construction, startup testing, and turnover to operations of F-Area Tank Farm support services**

In closing her presentation, Ms. Blanco emphasized that there is a critical need for space gain in the Tank Farm since only one evaporator is online and the Salt Processing selection has not yet been made.

One of the closing questions was related to the leaking at Tank 6. Ms. Blanco provided the group with the following update. Ms. Blanco said that on January 12, 2001, an alarm for a leak of 90 gallons (about one-half inch) of HLW in the annulus was received. Ms. Blanco said that the tank has a ventilation system, most of the leaked waste had evaporated, and the annulus had been protected at all times. A magnetic wall crawler (a technology development) that rides on tracks and has a camera attached, walked on the outside of the tank wall and inspected 75 percent of the tank wall. The wall crawler showed there were six indications of leak sites, four were damp, but no waste was seen coming through. There were no puddles, only dampness. Ms. Blanco said that as of February 27, most of the waste had already evaporated; however, the leak is still under close investigation. If it was considered necessary to transfer the waste, Ms. Blanco said it would go to Tank 8.

In closing, Mr. Gnann was asked when the high alpha activity waste and its investigation would be discussed. Mr. Gnann said HLW owed the CAB a response and would bring it to the CAB at a later date.

Facilities Disposition Program Review

Mel Galin, Chair of the Strategic and Long Term Issues (S&LTI) Committee, reviewed the programs of interest to the S&LTI Committee. They were the SRS budget and various plans, technology development, stewardship and facility disposition. Mr. Galin invited the CAB and interested public to attend the Stewardship Subcommittee videoconference on March 8.

Mr. Galin introduced Angelia Adams, the DOE Program Manager for the Facility Disposition Program. Ms. Adams stated that the mission of the Facility Disposition Program is twofold. One is to cost effectively manage SRS inactive facilities in a manner that protects the site worker, the public and the environment. The other is to operate the Decontamination Facility to provide cost effective decontamination and size reduction services to the site. The Decontamination Facility reduces the size of the scrap material and packages it for disposal.

The facility disposition process starts with the operation of a facility, moves to disposition and then long-term stewardship in which decommissioning occurs. When facility operations are complete the facility is deactivated as much as possible before turning the facility over to the Facility Disposition Program. During the operations phase, the Facility Disposition Program performs deactivation planning. Post shutdown surveillance and maintenance (S&M) is performed before the actual decommissioning occurs. The present site schedule shows site closure in 2038 with no major decommissioning planned until after 2070.

Ms. Adams reviewed the 13 Project Baseline Summaries (PBSs) for the program. Of the 13, only six included inactive facilities. Ms. Adams reviewed the facilities and scope of work included in each PBS and highlighted the inactive facilities. The work to be performed and time schedule was discussed.

Ms. Adams explained that while there is no active reuse committee on site, all facilities are considered by operations for reuse. Some equipment and facilities are too contaminated for reuse and others were developed for such special operations that there is no other reuse. It was pointed out during discussion that some facilities are too old to meet current permit requirements and problems can arise in trying to reuse old equipment. In addition, the cost to meet current permit requirements can be exorbitant.

Ms. Adams stated that the contaminated large equipment disposition program was deferred in 2001 due to budget constraints. This is an initiative to dispose of large, contaminated equipment at numerous locations on site.

Don Moniak asked how much contaminated material remained in R Basin. Ms. Adams responded that she did not have that specific information with her but would get back to Mr. Moniak with the answer.

It was suggested that the Facilities Roadmap that was handed out show funded and non-funded projects for better clarification. Concern was also expressed that material that may be contaminated was left out in the open in a field. Ms. Adams assured the group that this equipment was in a confined area and not accessible to routine traffic.

Lee Poe requested that Mr. Galin invite the Facility Disposition Program back to a S&LTI Committee meeting to discuss two items. One is the very good risk reduction program used to reduce risk. The other is the site plans, strategy and milestones for the closing of the site in 2070. Mr. Poe felt that the public should be involved in those strategic discussions. Ms. Adams stated that the decommissioning process has public involvement built into the process.

The following questions/issues were noted during the meeting. (Responses were provided within two weeks to all meeting participants.)

- **Public Comments on Public Participation Policy**
- **Copies of New PBI available for public**
- **Contract and IPL available for public**
- **F/H Groundwater Process (Early involvement prior to RCRA)**
- **Phytoremediation Presentation (including releases of tritium)**
    - **Be proactive in communications**
- **TVA, AM/CM, Impact of Cost to Shutdown Canyons on NM agenda**
- **Request for MOA with TVA/NEPA Analysis**
- **What portion of $300M split is TSF project**
- **Is liquid LLW from MOX going to ETF?**
- **Are there mercury TMDL issues rleated to ETF releases to outfalls?**
- **Is SRS going to use exemptions to reduce LLW inventory?**
    - **Who pays for MRF facility in North Augusta?**
- **Where is high activity alpha waste from MOX going?**
- **Has this issue been addressed by SRS and if not it needs to be investigated.**
- **Facility Disposition risk reduction and plan/strategy for 2070 closure on S&LTI agenda**
- **What is the contaminated material in the R basin?**
- **Does SRS have a beryllium prevention plan in place?**

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