



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board Meeting Minutes**

**Adams Mark Hotel Columbia, S.C.  
July 21-22, 2003**

### **Monday, July 21, 2003 Attendance**

#### **SRS CAB Members**

Donna Antonucci  
Jennifer Barrington  
Gerald Devitt  
Mary Drye  
Mel Galin  
Perry Holcomb  
Bill Lawless  
William Lawrence  
Wendell Lyon  
Darryl Nettles  
Harold Rahn  
Dorene Richardson  
Murray Riley  
DeAnne Smoak  
Jean Sulc  
Bill Vogelee  
Wade Waters  
Bill Willoughby

#### **Ex-Officio Members**

Charlie Anderson, DOE  
Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC  
Robert Pope, EPA  
Dawn Taylor, EPA

#### **Stakeholders/Regulators**

Adrienne Wright, SCDHEC  
Herman Mischner  
Bob Meisenhaumer  
Val Loiselle  
Lana Sindler  
Ruth Thomas

#### **DOE /Contractor**

Sandra Waisley, DOE-HQ  
Gerri Flemming, DOE  
Rick Ford, DOE  
Wade Whitaker, DOE  
Les Germany, DOE  
Dave Freeman, WSRC  
Bill Payne, WSRC  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
Sonny Golston, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Jim Heffner, WSRC  
Pete Fledderman, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Kelly Way, WSRC  
Mike Shotton, BSRI

SRS CAB members Meryl Alalof, Leon Chavous, Ann Dalton, Lola Richardson, Gloria Williams Way and Carolyn Williams were unable to attend. The meeting opened with Charlie Anderson, DOE, serving as Designated Federal Official. Mike Schoener served as facilitator and the Board's Technical Advisor Rick McLeod was also present. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

#### **Strategic Initiatives Committee**

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES):

Bill Payne, WSRC, provided a presentation on the issues concerning the SRS NPDES permit and why it may result in large monetary expenditures to SRS over the next few years. A new permit is expected around November 2003 with very low discharge limits for copper, lead and zinc. This will result in low limits in ephemeral streams. The limits cannot be greater than the natural

background concentrations of constituents in the stream. Also, the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) value used in the limit calculation is now the long-term average rather than the TSS limit as used in the past. The copper and lead limits will be in the range of parts per billion and technology may not be available to reach these low limits.

Both DHEC and the site are working to identify innovative solutions that will help meet the new permit limits. Some of the options are to apply for variances to the permit limits, perform receiving stream Use Attainability Analysis, consider monitoring and reporting requirements in the permit instead of limits and/or come into compliance with the new limits. To come into compliance could mean making operational changes, relocating discharges, re-piping outfalls to larger receiving streams, or installing wastewater treatment. Of the 31 outfalls, only 13 may need possible solutions to meet the limits.

SRS has three years to come into compliance unless DHEC allows five years. Five years is possible if the site has proper justification.

Mel Galin presented a draft motion regarding the NPDES permit (see attachment). Following extensive discussion, several modifications were made. Mr. Galin also presented a draft motion regarding SRS historic preservation (see attachment). He discussed recent public meetings held regarding the issue of historic preservation and public comments that more information is needed.

### **Environmental Restoration Committee**

Perry Holcomb stated that the name of the ER Committee should be changed to better represent the scope of that committee which now includes the sites deactivation and decommissioning activities. The proposed name is the Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee. He also presented a draft motion regarding the SRS Integrated Deactivation & Decommissioning Plan (see attachment) for CAB consideration. He referred to the Board's involvement in a workshop regarding D&D activities that was held in June and noted that several members had provided individual public comments on the integrated plan.

### **R-Reactor Seepage Basin (RRSB) 108-4R Overflow Basin Operable Unit (OU) Proposed Plan**

Mike Shotton, BSRI, presented the proposed plan for the RRSB and 108-4R Overflow Basin. Mr. Shotton discussed the history of the operable unit, which consists of six seepage basins, an abandoned process sewer line and an abandoned sanitary sewer line as well as an overflow basin. A non-routine discharge occurred in 1957 due to a test failure and released approximately 2700 curies of radionuclides primarily to Basin 1. Basins 2 through 6 were constructed between November 1957 and March 1958 to handle the large volume of contaminated water. The basins received an estimated 5 million gallons of purge water from the R-Reactor Disassembly Basin. Basins 1 through 5 were all deactivated and backfilled by 1960 and in 1964 basin 6 was deactivated and subsequently backfilled in 1977. In 1996, the backfilled Reactor Seepage Basins were covered with clean soil and an asphalt cover was installed.

The constituents of concern (COC) for the RRSB are cesium 137, strontium 90, americium 241, plutonium 239/240, plutonium 238, and cobalt 60. Mr. Shotton explained that the seepage basins

contain elevated levels of radioactive contamination ( $5 \times 10^{-7}$  maximum health risk), which warrant action. The abandoned sewer lines contain elevated levels of radioactive contamination warranting action as well. RRSB Groundwater has elevated strontium 90 activities exceeding the Drinking Water Standard.

Mr. Shotton presented the following remedial action objectives:

#### Seepage Basin:

- minimize transport of soil contaminants to groundwater
- prevent industrial worker exposure to contamination
- treat principal threat source material as practicable

#### Abandoned Process Sewer Lines

- prevent industrial worker exposure to pipelines
- treat principal threat source material as practicable

#### Sanitary Sewer System

- prevent industrial worker exposure to sanitary sewer lines and subsurface soil contaminants
- prevent industrial worker exposure to contaminated vegetation
- prevent future transfer of subsurface soil contaminants through vegetation uptake
- treat principal threat source material as practicable

#### Groundwater

- prevent industrial worker exposure to groundwater contaminated above Drinking Water Standards
- minimize the spread of groundwater contamination and prevent discharge of contaminated groundwater to surface water

The preferred alternatives are to reinforce the concrete intruder barrier system, excavate process lines outside the boundary fence with disposal on unit and establish mixing zones with institutional controls.

The schedule calls for public comments by July 9, 2003, submittal of Rev.0 Record of Decision (ROD) on July 22, 2003 and a signed Rev. 1 ROD by February 18, 2004 with remedial actions to begin by March 4, 2005.

Wade Waters, having heard the presentation, believed that the preferred remedial alternative was not a practical solution to the problem. Mr. Shotton stated that there has been demonstrated success with the use of monitored natural attenuation and the use of mixing zones. Bill Willoughby was concerned with the asphalt cap allowing vegetation to grow on it in the future. Mr. Shotton stated that the plan called for a maintenance program to assure that would not occur

at the site. Mr. Shotton stated that the COC's currently above acceptable limits would be within acceptable limits in approximately 50 years.

Perry Holcomb presented a draft motion in support of the R Reactor preferred alternative (see attachment). The Board briefly discussed the motion and whether it should be provided in a formal letter versus a recommendation. It was determined the draft motion would stand, however several brief modifications were made for consideration.

### **Waste Management Committee**

Bill Willoughby provided background information and brought the committees up to date on the West Valley (WV) Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement and the WM Committee's subsequent recommendation (see attachment). Mr. Willoughby explained that Waste Isolation Pilot Plant is chartered to receive defense waste only. Some of the WV waste is civilian waste, and if SRS takes the WV waste, SRS may not have a way to ship it out or dispose of it. Mr. Lawless suggested that the CAB recommend that no waste be received unless it is certified as defense and meets the WIPP WAC.

Questions and discussion followed concerning the shipping and receiving facility, the shipping containers, and funding. Mr. Willoughby made the point that a previous recommendation dealing with WV waste (#51) had to do with transfer of radioactive material among sites. It passed with a vote of seven for the motion, six against it, and six abstaining.

Mr. Holcomb stated that the CAB would have to word the recommendation to define "shipment." The CAB would have to word the recommendation in such a way so that SRS would be shipping out more waste than they would be receiving. Mr. Lawless stated that the CAB is asking for two equitable shipments out for every one that it receives. A discussion of shipments and shipment definition followed. Several word changes were made.

Next the group discussed the "Comparison Study of Radioactivity Disposal" recommendation (see attachment). Much discussion revolved around the WIR lawsuit ruling and public policy. Mr. Lawless suggested clarifying by saying at some later time, the public policy needs to be established.

The group agreed to delete recommendation #1 since it is already being done. Mr. Lawless's concern is that DOE would capitulate and not appeal and the worst case scenario would result. He is concerned about the state of affairs. In addition, he believes that this could stop the day to day process. The lawsuit states that anything that comes into contact with HLW is indeed HLW itself. The CAB doesn't want DOE to see this as a roadblock to cleanup.

Mr. Waters suggested that the CAB write a strong letter to the appropriate officials and include a wide distribution. The group agreed to table this motion. Several members agreed to meet with Mr. McLeod after the meeting to outline several points for a letter and present to the full CAB the following day.

### **SRS Environmental Monitoring**

Jim Heffner and Pete Fledderman of WSRC, provided an educational briefing on the site's

environmental monitoring program (see attachment). They discussed the history of the site's program, the environmental philosophy, monitoring descriptions and 2002 program results. SRS has a long history of environmental monitoring activities and a comprehensive monitoring program as well as a clear understanding of dose impacts to the public. Environmental monitoring characterizes and quantifies contaminants to demonstrate compliance with applicable standards. Mr. Heffner discussed the state and federal regulations that drive program requirements; explained contaminant pathways; and described the types of surveillance samples showing pictures of how samples are retrieved from the environment. Pete Fledderman presented SRS highlights from the program in 2002 noting that liquid doses are down slightly, airborne dose remains constant, toxic chemical releases are down and the Clean Air Act compliance rate is 98 percent. SRS received four notices of violation under the Clean Water Act and one under the Clean Air Act in 2002. For 2002, the radiation dose to the public living near SRS is well below DOE's 100-mrem/year standard and downriver water consumers is well below EPA's 4-mrem/year standard.

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

## **Tuesday, July 22, 2003 Attendance**

### **SRS CAB Members**

Meryl Alalof  
Donna Antonucci  
Jennifer Barrington  
Gerald Devitt  
Mary Drye  
Mel Galin  
Perry Holcomb  
Bill Lawless  
William Lawrence  
Wendell Lyon  
Darryl Nettles  
Harold Rahn  
Dorene Richardson  
Murray Riley  
DeAnne Smoak  
Jean Sulc  
Bill Voegelé  
Wade Waters  
Gloria Williams-Way  
Bill Willoughby

### **Ex-Officio Members**

Alice Doswell, DOE  
Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC  
Robert Pope, EPA  
Dawn Taylor, EPA

### **Stakeholders/Regulators**

Bill Krecker, SCDHEC  
Ann Clark, SCDHEC  
Mary Lou Robinson  
Val Loiselle  
Bob Meisenhaumer  
Dell Isham  
Sarah Williams  
May Samuel  
Barbara Paul  
Jacob Jordan  
David Adcock  
Don Moniak

### **DOE /Contractor**

Sandra Waisley, DOE-HQ  
Ken Bromberg, DOE-HQ  
Sterling Franks, DOE  
Jeff Allison, DOE  
Kevin Hall, DOE  
Wade Whitaker, DOE  
Fran Williams, WSRC  
Rick Ford, DOE  
Joan Bozonne, DOE  
Joe Carter, WSRC  
John Dickenson, WSRC  
Sonny Goldston, WSRC  
Paul Huber, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC  
Dawn Haygood, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC  
Kelly Way, WSRC  
Tiajuana Cochnauer, USFS

SRS CAB members Leon Chavous, Ann Dalton, Lola Richardson and Carolayne Williams were unable to attend. The meeting opened with Alice Doswell, DOE, serving as Designated Federal Official. Mike Schoener served as facilitator and the Board's Technical Advisor Rick McLeod was also present. The meeting was open to the public and posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

### **Key Decisions Made by the Board**

**Recommendation 165 - SRS National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)** The SRS CAB recommends DOE work with SCDHEC to gain a minimum 3-year period and maximum 5-year period for monitoring designated outfalls that may be affected by the new limit prescribed under the revised NPDES permit. It also requests that SRS provide a schedule for a developing a cost-benefit analysis which demonstrates water quality impacts versus the cost to achieve compliance. The recommendation also addresses the need for DOE to work with SCDHEC to develop a more reasonable approach to regulating discharges into ephemeral streams such as site specific standards. Progress reports to the Board are requested by September 22, 2003.

**Recommendation 166 - Historic Preservation at SRS** The Board asks SRS and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to expand public involvement by holding public workshops and/or educational information meetings where input from the public and former SRS workers is collected and the appropriate information on important artifacts and historic facilities is included in the historic preservation Programmatic Agreement (PA). It also asks SRS to submit a draft PA for stakeholder review prior to finalizing the agreement with SHPO.

**Recommendation 167 - Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D) Plan** In support of the Environmental Management Integrated Deactivation and Decommissioning Plan, the SRS CAB recommends that DOE ensures the D&D Program is focused on risk reduction and mitigation, not merely on reduction of the site "footprint". The recommendation also addresses the Board's concern that SRS should concentrate efforts to remove all principal sources of hazards (source terms) as the first part of the D&D activities and incorporate this concept in the next Plan revision. The Board also asks SRS to continue to press for funds to implement the program per the timeline in the Integrated D&D Plan.

**Recommendation 168 - R Reactor Seepage Basin** The SRS CAB supports the R-Reactor Seepage Basin Proposed Plans and the preferred alternatives including the use of mixing zones, where applicable for remedial actions. The SRS CAB recommends DOE work with SCDHEC to avoid any costly and ineffective remedial system, such as pump and treat and re-inject, for contaminated groundwater in the R-Reactor Seepage Basins area.

**Recommendation 169 - Draft West Valley Demonstration Project (WVDP) Waste Management EIS** Upon review of the draft EIS, the SRS CAB asks that as precursors to the receipt of this waste, SRS ensure adequate TRU waste storage and funding be made available to handle the additional costs. A second glass waste canister storage building should be operational prior to receipt of such waste. The Board also asks SRS to place the high activity TRU waste on a priority disposal schedule with the appropriate certified and licensed shipping containers. Further, the Board recommends that for every volume of WVDP TRU waste received by SRS, a shipment of high activity SRS TRU waste equal to twice the receiving volume be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP). It is also recommended that waste shipped to SRS for temporary storage is packaged according to WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria without the need for additional processing.

### **Agency Update**

Keith Collinsworth, SCDHEC, reported on the SRS budget, which required regulator commitment to support accelerated cleanup. All parties have signed a letter of commitment and a memorandum of agreement to agency cooperation was signed June 23. Mr. Collinsworth also reported on SCDHEC testimony regarding the recent GAO review of the high level waste program. Mike Wilson from the State of Washington and David Wilson of SC testified before a congressional committee. Mr. Collinsworth offered to provide the testimony for the CAB and noted further clarification is needed of the issue. He commented that if draft legislation is required, this should be an open process.

Dawn Taylor, EPA, also commented on the Memorandum of Agreement, noting the agencies are working fast and furious. She stated EPA is hoping to hire two new people in the near future.

Jeff Allison, Site Manager, also noted the collaborative effort to craft the commitment letter that released \$52 million dollars for the SRS budget. Mr. Allison provided an approved organization chart and briefed the CAB on new assignments at SRS. Mr. Allison also acknowledged concerns regarding the WIR ruling, noting the impacts to the entire complex range from minor to severe. He stated DOE is awaiting guidance from HQ. Mr. Allison also stated that as soon as DOE can share the Deactivation Plan for F Canyon, they will. Mr. Allison noted there are several fairly significant issues, in a sensitive time, and CAB support was needed to work through these issues.

Later in the morning, Alice Doswell also addressed the Memorandum of Agreement, which provides a common SCDHEC/EPA-4/SRS vision on how to reach area closures and National Priority List deletions and aligns facility decommissioning and environmental restoration work. She noted the Area Closure Core Team had been established and was working to streamline ER documentation by 30 percent. A complete comprehensive cleanup plan and Federal Facility Agreement milestones are expected by September 30.

### **Public Comment**

Del Isham, Executive Director of SC Chapter of Sierra Club

Mr. Isham stated he is interested in CAB activities and thanked the Board for coming to Columbia, a central location where they could see the activities. He stated he appreciated the fact that the CAB moves its meetings around SC and GA and stated he hoped the board returned.

Bill Lawless stated that Lana Sindler of Columbia, S.C. asked for info about plant evacuation plans and emergency preparedness.

### **Facilitator Update**

Mike Schoener presented the Recommendation Summary Report (see attached). Fifteen recommendations are pending, three open and 146 closed. The Board is awaiting responses from EPA and SCDHEC. Keith Collinsworth provided a response to Recommendation 161.

### **National Nuclear Security Administration**

Ken Bromberg, DOE, provided a briefing on the National Nuclear Security Administration (see attachment). He discussed fissile materials disposition and noted the locations with surplus fissile

materials. He noted that NNSA is not principally directed at cleanup activities. The NNSA program goals are to dispose of 174 metric tons of surplus U.S. high enriched uranium, to dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons grade U.S. plutonium, to work with Russia to dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade Russian plutonium. He discussed the U.S. strategy for disposition of highly enriched uranium and plutonium. The strategy for plutonium disposition includes two facilities to be constructed at SRS- the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility and the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility. Many alternatives were originally considered including sending it to the sun, burning it in the ocean, and subarctic disposal. The original plan included three facilities, one for immobilization, however life-cycle costs of the three- facilities would have been \$6 billion, therefore immobilization was dropped. The Russians also had concerns about the immobilization alternative.

In the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility, polished plutonium oxide will be mixed with uranium oxide and resulting oxide and resulting mixed oxide will be formed into pellets that are loaded into MOX fuel assemblies. It will dispose of 3.5 tons of MOX per year. MOX fuel will be irradiated in U.S. commercial reactors operated by Duke Power. Once irradiated, the plutonium will meet the spent fuel standard, making it inaccessible and unattractive for retrieval and weapons use.

Sterling Franks, DOE Nuclear Nonproliferation Manager at SRS, discussed the U.S. plutonium disposition facilities schedule, and provided further details on the two facilities. The Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility is an entombed facility that will require 109,000 cubic yards of concrete and 7,780 tons of reinforcing steel. It will be approximately 278,000 square feet and employ 450 individuals. The facility will package plutonium oxide to send to the MOX facility. It is being designed by Washington Group International and design is 60 percent complete.

At the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility, polished plutonium oxide will be mixed with uranium oxide and the resulting mixed oxide formed into pellets. The pellets will be loaded into MOX fuel assemblies to be used as fuel in commercial power reactors. This facility is being designed by Duke Cogema Stone&Webster and design is over 70 percent complete.

Discussion revolved around the use of commercial nuclear reactors, the need for any new reactors (not needed), and labor forces, which will be a mix of current and new employees. SRS has plutonium handling and glovebox experience, which was one of the primary reasons that SR was selected for the PCDF. Board members questioned if NNSA would utilize citizens input. Mr. Bromberg responded that NNSA has received tens of thousands of comments, operate a website and held over one hundred public meetings in the siting of these facilities. He asked for clarification of what was expected and noted he would entertain ideas however the program is on a very tight schedule. There was a great deal of discussion regarding the benefits of public involvement for DOE and the site specific advisory boards.

Board members questioned safeguards in place to ensure Russia is meeting its commitments, the risk factors associated with the projects, and schedule impacts resulting from the agreement with Russia.



### **Strategic Initiatives Committee**

Mel Galin, Committee Chair, presented a draft motion for the SRS National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit Revision (see attachment). The motion asked that DOE work with SCDHEC to gain a monitoring schedule between three and five years for designated outfalls that may be affected by the new hardness limit under the revised NPDES permit and allow SRS to use this data to develop a cost-benefit analysis, which demonstrates water quality impacts versus the cost to achieve compliance. Following discussion and brief changes, Murray Riley moved the board adopt the recommendation and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion was passed by a vote of 17 in favor and two opposed.

Mel Galin presented a second draft motion on historic preservation at SRS (see attachment). It recommended that more public workshops or educational information meetings be included where input from the public and former SRS workers is specifically collected and the appropriate information on important artifacts and historic facilities is included in the historic preservation effort agreement. Bill Lawless moved the Board adopt the recommendations and William Lawrence seconded. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.

### **WSRC Contract Modifications**

Bill Johnson, WSRC, provided a presentation on the modifications in WSRC's contract at SRS (see attachment). Mr. Johnson noted that EM desired a more aggressive approach to accelerate cleanup and reduce risks/liabilities. Contract renegotiation began in February. There are two customers- EM and NNSA. There was no change to the NNSA scope or requirements for performance-based incentives. The EM scope and requirements were restructured into a single performance incentive. Contract terms run through September 30, 2006 with an option to extend for up to two months.

Mr. Johnson discussed the advantages of the contract modification, contract scope focus on end states, management challenges and how performance will be measured. He discussed high level waste disposition, waste solidification, liquid waste disposition, nuclear material stabilization and significant accomplishments in each of these areas.

### **Public Comments**

#### **Don Moniak, Aiken, S.C.**

Mr. Moniak commented that before you buy into accelerated cleanup, you must realize cleanup is driven by many things, including bonuses for the brass. He stated that at Rocky Flats, corners were cut and more worker exposures were accepted. He discussed how in 1998 DOE was shipping pits from Rocky Flats to Pantex, and it was getting toward September and workers were getting tired, and one manager wrote we should slow down in a memo to another manager. The other manager said I think we can get through, the bonus incentive is coming up. Mr. Moniak commented that fatigue is a serious safety issue. He questioned the relation in accelerated cleanup to pit production. Mr. Moniak commented there is potential for it to be built underground, stating that while there is no requirement now, it could change, and clearly there are thoughts about this. He said this puts WIPP and Nevada on the list or otherwise it doesn't make much sense. Mr. Moniak said that some of the governors closest friends have been advocating for pit production for years. He stated the PDCF is part of a Modern Pit Facility and if you think it's not true its just mind boggling. PCFD and Modern Pit, who in congress would

accept that kind of redundancy, he asked. Mr. Moniak stated he was the 99<sup>th</sup> person to speak at the Modern Pit Facility hearing. The Augusta paper pictured protestors, which gave him a chuckle. SRS was at the front end of the weapons program, but they are far away from Rocky Flats, he said. Mr. Moniak noted the incredible amount of misinformation put out by the Department. He said not to confuse product reliability with military requirements. We have 20,000 pits in country, many not good for weapons anymore, he said.

#### **Sarah Williams, Columbia, S.C.**

Ms. Williams stated her disappointment in the Modern Pit Facility hearing and stated she thought the public was being railroaded by DOE. She said she feels like Alice in Wonderland here today.

#### **DOE-Headquarters Designated Federal Officer Report**

Sandra Waisley, Designated Federal Officer for the SSABs discussed the EM Reorganization, 2004 budget and the SRS CAB success stories. Ms. Waisley served on Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson's reorganization committee. The Secretary ordered a top-to-bottom review in 2002, which required significant changes. The new organization is a matrixed organization to get employees out of stovepipes and encourage coordination and interaction. It's a fully integrated organization that encourages more creative thinking and strategy. She walked through the new organization chart and explained the responsibilities of the various offices. The reorganization package is complete and going to union this week and DOE hopes to implement in August. The benefits of the new organization is the removal of stovepipes, roles and responsibilities will be more clear, less redundancy, and more focus on accelerated cleanup.

Ms. Waisley noted the SRS CAB Success Stories and provided observations. She stated she was pleased by the fifteen examples provided and expounded with comments and questions on many of the stories.

Ms. Waisley commented that the projected budget from the EM complex is \$7.24 billion in 2004. Funding request continues with great progress. Funding will peak in 2005 and then decline to \$5 billion in 2008. SR funding will be \$1.43 billion in FY04. Cleanup is anticipated 30 years earlier in 2035 with lifecycle savings of \$50 billion. Ms. Waisley reiterated that EM and Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson are committed to the SSABs. She stated SRS CAB funding will be \$349,000 in FY04.

Board members questioned if the SSAB Charter would be renewed and Ms. Waisley stated she was confident it would be renewed. Board members also expressed concern regarding the boundaries of the Board charter, noting they understood the boundary, but as NNSA activities increase and more interest emerges from the public, the Board would like for EM to work with NNSA to determine public involvement in NNSA activities. Bill Lawless moved that a Focus Group be formed to provide ideas on citizens involvement in NNSA issues. He suggested that Wade Waters chair this Focus Group. Nineteen members were in favor. (However, it was later determined that this does not fall within the scope of the CAB, and a small group of CAB members will work to draft a letter to share lessons learned.)

#### **Environmental Restoration Committee**

Perry Holcomb, Committee Chair, moved the name of the ER committee be changed to Facilities

Disposition & Site Remediation. Bill Lawless seconded. Nineteen members were in favor. Mr. Holcomb presented a draft motion on the SRS Integrated Deactivation and Decommissioning Plan (see attached) that recommended DOE-HQ and DOE-SR ensure the SRS D&D Program is focused on risk reduction and mitigation and not merely on reducing the site footprint. It also recommended that SRS concentrate efforts to remove all principal sources of hazards as the first part of the D&D activities and incorporate this concept in the next plan revision. It also asks that SRS continue to press for budgetary funds to implement the D&D Program per the timeline in the plan. Perry Holcomb moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion was adopted by a vote of 18 in favor.

Perry Holcomb presented a second draft motion regarding the R Reactor Seepage Basin Proposed Plan (see attached). The motion supports the proposed plan and preferred alternatives and supports the use of mixing zones, where applicable for remedial actions. It recommends continued cooperation between SRS and SCDHEC to avoid any costly and ineffective remedial system, such as pump-and-treat and reinject for contaminated groundwater in the R Reactor Seepage Basins. Bill Lawless moved the motion and Mary Drye seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 17 in favor and two abstentions by Mel Galin and Gerald Devitt.

### **Waste Management Committee**

Bill Willoughby noted that although the charter of the CIF Focus Group had expired, an issue has arisen that needs further consideration. The Focus Group is now looking with WSRC at alternatives to address the situation and asked for an extension of the focus group for six months. This was granted.

Bill Lawless presented a draft motion regarding the West Valley Demonstration Project Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (see attachment). Upon review of the draft EIS, the SRS CAB asks that as precursors to the receipt of this waste, SRS ensure adequate TRU waste storage and funding be made available to handle the additional costs. A second glass waste canister storage building should be operational prior to receipt of such waste. The Board also asks SRS to place the high activity TRU waste on a priority disposal schedule with the appropriate certified and licensed shipping containers. Further, the Board recommends that for every volume of WVDP TRU waste received by SRS, a shipment of high activity SRS TRU waste equal to twice the receiving volume be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP). It is also recommended that waste shipped to SRS for temporary storage be packaged according to WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria without the need for additional processing. Bill Vogeles moved the Board adopt the motion and Bill Willoughby seconded. The motion passed with a vote of nineteen members in favor.

Bill Willoughby presented comments (see attached) that the SRS CAB consider for inclusion in a letter to DOE regarding the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing lawsuit. He asked the Board for the authority to draft the letter for signature by the Board Chair and WM Committee Chair. Bill Willoughby moved the board agree to drafting the letter regarding the WIR ruling. Bill Lawless seconded the motion. Nineteen members were in favor of the motion.

### **Nuclear Materials Committee**

The next meeting of the NM Committee will take place August 18 at 5 p.m. at the Aiken Federal

Building. The topics will be a recent DNFSB letter regarding F Canyon. The disposition path for plutonium at SRS is the second topic for discussion.

### **Administrative Committee**

In Lola Richardson's absence, Wade Waters presented a proposal to amend the Board Bylaws. The Administrative Committee agreed that officer elections should be moved to November or the last meeting of the year with the new leaders taking office in at the end of the January meeting. Perry Holcomb moved the Board adopt the amendment and Bill Lawless seconded. The motion passed with nineteen members in favor. The Administrative Committee also agreed to revert back to the original method of election with the Chair and Vice Chair as two separate positions on the ballot. Bill Vogele moved the Board adopt this suggestion and Meryl Alalof seconded. Nineteen members were in favor of this change as well.

Mr. Waters stated that the Administrative Committee had determined that the Board demographics were still consistent and that 12 females and eight African Americans should still be required. The Administrative Committee is however proposing a change to the membership categories that removes the "at least" requirements in a category, but sets maximum limits so that the Board does not become dominated by any one category, he said. Gerald Devitt moved the Board adopt the bylaws amendment and Darryl Nettles seconded the changes to membership categories. Nineteen members were in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Waters reported that after a great deal of discussion, the Administrative Committee decided on an alternative approach to a candidate interview panel, which is to improve the current phone interviews by conducting interviews with all applicants prior to candidate selections. Interviews will be conducted by CAB members in lieu of staff in September. Membership selection will take place in late October.

### **Process Retreat Actions**

Mike Schoener noted that the committee guidelines had been adopted by the Executive Committee.

Mel Galin noted the Strategic Initiatives Committee had changed its name to Strategic & Legacy Management.

There was also brief discussion regarding ex-officio representation and the State of Georgia. Mr. Galin noted that James Sanders had been selected for political as well as technical considerations and now there is a new governor. He wants to determine the interest and status of Dr. Sanders and see if a new ex-officio member from Georgia should be sought.

### **Public Comments**

#### **Don Moniak, Aiken, S.C.**

Mr. Moniak commented on the CAB meeting schedule and locations and asked why the board did not meet in the New Ellenton community center. He stated there is new information out regarding the concerns of the DNFSB. He stated he was surprised it was available since not much is any more. It refers to long term storage at K reactor and increased surveillance requirements. The characterization of the anomalies in plutonium surplus seem to have been

overlooked, he said, and is high for Rocky Flats materials. All will meet 3013 standard but some are pushing it, he said. Mr. Moniak stated that many don't like pushing the envelope. Last year at Rocky Flats, there was a furnace failure that was quite a site the slag it produced, he said. This was unexpected. Lot of unexpected things happen there, he said. If you just ask, they may give it to you, but I'm not going to give you the web site because they might shut it down, he said. If you want to understand safety you have to bulk download and then the Greenville News bulk downloads and then it's shutdown. An employee from Idaho wanted info on SRS because there was nothing in the reading room, he said. Mr. Moniak commented that information is the basis for being an activist. The Pantex CAB is no more, which was a happy day when they shutdown, he stated. He said he was proud to be blocked from that CAB. He asked who on the SRS CAB is an environmental activist and what environmental group or movement they represent. Mr. Moniak also commented that the CAB does not have a local landowner category. He thanked the CAB for having public comments at various times. He said Pantex always made you wait until the end.

## **Handouts**

- Agenda, July 21-22, 2003
- SRS National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Renewal, Bill Payne, WSRC
- SRS National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Revision, Mel Galin, CAB
- Historic Preservation at SRS, Mel Galin, CAB
- Deactivation and Decommissioning Plan, Perry Holcomb, CAB
- R Reactor Seepage Basins, Bruce Schappell, BSRI
- R Reactor Seepage Basin, Perry Holcomb, CAB
- Draft WVDP Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement, Bill Willoughby, CAB
- Comparison Study of Radioactivity Disposal, Bill Willoughby, CAB
- An Overview of SRS Environmental Monitoring Program, Jim Heffner, WSRC
- Operations Update, July 2003
- DHEC Memorandum of Agreement for Achieving an Accelerated Cleanup Vision
- Office of Fissile Materials Disposition, National Nuclear Security Administration
- SRS CAB Recommendation Summary
- Modifications in WSRC's Contract at SRS, Bill Johnson, WSRC
- WIR Lawsuit Response Letter Outline, Bill Willoughby, CAB
- Summary of Proposal to Amend the SRS CAB Bylaws, July 22, 2003
- Statement of Jessie Roberson before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
- NEPA Report
- SRS CAB Calendar