



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Nuclear Materials Committee Meeting Summary

**Aiken Federal Building, Aiken, SC
April 14, 2003**

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Nuclear Materials Committee (NMC) met on Monday, April 14, 2003, at the Aiken Federal Building, Aiken, SC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the following topics: the NEPA Decision by DOE for the F-Canyon Complex Deactivation Project, the Nuclear Materials Committee 2003 Work Plan, and to hear public comment. Attendance was as follows:

CAB Members

Jerry Devitt*
Murray Riley*
Wade Waters*

Stakeholders

Mike French
Karen Daily
Russ Messick
Lee Poe

DOE/Contractors

George Klipa, DOE
George Mishra, DOE
Julie Petersen, DOE
Drew Grainger, DOE
Phil Breidenbach, WSRC
John Dickenson, WSRC
Bill Condon, WSRC
Teresa Haas, WSRC
P. K. Hightower, WSRC
Ross Fanning, WSRC
Barry Shedrow, WSRC
Jack Mayer, WSRC
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC

* NMC Members present

** Note: Perry Holcomb, William Lawrence, and Bill Willoughby are CAB members of the NMC, but were unable to attend this session.

Welcome and Introduction

Jerry Devitt, NMC Chair, welcomed the group, requested that each attendee introduce themselves and their affiliation. He introduced the evening's presenter as Lee Poe, a stakeholder who wished to voice his concerns about the site's interpretation of meeting the requirements established by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) relative to F-Canyon.

F-Canyon Complex Deactivation Project – NEPA Decision by DOE

Lee Poe opened his presentation reminding the committee of the February 20 briefing by Phil Breidenbach in Aiken, SC. During that meeting, Mr. Breidenbach had said that through their analysis SRS had determined that the ongoing suspension activities as well as the proposed activities for the deactivation of F-Canyon were in full compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Mr. Poe challenged the position that NEPA requirements have been adequately met. Mr. Poe stated that in his opinion terms such as deactivation and suspension are confusing, and he felt that the communication with stakeholders should be improved. He acknowledged that the CAB has supported suspension with a recent recommendation but he questions the final state in which F-Canyon and FB-Line will be left. He feels that the envisioned "end-use" of those facilities has not been properly defined. While he doesn't disagree with the premise to reduce costs, Mr. Poe felt it was unclear to stakeholders what would actually be done to F-Canyon and FB-Line. He then reviewed the deactivation project key points and identified several documents that he felt should be given to stakeholders.

When questioned about the status of those requested documents, George Klipa replied that while the request for the documents had been received, DOE had not yet approved these documents. The document request had been evaluated by DOE and it was determined that the documents would not be released to the public until they are first reviewed and approved. Mr. Klipa further stated that it is not anticipated that the documents would be approved unless a formal deactivation order is issued. Mr. Poe reiterated his request for the documents and asked DOE to seek more stakeholder involvement in these plans.

Mr. Poe detailed his long experience with F-Canyon and challenged the assumption that the categorical exclusions (CXs) used to document the suspension and deactivation plans were appropriate. He felt the CXs are only checklists that are a subjective analysis, which are not suitable for the actions proposed for F-Canyon. He further explained some of the factors included in the CXs. Mr. Poe said that in his judgement, shutting down F-Canyon is a major decision by DOE and by definition would require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He referenced the requirements found in the Code of Federal Regulations and the Council of Environmental Quality NEPA Guidance that he believed supported his position.

Mr. Poe reminded the committee of CAB Recommendation 156, F-Canyon Suspension and questioned the adequacy of the DOE response. During a discussion about CAB Recommendation #156 this recommendation, F-Canyon Suspension, Wade Waters stated that Mr. Poe was incorrect in his assumption that DOE had not provided a response for item 2 and 3 of that recommendation. It was stated The committee was reminded of that the information provided in the December 19, 2002 meeting by WSRC and DOE it had been determined by Mr. Ken Goad, former NM Committee Chair, to meet the intent of those parts of the recommendation.

Mr. Poe concluded his presentation with a series of recommendations. While he felt that the deactivation work for F-Canyon and FB-Line should proceed, he requested that DOE involve stakeholders immediately in the process and begin an end-state analysis of the facilities.

A series of questions ensued about the status and mission of the various stabilization facilities in F and H Areas and answers were provided by DOE and WSRC representatives. Key points raised during the discussion included the following:

1. In response to a question about the approach used to close other facilities at SRS, Drew Grainger responded that it varied depending on the nature of the facility. He emphasized

that we don't know enough about the end-state of F-Canyon to make a NEPA determination.

2. Mr. Grainger said he was confident in the evaluation made for suspension and deactivation. When challenged by Mr. Poe, both Mr. Klipa and Mr. Grainger stated the decisions made up to this point have not prejudiced the final end state determination. Mr. Grainger emphasized that additional NEPA evaluations would be made before any decommissioning decisions would be made.
3. When asked if DOE had looked at the various facility issues that Lee Poe had raised such as contaminated ducts, Mr. Klipa responded that work is in progress and he felt they were on a solid basis.
4. Mr. Klipa said work is ongoing with the DNFSB to resolve their differences and any facility end state determination was premature.
5. When asked that the site develop an end state vision of what F-Canyon and FB-Line would look like in 2006, it was restated by Mr. Klipa that the facilities' state for 2006 had been described as cold, dark and dry but that was not a final end state.
6. It was acknowledged that suspension activities are ongoing and Mr. Klipa emphasized that while the deactivation of F-Canyon in 2006 was a goal, there is no current authorization to pursue such an activity. He further stated that DOE wants to continue to work with the CAB on F-Canyon issues as they had for the last year, but are not ready to discuss potential deactivation activities any further because no decision has been made to pursue deactivation.

Mr. Poe restated his desire for DOE to prepare an EIS and to get a formal DOE Record of Decision (ROD) for the end state analysis or to more completely justify why the EIS is not needed. He asked the Nuclear Materials Committee to support his position and to ask the CAB to support these actions in a formal recommendation. In response, Mr. Devitt responded that the committee would continue to monitor the progress of F-Canyon suspension.

Nuclear Materials Work Plan for 2003

Jerry Devitt asked the committee if they had reviewed the Nuclear Materials portion of the CAB 2003 Workplan. The majority of those in attendance indicated they had not. Mr. Devitt suggested that this item be deferred for a later meeting but asked that those in attendance review it and provide any feedback they may have.

Public Comment

Mr. Devitt requested if the public had any comments at this time. With no other public comments, the meeting was adjourned.

For additional information or meeting handouts, call 1-800-249-8155.

Follow-Up Actions

Wade Waters stated that they are willing to work with DOE on all issues but they want early stakeholder involvement. To provide feedback, he wants the site to provide an end state vision. Action: Provide additional information on F-Canyon end state composite analysis for site to NMC members. Responsible Party: George Klipa